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## SUPERI NTENDENT DAV D TAYLOR WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS, AS FOLLOVS

1 Q. MR. MCHEÁL O HGG NS: Good morning Superintendent Taylor.
A. Good morning Mr. O'Higgins.

2 Q.
When we finished up yesterday I was asking you some questions about the methodology or the approach you took to what you've given evidence about, namely a smear campaign and the command that was given to you by Martin Callinan you say. Can I ask you, in relation to the sexual abuse allegation that you say you were to whisper about or leave or mention to journalists, that included an idea that -- well, was the purpose of that not to give the journalists to believe that in fact there was something to the allegation?
A. No, it was to draw their attention to a motivation. We11, you see, you might help us with that. Because I had thought part of the smear campaign purpose was to turn whomever you were briefing off Sergeant McCabe, and to that end, part of the scheme involved you giving them to understand that there was something in it, by which I mean in the sexual abuse allegation.
A. No. It was to draw their attention to his motivation as to why he was bringing these matters to the public arena.

4 Q. But did you not say in one of your statements that in
fact part of the rationale or methodology of the smear was that there was no smoke without fire?
A. That's in relation to his motivation as to what brought him forward, that this investigation was the motivation for bringing these matters forward to the public arena. 10:39
5 Q. But you see, no smoke without fire -- well, first of all, is it your position that you were to impart the message 'There is no smoke without fire' --
A. No.

6 Q. -- in relation to the sexual abuse allegation?
A. No, I merely imparted the information as directed by the Commissioner, to say that Sergeant McCabe was driven by revenge, emanating from the investigation.
7 Q. And is it your position that you were never instructed and you never did indicate to a journalist 'There's no smoke without fire' in relation to the sexual abuse allegation --
A. No.

8 Q. Is that your --
A. That's correct.

9 Q. That's your position on that?
A. Mm-hmm.

10 Q. All right. Now, dealing further then with the smear campaign, when you discussed it with Nóirín O'Sullivan, did you get any impression from her that she felt it was wrong?
A. No.

11 Q. You didn't?
A. No.

12 Q. When you discussed it with Andrew McLindon, did you get any impression from him that he felt it was wrong?
A. No.

13 Q. He is a civilian obviously.
A. Yes.

14 Q. Would you mind turning to page 128 of the materials please, if we could have that up on the screen, which I think is in volume 1. And this is, just to orientate it for you, Superintendent, this is your interview with the Tribunal investigators of 5th May 2017, which is a reasonably lengthy document, I think some 30 pages. And on page 12 of that, which is at page -- on page 13 of that, which is page 128 , if we could go down to line 200, halfway down the page. Do you see that there?
A. Yes.

15 Q. This is what you told the Tribunal investigators:
"I was to say that Maurice MECabe was driven by agendas, he's motivated by revenge and that revenge is dri ven by the allegation, the sexual allegation made agai nst himby another menber's daughter a number of years ago. I would say that I did al ways clarify to the journal ist that a file had gone to the DPP and that there was no prosecution. However, this was the narrative."

And then you say:
"It was put in such a way that there was no stoke
wi thout fire. l would drop that in when tal king to the journal ists."
So, did you say that to the Tribunal investigator?
A. I did.

16 Q. And did you not say a few moments ago that in fact you didn't indicate to the journalists whom you were briefing that there was no smoke without fire?
A. Well, I said that, what I've always said to the journalists, that Sergeant McCabe bringing these matters into the public arena was driven by revenge and 10:44 this revenge emanated from the investigation into him. CHA RMAN No, if you just go back, if you wouldn't mind, Superintendent --
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN -- to the question you were asked. Counse1 10:44 asked you: "But you see, no smoke without fire -- wel1, first of all, is it your position that you were to impart the message 'There is no smoke out fire'?" The answer was "No". "In relation to the sexual abuse allegation?" "No, I merely imparted the information as
directed by the Commissioner to say that Sergeant McCabe was driven by revenge emanating from the investigation." That's, 1 think, what counsel is referring to.
A. Yes.

