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THE HEARING RESUMED ON WEDNESDAY, 12TH JULY 2017 AS FOLLOWS:

MR. MCGUINNESS: Sir, this morning we are continuing with the evidence of Ms. Kay McLough1in.

## MS. KAY MCLOUGHLIN CONTINUED TO BE EXAMINED BY

 MR. MCGUINNESS AS FOLLOWS:1 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: Thank you, Ms. McLoughlin. Yesterday, 09:30 I was asking you about the Maurice McCabe file. And, had you ever seen it before you went to it in May of 2015?
A. No, not to my knowledge, I can't recall seeing it prior to that.
2 Q. Okay. Now, yesterday I reminded you that in your statement you said that after you were appointed in October you started reviewing the unallocated files?
A. That's correct.

3 Q. Perhaps sometime before Christmas of 2014, is that
A. That's correct.

4 Q. And had you had any discussion at that stage with anyone about the Maurice McCabe file?
A. No, I don't recall having any conversation with anyone. 09:31

5 Q. OK. And certainly, may the Tribunal take it that you had no discussion with any Gardaí about it at that time?
A. No, not prior to when I took over my responsibilities
for the duty intake team at that time.
6 Q. okay. And when did you first then come across the Maurice McCabe file as part of your review?
A. Well, I prepared lists of cases that were unallocated using the MTP database, which is Measuring the Pressure.

7 Q. Yes.
A. So I highlighted cases for -- to be reviewed by the review team. I don't know if I said this yesterday: I highlighted cases that were of a high priority to follow up on first and then I looked at older cases after that.
8 Q. Okay. So it's not the case that you went to the filing cabinet, as it were, and selected the Maurice McCabe file?
A. No. Not at the first point, no.

9 Q. So, you first selected the group of high priority cases on --
A. Yes.

10 Q. -- the Measuring the Pressure list, is that right?
A. Yes, yes, children primarily.

11 Q. And having dealt with those you selected ones of medium priority?
A. Well, I focused on medium priority then and I focused on cases that were there the longest waiting allocation.

12 Q. Okay. Now, which one did Sergeant McCabe's file fall into?
A. Well, he fell into the one who was waiting a longer
period of time for allocation. It was there since 2013.

13 Q. All right. Now, I was asking you about the priority of the case and had it been, in fact, marked or designated with any form of priority?
A. I can't remember specifically, but I don't believe it was marked with high priority.
14 Q. okay. Well, you obviously reviewed it to some extent at that time and then later obviously in 2016, was there any form of priority marked on it or on the Measuring the Pressure system entry relating to it?
A. Well, as I said, I can't remember specifically. It could have been low or medium, I'm not sure.
15 Q. okay. You see, the file as it is doesn't carry Sergeant McCabe's name on the exterior cover of the file, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

16 Q. So if you were choosing it or selecting it deliberately out of the filing cabinet you would have to know the file number, wouldn't you?
A. Yes, the file number is on the measuring the Pressure database.
17 Q. Okay. And you can find it easily then in the filing cabinet with the filing number?
A. That's correct.

18 Q. And is that what you did?
A. Yes.

19 Q. Okay. Now, the Tribunal is anxious to know what you saw on the file when you commenced this review and
before you wrote your email to Gerry Lowry and Séamus Deeney. Would you agree with me it appears no work was done on the file before you got to it in 2015?
A. Well, it hadn't been allocated other than a letter being sent to the Gardaí in 2013. I didn't review it. 09:34 I, at that time -- it was selected by me for review, and I -- you know, when we met to review files, we all would have a bundle of maybe 20 or 30 files and we would pick one each to go through. I don't believe that I went through the Maurice McCabe file on that date in May 2015.
20 Q. We11, you see, in your email you say you have been reviewing files on the MTP today, "one relates to Maurice McCabe"?
A. Yes.

21 Q. So --
A. Séamus, I believe Séamus completed a review form the previous day to that email, and he highlighted some actions on it. I wanted it to be brought to Gerry Lowry's attention because I was concerned that it had been a long time waiting for the service to be followed up with.
22 Q. Are you referring to a case review form that is unsigned relating to the file?
A. I think it's signed.

23 Q. You think it's signed?
A. I think it's signed.

24 Q. okay. Well, in any event, the Tribunal is anxious to know what was on the file at the time that you were
commencing the review or had begun the review, and we have extracted all the documents that were on it --
A. Yes.

25 Q. -- and should have been apparently on it as of the end of 2014?
A. Yes.

26 Q. And I would be anxious for your assistance in this regard. Could you go to page 2009 -- sorry, 2209. It's in volume 9 of the documents. And do you see the cover file there?
A. Yes.

27 Q. okay. And then on the next page is the inner sheet which has been stapled on to the cover file?
A. Yes.

28 Q. And there is a large number of folders then --
A. That's correct.

29 Q. -- into which documents are included, and in the order, these appear in the order in which it was provided to the Tribunal, and these are documents which appear to have been on the file in 2013 and by the end of 2014 ?
A. Okay.

30 Q. Do you understand that? Do you?
A. Yes.

31 Q. And you have seen these before?
A. Yes.

32 Q. Now, the first document at 2212, that is the first intake record for one of the McCabes children, is that correct?
A. I haven't seen it yet but, yes.

33 Q. 2212. And the details of the report are at part 7 at the end of that.
A. Yes.

34 Q. And that contains the incorrect allegation?
A. Yes, that's correct. And that was at the front, I believe, of the --
35 Q. And 2213 is the next page.
A. Yes.

36 Q. And 2214 then is the next intake record with the same details.
A. Yes.

37 Q. 2215 and 2216 are there.
A. Yes.

38 Q. And then those intake records continue into 2217 and 2218. So there is seven pages of intake records?
A. Yes.

39 Q. One might call them, I suppose, four different documents.
A. Yes.

40 Q. The next document is the original intake record.
A. Yes.

41 Q. And you have seen that before, relating to Mr. McCabe?
A. Yes.

42 Q. And you have seen that that doesn't contain the incorrect allegation, isn't that right, at the bottom in part 7 ?
A. Yes.

43 Q. Now, that continues to page 2222, but the next actual document is page 2224, and this is a draft of the Garda notification that was sent.
A. Yes.

44 Q. Intended to be sent, certainly. Updated 2nd May of 2014.
A. Yes.

45 Q. And did you see that at that time?
A. I can't remember whether $I$ seen that at that time.

46 Q. Okay. We11, certainly at the top of the second page at 2225 , it records the error having been reported by Ms. Brophy it.
A. It says that there was an error, yes. It doesn't say what the error was.

47 Q. Yes. We will come to that. The next document is at page 2227. And that is the signed copy of the original erroneous notification dated 2nd of May, which is the file copy, the original of which was sent to the Gardaí, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

48 Q. That contains the erroneous allegation?
A. Yes.

49 Q. Now, did you see that at that time?
A. It's possible I did.

50 Q. Yes. At page 2229, this is an undated, unsigned and would appear to be the first draft of the Garda notification that became the draft sent on 2nd of May, 09:41 and that contains the erroneous allegation, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

51 Q. Now the next document, 2231, that is Laura Connolly's
email to Linda enclosing a draft for Garda circulation, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

52 Q. Do you remember seeing that document?
A. I can't -- at that time, I can't remember having seen that document.
53 Q. Okay. At page 2235, this is Ms. Connolly's note of her seeking instruction from Ms. Argue about the intake of the McCabe children, do you recall seeing that?
A. At that time I can't remember having seen that. It's 09:42 possible I did but I can't remember.
54 Q. okay. At page 2237, this is a copy of the email from Ms. Brophy to Ms. Argue of the 16th May, referring to their conversation about the error. Do you recall having seen that at this point in time?
A. No, I don't believe I read that at that time.

55 Q. At page 2238, at the bottom of the page, this is the email from Pamela Armitage to Eileen Argue.
A. Yes.

56 Q. Which is the first record of Laura Brophy's contact with Tusla, which details the error that was identified and it clearly specifies what the error was, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct, yes. I did not have sight of that, I did not read that at that time.
57 Q. Yes. Now, just to be clear, do you accept that all of these documents were actually on the file in 2014?
A. Yes, yes.

58 Q. Okay. And available for you to read if --
A. Yes, they were.

59 Q. And did you see, and do you see, at the top of that page Ms. Argue sent that on to Mr. Lowry?
A. Yes, I seen that, yes.

60 Q. Yes. On that day, some eight minutes after she had received it.
A. Yes, I did not review that at that point.

61 Q. Okay. We11, would it appear that Mr. Lowry knew of the error at that point in time if he had read this email?
A. It would appear from that email, yes.

62 Q. The next document is 2241 , which is the amended report sent in by Ms. Brophy dated the 14th of May of 2014. Do you recall seeing that?
A. I can't recall.

63 Q. Okay. And I think you can see on the screen there, it describes the alleged complaint in the way in which it had originally been described?
A. That's correct.

64 Q. And doesn't contain the error?
A. That's correct.

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

66 Q. That is a two-page document. In the correspondence section or perhaps it's in the -- it says "Case Conference Supervision Record Plan. Child in care review decision. Strategy" and there's a "case review section." At page 2245, there is a copy of Ms. Ward's 1etter to Ms. Argue in May of 2014 about the error, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

67 Q. On the next page, 2246, there is a copy of Ms. Brophy's letter to Ms. Argue about the error, dated 14th May 2014?
A. Yes.

68 Q. Now, did you see those at that time?
A. I don't believe I did.

69 Q. Okay. Do you accept that they were on the file?
A. Yes, I accept that they were on the file.

70 Q. At page 2247, that is a letter from Keara McGlone to inspector -- or Superintendent Cunningham there dated 15th August 2013. Did you see that at the time?
A. I have no memory of seeing that, either.

71 Q. Page 2248, it appears to be a standard form acknowledgement of the receipt of Ms. Brophy's report, 09:46 do you recall seeing that?
A. No, I don't recall seeing that at the time.

72 Q. And that appears to be the last document on the file for 2014, up to that period. Now, if the file consisted of all of these documents at that time, there 09:46 is approximately 43 pages in the file, which, including a11 the cover sheets and partition tabbed documents, leaves only 30 pages of material on the file at that point in time?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

73 Q. Do you accept that?
A. Yes.

74 Q. The error is contained on four documents, the four intake records relating to the McCabe children and the
two notifications that we first looked at there. So the error occurs on six pages?
A. That's correct.

75 Q. On the other hand, the remaining 19 pages, a number of them are devoted to the correction of the error and, in 09:47 particular, the email from Ms. Armitage relating to Ms. Brophy's call clearly identifies the error, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

76 Q. Now --
A. Or should I say Ms. Armitage's email is clearest.

77 Q. -- is based upon Ms. Brophy's --
A. Yes, message.

78 Q. -- phone call. Now, you must have opened that file before you wrote your email to Mr. Lowry and Mr. Deeney, is that not right?
A. Yes.

79 Q. And you record in your draft Barr letter that the abuse allegedly involved digital penetration?
A. That's correct.

80 Q. And you say:
"It is reported that this allegation was investigated by An Garda Síochána some years later."

Do you remember putting that in the letter?
A. No, but I --

81 Q. Perhaps we will just look at that at page 1535. That is the draft that you sent with that email.
A. Okay.

82 Q. And in what is the fourth paragraph down, the second line of that says:
"The abuse alleged7y involved digital penetration and the victim was aged six to seven years old. It's reported that this allegation was investigated by An Garda Síochána some years later."
A. Yes.

83 Q. "A file was sent to the Director of Public Prosecutions 09:49 who directed that no prosecution take place."
A. That's correct.

84 Q. Now, you could only have got that information from the file unless somebody else told you of it, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

85 Q. And do you recall, in fact, taking possession of the file, opening it and gleaning that from the file?
A. I don't have a specific memory of it but $I$ believe I did take information from the file. I possibly had access to the Ms. D file also. But $I$ have no specific memory.
86 Q. And do you accept that you missed a crucial part of what was on the file relating to Sergeant McCabe?
A. Absolutely, I accept that.

87 Q. Now, in fairness to you, have you any explanation or is there anything that you'd like to say to the Tribunal in connection with that?
A. I have to say that $I$ did not review the file in its
entirety at that time. I had no cause to know that an error had been made in it, so I -- that is possibly a reason why I didn't, you know, review the file in its entirety. I suppose I looked for the concerns on the file, I found some documents that highlighted the
allegation of digital penetration and $I$ used those to include in the letter.
88 Q. All right. We11, do you accept that you must have failed to appreciate --
A. I failed to appreciate that there was a significant error on the file and $I$ failed to review the file thoroughly.
89 Q. All right. Now, it's just in the context where you have picked this out in the sense of identifying it as one that had been awaiting allocation or action --
A. Yes.

90 Q. -- and in the context of sending the email to Mr. Lowry and Mr. Deeney, which was unusual, I think you agreed yesterday that you would send such an email as this?
A. Yes, I wouldn't send such an email as this about other cases.
91 Q. And you knew obviously you were dealing with Mr. McCabe, whom you knew something about?
A. Yes, I knew from the media -- yeah, I was aware that he was in the media.
92 Q. Okay. Now, in that context, can I ask you, would it not have been, I suppose, obvious and important for you to have, in fact, reviewed the file fully before you were either consulting your line manager or drafting
such a letter?
A. Yeah, no, that's a fair comment but I had no -- I had no indication that there was an error on that file, from looking at it.
93 Q. okay. We11, would it be more accurate to say that there is no indication that there was an error on the file from the few documents that you did look at on the file?
A. That's correct.

94 Q. Now, there is a line in your email to Mr. Lowry and Mr. Deeney:
"It has come back in again due to media coverage of Mr. McCabe."
A. Yes.

95 Q. Now, can I ask you, why did you include that and on what basis did you say that in your email?
A. Well, it was speculation on my part. I would suggest that I put that in there because if somebody, as in this case Ms. D has made an allegation about Maurice McCabe in 2006 and if it comes back up again in the media, for somebody in that situation it may raise issues for them. I was aware she had gone to a counsellor and, therefore, I felt that Mr. McCabe's name being in the public domain may have triggered issues for her, and that was my assumption. I didn't know that.

96 Q. All right. Well, $I$ mean, there is a possible wide spectrum of different theories --
A. Yes.

97 Q. -- or conspiracies, but in any sense, were you or anyone in your department, out to get Sergeant McCabe?
A. Absolutely not.

98 Q. Were you in any way intent on assisting Garda management or senior members of An Garda Síochána in giving them ammunition against Sergeant McCabe?
A. Absolutely not. I have no cause to have a grievance with anybody that I would take such action.
99 Q. Okay. Well, one could look at a file like this perhaps 09:54 and there might be a number of responses to looking at the file. One is to, let's deal with this quickly and get it off our patch because of the high publicity factor. Was that any part of your decision-making or action?
A. No, I don't believe that occurred to me.

100 Q. Did you think perhaps that because of the fact that you thought it was an allegation of digital penetration, that you had to deal with it quickly because of Ms. D and the nature of the allegation that she had raised, was that a consideration?
A. No.

101 Q. Now, just to be clear about Mr. Deeney's position at this point in time. Obviously Mr. Lowry was your line manager, why were you sending it to Mr. Deeney as well? 09:55
A. In 2015 Mr. Deeney was my direct manager. Not until 2016 was Gerry Lowry my direct line manager.

102 Q. I see.
A. Yeah.
Q. What position did Mr. Lowry occupy at that point?
A. He was the area manager.

104 Q. The area manager?
A. Yes.

105 Q. Al1 right. We11, the draft letter, was it appropriate 09:55 for you to, as it were, jump from the phase of reviewing the file on the MTP system to issuing a draft Barr letter?
A. Well, it was a draft letter, that's -- it wasn't for issuing at that point.
106 Q. We11, what was the point of seeking -- bringing it to their attention and seeking their views on it?
A. I was just making them aware of the concerns that I understood that were alleged in relation to Mr . McCabe.
107 Q. okay. But in the ordinary course of events, the file gets allocated first before any such step is ever even reached, if it's ever reached, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

108 Q. Now, is it the case that going back to this allocation issue, you were in fact dealing with it as if it was allocated to you?
A. I couldn't deal with it as if it was allocated to me; I had a considerable amount of other responsibilities at that time.
109 Q. okay. But that's what I am wondering: Is this a bypassing or a fast forwarding of the procedure, for you to go to this stage of doing a draft Barr letter without allocation, an initial assessment, maybe a further assessment and lots of other steps after that?
A. I had not intended to issue that letter at that time, it was just to bring the concerns to Séamus and Gerry's attention in terms of how we proceed.
110 Q. Well, I suppose your expectation was that they would read the letter, the draft letter?
A. Yes.

111 Q. And you have heard from Mr. Lowry saying that he doesn't think he did read the letter?
A. Yes.

112 Q. Are you surprised to hear that?
A. I heard that yesterday, I think, yes.

113 Q. Yes. We11, he has obviously accepted responsibility for that himself?
A. That's correct, yes.

114 Q. But do you know or have you any knowledge as to whether 09:57 Mr. Deeney actually read the letter, your line manager?
A. It's possible -- I don't know, I don't know that answer.
115 Q. Okay. We11, put it this way: Did you have any discussion with both of them together or either of them 09:58 on their own about your email or about the letter?
A. I have no recollection.

116 Q. Okay. And you've certainly no note of it anyway --
A. No.

117 Q. -- in any event, is that right?
A. That's correct.

118 Q. Now, I am not sure whether this is in any way criticism of you or the system, and I don't intend it personally, but in a situation like this where you weren't the
intake team leader, where you hadn't been involved in the intake records relating to the McCabe children, would it have been appropriate or usual for you to consult others who had dealt with it previously?
A. Possibly, but neither Eileen Argue or Louise Carolan were in the service at that time, they had both left the service. So, in relation to the creation of those documents, I -- Ms. Argue had left the service.
Yes. But I mean, you must have got the information from either one of the four intake records relating to the McCabe children or possibly the Garda notification, but you must have seen that Laura Connolly had created those and that they hadn't been signed off on by any team leader as far as authorising the intake of or creation of a file in relation to the children?
A. Yes, I seen -- Well, I have seen Laura Connolly's note, I can't remember if I had at the time. But she appears to have been instructed to create those documents by the team leader.
120 Q. okay. But is it part of the procedure or not that they would or should be signed off on if they are to result in an action such as the creation of a file relating to the children?
A. Well, I can't say in terms of the procedure but I can say that I wouldn't have given that instruction. I don't believe I would have, unless there was -- unless there was, you know, more -- you know, more serious grounds for concern.
121 Q. Okay. Well, I mean, may the Tribunal take it that you
agree that it's unusual to create an intake record relating to adults as opposed to children of an abuser?
A. Well, the intake record wasn't created for adults. However, we didn't have any other system for recording and tracking information where there's an allegation made against an adult.
122 Q. We11, I am not clear now what response you got from Mr. Lowry or Mr. Deeney to your email?
A. We11, I understand that Mr. Deeney replied to that email.

123 Q. Yes. And prior to that did you have any discussion with him?
A. I can't recal1.

124 Q. We11, perhaps we would look at 1560. That is the reply, I think, from Mr. Lowry.
A. Yes.

125 Q. He said:
"Dear Kay
Thanks for the update and bringing this matter to my attention. I have a memory that this matter was reported to An Garda Síochána at some stage, so we would need to coordinate with them before taking the steps outlined below. I will discuss with you."
A. Mm-hmm.

126 Q. Now, first of a11, obviously he is thanking you for the 10:02 update and bringing the matter to his attention.
A. Mm-hmm.

127 Q. Did you conclude from that that he'd actually looked at it, including the draft?
A. I can't remember what I concluded.

128 Q. Yes. Well, you'd sent him the draft in the expectation that he would look at it, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

129 Q. Okay. And he is thanking you for bringing the matter to your attention. The whole purpose of the email was to bring the draft Barr letter to his attention, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

130 Q. Yes. You must have concluded that he had read it, isn't that only fair to yourself?
A. I might have made that assumption, I can't remember.

131 Q. Now, he says there:
"I have a memory that this matter was reported to An Garda Síochána at some stage, so we would need to coordinate with them before taking the steps outlined below. I will discuss with you."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

132 Q. We11, do you recollect or did that spur a recollection in your mind that there was, in fact, a Garda notification on the file?
A. I was aware that there was a garda notification on the file.

133 Q. And can I ask you, did you go back to the file after you received this reply from Mr. Lowry?
A. I have no recollection at that point of going back to the file.

134 Q. Okay. But he is suggesting the need to coordinate with them, so did you coordinate with them?
A. Not at that point, no.

135 Q. okay. well, at what stage did you coordinate with them?
A. I believe that I raised the matter with Sergeant Byrne 10:03 at a garda liaison meeting in October 2015.
136 Q. Well, obviously there is no mention of Sergeant Byrne on the file?
A. That's correct.

137 Q. And there was a letter obviously that Ms. McGlone had sent to Superintendent Cunningham?
A. That's correct.

138 Q. And have you any memory of having seen that letter at the time we are talking about?
A. I have no memory of it.

139 Q. Okay.
A. I have no memory of it.

140 Q. Okay. We11, you didn't attempt to contact Superintendent Cunningham --
A. No.

141 Q. -- or the inspector in charge?
A. No.

142 Q. Did you know whether any other members of An Garda Síochána had any contact with anyone in your department about this?
A. No. There was no evidence that there had been any contact between the Gardaí and ourselves in relation to this. And I had no knowledge of it, either.

143 Q. We11, you were based in Cavan, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

144 Q. And you were, I think, still splitting your time between there and Monaghan at that point in time, is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. But who was Sergeant Byrne?
A. Sergeant Byrne was the garda, he was one of the liaison officers from the Bailieboro district that we met with infrequently in relation to cases that were open to both services, both the Gardaí and Tusla, in Cavan-Monaghan or in the Bailieboro area, in particular.
146 Q. And do you recal1 receiving a letter from Sergeant Byrne at some stage --
A. No.

147 Q. -- identifying himself as the sergeant at Bailieboro with responsibility for liaison?
A. I don't recall ever receiving that information, but I can't remember. But I know that I engaged in Garda liaison meetings with Sergeant Byrne in Bailieboro.
148 Q. We have received a letter this morning from Sergeant Byrne from his records.
A. Okay.

149 Q. It's not on the system but I am going to hand you a copy of that [SAME HANDED].
A. Yes.

150 Q. And I appreciate you have seen this this morning, but if you received this, you would have received it in November 2014?
A. Yes.

151 Q. And I was wondering have you any memory of receiving that letter?
A. I have no memory of receiving this letter but I became aware that at some point, $I$ don't know when, and it's possibly through this letter but I have no recollection, that Sergeant Byrne was the Garda liaison officer in Bailieboro.
152 Q. okay. Just for the record, it reads as follows:
"Addressed to Ms. Kay MCLough7in, SWTL --"
which means social work team leader $I$ think.
"-- Child and Family, Drumalee Cross, Cavan.
Re: Joint An Garda Síochána and Child and Family Agency liaison meetings.

Dear McLough7in
I am a sergeant at Bailieboro Garda Station with
responsibility as the Child and Family Agency liaison officer in respect of the Bailieboro Garda district. I understand you are the new social work team leader for the area and $I$ am writing to you with a view to organising a joint agency liaison meeting at your ear7iest convenience.

The 7ast meeting held was in December 2013 with Ms. Keara McGlone. I would be very much ob7iged if you
could contact me regarding your availability and we can arrange a date and venue for the meeting that suits you. I am generally flexible regarding dates and times."

And he gives his contact number. I think obviously, you had come into position in that regard in october 2014?
A. That's correct.

153 Q. And then at the very beginning of the next month the Gardaí appear to have written this letter to you, having identified you in your new position?
A. That's correct.

154 Q. And do you recall, in fact, meeting Sergeant Byrne at any liaison meeting after that period in time?
A. I can't recall when the meetings took place but I know meetings did.
155 Q. Okay. Did you ever write and schedule -- or phone and try and schedule any discussion with any Garda liaison team and have it formally put on an agenda?
A. Have -- the matters before the Tribunal?

156 Q. Yes.
A. No.

157 Q. Is there any reason why you wouldn't do that or why you didn't do that?
A. Because I was managing a service, I wasn't an allocated social worker. It would have needed an allocated social worker to carry out the type of tasks that were required, such as a meeting with the Gardaí.

158 Q. Okay. I think after you had received the emai 1 from Mr. Lowry that we have been previously looking at, I think did you try and make an appointment with Ms. D?
A. Yes.

159 Q. Perhaps you would look at document 1562.
A. Yes, I did try to make an appointment with Ms. D.

160 Q. And is that a contact you made after receiving a copy of the waiting list review form that I referred to earlier?
A. That was as a result of the review of -- the review day 10:10 we had in May and an instruction from that was to meet with Ms. D.

161 Q. Okay. Perhaps we would look at the review form. It's KM5, that is page -- sorry, this is the waiting list review form that we are talking about.
A. Yeah.

162 Q. Could you just talk us through that? Ms. D is identified at the top and there seems to be a note beside her name there?
A. Yeah.

163 Q. Is that your handwriting?
A. No.

164 Q. No. Can you decipher that for us?
A. I think it says "Alleged victim".

165 Q. okay. And in the body of it, "Child protection concerns" it says "Allegation of CSA against Maurice McCabe'?
A. Yes.

166 Q. "Management decision", and that says "Contact Ms. D re checking the reliability and accuracy of allegations made. Review information. Letter proposed for Maurice McCabe. To contact established current address." And then that is signed off by Mr. Deeney, is that correct?
A. Yes.

167 Q. And that is effectively directed to you, then, is that right?
A. It was placed on the file.

168 Q. That is the way it works, is it?
A. Yes.

169 Q. And you took action on foot of that?
A. Yes.

170 Q. And you wrote a letter seeking an appointment with her at June 2nd, I think, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

171 Q. And I think she failed to attend that, is that right?
A. Yes.

172 Q. Was she contacted though in the interim?
A. Yes, yes.

173 Q. And was that a contact directly with you?
A. Yeah, I got a message from her mother to contact her and I was provided with a phone number.
174 Q. And what was the result of that, then?
A. The result of that was that she said she had exams coming up and I couldn't attend on that date, but I asked her would she agree to attend after her exams and she indicated that she would.

175 Q. Okay. And was any date fixed upon?
A. No.

176 Q. You had also received an email back from Mr. Deeney as well on the 7th -- sorry, on 8th of May, is that correct? If we could look at page 1563.
A. Yes.

177 Q. And you see that, it says: "Dear Kay, we discussed this case yesterday." Now, was that face-to-face discussion with --
A. That was the review day where we took the files to a meeting room and reviewed them. My understanding is that Séamus reviewed the Maurice McCabe file.

178 Q. Okay.
A. Because he completed the review form.

179 Q. okay. Now, does that mean he had the file?
A. Yes.

180 Q. Okay. And he would have taken that file from where?
A. Well, again, we used the MTP list to identify the file and then we went and either got the file ourselves or were assisted by an administrator to get the file.
181 Q. You see, I am wondering had you put the file back? I mean, you must have had it obviously to draft the Barr 1etter.
A. Yes.

182 Q. Would you keep that out or put it back?
A. I may have kept that with me while I was waiting for an 10:14 appointment to come in.

183 Q. So, do you think it's possible you could have handed the file over to Mr. Deeney?
A. Say that again, sorry.

184 Q. Do you think it's possible you could have handed the file over to him?
A. I mean, the files were brought up into a meeting room, they were placed on a desk and we all picked files from the bundle with the purpose of reviewing and whoever reviewed the file would have filled out the review form. So I am making the assumption -- I can't remember that Séamus Deeney reviewed the file but I am making the assumption that because the review form was completed by Séamus that he reviewed the file.

185 Q. Okay. We11, have you any actual knowledge that he read the file or not?
A. I can't -- I can't be certain, but for him to have completed the review form he -- I would have expected that he read the file.
Q. Okay. We11, I am just coming to one interpretation, perhaps, of events here in this period of a few days that you had, as it were, sprung the draft Barr letter on Mr. Deeney and Mr. Lowry?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
A. Well, he is addressing -- he's outlining steps that should be taken before that letter is sent.

188 Q. Well, you'd agree with me, he is clearly not authorising the sending of the Barr letter?
A. Well, he is saying to complete the other tasks first.

189 Q. Yes. And I think, do you accept that those other tasks were not completed first?
A. I accept that, yes. I did attempt to meet with Ms. D, however she didn't attend. I accept that they didn't take place. In terms of her counsellor, I would have needed to meet with her first and seek her consent before I contacted her counsellor.

190 Q. Well, 1et's just look at step number 1 there, it says:
"We will contact the alleged victim as there is some discrepancy in the allegations forwarded to us."

Was there some discussion at the review meeting about discrepancies?
A. I only remember -- my only recollection is that Séamus did feel there was discrepancies, but I wasn't -- those discrepancies were not identified to me.
191 Q. Well, you see, that is what I was coming to, because you obviously had seen the file. In your draft you said something that wasn't accurate in the sense that you said there was the allegation of digital penetration, and that had been investigated by the guards. So I am just wondering was the discrepancy discussed or considered to be that, whether the guards had actually investigated that or not, or was it considered to be a discrepancy between two accounts that Ms. D was said to have given?
A. I have no recollection of the discrepancies being identified and I have no recollection of any
discussion.
192 Q. Okay. Well, can I put this suggestion to you, Ms. McLoughlin: That if the file had been read, as it were, cover to cover, the few pages I have identified there, it would have shown, in fact, that there was no discrepancy between what Ms. D was saying originally and what she was saying in her -- the account of her referral from Rian, do you accept that?
A. Yes.

193 Q. So a reading of the file would have shown no such discrepancy as would have required to go back to Ms. D, in that regard?
A. I -- yes --

194 Q. Now, perhaps you stil1 think there was a necessity to go back to check the reliability and accuracy of her in 10:19 terms of her --
A. Well, yes.

195 Q. -- in terms of credibility assessment.
A. I think there's -- she had made a statement to the Gardaí in 2006, I was aware of that, but I didn't have sight of it, but I understood she had done that. In terms of -- I didn't know what the discrepancies were.

196 Q. OK.
A. I hadn't read the file thoroughly.

197 Q. We11, question number one then arising from that:
Would you not be concerned receiving this email to go to Mr. Deeney and say 'look, I am not clear what you mean when you are talking about the discrepancy in the allegation'?
A. I don't recall doing that.

198 Q. Okay. Or the alternative step is: Look, I am not sure what Séamus is talking about in terms of a discrepancy, I better pick up the file again and see if I can see what the discrepancy is. Did you consider doing that?
A. No.

199 Q. No. Okay. Well, it's just you appear to have then proceeded on the basis of -- if you didn't know what he was talking about it's difficult to see how you could have successfully completed step number 1 if you didn't 10:20 know what the discrepancy was, is that a fair question to put?
A. Your wording is a little bit confusing.

200 Q. I am sorry.
A. If I had met -- if I had met Ms. D --

201 Q. Yes.
A. -- it would have been clarified. If the false allegation, if the error wasn't on file would we still have met Ms. D? Possibly.
202 Q. Yes. No, I understand that. That is perfectly
possible. But I wonder, is it correct that it would have been cleared up in that way, because if you had met Ms. D to question her about a discrepancy, she wouldn't know what you were talking about, isn't that right. Or, do you think she would?
A. If I had met Ms. D at that point in time I think she would be highlighting to me that her counsellor had assured her that she was correct in information, that is all I can --
Q. OK.
A. -- say in hindsight.

204 Q. Yes. And the file would have told you that, in any event, at that point in time?
A. Had it been read thoroughly, yes.

205 Q. Al1 right. Now, step 2:
"Determine whether we need to interview anyone else who may be of relevance. For examp7e, the counsellor."

Now, I don't know if you were here for Ms. Brophy's evidence.
A. No.

206 Q. She was asked about being consulted by, you know, the Social work Department to whom she had made a referral, 10:21 and she said she would have had no difficulty clarifying anything in her referral with the Social Work Department. Would you have considered that that was a perfectly reasonable step to take, to ring the counsellor?
A. I wouldn't have done that without Ms. D's consent.

207 Q. We11, you see, you don't appear to have gone back to Mr. Deeney and said look, you have imposed an impossible condition on me here because I can't talk to the counsellor without her consent, and --
A. Yes, I accept your statement.
Q. You see, you didn't go seeking Ms. D's consent then either, isn't that right?
A. We11, I did seek to meet with her, yes, but I didn't

209 Q. Yes. But you certainly never wrote out to Ms. D and said, look, I am formally looking for your consent for me to speak to your counsellor about the referral that you authorised her to send in?
A. I didn't do that.

210 Q. Okay. And did you consider that her consent, which you didn't seek, and this condition that you didn't go back to Mr. Deeney about was a reason for just ignoring this second step or jumping over it?
A. We11, because I didn't have her consent I didn't contact her counsellor.
211 Q. All right. Okay. Number 3:
"On review of the above, inform the alleged abuser of the allegations."

Now, I suppose in the scheme of things, there was effectively nothing for you to review then the way you had decided to proceed before you took that step.
A. Yes.

212 Q. A11 right. Now, I think you did record a telephone call with Ms. D and that's at page 1567. Perhaps we would look at that. And I think that records a telephone call of the 15th May 2015?
A. Yes.

213 Q. And that is -- is that your handwriting?
A. Yes.

214 Q. Perhaps you'd read that out?
A. "Te7ephone call to Ms. D who stated she could not attend, also wanted to know what's happened. I outlined a process under Barr judgment. She said she is doing exams in June and --" I think "-- will meet us thereafter -- but will meet us thereafter. I agreed. I asked her to call me when exams were over." Or "near over", I think.
215 Q. Okay. Now, you don't mention referring to the Barr judgment in your statement. You do obviously have a note of it there?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

216 Q. Do you think you explained the procedure to her or just mentioned the name of the Barr judgment without explaining it?
A. I don't even -- I don't know if I used the word "Barr judgment" in my conversation with her. It's possible I didn't. But I would have explained our obligations to follow up on concerns regarding allegations of child sexual abuse and that we had a duty to ensure that other children weren't at risk and therefore I needed to meet with her to go through her allegation. I would have outlined to her also, I believe, that the reason I was contacting her was because of Ms. Brophy's referral in 2013.
217 Q. Yes. Well, you see, you record her as asking there 10:26 'What's happened?' and she might well ask what had happened because it had been years since she had corrected Ms. Brophy's error and Ms. Brophy --
A. Yes.

218 Q. -- Ms. Brophy herself correct the error insofar as she could, and there'd been no subsequent contact effectively until this period in May of 2015, going into June, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

219 Q. We11, in your statement you say:
"From my recollection she said she thought that this had all been dealt with back in 2006/2007."

Now, obviously that is not in your note, but --
A. No.

220 Q. -- you must have been taking, I am sure, great care in the making of your statement, and you do have a recollection of her saying that?
A. Yes, I do.

221 Q. She thought it had been all dealt with?
A. Yes.

222 Q. And can you recollect what you said in response?
A. I outlined to her that it hadn't been dealt with in 2006/2007, in relation to Mr. McCabe, I think.

223 Q. We11, did you see it as outstanding business, as it were, with Mr. McCabe at that point?
A. Pardon?

224 Q. Did you see it as outstanding business from the point 10:27 of view of the social work department, with Mr. McCabe?
A. Yes, I seen it as, that we hadn't met with Mr. McCabe back in 2007 to outline the allegations that we had received and to offer him the opportunity respond and
to assess whether he -- you know, having considered his response, to assess whether he had -- or whether he posed a risk to children.
225 Q. All right. I think you say in your statement, you completed that contact sheet obviously, and you say in your statement you can't remember making contact with Ms. D again in relation to a further appointment and you can't say whether you did or not?
A. I don't betieve I did.

226 Q. And there is no record of it?
A. Yes.

227 Q. Now, I think you didn't organise any meetings with any other relevant stakeholders in the matter, as such?
A. No.

228 Q. You have referred, in fairness to you, to I think raising the matter in some context in October, possibly, 2015, at a meeting?
A. Yes.

229 Q. And can you just describe that?
A. It was a Garda liaison meeting and $I$ raised it with Sergeant Byrne. It wasn't on the agenda and I just wanted to know whether the Gardaí had done anything since we had Garda notified them in 2014.
230 Q. I am sorry, could you just repeat that answer?
A. well, my intention was to find out what status the Garda investigation was at, whether it was opened or closed. As we had sent them a Garda notification in 2014.

231 Q. okay. We11, I mean, I think you had -- you had been
able to glean yourself from the file that there had been no prosecution, the matter having been the subject-matter of a submission of a file to the DPP and a decision not to prosecute?
A. Yes, I was aware of that, yes. I was just confirming that; that that was still the case.
232 Q. okay. Well, Sergeant Byrne does have a recollection that you mentioned the matter in the context of you saying to him that you were having to go to talk to Mr. McCabe, and essentially what was the position in relation to Mr. McCabe. And I think he is saying that all he told you was that it predated his arrival in Bailieboro and that he knew nothing about what had transpired.
A. Yes.

233 Q. Do you recollect him saying something along those lines to you?
A. Well, from my memory, I think that's -- yes, that is a fair account.
234 Q. okay. And do you think he told you that the Garda investigation had been completed and there was no prosecution?
A. well, that is what I took, or I understood that there was no ongoing case in the Gardaí.
235 Q. But do you think he said that to you or that was something you knew already?
A. I can't remember specifically. It's possible I asked him. My understanding is that he confirmed there was no investigation, that it had been dealt with
previously.
236 Q. Now, I am not criticising Sergeant Byrne or you, but is it not practice for matters - if you had wanted to raise matters such as this - to be put on a formal agenda with some notice to An Garda Síochána?
A. Well, when the notification is sent, those -- between either service, those notifications create discussion for Garda liaison meetings. So, unless it's closed to the Gardaí -- if it's closed to the Gardaí it tends not to be on that agenda. But I had no written information as a result of our notification in 2014 that it was closed to the Gardaí, so, as a result, I was just confirming that it was. But I had no response to our Garda notification from 2014.

237 Q. Okay. We11, I mean, is it the usual procedure to put matters on an agenda for these sort of meetings?
A. We tend -- my understanding is that the list is created, the Gardaí send the list of cases over that are currently open to them or are pending closure and then we prepare our -- we prepare -- we prepare the information that we need to share with the Gardaí in relation to those cases.

238 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

239 Q. But I mean, is it the case that you never received a letter from the Gardaí?
A. Yes.

240 Q. And in particular, you never received a letter from them notifying you that this case was on a list for
investigation, was still open --
A. No, we never received any letter to that effect.

241 Q. -- and was going to be or was on the agenda for any liaison meeting?
A. That's correct.

242 Q. I think Ms. Duignan was at this particular meeting with you, is that correct?
A. Yes.

243 Q. Ms. Denise Duignan. And in her account -- I'm sure you have seen her statement, have you?
A. Yes.

244 Q. I think she says this was raised after the meeting had ended, effectively as people were about to leave?
A. That is quite possible.

245 Q. And not in a formal way? You just approached --
A. No, no. It wasn't on the agenda. It wasn't -- yeah.

246 Q. Just coming then to the letter that you issued at the end of December of 2015. Could I just ask you to look at a document at page 541? I am not sure if you see that, it's a document, a lot of which has been blacked out, but it appears to be from the -- an extract from the card system, there is a lot of redactions relating to third parties.
A. okay.

247 Q. But it appears to show some action on the 9th November of 2015. Can you read the entry there?
A. I think it's: "McCabe, Maurice. Adu7t unknown." In relation to address. "File number --" there is a reference "-- 2.82013" and the next reference "3.92005.

Alleged perpetrator. Open. Duty case. CPM date 9/11/15 on file."
248 Q. Yes. Now, we have -- we have seen the extract -- we have the extract relating to Ms. Connolly, it's got the same entry "Duty case" as of $30 / 4 / 2014$ when she made the entry, but the reference to "Duty case" there, could you help us what that might refer to at that point in time on 9th of November?
A. Well, it indicates that it's a duty case, that it would be with the duty worker at that time.
249 Q. okay. And do you know of anyone to whom it was assigned at that time?
A. No.

250 Q. okay.
A. I don't believe it was a duty case at that time.

251 Q. okay. well, I am just wondering, would it reflect the fact that you had taken up the case again in November?
A. Yes, but I am not the duty worker so -- yeah.

252 Q. okay. Did you go back and retrieve the file or had it been put back in the filing cabinet after may?
A. Yes, it would have been put back in the filing cabinet after May.
253 Q. We11, did you go back and retrieve the file then before you wrote the letter out on the 29th of December?
A. I have no specific memory, but I believe I did.

254 Q. And did you consider whether or not you ought to have reported back to Mr. Deeney and/or Mr. Lowry about whether you had been able to achieve all or any of the five steps set out by Mr. Deeney?
A. I have no recollection of what my thinking was at that time --
Q. okay.
A. -- other than I hadn't been able to proceed and I suppose I was trying to move the case forward.
Q. I mean, at this point in time, you had obviously previously known of Sergeant McCabe, you had referred to media coverage yourself in your previous email, and is that in any way associated with why you were trying to move the case on at this point in time?
A. I mean, it was one of many cases that I was trying to move forward and, you know, to a conclusion, so I think that's --

257 Q. OK.
A. That is my response.

258 Q. Okay. Were you conscious of continuing intense and very voluminous press coverage of Sergeant McCabe and actions in relation to Sergeant McCabe that were occurring at that point in time?
A. Was I conscious? I was aware of the media, yes, coverage, during 2014, and any other -- I would be aware of media coverage. In terms of that impacting on me in the case, is that the question?
259 Q. We11, did it have any bearing on what you were doing at a11?
A. Well, I would treat all cases similarly or fairly -you know, equally. It wouldn't be a reason to treat the case differently.

260 Q. It's just in the context of all the sudden work around
the file in May of 2015, which then appears to have petered out, is there any particular reason then why you didn't progress it any further after that and then why you took it up again in late 2015?
A. My primary responsibilities were to manage a team of social workers, you know, who responded to referrals coming into our service and that primarily was my role. I didn't have the capacity to case-manage per se so this case wasn't followed up in a consistent way by me or by anyone else.
261 Q. Al1 right. Well, that's a very fair statement. But can I ask you this, and it was perhaps unfair for me to ask you to try and recollect what your precise thinking was at the point in time, but obviously you knew when you took up the file again, I take it, that Mr. Deeney had, as it were, prescribed these five steps?
A. Yes.

262 Q. And would you agree with me that it would have been appropriate to perhaps report back to him and/or have a discussion about where matters stood at that stage before issuing the letter?
A. Possibly, yes. I also feel that I should have written to Ms. D one more time and offered her a further appointment.
263 Q. All right. well, that's a fair answer, obviously. But 10:41 I think in fairness to yourself, you say in your own statement:
"I do not believe I adhered strictly to the
five-point-p7an up to point 3."
A. Yes.

264 Q. "I did not fee1 I could contact Ms. D without Ms. D's consent."
A. Yes.

265 Q. "I was aware the Garda file was closed."
A. Yes.

266 Q. "I wasn't aware of the discrepancy was as referred in Séamus Deeney's email. I had not read the file in total or understood it in terms of an error having been 10:41 made on the file. I took the decision to send it based on my understanding that a statement had been made by Ms. D to the Gardaí in 2006."
A. Yes.

267 Q. And you were aware that that had been made available to 10:41 Ms. O'Neill?
A. Yes.

268 Q. But at that point in time, you yourself hadn't considered her statement?
A. No, I hadn't seen her statement, only the information 10:42 on her file.

269 Q. Okay. So, would you not agree with me that perhaps elementary caution, maybe looking at it with the benefit of hindsight but as a cautious practitioner, you ought at the very least to have read Ms. D's original statement before you sent out an allegation -A. In hindsight, yes.

270 Q. And would you accept that all of the errors relating to failing to read the file, and other errors that you are
not responsible for, and failing to consider Ms. D's statement, meant that this letter should never have been issued by you?
A. Yes, I fully accept that.

Now, the letter has already been opened, I am not going to deal with it. Is there any comment that you would like to make in relation to the letter at this point in time before I proceed on?
A. I fully accept that that letter was inappropriate to be sent out, I fully take responsibility for it. The purpose of it was to advise Mr. McCabe that we had concerns, to afford him an opportunity to respond and to outline our processes in that regard. It did not suggest that we had any conclusion on the matter.
272 Q. Now, this is at a point where one year is turning into another?
A. Yes.

273 Q. You knew, obviously, the Ms. D file had been closed in 2007?
A. Yes.

274 Q. It appears from some of the records on the Excel sheet that it's noted as being open in relation to her at this point in time. But did you consider whether you perhaps ought to refer it to your line manager and/or legal services in view of the nine year period essentially that had passed since she has originally made the allegation back in 2006, as to whether it's appropriate to be pursuing?
A. I can't remember whether I considered that.

275 Q. Okay. A11 right. I think you received Mr. Coste11o's letter?
A. Yes.

276 Q. There was a clear indication in his letter of the 20th January that Mr. McCabe wouldn't be attending the meeting with you?
A. That's right.

277 Q. You appear then to have taken remedial action because you must have realised that the error on your part was not seeing what Ms. D had said in her statement and you 10:45 went looking for the statement?
A. Yes, I read the letter and it stated that the allegation of digital penetration had never been made, so that led me to look into that.
278 Q. Yes. Now, at that point in time, what I don't understand is, why you didn't, in fact, first go back to the Maurice McCabe file to see, well, in fact, is this allegation actually on the file as against him, and you don't appear to have done that at that point?
A. I believe that -- I think on the 2nd February 2016, I sent Emer O'Neill the email. I think she responded on the $3 r d$.

279 Q. Yes.
A. And I think at that time I reviewed both her documents that she had provided to me and the file.

280 Q. Yes.
A. And I struggled initially to find the error because, for instance, Ms. Brophy's letter said the sentence beginning with -- I forget what that was, but dot dot
dot and ending with this, is incorrect and should be removed. So I didn't have the document she referred to so I didn't know. The only clear indication to me that the digital penetration was an allegation sent in error, was from Pamela's email to Eileen Argue and that 10:47 was the only clear information on the file, that there was an error on the file of significance.
281 Q. Okay. Now --
A. From my reading of the file.

282 Q. Okay. -- in fairness to you, obviously, and we have seen it from the state of the file as it must have been at the beginning of 2014, there were six documents left on the file referring to the digital penetration allegation?
A. That's correct.

283 Q. There was -- that included the two draft notifications?
A. Yes.

284 Q. And obviously you weren't responsible for leaving those on the file?
A. No.

285 Q. But --
A. Not unless it had been brought to my attention that they were --
286 Q. Yes. But you deal with this at a later part of your statement, but would you agree with me that they either 10:48 ought to have been completely removed from the file or stamped as inaccurate and not to be relied upon?
A. My understanding is that they should have been removed from the file but the file should have had a note of
what had occurred and the removal, should have a note identifying that they were removed because they were incorrect. That is my understanding.
287 Q. And on the other hand, one of the other --
A. Had I -- sorry -- had I been asked -- had I been aware that there was an error on the file and that there was incorrect information on that file at that time, I would have sought the advice of a data specialist.

288 Q. okay. And I was going to draw to your attention, and I think you did note this in your statement, that, in fact, the amended Garda notification that was ultimately sent correcting the digital penetration error, a copy of that hadn't been returned to the file either?
A. I became aware in 2017 as part of our preparation for this Tribunal of Inquiry, that there was, in fact, a Garda notification sent clarifying the information in June 2014 and that it had amended Garda notification, and I am -- I think that that was in red bold writing.
289 Q. Now, on the other hand, the fact still remains that Ms. Armitage's email --
A. Yes, yes.

290 Q. -- and Ms. Brophy's correct reported were always on the file?
A. That's correct.

291 Q. Now, obviously you did realise at this point in time the error?
A. Yes.

292 Q. And I suppose the scale of the error is something of
great significance both for Sergeant McCabe and his family, but I take it you'd accept that receiving an allegation in a letter which must have arrived shortly after New Year's Day in 2016, must have created seismic shocks in the McCabe household?
A. Yes, I fully accept that. And regret it.

293 Q. I just want to be clear about one issue which is at the heart of the second part of this module, as it were; had you been consulting with Gardaí or informing Gardaí as you went along, of either what was on the file or what you knew about the case as far as Garda McCabe and this allegation of digital penetration was concerned?
A. No.

294 Q. Did you either seek or get direction or interference or any collaboration with the guards in how you dealt with 10:51 the file in any respect?
A. Absolutely not. I have no contact with Gardaí other than what I outlined.
Q. So, from the point of view of your own position and what you know of what occurred within Cavan, were all
of the errors in-house, created in-house and perpetuated or repeated and documented in-house, nothing to do with the Gardaí?
A. Yes. Absolutely nothing to do with the Gardaí.

296 Q. Now, you drew the attention of Mr. Lowry to Mr. Costello's letter, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

297 Q. And you provided a draft response?
A. Yes.

298 Q. And he had, in his email of the 8th February at page 1594, he had suggested reviewing Emer o'Neill's and the Garda file and update the attached and revert to him. And you had already, in fact, received Ms. D's statement, but did you review Ms. O'Neill's file?
A. I reviewed the statement that she forwarded to me. I didn't review her entire file. I reviewed Ms. D's file.
okay. And the reference there to Garda file, did you understand that to be the CSA file separate from the
A. Well, I understood that to be the section on our file of Garda notifications and correspondence, etcetera.
300 Q. Okay. Now, did you -- on foot of Mr. Lowry's email, did you update the attached, as it were, in response to 10:53 what he said?
A. When it came to my -- I think the letter states, the draft letter states $I$ am seeking further clarification, and I believe while the date on that is 2015, it was a draft letter, I hadn't sent it. I believe I wrote that 10:53 on 2 nd of February, at the time $I$ was reviewing the information --

301 Q. Yes.
A. -- on the files. So that letter was created at that time, but at some point I believe on that date, it came 10:53 to my attention that $I$ had made a grave error and that there was no allegation of digital penetration.
302 Q. Yes. You did review matters and obviously you reviewed Ms. O'Neill's file to the extent that you got Ms. D's
statement earlier?
A. Yeah. Subsequently, it was after I got her --

303 Q. And then you set out your analysis, as it were, in an email to Mr. Lowry. And perhaps we would look at 1603. This is your email of the 9th of February --
A. Yes.

304 Q. -- of 2016. And you have got a number of bullet-points set out there.
A. Yes.

305 Q. And perhaps, in fairness to you, we should go through them. You say:

## "Hi Gerard

I reviewed the statements made to the Gardai made by Ms. D on the file. The allegation regarding digital penetration was made erroneously by Rian counsellor, Ms. Brophy, in August 2013. The following is high7ighted."

And then bullet-points:
"The referral was made initially by telephone and did not include digital penetration allegation. This information was put on and intake record and was consistent with the information in Ms. D's Garda statement in 2006. "
and that is, I think, correct?
A. Yes.

306 Q. And will you accept from me that that could have been ascertained at any time from the creation of that original intake record in August 2013?
A. Sorry, could I -- explain that question again.

307 Q. Yes. I am sorry. That conclusion could have been come 10:55 to as early as August 2013?
A. We11, before we received the erroneous document, yes.

308 Q. Yes, yes.
A. Yes.

309 Q. Okay. Next bullet-point:
"we then, it would appear, received the same referral on an SRF and it appeared to contain the information... digital penetration, and it also stated that Ms. D's father was threatened if she disclosed the alleged abuse."

And that is that's correct also.
A. That is an assumption based object information transferred in from that SRF.

310 Q. Yes.
A. Because I have never seen that SRF.

311 Q. Yes. "We Garda notified this information from the SRF. I cannot find a date on this but suspect it was forwarded to the Gardai in August 2013."

And the first sentence is correct insofar as it related to the garda notification --
A. Yes.

312 Q. -- in May of '14?
A. Yes, yes.

313 Q. The second sentence as I understand it your evidence is that is not correct?
A. No, I think that was -- is either based on the intake 10:56 record instructing somebody to Garda notify or it's based on one of the Garda notifications, which I think was undated. I am not sure, but it's possible that I assumed it may have been in August ' 13 because it was an instruction of the team leader at the time.
314 Q. Yes. And I think you have seen Ms. McGlone's letter to Superintendent Cunningham.
A. Yes.

315 Q. That neither enclosed the referral which she hadn't seen -- the written referral, which she hadn't seen at 10:57 the time --
A. Yes.

316 Q. -- nor did it enclose any form of Garda notification?
A. Yes. No.

317 Q. Next bullet-point:
"There is a second copy of the Garda notification which has the original information from the 2014 notification on file and is dated 2/5/14. Eileen Argue has also sent a new notification on that date with the historic 10:57 information and this one does not include the errors. she does not inform the Gardai of an error on this. The date is also incorrect as we were not contacted by Ms. Brophy until 14/5/16."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

318 Q. And I think that's correct, because you divined from the file that Ms. Argue had corrected the error relating to digital penetration and left the same date on it --
A. Yes.

319 Q. -- as the original incorrect Garda notification?
A. Yes. And my view, that it clarifies the information, the correct information, but it does not state that -when she mentions the error from the previous Garda notification, it does not say that there was no allegation of digital penetration and this was sent in error. So it didn't state that.
320 Q. Yes. I suppose you weren't to know, obviously your service knew that from all the letters to Ms. Argue and from Ms. Brophy's phone call, but you weren't to know necessarily that the Gardaí had been separately written to by Rian, making it clear what the error was?
A. At that point I had known that Ms. Brophy had contacted Ms. Argue to state that the paperwork hadn't been forwarded, the correct paperwork hadn't been forwarded and she was anxious, that was possibly on the 16th of May. So I was aware that that had taken place only.
321 Q. Yes. The next bullet-point then is:
"There is a note on file written by Laura Connolly seeking direction from Eileen on 13/4/14 and in that Eileen directs Laura to complete intake record on all four of McCabes' children. This was done and included
the information re digital penetration."

And that's all there.
A. That's correct, yes.

322 Q. Next bullet-point: "On 14/5 we received a letter from 10:59 Ms. Brophy stating that there was an administrative error on the SRF, that she forwarded the correct SRF dated 14/5/14 to this service."

Again, that is correct?
A. Yes.

323 Q. Next bullet-point: "On 20/5 a letter from the director of Rian ask we return the erroneous document and advised to include copies of any garda protocol documents. The HSE data controller was notified according to this letter." Again, that's correct?
A. Yes.

324 Q. Next bullet-point: "It appears that the SRF sent in 2013 was returned. However, Garda notification remain on file. The file was never amended to reflect the correct SRF from Ms. Brophy and therefore there is no allegation re digital penetration."
A. Yes.

325 Q. And, obviously you have noted that Ms. Brophy had corrected it in her subsequent report?
A. Yes, yes. She had, but our file didn't reflect that. Yes. Our file didn't reflect that we -- our documents weren't amended to reflect that appropriately.
326 Q. We11, what you are saying is nobody sought to excise
from any part of your file --
A. Yes.

327 Q. -- the error that you had been notified about?
A. Yes.

328 Q. Now, a conclusion, I think which is correct, if you go 11:00 agree with me or not, all of these, information in these bullet-points was gleaned entirely from the file in your possession?
A. Yes, yes.

329 Q. And was there to be looked at, considered and enumerated in this fashion as far back as 2014 --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

330 Q. -- isn't that right?
A. Yes, yes.

331 Q. There is nothing there which in fact post-dates 2014 -- 11:01
A. No.

332 Q. -- isn't that correct?
A. No.

333 Q. Now, you say at the end of that "Perhaps we can discuss how to proceed," and I think there was effectively 11:01 radio silence from Mr. Lowry?
A. Well --

334 Q. Is that fair?
A. I do believe I had a conversation with him about an apology; that I wanted to ensure that we wrote to Mr. McCabe via his solicitors, apologising for the error. And I believe I did have a conversation with him in relation to that.

335 Q. All right. But was it a discussion then on foot of the
analysis and your draft response and can you recollect when that was?
A. I can't recollect -- I can't remember when that was, but it was some time after that.
336 Q. Yes. Now, you sent a reminder to him on 26th of February.
A. Yes.

337 Q. Again you said, "We need to discuss a response."
A. Yes.

338 Q. And you appear to have raised it in a supervision meeting in April, so he didn't come back to you in March either, is that right?
A. No, I don't believe -- I have no recollection.

339 Q. And it's mentioned in the record relating to your supervision and he says: "The Sergeant McCabe case has 11:03 been communicated to me by Kay" -- this is page 1608, I should say -- "The Sergeant McCabe case has been communicated to me by Kay. I have not looked at it. I need to do so." And I think at that stage he didn't do so?
A. No.

340 Q. Now, did you consider whether you should take it up at another level, either with Mr. Deeney, who was your line manager, or somebody more senior to Mr. Lowry, because this was explosive?
A. Mr. Deeney finished being my line manager in January 2016, so Mr. Lowry was my line manager at this time.

341 Q. Okay. And who was his line manager, was it Ms. Creamer at that stage?
A. Yes.

342 Q. And did you know Ms. Creamer?
A. Possibly. I can't remember when I met Ms. Creamer first.

343 Q. Okay.
11:04
A. I am not sure if she -- I am not sure when she took over.

344 Q. Al1 right. And did you know where she was based?
A. Mary Hargadon was there prior to her, but I am not sure when they --

345 Q. Mary Hargadon?
A. Yes. She was there prior. I am not sure when Ms. Creamer replaced Ms. Hargadon.
346 Q. We11, I am just concerned, because you had obviously, in 2015, been conscious of the media coverage, you knew 11:04 it was ongoing, you knew the reaction of Sergeant McCabe and his solicitor to the letter?
A. Yes.

347 Q. You knew that you had made this error, howsoever it had come about, you were anxious to correct it, and time was passing and months were passing by --
A. Yes.

348 Q. -- with neither a response nor an apology nor an explanation. And did you not consider that you'd have to raise it with somebody more senior to Mr. Lowry?
A. I didn't consider that, no. I was anxious that it be responded to. I did try to keep it on the agenda, but I didn't consider going further up the line, the line management line.

349 Q. Okay. You see, at some stage the establishment of this Sexual Abuse Retrospective Team was being contemplated, and I am not sure when you became aware of that first. We have some reference to it as being -- the plans to establish it being made in April, but were you familiar 11:05 with any discussion about that?
A. About the --

350 Q. The establishment of the SART team?
A. I can't remember. I think I -- I suspect I was made aware of the development of that team.
351 Q. okay. I am just wondering is there any basis for considering that Mr. Lowry was delaying on it, to your knowledge --
A. No.

352 Q. -- because this was going to be sent to the SART team?
A. Well, I don't believe Mr. Lowry delayed the process on purpose. I believe he lost sight of it and I tried to keep reminding him of it, but $I$ think he lost sight of it. I don't believe he intentionally delayed the sending of the letter.
353 Q. Okay. But when he considered the letter, did he suggest any changes to it before it, in fact, went out?
A. It's possible he did. I can't specifically remember.

354 Q. okay. Well, your letter did go out, and it seems to be dated 20th of June. It's page 1611.
A. Yes.

355 Q. Perhaps you would just look at that. And that letter has been read into the record.
A. That's right.
Q. Yes. And certain7y, he, if I am understanding his evidence correctly, he didn't attempt to get you to rejig it in any way, shape or form?
A. I am not sure if there was any significant changes made by Mr. Lowry.

358 Q. Okay. There was a further response to that from Mr. Coste11o, which the Tribunal has seen at page 1613, and we don't need to read that.
A. Yes.

359 Q. But you were concerned that that did require and it called -- it called itself, in its terms, for an urgent and immediate response?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

360 Q. But did you have any discussion about what ought to be put in a response to that letter?
A. I think -- the only discussion I think I remember was that it might be passed on to the Tusla legal services for a response.
361 Q. You see, if we could go to page 545, which is an
extract again from the card system. I am not sure whether we have that on screen. It's again one of these heavily-redacted documents masking a lot of third party information but recording the detail in it. But that seems to record that it was allocated to SART on 5th of July --
A. Yes.

362 Q. -- of 2017, is that right?
A. Yes.

363 Q. 2016, is that --
A. Yes, it was passed on to the SART team.

364 Q. So maybe just read the entry there.
A. I can't -- it's: "McCabe Maurice (adu7t) unknown" -the file dates again, as $I$ have already said earlier, with the X reference -- "Alleged perpetrator, file open. Allocated to retrospective team and 5/7/2016 and the file is with them."
365 Q. Now, just to be clear about the decision-making. who made that decision?
A. The decision was made by the -- the decision was made $\quad$ 11:10 that all retrospective cases would go to that team, and so, therefore, that file was included in that list of cases that would go to that team.

366 Q. Okay. And did you draw up the list in conjunction with anyone or on your own or --
A. My understanding is that the team leader for Cavan-Monaghan drew up that list, so they were all cases of adults who had allegations made by other adults who alleged child sexual abuse.

367 Q. Okay. Your email to -- or your response to Mr. Lowry's email at page 1616, perhaps we could just look at that. He asks you at the bottom of the page:
"Has this case been passed to the retrospective team?"
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

368 Q. And that is dated 20th of Ju7y?
A. Yes.

369 Q. He appears not to have known that it was allocated a fortnight ago?
A. Yes.

370 Q. And you obviously knew that. And did you know it at the time it was allocated on 5th of July or beforehand?
A. I may -- I would say that I didn't know that, and it's quite possible that I was on annual leave on 5 th of July and was not aware that it was passed on.

371 Q. Okay.
A. And Michae 1 Cunningham carried out that.

372 Q. Pardon?
A. Michae1 Cunningham, the team leader, would have passed that case file on to the SART team, along with other files.

373 Q. I am just concerned to know now, for instance, your email to Mr. Lowry in February outlining, in bullet-point, your analysis of the form, was that contained on the file?
A. Yes.

374 Q. Can you ask [sic] me this question: Did you consider in your letter of reply to Mr. Costello, which you actually sent out on the 20th, did you not consider
whether you should, in fact, make it clear how the error had occurred?
A. It did occur to me, yes, but that didn't happen.

375 Q. Right. okay. And what -- obvious7y you do remember it occurring to you, so what was your thinking about that, 11:13 the benefit of explaining or not -- not explaining how this horrible, shocking error had come about?
A. I did feel that an explanation would have helped the situation, but my recollection is that Gerry didn't agree, but $I$ can't be one hundred percent on that.

376 Q. Okay. What you do say in this email to Gerry is, you say: "Yes, Gerry, I am advised by Michael that it has. He has also advised that the retrospective team refer all solicitors' 7etters to legal representatives to respond. Give us a call when you get a chance. The 11:13 7etter is very emotiona7. However, it does bring up the fact that this was not responded to back when it was first made known to us and I cannot explain why. we had no role in relation to the Commission of Investigation and I was not aware that this allegation was in the pub7ic domain. The letter states that we behaved underhandedly in the comment egregious misfeasance. When this case came on to my desk, when I took it over I did not feel we could ignore these concerns and I felt obliged to fulfil my duties in relation to the allegation regardless of the whistleblower issues in the pub7ic domain regarding Mr. McCabe, which had nothing to do with this service." Now, you seem to be stating a position there --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

377 Q. -- in relation to your own -- the rationale for your own actions?
A. Yes.

378 Q. Can I just ask you why you were doing that?
A. Well, it was in relation to what Mr . Costello had said in his letter.

379 Q. Oh, right. And for no other reason?
A. Yes.

380 Q. And in terms of the digital penetration allegation, if you had been aware of -- that that was not correct and ought not to have been put in the Barr letter, would you have still sent out the Barr letter based upon the original allegation from 2006 ?
A. In hindsight, in hindsight I feel I -- that Ms. D should have been contacted again in relation to the information that she had previously made a Garda statement on and I would have written out to Mr. McCabe outlining that allegation, because that allegation does 11:15 require Tusla to investigate and that's why it was referred to the SART team.
381 Q. And that is a bottom line of your division, is it?
A. Yes, all allegations of child sexual abuse, we are obliged to follow up with them. Even non-contact abuse 11:15 is this -- we are required to investigate.
Q. All right. Now, you sent that letter on to a Lisa o'Logh1en, I think if --
A. Yes.

383 Q. -- if we look at 1617.
A. Yes, because she had the file.

384 Q. And was she dealing with it on the SART team?
A. I am not sure if she allocated the case to Clair Tobin. I think she did.

385 Q. Okay. But you, in fact, sent out, under your own name, a reply, which is to be found at 1621 --
A. Yes.

386 Q. -- referring to Mr. Costello's letter of the 20th July.
A. Yes.

387 Q. And you simply said: "Dear Mr. Costello, thank you for your letter dated 20/7/2016 and I acknow7edge receipt of same. The Child and Family Agency will respond to the issues you raise in due course."
A. Yes.

388 Q. Now, in terms of dealing with someone in Mr. McCabe's position or actually dealing with Sergeant McCabe through his solicitors here, would it not have been appropriate at this stage to tell them of the error, to tell them you were no longer dealing with the case and that it had been handed over to some specialist team and to provide contact details?
A. Okay, I was instructed to send a brief letter acknowledging receipt of the letter and outlining that the Child and Family Agency would respond. I was instructed to do that and I was instructed to keep the letter brief.

389 Q. You see, I am sure you have seen the SART intake form, as it were --
A. Yes.

390 Q. -- at one stage. But there is a description in that saying that the letter that you wrote was written because it was based upon the allegation made in Ms. D's statement of 2006. Now, that is not correct. 11:18
A. Can I see that document?

391 Q. Yes.
A. No, that is not correct.

392 Q. Just while we get the reference to that immediately. Your dealing with the file had ended?
A. Yes.

393 Q. You think Michae1 Cunningham handed over the file to the SART team in 2016?
A. Yes, yes, I am confident that he did, he assured me he did.

394 Q. Yes. And my concern is, did you have any discussion with Lisa O'Loghlen or with Clair Tobin about the basis upon which you wrote the letter of the 29th of December?
A. I don't believe I did.

395 Q. Okay. You have seen it, obvious7y, in the discovery?
A. Yes.

396 Q. And perhaps in fairness to -- to ask you to look at it now at page 1113, and obviously I am asking you to do so with the caveat, the same caveat that Mr. Lowry had, 11:19 that it's not his document?
A. This is the -- this is the risk form?

397 Q. Yes.
A. Not the intake form.

398 Q. The risk escalation. And you see that paragraph in the box marked "Nature of incident giving rise to escalation"?
A. Yes.

399 Q. And there is -- the second paragraph reads: "In 2014 11:19 Ms. D was attending therapy and made the disclosure to a therapist, who referred the matter to Social Work Department in Cavan. Social work Department received a copy of Ms. D's Garda statement taken on 5 December 2006 and used this to write to D.S. McCabe in December 11:20 2015. However, inaccurate details of the disclosure were given in the 7etter."

Now, that's --
A. That is not correct.

400 Q. That is wholly incorrect?
A. Yes, that is -- the first, "In 2014" should read in 2013.

401 Q. Yes. But it appears --
A. Then it moves on to say that the letter was based -- I 11:20 didn't have the statement until after I sent the 1etter.
402 Q. Yes.
A. I stated that already in my evidence.

403 Q. Yes. So would you agree with me that you never gave 11:20 that account --
A. No.

404 Q. -- to anyone in connection with the SART team?
A. No.

405 Q. You never recorded that anywhere yourself?
A. No.

406 Q. You never had the statement before you sent the letter?
A. Before I think the 3rd of February 2016.

407 Q. Although, obviously, you could have, and we won't go back over that ground.
A. I should have, but I hadn't.

408 Q. But when you did get it --
A. Yes.

409 Q. -- the original statement didn't contain --
A. That's correct.

410 Q. -- the allegation of digital penetration?
A. That's correct.

411 Q. Okay. And you didn't base your letter on Ms. D's statement?
A. Yes, unfortunately I didn't.

412 Q. And my concern here is whether you can shed any light on how this appears to be blaming Ms. D and the contents of her statement for the inclusion by you of the digital penetration issue in your letter?
A. Sorry, can you say that again. You are saying that this seems to blame Ms. D?
413 Q. Well, it's saying that the Social Welfare Department used Ms. D's statement to write the letter that contained the allegation that was incorrect, isn't that 11:21 right?
A. Yes.

414 Q. So it appears to be placing the blame on Ms. D's statement or how it was used to write the letter, and
can you help us as to how that --
A. I think this is an error. I think it's an error. I don't know that it seeks to blame Ms. D, but I do think it's an error, it's not correct.
415 Q. Yes. We11, my concern is to try and ask you, have you 11:22 any information or evidence as to how that error occurred in this document?
A. No, I don't know. It's not my document.

416 Q. And you weren't consulted about it at the time?
A. No. Sir, would it be possible to take a two-minute 11:22 break?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. It's half eleven. would people like to take an hour now as opposed to later on? You are nearly finished, Mr. McGuinness?

MR. MCGUINNESS: Yes, I am nearly finished.
CHAIRMAN: Let's do that.

THE HEARING ADJOURNED FOR LUNCH

THE HEARING RESUMED, AS FOLLOWS, AFTER LUNCH:

## MS. MCLOUGHLIN CONTINUED TO BE DIRECTLY EXAMINED BY MR. MCGUINNESS AS FOLLOWS:

417 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: Ms. McLough7in, just one or two matters more. Obviously, we have seen your draft Barr letter that you sent to Mr. Deeney and Mr. Lowry in May 2015.
A. Yes.

418 Q. Obviously that draft could have been based upon, in fact, one of six documents on the file which contain that erroneous allegation of digital penetration?
A. Yes, that's correct.

419 Q. Have you any recollection of which one you did base it 12:25 upon?
A. I couldn't swear to which one, but it was one of those incorrect documents.
420 Q. All right. And obviously you neither created those yourself?
A. No.

421 Q. And presumably you felt yourself that you were entitled to rely on the material that was on the file?
A. Well, I felt that that is where I would find the information of concern.

422 Q. Yes.
A. However, I fully acknowledge I didn't read the entire file.
423 Q. A11 right. Obvious7y, then, from having provided the
draft, nobody, and in particular mr. Deeney nor Mr. Lowry, brought it to your attention that the draft was in any way wrong or that, in particular, that this error had been created the previous year?
A. No, nobody had.

424 Q. And from your point of view personally you seem to have had the clear desire to try and correct the error when you found it, when it was brought to your attention?
A. Yes.

425 Q. And you identified what was on the file?
A. Yes.

426 Q. And you personally, as I understand it, were keen to explain to Mr. McCabe's solicitors, Sergeant McCabe's solicitors, how it had happened?
A. Well, it occurred to me that that should be considered, 12:26 yes.
427 Q. Okay. And just in terms of the final response then that was written, signed off by you, I think that's something you were told to do, as it were?
A. Well, that was what was agreed with Gerry Lowry and myself.

428 Q. Right. You were told to keep it brief?
A. No, not that letter. The letter that I sent in July in response to Mr. Costello's letter was, I was advised to be brief on that letter.

429 Q. Yes, yes.
A. But on the letter of apology that was sent in June, I wasn't instructed to keep that brief.
430 Q. No, no, I understand that. But I am talking about that
final letter you sent off in July --
A. Yes.

431 Q. -- that didn't contain any explanation or further apologies, because you were told to keep that brief?
A. Yes.

432 Q. And it was essentially a holding letter and you knew --
A. Yes.

433 Q. -- that the matter had gone to the SART team and to the legal advisers to Tus7a, is that right?
A. Yes. I can't remember who told me that it was gone to 12:27 the legal advisers, whether that was somebody from the SART team or whether it was Gerry Lowry.
434 Q. All right.
A. I don't recall. But I was made aware that it was gone to the SART team and that the legal, Tusla's legal services would respond to the letter.
435 Q. Okay. Just in terms of an overall picture of dealing with the unallocated files, I think in 2013 keara MCGlone had been team leader and she had responsibility at that point in time?
A. That's correct.

436 Q. Ms. Argue took over in January, or perhaps February of 2014?
A. February, early February. I think 10th February.

437 Q. Yes. Then she left the service to go to Kilkenny in 12:28 June 2014?
A. Yes.

438 Q. And Ms. Carmel McAulay, she had some responsibility until the counties were split up in 2014, in August, is
that right?
A. Yes.

439 Q. And then you took over in october 2014?
A. Yes. But I should point out that I did have responsibility for Cavan from possibly July/August. responsibility for dealing with the files had any hand, act or part in either it not getting allocated sooner or not being dealt with in any particular way or not?
A. Yes, I do. I do think that the significant change of personnel over that time period did contribute to, for instance, the erroneous information not getting corrected on the file. I believe Eileen Argue's departure and the departure of Louise Carolan, her line manager, I think at that particular time coincided closely with being advised by Laura Brophy and I do think that that in some way did impact on the documents not being corrected on the file.
441 Q. And obviously from this perspective in time, and no doubt from when you discovered the error, the file-keeping and the record-keeping in relation to the error could have been much better and much different, isn't that right?
A. Yes, absolutely.

442 Q. At all stages, perhaps?
A. Yes.

443 Q. And not just focusing on yours, obviously?
A. Well, $I$ believe that the allocation of a file to a social worker to follow up on it and to give, you know,
focused attention at a given time period, that it be followed up quickly and that they would have had -ideally, that it would be allocated to a social worker, that they would have read the file thoroughly and discussed it with their team leader and considered perhaps meeting with the Gardai or other stakeholders, would have been the appropriate action, and following through then with meeting Ms. D also, and that would have been the best.

444 Q. Yes.
A. And that's the ideal situation for all cases.

445 Q. Yes. Now, insofar as Sergeant McCabe is concerned, had you any prior dealings with him, to the best of your recollection, or had you ever met him in any capacity?
A. I can't remember having ever met him. It is possible I 12:30 did. It is quite possible that I did. I may have phoned Bailieboro Garda Station at maybe some point during my covering duty over the years and maybe I spoke to him, I don't know. I may have been at a case conference, though my role wouldn't have involved attending many case conferences in the period that I was in fostering.
446 Q. All right. Just insofar as communications with any Gardaí are concerned, I think you've no relatives who are guards?
A. No.

447 Q. You had a neighbour who is a guard. But did you ever discuss this or in particular --
A. No.

448 Q. -- any of the details of the allegation with any guard?
A. No. Other than asking Sergeant Byrne, I have not discussed this with any other guard.
MR. MCGUINNESS: Okay. Thank you, Ms. McLoughlin.
A. Thank you.

12:31

## END OF DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MCGUINNESS

MS. MCLOUGHLIN WAS CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. MCDOWELL:

449 Q. MR. McDOWELL: Ms. McLoughlin, Michael McDowell is my name. I am one of the barristers appearing in this matter for Sergeant McCabe. Could we go back to 2013 for a moment. We have heard that when Laura Brophy's telephone description of her inquiry was received, it was converted into an intake document, is that right?
A. That's correct.

450 Q. And that that document was considered at a referral meeting on the following Monday, the 12th August 2013?
A. That's correct.

451 Q. Would you have been present at that referral meeting?
A. I don't remember being at that meeting. I have no recollection.
452 Q. We11, have you checked your diary ever as to whether you were or were not at the meeting?
A. I checked to see if I was on duty and I was on duty in late -- in sort of around maybe the 20th July or 22 nd July for a week at that time. It is my practice to go on leave in August, and so, based on that, I don't
think I was at that meeting.
453 Q. I see. But from your experience in respect of the referral form prepared by Ms. Tinnelly, what would have happened in the normal course on Monday 12th August in respect of that form?
A. It would have been discussed at the meeting, it would been highlighted, you know the form would have been read out, the concerns would have been read out at that meeting and the team leader would have made a decision as to whether it be allocated -- whether it would be accepted as a referral - I think that may have already occurred - and what would happen. So it would appear that Ms. McGlone identified that it would await allocation and that it should be Garda notified.
454 Q. The first point that we have to be clear about is that it would have been discussed at that meeting, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

455 Q. So how many people, typically, would attend that meeting?
A. I can't say how many at that time. It's probably a sma11 number of people would have been at that meeting at that time.

456 Q. We11, can you help the Tribunal at all as to what 'a sma11 number' means?
A. Possibly five or six people, perhaps.

457 Q. Five or six people. So five or six people would have been aware on Monday -- in all probability on Monday, 12th August 2013, that this matter had been re-referred
to Tusla, or to -- yes, to Tusla?
A. I can't account for the people at the meeting or what was said at the meeting.
458 Q. No, but in the ordinary course you would imagine that five or six people would have been present at a discussion of the document and they would --
A. Yes.

459 Q. -- have been aware that the complaint against Sergeant McCabe --
A. Oh, yes, yes.

460 Q. -- had been re-referred to Tusla?
A. We11, when you say 're-referred', I don't know if they were aware of that at that point, but they were aware that it was referred.
461 Q. We11, surely they would have to have been aware of it, it was a re-referral having regard to what Ms. Tinnelly had noted?
A. I think Ms. Tinnelly had looked up the system and found no information on Maurice McCabe and had ticked that Maurice McCabe was not known to the service.

462 Q. Yes.
A. So I'm not sure if, at that point, if the people at that meeting would have been aware that it was a re-referral.

463 Q. I see.
A. I can't attest to that.

464 Q. Okay. But somebody subsequently was aware that it was a re-referral, because we know that the last witness, Mr. Lowry, was informed of it being a re-referral by Louise, isn't that right?
A. Em --

465 Q. He thinks it was she who said that the matter -- that it was a re-referral?
A. I think he said that, as far as he can recall, but he's 12:36 not sure, he thinks that at some point it was brought to his attention by Louise Carolan.

466 Q. Yes. Do you think that you may have ever discussed it with Louise Carolan?
A. That I did?

467 Q. Yes. Ever?
A. I have no recollection of discussing it with Louise Carolan. She was my line manager at that time.

468 Q. Yes.
A. But my responsibilities were in relation to the further 12:36 assessment child protection team.

469 Q. Yes.
A. So I would not have had cause to discuss it with her.

470 Q. I see. But at some point between August of 2013 and early 2014, you were aware that a complaint of child sexual abuse had been referred in respect of Maurice McCabe?
A. Yes.

471 Q. And that there was a file opened on the matter?
A. Yes.

472 Q. And you said yesterday, in answer to Mr. McGuinness, that you can't be specific as to how you became aware --
A. Yes.


473 Q. -- that Sergeant McCabe --

474 Q. But you advance two possibilities: a conversation in the office --
A. Yes.

475 Q. -- or hearing it through a thin-partitioned wall?
A. Yes.

476 Q. And I just want to ask you in relation to the latter possibility, do you consider that that is a probable explanation as to how you became aware that Sergeant McCabe was the subject of a file --
A. It's possible --

477 Q. No, I asked you was it probable, not possible.
A. I would say possible.

478 Q. I'm asking you did you think it was probable that that 12:38 happened?
A. I can't remember, so $I$ can't say 'probable'. I can only say 'possible'.
479 Q. Would you agree with me that it was improbable?
A. Em, no.

480 Q. So you think it is as likely as not that that's how --
A. We11, I certainly heard it within the office. It's possible through -- but $I$ have no recollection, $I$ can't definitively, you know, give an account as to how I heard about it.
481 Q. But agree with Mr. Lowry's description of the fact that it had been re-referred as a significant event. He says that whoever informed him of this informed him of it, he recognised it to be a significant -- an event of
significance that he would expect to be told about?
A. Em...

482 Q. Would you agree with that view?
A. Not totally.

483 Q. Why would you not agree with Mr. Lowry on that point, that it was a significant event?
A. Well, I think the significance was that it was re-referred because it hadn't been dealt with previously in 2007. That would be my view in terms of its significance.

484 Q. So when Ms. Carolan -- he says that whoever it was, Ms. Carolan or some other person, informed him of this he would have expected that to be done because it was an event of significance.
A. Okay.

485 Q. And I'm just asking you, are you saying that it was significant because it was a re-referral or because it was Sergeant McCabe?
A. Well, because it was a re-referral of a case that hadn't been dealt with in 2007. I don't think we
treated it any differently to any other referral in relation to, you know, allegations of child sexual abuse made against an adult.
486 Q. Mr. Lowry was of the view that it was an event of significance, and he said that twice in his evidence, 12:40 and I'm just wondering, you seem to have a difficulty agreeing with that proposition and I just wonder do you agree that it was significant -- that it was significant that Sergeant McCabe was being referred or
re-referred in these circumstances?
A. Are you asking about my current view on that?

487 Q. No. At the time.
A. I have no recollection of what I thought, other than I was aware that Mr. McCabe was discussed in the media and I was aware that the referral had come back in. So I was aware of that information. whether I put significance on it, I cannot say.
488 Q. When you use the words that you just used now, that you were aware that Mr. McCabe was discussed in the media 12:41 and you were aware that the referral had come back in --
A. Yes.

489 Q. -- that suggests that you knew that Sergeant McCabe was a high profile person in relative terms, and that this ${ }_{12: 41}$ was a re-referral?
A. Yes. when I -- I was aware, yes.

490 Q. How were you aware there was a re-referral?
A. As I've explained, I heard, I heard something in the office. I'm not sure where. I was aware, as I have 12:41 stated in my evidence, I was aware that there was a referral in relation to this case and it was followed up by the social worker Rhona Murphy in 2006 and 2007.
491 Q. Well, how were you aware --
A. So I was aware --

492 Q. How were you aware of that, Ms. McLoughlin?
A. I can't remember how $I$ became aware of it, but it was a small office at the time, a small department. I was aware of the case. I can't remember how I was aware,
but it was discussed possibly in my presence and I was aware of it.
493 Q. So you were aware at some stage between August 2013 and early 2014 that it was a re-referral?
A. oh, yes.

494 Q. And that it had already been dealt with in 2006/2007?
A. I was aware that -- I wasn't aware that Mr. McCabe had been followed up with in relation to the allegations.
495 Q. No, but the allegation had been dealt with in your office --
A. Yes.

496 Q. -- in 2006 and 2007?
A. Yes.

497 Q. You're aware of that?
A. Yes.

498 Q. Is that your testimony now?
A. Yes, I understood -- my information was that there was a case opened in relation to Ms. D at that time, in 2006/2007.
499 Q. And you weren't involved in that case --
A. No.

500 Q. -- yourself?
A. No.

501 Q. So somebody must have said that to you, isn't that right?
A. Well, I may have been in somebody's presence, I could have been in the administration office when somebody was pulling the file or asking somebody to complete something on the file, or something like that. It's
possible. But these are just scenarios. You know, we do sometimes know about each other's cases.
502 Q. Yes. You're not an order of Trappists?
A. No, we're not.