17 Q. MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: So what did you mean in telling the Tribunal investigator the methodology involved indicating or imparting "No smoke without fire"; what smoke and what fire?
A. Bringing these matters of the penalty points to the public arena was driven by, motivated by revenge. why did you use the expression, in purporting to describe the methodology of the smear campaign, "I woul dindi cate no smoke without fire"?
A. Because that showed his motivation in bringing these matters to the public arena.
Q. I suggest to you "No smoke without fire" means there's something in the allegation, the allegation is likely to be true. That's what that expression means.
A. I don't accept that.
Q. I see. And are you in a position to reconcile what you told us a few minutes ago with what $I$ suggest to you is a different account in the statement to the Tribunal investigators?
A. No. As I said, my position, as directed by the Commissioner, was always to bring the journalists' attention to the fact that Sergeant McCabe was motivated by revenge in bringing these matters to the public arena.

21 Q. On your case, the smear campaign stopped in March on Martin Callinan's departure.
A. Yes.
A. Because of -- I was no longer working for Commissioner Callinan at the moment, at the time, and there'd been a huge upheaval.
Q. So are you saying that it continued up until the Commissioner left, but you're clear it lasted up until

25th March 2014?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's your position that it stopped and was not continued by Nóirín o'sullivan?
A. That's my -- yes. We11, that was going to be my question. I mean, here we had what was apparently a four-party agreed or discussed plan, McLindon, O'Sullivan, Commissioner Callinan and yourself, you're all in on it, on your case. Yes, there's been the departure of Commissioner Callinan, but I suggest to you, on your logic, there's no reason - in fact, if anything, there's an increased logic now to continue besmirching Sergeant McCabe with this agreed policy that you discussed, you say. Now, was there any discussion with Nóirín O'Sullivan as to stopping the policy?
A. No.

27 Q. Was there any discussion -- did you have any
A. No. I was never in the Commissioner's office again after 25th March.
Q. We'11 come back to that. Was there any conversation with Andrew McLindon, with whom you continued to have discussions?
A. No.
Q. We11, does that make sense? would you not have, would you not have asked him 'what's the story? Are we not to
continue with the smear campaign?'
A. There was a huge shock to the system and to the organisation when Commissioner Callinan left abruptly.
Q. But surely, particularly in your circumstances, you would've wanted to impress the likely new boss or the acting, the interim Commissioner?
A. I wasn't going to -- that was for her to make whatever decision she wanted to make.
Q.

But it would've come up with your chats with Andrew McLindon, surely?
A. The chats after Commissioner Callinan left were all
about the upheaval in relation to Commissioner Callinan leaving and the sense of shock around the system.

33 Q. I grant you that, there would've been upheaval and there would've been discussions around the upheaval for some period of time, but can you explain to the
Tribunal why there was a sudden halting or cessation of the smear campaign, in circumstances where two of the people who were in on it remained in situ?
A. When Commissioner Callinan left, it stopped. I can say no more than that.
And it never came up in conversation with anybody why had it stopped or was it to stop or 'Should we keep going with it?'
A. No.

42 Q. Was the smear campaign ever discussed at these
meetings?
A. No, it wasn't.

43
Q.

But you see, here we have Martin Callinan, Nóirín O'Sullivan, Andrew McLindon at these meetings and yet there's no mention of how the smear campaign is coming along, progress on the smear campaign.
A. The meetings in preparation for PAC were strategy meetings based on how to be prepared and have all the information available to the Commissioner to answer whatever questions the deputies would put to him.
44 Q. Yes. And in the aftermath of any of these meetings did none of the trio that you say were involved or had discussed it, did none of them ask for an update on how the smear was coming along?
A. No.
Q. Did you have any discussion with any of the three about what would be the most effective way of implementing the smear campaign?
A. No, in the sense that the direction had been given to me by Commissioner Callinan previous to the PAC and I was taking the opportunity, when availed, to carry out his direction.

46 Q. You've told us, haven't you, that from your perspective there was nothing wrong, you saw nothing wrong with the command you'd been given?
A. No.

47 Q. That being so, in order to make it more effective, would it not have been a sensible plan to avail of the legitimate facility of the Press office and the
colleagues in the Press Office to propagate the smear campaign?
A. No. Because it's high level conversations, it wasn't a matter for the desk sergeants to deal with.