503 Q. I mean, you do speak to each other?
A. We do talk to each other.

504 Q. I take it there's coffee time and the like, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

505 Q. So it is fair to say, therefore, and I'm not trying to distort matters, that during that period you were conscious of two things: that a man who was prominent in the media had become the subject of a re-referral --
A. Yes.

506 Q. -- and that when you use the term 're-referral', that 12:44 the allegation of abuse in question had been dealt with in the service in 2006/2007?
A. The allegation, as far as $I$ was aware, was dealt with in relation to Ms. D, but I believe I was aware that Mr. McCabe had not been followed up with.
507 Q. We11, how did you know that in 2006 or 2007, that he hadn't been followed up?
A. I can't remember, but I was aware --

508 Q. Sorry, in 2013, how could you have known that he hadn't been followed up in 2006 and --
A. Because I was aware that there was a re-referral and a file was created and opened in 2013. That would indicate to me -- it wouldn't have been necessary to re-open the case had it been dealt with in 2007, so a
file was reopened as a result. If there had been an earlier file created in 2007, there would be no need to create another file in 2013.
509 Q. I'm finding this very difficult to follow.
A. Okay.

510 Q. You're saying -- you're saying that in 2013 the file wouldn't have been reopened if it had been fully dealt with in 2006/2007?
A. Yes.

511 Q. And you knew from whatever conversation or what was happening in your office that it had been dealt with at that time but that Sergeant McCabe had never been contacted?
A. I had been aware that Ms. D's case had been dealt with, that she had been offered services within our department. I was not aware that at any time the case was allocated -- or that a case was followed up in relation to Mr. McCabe. And the creation of a file in 2013 would indicate to me that there never was a file opened in relation to Mr. McCabe in 2007.
CHAIRMAN: Yes. So what you seem to be saying is, there's two aspects to this: the first is, if someone claims that something happened to them, counselling for them.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: If it happened in consequence of somebody else, well then you are obliged to see, look, is there a danger further.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So one had been done, two wasn't done. That was your mindset all the way through, it seems to me?
A. Sorry, say that again?

CHAIRMAN: Number two was, is the person alleged to be the person who did the thing to the victim --
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- still a danger to other people.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So, you do two things. It's the victim and the alleged perpetrator.
A. Yes, and they are two separate files.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
A. They are two separate pieces of work that would be completed.
512 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: But we know that the decision was made to open the file without any examination of any prior file, isn't that right?
A. Em...

513 Q. We know that Ms. Keara McGlone did not go to any other file to find out whether Sergeant McCabe was followed up on in 2006/2007 when she directed that the file be opened?
A. Yes. My understanding is that Ms. Tinnelly checked with the file index, asked the administrator to check the file index, was there any file in relation to Mr. McCabe, and she was instructed that there wasn't. So as a result, then, an intake record was completed and a file was opened.

514 Q. I see. Now, do you agree with the evidence given by

Keara McGlone or the answers she gave to the investigators here, to the effect that there would have been no need to notify the Gardaí if they had already been notified of the allegations?
A. Yes, I agree with that.
$12: 48$
515 Q. So, does it follow from that, that the whole process of notifying the Gardaí arose from a failure to appreciate that the Gardaí had already been notified in 2006/2007?
A. Yes, that would be my thinking on the case.

516 Q. Yes. If it had been appreciated the guards already knew about the matter, the only focus of your service would have been to interact with Garda McCabe to satisfy yourselves that he was not a danger to children, is that right?
A. Yes.

517 Q. So does it follow, therefore, that the decision to notify the Gardaí was in effect a decision made accidentally and by inadvertence?
A. Well, I can't account for, you know, the decision to notify the Gardaí. Initially it was considered to be notified, but I think when it came to Ms. McGlone's attention that it had already been dealt with in 2006 and 2007, I think that would indicate that she had considered that it didn't need to be notified to the Gardaí.
518 Q. And therefore, that by the 15th August, when her letter written out in manuscript on the 12th August --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

519 Q. -- was typed up and sent to

Superintendent Cunningham --
A. Yes.

520 Q. -- in which she said she was aware that the guards had been involved in 2006/2007 --
A. Yes.

521 Q. -- by that stage the instruction to Garda notify should have been withdrawn?
A. Yes.

522 Q. But wasn't?
A. Yes. It wasn't recorded that --

523 Q. Yes. So on the same day as she wrote out the letter in manuscript, there was a referrals meeting, and, for some reason, the process of Garda notification proceeded almost on automatic pilot thereafter?
A. Well, I cannot really give any evidence in relation to 12:51 the sequence of events in terms of at what stage, for instance, the Garda notification tick-box was ticked and the Garda notify piece written in on the comments section, that may have been at the point of when Ms. McGlone signed it, she can only account for that. 12:51 So, the decision to Garda notify, I can't account for either.

524 Q. It seems unusual, doesn't it, in the circumstance?
A. I can't - I can't account for that action.

525 Q. Well, let's break it down into its pieces. Ms. McGlone 12:52 knew on the 12th August, when she wrote her manuscript 1etter --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

526 Q. -- that the guards already knew about it?
A. Yes.

527 Q. And you've agreed with me that she is correct in saying that there was no need to notify the guards once she was aware of that fact?
A. Yes.

528 Q. And notwithstanding that she had that awareness, she did nothing to stop her direction to notify the Gardaí on the day?
A. She didn't amend the document in relation to Garda notifying or place anything else on file to say not to 12:52 Garda notify.

529 Q. Is that something that you would agree with me was unusual?
A. I wouldn't say it was unusual.

530 Q. We11, was it --
A. I would say it wasn't done.

531 Q. Was it a normal thing that people would realise that they have made a redundant and purposeless direction and just leave it uncorrected, are you saying that's normal?
A. I'm saying that we don't amend documents that we have created, but we update them. So it may be at point of allocation that her instructions to a social worker who might be allocated, they may have been instructed the appropriate action. So Garda notifying, they may have 12:53 been told not to Garda notify but to maybe request a meeting with the Gardaí instead.

532 Q. By using a simple yellow Post-It and sticking it onto the file that was at the referrals committee meeting
that day, the Garda notification process could have been stopped?
A. Well, yes.

533 Q. And I have to ask you, surely it is unusual that that was not done? That cannot have been the normal standard of sloppiness in your service?
A. Em, I need to consider your question.

CHAIRMAN: In other words, was there something more to it than sloppiness, isn't that the question, Mr. McDowell?
MR. McDOWELL: No, I am saying, first of all, it was not the norm that people would just walk away from files and leave them uncorrected.

CHAIRMAN: But is there an implication behind the question? Because $I$ think the witness isn't getting it.

MR. MCDOWELL: The witness said that she didn't accept that it was unusual.

534 Q. I have to suggest to you that it would be unusual for somebody not to take an elementary step of that kind.
I hope it is unusual that people would behave that -that they would not behave in a manner which defies logic?
A. We11, Ms. McGlone wrote to the Gardaí instead of sending a Garda notification.

535 Q. Yes.
A. And in that letter it's clear that the Gardaí are aware of the case. So that's my understanding.

536 Q. And anybody who later saw that file would have known
that the Gardaí had been notified?
A. Yes. If somebody -- yes. Well --

537 Q. But someone like Ms. Connolly comes across the file and she sees that the guards have been notified but decides that she is, nonetheless -- has a standing instruction 12:55 to Garda notify, is that your appreciation of the situation?
A. My appreciation of the situation is that Ms. McGlone was no longer the team leader and Ms. Argue was then responsible for the actions that occurred on that file. 12:55

538 Q. Yes.
A. And my understanding is that it was her who identified that as a task for Ms. Connolly. That was the impression $I$ took from my review of the file.
539 Q. I see. That is interesting. Your impression is that 12:56 Eileen Argue intervened at some stage and told Ms. Connolly to Garda notify?
A. That's my understanding. I took that from the notes that Ms. Connolly had put on the file.
540 Q. I see. And we know, don't we, that Ms. Connolly's
written request for directions went with the file to Ms. Argue?
A. Yes, yes.

541 Q. And again, I have to ask you, is it usual or unusual that a person would give a direction without opening the file to which the query related?
A. Yes. It would be unusual that they would give an instruction without opening the file.
542 Q. And it would have been evident on opening the file that the Gardaí were aware of it, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

543 Q. Those are two unusual features of this matter, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

544 Q. The first being that Keara McGlone failed to call back her written direction, isn't that right?
A. We11, I feel she clarified that in the letter. So from reading the letter, the Gardaí were already known -already knew about the case.

545 Q. Yes. And the process of Garda notification was entirely redundant?
A. Yes.

546 Q. And then secondly, when Ms. Connolly is allocated the file, she asked for directions, and, somehow, the fact 12:57 that the Gardaí were already aware of the matter escapes Ms. Argue's attention when the file is sent to her?
A. I can't account for Ms. Argue's decision-making in that matter.

547 Q. I see. But as far as you were concerned, you had this general awareness, from whatever source, that Sergeant McCabe, a man who is prominent in the media, had been the subject of a re-referral and you also believed that it had not been properly -- he had not been properly followed up on in 2006/2007?
A. Yes. It had not been followed up on at all in relation to Mr. McCabe.

548 Q. And that, then, is effectively the state of your
knowledge until 2015, is that right?
A. Yes.

549 Q. In relation to the awareness you had, were you aware that, on one reading of the file, it was being alleged that Sergeant McCabe had carried out a rape offence on Ms. D?

CHAIRMAN: Do you know what a rape offence is?
A. Yes. oh, yes, absolutely.

CHAIRMAN: I mean, it --
A. Yes, from my reading of the documents I read on the file I was aware of that offence.

550 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: We11, you see, the point is, you're aware that this is a re-referral, you're aware that it hadn't been followed up, but I am asking you, from the office talk, or whatever, however it got into your head 12:59 that this event of some significance had taken place, what was the nature of the allegation against Sergeant McCabe? Was it --
A. I wasn't aware of what the information of the allegations were. while you may be aware that a case 13:00 is opened and you may be aware that a colleague is dealing with it, you know, we wouldn't necessarily discuss the details of abuse about a person in the office in that way. So I was n't aware of the details.
551 Q. If a child -- but if a prominent person in the media was being complained to your service as a child rapist, surely that's entirely different from the other scenario, which is the hide-and-seek couch scenario?
A. From the service point of view, all allegations of
abuse need to be followed up. So from my point of view, whatever the information was on file, and it was an allegation of sexual abuse, it needed to be followed up. That's our obligation as an agency.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
A. Because of what we know.

CHAIRMAN: Perhaps I could intervene, it may help, and if it doesn't help, I'm sorry. But you probably heard, you know, or read in the media about the whole issue of sentencing in relation to sexual abuse cases and that.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And are judges doing the right job.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And there have been attempts to classify offences according to whether you get on the ladder, whether you are one, two, three, four or five. All of these are arbitrary, but they are human responses to a very difficult situation.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And the DPP's decision here was that this didn't amount to sexual abuse, if it happened, and there was a question-mark in relation to that as well. But what Mr. McDowell is asking you is: There's a very different thing to being not on the ladder to being at, let's say, rung number four of the ladder, and in the event that you are not on the ladder, isn't that a very different thing to being on rung number four out of five of the ladder? That is, I think, the question that you are putting, Mr. McDowell.

MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.
A. Okay, okay. Well, our role in Tusla is about child protection. Our expertise is in relation to protecting children. You know, we're not experts in relation to the criminal side of things. And while we do seek to work with the Gardaí, from our point of view if we are following up on a case where there is a conviction, it is more straightforward, it's those cases that where there isn't -- you know, where there isn't a direction, perhaps, from the DPP to follow through that are more complicated and difficult cases to follow up. We do have an obligation to follow up on all child sexual abuse allegations, even noncontact cases such as viewing child pornography, and that is because of the research carried out into child sexual abuse. So that is why we are obliged to look at all allegations of inappropriate contact with children of a sexual nature, and that is an obligation that we have.
552 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Well, can we agree on this, perhaps: that if you had known from conversation in the office that this was an allegation of digital, vaginal and anal penetration, your concept of Sergeant McCabe would have changed very dramatically.
A. No. It's an allegation, so -- it's an allegation. I don't know whether it is true or false. I can't form any view on anybody, you know, because allegations are what they are - allegations. So it should not influence me in my response. It should --
553 Q. No. I'm just saying in 2013 you weren't involved in

Sergeant McCabe's file. You knew he was a prominent man in the media. And if you had considered that a very serious allegation was being made against him, would it have put a question-mark in your mind over him as a --
A. But I wasn't aware.

554 Q. -- a prominent figure in the public domain?
A. At that time I was only aware that there was an allegation of CSA. I wasn't aware of what that was. Regardless of what it was, it is an allegation. It wouldn't flower -- or colour, should I say, my judgment or --
555 Q. Okay. Then can we move on then to May 2015. At page 451 in volume 2 you send an email to Gerry Lowry and Seamus Deeney. Do you recall sending that email?
A. Yes, yes.

556 Q. This, on what you are telling us, was your next involvement or next knowledge of this file, is that right?
A. Yes.

557 Q. I gather that much from your statement, but the point I want to ask you about is this: did nobody at the water cooler or at the coffee table or in general conversation around the office or speaking through walls, ever alert you to the fact that a monumental error had taken place in respect of Sergeant McCabe in 2014?
A. No, I wasn't aware of it.

558 Q. You see, it's a bit of a mystery, isn't it, that a
very, very serious error had come to light in respect of this file and nobody at your level is made aware of it?
A. Well --

559 Q. Let's go through the people. Laura Connolly was utterly unaware that she had made a major mistake until this Tribunal was established.
A. Yes.

560 Q. You, in 2015, a year afterwards, just a year, exactly a year after this catastrophic error, you're unaware that 13:07 that catastrophic error had been made?
A. Yes.

561 Q. Eileen Argue was aware of it, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

562 Q. Mr. Deeney was aware of it?
A. Yes.

563 Q. Mr. Lowry was aware of it?
A. Yes, it would appear from the email.

564 Q. But nobody else in your company was aware that the office had engaged in a disastrous error the previous year?
A. I have no recollection of being made aware of it whatsoever. I have -- I cannot account for anyone else, other than myself.
565 Q. I see. So it seems as if maybe a decision was made not 13:07 to mention it around the office and to hush it up?
A. Well, that wouldn't be my view.

566 Q. It wouldn't be your view?
A. Yes, it wouldn't be my view. My view is that both

Ms. Carolan and Eileen Argue left the service at the time this came in, and while ms. Argue took steps to clarify the Garda notification, no further steps were taken to amend the file, and I believe that's because she left the service, as did her line manager.

567 Q. We11, okay, can we --
A. So the lack of continuity.

568 Q. Do you not consider it odd that Ms. Connolly was not asked at the time anything about the highly erroneous Garda notification that she had drawn up? she was never alerted to the fact that she had done this, according to her testimony?
A. If she wasn't made aware of it, then I accept that she wasn't made aware of it.
569 Q. Can you think of any good reason why, if something like 13:09 that happened, if you had executed a document which turned out to be entirely wrong, on a false premise, that nobody would ever mention it to you for three years thereafter?
A. I can't account for her not being aware of it. But if she wasn't made aware of it, that's quite possible because maybe Ms. Argue left the service, that's a possibility.
570 Q. But Mr. Deeney and Mr. Lowry are both there and they know about this?
A. They have been made aware of it, yes.

571 Q. Yes.
A. In an email.

CHAIRMAN: To the extent to which they appreciated it,

Mr. McDowe11, I mean the jury is out on that. I know there's not a jury, you know.

MR. MCDOWELL: Mr. Deeney --
CHAIRMAN: We certainly heard a lot of confusing evidence.

MR. MCDOWELL: Chairman, Mr. Deeney clearly knew, because he was party to the sending in of the correct document. The correct in inverted commas.
CHAIRMAN: Yes, but then, you know, sometimes if you read an illegal document, it appears that - well, bells 13:10 start to ring in my head to say, I wonder did they actually read the whole thing. And that is what appears at point 1 of the famous five-point pl an. MR. MCDOWELL: We will come to Mr. Lowry at a later stage.

572 Q. Anyway, you wrote to Gerry and Séamus, namely Mr. Lowry and Mr. Deeney, on the 7th May 2015?
A. Yes.

573 Q. And you said that you had been "reviewing files on the MTP today. One relates to Maurice McCabe and I would like to discuss this case with you both."

Now, why did you want to speak to both of them before you brought the matter any further? why weren't you content to deal with Mr. Deeney?
A. Well, I think in this case, as I've stated, I wanted to bring this to case Mr. Lowry's attention because it was a high profile case at that point or prior to that point, so $I$ wanted him to be aware of it. In terms of

Séamus, he had been part of the review, he had reviewed the file the previous day, and I was just following up in relation to that, making them aware of it.
574 Q. Mr. Deeney had reviewed the file the previous day?
A. Well, my understanding is in terms of -- his
handwriting is on the review form for that date and that he actually looked at that file on that date. I'm basing that on the fact that he completed that form. So he looked at that file on that date.
575 Q. I see. And that's what appears at page 450 then, is that right?
A. Yeah.

576 Q. And I think you made a statement to the Tribunal on the 20th March, and one paragraph of it reads:
"When I took over responsibility for duty intake service in October 2014 there were a considerab7e number of cases awaiting allocation to a social worker. I undertook, along with principal social worker Séamus Deeney and Gail Pender, Manager, Tus7a's Castleblayney wellbeing Centre, to review these files and to identify actions that could be taken to ensure that the cases got an adequate response."

And that's 1530, that appears in the books.
A. Yes.

577 Q. Do you recal1 making that statement?
A. I made that statement in either the end of May or the beginning of June this year, not in March.

578 Q. We11, it's dated 20th March 2017.
A. Oh, my statement. Oh, sorry, yes.

579 Q. In any event, so you had a discussion, you believe, on the 6th May 2015 with Mr. Deeney because his signature appears --
A. Yeah.

580 Q. -- where your signature might appear on the document, is that right?
A. Yes, whoever reviewed the form, his or mine, yes.

581 Q. Page 450.
A. Yeah.

582 Q. The management decision on that review date was: "Contact re checking the reliability and accuracy of allegations made."
Is that right?
A. Yes.

583 Q. Can you explain what that was about?
A. That he's instructing that what should happen is that Ms. D should be contacted regarding the accuracy and reliability of her allegations.
584 Q. He was doing this not in conjunction with you. This isn't a note of a meeting. This is a management decision, or are you party to the decision?
A. This is his review of the file and it's his view of what should take place.
585 Q. Were you sitting in a room with him while you discussed it and he came to this management decision?
A. Yeah. Well, most likely I was, but I can't --

586 Q. So can we take it there was a discussion?
A. I can't remember a discussion, but it's possible there was, but I can't remember.
587 Q. Well, you could hardly be in a room with him dealing with the file and not saying a word to each other. You don't operate on that basis?
A. Well, we were discussing the files.

588 Q. Yes.
A. And says some things about them, but I don't know to what degree and I have no recollection of that discussion.

589 Q. He writes down "Contact Ms. D re checking the reliability and accuracy of allegations made".
A. Yes.

590 Q. Can you just at this stage assist the Tribuna1. what discussion could possibly have taken place which required contact with Ms. D to check the reliability and the accuracy of the allegations?
A. Well, that was our practice, to try and endeavour to meet with somebody who has made allegations. It's part of our responsibility to check --
591 Q. okay.
A. -- their account.

592 Q. And did you know what the allegations were at that point?
A. I can't say if they were. No, I can't, I can't remember.

593 Q. Can I ask you were you proceeding -- do you think you were proceeding on the basis that it was an allegation of digital penetration or an allegation of playing hide
and seek and gyrating on top of a girl?
A. I can't remember, I can't remember. I can't remember if Séamus -- I don't believe he did high1ight the two accounts. But he may have been aware of it. But I can't account for that.

594 Q. You see, it could just be a normal thing, just: would you follow up with Ms. D and verify the reliability and accuracy of the allegation she made.
A. Yes.

595 Q. A run-of-the-mil1 direction.
A. Yeah.

596 Q. Or it could be one which was caused by seeing a problem on the file. which do you think it was?
A. I don't know. But I can tell you that we are obliged to meet with people who make allegations and to go through their account and to consider the reliability of their information.
597 Q. Amn't I right in saying, and I think it's been conceded by a number of witnesses here, and agreed by them a11, that before you would issue a Barr letter, you would, in fact, carry out some evaluation of the reliability of the material?
A. Yes, I'd agree with that.

598 Q. And then the next arrow is "review information".
A. Yes.

599 Q. And the next arrow is "7etter". What does that mean?
A. "Letter prepared for" -- sorry, it just moved.

600 Q. "For Maurice McCabe", is it?
A. Yes.
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601 Q. "To contact". And then there is "estab7ish current address", is that right?
A. Yes.

602 Q. So that meeting takes place on the 6th May?
A. Or 7th.
Q. We11 --
A. Yeah.

604 Q. Maybe it's the 7th.
A. Well, he's dated it the 7th.

605 Q. Maybe it's the 7th.
A. Yeah.

606 Q. Then you write -- you write an email to one of the participants, Séamus Deeney, on the following page?
A. Yes.

607 Q. And to Gerry Lowry, is that right?
A. Yes.

608 Q. You say:
"I, along with Gail, have been reviewing files on the MPT today. One relates to Maurice McCabe and I would like to discuss this case with you both before taking any action as it appears that this concern was referred to us in 2007 and Mr. McCabe was never met."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

609 Q. So you were, in one sense, writing to Mr. Deeney about 13:18 things that he knew himself, isn't that right?
A. Em, possibly, yeah.

610 Q. If he was involved --
A. Yes.

611 Q. -- in looking at the file with you?
A. Yes.

612 Q. "It has come back in again due to media coverage of Mr. McCabe."
A. Yes.

613 Q. And you say that was speculation?
A. Yes.

614 Q. It was a strange speculation to make, was it not?
A. Well, I think I've outlined yesterday what that was based on. From my understanding of human behaviour, if 13:19 you've had a grievance with somebody in the past and then, years later, that person is somehow brought to your attention, it will bring back your issues and you may do something about that, or so it -- but it was an assumption. I didn't know that.

615 Q. I see. But then the next thing you say is:
"The outstanding actions are that Mr. McCabe be written to outlining the allegations and then be met and afforded an opportunity to respond."
A. Yes.

616 Q. But you'd agreed the previous day -- sorry, it may be the same day with Mr. Deeney, that verification and assessment of the allegations, their credibility, would have to precede such a letter?
A. Yes.

617 Q. And you don't say that there?
A. Okay.

618 Q. Why not?
A. Sorry, it's just moved. I was reading it.

619 Q. Take your time.
CHAIRMAN: It's easier to see it in hard copy.
A. Oh, no, it's okay. It just moved. And it's back. I can't say why I didn't include the meeting with Ms. D in that email.

620 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Because suddenly we're leaping past that, to the point that Mr. McCabe be written to to outline the allegations and then be met and afforded an opportunity to respond. So we're just leaving out that step --
A. Yes.

621 Q. -- that any verification or assessment of credibility should take place?
A. Yes. I can't account for why I didn't include that. It may not have occurred to me at that time. I cannot 13:21 account for it.
622 Q. "And we would have to advise him that we would need to tel1 his wife about this information so that she can be protective."
A. Mm-hmm.

623 Q. What allegation did you think that Mrs. McCabe was to be informed about?
A. Given that I attached the letter with the allegations then, it was the content of that letter.
624 Q. which is penetration?
A. Yes.

625 Q. So we're moving on to informing him -- or, first of a11, arranging to meet him without any credibility assessment, and secondly, to contemplating that we will
have to tell him that we will have to inform his wife about the digital penetration allegation?
A. Yes.

626 Q. Is that right?
A. Yes. But we would -- before that, we would have had to ${ }^{13: 22}$ afford him an opportunity to respond.
627 Q. Yes.
A. His response may have influenced the outcome.

628 Q. "We would have to advise him that we would need to tell his wife about this information so that she could be protective."
A. Yes.

629 Q. "It is likely that she is aware of the allegations as a file was sent to the DPP. However, no prosecution was directed."
so stopping there. You believed that a file in respect of the digital penetration allegation had been sent to the DPP, is that right?
A. Yes, that's what I believed at the time based on what I had seen on the file and what I had considered on the file.

630 Q. Yes. And that the DPP had directed no prosecution in respect of that allegation?
A. Yes.

631 Q. "Mr. McCabe has female children and the victim was a 13:23 seven-year-old child when the alleged incident occurred."

And then you say:
"My issues are that we are proposing to tell this woman we have concerns after not doing it for possibly up to eight years, and also, I am not confident about sending the Barr letter to an address that may be out of date." 13:23

So your issues are informing Mrs. McCabe about the digital penetration allegation, having not done so for eight years --
A. Mm -hmm.

632 Q. -- and the assumption being that this was the same allegation that had been made eight years previously, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

633 Q. And getting the address right?
A. Yes.

634 Q. But no concern whatsoever expressed about validating in any sense or assessing the credibility of the complaint?
A. Yes. Other than --

635 Q. Now, can I ask you, is that not very unusual too, or is it usual?
A. This case, from my point of view, is different because this person, Ms. D, as a child, made a statement to the Gardaí and that's what created the confusion for me, I 13:24 would say. So yes, it was unusual. But that's what made it different: that she had made a statement to the Gardaí, she had made two statements, she had met with counsellors back in 2007 and she had gone to

636 Q. Can I just stop you there. You're saying that she had gone to the Gardaí and had gone to counsellors. where were you getting that information from?
A. From her file.

637 Q. Her file?
A. I was aware that she had made statements to the Gardaí.

638 Q. And what about the counsellors?
A. I was aware that she had attended with Emer O'Neill and Orla Curran.

639 Q. I see.
A. Because of their letter on her file and from the referral from Rian in 2013.

640 Q. I see. And you assumed that the allegations that she made in 2006 were of a rape offence?
A. I assumed that, yes, based on the erroneous information on the file.

641 Q. Now, Mr. Lowry receives your email and doesn't look at your proposed letter, according to his own testimony, which would have alerted him to the proposition that you were assuming that this was a rape offence allegation?
A. Yes.

642 Q. And of course we know that he would, if he had opened the letter, immediately have realised that you were under a misapprehension that that was a genuine complaint of Ms. D, isn't that right?
A. Can you repeat that last sentence?

643 Q. If he had opened the letter and read it, he would have
known -- he would have immediately understood that you were proceeding on the basis that Ms. D's allegation was of digital penetration rape offence?
A. Yes.

644 Q. But he didn't bother to look at your draft?
A. Well, he has no recollection of opening it or reading it.
645 Q. You see, the point is that if he did read it, it would have leapt out at him that all of this was dealt with a year ago and that's the wrong allegation, isn't that right?
A. Possibly, yes.

646 Q. So it must be that he either looked at it and had forgotten what had happened in May 2014, or else just didn't bother looking at it or reading it?
A. Well, it's possible that he had forgotten what had happened in 2014 in either scenario.
647 Q. I see. But Mr. Deeney couldn't have forgotten about it?
A. We11, I can't account -- Mr. Deeney will --

648 Q. There was a huge flap, there was a huge flap within your service to get back documents and to put in revised Garda notifications and to explain to the guards why you were looking for copies of documents back, and all of that was going on in 2014. It could hardly be that either of these two gentlemen had simply suffered minor amnesia about the matter?
A. We11, I can't account for Mr. Deeney or Mr. Lowry in terms of reading that letter and recalling events of

May or June 2014.
CHAIRMAN: what Mr. McDowell is really asking you is this: one hopes --
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- it can't have happened very often that
13:29 there is a cut-and-paste error, whereby, just to take a different example, instead of someone being accused of punching someone in the face, they're accused of murdering them, instead.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And I think Mr. McDowe11 is saying, look, isn't that the kind of thing that would have been talked about, it would have been everywhere, you know, how did this thing happen? what are we going to do about it? And indeed it was talked about to some extent and it was all withdrawn. Given that it is not a regular occurrence --
A. It's not.

CHAIRMAN: -- what he's saying is, surely it would have been discussed, surely you would have been aware of it, 13:29 surely everyone at some stage would have been talking about it. Is that fair, Mr. McDowe11?
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes, Judge.
A. I cannot say. I have read Ms. Argue's email to them and I think the strongest piece of communication was particular concern. And I think that it should have been picked up and corrected. I can on7y -- I can only assume that change of personnel 1ed to it not -- to
that not happening, and that the people who had responsibility for that left the service and I believe that that's why it wasn't corrected on the file. That's my opinion.
649 Q. But you' 11 know, Ms. McLoughlin, that the Gardaí, in 2014, when they were asked to send back the material, were sending letters to your service demanding to know how this error had taken place and refusing to send back the --
A. I have not seen any letters from the Gardaí.

650 Q. You don't even know that now?
A. No.

651 Q. That the guards responded immediately to the two conflicting Garda notifications and demanded an explanation as to how it had happened?
A. I have not seen those on the file. I have not seen those documents.
652 Q. I quite appreciate that you may not have seen the documents, but surely you now know that the Gardaí reacted to getting these two very different Garda notification forms and demanded explanations as to how this had happened?
A. I'm not aware of that.

CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact, that did happen.
A. Okay.

CHAIRMAN: which is one of the questions I put to Mr. Lowry yesterday.
A. Yes, I accept that.

CHAIRMAN: Do you remember the guards --
A. I did, yes, but I wasn't aware of it. CHAIRMAN: It was discussed yesterday.
A. It was, yes, I heard that yesterday.

CHAIRMAN: In other words, you're aware of it from that --
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- but not otherwise?
A. Yes, only from that.

CHAIRMAN: oh, yes.
653 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: I see. I'm just asking about the two people you're dealing with. You're suggesting they might have forgotten about all of this. They couldn't possibly have forgotten about it, isn't that right?
A. I think it's possible to forget about a lot of the information that people have until such time as they are reminded of it.

654 Q. There are things that people might want to forget, but I have got to suggest to you that it is a different thing actually forgetting them?
A. I think the nature of our work requires us to take in a 13:32 huge amount of information and it's very difficult to maintain, and that's why, you know, we endeavour to keep files, I suppose our memories are jogged. And I think, you know, there's lots of things that I can't remember.

655 Q. I see. Anyway, Mr. Lowry writes back to you and says, "Thanks for the update." And this is the day, this is the 7th May 2015.
"Thanks for the update and bringing this matter to my attention. I have a memory that this matter was reported to An Garda Síochána at some stage, so we would need to coordinate with them before taking the steps out7ined below."

And they're the steps set out in your letter, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

656 Q. You knew at that stage that it had been reported to the 13:33 Gardaí?
A. Yes.

657 Q. Isn't that right?
A. Yes.

658 Q. So this wasn't information he was giving you; you knew 13:33 well, full well, when you wrote him that email, that the Gardaí had been alerted to Ms. D's original allegation, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

659 Q. And so he said:
"we would need to coordinate with them before taking the steps outlined below."
A. Yes.

660 Q. Now, what did you understand by that?
A. I wasn't sure what he meant by that. I think he meant 13:33 that I contact the Gardaí to see what the status of the case was with them, possibly. But I don't know what he meant.

661 Q. Status of the case?
A. whether it was closed --

662 Q. That it had gone to the DPP and --
A. That it wasn't reopened at any time. That it was closed in 2007 or had it been reopened or -- that is what my interpretation of that would be.

663 Q. So you thought that coordinating with the Gardaí meant find out from the Gardaí have they reopened the file in relation to this matter or is it still one which stands closed since 2007?
A. Yes, that's my interpretation.

664 Q. And that was to be done before you contacted Sergeant McCabe?
A. That's correct.

665 Q. But why, if you were only concerned with his being a risk to children?
A. That was his instruction.

666 Q. Yeah, but I'm just -- you're receiving this instruction. I am just trying to -- you have to make some sense of what you are being told, and he's saying don't send, don't make contact with Sergeant McCabe until you find out are the Gardaí reinvestigating this matter?
A. Yes.

667 Q. That's what you understood it to mean?
A. Yes.

668 Q. I see.
A. That was my interpretation.

669 Q. He then says, "I will discuss with you."
A. Yes.

670 Q. Did he discuss it with you?
A. I can't remember. I've no recollection.

671 Q. What's the Tribunal to infer from that; that he didn't discuss the matter further with you or that he did?
A. I can't remember having any discussion with him about 13:35 it after this time, after that email was sent.

672 Q. But you do receive an email which is circulated to Mr. Lowry on the following day, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

673 Q. And this is from Séamus Deeney?
A. Yes.

674 Q. And he is saying:
"We will contact the alleged victim as there is some discrepancy in the allegations forwarded to us."
A. Yes.

675 Q. Well, what discrepancy did you believe existed when you read that?
A. I didn't know what discrepancy he was referring to.

676 Q. Yeah. He says:
"we discussed this yesterday. we decided that..."

Was that a reference to himself and Mr. Lowry or a reference to himself and you?
A. It's possibly to himself and me.

677 Q. Yes. And "We decided that we would contact the alleged victim as there is some discrepancy in the allegations forwarded to us."
A. Yes.

678 Q. If you did have a discussion and if you did decide that there was a discrepancy, Ms. McLough1in, I'm asking you now to do your level best and think back; it must have been clear to you, was it not, that there were two separate inconsistent sets of allegations at the time?
A. I can honestly say that I wasn't aware of what the two different accounts were at that stage.
679 Q. We11, what discrepancy did you agree with him needed to be investigated?
A. I took it that we needed to meet with Ms. D to clarify our information on the files.

680 Q. No, no, no.
A. That's what I took this --

681 Q. You said, "We discussed this case yesterday. We decided that we would contact the alleged victim as there is some discrepancy in the allegations forwarded to us."
A. I have no recollection of the discrepancies being high1ighted to me.
682 Q. Well, they were in black and white.
A. Okay.

683 Q. And it was stated that you had agreed that there were discrepancies?
CHAIRMAN: Well I am not sure it went that far, Mr. McDowe11. I mean I don't think -- well, certainly 13:38 Mr. Lowry hasn't said that he knew from Mr. Deeney or he knew from a discussion that somebody pointed out, look, here's on the one hand, as you say it, the hide and seek, the gyration on the couch, and here's, on the
other hand, digital penetration of the vaginal orifice and anus as well. I don't think anyone has said that conversation. But what this means, of course, is important, I agree with you. I am just thinking, Mr. McDowe11, that, you know, even going back to 2006, 13:38 there's an account to the aunt --

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: -- as to being on the floor, there's an account to somebody else being on the couch. That is a discrepancy. But it is not all that material compared to this, which are poles apart.
MR. MCDOWELL: But that would be relevant, Chairman, with respect --
CHAIRMAN: Yeah.
MR. MCDOWELL: -- if we were talking about the couch and all the rest of it.

CHAIRMAN: And nothing else, yeah.
MR. MCDOWELL: But the witness has said she believed she was dealing with a digital rape case.
CHAIRMAN: So I think the question, therefore, is:
What did you think the discrepancy was or did you address your mind to it? I think that is Mr. McDowell's question ultimately, isn't it, Mr. McDowe11?
A. I didn't know what Séamus meant by "discrepancy".

684 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: We11, then the next sentence may jog your memory, because it says:
"This will allow us to check the reliability and
accuracy of these allegations and determine whether there is a foundation to the allegations."

So it would need to be a fairly major discrepancy if it was going to assist them to decide whether there was a 13:39 foundation at all for these allegations.
A. That is Seamus's account, yes.

685 Q. The second point, he says:
"Determine whether we need to interview anybody else who may be of relevance, e.g. the counsellor."
A. Yes.

686 Q. And you said that you would have thought yourself somehow inhibited or prohibited from going to Laura Brophy to check on any discrepancies between the versions given?
A. Without her consent, yes.

687 Q. But you never sought that consent?
A. I didn't get the opportunity.

688 Q. I see. "And on review of the above, inform the alleged abuser of the allegations."
So there was to be a credibility assessment done before Sergeant McCabe was to be approached, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

689 Q. "And p7an the action to be taken to inform third parties, e.g. his wife."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

690 Q. "And determine protective action and plan for the case."
A. Yes.

691 Q. Now, can you tel1 me why, for a second time, the credibility dimension of this just simply evaporates in your mind, the necessity to assess credibility disappears out of the equation for a second time?
A. As I have stated yesterday, I did attempt to meet with 13:41 Ms. D. That attempt didn't come about, it didn't happen, and when I went back to look at the file again, I considered the statements that she had made, I had to consider that she made statements to the Gardaí and --
692 Q. Did you consider the statements themselves?
A. No, I didn't.

693 Q. So there you are, you're trying to assess the -- your aim is to assess the credibility before you approach Sergeant McCabe, you have difficulty in contacting Ms. D?
A. Yes.

694 Q. You don't -- you aren't acquainted at all with the contents of her original statements?
A. No. But I'm aware that --

695 Q. And yet, somehow, you decided to dispense with all of that necessary precondition for approaching Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes.

696 Q. And can I ask you why you did that?
A. I can only acknowledge that it was an error on my part and I regret that. I think my reasoning was as stated, that she had made a statement to the Gardaí, that also Mr. McCabe had never been contacted or afforded an opportunity to respond, and I think that was part of my
thinking as well.
697 Q. I mean, obviously I don't want to spend too much time on this, but let's be clear about this; you knew it was absolutely standard form before you approached any alleged abuser that you do a credibility assessment?
A. Yes.

698 Q. You didn't bother to look at her original statements, even to find out what her original complaint was?
A. I didn't look at her original statements. I read, I read a letter from Emer o'Neill on the file in relation 13:43 to her file in relation to offering her a service.

CHAIRMAN: I wonder could I ask a question which may be pertinent to the line you're pursuing, Mr. McDowell.
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: And that is this: I think it was told by
Laura Brophy, I will check this but I have a definite recollection of being told, look -- I think it was, in fact, the next witness. I asked, look, do you not do this thing, assessment, appropriate effect, relevant detail, et cetera, to assess whether someone is telling 13:43 the truth or not.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And I was told that in circumstances where someone has made a statement to the Gardaí --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHAIRMAN: -- you seem to take the statement at face value and don't do that.
A. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN: So if that is so and you are saying, we11,
before you write a Barr letter you've got to do an assessment, there is just a contradiction between those two things.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And that's part of the area that
Mr. McDowell is exploring and I'm just wondering about that. So why, on the one hand, say, well, we're not going to ask her to relive it because she's made a statement to the Gardaí, and then how does that square with, well, before we write a Barr letter we should talk to the person to see whether we're, you know, barking up the right tree here, more or less?
A. Well, I have used statements from children and from adults to avoid putting them through going through their statement again, in my work. I've I think been shown, for instance, videotapes of Gardaí interviews has been particularly useful in assessing allegations that children make against adults. I have had -- you know, I can think of a case where somebody was abroad, I didn't particularly want to go into a discussion over 13:45 the phone with them about their allegations and they gave me consent to get their Garda statement. So particularly when someone has made a Garda statement, for me it does provide some significance because they were prepared to stand over their allegation and sign off on a statement made to the Gardaí. What I was unclear about was where did that leave me eight years later, and that is my error, and perhaps I should have sought expert advice on that, and I regret not doing
that.
699 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Well, apart from seeking expert advice, you could have sought to have sight of her original Garda statements, isn't that right?
A. Yes, and I regret that too.

700 Q. And that wouldn't have involved getting her relive the allegation --
A. That's true.

701 Q. -- in any shape or form?
A. That's true.

702 Q. And that's what you did do in 2015, isn't that right -or '16?
A. '16, yes.

703 Q. Isn't that right?
A. Yes.

704 Q. But, you see, the five steps described by Séamus Deeney don't involve the one and only step identified by Gerard Lowry on the 7th, which was the need to coordinate with the Gardaí before taking any steps?
A. Yes.

705 Q. And did you take Mr. Deeney as somehow overruling the need to coordinate with the Gardaí step and his five steps?
A. We11, I could have interpreted step 2 as interview or to contact the Gardaí as well as counsellor. He says "may be of relevance" -- "anyone else who may be of relevance, e.g. the counsellor". So that could have also meant maybe the Gardaí. So I didn't see that as a contradiction.

706 Q. Yes. Now, on the 15th May 2015 you spoke to Ms. D, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

707 Q. And she was telling you about that she was getting ready for exams, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

708 Q. But you noted her as asking what had happened?
A. Yes.

709 Q. What did you tell her had happened?
A. I had explained to her that as a result of it being re-referred in through Rian, we had to consider the case in relation to Sergeant McCabe and to consider if other children were at risk.

710 Q. I see.
A. And that that's why I was getting back in touch with her at that time, as I recall.

711 Q. Did she mention at all to you what had happened the previous year?
A. No. The conversation was brief.

712 Q. It was strange, surely, that she wouldn't mention, by 13:48 the way --
A. It was strange --

713 Q. -- you know that a year ago an almighty mess was made by your service of this and I had to intervene to stop the rape allegation from being proceeded with, isn't that right? This is in her head.
A. No.

714 Q. She couldn't have forgotten what had happened the previous year?
A. Well, I'm not going to blame Ms. D for my mistakes. 715 Q. No.
A. Certainly not.

716 Q. She never mentioned it to you on the phone, is that what you are saying?
A. Yes. And -- yeah.

717 Q. I see. Now, we come to late December and you say you probably dictated in advance the letter that went out on 29th December 2015, is that right?
A. Say that again, sorry.

718 Q. You probably dictated the letter, which is at page 462, in advance of that date?
A. Yes, I wrote that letter, yes, in advance of that date.

719 Q. Yes. And did it differ apart from -- did it differ in any way apart from the dates from the draft you prepared at the beginning?
A. And the appointment dates. I don't believe it did. CHAIRMAN: Just a coincident date in relation to that, Mr. McDowe11, which may have no significance, I don't know, there is lots of coincidences. The 16th April 2015 was, the designated officer in GSOC issued a Section 97 report on the Ms. D case and found that there should be no proceedings taken against Superintendent Cunningham or Detective Sergeant Fraher for the investigation into her allegations that. That 13:50 is literally a couple of weeks previously.

MR. MCDOWELL: It is, yes, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
720 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: I take it you weren't aware of GSOC's involvement in this, were you?
A. No.

721 Q. The Garda ombudsman Commission?
A. No, I don't believe I was aware of the role of the ombudsman until documents from this Tribunal were provided.
722 Q. Anyway, you send that letter and it arrives in the McCabe house on the 5th January and Mrs. McCabe opens it and gets a terrible shock. Did you feel any obligation to confer with anybody in your service before you sent that letter out?
A. I did not.

723 Q. Was it an effort to show that something had happened in the calendar year 2015 and that the thing hadn't just gone to sleep yet again, a kind of precursor of a new year's resolution, we'11 show some action on this file in the dying days of 2015? what was it that inspired you to write that letter at that time?
A. I regret that I wrote the information in it that was incorrect because I wasn't aware of it.
724 Q. I know you regret --
A. There was no, there was no -- what I can say is that case wasn't allocated to a social worker. when I had time to complete tasks on case files, I took that opportunity to do that, and it's possible the letter was prepared in maybe earlier December but I delayed posting it until after Christmas, because there would be a policy in the department not to send out such letters before christmas and then have the service not
available to respond to the issues that would arise from such letters. So I would have delayed sending the letter on purpose until after Christmas.
725 Q. But as far as you knew, Mr. Lowry had read that -- the proposed text of that letter back in May and he told you not to send it until you'd taken certain steps?
A. Yes.

726 Q. And why did you fee1, at that stage, absolved from the direction you got from your superior?
A. I can't account for why I did that, other than the fact 13:53 that I regret it and apologise for my inappropriate response to following up in relation to this letter and in relation to reviewing the file. I deeply regret that. I deeply regret, as you outline, that it caused upset to the McCabe family.

727 Q. I appreciate that now, Ms. McLough1in, but I'm asking you how you felt justified in doing so. Just saying that you deeply regret doing so, doesn't help. I'm trying to work out how, when your superiors tell you don't write that letter out, you suddenly decide I will write it out.
A. I can't account, other than that I attempted to carry out the steps, I did check with the Gardaí, I attempted to contact Ms. D and I hadn't been able to, I suppose, move the case forward. I think my reasoning was that 13:54 Mr. McCabe also had a right to respond, and I cannot account otherwise.

728 Q. Now, can I just bring you back two pages to page 460. This is a contact sheet in which you recorded what had
happened on the 15th May 2015, and you write at the end, or towards the end of the page, "Ms. D did not re-contact".
A. Yes.

729 Q. When do you think you wrote that?
A. I can't be sure. Possibly in July of that year. I'm not sure.
730 Q. And why did you note that there?
A. Because I had no recollection of her contacting, re-contacting.
731 Q. I see. You see, it's one thing to say that you regret sending a letter, it's one thing to say that you regret that it included an allegation which could have been easily found to be false, an allegation of a rape offence, but it's an entirely different thing to say that over six months nothing happens and then suddenly you decide to dispense with all of your own procedures and to send a letter with no credibility assessment having taken place. First of all, do you think it was fair to Sergeant McCabe to send an allegation in writing in this way when no attempt had been made by your service over the previous ten years to assess its credibility?
A. I think it's regrettable that no attempt had been made to complete the work over the ten years.
732 Q. No, but, I mean, I am asking you a different question. I'm saying, was it fair to Sergeant McCabe --
A. Yeah, it's unfair to him.

733 Q. -- to send an accusation --
A. No, I agree it is unfair to him.

734 Q. Yes.
A. Definitely.

735 Q. You must have felt that at the time; I am being unfair, I am sending this man an allegation that $I$ know has never been tested as to its credibility?
A. I certainly felt it was unfair that we had not responded previously to what had been alleged in 2006.
736 Q. Unfair on Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes, that we had not afforded him the opportunity in 2007 to respond to those concerns at that time when he was already dealing with the Garda investigation and when that issue was live in his life, so yes.

737 Q. But you knew that the whole file had been closed, without doing so, and that the DPP --
A. Yes.

738 Q. -- had directed no prosecution?
A. Yes.

739 Q. So Sergeant McCabe was not living under some continuing injustice that you were not -- that your service was not further following up on this issue with him. That wasn't unfair, as far as he was concerned?
A. Sorry, I -- what was not unfair?

740 Q. I am suggesting it was unfair on him that ten years had elapsed and that nobody had knocked on his door or written to him and said, by the way, we want to assess you as a risk to children?
A. Well, it was unfair that it hadn't been dealt with previously, and it was the correct thing to do, I
believe, in 2007.
741 Q. But it wasn't --
A. And so, for me to come along in the end of 2015, yes, it was not -- it was far from ideal.

742 Q. But put it this way: was it not only far from ideal, it ran contrary to every instruction you had ever been given?
A. As stated, I wrote the letter based on the fact that this person had signed a statement to the Gardaí in 2006 and I wrote it in that context and was willing at 13:58 that time, I had no reason to believe that that was ever -- allegation was ever withdrawn, and I wrote it in that context.

743 Q. But it was against every standard rule of procedure in your organisation to do this?
A. Well, what I can say is, because the case had not been dealt with in 2006/2007, it created ambiguity for me and that's why I made that error.

CHAIRMAN: In other words, you say you did it in good faith but you appreciate you got it wrong?
A. Yes, but I got it wrong.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.
A. I don't doubt that.

MR. McDOWELL: I see.
A. And I regret that.

744 Q. So you thought you were doing Sergeant McCabe a favour by writing this letter?
A. No, I'm not saying that.

745 Q. We11, you were being fair to him, you were remedying an
unfairness?
A. Well, I was providing him with an opportunity to respond to information we had on files about him, which I felt at that time that he had a right to be made aware of --

746 Q. In order to --
A. -- and a right to respond.

747 Q. But in order to -- it wasn't purely just to ask him would he like to respond; it was as part of a process to determine whether he was a risk to children, that's the purpose behind it?
A. Yes, yes.

748 Q. So which is it?
A. Well, it is both. Both.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. That's what was said to me,
Mr. McDowe11. In terms of the theory, if I can say, I find it a wee bit surprising that it was like a service you offered to people.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: And at the same time, of course, it was to see are there other people to be protected. But I understand those are the instructions you're under and you're not responsible for that.
A. Yes, yeah.

CHAIRMAN: Yeah.
A. Yeah.

749 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Could I bring you to page 2600 in Volume 1, I think it is.

CHAIRMAN: will you be much longer, Mr. McDowell?

MR. MCDOWELL: About ten more minutes.
CHAIRMAN: Are you all right?
A. Yes, I'm okay.

750 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: This is a statement by Ms. Mary Tiernan to the Tribunal.
A. Yes.

751 Q. And at paragraph 2.8 she says:
"However, I do recall after the meeting of the 24th April 2007 I discussed with Ms. O'Reilly on one or two occasions the outcome of her request to her colleagues in Meath. I recall that I was informed by her that on approaching the principal social worker in Meath it had not been agreed to follow up as requested. I cannot remember when that discussion took place, but I believe 14:02 it would have been during 2007. My recollection is that in discussing with Ms. O'Reilly any further follow-up she might have been contemplating, my focus remained on maintaining the position that it would not have been appropriate for follow-up by any social
worker from our department and confirming that she would have been aware that no file had been created in relation to Mr. McCabe or his family. Given the specific content of the allegation made by MS. D to her parents and Garda investigators initially and repeated to Ms. Emer O'Neill and Ms. Orla Curran, I believe we both considered it was un7ike7y that considered analysis of the case would be 7ike7y to conclude that a threshold had been reached to support substantial
further involvement after informing Mr. McCabe of the report."
would you agree with that judgement of Ms. Tiernan, Mary Tiernan?
A. Em, she seems to state that "after informing Mr. McCabe".
752 Q. Yes.
A. I cannot say that I'd necessarily with it. I think the allegation did -- did require assessment.
753 Q. Yes.
A. So I don't necessarily agree with it, from what I know today.
754 Q. When you wrote -- when you received the letter from Séan Costello \& Company Solicitors on the 28th January 2015 strongly protesting about the digital allegation?
A. Yes.

755 Q. In your letter of the 28th December, you recall that?
A. Yes.

756 Q. You wrote to Emer o'Neill by email, which is at page 471, saying:
"I'm following up in relation to Garda Maurice McCabe who you may remember Ms. D made allegations against in 2007. From the file I understand that Ms. D's Garda statement was given to you by Ms. D's parents back in 2007 and this was to prevent Ms. D having to go through the allegations again. I wonder could I have a copy or view this statement as currently I am assessing what

risk, if any, Maurice McCabe poses to children."

So at this stage you are dealing with their response that this is the first time that the digital rape allegation had been brought to their client's attention, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

ChaIrman: would you just give me the date of that, Mr. McDowell.

MR. MCDOWELL: That is on the 2nd February 2016.
CHAIRMAN: Right. And then the other date was, you said 28th December?
MR. MCDOWELL: 28th January was the response from Séan A. Costello, the main response. They sent a holding letter saying he wouldn't be attending the proposed interview.

CHAIRMAN: I beg your pardon.
MR. MCDOWELL: Page 468.
CHAIRMAN: The letter of the 28th December is what year?
MR. MCDOWELL: The 28th December is Ms. McLoughlin's letter.

CHAIRMAN: The Barr letter?
MR. MCDOWELL: The Barr letter, yes.
CHAIRMAN: That is the 29th December.
MR. McDOWELL: Sorry.
CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, that just confused me for a second.
MR. MCDOWELL: And the 28th January is the substantive
reply by Sergeant McCabe's solicitor, is that right?
CHAIRMAN: Sorry for interrupting.
757 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Then you write to Emer o'Neill and you obtain -- on the 3rd February you obtain the copy of the statement that was made, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

758 Q. Now, at that stage, I take it, when you read that, you realised that there's something very strange here about a digital rape allegation, is that right?
A. Yes, I think I reviewed the file and read the statements at that time, some time before 9th February.
759 Q. Yes. And on the 4th January at page 489 Gerry Lowry says:
"As discussed, please review Emer o'Neill's and the Garda file, update the attached and revert to me."

Have you got that, page 489?
A. Yes.

760 Q. Do you see that?
A. Yes. oh yes.

761 Q. And the attached was your proposed draft reply to Mr. Costello, is that right?
A. Yes.

762 Q. And your proposed draft reply at that stage read:
"In relation to the allegation of digital penetration $I$ am currently seeking clarification in relation to this. this allegation was forwarded to this service on behalf
of the complainant in April 2014."
well, that was wrong?
A. Yes.

763 Q. But at that time you thought that that was so, you believed that it was in April 2014, this allegation had 14:07 been made?
A. Yes.

764 Q. Yes. And he asked you -- Mr. Lowry asked you to update the attached and to revert to him, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

765 Q. And then you write him the letter of the 9th February 2016, which is at page 490, where you set out as best you could your understanding of the situation at that time, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

766 Q. Tell me, did you talk to anybody else in the service before you prepared that reply?
A. I don't think so. I think I prepared that, yeah, on my own.
767 Q. That was entirely your own --
A. Yes.

768 Q. -- research? I mean, there are some errors in it, but you have been brought over them and I don't want to waste the Tribunal's time in relation to it. on the 26th February at page 492 you send an email to Gerry Lowry saying:
"I am sending this to you again as it has gotten forgot about. We need to discuss a response."

Were you anxious that Mr. Lowry was doing nothing about the matter?
A. I was anxious that we hadn't written back to Mr. Costello and apologised for the erroneous
information being included in the letter. So I was anxious that that happen.
769 Q. Yes. And did you have a discussion about how to respond?
A. It's possible I did. I don't have any specific recollection, but I know I discussed with Gerry the need to apologise and he agreed.
770 Q. Yes. If you then go on to page 494, it would appear that there was a routine supervisory meeting held by your supervisor, Mr. Lowry, with you on the 8th April 2016?
A. Yes.

771 Q. Isn't that right?
A. Yes.

772 Q. And on the second page of that -- I mean, the first page is all to do with your performance and your duties and how you're getting on with your duties and your proficiency, and the second page says:
"The Sergeant McCabe case has been communicated to me by Kay. I have not looked at it, I need to do so."
A. Yes.

773 Q. So we are to take it that from -- on the 8th Apri1, which is nearly two months after you became aware of
the mistake that had been made and the substance of the mistake --
A. Yes.

774 Q. -- you put down for discussion at that conference the fact that Sergeant McCabe case, and he noted down that he hadn't dealt with your communications in relation to that matter?
A. Yes.

775 Q. Can I take it that you felt somewhat let down by him at this stage?
A. We11, I was keen that it happen and I was keen to remind him of it. I was anxious that the apology letter be issued.

776 Q. Yes. And were you given any reason why it hadn't been issued?
A. No.

777 Q. Because I note that Mr. Lowry said that he was -- when you brought the matter to his attention, that he was immediately of the view that an apology was apposite, and I'm just wondering how two months goes by and stil1 14:11 you have no explanation -- he hasn't bothered to look at the work you've sent him?
A. Well, I would say that he lost sight of it.

778 Q. But it was a fairly serious matter, wasn't it?
A. It was.

779 Q. You had accused a man of a rape offence in the wrong?
A. Yes.

780 Q. You had notified him of it?
A. Yes.

781 Q. He knew full well what had happened, and two months later he has done nothing about it?
A. Yes. I believe I should have reminded him more often as well.
782 Q. Well, now, with respect now, Ms. McLough1in, are you serious, that you should have reminded your superior about the need for him to deal with the correspondence you'd sent him on this grave matter?
A. Well, given my level of anxiety $I$ was keen that this be responded to quickly and I didn't want it to drag on. 14:12

783 Q. Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. McDowell, I think I've stated my position in relation to another issue, which is I think that if somebody gets a letter, they should answer a letter.
MR. McDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: And I'm not sure this is any different, unless someone persuades me.
MR. MCDOWELL: No.
784 Q. I suggest to you that this non-response went on and on 14:12 and on until, was it July?
A. June.

785 Q. June. And, in June, a so-called apology is made --
A. Yes.

786 Q. -- to Sergeant McCabe, but your desire that some
explanation be given to him as to how this false accusation be made was not complied with on the express instruction of Mr. Lowry?
A. Possibly, yes. That's my recollection.

787 Q. That's no 'possibly' about it?
A. Well, that's my recollection.

788 Q. You wanted to explain it to him and he was saying don't?
A. Well, I wanted to explain it to some degree. Yes, I 14:13 did want to give some explanation as to how it occurred.
789 Q. And when you sent this terse and utterly uninformative apology, you get a letter from Costello \& Company on the 20th July 2016, isn't that right?

14:13
A. Yes.

790 Q. And they point out that no explanation has been given?
A. Yes.

791 Q. They point out their dismay at what has happened?
CHAIRMAN: I appreciate that, Mr. McDowell, and it has 14:14 to be said these letters are eloquent. Most letters from solicitors, no disrespect intended, would leave one gasping for air in order to stay awake, but these don't fit into this.
MR. MCDOWELL: I'm not going to read through the whole 14:14 thing, but I am just saying that you took the view that this letter was emotional?
A. Yes.

792 Q. And I have got to suggest to you that it was far from emotional; it was very reserved in the circumstance that you were deliberately being economical in your explanation to them?
A. I accept that. I think they had a right to be angry. I don't dispute that.

793 Q. Just one other thing, you mentioned that you dealt with sergeant Byrne, $I$ think, in Bailieboro?
A. Yes.

794 Q. Why was it that you went back to Bailieboro? Surely Bailieboro had no connection with the -- it was the wrong district, wrong station -- wrong -CHAIRMAN: I think the explanation earlier given, in any event, was that it's where the alleged offence took place.
MR. MCDOWELL: No, it wasn't.
CHAIRMAN: Somebody said that, Mr. McDowell.
MR. MCDOWELL: No, no, certainly not. The alleged
offence was the other end of County Cavan, in the Cavan district. So I am just wondering --
CHAIRMAN: A11 right, yeah, you may be right. I didn't 14:15 focus on that.
A. Yes, I believe that's correct, that that was the wrong district.
MR. MCDOWELL: It was a mistake to go to Bailieboro, wasn't it?
A. Yes, it was, you're right, because it occurred in a different district.
MR. MCDOWELL: Thank you very much.

END OF CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MCDOWELL

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Is there anyone who needs to ask any other questions?
MR. DIGNAM: Chairman, on behalf of An Garda Síochána,
there are a number of areas that I would like to cover with Ms. McLoughlin, but I think I will probably be at 1east 20 minutes.
CHAIRMAN: We have 20 minutes, but that is all we have. Mr. McDermott, are you content? You are? Yes. Good. 14:16 Thank you. So if we could confine it to that, but I'm afraid you are confined to that, please, at the most. MR. DIGNAM: Certainly, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: Ms. McLoughlin, you don't require to have a break now, do you?
A. I'm good for 20 minutes.

CHAIRMAN: Let's try and finish this then.

MS. MCLOUGHLIN WAS CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. DIGNAM:

795 Q. MR. DIGNAM: Ms. McLoughlin, as I said to the Chairman, there are just a number of areas I want to cover with you and some of them have been touched on by Mr. McGuinness and indeed Mr. McDowell. I think you have accepted in your evidence, Ms. McLoughlin, that you only read part of the file that was available to you, isn't that correct?
A. That is correct.

796 Q. And that was in the context of carrying out your review in May 2015?
A. That's correct.

797 Q. Yes. And you seem -- is it fair to say that you read the smaller part of the file --
A. Yes.

798 Q. -- rather than the majority?
A. Yes, I read the section of the file where the concerns would be contained.

799 Q. Yes.
A. But I can't say I read all of the documents in those sections.

800 Q. Yes. Is it also fair to say, Ms. McLough1in, that the part that you did read, you in fact misread?
A. Can you specify that?

801 Q. Yes. You refer in your statement -- or your interview, 14:17 rather, with the Tribunal investigators, that you believed that the second Garda notification, which was in fact dated 2 nd May but had been prepared at a later stage, was a duplicate of the original?
A. Yes, I misread that, yes.

802 Q. Yes. And they were two documents which were available to you and which you looked at?
A. And which I may have assumed were one and the same instead of different.
803 Q. Yes. And you accept, therefore, that you misread the 14:17 document that you did?
A. Yes, yes.

804 Q. Or that you did look at?
A. Yes.

805 Q. Now, it was that review that you carried out in 2015 which led to a number of events, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

806 Q. It led to you trying to contact -- sorry, led to you contacting Ms. D?
A. Yes.

807 Q. And having the conversation with her in June 2015?
A. Yes.

808 Q. Yes. And it led to the sending of the Barr letter containing the incorrect allegation --
A. Yes.

809 Q. -- on the 29th December 2015, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

810 Q. And that flowed, therefore, from your partial reading and misreading of the file, is that right?
A. Yes.

811 Q. And in fairness to you, you appear to accept that on a number of occasions in your interview with the investigators?
A. That's right.

812 Q. If I could just bring you to a section of your interview at page 1476. This is where the investigators asked you about a number of documents and, as I understand it, they were all taken from -they're all documents which were on the file. You'11 see where you say at the top of page 1476 that "I had been asked whether $I$ had sight of the following documents at the time," that's 7th May 2015, so at the time of your review. And the investigators then took you through a number of documents and you gave your account as to whether you had seen those at the time, whether you had read them or whether they were documents which you subsequently saw, do you remember that passage in the interview?

813 Q. Yes. Now, I'm not going to take to you all of the documents but I just want to refer to some of them very briefly, and you will have seen these so I'm not going to open them up formally to you, Ms. McLoughlin.
A. okay.

814 Q. But I will just direct you to them.
A. Yes.

815 Q. And these are all documents that you -- the ones that I am going to refer to, are all documents which you accept were on the file at the time --
A. Yes.

816 Q. -- and were therefore available to you to have read?
A. Yes.

817 Q. At page 1537 we have -- have you got that, Ms. McLoughlin?
A. It's coming up, yes.

818 Q. That's the original intake record, isn't it, based on the verbal report --
A. Yeah.

819 Q. -- made by Ms. Brophy --
A. Yeah.

820 Q. -- to Tus7a on the 9th August 2013?
A. Yes.

821 Q. And that was available to you, wasn't it?
A. Yes.

822 Q. Isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

823 Q. It was on the file?
A. Yes.

824 Q. And that doesn't refer to any allegation of digital penetration, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

825 Q. You then have, on page 1548, the Garda notification, the original Garda notification made by Tusla, which was signed on the 2nd May. That is at 1548. That is the one containing the incorrect allegation, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

826 Q. You then have, at 1550, you have the email from Eileen Argue to Mr. Lowry?
A. Yes.

827 Q. Which is cc'd to Louise Carolan?
A. Yes.

828 Q. This is the one which you -- I think you mentioned it today in your evidence also, but on page 1506 you identify as being the clearest piece of information in relation to the mistake?
A. Yes.

829 Q. If I just bring you to that, this is the email-thread beginning with an email from Pamela Armitage?
A. Yeah.

830 Q. And then, above that, an email from Eileen Argue to Mr. Lowry --
A. Yes.

831 Q. -- Ms. Carolan, Mr. Deeney and cc'd Ms. Armitage, and you identified this as being a clear statement --
A. Yes.

832 Q. -- of the error which at this stage was on the file?
A. Yes.

833 Q. And identified on the file, is that right?
A. Particularly Pamela Armitage's email to Eileen.

834 Q. Ms. Armitage says: "Dear Eileen, Laura Brophy has just 14:21 called to say that she has made an error in her report to us re MS. D. The line 'that this abuse involved digital penetration, both vaginal and anal' is an error and should not be in the referral. It is in fact a line from another referral on another adult that has been pasted in error. Laura has apologised and is sending us an amended report ASAP."
A. Yes.

835 Q. Now, that was 14th May 2014 at 11:05.
A. Yes.

836 Q. You then have at pages 1551 and 1552 the letter from Ms. Brophy to Ms. Argue.
A. Yes.

837 Q. And on 1552 the amended report from Ms. Brophy of the --
A. Yes.

838 Q. -- 14th May 2014.
A. Yes.

839 Q. And that says in the "Description of Abuse":
"That Ms. D informed me that there was a singular incident of sexual abuse. At the time of the incident both Ms. D and the alleged were fully clothed and the incident involved inappropriate contact as the alleged rubbed himself up and down against Ms. D in a sexual manner."
A. Yes.

840 Q. So that is on file?
A. Yes.

841 Q. And that makes it clear that the extent of the allegation was simply as is set out in that short description, is that right?
A. Yes.

842 Q. And then at 1555 and 1556 you have another email from Ms. Argue to Linda Dewhirst, which was cc'd to Pamela Armitage?
A. Yes.

843 Q. The of 7th June?
A. Yes.

844 Q. With an attached draft amended Garda notification.
A. Yes.

845 Q. Yes. And you accept that that Garda notification was on the file, but you seemed to --
A. Yes.

846 Q. -- take some issue about whether or not the email was, in fact, on the file, the covering email?
A. Yeah, I'm not sure about the email.

847 Q. Es. But you accept that the amended Garda notification?
A. Yes.

848 Q. Draft -- it was only a draft at that stage?
A. Yes.

849 Q. And I'm not going to read all of that out,

Ms. McLoughlin, but do you accept that there is no reference to the digital penetration allegation in that?
A. Yes.

850 Q. Yes. And you didn't know at the time, as I understand it, but you must know now, that that ultimately was sent out in those terms on the 20th June 2014 to the Gardaí, in those terms?
A. That's right. But I had no sight of the final draft of that.
851 Q. Now, they're all documents, isn't that right, Ms. McLoughlin --
A. Yes.

852 Q. -- that you accept were on the file when you reviewed it in May 2015?
A. That's correct, yes.

853 Q. And you must agree, therefore, Ms. McLoughlin, that those documents make it absolutely clear that the allegation of digital penetration was incorrect and was no longer a live allegation to anybody who read the file and read it correctly?
A. We1l, from my point of view, those documents set out clearly what the allegations were. They don't set out what the allegations were not. And I wasn't, at the time of viewing those records for those that I did view, I wasn't aware that there was an error in relation to digital penetration, and, as I stated earlier, Pamela Armitage's email was the clearest piece of information on the file that $I$ did not view and
regret not viewing in relation to the clarification.
854 Q. I understand that, Ms. McLoughlin, but if you had read the file --
A. Yes.

855 Q. -- the entire file --
A. Yes.

856 Q. -- it was clear, if from no other document --
A. Yeah.

857 Q. -- clear from Ms. Armitage's email, that the allegation of digital penetration was a mistake?
A. Yes.

858 Q. And shouldn't have been included?
A. Yes, in the letter.

CHAIRMAN: what is your page number for that?
MR. DIGNAM: 1550.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
859 Q. MR. DIGNAM: So it was absolutely clear from the file, if the file was read --
A. Yes.

860 Q. -- that the allegation of digital penetration was a mistake?
A. Yes.

861 Q. Wasn't a correct allegation?
A. Yes.

862 Q. And therefore wasn't a live allegation at that stage? 14:25
A. Yes.

863 Q. If I could ask you then to turn to 1505 , Ms. McLoughlin. This is a page from your statement where you say that, at the top of the page, that:
"I believe my comment in the email was based on the social work team leader recommendation on the file that a Garda notification be forwarded in 2013."
A. Yes.

864 Q. And this is in response to a question arising from -that was asked by the investigators --
A. Yes.

865 Q. -- about how you were able to say, when you were corresponding with Mr. Lowry and Mr. Deeney, that a Garda notification had been made in 2013?
A. Yes.

866 Q. You accept that is incorrect now?
A. That is incorrect, I accept that.

867 Q. Yes. And I think you described that as being based on 14:26 a presumption that because a direction was given that a Garda notification --
A. Yes.

868 Q. -- should be made, that it was therefore made at that time?
A. Yes.

869 Q. Does that fairly describe your position in relation to that?
A. Yes.

870 Q. Yes. Were you in a position to or are you in a position to make that presumption, because Garda notification, when a referral comes in, is almost automatic?
CHAIRMAN: In other words, what he is saying is, you
get an allegation of child sexual abuse to you as opposed from the Gardaí.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Under the modern legislation, and even back then, it was the practice it goes to the Garda.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Is that fair?
A. Yes, garda notification should be sent immediately. CHAIRMAN: Yes.
A. Because the Gardaí have a duty to follow up in a timely 14:27 fashion and we have a duty to notify them in a timely fashion.
CHAIRMAN: There's nothing sinister about it.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It simply happens.
A. Yes.

MR. DIGNAM: Thank you, Judge.
871 Q. And in fairness to you, Ms. McLoughlin, you say at page 251 of your interview:
"Our practice is to notify the Gardaí even before we have carried out any investigations into the veracity of the allegations as it is up to the Gardai to investigate any criminal allegations made..."
A. That's correct.

872 Q. "... and to decide whether it reaches the threshold for a prosecution."
A. Yes, and we should be notifying them in a timely manner.

873 Q. Yes. And you accept, and I think this has been accepted by other witnesses, Ms. McLough1in, if you disagree you might tell us, that the letter that was sent to Superintendent Cunningham on the 15th August didn't constitute a Garda notification by Tusla, is that fair?
A. No, no. It's automating to discuss the matter.

874 Q. Yes. Now, if I can then just turn to the conversation you had, and we will finish on this, Ms. McLoughlin, the conversation that you had with Sergeant Byrne.
A. Yes.

875 Q. You were asked by Mr. McGuinness in relation to a 1etter which you received --
A. Yes.

876 Q. -- which Sergeant Byrne will say he sent to you, you have no recollection of receiving that letter, but you don't deny that you may have received it?
A. No, I accept that it was received and it may have been dealt with on my behalf by my administrator.
877 Q. Yes. Now, Ms. McLough1in, were you aware -- sorry, if I understand it correctly, there was quite a turn-over of staff in the period late 2013 into late 2014, is that fair?
A. Yes.

878 Q. And I think the sequence was that Ms. McG1one was the social work team leader up to January 2014 ?
A. Yes.

879 Q. There was then a bit of a hiatus and Ms. Argue was appointed --
A. Yes.

880 Q. -- in February 2014?
A. Yes.

881 Q. She vacated the post on the 30th May 2014?
A. Yes.

882 Q. And then Ms. Carme1 McAulay, I think, took over from Ms. Argue, is that correct?
A. Yeah.

883 Q. And then she vacated the post, if I understand correctly, in July 2014?
A. Yes, for Cavan, yes.

884 Q. Yes. And then you were appointed to the post?
A. Yes.

885 Q. When? when was that?
A. I was appointed to cover Cavan in July 2014 and I was 14:30 appointed as covering full duty intake tasks, responsibilities in October for both counties.
886 Q. Now, were you aware of efforts being made by Sergeant Byrne to arrange meetings with the relevant social team leaders over that period? He tried to arrange a meeting with you, isn't that right, on the basis of the 1etter?
A. Yes, yes.

887 Q. And he will say in his evidence that he wrote an identical letter, in fact, to Ms. McAulay when she was -- when she took over the post?
A. Okay.

888 Q. But, in fact, didn't have a meeting with Ms. McAulay because one was cancelled?

889 Q. And then Ms. McAulay departed and you took over?
A. That's correct, yes.

890 Q. He was making efforts to arrange a meeting with the social team --
A. Yes, I fully accept that.

891 Q. Now, you said in relation to the meeting which you had with --

CHAIRMAN: Sergeant Byrne.
892 Q. MR. DIGNAM: Sergeant Byrne, yes, in October 2015, you 14:31 were asked by Mr. McGuinness in relation to the direction or suggestion by Mr. Lowry that you coordinate with the Gardaí.
A. Yes.

893 Q. And that was in May 2015. Mr. McGuinness asked you did 14:31 you coordinate with the Gardaí and you responded that you didn't coordinate with them at that point?
A. Yes.

894 Q. And Mr. McGuinness picked you up on that and asked at what stage did you coordinate with them, and you said, 14:31 in response, that I believe I raised the matter with Sergeant Byrne at a Garda liaison meeting --
A. Yes.

895 Q. -- in October 2015?
A. Yes.

896 Q. Now, leave aside Bailieboro being the -- whether or not it was the correct district, just for the moment.
A. Yes.

897 Q. Is it your case that the conversation which you
describe having with Sergeant Byrne was coordination with the Gardaí in relation to this case?
A. No. I would say it was clarification of the status of the case with the Gardaí.
Q. Yes. But you put that up, in response to Mr. McGuinness's question, as being the coordination that you'd been directed to have with the Gardaí?
A. Well, I was meeting with the Gardaí, but in terms of -I'm not sure what Mr. Lowry meant by 'coordinating'. CHAIRMAN: Yes. In any event, the problem was that Sergeant Byrne knew nothing?
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: And no disrespect intended.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: But you could have taken it further and said, well, who does know something --
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- or whatever.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: It might be fair to concede that?
A. Yes.

899 Q. MR. DIGNAM: And in fairness to you, Ms. McLoughlin, when you made your initial statement, I think you qualified it by saying that you're not even sure whether you did have a conversation with Sergeant Byrne 14:32 but that you subsequently checked it out with your administrator --
A. Yes.

900 Q. -- and she confirmed that you had?
A. Yes.

901 Q. And you deal with that at page 1531 --
A. That's correct.

902 Q. -- of your -- which is the interview notes?
A. Yes.

903 Q. Sorry, at 1519 of your interview notes, where you say in response to a question about seeking more details about the Tusla garda liaison meeting and what exactly what was said between you and Sergeant Byrne, you say:
"I was not even sure, I had a vague memory that $I$ had asked Sergeant Tony Byrne about the status of the garda investigation into the allegation."

So, isn't it fair to say that that was a conversation that you had at a meeting rather than coordination --
A. Yes.

904 Q. -- with the Gardaí in relation to it?
A. Yes. Okay, yes.

905 Q. Yes. And you have seen Sergeant Byrne's account --
A. I have, yes.

906 Q. -- of how you raised that. It was at the end of the meeting.
A. Yes.

907 Q. In fact, it was after his assistant had even left the 14:33 room. You asked him about the Sergeant McCabe case. He said it predated his time. And that seems to have been the end of it really, is that right?
A. Yes.

908 Q. And you didn't follow that up with a letter to him --
A. No.

909 Q. -- looking for further information?
A. No.

910 Q. No.
A. I didn't.

911 Q. And you didn't follow it up with a letter to anybody else --
A. No, I didn't.

912 Q. -- in An Garda Síochána looking for further
information. And in fact, Ms. McLough1in, in dealing with that liaison, those liaison meetings, you said that if a case is closed to the Gardaí then it tends not to be on the agenda?
A. That's correct.

913 Q. Yes. And to the best of your knowledge was the Sergeant McCabe/Ms. D case ever on an agenda for a garda liaison meeting that you were at?
A. I have no recollection that it was ever on the agenda for a garda liaison meeting.
914 Q. And doesn't that suggest to you, Ms. McLough7in, that the case was closed to the Gardaí?
A. Yes, it would suggest to me that. Yes.

915 Q. And then finally, Ms. McLough1in, on -- sorry, just two more questions, Ms. McLoughlin. On page 34, in giving 14:34 your evidence today you said that you told Ms. D when you spoke to her in May 2015 that the case hadn't been dealt with in '06/'07. Now that can only mean that Tusla --
A. Yes.

916 Q. -- /HSE hadn't dea7t with it?
A. Yes.

917 Q. Because the Gardaí had fully dealt with it?
A. Yes.

918 Q. Yeah. And they had brought it to the stage of directions from the DPP?
A. Yes.

919 Q. Now finally, Ms. McLough1in, you were asked by Mr. McDowell whether it would be unusual for someone to 14:35 give a direction in relation to a file without opening the file, and I think you said yes, it is unusual.
A. Yes.

920 Q. In fact, in the context of what we know about what happened here, where there was a litany of mistakes one 14:35 after the other, and in fact where you took action on a file without reading the whole file --
A. Yes.

921 Q. -- I have to put it to you that it doesn't seem to be that unusual in the context of the way this case was handled?
A. We11, I can't account for whether --

CHAIRMAN: Well, yeah. I mean the other thing is: I'm not sure we've identified any other files with this kind of error in it.

MR. DIGNAM: No, I appreciate that.
CHAIRMAN: I mean, people skipping through files, or however, $I$ don't know usual or unusual that is in this circumstance.

MR. DIGNAM: No, but I think it is important because what Mr. McDowell I think was playing around the edges, Judge, with and in fact the Tribunal --
CHAIRMAN: We11, you can get to the point. I don't mind, Mr. Dignam. I'm not trying to stop you, you know.

MR. DIGNAM: Yes.
922 Q. Ms. McLoughlin, and I don't want speak to for Mr. McDowe11 but what he appeared to be suggesting was that there was something unusual, and I read from that something sinister, about what was going on in certain actions being taken. Was there any direction or influence or other agenda going on when you made your mistakes in relation to this file?
CHAIRMAN: In other words, it's the same question again --
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: -- were you the puppet of the Gardaí in relation to anything?
A. No, no, no. I have a duty of care to all clients who come on my desk and if I felt I was in some way biased or even very acquainted with somebody I wouldn't deal with the case. I have no agenda, and nor was I aware of any agenda. And I can't account for Ms. Argue's reading of the file also.
MR. DIGNAM: Thank you.

MS. KAY MCLOUGHLIN WAS THEN RE-EXAMINED BY
MR. MCGUINNESS:

923 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: Thank you, Ms. McLough1in, just one further issue before we release you. Could I ask you to look at one document at page 2319? It's an undated case review form. Now, you may recall we looked at a signed and dated case review form earlier in May 2015.
A. Yes.

924 Q. Signed by Mr. Deeney. This is a different case review form and it's on the Sergeant McCabe file. And it's preceded in the file that we got by the SART review and the SART audit, which date from later. So they couldn't have been on the file when you first reviewed it in 2015, they both date from 2016. Now I should say for the record that this is referred to in our index to volume 2, at page 3 of the index, as dated 2/8/2013, but I think you will see from this file there's no date 14:38 on it at all.
A. Yeah.

925 Q. That's the case reference number at the top --
A. Yes.

926 Q. -- isn't that correct?
A. Em...

927 Q. Now Ms. Murphy --
A. Yes.

928 Q. Ms. Murphy was asked about this, and it's not her handwriting and she wasn't able to identify it, it doesn't seem to me, from the samples of your handwriting --
A. No.

929 Q. -- that it is your handwriting on the document?
A. No, it's not.

930 Q. It doesn't look like Ms. Argue's handwriting to me, but would you be in a position to identify whose handwriting it is?
A. It's not Ms. Argue's handwriting, because she has very tiny writing.

931 Q. Yes. It seems to have come into existence some time after the corrected garda notification was sent and we know that that was signed by Mr. Deeney on the 10th June, sent to the Guards on the 20th June or thereabouts, so it appears to date from some date post the middle of June. Now it says: "Activities/services provided. Garda notification corrected in May '14 due from misinformation from Rian."
A. Yes.

932 Q. "Query regarding files for his children."

Now obviously if it is post June 2014, Ms. Connolly had already opened the files for the intake records.
Although no files were actually created for Mr. McCabe's children.
A. Yes.

933 Q. But, can you recollect anyone raising a query over the opening of the files for his children or whether it was intended to open files in fact?
A. I can't remember anything in relation to this.

934 Q. Al1 right. It says under the heading:
"Social Worker's Recommendations:

1. Awaiting allocation.
2. Case discussion to include Keara and Rhona."

Now we know Keara McG1one had gone by February 2014.
A. Yes.

935 Q. It would appear that Rhona Murphy's name was put in there then. And it says:
"Contact Garda re DPP decision 2007 clarification."

Do you recollect seeing this on the file --
A. No.

936 Q. -- when you reviewed it in 2015?
A. No. I don't recognise --

937 Q. okay. The reason I'm asking you is that the SART reviews couldn't have been on the file in May 2015?
A. No.

938 Q. But if this dates from 2014, this would have been the first document you'd have seen on the file --
A. Yes, but --

939 Q. -- if you opened that?
A. -- I don't believe that this was on the file. I don't, I don't recognise the handwriting.
940 Q. Al1 right.
A. And there's no signature on it.

941 Q. All right. Perhaps your solicitors will be able to help us identify it.
A. Yeah.

942 Q. Thank you Ms. McLoughlin.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your help, Ms. McLough1in. MS. MCLOUGHLIN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: A11 right. We11, I think there is just one more thing that I need to mention, and that is this:
There is an issue in relation to privacy and Ms. D and to what extent that is to be protected, and by whom and in what circumstances. That includes obviously press and photographers. Now I don't want to make an order which is going to cause trouble for people, especially if it ever have to be enforced. without hearing the relevant parties. The relevant parties would clearly be counse1 for the Tribunal and I don't know if anyone else would take an interest. I mean, if the newspapers wish to make a submission on this, I'm happy to hear a submission, by which I mean media organisation. But I 14:41 don't want to hear the same submission 15 times in a row. So Mr. McGuinness, have you any suggestion?
MR. McGUINNESS: Well. I know counsel --
CHAIRMAN: Sorry, you might like to sit down now. MS. McLOUGHLIN: I'm okay.
CHAIRMAN: Fine, if you are happy there.
MR. MCGUINNESS: I know counse1 for Ms. D is here and I am sure he would wish to be heard and he might lead off on the matter. And counsel for sergeant McCabe might have a view to express.
CHAIRMAN: We11, do you think you will have a view? You can think about it overnight.
MR. MCDOWELL: I thought it was going to be dealt with tomorrow, Judge.

CHAIRMAN: what?
MR. MCDOWELL: My understanding was --
CHAIRMAN: No, I'm just trying to see who is going to be making a submission, Mr. McDowe11, I'm not asking for a submission now. In fact, we might sit at nine o'clock to hear this, because we're losing a bit of time. Traffic is light. Is there any newspaper, I mean media organisation that wants to make a submission about this? I mean, I'm inviting it because it's advisable given that it's going to be against media. Well, have I put you on fair warning, in which case you can make a submission tomorrow if you want, you don't have to send in any letter or anything. I don't know who is nodding or not nodding but we will have to leave it at that. All right. So it's going to be nine in 14:42 the morning I'm afraid.