48 Q.
But would it not have been more effective to enlist the $10: 53$ assistance of others in the Press office to get the message out?
A. The Commissioner gave me a direction at that level and I maintained it at that level.

49 Q.
But he gave you that direction in your role as Press officer, isn't that so, isn't that what you've told us?
A. Yes.

50 Q. So wouldn't it follow then, isn't it logical that you would, having been instructed as Press officer, use the Press office to get the message out?
A. No.

51 Q. Pardon?
A. No.

52 Q. It would not have been logical? It would not have made sense to you? Did you think about it or --
A. No.

53 Q. -- did you decide --
A. It wasn't appropriate.

54 Q. And why was it not appropriate, in your opinion?
A. The Press office deal with run of the mill press
queries from journalists and its time is consumed dealing with press queries and responding to press, as I say press queries, press questions in relation to a whole range of Garda matters.

55
Q. But you see, I thought the scheme was to be dropping the information into conversations on an opportunistic basis with journalists. Surely that's something your colleagues in the Press office could do as effectively?
A. It was a direction given by the Commissioner at that level and that's the level it was kept at.

56 Q. Yes. The persons to whom you imparted this unpleasant information, can I ask you about their reaction? In relation to, for instance -- well, let's take any one of the list you care to nominate. Paul Reynolds, you briefed him. what was his reaction?
A. He just heard what I was saying and took it on board.

## 57 Q. Mr. Williams?

A. Same.

58 Q. Juno McEnroe?
A. Same.

59 Q. No reaction from any of these people?
A. As I said before, journalists don't react when you give them information, they take information, it's their job to take and collate information and how they process it 10:56 is their business afterwards.

60 Q. We11, presumably this seismic information prompted a request for some corroborative information from you or corroborative document or file from you?
A. No.

61 Q. Conor Lally, what was his reaction?
A. The same.

62 Q. Was he surprised?
A. He didn't express any surprise to me.

was driven by revenge and this revenge was rooted in this investigation.
74 Q. And not one of them asked you further questions about it?
A. No. In the sense it was, the opportunity was to drop it into the conversation. They had a lot more sources and they could make their own inquiries.

But you see, the comprehensive investigation carried out by Chief Superintendent Frank Clerkin appeared to indicate - and I had understood you not to take issue with it - that from time to time you were complying with journalists' requests for information, documents, background, details across a range of subjects. That's what journalists do, isn't that right, legitimately?
A. Yes. Yeah.

Right. So why would journalists, when they hear from you interesting information, salacious information, smearing information, why would they not at least inquire from you 'Give me further detail if you can' or 'Give me a document', why would they not do that?
A. I don't know why they -- you'd have to ask them that. But all I can say is I passed on that information on to them and it was a matter for themselves how they progressed it.
CHA RMAN I think what counsel is asking you is this, that journalists tend to ask questions and clearly in relation to some of the events, like the burglary at the home of a well known person, they had to come to you to ask for particular details in relation to that.

You supplied them. You shouldn't have, but that's neither here nor there. And so, what counsel is saying, is, look, if you give a bit of information about Maurice McCabe, the question that might trip off their tongue is 'well, what's in this David?', or some question to that effect. Is it fair to summarise your question in that way, Mr. O'Higgins?
MR. MCHEÁL OHGGN: Yes, Chairman.
CHAL RMAN Yes. So that, I think, is the question.
A. Well, the whole idea was to give them the information, was to frame the message to them and they would go and make their own inquiries then.
77 Q. MR. MCHEÁL OHGGN: The Chairman's summary of my question was, look, journalists doing their job --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

78 Q. -- as all of these journalists would've done, would come back with further requests for information or materials. That's what journalists do, acting legitimately. All right? Do you agree about that?
A. Yes.