THE HEARING THEN ADJOURNED UNTIL THURSDAY, 13TH JULY 2017 AT 9:00AM


9:00AM [1] - 167:19
9th [6] - 43:25, 44:8, 54:5, 137:11, 138:11, 147:23

## A

able [7]-41:1, 44:28, 45:4, 129:24, 153:9, 163:25, 165:25 above-named [1] 1:27
abroad [1] - 124:19
absolutely [10] -
16:25, 19:4, 19:8, 52:17, 52:24, 76:24, 95:8, 123:4, 151:18,
152:17
absolved [1] - 129:8
abuse [20] - 15:18,
16:5, 38:19, 55:16,
64:29, 67:24, 67:25, 81:21, 83:23, 86:16, 95:23, 96:1, 96:3, 96:10, 96:21, 97:13, 97:15, 149:7, 149:27, 154:1
Abuse [2]-62:2,
149:24
abuser [4]-23:2,
37:15, 121:20, 123:5
accept [34]-12:26,
14:8, 14:9, 14:26,
16:23, 16:25, 17:8,
33:1, 33:3, 33:4, 34:8,
36:26, 47:28, 48:4,
48:9, 52:2, 52:6, 55:1, 92:17, 100:13,
114:28, 142:28,
145:20, 146:12,
147:11, 150:18,
150:24, 151:1,
151:14, 153:13,
153:14, 155:1,
155:18, 157:6
accepted [4]-21:12,
79:11, 144:20, 155:2
access [1] - 16:21
accidentally [1] -
89:18
according [4] -
58:16, 96:15, 100:12, 111:19
account [30]-34:7,
41:19, 43:9, 70:26, 80:2, 82:24, 89:19, 90:20, 90:21, 90:24, 94:19, 99:23, 100:20, 104:22, 105:5, 105:16, 108:14,

108:16, 112:20,
112:28, 120:6,
121:7, 129:10,
129:22, 129:27,
146:26, 159:20,
161:22, 162:24
accounts [3] - 33:26,
105:4, 119:7
accuracy [8] - 30:1,
34:15, 103:13,
103:19, 104:12,
104:17, 105:8, 121:1
accurate [2] - 18:5,
33:20
accusation [2]-
130:29, 141:27
accused [3] - 113:7,
113:8, 140:26
achieve [1] - 44:28
acknowledge [3] -
68:12, 73:27, 122:25
acknowledgement
[1] - 14:15
acknowledging [1] -
68:24
acquainted [2] -
122:17, 162:22
act $[1]-76: 8$
ACT [2] - 1:4, 1:9
action [16] - 1:28,
17:15, 19:9, 19:15,
22:22, 30:12, 43:25, 49:8, 77:7, 90:24,
91:25, 106:22,
121:24, 121:27,
128:16, 161:16
actions [7]-8:19,
45:18, 67:4, 93:10,
102:22, 107:17,
162:12
activities/services
[1] - 164:12
actual [2]-10:28,
32:11
address [7] - 30:3,
43:28, 63:4, 106:2,
110:5, 110:15, 120:22
addressed [1] -
27:11
addressing [1] -
32:25
adequate [1] -
102:23
adhered [1] - 46:29
ADJOURNED [2] -
72:18, 167:18
administration [1] -
85:27
administrative [1] -
58:6
administrator [4] -
31:19, 88:24, 155:19, 158:27
adult [5] - 23:6,
43:27, 64:13, 83:23, 149:10
adults [6]-23:2,
23:3, 64:28, 64:29,
124:14, 124:18
advance [4]-82:3,
127:8, 127:12, 127:13
advice [3]-51:8,
124:29, 125:2
advisable [1] -
167:10
advise [3]-48:11,
108:17, 109:9
advised [5] - 58:14,
66:12, 66:13, 74:24, 76:16
advisers [2]-75:9,
75:11
afford [2] - 48:12,
109:6
afforded [4] -
107:19, 108:8,
122:28, 131:10
afraid [2] - 144:7,
167:16
AFTER [1] - 73:1
afterwards [1] - 99:9
aged [1] - 16:6
Agency [4]-27:17,
27:21, 68:13, 68:25
agency [2]-27:25,
96:4
agenda [14]-28:20,
40:21, 42:5, 42:10,
42:16, 43:3, 43:16,
61:27, 160:14,
160:17, 160:19,
162:13, 162:23,
162:24
ago [3]-65:9,
112:10, 126:23
agree [26]-8:2, 23:1,
30:27, 32:27, 46:18,
47:22, 50:25, 59:6,
66:10, 70:25, 82:19,
82:26, 83:3, 83:5, 83:28, 88:29, 89:5, 91:12, 97:19, 105:23, 119:8, 120:4, 131:1, 135:4, 135:12, 151:17 agreed [9]-17:18,
38:5, 74:20, 91:2,
105:19, 107:21,
119:22, 134:14,
139:12
agreeing [1] - 83:27
aim [1] - 122:13
air [1] - 142:18
ALAN [1] - 2:29
alert [1]-98:25
alerted [3]-100:11,
111:20, 116:17
allegation [92] -
10:4, 10:25, 11:19, 11:26, 15:23, 16:7, 17:6, 18:20, 19:18, 19:20, 23:5, 29:26, 33:21, 35:18, 38:21, 47:26, 48:27, 49:13, 49:18, 50:4, 50:14, 52:3, 52:12, 53:27, 54:15, 54:23, 57:12, 58:22, 66:20, 66:26, 67:11, 67:15, 67:20, 69:4, 71:12, 71:25, 73:13, 78:1, 85:9, 86:16, 86:18, 95:17, 96:3, 97:21, 97:24, 98:3, 98:9, 98:10, 104:28, 104:29, 105:8, 108:21, 109:2, 109:17, 109:23, 110:8, 110:12, 111:22, 112:2, 112:10, 116:18, 124:25, 125:7, 126:25, 130:13, 130:14, 130:20, 131:5, 132:12, 134:24, 135:10, 135:16, 136:5, 137:9, 137:27, 137:29, 138:5, 146:5, 148:2, 148:8, 150:7, 151:2, 151:19, 151:20, 152:9, 152:20, 152:23, 152:25, 154:1, 159:13 allegation' [1] 34:29
allegations [46] 30:1, 33:11, 37:16, 38:18, 39:28, 64:28, 67:24, 83:22, 85:8, 89:4, 95:20, 95:29, 97:13, 97:16, 97:26, 97:27, 103:14, 103:20, 104:12, 104:17, 104:19, 104:23, 105:15, 107:18, 107:23, 108:8, 108:23, 109:13, 111:14, 118:14, 118:27,
119:5, 119:16, 121:1, 121:2, 121:6, 121:20,

124:17, 124:21,
127:25, 135:24,
135:28, 151:23,
151:24, 154:23, 154:24
alleged [22] - 13:16,
20:14, 29:24, 33:10,
37:15, 44:1, 55:15, 64:29, 88:4, 88:10, 95:4, 109:26, 118:13, 118:26, 119:15,
121:19, 123:5, 131:8,
143:8, 143:12,
149:28, 149:29
Alleged [1] - 64:15
allegedly [2]-15:19, 16:5
allocated [18] - 8:4,
20:16, 20:21, 20:22,
28:26, 28:27, 64:5,
64:16, 65:8, 65:12, 68:4, 76:8, 77:3, 79:10, 87:17, 91:24, 94:14, 128:23
allocation [10] -
6:26, 7:1, 17:15,
20:19, 20:28, 76:28,
79:14, 91:23, 102:18,
164:29
allow [1] - 120:29
almighty [1] - 126:23
almost [2]-90:14,
153:27
alternative [1] - 35:2
ambiguity [1] -
132:17
amend [3]-91:9,
91:21, 100:4
amended [9]-13:11,
51:11, 51:18, 58:20,
58:28, 149:12,
149:19, 150:16, 150:24
ammunition [1] 19:7
amn't [1] - 105:18
amnesia [1] - 112:27
amount [3]-20:23,
96:21, 115:21
anal [1] - 97:22
anal' [1] - 149:8
analysis [4] - 54:3,
60:1, 65:24, 134:28
AND [5] - 1:4, 1:5,
1:9, 3:20, 3:22
angry [1] - 142:28
annual [1]-65:14
answer [5]-21:18,
40:24, 46:25, 81:26,
141:14
answers [1]-89:1
ANTHONY [1] - 2:26
anus [1]-120:2
anxiety [1] - 141:9
anxious [11]-7:28,
8:28, 9:7, 57:22,
61:20, 61:26, 63:8,
139:2, 139:4, 139:7,
140:12
anyway [4] - 21:23,
101:16, 115:26, 128:7
apart [4]-120:11,
125:2, 127:14, 127:15
apologies [1]-75:4
apologise [2] -
129:11, 139:12
apologised [2] -
139:5, 149:11
apologising [1] -
59:26
apology [10] - 59:25,
61:23, 63:3, 63:6,
74:27, 140:12,
140:19, 141:23, 142:9
appear [18]-9:18,
9:19, 11:24, 13:8,
13:10, 28:11, 35:7,
36:22, 49:8, 49:19,
55:12, 60:10, 79:12,
99:18, 103:7, 139:13,
146:12, 165:5
APPEARANCES [1] 2:1
appeared [2] - 55:13,
162:9
appearing [1] - 78:12
appellant ${ }_{[1]}-3: 30$
appointed [5] - 5:17,
155:29, 156:12,
156:15, 156:16 appointment [7] -
29:3, 29:6, 30:14,
31:26, 40:7, 46:24,
127:17
apposite [1] - 140:19
appreciate [9]-17:9,
17:10, 26:27, 89:7,
114:18, 129:16,
132:20, 142:15,
161:26
appreciated [2] -
89:10, 100:29
appreciation [2] -
93:6, 93:8
approach [1] -
122:13 approached [3] -
43:15, 121:22, 123:4 approaching [2] 122:21, 134:13
appropriate [10] -
20:5, 22:3, 46:19,
48:28, 63:2, 68:19,
77:7, 91:25, 123:19,
134:20
appropriately [1] -
58:28
April [8] - 60:11,
62:5, 127:20, 134:10,
138:1, 138:5, 139:15,
139:28
arbitrary [1] - 96:17
area [5]-20:2, 20:3,
26:11, 27:24, 124:5
areas [2]-144:1,
144:17
argue [18]-12:8,
12:13, 13:3, 13:28,
14:3, 22:8, 57:3,
57:15, 57:20, 75:22,
93:9, 93:22, 100:2,
100:22, 149:17,
150:11, 155:28, 156:7
Argue [9]-12:18,
22:5, 50:5, 56:24,
93:16, 99:13, 100:1,
148:12, 148:24
argue's [6]-94:17,
94:19, 113:24,
162:24, 164:2, 164:5
Argue's [1] - 76:13
arise [1] - 129:1
arising [2] - 34:25,
153:6
Armitage [7]-12:18,
15:6, 113:26, 148:22,
148:27, 149:5, 150:12
Armitage's [5] -
15:11, 51:21, 149:4,
151:28, 152:9
arose [1] - 89:7
ARRAN [1] - 2:16
arrange [4]-28:2,
156:19, 156:20, 157:4
arranging [1] -
108:28
arrival [1] - 41:12
arrived [1] - 52:3
arrives [1]-128:7
arrow [2]-105:24,
105:26
ARTHUR [1] - 2:27
AS [4]-5:1, 5:8,
73:1, 73:4
ASAP [1] - 149:12
ascertained [1] -
55:2
aside [1] - 157:26
aspects [1]-87:22
assess [8]-40:1,

40:2, 122:3, 122:12,
122:13, 123:20,
130:22, 131:26
assessing [3] -
110:18, 124:17, 135:29
assessment [13] -
20:28, 20:29, 34:18, 81:16, 107:23, 108:12, 108:29,
121:21, 123:5,
123:19, 124:2,
130:18, 135:10
assigned [1] - 44:12
assist [2]-104:14,
121:5
assistance [1]-9:7
assistant [1] -
159:25
assisted [1] - 31:19
assisting [1] - 19:5
associated [1] - 45:9
ASSOCIATED [1] 3:25
assume [1]-113:29
assumed [4]-56:9,
111:14, 111:16, 145:18
assuming $[1]$ -
111:21
assumption [7] -
18:26, 24:12, 32:7,
32:9, 55:19, 107:15,
110:11
assured [2] - 35:28,
69:14
AT [1] - 167:19
attached $[7]-53: 3$,
53:15, 108:23,
137:16, 137:22,
138:9, 150:16
attempt [7]-25:18,
33:3, 63:12, 122:5,
122:6, 130:21, 130:24
attempted [2] -
129:22, 129:23
attempting [1] -
63:10
attempts [1]-96:14
attend [6]-30:17,
30:26, 30:27, 33:4,
38:2, 79:19
attended [1] - 111:9
attending [4] - 49:5,
70:6, 77:21, 136:15
attention [22]-8:20,
20:12, 21:3, 23:20,
23:26, 24:6, 24:7,
50:22, 51:9, 52:25,
53:26, 74:2, 74:8,

77:1, 81:7, 89:22,
94:17, 101:27,
107:13, 116:2, 136:6,
140:18
attest ${ }_{[1]}-80: 26$
audit [1] - 163:10
August [18] - 14:12,
54:17, 55:3, 55:6,
55:25, 56:9, 75:29,
78:19, 78:29, 79:4,
79:29, 81:19, 85:3,
89:26, 89:27, 90:26,
147:23, 155:4
aunt [1]-120:6
authorised [1] - 37:5
authorising [2] -
22:14, 32:28
automatic [2] -
90:14, 153:28
automating [1] -
155:7
availability [1]-28:1
available [7]-12:29,
47:15, 129:1, 144:21,
145:16, 147:13,
147:25
avoid [1] - 124:14
await [1] - 79:13
awaiting [3] - 17:15,
102:18, 164:29
awake [1] - 142:18
aware [108]-17:24,
18:23, 20:13, 24:23,
27:5, 34:20, 41:5,
45:20, 45:22, 47:6,
47:8, 47:15, 51:5,
51:15, 57:23, 62:3,
62:10, 65:15, 66:20,
67:12, 75:14, 79:28,
80:8, 80:13, 80:15,
80:23, 80:27, 81:20,
81:28, 82:2, 82:10,
84:5, 84:6, 84:7,
84:10, 84:11, 84:17,
84:18, 84:20, 84:21, 84:24, 84:25, 84:26, 84:27, 84:29, 85:2, 85:3, 85:7, 85:14, 86:18, 86:19, 86:23, 86:26, 87:14, 87:16,
90:3, 91:4, 92:27, 94:1, 94:16, 95:3, 95:11, 95:13, 95:19, 95:20, 95:21, 95:24, 98:6, 98:8, 98:9, 98:28, 99:2, 99:13, 99:15, 99:17, 99:19, 99:22, 100:13,
100:14, 100:20, 100:21, 100:26,

101:29, 102:3, 105:4,
109:13, 111:7, 111:9,
113:20, 114:23,
115:1, 115:4, 119:6,
122:19, 127:29,
128:4, 128:20, 133:5,
134:22, 139:29,
151:26, 155:20,
156:18, 162:23
awareness [3] -
91:6, 94:22, 95:3

## B

Bailieboro [14] -
26:8, 26:11, 26:16,
26:20, 27:8, 27:20,
27:22, 41:13, 77:17, 143:2, 143:4, 143:5,
143:19, 157:26
barking [1] - 124:12
Barr [22] - 15:18,
20:8, 20:27, 24:7,
31:21, 32:18, 32:24,
32:28, 38:3, 38:8,
38:13, 38:15, 67:13, 67:14, 73:7, 105:20, 110:5, 124:1, 124:10, 136:23, 136:24, 146:4
barristers [1] - 78:12
base [2]-71:14,
73:15
based [19] - 15:12,
25:29, 47:11, 55:19,
56:5, 56:7, 61:8,
67:14, 69:4, 70:20, 73:11, 78:29, 107:10,
109:19, 111:16,
132:8, 147:18, 153:2, 153:15
basing [1] - 102:8
basis [8]-18:17,
35:8, 62:11, 69:17,
104:5, 104:28, 112:2,
156:21
BAXTER [1] - 3:22
BE [2] - 5:7, 73:3
bearing [1] - 45:24
became [9]-11:25,
27:4, 51:15, 62:3,
81:27, 82:2, 82:10,
84:27, 139:29
become [1]-86:13
beforehand [1] -
65:12
beg [1] - 136:17
beginning [6] -
28:10, 49:29, 50:12,
102:29, 127:16,

148:22
begun [1]-9:1
behalf [3]-137:29,
143:29, 155:19
behave [2]-92:21,
92:22
behaved [1] - 66:22
behaviour [1] -
107:10
behind [2]-92:14,
133:11
BELL [1] - 3:13
bells [1] - 101:10
below [4]-23:23,
24:18, 116:5, 116:22
benefit [2] - 47:24,
66:6
beside [1]-29:19 best [5]-77:9,
77:13, 119:3, 138:12,
160:16
better [2]-35:4,
76:22
between [10]-25:27,
26:3, 33:26, 34:6,
42:6, 81:19, 85:3,
121:14, 124:2, 159:9
biased [1] - 162:21
bit [5] - 35:13, 98:29,
133:17, 155:28, 167:6
BL [10]-2:7, 2:9,
2:15, 2:19, 3:1, 3:5,
3:11, 3:13, 3:16, 3:21
black [1] - 119:20
blacked [1] - 43:20
blame [4]-71:22,
71:28, 72:3, 127:1
blaming [1] - 71:18
body [1] - 29:25
bold [1] - 51:19
books [1] - 102:25
bother [3] - 112:5,
112:15, 123:7
bothered [1] -
140:21
bottom [4] - 10:25,
12:17, 65:3, 67:23
box [2]-70:2, 90:17
break [3]-72:11,
90:25, 144:10
BREFFNI ${ }_{[1]}-2: 15$
BRIAN [1] - 2:29
brief [7]-68:23,
68:27, 74:22, 74:25, 74:28, 75:4, 126:19
briefly [1] - 147:4
bring [9]-21:2, 24:7,
66:16, 101:27,
107:13, 129:28,
133:27, 146:16,

148:21
bringing [5] - 20:11, 23:19, 23:26, 24:5, 116:1 Brophy [18] - 11:10, 12:13, 13:12, 38:28,
39:1, 54:17, 56:29,
57:19, 58:6, 58:21,
58:24, 76:16, 121:14,
123:16, 147:21,
149:5, 149:17, 149:19
Brophy's [12] -
12:20, 14:2, 14:15, 15:7, 15:12, 36:11, 38:23, 38:28, 49:28,
51:23, 57:16, 78:14
brought [12]-8:19,
32:3, 50:22, 74:2,
74:8, 81:6, 101:24, 107:12, 136:5, 138:23, 140:18, 161:6 BUCKLEY [1] - 2:9 bullet [10]-54:7,
54:20, 55:10, 56:20, 57:24, 58:5, 58:12,
58:18, 59:7, 65:24 bullet-point [7] -
55:10, 56:20, 57:24,
58:5, 58:12, 58:18, 65:24
bullet-points [3] -
54:7, 54:20, 59:7
bundle [2]-8:8, 32:5
business [2]-39:22,
39:25
BY [25] - 1:5, 1:8,
2:10, 2:15, 2:19, 2:23,
2:27, 3:1, 3:6, 3:11,
$3: 14,3: 16,3: 22,4: 4$,
4:5, 4:6, 4:7, 5:7,
73:3, 78:7, 78:9,
143:25, 144:14,
162:28
bypassing [1] 20:26
Byrne [25] - 25:5, 25:7, 26:6, 26:7, 26:14, 26:20, 26:22, 27:7, 28:14, 40:21, 41:7, 42:2, 78:2, 143:2, 155:10, 155:15, 156:19, 157:9, 157:10, 157:22, 158:1, 158:11, 158:25, 159:9, 159:12
BYRNE [1]-2:24
Byrne's [1] - 159:20
$-$
cabinet [5] - 6:14
7:19, 7:24, 44:20, 44:21
calendar [1]-128:14
cancelled [1] -
156:29
cannot [11]-55:24,
66:18, 84:8, 90:15,
92:5, 99:23, 108:15,
113:24, 129:26,
134:14, 135:9
CAOIMHE [1] - 3:14
capacity [2]-46:8,
77:14
card [2]-43:22, 64:1
care [3]-13:25,
39:13, 162:20
Carmel [2] - 75:28, 156:6
Carolan [10] - 22:5,
76:14, 81:7, 81:9,
81:13, 83:11, 83:12,
100:1, 148:14, 148:27
carried [5] - 65:17,
95:5, 97:15, 145:25, 154:22
carry [4]-7:14,
28:28, 105:21, 129:22
carrying [1] - 144:24
CARTHAGE [1] - 3:6
case [86]-6:13, 7:4,
8:23, 13:24, 13:26, 18:20, 20:19, 31:7, 32:22, 41:6, 41:24, 42:25, 42:29, 44:1, 44:5, 44:6, 44:9,
44:15, 44:17, 45:5, 45:10, 45:23, 45:28, 46:8, 46:9, 52:11, 60:15, 60:17, 65:4, 65:20, 66:23, 68:4, 68:20, 77:19, 77:21, 83:19, 84:22, 84:29, 85:18, 85:20, 86:29, 87:14, 87:16, 87:17, 89:9, 92:28, 94:10, 95:20, 97:7, 101:21, 101:26, 101:27, 101:28, 106:21, 110:23, 116:27, 116:29, 119:14, 120:19, 121:28, 124:19, 126:12, 127:22, 128:23, 128:24, 129:25, 132:16, 134:28, 139:25, 140:5,

157:29, 158:2, 158:4, 159:26, 160:13, 160:17, 160:22, 160:27, 161:20, 162:23, 163:4, 163:5, 163:7, 163:18, 165:1, 167:11
case-manage [1] 46:8
cases [23] - 6:4, 6:8,
6:10, 6:11, 6:17, 6:25,
17:21, 26:9, 42:18,
42:22, 45:11, 45:26, 64:21, 64:23, 64:28, 77:11, 86:2, 96:10, 97:8, 97:11, 97:13, 102:18, 102:22
CASTLE [1] - 1:17
Castleblayney [1] -
102:20
catastrophic [2] 99:10, 99:11
caused [2]-105:12,
129:14
caution [1] - 47:23
cautious [1] - 47:24
Cavan [11]-25:29,
26:11, 27:15, 52:20, 64:27, 70:8, 76:5,
143:13, 156:11, 156:15
Cavan-Monaghan
[2] - 26:11, 64:27
caveat [2]-69:25
cc'd [3]-148:14,
148:27, 150:11
Centre [1] - 102:21
CERTAIN [1]-1:4
certain [3]-32:13,
129:6, 162:11
certainly [13] - 5:26,
11:3, 11:8, 21:23,
37:2, 63:11, 82:22,
101:4, 119:25, 127:3,
131:7, 143:12, 144:8
certify [1] - 1:25
cetera [1]-123:20
CHAIRMAN [97] -
72:12, 72:16, 87:21, 87:26, 88:1, 88:4, 88:7, 88:9, 88:12, 92:8, 92:14, 95:7, 95:9, 96:5, 96:7, 96:12, $96: 14,96: 20$, 100:29, 101:4, 101:9, 108:2, 113:2, 113:5, 113:11, 113:19, 114:24, 114:26, 114:29, 115:2, 115:4, 115:7, 115:9, 119:24,

120:8, 120:14,
120:17, 120:20,
123:12, 123:15,
123:23, 123:26,
123:29, 124:5,
127:18, 127:28,
132:19, 132:22,
133:15, 133:20,
133:25, 133:29,
134:2, 136:8, 136:11,
136:17, 136:19,
136:23, 136:25,
136:27, 137:2,
141:12, 141:17,
142:15, 143:7,
143:11, 143:15,
143:27, 144:4, 144:9,
144:12, 152:14,
152:16, 153:29,
154:4, 154:7, 154:9,
154:13, 154:15,
157:9, 158:10,
158:13, 158:15,
158:18, 158:20,
161:23, 161:27,
162:4, 162:15,
162:18, 166:1, 166:3,
166:19, 166:21,
166:26, 167:1, 167:3
Chairman [5] -
101:6, 120:12,
143:29, 144:8, 144:16
CHAMBERS [1] - 3:7
chance [1] - 66:15
change [2]-76:10,
113:29
changed [1] - 97:23
changes [2]-62:22,
63:14
charge [1]-25:21
CHARLETON [2] -
1:12, 2:2
check [8]-34:15,
88:24, 104:16,
104:20, 120:29,
121:14, 123:16,
129:23
checked [4] - 78:24,
78:26, 88:23, 158:26
checking [3]-30:1,
103:13, 104:11
CHIEF [1] - 2:20
child [17] - 13:25,
29:25, 38:18, 64:29, 67:24, 81:16, 81:20, 83:22, 95:25, 95:26, 97:2, 97:12, 97:14, 97:15, 109:26, 110:24, 154:1 Child [5] - 27:15,

27:16, 27:21, 68:13, 68:25
children [26] - 6:21, 9:27, 12:9, 14:29,
22:2, 22:11, 22:15,
22:23, 23:2, 38:20,
40:3, 57:29, 89:14,
97:4, 97:17, 109:25, 117:15, 124:13,
124:18, 126:13,
131:27, 133:10,
136:1, 164:16,
164:21, 164:24
choosing [1] - 7:18
Christmas [4]-5:20,
128:27, 128:29, 129:3
circulated [1] - 118:7
circulation [1] - 12:1
circumstance [3] -
90:23, 142:25, 161:29
circumstances [3] -
84:1, 123:23, 166:7
claims [1] - 87:23
Clair [2]-68:4, 69:17 clarification [5] -
53:18, 137:28, 152:1, 158:3, 165:8
clarified [2] - 35:17, 94:8
clarifies [1] - 57:8
clarify [2]-100:3,
119:10
clarifying [2]-36:17,
51:17
classify [1] - 96:14
clear [22]-12:26,
19:23, 23:7, 34:27,
49:4, 50:3, 50:6, 52:7,
57:18, 64:18, 66:1, 74:7, 79:15, 92:27, 119:4, 123:3, 148:28, 150:6, 151:18, 152:7, 152:9, 152:17
cleared [1] - 35:22
clearest [3]-15:11, 148:18, 151:28
clearly [6] - 12:22,
15:7, 32:27, 101:6, 151:23, 166:11
client's [1] - 136:5
clients [1] - 162:20
CLIONA [1] - 3:13
closed [12] - 40:27,
42:8, 42:9, 42:12, 47:6, 48:18, 117:1, 117:4, 117:9, 131:14, 160:13, 160:22
closely [1] - 76:16
closure [1] - 42:19
clothed [1] - 149:28

| coffee | 50:26 | $93$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 98:23 | complicated [1] - | $93: 19,94: 14,99: 5,$ | $125: 25,129: 24,$ |
| coincided [1] - 76:15 coincidences [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97:11 } \\ & \text { complied [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 100:8, 164:18 Connolly's [4] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:29, 145:28, } \\ & 149: 29,165: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 127:20 } \\ & \text { coincident [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:27 } \\ & \text { concede [1] - 158:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 29,12: 7,22: 16, \\ & 93: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { contact" [2]-106:1, } \\ & \text { 130:3 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 127:18 | conceded | CONOR [1] - 2:18 | ntacted [9] - |
| collaboration [1] - | 105:18 | conscious [4] | 30:19, 33:7, 56 |
| 52:15 | ncept [1] - 97:22 | 45:16, 45:20, 61:15, | 57:19, 67:17, 87:13, |
| colleague [1] - 95:21 | concern [8]-22:28, $69: 16,71: 17,72: 5$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 86:12 } \\ \text { cons } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:19, 117:11, } \\ & \text { 122:28 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 134:11 | 73:25, 106:22 | 36:21, 36:25, 36:27, |  |
| u | 110:17, 113:2 | 37:3, 37:7, 37:11 | 38:23, 122:14, 130:9, |
| ming [6]-30:26, | concerned [11] - | 47:4, 121:16, 121:17, | 130:10, 145:29 |
| 32:16, 33:18, 43:17, | 8:20, 34:26, 52:12, | 124:22 | contain [6]-10:24, |
| 46:7, 147:17 | 61:14, 63:20, 65:22, | consequence [1] - | 13:19, 55:13, 71:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { commas [1]-101:8 } \\ & \text { commenced [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 12,77: 24,94: 21, \\ & 117: 14,131: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87:26 } \\ & \text { consider [20] - 35:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 12,75: 3 \\ & \text { contained }[4]- \end{aligned}$ |
| 7:29 | $\begin{gathered} \text { concerns [11]-17:4, } \\ \text { 20:13. 21:2. 29:26. } \end{gathered}$ | $37: 7,44: 26, ~ 48: 1$, $48: 23,60: 22,61: 24$, | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 28,65: 25,71: 25, \\ & 145: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| commencing [1] |  |  |  |
|  | $79: 8,110: 3,131: 11$ | $65: 27,65: 29,82: 9,$ | $146: 5,148: 8$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 48:6, 66:22, 153:2 } \\ \text { comments }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:2 } \\ & \text { conclude }[3]-23: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 92:7, 100:8, 105:16, } \\ & \text { 122:9, 122:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { contains }[3]-10: 4, \\ & 11: 19,11: 26 \end{aligned}$ |
| 90:18 | 63:2, 134:28 | 126:11, 126:12 | contemplated [1] - |
| Commission [2] - | concluded [2]-24:1, | considerable [2] - | 62:2 |
| 66:19, 128:3 | 24:10 | 20:23, 102:17 | contemplating [2] - |
| COMMISSIONER [1] | conclusion [4]- | consideration [1] - | 108:29, 134:18 |
| $-2: 18$ | $45: 12,48: 14,55: 5$ | 19:21 | content [4] - 101:25, <br> 108:24, 134:24, 144:5 |
|  | ditio |  |  |
| communicated [3] - | 37:8 | $40: 1,47: 19,48: 29$ | $122: 18$ |
| 60:16, 60:18, 139:25 | confer [1] - 128:10 | 59:10, 62:21, 74:15, | context [11] - 17:13, |
| communication [1] - | conference [3] | 77:5, 78:18, 89:20, | 17:17, 17:26, 40:16, |
| 113:25 | 13:25, 77:20, 140: | 89:24, 98:2, 109:20, | 41:8, 45:29, 132:10 |
| mmunicat | conferences [1] | 122:8, 134:2 | 132:13, 144:2 |
| - 77:23, 140:6 | 77:21 | considering [1] - | 161:14, 161:20 |
| Company [2] - | confident [2]-69:14, | 62:12 | continue [1] - 10:14 |
| 135:15, 142:9 | 110:4 | nsisted [1] - 14:20 | CONTINUED [2] - |
| company [1] - 99:19 | nfine [1] - 144:6 | consistent [2]-46:9, | 5:7, 73:3 |
| COMPANY [2] - 2:15, | onfined [1] - 144:7 | 54:25 | continues [1] - 10:28 |
| 3:22 | confirmed [2] - | conspiracies [1] - | continuing [3] - 5:4 |
| compared | 41:28, 158:29 | 19:2 | 45:16, 131:19 |
| 120:10 | confirming [3] | constitute [1] - 155:5 | continuity [1] - 100:7 |
| complainant [1] - | 41:5, 42:13, 134:21 | consult [1]-22:4 | contradiction [2] - |
| 138:1 | conflicting [1] - | consulted [2] - | 124:2, 125:29 |
| complained [1] - | 114:14 | 36:14, 72:9 | contrary [1] - 132:6 |
| 95:26 | confused [1] - | consulting [2] | contribute [1] - |
| complaint [6] - | 136:27 | 17:29, 52:9 | 76:11 |
| 13:16, 80:8, 81:20, | confusing [2] - | Contact [1] - 104:11 | controller [1] - 58:15 |
| 110:19, 111:27, 123:8 | 35:13, 101:4 | contact [34]-12:20, | convenience [1] - |
| complete [5] - 32:29, | confusion [1] - | 25:18, 25:24, 25:27, | 27:26 |
| 57:28, 85:28, 128:24, | 110:25 | 28:1, 28:6, 29:7, | conversation [17] - |
| 130:25 | conjunction [2] - | 29:29, 30:3, 30:21 | 5:25, 12:14, 38:16, |
| completed [11] - | 64:24, 103:21 | 30:22, 33:10, 37:12 | 59:24, 59:27, 82:3, |
| 8:17, 31:13, 32:10, | CONLON [1] - 3:6 | 39:2, 40:5, 40:6, 47:3, | 87:10, 97:20, 98:24, |
| 32:14, 33:2, 35:10, | connection [3] - | 52:17, 67:25, 68:22, | 120:3, 126:19, 146:2, |
| 40:5, 41:21, 88:14, | 16:28, 70:28, 143:5 | 97:17, 103:13, | 155:8, 155:10, |
| 88:27, 102:8 | Connolly [11] - | 104:16, 116:26, | 157:29, 158:25, |
|  | 22:12, 44:4, 57:26, | 117:20, 118:13, | 159:15 |

converted [1] - 78:16
conviction [1] - 97:7
cooler [1] - 98:23 coordinate [13] -
23:22, 24:17, 24:29, 25:1, 25:3, 116:4, 116:21, 125:19,
125:22, 157:13,
157:16, 157:17,
157:20
coordinating ${ }_{[1]}$ -
117:6
coordinating' ${ }_{[1]}$ -
158:9
coordination [3] -
158:1, 158:6, 159:16
copies [2]-58:14, 112:24
copy [13]-11:14, 11:16, 12:12, 13:27, 14:2, 26:25, 29:7, 51:13, 56:22, 70:9, 108:2, 135:28, 137:4
COPYRIGHT [1] 3:28
correct [101] - 5: 19, 5:21, 5:22, 7:16, 7:17, 7:25, 9:16, 9:28, 10:5, 11:17, 11:27, 12:2, 12:3, 12:23, 12:24, 13:18, 13:20, 13:22, 13:29, 15:3, 15:8, 15:9, 15:20, 16:12, 16:15, 18:9, 20:17, 20:18, 21:14, 21:26, 24:8, 24:9, 25:9, 25:12, 25:29, 26:1, 26:4, 28:9, 28:13, 30:5, 30:15, 30:16, 31:4, 35:21, 35:28, 39:1, 39:4, 43:5, 43:7, 50:15, 51:23, 51:25, 52:26, 54:28, 55:18, 55:27, 56:4, 57:2, 57:9, 57:21, 58:4, 58:7, 58:10, 58:16, 58:21, 59:5, 59:17, 61:20, 67:12, 69:5, 69:8, 70:15, 71:11, 71:13, 72:4, 73:14, 74:7, 75:21, 78:17, 78:20, 91:2, 101:7, 101:8, 117:13, 126:6, 131:29, 143:17, 144:22, 144:23, 144:26, 147:27, 148:4, 151:16, 152:23, 154:25, 156:7, 157:3, 157:27, 159:3, 160:15, 163:20
corrected [9] -
38:28, 57:3, 58:25,
76:13, 76:18, 113:28, 114:3, 164:8, 164:13 correcting ${ }_{[1]}$ -
51:12
correction [1]-15:5
correctly [4]-63:12,
151:21, 155:21,
156:10
correspondence [3]

- 13:23, 53:13, 141:7 corresponding ${ }_{[1]}$ 153:10
Costello [9]-63:17,
65:28, 67:7, 68:11,
135:15, 136:14, 137:23, 139:5, 142:9 COSTELLO ${ }_{[1]}$ 2:15
Costello's [4]-49:1,
52:26, 68:9, 74:24
couch [4]-95:28,
119:29, 120:9, 120:15 counsel [4]-166:12,
166:18, 166:22,
166:24
counselling [2] -
87:23, 111:1 counsellor [12] -
18:24, 33:5, 33:7, 35:27, 36:9, 36:20, 36:25, 37:4, 37:12,
54:16, 121:10, 125:25 counsellor" [1] -
125:27
counsellors [3] -
110:29, 111:3, 111:8
countermanding ${ }_{[1]}$
- 32:23
counties [2]-75:29,
156:17
County [1] - 143:13
couple [1]-127:26
course [7]-20:15,
68:14, 79:4, 80:4,
111:24, 120:3, 133:20
COURT [2]-1:13,
2:3
cover [9]-7:15,
9:10, 9:13, 14:22,
34:4, 144:1, 144:17, 156:15
coverage [7]-18:13,
45:8, 45:17, 45:21,
45:22, 61:15, 107:3
covering [3]-77:18,
150:22, 156:16
COX $_{[1]}-2: 27$
CPM [1] - 44:1
creamer [4]-60:28,
61:2, 61:3, 61:13
create [4]-22:18,
23:1, 42:7, 87:3
created [15]-22:12, 23:3, 42:18, 52:4, 52:21, 53:24, 73:19,
74:4, 86:27, 87:2, 91:22, 110:25,
132:17, 134:22, 164:20
creation [5]-22:7,
22:15, 22:22, 55:2,
87:18
credibility [13] -
34:18, 107:23,
108:12, 108:28,
110:18, 121:21,
122:2, 122:3, 122:13,
123:5, 130:18,
130:23, 131:6
criminal [2] - $97: 5$,
154:24
criticising [1] - 42:2
criticism [1]-21:27
CROSS $[5]$ - 4:5, 4:6,
78:9, 143:25, 144:14
Cross [1]-27:15
CROSS-
EXAMINATION [1] -
143:25
CROSS-EXAMINED
[4]-4:5, 4:6, 78:9, 144:14
crucial ${ }_{[1]}-16: 23$
CSA [3]-29:26,
53:10, 98:9
Cunningham [10] -
14:11, 25:11, 25:19,
56:12, 65:17, 65:19,
69:12, 90:1, 127:24,
155:4
Curran [2]-111:10,
134:26
current [3]-30:3,
84:2, 106:1
CUSH ${ }_{[1]}-2: 22$
cut [1]-113:6
cut-and-paste [1] -
113:6
D
d's [5] - 87:14, 112:2,
116:17, 135:25,
135:26
D's [15]-36:21,
36:27, 47:3, 47:25,
48:1, 53:4, 53:7,

53:29, 54:25, 55:14, 69:5, 70:9, 71:14, 71:24, 71:28
D. [1] $^{2}$ - 70:10
danger $[3]-87: 28$,
88:7, 89:13
DARREN [1] - 3:11
data [2]-51:8, 58:15
database [2]-6:5, 7:22
date [26]-8:11, 28:2,
30:26, 30:29, 44:1,
53:19, 53:25, 55:24,
56:25, 56:28, 57:4,
102:6, 102:7, 102:9,
103:12, 110:5,
127:12, 127:13,
127:18, 136:8,
136:11, 163:10,
163:12, 163:15,
164:11
dated [14]-11:15,
13:12, 14:3, 14:11, 56:24, 58:8, 62:25, 65:6, 68:12, 103:1, 106:9, 145:13, 163:5, 163:14
dates [6]-28:3, 59:15, 64:14, 127:15, 127:17, 165:17
DAVID ${ }_{[1]}$ - 3:5
DAY $_{[1]}-1: 18$
days [2]-32:17,
128:17
deal $[9]-19: 12$, 19:19, 20:22, 48:6, 50:24, 101:25, 141:7, 159:2, 162:22
dealing [16]-17:22, 20:20, 68:3, 68:16, 68:17, 68:20, 69:10, 75:17, 76:7, 95:22, 104:3, 115:11, 120:19, 131:12, 136:3, 160:11
dealings $[1]-77: 13$
dealt [29]-6:22,
22:4, 39:9, 39:17, 39:20, 41:29, 52:15, 76:9, 83:8, 83:20, 85:6, 85:9, 86:16, 86:18, 86:29, 87:7, 87:11, 87:14, 89:22, 112:9, 131:28,
132:17, 140:6, 143:1, 155:19, 160:28,
161:2, 161:4, 166:28
Dear [4]-23:18, 31:6, 68:11, 149:5 dear ${ }_{[1]}$ - 27:19

December [15] -
27:28, 43:18, 44:24, 69:19, 70:9, 70:10,
127:7, 127:9, 128:26, 135:18, 136:12,
136:19, 136:21,
136:25, 146:7
decide [5]-119:1,
121:5, 129:20,
130:17, 154:26
decided [5] - 37:20,
118:21, 118:26,
119:15, 122:20
decides [1] - 93:4
decipher [1]-29:23
decision [24]-13:26,
19:14, 29:29, 32:21,
41:4, 47:11, 64:18,
64:19, 64:20, 79:9, 88:15, 89:16, 89:17, 89:19, 90:21, 94:19, 96:20, 99:25, 103:12, 103:23, 103:27, 165:8
decision-making [3]
-19:14, 64:18, 94:19
Deeney [48]-8:2,
15:16, 17:18, 18:11, 19:25, 19:26, 21:16, 23:8, 23:9, 30:4, 31:2, 31:28, 32:8, 32:19, 34:27, 36:23, 37:9, 44:27, 44:29, 46:15, 60:23, 60:26, 73:8, 74:1, 98:15, 99:15, 100:24, 101:3, 101:6, 101:17, 101:25, 102:4, 102:20, 103:4, 106:13, 106:25, 107:22, 112:18, 112:20, 112:28, 118:10, 119:26, 125:16, 125:21, 148:27, 153:10, 163:7, 164:9
Deeney's [2]-19:23, 47:9
deeply [3] - 129:13,
129:14, 129:18
defies [1]-92:22
definite $[1]$ - 123:16
definitely ${ }_{[1]}-131: 3$
definitively [1] -
82:24
degree [2]-104:9,
142:5
delayed [4]-62:16,
62:19, 128:26, 129:2
delaying ${ }_{[1]}-62: 12$
deliberately ${ }_{[2]}$ -
7:18, 142:26
demanded [2] -
114:14, 114:21
demanding ${ }_{[1]}$ -
114:7
Denise [1]-43:9
deny [1]-155:17
departed [1]-157:2
department [9] -
19:3, 25:24, 36:15,
36:18, 39:26, 84:28,
87:16, 128:28, 134:21
Department [3]-
70:8, 71:23
departure [2]-76:14
describe [3]-40:19,
153:22, 158:1
described [3] -
13:17, 125:16, 153:15 describes [1]-13:16 description [4] -
69:2, 78:15, 82:26, 150:8
Description [1] -
149:24
designated [2] - 7:4,
127:21
desire [2]-74:7,
141:25
desk [3] - 32:4,
66:23, 162:21
detail [2]-64:4,
123:20
details [9]-10:1,
10:10, 12:21, 68:22,
70:11, 78:1, 95:23,
95:24, 159:7
Detective [1] -
127:24
determine [5] - 36:8,
121:1, 121:9, 121:27,
133:10
development ${ }_{[1]}$ -
62:10
devoted [1] - 15:5
Dewhirst [1] -
150:11
DIARMUID [1] - 2:6
diary ${ }^{[1]}$ - $78: 24$
dictated [2] - 127:8,
127:11
differ ${ }_{[2]}$ - 127:14
different [18]-10:17,
18:29, 76:22, 95:27, 96:24, 96:27, 110:23, 110:27, 113:7, 114:20, 115:18, 119:7, 130:15, 130:26, 141:17, 143:22, 145:19, $163: 7$
differently [2] -

45:28, 83:21
difficult $[5]-35: 9$, 87:4, 96:18, 97:11, 115:21
difficulty [3]-36:16, 83:26, 122:14
digital [41]-15:19,
16:5, 17:6, 19:18,
33:21, 49:13, 50:4,
50:13, 51:12, 52:12,
53:27, 54:15, 54:23,
55:14, 57:4, 57:12,
58:1, 58:22, 67:11,
71:12, 71:20, 73:13,
97:21, 104:29, 109:2,
109:17, 110:8, 112:3,
120:1, 120:19,
135:16, 136:4, 137:9,
137:27, 148:2, 149:8,
151:2, 151:19,
151:27, 152:10,
152:20
Dignam [1]-162:5
DIGNAM [15]-2:18,
4:6, 143:29, 144:8,
144:14, 144:16,
152:15, 152:17,
154:17, 157:10,
158:22, 161:26,
162:1, 162:7, 162:26
dimension [1] -
122:2
DIRECT [1] - 78:7
direct [3]-19:26,
19:27, 147:7
directed [7]-16:11,
30:7, 88:21, 109:15,
109:22, 131:17, 158:7
direction [13] -
52:14, 57:27, 91:7,
91:18, 93:25, 94:7,
97:9, 105:10, 129:9,
153:16, 157:12,
161:11, 162:12
directions [3] -
93:21, 94:15, 161:7
directly [1]-30:21
DIRECTLY ${ }_{[1]}$ - 73:3
director ${ }_{[2]}$-16:10,
58:12
directs [1]-57:28
disagree ${ }_{[1]}-155: 3$
disappears [1] -
122:4
disastrous [1] -
99:20
disclosed [1] - 55:15
disclosure [2] - $70: 6$,
70:11
DISCLOSURES [2] -

1:3, 1:4
discovered [1] 76:20
discovery [1] - 69:21
discrepancies ${ }^{[8]}$ -
33:14, 33:16, 33:17,
33:28, 34:22, 119:18,
119:23, 121:14
discrepancy [21] -
33:11, 33:23, 33:26,
34:6, 34:11, 34:28,
35:3, 35:5, 35:11,
35:23, 47:8, 118:14, 118:16, 118:18,
118:27, 119:2, 119:8,
119:16, 120:10,
120:21, 121:4
discrepancy" ${ }_{[1]}$ 120:25
discuss [14]-23:23,
24:18, 59:19, 60:8, 77:28, 81:18, 95:23, 101:21, 106:21, 117:28, 118:1, 118:4, 138:29, 155:7
discussed [18] -
31:6, 33:24, 77:5,
78:3, 79:6, 79:16,
81:8, 84:5, 84:10,
85:1, 103:26, 113:20,
115:2, 118:21, 119:14, 134:10, 137:15, 139:11
discussing [3] -
81:12, 104:6, 134:17
discussion [30] -
5:23, 5:27, 21:20,
23:11, 28:19, 31:8,
33:13, 34:1, 42:7,
46:20, 59:29, 62:6,
63:9, 63:24, 63:26,
69:16, 80:6, 103:3,
103:29, 104:1,
104:10, 104:15,
118:5, 119:1, 119:27,
124:20, 134:15, 139:8, 140:4, 165:1
dismay [1]-142:14
dispense [2] -
122:20, 130:17
dispute [1]-142:29
disrespect [2] -
142:17, 158:13
distort [1] - 86:11
district [7]-26:8,
27:22, 143:6, 143:14, 143:18, 143:22, 157:27
divined [1] - 57:2
division [1]-67:23
document [33] -
9:26, 10:20, 10:29,
11:13, 11:29, 12:4,
12:6, 13:11, 13:23,
14:18, 29:5, 43:19,
43:20, 50:2, 55:7,
58:13, 69:6, 69:26,
72:7, 72:8, 78:16, 78:18, 80:6, 91:9, 100:16, 101:8,
101:10, 103:7,
145:21, 152:7, 163:3,
163:29, 165:18
documented [1] -
52:22
documents [41] -
9:2, 9:9, 9:17, 9:19,
10:18, 12:27, 14:20,
14:22, 14:28, 17:5,
18:7, 22:8, 22:18,
49:24, 50:12, 58:15,
58:27, 64:3, 73:12,
73:18, 76:17, 91:21,
95:10, 112:22,
112:24, 114:17,
114:19, 128:5, 145:5,
145:16, 146:18,
146:20, 146:23,
146:25, 146:28,
147:3, 147:9, 147:10,
151:11, 151:18,
151:22
domain $[4]$ - 18:25,
66:21, 66:27, 98:7
DONAL [1] - 2:19
DONALD [1]-2:19
done [16] - 8:3,
34:21, 36:21, 40:22,
49:19, 57:29, 83:13,
88:1, 91:16, 92:5,
100:11, 110:8,
117:11, 121:21, 141:2
door [1]-131:25
$\operatorname{dot}[3]-49: 29,50: 1$
doubt [2]-76:20,
132:23
down [8]-16:2,
90:25, 104:11, 140:4,
140:5, 140:9, 150:1,
166:19
DPP [9]-41:3,
97:10, 109:14,
109:18, 109:22,
117:2, 131:15, 161:7,
165:8
DPP's [1] - 96:20
draft [35]-10:29,
11:24, 11:25, 12:1,
15:18, 15:29, 20:5,
20:7, 20:9, 20:27,

21:5, 23:29, 24:2,
24:7, 31:21, 32:18,
32:24, 33:19, 50:16,
52:28, 53:18, 53:20,
60:1, 73:7, 73:11,
74:1, 74:2, 112:5,
127:15, 137:22,
137:25, 150:16,
150:27, 151:9
drafting [1] - 17:29
drag [1] - 141:10
dramatically ${ }_{[1]}$ -
97:23
draw [2]-51:9,
64:24
drawn [1] - 100:10
drew [2]-52:25,
64:27
Drumalee [1]-27:15
DUBLIN [9]-1:17,
2:12, 2:17, 2:21, 2:25,
2:28, 2:30, 3:8, 3:18
due [4]-18:13,
68:14, 107:3, 164:13
Duignan [2]-43:6,
43:9
DUNNE ${ }_{[1]}-3: 16$
duplicate [1] -
145:14
during [4]-45:21,
77:18, 86:11, 134:16
duties [3]-66:25,
139:21, 139:22
duty $[17]-6: 1,38: 19$, 44:1, 44:5, 44:6, 44:9, 44:10, 44:15, 44:18, 77:18, 78:26, 102:16, 154:10, 154:11,
156:16, 162:20
dying [1] - 128:17
DÁlL [1] - 1:5

## E

e.g [3]-121:10,

121:25, 125:27
EAMON [1] - 3:1
EARL [1] - $3: 23$
earliest [1]-27:26
EARLSFORT ${ }_{[2]}$ -
2:27, 3:17
early [4]-55:6,
75:24, 81:20, 85:4
easier $[1]$ - 108:2
easily [2]-7:23,
130:14
economical ${ }_{[1]}$ -
142:26
edges [1]-162:2
effect [5] - 32:23,
43:2, 89:2, 89:17, 123:19
effectively [6] - 30:7,
37:19, 39:3, 43:13,
59:20, 94:29
effort [1] - 128:13
efforts [2]-156:18, 157:4
egregious [1] - 66:22
eight $[5]-13: 5$,
110:4, 110:9, 110:12, 124:27
Eileen [14]-12:18, 22:5, 50:5, 56:24, 57:27, 57:28, 76:13, 93:16, 99:13, 100:1, 148:11, 148:24, 149:4, 149:5
either [21]-14:13,
17:29, 21:20, 22:10, 25:28, 31:18, 36:28, 42:7, 50:25, 51:14, 52:10, 52:14, 56:5, 60:12, 60:23, 76:8,
90:22, 102:28,
112:13, 112:17,
112:26
elapsed [1]-131:25
elementary [2] -
47:23, 92:20
eleven [1] - 72:12
ELIZABETH $[1]$ - 2:7
eloquent ${ }_{[1]}$ - 142:16
ELY ${ }_{[1]}$ - 2:30
em [5]-81:2, 82:20,
92:7, 106:27, 135:6
em.. [3]-83:2, 88:18, 163:21
email [63]-8:1, 8:12, 8:18, 12:1, 12:12, 12:18, 13:9, 13:10, 15:6, 15:11, 15:15, 15:29, 17:17, 17:19, 17:20, 18:10, 18:17, 21:21, 23:8, 23:10, 24:6, 29:1, 31:2, 32:23, 34:26, 45:8, 47:9, 49:21, 50:5, 51:21, 53:1, 53:14, 54:4, 54:5, 65:1, 65:2, 65:23, 66:11, 98:14, 98:15, 99:18, 100:28, 106:12, 108:5, 111:18, 113:24, 116:16, 118:6, 118:7, 135:20, 138:25, 148:11, 148:21, 148:22, 148:24, 149:4, 150:10,

150:21, 150:22,
150:23, 151:28,
152:9, 153:2
email-thread [1] -
148:21
Emer [8]-49:21,
53:2, 111:9, 123:10,
134:26, 135:20,
137:3, 137:15
emotional [3] -
66:16, 142:22, 142:25
enclose [1] - 56:18
enclosed ${ }_{[1]}-56: 14$
enclosing ${ }_{[1]}$ - 12:1
END [2]-78:7,
143:25
end [12]-9:4, 9:20,
10:2, 43:18, 59:19,
102:28, 130:2, 132:3,
143:13, 159:22
159:28
endeavour [2] -
104:18, 115:22
ended [2]-43:13,
69:10
ending ${ }_{[1]}$ - $50: 1$
enforced [1] - 166:10
engaged [2]-26:19,
99:20
ensure [3]-38:19,
59:25, 102:22
entire [3]-53:7,
73:27, 152:5
entirely [6] - 59:7,
94:12, 95:27, 100:17,
130:15, 138:20
entirety $[2]-17: 1$, 17:4
entitled [1] - 73:22
entry [5] - 7:11,
43:26, 44:5, 44:6,
64:12
enumerated ${ }_{[1]}$ -
59:11
EQUALITY ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1:9
equally [1] - 45:27
equation [1] - 122:4
erroneous [10] -
11:15, 11:19, 11:26,
55:7, 58:13, 73:13,
76:12, 100:9, 111:16, 139:5
erroneously [1] -
54:16
error [68] - 11:9,
11:11, 11:12, 12:14,
12:21, 12:22, 13:9,
13:19, 13:28, 14:3,
14:28, 15:2, 15:5,
15:7, 17:2, 17:11,

18:3, 18:6, 35:18,
38:28, 39:1, 47:10,
49:9, 49:27, 50:5,
50:7, 51:6, 51:13,
51:27, 51:29, 53:26,
56:27, 57:3, 57:10, 57:13, 57:18, 58:7, 59:3, 59:27, 61:19, 63:10, 66:2, 66:7, 68:19, 72:2, 72:4, 72:6, 74:4, 74:7, 76:20, 76:22, 98:26, 99:1, 99:10, 99:11, 99:20, 113:6, 114:8, 122:25, 124:28,
132:18, 149:1, 149:6,
149:8, 149:11,
151:26, 161:25
errors [5] - 47:28,
47:29, 52:21, 56:26, 138:22
es [1] - 150:24
escalation [2] - 70:1, 70:3
escapes [1] - 94:17
especially [1] - 166:9
essentially [3] -
41:10, 48:26, 75:6
establish [2]-62:5,
106:1
ESTABLISHED ${ }_{[1]}$ 1:8
established [2] -
30:3, 99:7
establishment [2] -
62:1, 62:8
et $[1]-123: 20$
etcetera [1] - 53:13
evaluation [1] -
105:21
evaporates [1] -
122:2
event [13]-8:28,
21:25, 36:4, 82:27,
82:29, 83:6, 83:14,
83:24, 95:16, 96:26,
103:3, 143:8, 158:10
events [5]-20:15,
32:17, 90:16, 112:29,
145:26
everywhere [1] -
113:13
evidence [16] - $5: 5$,
25:26, 36:12, 56:3,
63:12, 70:24, 72:6,
83:25, 84:21, 88:29,
90:15, 101:5, 144:20,
148:17, 156:24,
160:26
EVIDENCE ${ }_{[1]}-1: 9$
evident [1] - 93:29
exactly [2]-99:9,
159:8
EXAMINATION ${ }_{[2]}$ -
78:7, 143:25
examination [1]
88:16
EXAMINED $[9]-4: 4$,
4:5, 4:6, 4:7, 5:7,
73:3, 78:9, 144:14,
162:28
example [2]-36:9,
113:7
exams [5]-30:25,
30:27, 38:4, 38:6,
126:5
Excel [1] - 48:21
excise [1]-58:29
executed [1] -
100:16
existed ${ }_{[1]}-118: 16$
existence ${ }_{[1]}$ - 164:7
expect ${ }_{[1]}-83: 1$
expectation [2] -
21:4, 24:2
expected [2]-32:14,
83:13
experience [1] - 79:2
expert [2]-124:29,
125:2
expertise [1]-97:3
experts [1]-97:4
explain [8]-55:4,
63:10, 66:18, 74:13,
103:17, 112:23,
142:3, 142:5
explained [4] -
38:12, 38:17, 84:19, 126:10
explaining [3]-
38:14, 66:6
explanation [12] -
16:26, 61:24, 66:8,
75:3, 82:10, 114:15,
140:21, 141:26,
142:6, 142:12,
142:27, 143:7
explanations ${ }_{[1]}$ -
114:21
exploring ${ }_{[1]}$ - 124:6
explosive [1]-60:25
express [2]-141:27,
166:25
expressed [1] -
110:17
extent $[7]-7: 8$,
53:29, 63:5, 100:29,
113:16, 150:6, 166:6
exterior [1]-7:15
extract [4]-43:21,

44:3, 44:4, 64:1
extracted [1] - 9:2

## F

face [4] - 31:7, 113:8,
123:26
face-to-face ${ }_{[1]}$ 31:7
fact [46] - 7:4, 16:17,
17:28, 19:17, 20:20,
24:21, 28:14, 34:5,
44:17, 49:16, 49:17,
51:11, 51:16, 51:20,
53:4, 59:15, 62:22,
66:1, 66:17, 68:6,
73:12, 82:26, 91:4, 94:15, 98:25, 100:11, 102:8, 105:21,
114:24, 123:18,
129:10, 132:8, 140:5,
145:8, 145:13, 149:9,
150:22, 156:25,
156:28, 159:25,
160:11, 161:14,
161:16, 162:3,
164:25, 167:5
factor ${ }_{[1]}$ - 19:14
failed [5] - 17:9,
17:10, 17:11, 30:17, 94:6
failing [2] - 47:29,
48:1
failure [1]-89:7
fair [20]-18:2, 24:11,
35:11, 41:19, 46:11,
46:25, 59:23, 86:10,
113:22, 130:20,
130:27, 132:29,
144:27, 145:7, 154:7,
155:6, 155:23,
158:20, 159:15, 167:11
fairly [4]-45:26,
121:4, 140:24, 153:22
fairness [9]-16:26,
40:15, 46:26, 50:10, 54:10, 69:23, 146:12,
154:18, 158:22
faith $[1]$ - 132:20
fall $[1]-6: 27$
false [5]-35:17,
97:25, 100:17,
130:14, 141:26
familiar [1] - 62:5
Family [5]-27:15,
27:16, 27:21, 68:13, 68:25
family [3]-52:2,

129:15, 134:23
famous [1] - 101:13
FANNING [1] - 2:10
far [12]-22:14,
52:11, 59:11, 81:5, 86:18, 94:21, 119:24, 129:4, 131:22, 132:4,
132:5, 142:24
fashion [3]-59:11,
154:11, 154:12
fast [1]-20:26
father [1]-55:15
favour [1] - 132:26
features [1] - 94:3
February [18] 49:20, 53:1, 53:21, 54:5, 60:6, 65:23, 71:4, 75:22, 75:24, 136:10, 137:4, 137:11, 138:11, 138:25, 156:2, 165:3
FEBRUARY [2] - 1:6, 1:10
fell [1] - 6:29
felt [10] - 18:24, 66:25, 73:22, 73:24, 129:17, 131:4, 131:7, 133:4, 140:9, 162:21
female [1]-109:25
FERRY [1] - 3:5
few [3]-18:7, 32:17, 34:4
figure [1] - 98:7
file [246]-5:11, 5:24, 6:3, 6:15, 6:27, 7:14, 7:16, 7:20, 7:21, 7:29, 8:3, 8:10, 8:24, 8:29, 9:10, 9:13, 9:20, 11:16, 12:27, 14:8, 14:9, 14:18, 14:19, 14:21, 14:23, 15:14, 16:10, 16:14, 16:18, 16:20, 16:21, 16:24, 16:29, 17:3, 17:5, 17:11, 17:28, 18:3, 18:7, 18:8, 19:10, 19:12, 20:7, 20:15, 22:15, 22:22, 24:22, 24:24, 24:25, 24:28, 25:8, 30:9, 31:11, 31:14, 31:16, 31:17, $31: 18,31: 19,31: 20$, 31:28, 32:2, 32:6, 32:8, 32:10, 32:12, 32:15, 33:19, 34:3, 34:10, 34:24, 35:4, 35:18, 36:3, 41:1, 41:3, 43:28, 44:2, 44:19, 44:23, 46:1, 46:15, 47:6, 47:9,

47:11, 47:21, 47:29, 48:18, 49:17, 49:18, 49:25, 50:6, 50:7, 50:9, 50:11, 50:13, 50:19, 50:26, 50:29, 51:6, 51:7, 51:13, 51:24, 52:10, 52:16, 53:3, 53:5, 53:7, 53:8, 53:9, 53:10, 53:11, 53:12, 53:29, 54:15, 56:24, 57:3, 57:26, 58:20, 58:26, 58:27, 59:1, 59:7, 64:14, 64:15, 64:17, 64:22, 65:20, 65:25, 68:2, 69:10, 69:12, 73:12, 73:23, 73:28, 74:10, 76:13, 76:18, 76:21, 76:28, 77:4, 81:24, 82:11, 85:28, 85:29, 86:27, 87:1, 87:2, 87:3, 87:6, 87:18, 87:19, 88:16, 88:17, 88:20, 88:21, 88:24, 88:25, 88:28, 91:10, 91:29, 92:29, 93:3, 93:10, 93:14, 93:19, 93:21, 93:26, 93:28, 93:29, 94:15, 94:17, 95:4, 95:11, $96: 2$, 98:1, 98:18, 99:2, 100:4, 102:2, 102:4, 102:7, 102:9, 103:24, 104:4, 105:13, 107:1, 109:14, 109:16, 109:20, 109:21, 111:5, 111:6, 111:12, 111:17, 114:3, 114:16, 117:7, 122:7, 123:10, 123:11, 128:16, 129:13, 131:14, 134:22, 135:25, 137:10, 137:16, 144:21, 144:28, 145:2, 146:10, 146:20, 147:11, 147:29, 149:1, 149:3, 150:4, 150:19, 150:22, 151:14, 151:21, 151:29, 152:3, 152:5, 152:17, 152:18, 153:3, 161:11, 161:12, 161:17, 162:14, 162:25, 163:8, 163:9, 163:11, 163:15, 165:10, 165:15, 165:18, 165:21
file-keeping [1] 76:21
files [28] - $5: 18,8: 7$, 8:8, 8:13, 31:9, 32:3, 32:4, 53:24, 65:21, 75:18, 76:7, 88:11, 92:13, 101:19, 102:21, 104:6, 106:19, 115:23, 119:11, 128:24, 133:3, 161:24, 161:27, 164:16, 164:19, 164:20, 164:24, 164:25
filing [6] - $6: 13,7: 19$, 7:23, 7:24, 44:20, 44:21
filled [1] - 32:6
final [3]-74:17,
75:1, 151:9
finally [2]-160:24, 161:9
fine [1] - 166:21
finish [2]-144:12, 155:9
finished [3]-60:26, 72:14, 72:15
FINTAN [1] - 3:11
FIONA [1] - $3: 22$
first [30] - 6:2, 6:11, 6:16, 6:17, 9:26, 11:24, 12:20, 15:1, 20:16, 23:25, 32:29, 33:2, 33:6, 49:16, 55:27, 61:4, 62:3, 66:18, 70:17, 79:15, 87:22, 92:11, 94:6, 108:27, 130:19, 136:4, 139:20, 163:11, 165:18 fit [1] - 142:19 five [12]-44:29, 46:16, 47:1, 79:26, 79:27, 80:5, 96:16, 96:28, 101:13, 125:16, 125:22 five-point [1] 101:13
five-point-plan [1] 47:1
fixed [1] - 30:29
flap [2] - 112:21
flexible [1] - 28:3
floor [1] - 120:8
flowed [1] - 146:9
flower [1] - 98:11
focus [3]-89:11,
134:18, 143:16
focused [3]-6:24, 77:1
focusing [1]-76:27
folders [1] - 9:15
follow [17]-6:11,
38:18, 67:25, 76:29, 87:4, 89:6, 89:16, 97:10, 97:11, 97:12, 105:7, 134:14, 134:18, 134:20, 154:10, 160:1, 160:7
follow-up [2] 134:18, 134:20
followed [16] - 8:21, 32:22, 46:9, 77:2, 84:22, 85:8, 86:20, 86:22, 86:25, 87:17, 88:20, 94:26, 94:27, 95:14, 96:1, 96:3
FOLLOWING [1] 1:5
following [12]-1:26,
54:17, 77:7, 78:19,
97:7, 102:2, 106:13, 118:8, 129:12,
131:21, 135:23,
146:22
follows [1] - 27:9
FOLLOWS [4]-5:2,
5:8, 73:1, 73:4
foot [3]-30:12,
53:14, 59:29
FOR [15] - 1:8, 2:6, 2:9, 2:14, 2:18, 2:22, 2:26, 2:29, 2:32, 3:11, 3:13, 3:16, 3:19, 3:21, 72:18
forget [3]-49:29,
115:14, 115:17
forgetting [1] 115:19
forgot [1] - 138:28
forgotten [6] -
112:14, 112:16,
112:18, 115:12,
115:13, 126:28
form [31]-7:5, 7:10,
8:17, 8:23, 14:14, 29:8, 29:13, 29:15, 31:13, 32:7, 32:9, 32:14, 32:22, 56:18, 63:13, 65:24, 68:28, 69:27, 69:29, 79:3, 79:5, 79:7, 97:25, 102:6, 102:8, 103:9, 123:4, 125:9, 163:4, 163:5, 163:8
formal [2]-42:4, 43:15
formally [3] - 28:20, 37:3, 147:5
forms [1] - 114:21
fortnight [1] - 65:9
forward [3] - 45:5,

45:12, 129:25
forwarded [11] -
33:11, 53:6, 55:25,
57:21, 58:7, 118:14, 118:28, 119:16, 137:29, 153:4
forwarding [1] -
20:26
fostering [1] - 77:22
foundation [2] -
121:2, 121:6
four [8]-10:17,
14:28, 22:10, 57:29,
96:16, 96:25, 96:27
fourth [1] - 16:2
Fraher [1] - 127:24
front [1] - 10:5
fulfil [1] - 66:25
full $[3]-116: 16$,
141:1, 156:16
fully [10] - 17:28, 48:4, 48:9, 48:10, 52:6, 73:27, 87:7, 149:28, 157:6, 161:4

## G

Gail [2]-102:20,
106:19
GALLAGHER [2] 2:29, 2:29
Garda [92] - 10:29, 11:24, 12:1, 15:24, 16:8, 19:5, 19:6, 22:11, 23:21, 24:16, 24:21, 25:23, 26:19, 27:7, 27:16, 27:20, 27:22, 28:19, 40:20, 40:23, 40:26, 40:27, 41:20, 42:5, 42:8, 42:14, 47:6, 51:11, 51:17, 51:18, 52:11, 53:3, 53:9, 53:13, 54:25, 55:23, 56:6, 56:7, 56:18, 56:22, 57:7, 57:10, 58:19, 67:18, 70:9, 77:17, 79:14, 89:12, 90:6, $90: 13,90: 17,90: 18$, 90:21, 91:9, 91:11, 91:25, 91:26, 92:1, 92:25, 93:6, 93:17, 94:11, 100:3, 100:10, 112:23, 114:14, 114:20, 116:3, 124:22, 124:23, 125:4, 128:3, 131:12, 134:25, 135:23,
135:25, 137:16, 143:29, 145:12,

148:5, 148:6, 150:16,
150:18, 150:24,
153:4, 153:11,
153:17, 153:26,
154:5, 155:5, 157:22, 160:10
GARDA [2] - 3:3, 3:13
garda [13]-24:23,
25:6, 26:7, 55:28,
58:14, 154:8, 159:8,
159:12, 160:18,
160:20, 164:8,
164:13, 165:8
Gardaí [84]-5:27,
8:5, 11:17, 25:27,
26:10, 28:11, 28:29,
34:20, 40:22, 41:24,
42:9, 42:12, 42:18,
42:21, 42:26, 47:13,
52:9, 52:17, 52:23,
52:24, 54:14, 55:25,
56:27, 57:17, 77:6,
77:24, 89:3, 89:7,
89:8, 89:17, 89:20,
89:25, 91:7, 91:27,
92:24, 92:27, 93:1,
94:1, 94:9, 94:16,
97:6, 110:25, 110:28,
111:3, 111:7, 114:5,
114:10, 114:19,
116:11, 116:17,
116:26, 117:6, 117:7,
117:21, 122:9,
122:27, 123:24,
124:9, 124:16,
124:26, 125:19,
125:22, 125:25,
125:28, 129:23,
132:9, 151:8, 154:2,
154:10, 154:21,
154:23, 157:13,
157:16, 158:2, 158:4,
158:7, 158:8, 159:18,
160:13, 160:22,
161:4, 162:18
gasping [1] - 142:18
gather [1]-98:21
general [2]-94:22,
98:23
generally [1] - 28:3
gentlemen [1] -
112:26
genuine [1] - 111:26
Gerard [2]-54:13,
125:18
Gerry [14]-8:1, 8:19, 19:27, 66:9, 66:11, 66:12, 74:20, 75:12, 98:14, 101:16,

106:15, 137:12,
138:25, 139:11
Gerry's [1]-21:2
GILLANE [1] - 2:32
girl [1] - 105:1
given [18]-22:25,
33:27, 70:12, 77:1,
88:29, 108:23,
113:16, 121:15, 132:7, 134:23,
135:26, 140:14,
141:9, 141:26,
142:12, 143:7,
153:16, 167:10
glean [1]-41:1
gleaned [1] - 59:7
gleaning [1] - 16:18
GORDON [1] - 2:15
grave [2]-53:26,
141:8
great [2] - 39:13, 52:1
grievance [2] - 19:8,
107:11
ground [1] - 71:6
grounds [1] - 22:28
group [1] - 6:17
GSOC [1] - 127:21
GSOC's [1] - 127:29
guard [3]-77:27,
78:1, 78:3
guards [13]-33:23,
33:24, 52:15, 77:25,
89:10, 90:3, 90:29,
91:3, 93:4, 112:24,
114:13, 114:29,
164:10
GUNNING [1] - 3:21
GWEN [1] - 1:30
Gwen [3]-1:25,
3:28, 3:30
gyrating [1] - 105:1
gyration [1] - 119:29
H
half [1] - 72:12
HALIDAY [1] - 2:16
HALL [1]-2:11
HANAHOE [1] - 3:6
hand [8]-15:4,
26:24, 51:4, 51:20,
76:7, 119:28, 120:1,
124:7
handed [4]-31:27,
32:1, 68:21, 69:12
HANDED] [1] - 26:25
handled [1] - 161:21
handwriting [10] -

29:21, 37:27, 102:6, 163:25, 163:27, 163:29, 164:2, 164:4, 164:5, 165:22
happy [2] - 166:14, 166:21
HARCOURT [1] 2:25
hard [1] - 108:2
hardly [2]-104:3,
112:26
Hargadon [3]-61:9,
61:11, 61:13
HARRINGTON [1] 3:1
HARRISON [1] - 3:3
HARTY [1] - 3:3
HATCH [2]-2:11, 2:11
HAYES [1] - 3:16
head [3] - 95:15,
101:11, 126:26
heading [1] - 164:27
hear [4]-21:10,
166:14, 166:16, 167:6
heard [11]-21:7,
21:11, 78:14, 82:22,
82:25, 84:19, 96:8,
101:4, 115:3, 166:23
hearing [2] - 82:6, 166:10
HEARING [4] - 5:1,
72:18, 73:1, 167:18
heart [1] - 52:8
heavily [1] - 64:3
heavily-redacted [1]

- 64:3

HEGARTY [1] - $3: 9$
held [2]-27:28,
139:14
HELD [1] - 1:17
help [8] - 44:7, 72:1,
79:24, 96:7, 96:8,
129:18, 165:26, 166:1
helped [1] - 66:8
herself [1] - 39:1
Hi [1] - 54:13
hiatus [1] - 155:28
hide [3]-95:28,
104:29, 119:28
hide-and-seek [1] -
95:28
high [6] - 6:10, 6:17, 7:7, 19:13, 84:15, 101:28
highlight [2] - 105:3, 113:26
highlighted $[7]-6: 8$,
$6: 10,8: 18,17: 5$,
54:18, 79:7, 119:19
highlighting [1] -
35:27
highly [1] - 100:9
himself [7]-21:13,
26:16, 106:26,
118:23, 118:24,
118:25, 150:1
hindsight [5] - 36:2,
47:24, 47:27, 67:16
historic [1] - 56:25
hmm [18] - 14:25,
23:24, 23:27, 24:19,
32:20, 38:11, 57:1,
59:12, 63:23, 65:5,
67:2, 89:28, 90:28,
106:24, 108:20,
110:10, 121:26,
123:25
holding [2] - 75:6,
136:14
honestly [1] - 119:6
hope [1] - 92:21
hopes [1] - 113:3
horrible [1] - 66:7
hour [1]-72:13
HOUSE [3]-2:16,
2:20, 3:17
house [4]-52:21,
52:22, 128:8
household [1] - 52:5
howsoever [1] -
61:19
HSE [2]-2:22, 58:15
huge [3]-112:21,
115:21
human [2]-96:17, 107:10
hundred [1] - 66:10
hush [1] - 99:26

- I
ideal [3]-77:11,
132:4, 132:5
ideally [1] - 77:3
identical [1] - 156:25
identified [13] -
12:21, 28:12, 29:18,
33:17, 33:29, 34:4,
74:10, 79:13, 93:12,
125:17, 148:28,
149:3, 161:24
identifies [1] - 15:7
identify [6]-31:17,
102:21, 148:18,
163:25, 164:3, 165:26
identifying [3] -
17:14, 26:16, 51:2
ignore [1] - 66:24
ignoring [1] - 37:9
illegal [1] - 101:10
imagine [1] - 80:4
immediate [1] -
63:22
immediately [6] -
69:9, 111:25, 112:1,
114:13, 140:19, 154:8
impact [1] - 76:17
impacting [1] - 45:22
implication [1] -
92:14
important [3] -
17:27, 120:4, 162:1
imposed [1] - 36:23
impossible [1] -
36:24
impression [2] -
93:14, 93:15
improbable [1] -
82:19
IN [1] - 1:17
in-house [3] - 52:21,
52:22
inaccurate [2] -
50:27, 70:11
inadvertence [1] -
89:18
inappropriate [4]-
48:9, 97:17, 129:11,
149:29
incident [5] - 70:2,
109:26, 149:27,
149:29
include [8]-17:7,
18:16, 54:23, 56:26, 58:14, 108:4, 108:14, 165:1
included [7] - 9:17,
50:16, 57:29, 64:22,
130:13, 139:6, 152:12
includes [1] - 166:7
including [2] - 14:21,
23:29
inclusion [1] - 71:19
inconsistent [1] -
119:5
incorrect [16] - 10:4,
10:25, 50:1, 51:3,
51:7, 56:28, 57:7,
70:16, 71:25, 73:18,
128:20, 146:5, 148:8,
151:19, 153:13,
153:14
indeed [2] - 113:15,
144:19
INDEPENDENT [1] -
3:19
index [4]-88:24,
88:25, 163:13, 163:14

| INDEX [1] - 4:1 <br> indicate [3]-86:28, | $\begin{gathered} \text { instance [5] - 49:28, } \\ \text { 65:22, 76:12, 90:17, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 93:16 } \\ & \text { interview [11] - 36:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:29, 137:12, } \\ & 155: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 29,75: 18,88: 19, \\ & 89: 1,94: 6,165: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 87:19, 89:23 | 124:16 | 121:9, 125:24, | job [1] - 96:12 | 165:3 |
| indicated [1] - 30:28 | instead [5] - 91:27, | 136:16, 145:10, | jog [1] - 120:26 | keen [5] - 63:6, |
| indicates [1] - 44:9 | 92:24, 113:7, 113:9, | 146:13, 146:17, | jogged [1] - 115:23 | 74:12, 140:11, 141:9 |
| indication [4]-18:3, | 145:19 | 146:29, 154:19, | JOHN [3] - 3:5, 3:11, | keep [8]-31:24, |
| 18:6, 49:4, 50:3 | INSTRUCTED [11] - | 159:4, 159:6 | 3:22 | 61:27, 62:18, 68:26, |
| infer [1] - 118:3 | 2:10, 2:15, 2:19, 2:23, | interviews [1] - | joint [2]-27:16, | 74:22, 74:28, 75:4, |
| influence [2] - 97:28, | 2:27, 3:1, 3:6, 3:11, | 124:16 | 27:25 | 115:23 |
| 162:13 | 3:14, 3:16, 3:22 | INTO [1] - 1:3 | JON [1] - 2:23 | keeping [2] - 76:21 |
| influenced [1] - | instructed [7] - | inverted [1] - 101:8 | JUDGE [2]-1:12, | KEITH [1] - 3:3 |
| 109:8 | 22:18, 68:23, 68:26, | investigate [3] - | 2:3 | KELLY [3] - 2:10, |
| inform [5]-37:15, | 74:28, 88:26, 91:24 | 67:21, 67:26, 154:24 | Judge [6] - 113:23, | 2:10, 3:20 |
| 56:27, 109:1, 121:19, | instructing [2] - | investigated [5] - | 123:14, 127:27, | KENNEDY [1] - 3:1 |
| 121:24 | 56:6, 103:18 | 15:23, 16:7, 33:22, | 154:17, 162:3, 166:29 | kept [1] - 31:25 |
| information [50] - | instruction [11] - | 33:25, 119:9 | judgement [1] - | KEVIN [1] - 3:13 |
| 16:13, 16:20, 22:9, | 12:8, 22:25, 29:11, | investigation [7] - | 135:4 | KEVIN'S [1] - 2:12 |
| 23:5, 26:18, 30:2, | 56:10, 90:6, 93:5, | 40:26, 41:21, 41:29, | judges [1] - 96:12 | KIERAN [2] - 2:10, |
| 35:28, 42:10, 42:21, | 93:28, 117:16, | 43:1, 127:25, 131:12, | judgment [5] - 38:3, | 3:20 |
| 47:20, 50:6, 51:7, | 117:18, 132:6, 141:28 | 159:13 | 38:9, 38:13, 38:16, | KILFEATHER [1] - |
| 51:17, 53:22, 54:24, | instructions [2] - | Investigation [1] - | 98:11 | 3:3 |
| 54:25, 55:19, 55:23, | 91:23, 133:22 | 66:20 | July [14] - 64:6, 65:6, | Kilkenny [1] - 75:25 |
| 56:23, 56:26, 57:8, | INSTRUMENT [1] - | investigations [1] - | 65:12, 65:15, 68:9, | KIMBER [1] - 3:13 |
| 57:9, 58:1, 59:6, 64:4, | 1:8 | 154:22 | 74:23, 75:1, 78:27, | kind [4] - 92:20, |
| 67:18, 72:6, 73:25, | intake [26]-6:1, | investigators [7] | 78:28, 130:6, 141:21, | 113:12, 128:15, |
| 76:12, 80:19, 84:7, | 9:27, 10:9, 10:14, | 89:2, 134:25, 145:11, | 142:10, 156:10, | 161:25 |
| 85:17, 95:19, 96:2, | 10:15, 10:20, 12:8, | 146:14, 146:18, | 156:15 | KM5 [1] - 29:14 |
| 105:17, 108:18, | 14:29, 22:1, 22:2, | 146:24, 153:7 | JULY [3]-1:18, 5:1, | knocked [1] - 131:25 |
| 109:10, 111:4, | 22:10, 22:14, 23:1, | inviting [1] - 167:9 | 167:18 | knowledge [8] - |
| 111:16, 115:15, | 23:3, 54:24, 55:3, | involve [1] - 125:17 | July/August [1] - | $5: 14,21: 15,25: 28$ |
| 115:21, 116:15, | $56: 5,57: 28,68: 28$ | involved [11] - 15:19, | 76:5 | $32: 11,62: 13,95: 1$ |
| 119:11, 128:19, | 69:29, 78:16, 88:27, | 16:5, 22:1, 77:20, | jump [1] - 20:6 | 98:18, 160:16 |
| 133:3, 139:6, 148:18, | 102:16, 147:18, | 85:20, 90:4, 97:29, | jumping [1] - 37:10 | known [10] - 45:7, |
| $151: 29,160: 3,160: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 156:16, 164:19 } \\ & \text { intend }[1]-21: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 106: 28,125: 6,149: 7 \\ & 149: 29 \end{aligned}$ | June [19] - 30:15, | 57:19, 65:8, 66:18, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { information" [1] - } \\ & \text { 105:24 } \end{aligned}$ | intend [1]-21:28 <br> intended [5] - 11:3 | 149:29 | 38:4, 39:4, 51:18, | 80:20, 86:24, 92:29, |
| information.. [1] - | 21:1, 142:17, 158:13, | 98:18, 128:1, 135:1 | 102:29, 113:1, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 55:13 } \\ & \text { informed }[7]-80: 29, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:25 } \\ & \text { intense [1] - 45:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IRISH [1] - 3:16 } \\ & \text { issue [12] - 20:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:22, 141:23, } \\ & \text { 146:2, 150:14, 151:7, } \end{aligned}$ | L |
| 82:28, 83:12, 108:22, | intent [1] - 19:5 | 21:1, 52:7, 71:20, | 164:10, 164:12, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 134:12, 149:26 } \\ & \text { informing }[5]-52: 9, \end{aligned}$ | intention [1]-40:25 intentionally [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 9,105: 20,131: 13 \\ & 131: 21,141: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:18 } \\ & \text { jury [2] - 101:1, } \end{aligned}$ | lack [1] - 100:7 <br> ladder [5] - 96:15, $96.24,96.25,96.26$ |
| 108:27, 110:7, 135:1, | $62: 19$ | $150: 21,163: 2,166: 5$ $\text { issued }[5]-43: 17$ | $101: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 24,96: 25,96: 26, \\ & 96: 28 \end{aligned}$ |
| ```135:6 infrequently [1] -``` | interact [1] - 89:12 <br> interest [1] - 166:13 | $\begin{gathered} \text { issued [5] - 43:17, } \\ 48: 3,127: 21,140: 13, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JUSTICE [3] - 1:8, } \\ & \text { 1:12, 2:2 } \end{aligned}$ | large [1] - 9:15 |
| 26:9 | interesting [1] - | 140:15 | justified [1] - 129:17 | last [4]-14:18, |
| inhibited [1] - 121:13 initial [2] - 20:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 93:15 } \\ & \text { interference [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { issues [9] - 18:23, } \\ \text { 18:26, 66:27, 68:14, } \end{gathered}$ | K | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:28, } 80: 28,111: 28 \\ & \text { late }[5]-46: 4,78: 27, \\ & 127: 7,155: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 158:23 } \\ & \text { injustice [1] - 131:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $52: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 107: 13,110: 2,110: 7 \\ & 113: 26,129: 1 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 127:7, 155:22 } \\ & \text { latter [1] - 82:8 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { injustice [1] - 131:20 } \\ & \text { inner [1] - 9:12 } \end{aligned}$ | interim [1] - 30:19 interpretation [4] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:26, } 129: 1 \\ & \text { issuing [4] - 20:7, } \end{aligned}$ | KATHLEEN [1] - 2:7 | Laura [13]-11:29, |
| inquiry [2] - 51:16, | 32:16, 117:5, 117:10, | 20:10, 32:24, 46:21 | KATHY [1] - 2:19 | 12:20, 22:12, 22:16, |
| 78:15 | 117:27 | itself [1] - 63:21 | KAVANAGH [1] - 2:4 | 57:26, 57:28, 76:16, |
| INQUIRY [2] - 1:3, | interpreted [1] - |  | KAY [3] - 4:3, 5:7, | 78:14, 99:5, 121:13, |
| 1:9 | 125:24 | J | 162:28 | 123:16, 149:5, 149:11 |
| insofar [4]-39:1, | interrupting [1] - |  | Kay [7] - 5:5, 23:18, | LAVERY [1] - 3:17 |
| 55:27, 77:12, 77:23 | 137:2 |  | 27:11, 31:6, 60:16, | LAWLOR [1] - 3:11 |
| inspector [2]-14:11, | intervene [2] - 96:7, | January [9] - 49:5, | $60: 18,139: 26$ | lead [1] - 166:23 |
| 25:21 | 126:24 | 60:26, 75:22, 128:8, | KEALY [1] - 3:25 | LEADER [1] - 2:7 |
| inspired [1] - 128:17 | intervened [1] - | 135:15, 136:13, | Keara [8]-14:10, | leader [14]-22:1, |