79 Q. Right. You say, peculiarly, in this instance not a single one of the journalists on the list did that. They remained mute, they did not react one way or the other and, most peculiarly, did not come back and ask a further question surrounding the issue. Now, are you seriously suggesting that happened every single time?
A. Every time I had the opportunity, I dropped in the information in relation to the motivation of Sergeant McCabe. That was the methodology of the way I
operated. I gave the information to the journalist, they would go off and do, I assume, their own inquiries, as they would do with any issue, and contact a number of other sources.
80 Q. You, I think, Superintendent, if we take into account your PD, your protected disclosure, you made a statement -- you made that on, I think, 30th September 2016, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

81 Q. You made your next statement on 13th March 2017 to this 11:01 Tribunal, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

82 Q. 5th May 2017 to this Tribunal, is that right?
A. That's right.

83 Q. And another one on 27th September 2017?
A. That's right, yes.

84 Q. Right. And you're aware, aren't you, that notwithstanding it being an important detail in your allegations that Andrew McLindon was involved and you discussed it with him - I think more than once, is that 11:02 right, the smear campaign?
A. Yes.

85 Q. How many times?
A. I can't put an exact number of times on it, Mr. O'Higgins.
86 Q. Two or three? Four or five?
A. I can't. But I would've spoken to him about it.

87 Q. Double figures?
A. I can't put numbers on it.

88

A11 right. So on your case, he was all over this, was he? He was fully on board with the whole thing, you open7y discussed it with him a number of times?
A. Yes.
Q. Right. Did he show enthusiasm for the project?
A. He's not a person that shows much emotions. He's a professional and that's the way he operates.

In fact, Superintendent, if we look at your next statement to the Tribunal, 13th March 2017, for the first time in that statement you make the allegation attributing to Martin Callinan "ki ddie fiddl er". All
right? But in that statement, which is your second go, so to speak, there's no mention of Andrew McLindon. That's the case, isn't it?
A. Em, if you tell me so, Mr. O'Higgins, I --

96 Q. Well, do we need to go through it?
A. No, I accept what you're saying. I'm not disputing it. So it's not until your statement of 5th May, offering number three, 5th may 2017, that you make this allegation that Andrew McLindon was a person with whom you discussed the smear campaign.
A. Yes, mm-hmm.
Q. And you don't appear to have told Maurice McCabe of the allegation against Andrew McLindon, am I correct about that?
A. No.

99 Q. So, you didn't tel1 Maurice McCabe, is that right?
A. No.

100 Q. Is that not something, in your discussions with Maurice, you would've covered? This was a civilian who, on your case, was now contaminated by this Garda culture you've described, a civilian was now doing down, participating in a plot to discredit Maurice McCabe by besmirching his reputation, perhaps one of the most senior civilians in the force. why would you not impart that to Maurice McCabe in your cathartic meetings with him?
A. It wasn't part of the conversation.
Q. But were you not unburdening yourself of everything to do with the smear campaign?
A. Which I told Sergeant McCabe about.
Q. Pardon?
A. Which I told Sergeant McCabe about.

103 Q. But not about Andrew McLindon.
A. As I said, it, as a conversation, it didn't come up in the conversation.
Q. Or in your first two statements?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I ask you about your changed position in relation to, you become aware that the smear campaign was wrong? when did it dawn on you?
A. It dawned on me, I can't give the exact date, but as I said, I made my protected disclosure in 2016.
Q. We11, can you not put an approximate date on when you had your epiphany?
A. As I said to you, you evolve to that situation. And as I said, I made my protected disclosure in 2016.

107 Q. Well, that was September 2016, isn't that so?
A. That's right.
Q. Right. Was it soon before you made the protected disclosure or is it something that you'd come to realise at an earlier point?
A. As I said, my thought process had evolved and I decided it was the right thing to do.
109 Q. But can you not connect it with an event or a personal experience or a period of your life? Because I mean, we're looking at a fairly broad picture; Martin Callinan departed and you say the smear campaign sudden7y stopped -- we11, let's leave out "sudden7y";
it ceased 25th March 2014. There's two years, two and a half years approximately up until you make your protected disclosure.
A. Yes.

110 Q. So when did you have your epiphany?
A. As I said, my thought process evolved. I made my protected disclosure in 2016.

111 Q. I have that point. But when did you have your -- when did the light bulb come on that this whole smear campaign was morally wrong?
A. As I said, it was an evolution. I can't give you the exact date, all I can say is I made my protected disclosure in September 2016.
Q. All right. Well, tell us about the evolution. When did it evolve?
A. It evolved in my mind as to what was -- I had done and was part of was wrong.