22:14, 22:19, 27:13,
27:23, 56:10, 64:26, 65:19, 75:19, 77:5, 79:9, 93:9, 153:3, 155:26
leaders [1] - 156:20
leaping [1] - 108:6
leapt [1]-112:9
least [2] - 47:25,
144:3
leave [9]-43:13, 65:14, 78:29, 91:19, 92:13, 124:27, 142:17, 157:26,
167:14
leaves [1] - 14:23
leaving [2] - 50:18, 108:9
led [6] - 49:14, 113:29, 145:26,
145:28, 146:4
left [10] - 22:6, 22:8,
50:12, 57:4, 75:25,
100:1, 100:5, 100:22,
114:2, 159:25
legal $[7]-48: 25$,
63:27, 66:14, 75:9,
75:11, 75:15
legislation [1] 154:4
LEGORBURU [1] 2:23
LEHANE [1]-3:11
less [1] - 124:12
letter [158]-8:4, 13:28, 14:3, 14:10, 15:18, 15:26, 17:7, 18:1, 20:5, 20:8, 20:9, 20:27, 21:1, 21:5, 21:8, 21:16, 21:21, 24:7, 25:10, 25:13, 26:13, 26:21, 27:3, 27:4, 27:6, 28:11, 30:2, 30:14, 31:22, 32:18, 32:24, 32:26, 32:28, 42:26, 42:28, 43:2, 43:17, 44:24, 46:21, 48:2, 48:5, 48:7, 48:9, 49:2, 49:4, 49:12, 49:28, 52:3, 52:26, 53:17, 53:18, 53:20, 53:24, 56:11, 58:5, 58:12, 58:16, 61:17, 62:20, 62:21, 62:24, 62:27, 63:2, 63:7, 63:25, 65:28, 66:16, 66:21, 67:8, 67:13, 67:14, 67:27, 68:9, 68:12, 68:23, 68:24, 68:27, 69:3,

69:18, 70:12, 70:20,
70:22, 71:3, 71:14, 71:20, 71:24, 71:29, 73:8, 74:23, 74:24, 74:25, 74:27, 75:1, 75:6, 75:16, 89:26,
90:11, 90:27, 92:27, 94:8, 94:9, 105:20, 105:27, 107:24, 108:23, 108:24, 110:5, 111:12, 111:19, 111:25, 111:29, 112:29, 116:7, 123:10, 124:1, 124:10, 127:8, 127:11, 127:13, 128:7, 128:11, 128:18, 128:25, 129:3, 129:5, 129:12, 129:20, 130:12, 130:18, 132:8, 132:27, 135:14, 135:18, 136:15, 136:19, 136:22, 136:23, 136:24, 138:11, 139:6, 140:13, 141:14, 141:15, 142:9, 142:22, 146:4, 149:16, 152:13, 155:3, 155:13, 155:16, 156:22, 156:25, 160:1, 160:7, 167:13
letter" [1] - 105:26
letters [8]-57:15,
66:14, 114:7, 114:10,
128:29, 129:2, 142:16
level [4]-60:23,
99:2, 119:3, 141:9
liaison [19]-25:6, 26:7, 26:17, 26:20, 27:7, 27:17, 27:21, 27:25, 28:15, 28:19, 40:20, 42:8, 43:4, 157:22, 159:8, 160:12, 160:18, 160:20
life [1] - 131:13
light [3]-71:17,
99:1, 167:7
likely [4]-82:21, 103:28, 109:13, 134:28
Linda [2] - 12:1,
150:11
line [21] - 16:3, 17:29, 18:10, 19:24, 19:27, 21:16, 48:24, 60:24, 60:26, 60:27,

60:28, 61:28, 61:29, 67:23, 76:14, 81:13, 100:5, 123:13, 149:7, 149:10
lines [1] - 41:16
Lisa [2]-67:27,
69:17
list [10] - 6:20, 29:8, 29:14, 31:17, 42:17, 42:18, 42:29, 64:22, 64:24, 64:27
lists [1] - 6:4
litany [1] - 161:15
literally [1] - 127:26
LITTLE [1] - 2:21
live [3]-131:13,
151:20, 152:25
living [1] - 131:19
loaned [1] - 3:29
location [1]-63:4
logic [1] - 92:23
longest [1]-6:25
LONGFORD [1] 3:24
look [35] - 15:28,
18:7, 19:10, 23:14, 24:3, 29:5, 29:13, 31:4, 33:8, 35:2, 36:23, 37:3, 37:24, 43:18, 49:14, 54:4, 62:27, 65:2, 68:1, 69:23, 87:27, 97:16, 111:18, 112:5, 113:11, 119:28, 122:7, 123:7, 123:9, 123:17, 123:18, 140:21, 145:23, 163:3, 164:2
looked [13]-6:11, 15:1, 17:4, 23:28, 59:10, 60:18, 80:18, 102:7, 102:9, 112:13, 139:26, 145:17, 163:4 looking [11] - 18:4, 19:11, 29:2, 37:3, 47:23, 49:11, 107:1, 112:15, 112:24, 160:3, 160:10 losing [1] - 167:6 lost [3]-62:17, 62:18, 140:23
Louise [7]-22:5, 76:14, 81:1, 81:7, 81:9, 81:12, 148:14 low [1]-7:13
LOWER [1] - 2:11
Lowry [62] - 8:1,
13:3, 13:8, 15:15,
17:17, 18:10, 19:24, 19:27, 20:1, 21:7,

23:8, 23:15, 24:26, 29:2, 32:19, 44:27, 52:25, 54:4, 59:21, 60:24, 60:27, 61:25, 62:12, 62:16, 63:9, 63:15, 65:23, 69:25, 73:8, 74:2, 74:20, 75:12, 80:29, 83:5, 83:24, 98:14, 99:17, 100:24, 101:14, 101:16, 106:15, 111:18, 112:28, 114:27, 115:26, 118:8, 118:23, 119:26, 125:18, 129:4, 137:12, 138:8, 138:26, 139:2, 139:15, 140:17, 141:28, 148:12, 148:25, 153:10, 157:12, 158:9
Lowry's [5] - 8:20, 53:14, 65:1, 82:26, 101:27
LUNCH [2] - 72:18, 73:1

| $\mathbf{M}$ |
| :---: |

MADE ${ }_{[2]}-1: 3,1: 8$
made" [1]-104:12
made.. [1] - 154:24
main [1] - 136:14
maintain [1] - 115:22
maintaining [1] -
134:19
MAIRE [1] - 3:13
major [2]-99:6,
121:4
majority [1] - 145:1
Malone [3]-1:25,
3:28, 3:30
MALONE [1] - 1:30
man [5]-86:12,
94:23, 98:2, 131:5, 140:26
manage [2] - 46:5, 46:8
management [7] -
19:6, 29:29, 32:21,
61:29, 103:12,
103:22, 103:27
Manager [1] - 102:20
manager [15] -
17:29, 19:25, 19:26, 19:27, 20:2, 20:3, 21:16, 48:24, 60:24, 60:26, 60:27, 60:28, 76:15, 81:13, 100:5
managing [1]-28:26
manner [4]-3:29,
92:22, 150:2, 154:29 manuscript [3] -
89:27, 90:12, 90:26
March [4] - 60:12,
102:14, 102:29, 103:1
MARK [2] - 3:3, 3:16
mark [2] -96:22,
98:4
marked [4]-7:4, 7:7, 7:10, 70:2
MARRINAN [1] - 2:6
MARTIN [1] - 3:9
Mary [4]-61:9,
61:11, 134:4, 135:5
masking [1] - 64:3
material [5] - 14:23,
73:23, 105:22, 114:6, 120:10
matter [38]-23:19, 23:20, 23:26, 24:5, 24:15, 25:5, 40:13, 40:16, 41:2, 41:3, 41:8, 48:14, 70:7, 75:8, 78:13, 79:29, 81:3, 81:24, 89:11, 94:3, 94:16, 94:20, 101:24, 112:27, 114:24, 116:1, 116:2, 117:8, 117:22, 118:4, 139:3, 140:7, 140:18, 140:24, 141:8, 155:7, 157:21, 166:24
matters [8]-28:21, 42:3, 42:4, 42:16, 46:20, 53:28, 73:7, 86:11
MATTERS [1] - 1:5
Maurice [21]-5:11, 5:24, 6:3, 6:14, 8:10, $8: 14,18: 20,29: 26$,
30:2, 31:11, 43:27, 49:17, 64:13, 80:19, 80:20, 81:21, 101:20, 105:28, 106:20, 135:23, 136:1
McAulay [5] - 75:28, 156:6, 156:25, 156:28, 157:2
McCabe [110]-2:14, 5:11, 5:24, 6:3, 6:14, 8:10, 8:14, 10:22, 12:9, 14:29, 16:24, 17:23, 18:14, 18:21, 19:3, 19:7, 20:14, 22:2, 22:11, 29:27, 30:3, 31:11, 39:21, 39:23, 39:26, 39:27, 41:10, 41:11, 43:27,

45:7, 45:17, 45:18, 48:11, 49:5, 49:17, 52:1, 52:5, 52:11, 59:26, 60:15, 60:17, 61:17, 64:13, 66:28, 67:19, 68:17, 70:10, 77:12, 78:13, 80:9, 80:19, 80:20, 81:22, 82:1, 82:11, 83:18, 83:29, 84:5, 84:10, 84:14, 85:7, 86:20,
87:12, 87:18, 87:20, 88:20, 88:26, 89:12, 94:23, 94:28, 95:5, 95:18, 97:22, 98:26, 101:20, 105:28, 106:20, 106:23, 107:4, 107:17, 108:7, 108:21, 109:25, 110:7, 117:12, 117:20, 121:22, 122:14, 122:22, 122:28, 126:12, 128:8, 129:15, 129:26, 130:20, 130:27, 131:9, 131:19, 132:26, 134:23, 135:1, 135:23, 136:1, 139:25, 140:5, 141:25, 159:26, 163:8, 166:24
McCabe" [1] - 135:7
McCabe's [9]-6:27,
7:15, 18:24, 68:16,
74:13, 98:1, 137:1, 164:21
McCabe/Ms [1] 160:17
McCabes [1] - 9:27
McCabes' [1] - 57:29
McDermott [2] -
2:26, 144:5
McDowell [71] - 2:14, 78:11, 88:15, 92:10, 92:11, 92:17, 95:12, 96:23, 96:29, 97:1, 97:19, 101:1, 101:3, 101:6, 101:14, 108:6, 113:2, 113:11, 113:22, 113:23, 115:10, 119:25, 120:5, 120:7, 120:12, 120:15, 120:18, 120:24, 120:26, 123:13, 123:14, 124:6, 125:2, 127:19, 127:27, 127:29, 132:24, 133:16, 133:19, 133:27,

133:29, 134:1, 134:4, 136:9, 136:10, 136:13, 136:18, 136:21, 136:24, 136:26, 136:29, 137:3, 141:12, 141:16, 141:19, 142:15, 142:20, 143:10, 143:11, 143:12, 143:19 143:23, 143:25, 144:19, 161:10 162:2, 162:9, 166:28, 167:2, 167:4
MCDOWELL [2] 4:5, 78:9
McDowell's [1] 120:23

## McGARRY [1] - 2:14

McGlone [14] -
14:10, 25:10, 27:29, 75:19, 79:13, 88:19,
89:1, 90:20, 90:25,
92:24, 93:8, 94:6,
155:25, 165:3
McGlone's [2] -
56:11, 89:21
MCGUINNESS [3] -
2:6, 4:4, 4:7
McGuinness [22]-
2:19, 3:11, 5:4, 5:8, 5:10, 72:14, 72:15,
73:4, 73:6, 78:4, 78:7, 81:26, 144:19,
155:12, 157:11,
157:15, 157:19,
162:29, 163:1,
166:17, 166:18,
166:22
McGuinness's [1] -
158:6
MCLOUGHLIN [2] -
4:3, 78:9
McLoughlin [45] 5:5, 5:7, 5:10, 27:11, 27:19, 34:3, 73:3, 73:6, 78:4, 78:11, 84:26, 114:5, 119:2, 129:16, 141:5, 144:2, 144:9, 144:14, 144:16, 144:20, 145:7, 147:5, 147:16, 151:1, 151:12, 151:17, 152:2, 152:28, 154:18, 155:2, 155:9, 155:20, 158:22, 160:11, 160:21, 160:24, 160:25, 161:9, 162:8, 162:28, 163:1,

165:28, 166:1, 166:2, 166:20
McLoughlin's [1] 136:21
mean [29]-18:28,
22:9, 22:29, 31:14,
31:21, 32:3, 34:28,
40:29, 42:15, 42:25,
45:6, 45:11, 86:5, 95:9, 101:1, 105:26,
117:24, 119:25, 123:2, 130:26, 138:22, 139:20, 160:28, 161:23, 161:27, 166:13, 166:15, 167:8, 167:9 means [3]-27:13,
79:25, 120:3
meant [8]-48:2,
116:25, 116:28,
117:6, 120:25,
125:28, 158:9
Measuring [4] - 6:5, 6:20, 7:11, 7:21
Meath [2]-134:12, 134:13
MEDIA [1] - 3:20
media [19]-17:24,
17:25, 18:13, 18:22, 45:8, 45:20, 45:22, 61:15, 84:5, 84:10, 86:13, 94:23, 95:25, 96:9, 98:2, 107:3, 166:15, 167:8, 167:10 medium [3]-6:22, 6:24, 7:13
meet [12]-29:11, 33:3, 33:6, 36:29, 38:4, 38:5, 38:21, 104:19, 105:15, 108:28, 119:10, 122:5 meeting [51] - 25:6, 27:25, 27:28, 28:2, 28:14, 28:15, 28:29, 31:10, 32:3, 33:13, 40:17, 40:20, 43:4, 43:6, 43:12, 49:6, 60:11, 77:6, 77:8, 78:19, 78:21, 78:22, 78:25, 79:1, 79:6, 79:9, 79:16, 79:20, 79:22, 80:2, 80:3, 80:23, 90:12, 91:27, 91:29, 103:22, 106:4, 108:4, 134:9, 139:14, 156:21, 156:28, 157:4, 157:7, 157:22, 158:8, 159:8, 159:16, 159:23, 160:18, 160:20
meetings [9]-26:20, 27:17, 28:16, 28:17, 40:12, 42:8, 42:16, 156:19, 160:12
MEMBER [2] - 1:12, 2:2
members [2] - 19:6, 25:23
memories [1] -
115:23
memory [15] - 14:13,
16:19, 16:22, 23:20, 24:15, 25:13, 25:15, 25:17, 27:2, 27:4, 41:18, 44:25, 116:2, 120:27, 159:11 mention [7]-25:7, 38:8, 99:26, 100:18, 126:17, 126:20, 166:4 mentioned [6] 38:13, 41:8, 60:14, 127:4, 143:1, 148:16
mentions [1]-57:10
mess [1]-126:23
message [2] - 15:13, 30:22
met [15]-8:7, 26:8, $35: 15,35: 19,35: 23$, 35:26, 39:27, 61:3, 77:14, 77:15, 106:23, 107:18, 108:8, 110:28
MICHAEL [6] - 2:14,
2:22, 3:5, 3:6, 3:9, 3:25
Michael [5] - 65:17, 65:19, 66:12, 69:12, 78:11
middle [1] - 164:12 might [17]-10:17, 19:11, 24:12, 38:26, 44:7, 63:27, 91:24, 103:7, 115:12, 115:17, 134:18, 155:3, 158:20, 166:19, 166:23, 166:24, 167:5 mill [1] - 105:10 mind [6]-24:21, 63:4, 98:4, 120:22, 122:3, 162:5 mindset [1]-88:2 mine [1]-103:9
MINISTER [1] - 1:8
minor [1] - 112:27 minute [1] - 72:10
minutes [5] - 13:5, 134:1, 144:3, 144:4, 144:11
misapprehension [1] - 111:26
misfeasance [1] -
66:23
misinformation [1] -
164:14
misread [3] - 145:8,
145:15, 145:20
misreading [1] -
146:10
missed [1] - 16:23
mistake [7]-99:6,
140:1, 140:2, 143:19, 148:19, 152:10, 152:21
mistakes [3]-127:1,
161:15, 162:14
modern [1] - 154:4
module [1] - 52:8
moment [2]-78:14,
157:27
Monaghan [3]-26:3,
26:11, 64:27
Monday [4]-78:19, 79:4, 79:28 month [1]-28:10
months [5]-61:21,
130:16, 139:29,
140:20, 141:1
monumental [1] -
98:25
MORAN [1] - 3:14
morning [4] - 5:4,
26:21, 26:27, 167:16
most [3] - 103:28,
142:16, 144:7
mother [1] - 30:22
move [5] - 45:5,
45:10, 45:12, 98:13, 129:25
moved [3]-105:27,
107:29, 108:3
moves [1] - 70:20
moving [1] - 108:27
MPT [1] - 106:20
MR [107]-1:12, 2:2,
2:4, 2:6, 2:6, 2:9,
2:10, 2:14, 2:14, 2:15,
2:18, 2:18, 2:19, 2:22, 2:23, 2:23, 2:24, 2:26,
2:29, 2:32, 3:1, 3:3,
3:5, 3:5, 3:9, 3:11, $3: 11,3: 13,3: 16,3: 20$, 3:21, 3:25, 4:4, 4:5, 4:6, 4:7, 5:4, 5:8, 5:10, 72:15, 73:4, 73:6, 78:4, 78:7, 78:9, 78:11, 88:15, 92:11, 92:17, 95:12, 97:1, 101:3, 101:6, 101:14, 108:6, 113:23,
115:10, 120:7,

120:12, 120:15
120:18, 120:26,
123:14, 125:2,
127:27, 127:29,
132:24, 133:19,
133:27, 134:1, 134:4,
136:10, 136:13,
136:18, 136:21,
136:24, 136:26,
136:29, 137:3,
141:16, 141:19,
142:20, 143:10,
143:12, 143:19,
143:23, 143:25,
143:29, 144:8,
144:14, 144:16,
152:15, 152:17,
154:17, 157:10,
158:22, 161:26,
162:1, 162:7, 162:26,
162:29, 163:1,
166:18, 166:22,
166:28, 167:2
MS [18]-2:7, 2:7,
2:9, 2:19, 3:1, 3:9,
3:13, 3:14, 3:21, 3:22,
4:3, 5:7, 73:3, 78:9,
144:14, 162:28,
166:2, 166:20
MTP [5] - 6:5, 8:13,
20:7, 31:17, 101:20
MULLAN [1] - 2:7
murdering [1] -
113:9
Murphy [3]-84:23,
163:22, 163:24
Murphy's [1] - 165:5
must [18]-3:29,
15:14, 17:8, 22:9, 22:12, 24:10, 31:21, 39:13, 49:9, 50:11, 52:3, 52:4, 85:24, 112:13, 119:3, 131:4, 151:6, 151:17
mystery [1] - 98:29
MÍCHEÁL [1] - 2:18

## N

n't [1] - 95:24
name [7]-7:15,
18:25, 29:19, 38:13,
68:6, 78:12, 165:5
named [1] - 1:27
namely [1] - 101:16
nature [6]-19:20,
63:5, 70:2, 95:17,
97:17, 115:20
near [1] - 38:6
nearly [3] - 72:14,

72:15, 139:29 necessarily [4] -
57:17, 95:22, 135:9,
135:12
necessary [2] -
86:28, 122:21
necessity [2] -
34:14, 122:3
need [28]-23:22,
24:16, 24:29, 36:8,
42:21, 60:8, 60:19,
63:1, 63:18, 87:2,
89:3, 89:24, 91:3,
92:7, 96:1, 108:17,
109:9, 116:4, 116:21,
121:4, 121:9, 125:18,
125:22, 138:29,
139:12, 139:26,
141:7, 166:4
needed [6]-28:27,
33:6, 38:20, 96:3,
119:8, 119:10
needs [1]-143:27
neighbour [1] -
77:27
never [19]-37:2,
42:25, 42:28, 43:2,
48:2, 49:13, 55:22,
58:20, 70:25, 71:1,
71:3, 87:12, 87:19,
100:11, 106:23,
121:17, 122:28,
127:4, 131:6
New [1] - 52:4
new [4]-27:23,
28:12, 56:25, 128:15
NEWS [1] - $3: 19$
newspaper [1] -
167:7
newspapers [1] -
166:13
NEWSPAPERS [1] -
3:25
next [24]-9:12, 10:7,
10:9, 10:20, 10:28,
11:13, 11:29, 13:11,
14:2, 28:10, 43:29,
55:10, 56:20, 57:24,
58:5, 58:12, 58:18,
98:17, 98:18, 105:24, 105:26, 107:16,
120:26, 123:18
NIALL [1] - 2:9
nine [3]-48:25,
167:5, 167:15
nobody [8] - 58:29,
74:1, 74:5, 98:22,
99:2, 99:19, 100:18, 131:25
non [2]-67:25,

141:20
non-contact [1] 67:25
non-response [1] -
141:20
noncontact [1] -
97:13
nonetheless [1] -
93:5
norm [1] - 92:12
normal [5] - 79:4,
91:17, 91:20, 92:5,
105:6
note [13]-12:7,
21:23, 22:16, 29:18,
38:10, 39:11, 50:29, 51:1, 51:10, 57:26,
103:22, 130:8, 140:17
noted [5] - 48:22,
58:24, 80:17, 126:7,
140:5
notes [4]-1:27,
93:18, 159:4, 159:6
nothing [13] - 37:19,
41:13, 52:23, 52:24,
59:15, 66:28, 91:7,
120:17, 130:16,
139:2, 141:2, 154:13,
158:11
notice [1] - 42:5
notification [43] -
11:1, 11:15, 11:25,
22:11, 24:22, 24:23,
40:27, 42:6, 42:11,
42:14, 51:11, 51:17,
51:18, 55:28, 56:18,
56:22, 56:23, 56:25,
57:7, 57:11, 58:19, 90:13, 90:17, 92:1, 92:25, 94:11, 100:3, 100:10, 114:21, 145:12, 148:5, 148:6, 150:16, 150:18, 150:25, 153:4,
153:11, 153:17, 153:27, 154:8, 155:5, 164:8, 164:13
notifications [7] -
15:1, 42:7, 50:16, 53:13, 56:7, 112:23, 114:14
notified [12] - 40:23,
55:23, 58:15, 59:3,
79:14, 89:4, 89:8,
89:21, 89:24, 93:1, 93:4, 140:28
notify [15] - 56:6, 89:3, 89:17, 89:20, 90:6, 90:18, 90:21, 91:3, 91:7, 91:11,

91:26, 93:6, 93:17, 154:11, 154:21 notifying [5] - 42:29, 89:7, 91:10, 91:25, 154:28
notwithstanding [1]

- 91:6

November [4] -
26:29, 43:25, 44:8,
44:17
number [28]-7:20,
7:21, 7:24, 9:15, 15:4,
19:11, 28:6, 30:23,
33:8, 34:25, 35:10,
37:13, 43:28, 54:7,
79:22, 88:4, 96:25,
96:27, 102:18,
105:19, 144:1,
144:17, 145:26,
146:13, 146:18,
146:25, 152:14,
163:18
number' [1] - 79:25
-
o'clock [1] - 167:6
O'DONNELL [1] -
2:23
O'HIGGINS [2] -
2:18, 3:5
O'Loghlen [2] -
67:28, 69:17
O'Neill [7]-47:16,
49:21, 111:9, 123:10,
134:26, 135:20, 137:3
O'Neill's [4] - 53:2,
53:5, 53:29, 137:15
O'Reilly [2] - 134:10,
134:17
O'REILLY [1]-3:13
object [1] - 55:19
obligation [4]-96:4,
97:12, 97:18, 128:10
obligations [1] -
38:17
obliged [6] - 27:29,
66:25, 67:25, 87:27,
97:16, 105:14
obtain [2]-137:4
obvious [1] - 17:27
obviously [39] - 7:8,
7:9, 17:22, 19:24,
21:12, 23:25, 25:7, 25:10, 28:6, 31:21,
33:19, 38:9, 39:11,
40:5, 45:6, 46:14,
$46: 25,48: 18,50: 10$,
50:18, 51:26, 53:28,

57:14, 58:24, 61:14,
65:11, 66:4, 69:21,
69:24, 71:5, 73:7,
73:11, 73:19, 73:29, 76:19, 76:27, 123:2, 164:18, 166:7

## occasions [2] -

134:11, 146:13
occupy [1]-20:1
occur [1] - 66:3
occurred [12] -
19:16, 51:1, 52:20,
66:2, 72:7, 74:15,
79:12, 93:10, 108:15,
109:27, 142:7, 143:21
occurrence [1] -
113:17
occurring [2] -
45:19, 66:5
occurs [1] - 15:2
October [9]-5:18,
25:6, 28:7, 40:16,
76:3, 102:17, 156:17,
157:10, 157:24
odd [1] - 100:8
OF ${ }_{[6]}-1: 3,1: 9$,
1:12, 2:3, 78:7,
143:25
offence [10] -95:5,
95:7, 95:11, 111:15,
111:21, 112:3,
130:15, 140:26,
143:8, 143:13
offences [1] - 96:15
offer [1] - 39:29
offered [3] - 46:23,
87:15, 133:18
offering [1] - 123:11
OFFICE [1] - 2:20
office [13]-82:4,
82:22, 84:20, 84:28,
85:10, 85:27, 87:11, 95:15, 95:24, 97:20,
98:24, 99:20, 99:26
officer [3] - 27:8,
27:22, 127:21
officers [1] - 26:8
often [2] - 113:5,
141:3
OK [4] - 5:26, 34:23,
36:1, 45:14
old [2]-16:6, 109:26
older [1]-6:11
Ombudsman [2] -
128:3, 128:5
ON [4] - 1:6, 1:10,
1:18, 5:1
once [1]-91:3
one [57]-6:27, 6:29,
8:9, 8:13, 9:27, 10:17,

17:15, 19:10, 19:12,
22:10, 26:7, 32:16,
34:25, 45:11, 46:23,
48:15, 51:4, 52:7,
56:7, 56:26, 64:2,
66:10, 69:2, 73:6,
73:12, 73:15, 73:17,
78:12, 88:1, 95:4,
96:16, 101:20,
102:14, 105:12,
106:12, 106:20,
106:25, 113:3,
114:26, 117:8,
119:28, 124:7,
125:17, 130:11,
130:12, 134:10,
142:18, 143:1,
145:18, 148:8,
148:16, 156:29,
161:15, 163:1, 163:3,
166:3
ones [2]-6:22,
147:9
ongoing [2] - 41:24,
61:16
open [10]-26:9,
42:19, 43:1, 44:1,
48:22, 64:16, 86:29,
88:16, 147:5, 164:25
opened [15] - 15:14
40:26, 48:5, 53:11,
81:24, 85:18, 86:27,
87:20, 88:22, 88:28,
95:21, 111:24,
111:29, 164:19,
165:20
opening [7]-16:18,
93:25, 93:28, 93:29,
112:6, 161:11, 164:24
opens [1] - 128:8
operate [1] - 104:5
opinion [1] - 114:4
opportunity [10] -
39:29, 48:12, 107:19, 108:9, 109:6, 121:18,
122:29, 128:25,
131:10, 133:2
opposed [3]-23:2,
72:13, 154:2
order [7]-9:17, 9:18,
86:3, 133:6, 133:8,
142:18, 166:8
ordinary [2] - 20:15,
80:4
organisation [3] -
132:15, 166:15, 167:8
organise [1] - 40:12
organising [1] -
27:25
orifice [1] - 120:1
original [18]-10:20, 130:2, 133:27,
11:14, 11:16, 47:26, 135:20, 136:18,
55:3, 56:23, 57:7,
67:15, 71:10, 116:17,
122:18, 123:7, 123:8,
123:9, 125:3, 145:14,
147:18, 148:6
originally [3] - 13:17,
34:6, 48:26
Orla [2]-111:10, 134:26
OSMOND [1] - 2:20
OTHER [1] - 1:4
otherwise [2] -
115:7, 129:27
ought [6] - 44:26,
47:25, 48:24, 50:26,
63:24, 67:13
ourselves [2] -
25:27, 31:18
outcome [2]-109:8,
134:11
outline [4]-39:28,
48:13, 108:8, 129:14
outlined [9] - 23:23,
24:17, 38:3, 38:22,
39:20, 52:18, 107:9,
116:5, 116:22
outlining [5] - 32:25,
65:23, 67:20, 68:24,
107:18
outstanding [3] -
39:22, 39:25, 107:17
overall [1] - 75:17
overnight [1] -
166:27
overruling [1] -
125:21
own [11]-21:21,
46:26, 52:19, 64:25,
67:3, 67:4, 68:6,
111:19, 130:17,
138:19, 138:20

P
page [62] -9:8, 9:12,
10:7, 10:28, 10:29,
11:8, 11:14, 11:23,
12:7, 12:12, 12:17,
13:3, 13:23, 13:27,
14:2, 14:10, 14:14,
15:28, 29:14, 31:4, 37:23, 43:19, 53:1, 60:16, 62:25, 63:17, 63:29, 65:2, 65:3, 69:24, 98:13, 102:10, 103:10, 106:13, 127:11, 129:28,

137:12, 137:18, 138:12, 138:25, 139:13, 139:20, 139:21, 139:23, 146:17, 146:21, 147:15, 148:5, 148:17, 152:14, 152:28, 152:29, 154:18, 159:2, 160:25, 163:3, 163:14
PAGE [1]-4:2 pages [8]-10:15, 14:21, 14:23, 15:2, 15:4, 34:4, 129:28, 149:16
Pamela [6] - 12:18,
113:26, 148:22,
149:4, 150:11, 151:28
Pamela's [1] - 50:5 paperwork [2] 57:20, 57:21
paragraph [5] - 16:2, 70:1, 70:5, 102:14, 134:7
pardon [3]-39:24,
65:18, 136:17
parents [2] - 134:25,
135:26
PARLIAMENT [1] 3:7
part [22]-6:3, 10:1,
10:26, 16:23, 18:18,
19:14, 22:20, 49:9,
50:24, 51:15, 52:8,
59:1, 76:8, 102:1,
104:19, 122:25,
122:29, 124:5, 133:9,
144:21, 144:28, 145:8
partial [1]-146:9
participants [1] -
106:13
particular [11] - 15:6,
26:12, 42:28, 43:6,
46:2, 74:1, 74:3, 76:9,
76:15, 77:28, 113:27
particularly [4] -
124:17, 124:20,
124:23, 149:4
parties [4]-43:23,
121:25, 166:11
partition [1]-14:22
partitioned [1] - 82:6
party [4]-3:30, 64:4,
101:7, 103:23
passage [1] - 146:29
PASSED [1]-1:5
passed [6] - 48:26,
63:27, 64:11, 65:4,

65:15, 65:19
passing [2]-61:21
past [2]-107:11,
108:6
paste [1]-113:6
pasted [1]-149:11
patch [1] - 19:13
PATRICIA [1] - 3:1
PATRICK [1] - 2:6
PAUL [3]-2:14,
2:26, 3:21
Pender [1] - 102:20
pending [1]-42:19
penetration [38] -
15:19, 16:5, 17:6,
19:18, 33:22, 49:13,
50:4, 50:13, 51:12,
52:12, 53:27, 54:16,
54:23, 55:14, 57:4,
57:12, 58:1, 58:22, 67:11, 71:12, 71:20,
73:13, 97:22, 104:29,
108:25, 109:2,
109:17, 110:8, 112:3,
120:1, 137:27, 148:3,
149:8, 151:2, 151:19,
151:27, 152:10,
152:20
people [24]-43:13,
72:12, 79:19, 79:22,
79:26, 79:27, 80:2,
80:5, 80:22, 88:7,
91:17, 92:12, 92:21,
99:5, 105:15, 114:1,
115:11, 115:15,
115:17, 133:18,
133:21, 161:27, 166:9
per [1]-46:8
percent [1] - 66:10
perfectly [2]-35:20, 36:19
performance [1] -
139:21
perhaps [31]-5:20,
13:24, 15:28, 19:10,
19:17, 23:14, 29:5,
29:13, 32:17, 34:14,
37:23, 37:29, 46:12,
46:19, 47:22, 48:24,
54:4, 54:10, 59:19,
62:27, 65:2, 69:23,
75:22, 76:25, 77:6,
79:26, 96:7, 97:10,
97:19, 124:28, 165:25
period [12]-7:1,
14:19, 28:15, 32:17,
39:3, 48:25, 76:11,
77:1, 77:21, 86:11,
155:22, 156:20
permission [1] - 3:30
perpetrator [3] -
44:1, 64:15, 88:10
perpetuated [1] -
52:22
person [11]-83:12,
84:15, 88:4, 88:5,
93:25, 95:23, 95:25,
107:12, 110:24,
124:11, 132:9
personally [3] -
21:28, 74:6, 74:12
personnel [2] -
76:11, 113:29
perspective [1] -
76:19
persuades [1] -
141:18
pertinent [1] -
123:13
PETER [3] - 1:12,
2:2, 2:4
petered [1]-46:2
phase [1]-20:6
phone [6]-15:14,
28:18, 30:23, 57:16,
124:21, 127:4
phoned [1] - 77:17
photocopied [1] -
3:29
photographers [1] -
166:8
pick [2]-8:9, 35:4
picked [4]-17:14,
32:4, 113:28, 157:19
picture [1]-75:17
piece [4]-90:18,
113:25, 148:18,
151:28
pieces [2]-88:13,
90:25
pilot [1] - 90:14
place [17]-16:11,
28:16, 33:5, 57:23,
63:7, 63:8, 91:10,
95:16, 98:26, 103:25,
104:15, 106:4,
108:13, 114:8,
130:19, 134:15, 143:9
PLACE [1] - 2:30
placed [2] - 30:9,
32:4
placing [1]-71:28
plan [5]-13:25,
47:1, 101:13, 121:24,
121:27
plans [1]-62:4
playing [2] - 104:29,
162:2
PLC [1] - 3:20
point [72]-6:16,

12:15, 13:7, 13:9,
14:24, 19:24, 20:1, 20:10, 20:11, 24:27, 25:2, 26:3, 27:5, 35:26, 36:4, 39:23, 39:25, 44:8, 45:6, 45:10, 45:19, 46:14, 47:1, 47:18, 48:7, 48:15, 48:23, 49:15, 49:19, 51:26, 52:19, 53:25, 55:10, 56:20, 57:19, 57:24, 58:5, 58:12, 58:18, 65:24, 74:6, 75:20, 76:4,
77:17, 79:15, 80:13, 80:22, 81:6, 81:19,
83:5, 90:19, 91:22, 95:12, 95:29, 96:1, 97:6, 98:21, 101:13,
101:28, 101:29,
104:24, 108:7,
110:23, 112:8, 121:8,
142:12, 142:14,
151:22, 157:17, 162:4
pointed [1] - 119:27
points [3]-54:7,
54:20, 59:7
poles [1] - 120:11
policy [1]-128:28
pornography [1] -
97:14
posed [1] - 40:3
poses [1] - 136:1
position [14]-19:23,
20:1, 28:7, 28:12,
41:10, 52:19, 67:1,
68:17, 134:19,
141:13, 153:22,
153:25, 153:26, 164:3
possession [2]-
16:17, 59:8
possibilities [1] -
82:3
possibility [2]-82:9, 100:23
possible [27] - 11:22,
12:11, 18:28, 21:17,
31:27, 32:1, 35:21,
38:16, 41:27, 43:14,
56:8, 62:23, 65:14,
72:10, 77:15, 77:16,
82:12, 82:13, 82:14,
82:23, 86:1, 100:21,
104:1, 112:16,
115:14, 128:25,
139:10
possible' [1] - 82:18
possibly [22] - 16:20,
17:2, 22:5, 22:11, 27:6, 35:19, 40:17,

46:22, 57:22, 61:3,
76:5, 79:26, 85:1,
104:15, 106:27,
110:3, 112:12,
115:13, 116:27,
118:25, 130:6, 141:29
Post [1]-91:28
post $[7]-59: 15$,
156:4, 156:9, 156:12,
156:26, 164:11,
164:18
post-dates [1] -
59:15
Post-It [1] - 91:28
posting [1]-128:27
practice [5] - 42:3,
78:28, 104:18, 154:5,
154:21
practitioner [1] -
47:24
precede [1] - 107:24
preceded [1]-163:9
precise [1]-46:13
precondition [1] -
122:21
precursor [1] -
128:15
predated [2]-41:12,
159:27
premise [1] - 100:17
preparation [1] -
51:15
prepare [3]-42:20
prepared [9]-6:4,
79:3, 105:27, 124:25,
127:16, 128:26,
138:17, 138:18,
145:13
prescribed [1] -
46:16
presence [2] - 85:1,
85:26
present [2]-78:21,
80:5
press [2]-45:17,
166:7
Pressure [4]-6:6,
6:20, 7:11, 7:21
presumably [1] -
73:22
presumption [2] -
153:16, 153:26 prevent [1] - 135:27
previous [11]-8:18,
45:8, 57:10, 74:4,
99:20, 102:2, 102:4,
107:21, 126:18,
126:29, 130:22
previously [10] -
22:4, 29:2, 42:1, 45:7,

67:18, 83:9, 110:12,
127:26, 131:8, 131:29
primarily [2] - 6:21, 46:7
primary [1] - 46:5
principal [2] -
102:19, 134:13
priority [8]-6:10,
6:17, 6:23, 6:24, 7:3,
7:5, 7:7, 7:10
privacy [1] - 166:5 probability [1] -
79:28
probable [3]-82:9,
82:13, 82:15
probable' [1] - 82:17
problem [2] - 105:12,
158:10
procedure [6] -
20:26, 22:20, 22:24,
38:12, 42:15, 132:14
procedures [1] -
130:17
proceed [5] - 21:3,
37:20, 45:4, 48:8,
59:20
proceeded [3] - 35:8,
90:14, 126:25
proceeding [3] -
104:27, 104:28, 112:2
proceedings [1] -
127:23
process [7]-38:3,
62:16, 89:6, 90:13,
92:1, 94:11, 133:9
processes [1] -
48:13
proficiency [1] -
139:23
profile [2]-84:15,
101:28
progress [1] - 46:3
prohibited [1] -
121:13
prominent [5] -
86:12, 94:23, 95:25,
98:1, 98:7
properly [2] - 94:25,
94:26
proposed [6] - 30:2,
111:19, 129:5,
136:15, 137:22,
137:25
proposing [1] -
110:2
proposition [2] -
83:27, 111:20
prosecute [1] - 41:4
prosecution [7] -
16:11, 41:2, 41:22,

109:14, 109:22,
131:17, 154:27
prosecutions [1] -
16:10
protected [2] -
133:21, 166:6
PROTECTED [2] -
1:3, 1:4
protecting [1]-97:3
protection [3] -
29:25, 81:16, 97:3 protective [3] -
108:19, 109:11,
121:27
protesting [1] -
135:16
protocol [1]-58:14
provide [2] - 68:22,
124:24
provided [7]-9:18,
30:23, 49:25, 52:28,
73:29, 128:6, 164:13
providing [1] - 133:2
Public [1] - 16:10
public [4]-18:25,
66:21, 66:27, 98:7
publicity [1] - 19:13
pulling [1] - 85:28
punching [1] - 113:8
puppet [1]-162:18
purely [1]-133:8
purpose [6]-24:6,
32:5, 48:11, 62:17,
129:3, 133:11
purposeless [1] -
91:18
pursuing [2]-48:28,
123:13
put [25]-18:19,
21:19, 28:20, 31:20,
31:24, 34:2, 35:12,
42:4, 42:15, 44:20,
44:21, 54:24, 63:25, 67:13, 84:7, 93:19, 98:4, 112:22, 114:26, 132:5, 140:4, 158:5,
161:19, 165:5, 167:11
putting [3]-15:26,
96:29, 124:14
$\mathbf{Q}$
qualified [1] - 158:24
QUAY [1]-2:16
query [3]-93:26,
164:16, 164:23
question-mark [2] -
96:22, 98:4
questions [3]-

114:26, 143:28,
160:25
quickly [4]-19:12,
19:19, 77:2, 141:10
QUINN [1] - 3:22
quite [6]-43:14,
65:14, 77:16, 100:21,
114:18, 155:21

## R

radio [1] - 59:21
raise [4]-18:22,
42:4, 61:25, 68:14
raised [7]-19:20,
25:5, 40:20, 43:12,
60:10, 157:21, 159:22
raising [2] - 40:16,
164:23
ran [1] - 132:6
rape [11]-95:5, 95:7,
111:15, 111:21,
112:3, 120:19,
126:25, 130:14,
136:4, 137:9, 140:26
rapist [1] - 95:26
rather [4]-63:3,
145:1, 145:11, 159:16
rationale [1] - 67:3
re [31]-27:16, 29:29,
58:1, 58:22, 79:29,
80:11, 80:16, 80:24,
80:28, 80:29, 81:4,
82:27, 83:8, 83:17,
83:19, 84:1, 84:16,
84:18, 85:4, 86:13,
86:26, 86:29, 94:24,
95:13, 103:13,
104:11, 126:11,
130:3, 130:10, 149:7,
165:8
RE [2]-4:7, 162:28
re-contact" [1] -
130:3
re-contacting ${ }_{[1]}$ -
130:10
RE-EXAMINED [2] -
4:7, 162:28
re-open [1]-86:29
re-referral [14] -
80:16, 80:24, 80:28, 80:29, 81:4, 83:17, 83:19, 84:16, 84:18, 85:4, 86:13, 86:26,
94:24, 95:13
re-referred [6] -
79:29, 80:11, 82:27,
83:8, 84:1, 126:11
reached [3]-20:17,

134:29
reaches [1] - 154:26
reacted [1]-114:20
reaction [1]-61:16
read [55]-12:16,
12:25, 12:29, 13:9,
21:5, 21:8, 21:16
24:10, 32:11, 32:15,
34:3, 34:24, 36:5,
37:29, 43:26, 47:9,
47:25, 47:29, 49:12, 62:28, 63:18, 64:12,
70:17, 73:27, 77:4,
79:8, 95:10, 96:9,
101:10, 101:12,
111:29, 112:8,
113:24, 118:17,
123:9, 123:10, 129:4,
137:7, 137:10,
137:25, 142:20,
144:21, 144:27,
145:2, 145:5, 145:8,
146:27, 147:13,
150:29, 151:20,
151:21, 152:2,
152:18, 162:10
reading [12] - 34:10,
50:9, 94:9, 95:4, 95:10, 107:29, 112:6, 112:15, 112:29,
146:9, 161:17, 162:25
reads [3]-27:9,
70:5, 102:14
ready [1]-126:5
realise [2]-51:26,
91:17
realised [3]-49:9,
111:25, 137:8
really [3] - 90:15,
113:2, 159:28
reason [12]-17:3,
28:24, 37:9, 38:22,
45:27, 46:2, 67:9,
90:13, 100:15,
132:11, 140:14,
165:14
reasonable [1] -
36:19
reasoning [2] -
122:26, 129:25
recalling [1] - 112:29
receipt $[3]-14: 15$,
68:12, 68:24
receive [1]-118:7
received [22]-13:6,
24:26, 26:21, 26:28, 29:1, 31:2, 39:29, 42:25, 42:28, 43:2, 49:1, 53:4, 55:7, 55:12, 58:5, 70:8,

78:15, 135:14,
155:13, 155:17,
155:18
receives [1]-111:18
receiving [9]-26:13,
26:18, 27:2, 27:4,
29:7, 34:26, 52:2,
117:17, 155:16
recognise [2] -
165:13, 165:22
recognised [1] -
82:29
recollect [8]-24:20,
39:19, 41:16, 46:13,
60:1, 60:3, 164:23,
165:10
recollection [35] -
21:22, 24:20, 24:27,
27:7, 33:15, 33:28,
33:29, 39:8, 39:15,
41:7, 45:1, 60:13,
63:6, 63:9, 66:9,
73:15, 77:14, 78:23,
81:12, 82:2, 82:23,
84:4, 99:22, 104:9,
112:6, 118:2, 119:18,
123:17, 130:9,
134:16, 139:11,
141:29, 142:2,
155:16, 160:19
recommendation [1]

- 153:3
recommendations
[1] - 164:28
record [23]-9:27,
10:9, 10:20, 12:20,
13:25, 15:18, 23:1,
23:3, 27:9, 37:22,
38:25, 40:10, 54:24,
55:3, 56:6, 57:28,
60:14, 62:28, 64:5,
76:21, 88:27, 147:18,
163:13
record-keeping [1] 76:21
recorded [3]-71:1,
90:10, 129:29
recording [2]-23:4,
64:4
records [11]-10:14,
10:15, 11:9, 14:29,
22:2, 22:10, 26:22,
37:24, 48:21, 151:25,
164:19
red [1]-51:19
redacted [1]-64:3
redactions [1] -
43:22
REDMOND [1] - 2:24
redundant [2] -

91:18, 94:12
refer [7]-44:7,
48:24, 66:13, 145:10, 147:3, 147:10, 148:2
reference [11] -
43:29, 44:6, 53:9,
62:4, 64:15, 69:9, 118:23, 118:24, 151:2, 163:18
referral [35]-34:8,
36:15, 36:17, 37:4, 38:23, 54:22, 55:12, $56: 14,56: 15,78: 18$, 78:21, 79:3, 79:11, 80:16, 80:24, 80:28, 80:29, 81:4, 83:17, 83:19, 83:21, 84:6, 84:11, 84:16, 84:18, 84:22, 85:4, 86:13, 86:26, 94:24, 95:13, 111:13, 149:9, 149:10, 153:27
referral' [1]-86:15
referrals [3]-46:6,
90:12, 91:29
referred [19]-29:8,
32:22, 40:15, 45:7, 47:8, 50:2, 67:22, 70:7, 79:29, 80:11, 80:14, 81:21, 82:27, 83:8, 83:29, 84:1, 106:22, 126:11, 163:13
referred' [1] - 80:12
referring $[6]-8: 23$,
12:13, 38:8, 50:13,
68:9, 118:18
reflect [5] - 44:16,
58:20, 58:26, 58:27,
58:28
refusing [1] - 114:8
regard [5] - 9:8, 28:7,
34:12, 48:13, 80:16
regarding [7]-28:1,
28:3, 38:18, 54:15,
66:27, 103:19, 164:16
regardless [2] -
66:26, 98:10
REGISTRAR [1] - 2:4
regret [14]-52:6,
122:26, 124:29,
125:5, 128:19,
128:21, 129:11,
129:13, 129:14,
129:18, 130:11, 130:12, 132:25, 152:1
regrettable [1] 130:24
regular [1]-113:17
reinvestigating [1] -

117:21
rejig [1] - 63:13
related [2]-55:27, 93:26
relates [3]-8:13,
101:20, 106:20
relating [15] - 7:11,
8:24, 10:22, 14:29,
15:6, 16:24, 22:2,
22:10, 22:22, 23:2,
43:22, 44:4, 47:28, 57:4, 60:14
relation [68] - 20:14,
22:7, 22:15, 25:27,
26:9, 39:21, 40:7,
41:11, 42:22, 43:28,
45:18, 48:7, 48:22,
53:11, 59:28, 66:19,
66:26, 67:3, 67:7, 67:17, 76:21, 81:15,
82:8, 83:22, 84:22,
85:8, 85:18, 86:19,
87:18, 87:20, 88:25,
90:15, 91:9, 94:27, 95:3, 96:10, 96:22,
97:3, $97: 4,102: 3$,
117:8, 123:10,
123:11, 126:12,
127:18, 129:12,
129:13, 134:23,
135:23, 137:27,
137:28, 138:24,
140:6, 141:13,
148:19, 151:27,
152:1, 153:22,
155:12, 157:7,
157:11, 158:2,
159:18, 161:11,
162:14, 162:19,
164:26, 166:5
relative [1] - 84:15
relatives [1]-77:24
release [1] - 163:2
relevance [4]-36:9,
121:10, 125:26, 125:27
relevant [6] - 40:13,
120:12, 123:19,
156:19, 166:11
reliability [10]-30:1, 34:15, 103:13,
103:20, 104:12,
104:16, 105:7,
105:16, 105:21, 120:29
relied [1] - 50:27
relive [2]-124:8,
125:6
rely [1] - 73:23
remain [1]-58:19
remained [1] -
134:19
remaining [1] - 15:4
remains [1] - 51:20
remedial [1]-49:8
remedying [1] -
132:29
remember [44]-7:6,
7:12, 11:7, 12:4, 12:5,
12:10, 12:11, 15:26,
22:17, 24:1, 24:12,
26:19, 32:8, 33:15,
40:6, 41:27, 48:29,
60:3, 61:3, 62:9,
62:23, 63:26, 66:4,
75:10, 77:15, 78:22,
82:17, 84:27, 84:29,
86:23, 104:1, 104:2,
104:26, 105:2,
114:29, 115:25,
118:2, 118:5, 134:15,
135:24, 146:28,
164:26
remind [1]-140:12
reminded $[4]-5: 16$,
115:16, 141:3, 141:6
reminder [1]-60:5
reminding [1] -
62:18
removal [1]-51:1
removed [4]-50:2,
50:26, 50:28, 51:2
reopened [5] - 87:1,
87:7, 117:3, 117:4,
117:7
repeat [2]-40:24,
111:28
repeated [2]-52:22,
134:25
replaced [1]-61:13
replied [1]-23:9
reply [8]-23:15,
24:26, 65:28, 68:7,
137:1, 137:22,
137:25, 138:17
report [11]-10:1,
13:11, 14:15, 46:19,
58:25, 127:22, 135:2,
147:19, 149:6,
149:12, 149:19
reported [9]-11:9,
15:23, 16:7, 23:21,
24:15, 44:27, 51:23,
116:3, 116:10
representatives [1] 66:14
reproduced [1] -
3:29
request [3]-91:26,
93:21, 134:11
requested [1] -
134:14
require [4]-63:20,
67:21, 135:10, 144:9
required $[4]-28: 29$,
34:11, 67:26, 104:16
requires [1]-115:20
research [2]-97:15,
138:22
reserved [1] - 142:25
resolution [1] -
128:16
RESOLUTIONS [1] 1:5
respect [11] - 27:22,
52:16, 79:2, 79:5,
81:21, 98:26, 99:1,
109:16, 109:23,
120:13, 141:5
respond [17]-39:29,
48:12, 66:15, 68:13,
68:25, 75:16, 107:19,
108:9, 109:6, 122:29,
129:1, 129:26,
131:11, 133:3, 133:7,
133:9, 139:9
responded [8] -
46:6, 49:21, 61:27,
66:17, 114:13, 131:8, 141:10, 157:16
respondent [1] 3:30
response [30]-23:7,
39:19, 40:2, 42:13,
45:15, 52:28, 53:15,
60:1, 60:8, 61:23,
63:16, 63:22, 63:25, 63:28, 65:1, 74:17, 74:24, 97:28, 102:23, 109:8, 129:12, 136:3, 136:13, 136:14, 138:29, 141:20, 153:6, 157:21, 158:5, 159:7
responses [2] -
19:11, 96:17
responsibilities [5] -
5:29, 20:23, 46:5,
81:15, 156:17
responsibility [11] 21:12, 26:17, 27:21, 48:10, 75:19, 75:28, 76:5, 76:7, 102:16, 104:20, 114:2
responsible [4] 48:1, 50:18, 93:10, 133:23
rest [1] - 120:16
result [9]-22:21,
29:10, 30:24, 30:25,

42:11, 42:12, 87:1,
88:27, 126:10
RESUMED [2] - 5:1,
73:1
retrieve [2]-44:19,
44:23
Retrospective [1] -
62:2
retrospective [4] -
64:16, 64:21, 65:4,
66:13
return [1] - 58:13
returned [2]-51:13,
58:19
revert [3]-53:3,
137:16, 138:9
review [51] - 6:3, 6:9,
7:29, 8:5, 8:6, 8:7,
8:17, 8:23, 9:1, 13:7,
13:26, 16:29, 17:3,
17:11, 29:8, 29:10,
29:13, 29:15, 30:2,
31:9, 31:13, 32:6,
32:9, 32:14, 32:21,
32:22, 33:13, 37:15,
37:19, 53:5, 53:7,
53:28, 93:14, 102:1,
102:6, 102:21,
103:12, 103:24,
105:24, 121:19,
137:15, 144:24,
145:25, 146:24,
163:4, 163:5, 163:7,
163:9
reviewed [20] - 6:8,
7:8, 17:28, 31:10,
31:11, 32:6, 32:8
32:10, 49:24, 53:6,
53:7, 53:28, 54:14,
102:1, 102:4, 103:9,
137:10, 151:14,
163:11, 165:12
reviewing [9]-5:18,
8:13, 20:7, 32:5, 53:2,
53:21, 101:19,
106:19, 129:13
reviews [1] - 165:15
revised [1]-112:23
Rhona [3]-84:23,
165:1, 165:5
Rian [7]-34:8,
54:16, 57:18, 58:13,
111:13, 126:11,
164:14
ring [2] - 36:19, 101:11
rise [1] - 70:2
risk [9]-38:20, 40:3,
69:27, 70:1, 117:15,
126:13, 131:27,

133:10, 136:1 108:29
role [5]-46:7, 66:19,
77:20, 97:2, 128:4 room [5] - 31:10, 32:3, 103:26, 104:3, 159:26
routine [1] - 139:14
row [1]-166:17
RTE [1]-2:32
rubbed [1]-150:1
rule [1]-132:14
run [1] - 105:10
run-of-the-mill [1]
105:10
rung [2] - 96:25,
96:27
RYAN [2] - 3:14, 3:14

| S |
| :--- |

SAINT [1] - 2:12
SAME [1]-26:25
samples [1] - 163:26
SART [16] - 62:8,
62:15, 64:5, 64:11, 65:20, 67:22, 68:3, 68:28, 69:13, 70:28, 75:8, 75:12, 75:15, 163:9, 163:10, 165:14
satisfy [1] - 89:13
saw [3] - 7:29, 92:29, 146:28
SC ${ }_{[12]}-2: 6,2: 6$,
2:14, 2:14, 2:18, 2:18,
2:22, 2:26, 2:32, 3:3,
3:5, 3:13
scale [1] - 51:29
SCANLON [1] - 2:24
scenario [3] - 95:28,
112:17
scenarios [1]-86:1
schedule [2]-28:18,
28:19
scheme [1] - 37:18
screen [2]-13:15,
64:2
se [1] - 46:8
Seamus [1] - 98:15
Seamus's [1] - 121:7
SEAN [3] - 2:15,
2:23, 2:32
SEANAD [1] - 1:6
second [14]-11:8,
16:2, 37:10, 52:8,
56:3, 56:22, 70:5,
121:8, 122:1, 122:4,
136:28, 139:20, 139:23, 145:12
secondly [2]-94:14,

Section [1] - 127:22
section [6]-13:24,
13:27, 53:12, 90:19,
145:2, 146:16
sections [1] - 145:6
see [68] - $7: 14,8: 12$,
9:9, 11:6, 11:21, 13:2,
13:15, 14:6, 14:12,
19:28, 31:6, 31:20
$33: 18,35: 4,35: 9$,
36:22, 36:27, 38:25,
39:22, 39:25, 43:19,
49:17, 62:1, 63:29,
68:28, 69:6, 70:1,
76:6, 78:26, 79:2,
80:25, 81:19, 87:27,
88:29, 93:15, 93:20,
94:21, 95:12, 98:29,
99:25, 102:10, 105:6,
107:16, 108:2,
111:11, 111:14,
112:8, 112:18,
115:10, 115:26,
116:26, 117:26,
121:19, 124:11, 125:16, 125:28, 126:14, 127:7,
130:11, 132:24,
133:21, 137:20,
146:21, 163:15, 167:3
seeing [10] $-5: 14$,
12:4, 12:9, 13:13,
14:13, 14:16, 14:17, 49:10, 105:12, 165:10 seek [8]-33:6,
36:29, 37:8, 52:14, 95:28, 97:5, 105:1,
119:29
seeking [10]-12:8,
20:11, 20:12, 30:14,
36:27, 53:18, 57:27,
125:2, 137:28, 159:7
seeks [1]-72:3
seem [8]-67:1, 74:6,
83:26, 87:21, 123:26,
144:27, 161:19,
163:26
sees [1] - 93:4
seismic [1]-52:4
selected $[4]-6: 14$,
6:17, 6:22, 8:6
selecting [1] $-7: 18$
send [18]-17:19,
17:20, 37:5, 42:18,
47:11, 68:23, 98:14,
114:6, 114:8, 117:20, 128:7, 128:28, 129:6,
130:18, 130:20,
130:29, 138:25,

167:13
sending [15] - 17:17,
19:25, 32:28, 62:20, 92:25, 98:15, 101:7, 110:4, 114:7, 129:2, 130:12, 131:5, 138:28, 146:4, 149:12
senior [3]-19:6,
60:24, 61:25
sense [6]-17:14,
19:2, 33:20, 106:25, 110:18, 117:19
sent [52]-8:5, 11:1,
11:3, 11:16, 11:25, 13:3, 13:12, 15:29,
16:10, 24:2, 25:11,
32:26, 40:27, 42:6, 47:26, 48:10, 49:21, 50:4, 51:12, 51:17, 53:20, 56:25, 57:12, 58:18, 60:5, 62:15, 65:29, 67:14, 67:27, 68:6, 70:21, 71:3,
73:8, 74:23, 74:27,
75:1, 89:29, 94:17,
109:14, 109:17,
118:6, 128:11,
136:14, 140:22,
141:8, 142:8, 151:7,
154:8, 155:4, 155:15,
164:8, 164:10
sentence [5] - 49:28,
55:27, 56:3, 111:28,
120:26
sentencing [1] -
96:10
separate [4]-53:10,
88:11, 88:13, 119:5
separately [1] -
57:17
sequence [2] -
90:16, 155:25
sergeant [6] - 26:16,
27:20, 143:2, 157:9, 157:10, 159:12
Sergeant [72]-6:27, 7:15, 16:24, 19:3, 19:7, 25:5, 25:7, 26:6, 26:7, 26:13, 26:20, 26:21, 27:7, 28:14, 40:21, 41:7, 42:2, 45:7, 45:17, 45:18, 52:1, 60:15, 60:17, 61:16, 68:17, 74:13, 77:12, 78:2, 78:13, 80:8, 82:1, 82:10, 83:18, 83:29, 84:14, 87:12, 88:20, 94:23, 95:5, 95:18, 97:22,
98:1, 98:26, 117:12,

117:20, 121:22,
122:14, 122:21,
126:12, 127:24,
130:20, 130:27,
131:9, 131:19,
132:26, 137:1,
139:25, 140:5,
141:25, 155:10,
155:15, 156:18,
157:22, 158:1,
158:11, 158:25,
159:9, 159:20,
159:26, 160:17,
163:8, 166:24
serious [5] - 22:27,
98:3, 99:1, 140:24,
141:6
Service [1]-3:30
service [33]-8:21,
22:6, 22:7, 22:8, 28:26, 42:7, 46:7, 57:15, 58:8, 66:28, 75:25, 80:20, 86:17, 89:11, 92:6, 95:26,
95:29, 100:1, 100:5, 100:22, 102:17,
112:22, 114:2, 114:7,
123:11, 126:24,
128:10, 128:29,
130:22, 131:20,
133:17, 137:29,
138:16
SERVICES [1]-1:30
Services [2]-1:25,
3:29
services [5] - 26:10,
48:25, 63:27, 75:16, 87:15
set $[8]-44: 29,54: 3$,
54:8, 116:7, 138:12,
150:7, 151:22, 151:23
sets [1]-119:5
seven [3]-10:15,
16:6, 109:26
seven-year-old [1] -
109:26
Sexual [1] - 62:2
sexual [14]-38:19,
64:29, 67:24, 81:21,
83:22, 96:3, 96:10,
96:21, 97:12, 97:15, 97:17, 149:27, 150:1, 154:1
SGT [1]-2:14
shape [2]-63:13, 125:9
share [1] - 42:21
SHATTER [2]-2:29, 2:29
shed [1] - 71:17
sheet [4]-9:12,
40:5, 48:21, 129:29
sheets [1]-14:22
SHIP [1] - 2:21
shock [1] - 128:9
shocking [1] - 66:7
shocks [1] - 52:5
short [1] - 150:7
shortly [1]-52:3
show [3] - 43:25,
128:13, 128:16
shown [3] - 34:5,
34:10, 124:16
sic [1] - 65:27
side [1] - $97: 5$
sight $[8]-12: 24$,
34:21, 62:17, 62:18,
125:3, 140:23,
146:22, 151:9
sign [1] - 124:25
signature [3] - 103:4,
103:7, 165:24
signed [14] - 8:25,
8:26, 8:27, 11:14, 22:13, 22:21, 30:4, 74:18, 90:20, 132:9, 148:7, 163:5, 163:7, 164:9
significance [11] -
50:7, 52:1, 83:1, 83:7,
83:10, 83:14, 83:25,
84:8, 95:16, 124:24,
127:19
significant [9] -
17:10, 63:14, 76:10, 82:27, 82:29, 83:6,
83:17, 83:28, 83:29
silence [1] - 59:21
similarly [1] - 45:26
simple [1] - 91:28
simply [5] - 68:11,
112:26, 122:2, 150:7, 154:15
singular [1] - 149:26
sinister [2] - 154:13,
162:11
sit [2]-166:19, 167:5
sitting [1] - 103:26
situation [8] - 18:22,
21:29, 66:9, 77:11,
93:7, 93:8, 96:18, 138:13
six [9] - 15:2, 16:6,
50:12, 73:12, 79:26,
79:27, 80:5, 130:16
skipping [1] - 161:27
sleep [1] - 128:15
sloppiness [2] -
92:6, 92:9
small [4]-79:22,

79:25, 84:28
smaller [1] - 144:28
so-called [1] -
141:23
Social [2]-70:7,
71:23
social [23]-27:13,
27:23, 28:27, 28:28,
36:15, 36:17, 39:26,
46:6, 70:8, 76:29,
77:3, 84:23, 91:23, 102:18, 102:19,
128:23, 134:13,
134:20, 153:3,
155:26, 156:19,
157:5, 164:28
SOLE [2] - 1:12, 2:2
solicitor [2]-61:17,
137:1
SOLICITOR [5] - 2:7,
3:1, 3:9, 3:20, 3:25
SOLICITOR'S [1] 2:20
Solicitors [1] -
135:15
SOLICITORS [5] -
2:10, 2:29, 3:3, 3:16,
3:23
solicitors [6] - 59:26,
68:18, 74:13, 74:14,
142:17, 165:25
solicitors' [1]-66:14
someone [10] -
68:16, 87:22, 93:3,
113:7, 113:8, 123:20,
123:24, 124:23,
141:18, 161:10
sometime [1] - 5:20
sometimes [2] -
86:2, 101:9
somewhat [1] 140:9
sooner [1] - 76:8
sorry [27]-9:8,
29:14, 31:3, 31:29, 35:14, 40:24, 51:5, 55:4, 55:5, 71:21, 86:24, 88:3, 96:8, 103:2, 105:27,
107:21, 107:29,
127:10, 131:23,
136:26, 136:27,
137:2, 145:28,
155:20, 159:6,
160:24, 166:19
sort [2]-42:16,
78:27
sought [5] - 51:8,
58:29, 121:17,
124:29, 125:3
source [1] - 94:22
speaking [1] - 98:24
specialist [2] - 51:8,
68:21
specific [6]-16:19,
16:21, 44:25, 81:27,
134:24, 139:10
specifically $[4]-7: 6$,
7:12, 41:27, 62:23
specifies [1] - 12:22
specify [1] - 145:9
spectrum [1] - 18:29
speculation [3]-
18:18, 107:6, 107:8
spend [1] - 123:2
split [1]-75:29
splitting [1] - 26:2
sprung [1] - 32:18
spur [1]-24:20
square [1] - 124:9
SRF [8]-55:13,
55:20, 55:22, 55:23,
58:7, 58:18, 58:21
staff [1] - 155:22
stage [33]-5:23,
20:27, 23:21, 24:16,
25:3, 26:14, 46:20,
60:20, 60:29, 62:1,
68:19, 69:2, 85:3,
90:6, 90:16, 93:16,
101:15, 104:14,
113:21, 116:3,
116:10, 119:7, 129:8,
136:3, 137:7, 137:25,
140:10, 145:14,
149:1, 150:27,
152:25, 157:20, 161:6
stages [1] - 76:25
stakeholders [2] -
40:13, 77:6
stamped [1] - 50:27
stand [1] - 124:25
standard [4]-14:14,
92:6, 123:4, 132:14
standing [1] - 93:5
stands [1] - 117:8
stapled [1] - 9:13 start [2]-63:3,
101:11
started [1] - 5:18
state [6]-50:11,
57:9, 57:13, 57:20, 94:29, 135:6
STATE [1] - 2:20
statement [58] -
5:17, 34:19, 36:26, 38:9, 39:6, 39:14, 40:4, 40:6, 43:10,
46:11, 46:27, 47:12,
47:19, 47:20, 47:26,

48:2, 49:10, 49:11,
50:25, 51:10, 53:5,
53:6, 54:1, 54:26,
67:19, 69:5, 70:9,
70:21, 71:3, 71:10, 71:15, 71:19, 71:24, 71:29, 98:21, 102:13,
102:27, 102:28, 103:2, 110:24,
110:27, 122:27,
123:24, 123:26,
124:9, 124:15,
124:22, 124:23,
124:26, 132:9, 134:4,
135:26, 135:29,
137:5, 145:10,
148:28, 152:28,
158:23
statements [12] -
54:14, 110:28, 111:7,
122:8, 122:9, 122:10,
122:18, 123:7, 123:9,
124:13, 125:4, 137:11
states [3]-53:17,
53:18, 66:21
stating [2] - 58:6, 67:1
Station [1] - 77:17
station [2]-27:20,
143:6
status [5] - 40:25,
116:26, 116:29,
158:3, 159:12
stay [1] - 142:18
stenographic [1] -
1:27
STENOGRAPHY [1]

- 1:30

Stenography [2] -
3:29, 3:30
stenography [1] 1:25
step [13]-20:16,
33:8, 35:2, 35:10,
36:6, 36:19, 37:10,
37:20, 92:20, 108:10,
125:17, 125:22, 125:24
steps [16]-20:29,
23:23, 24:17, 32:25, 44:29, 46:16, 100:2, 100:3, 116:5, 116:7, 116:22, 125:16,
125:19, 125:23,
129:6, 129:23
sticking [1] - 91:28
still [10]-26:2,
34:14, 35:18, 41:6,
43:1, 51:20, 67:14,
88:7, 117:8, 140:20
stood [1] - 46:20
stop [4]-91:7,
111:2, 126:24, 162:5
stopped [1] - 92:2
stopping [1] - 109:16
straightforward [1] -
97:8
strange [4] - 107:8,
126:20, 126:22, 137:8
strategy [1] - 13:26
STREET [5] - 2:11,
2:21, 2:25, 3:7, 3:23
strictly [1] - 46:29
strongest [1] -
113:25
strongly [1] - 135:16
struggled [1] - 49:27
subject [4]-41:3,
82:11, 86:13, 94:24
subject-matter [1] -
41:3
submission [8] -
41:3, 166:14, 166:15,
166:16, 167:4, 167:5,
167:8, 167:12
subsequent [2] -
39:2, 58:25 subsequently [4] -
54:2, 80:27, 146:28, 158:26
substance [1] -
140:1
substantial [1] -
134:29
substantive [1] -
136:29
succeed [1] - 37:1
successfully [1] -
35:10
succession [1] -
76:6
sudden [1] - 45:29
suddenly [3]-108:6,
129:20, 130:16
suffered [1] - 112:27
suggest [9]-18:18,
48:14, 62:22, 92:19,
115:18, 141:20,
142:24, 160:21,
160:23
suggested [1] - 53:2
suggesting [4] -
24:29, 115:11,
131:24, 162:9
suggestion [3] -
34:2, 157:12, 166:17
suggests [1] - 84:14
suits [1]-28:2
SUNLIGHT [1] - 3:7
Superintendent $[7]$ -

14:11, 25:11, 25:19, 32:29, 33:1, 128:24,
56:12, 90:1, 127:24, 156:16
155:4
superior [2] - 129:9,
141:6
superiors [1] -
129:19
supervision [3]-
13:25, 60:10, 60:15
supervisor [1] -
139:15
supervisory [1] -
139:14
supplied [1] - 3:29
support [1] - 134:29
suppose [10]-
10:17, 17:4, 17:27,
21:4, 37:18, 45:5,
51:29, 57:14, 115:23,
129:24
SUPREME [2]-1:13,
2:3
SUPT [1] - $3: 5$
surely [9]-80:15,
92:4, 95:27, 113:19,
113:20, 113:21,
114:19, 126:20, 143:4
surprised [1] - 21:10
surprising [1] -
133:17
suspect [2] - 55:24,
62:9
swear [1]-73:17
SWTL [1]-27:11
system [8]-7:11,
20:7, 21:28, 23:4,
26:24, 43:22, 64:1, 80:18
Séamus [18]-8:1,
8:17, 21:2, 31:11,
32:8, 32:10, 33:15,
35:3, 47:9, 101:16,
102:1, 102:19, 105:3,
106:13, 118:10,
120:25, 125:16
Séan [2] - 135:15,
136:13
Síochána [11] -
15:24, 16:8, 19:6,
23:21, 24:16, 25:24,
27:16, 42:5, 116:3,
143:29, 160:10

## T

tabbed [1] - 14:22
table [1] - 98:23
task [1] - $93: 13$
tasks [5] - 28:28,

156:16
TAYLOR [1] - 3:5
Team [1]-62:2
team [39]-6:1, 6:9,
22:1, 22:14, 22:19,
27:13, 27:23, 28:20, 46:5, 56:10, 62:8, 62:10, 62:15, 64:11, 64:16, 64:21, 64:23, 64:26, 65:4, 65:19, 65:20, 66:13, 67:22, 68:3, 68:21, 69:13, 70:28, 75:8, 75:12, 75:15, 75:19, 77:5, 79:9, 81:16, 93:9, 153:3, 155:26, 156:19, 157:5 telephone [5] -
37:22, 37:25, 38:1,
54:22, 78:15
TEN ${ }_{[1]}-2: 27$
ten [4]-130:22,
130:25, 131:24, 134:1
tend [1]-42:17
tends [2]-42:9,
160:13
term [1] - 86:15
terms [24]-21:3,
22:24, 33:5, 34:16, 34:18, 34:22, 35:3, 45:22, 47:10, 63:21, 67:11, 68:16, 74:17, 75:17, 83:9, 84:15, 90:16, 101:29, 102:5, 112:29, 133:16, 151:7, 151:8, 158:8
TERRACE [2]-2:27, 3:17
terrible [1] - 128:9
terse [1] - 142:8
tested [1]-131:6
testimony [3] -
85:16, 100:12, 111:19
text [1] - 129:5
thanking [2]-23:25, 24:5
that.. [1] - 118:21
THE [13]-1:4, 1:8,
1:9, 1:12, 2:3, 2:6,
2:18, 2:22, 3:16, 5:1,
72:18, 73:1, 167:18
themselves [1] -
122:10
THEN [2]-162:28, 167:18
theories [1]-18:29
theory [1] - 133:16
therapist [1] - 70:7
therapy [1] - 70:6
there'd [1] - 39:2
thereabouts [1] -
164:11
thereafter [4] - 38:5,
90:14, 100:19
therefore [14] -
18:24, 38:20, 58:21,
64:22, 86:10, 89:16,
89:26, 120:20,
145:20, 146:9,
147:13, 151:17,
152:25, 153:19
thin [1] - 82:6
thin-partitioned [1] -
82:6
thinking [6] - 45:1,
46:13, 66:5, 89:9,
120:4, 123:1
thinks [2]-81:3,
81:6
third [3]-43:23,
64:3, 121:24
thoroughly [4] -
17:12, 34:24, 36:5,
77:4
thread [1] - 148:21
threatened [1] -
55:15
three [2] - 96:16,
100:18
threshold [2] -
134:29, 154:26
THURSDAY [1] -
167:18
tick [1] - 90:17
tick-box [1] - 90:17
ticked [2]-80:19,
90:17
Tiernan [3] - 134:4,
135:4, 135:5
timely [3] - 154:10,
154:11, 154:28
TIMES [1] - 3:16
Tinnelly [4]-79:3,
80:16, 80:18, 88:23
tiny [1] - 164:6
TO [2] - 5:7, 73:3
Tobin [2]-68:4,
69:17
today [6]-8:13,
101:20, 106:20,
135:13, 148:17, 160:26
together [1] - 21:20
tomorrow [2]-
166:29, 167:12
Tony [1] - 159:12
took [28]-5:29,
28:16, 30:12, 31:9,
37:20, 41:23, 46:4,

46:15, 47:11, 61:6,
66:24, 75:22, 76:3,
93:14, 93:18, 100:2,
102:16, 119:10,
119:13, 128:24,
134:15, 142:21,
143:8, 146:24, 156:6,
156:26, 157:2, 161:16
top [7]-11:8, 13:2,
29:18, 105:1, 146:21,
152:29, 163:18
total [1] - 47:10
totally [1] - 83:4
touch [1]-126:15
touched [1] - 144:18
towards [1] - 130:2
tracking [1]-23:5
traffic [1] - 167:7
transcript [1]-1:26
Transcripts [1] -
3:28
transferred [1] -
55:20
transpired [1] -
41:14
Trappists [1] - 86:3
treat [2]-45:26,
45:27
treated [1] - 83:21
tree [1]-124:12
TRIBUNAL [2] - 1:3, 2:6
Tribunal [19]-5:26,
7:28, 8:28, 9:19,
16:27, 22:29, 28:21,
51:16, 63:17, 79:24,
99:7, 102:13, 104:14,
118:3, 128:5, 134:5,
145:11, 162:3, 166:12
Tribunal's [1] -
138:24
TRIBUNALS [1] - 1:9
tried [2]-62:17,
156:20
triggered [1] - 18:25
trouble [1] - 166:9
true [3]-97:25,
125:8, 125:10
truth [1] - 123:21
try [9]-28:19, 29:3,
29:6, 46:13, 61:27,
72:5, 74:7, 104:18, 144:12
trying [10] - 45:5, 45:9, 45:11, 86:10,
117:18, 122:12, 129:19, 145:28,
162:5, 167:3
turn [3]-152:27,
155:8, 155:21
turn-over [1] -
155:21
turned [1] - 100:17
turning [1] - 48:15
Tusla [14]-12:21, 26:10, 63:27, 67:21, 75:9, 80:1, 80:11, 97:2, 147:23, 148:6, 155:5, 159:8, 160:29
TUSLA [1] - 2:26 Tusla's [2]-75:15, 102:20
twice [1]-83:25
two [32]-13:23,
15:1, 33:26, 50:16, 72:10, 73:6, 82:3, 86:12, 87:22, 88:1, 88:4, 88:9, 88:11, 88:13, 94:3, 96:16, 105:3, 110:28, 112:26, 114:13, 114:20, 115:10, 119:4, 119:6, 124:3, 129:28, 134:10, 139:29, 140:20, 141:1, 145:16, 160:24 two-minute [1] -
72:10
two-page [1] - 13:23
type [1]-28:28
typed [1]-89:29
typically [1]-79:19
$\mathbf{U} \quad{ }_{6}^{6}$
ultimately [3] -
51:12, 120:23, 151:6
unallocated [3]-
5:18, 6:4, 75:18
unaware [2] - 99:6, 99:10
unclear [1] - 124:27
uncorrected [2] -
91:19, 92:13
undated [3]-11:23,
56:8, 163:3
UNDER [2] - 1:3, 1:9 under [7]-38:3,
68:6, 111:26, 131:19,
133:22, 154:4, 164:27
underhandedly [1] -
66:22
understood [8] -
20:14, 34:21, 41:23, 47:10, 53:12, 85:17, 112:1, 117:24 undertook [1] -
102:19
unfair [10]-46:12,

130:28, 131:1, 131:4, 131:7, 131:9, 131:22, 131:23, 131:24,
131:28
unfairness [1] -
133:1
unfortunately [1] -
71:16
uninformative [1] -
142:8
unknown [2]-43:27,
64:13
unless [6] - 16:14,
22:26, 42:8, 50:22,
141:18
unlikely [1] - 134:27
unsigned [2] - 8:24,
11:23
UNTIL [1] - 167:18
unusual [19]-17:18,
23:1, 90:23, 91:13,
91:14, 92:4, 92:18,
92:19, 92:21, 93:24,
93:27, 94:3, 110:21,
110:26, 161:10,
161:12, 161:20,
161:28, 162:10
up [64] - 6:11, $8: 22$,
14:19, 18:21, 30:26,
32:3, 32:23, 35:4,
35:22, 38:18, 44:17, 46:4, 46:9, 46:15, 47:1, 60:22, 61:28, 64:24, 64:27, 66:16, 67:25, 75:29, 76:29, 77:2, 80:18, 84:23, 85:8, 86:20, 86:22, 86:25, 87:17, 88:21, 89:29, 94:26, 94:27, 95:14, 96:1, 96:4 97:7, 97:11, 97:12, 99:26, 100:10, 102:2, 105:7, 110:3, 113:28, 124:12, 129:12, 131:21, 134:14, 134:18, 134:20, 135:23, 147:5, 147:17, 150:1, 154:10, 154:23, 155:26, 157:19, 158:5, 160:1, 160:7 update [9]-23:19,
23:26, 53:3, 53:15, 91:22, 115:27, 116:1, 137:16, 138:8
updated [1] - 11:3
UPPER [1] - 2:30
upset [1] - 129:15
urgent [1]-63:21
useful [1] - 124:17
usual [5] - 22:3,
42:15, 93:24, 110:22,
161:28
utterly [2] - 99:6,
142:8
$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$
vacated [2] - 156:4, 156:9
vaginal [3]-97:21,
120:1, 149:8
vague [1]-159:11
validating [1] -
110:17
value [1] - 123:27
venue [1]-28:2
veracity [1] - 154:22
verbal [1] - 147:19
verbatim [1]-1:26
verification [2] -
107:22, 108:12
verify [1]-105:7
versions [1] - 121:15
via [1]-59:26
victim [8] - 16:6,
33:10, 88:5, 88:9,
109:25, 118:13,
118:27, 119:15
victim" [1]-29:24
videotapes [1] -
124:16
view [28]-27:24, 39:26, 48:25, 52:19, 57:8, 74:6, 83:3, 83:9, 83:24, 84:2, 95:29, 96:2, 97:6, 97:26, 99:27, 99:28, 99:29, 103:24, 110:23, 135:29, 140:19, 142:21, 151:22, 151:26, 151:29, 166:25, 166:26
viewing [3]-97:14,
151:25, 152:1
views [1] - 20:12
Volume [2]-98:14,
133:27
volume [2]-9:9,
163:14
voluminous [1] -
45:17


76:29, 77:3, 84:23,
91:23, 102:18,
102:19, 128:23, 134:13, 134:21
worker's [1] - 164:28
workers [1] - 46:6
works [1] - 30:10
write [14]-28:18,
70:10, 71:24, 71:29,
106:12, 124:1,
124:10, 128:18,
129:20, 129:21,
130:1, 137:3, 138:11
writes [2]-104:11,
115:26
writing [6] - 27:24,
51:19, 106:25, 130:21, 132:27, 164:6
written [18]-3:30, 28:11, 42:10, 46:22, 56:15, 57:17, 57:26, 67:19, 69:3, 74:18, 89:27, 90:18, 93:21, 94:7, 107:17, 108:7, 131:26, 139:4
wrote [23]-8:1,
15:15, 30:14, 37:2, 44:24, 53:20, 59:25, 69:3, 69:18, 90:11, 90:26, 92:24, 101:16, 116:16, 127:13, 128:19, 130:5, 132:8, 132:10, 132:12, 135:14, 135:20, 156:24

## Y

year [16] - 48:15, 48:25, 74:4, 99:9, 99:10, 99:21, 102:29, 109:26, 112:10, 126:18, 126:23, 126:29, 128:14, 130:6, 136:20
year's [1] - 128:16
Year's [1] - 52:4
years [14]-15:24,
16:6, 16:8, 38:27,
77:18, 100:19, 107:12, 110:4, 110:9,
110:12, 124:27, 130:22, 130:25, 131:24
yellow [1]-91:28 yesterday [14]-5:10,
5:16, 6:9, 17:19, 21:11, 31:7, 81:26, 107:9, 114:27, 115:2, 115:3, 118:21,

119:14, 122:5
yourself [11]-24:11, 41:1, 45:8, 46:26,
47:18, 63:1, 71:1,
73:20, 73:22, 85:22,
121:12
yourselves [1] -
89:13
YVONNE [1] - 3:9
É

ÉIREANN [2] - 1:5,
1:6