113 Q. And what was to prevent you -- you've told us you were unable, I think, to see it was wrong at the time because, and I think you used the expression a few times, "the hothouse of Garda culture", is that right?
A. That's right.

114 Q. Right. But you were suspended on 28th May 2016 -- '15, from duty, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

115 Q. So would that not have triggered, if not then, shortly afterwards, your change of mind or your epiphany?
A. No.

116 Q. Why not?
A. As I said, it was an evolution. I came to realise what I'd done was wrong and I wanted to do the right thing.
117 Q. A11 right. We11, presumably you confided in somebody when you came to this realisation?
A. I spoke with my wife, yes.

118 Q. Your wife, Miche11e?
A. Yes.

119 Q. When was this?
A. As I said, I can't give you exact dates. But I mean, as I said, it's -- I consulted with my wife.
120 Q. We11, was it in the summer of 2016?
A. As I said, Mr. O'Higgins, it was an evolution in my mind. And I can't give you exact dates of when these things happened, but a11 I can say is I made up my mind that I had to do the right thing.
121 Q. We11, prior to telling your wife, had you told your wife that you had been directed to carry out a smear campaign?
A. Yes, my wife was aware of that.

122 Q. So this is prior to your realisation it was wrong you had told Michelle, is that right?
A. I told that I realised what I had been directed to do was wrong.
123 Q. No, no. No, no, just please focus on the question for a moment. You told us, did you, that you told Michelle 11:11 at some point that you'd been given a command by the Commissioner to carry out a smear campaign, is that right?
A. Yes.

124 Q. Right. This was at some time prior to you realising it was wrong, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Right. So, when was it that you told Michelle you'd been told to do it?
A. I can't give the exact dates in relation to that.

126 Q. We11, on your case, you were told to do it some time in 2013.
A. Yes.

127 Q. So would it have been in 2013?
A. I can't give an exact date, Mr. O'Higgins.

128 Q. Well, was it at the beginning, the middle or the end of the road?
A. I can't, I can't state that with any definity.

129 Q. Well, it was some appreciable length of time before you 11:12 realised it was wrong, is that right?
A. Some appreciable time when?

130 Q. Was it an appreciable period of time before the date or period when you actually realised it was wrong?
A. As I said, it was an evolution of I realised it was wrong.

131 Q. No, no, just focus on this for a second. I'm making a distinction - and you've agreed there is a distinction - between the time when you told michelle of the smear campaign and the time, the later time when you realised 11:13 it was wrong. Okay? Do you understand the distinction I'm seeking to draw?
A. Not really.

132
Q. A11 right. We11, you've told us, I think, that you
confided in Michelle --
A. Mm-hmm.

133 Q. -- that you had been commanded to carry out a smear campaign?
A. Yes. of time?
A. I can't help you with that. Because I just can't give any definity. A11 I know is in 2016 I made a protected disclosure.
Q. We11, are we talking weeks or months, or years?
A. As I said, it was an evolution in my thought process. It was what I'd been asked to do was wrong and I wanted to do the right thing.

137 Q. We11, when you told Michelle of the command, of the existence of the smear campaign, was it still ongoing
A. I would imagine -- yes.
Q. It was. So that helps us a little bit. That means, on your case, it's prior to March 2014, is that right?

139 Q. All right. So, what was your wife's reaction when you told her of the smear campaign and the command you'd been given?
A. I can't tell you what my wife's reaction is.
Q. Why not?
A. Because -- like, I mean, it's a conversation. Like, I mean, that was it, there was no --
Q. We11, first of all, where were you when you told her?
A. I'd imagine I was at home.

142 Q. Right. And was it something that you had been putting off doing and you suddenly felt you needed to get it behind you, or did it suddenly come out spontaneously?
A. Myself and my wife speak on a multiplicity of issues.

143 Q. Right. As you'd expect. So you brought up the subject 11:15 of the smear campaign. And what did you tell her?
A. I told her that Sergeant McCabe, in bringing these allegations to the public arena, was driven by revenge and this revenge was motivated in an allegation that had been investigated by him in 2006.
144 Q. And did you relate to her you were to slip into the conversations with the journalists "No smoke without fire" in relation to the sexual allegation?
A. No.

145 Q. Did you relay to her that you were to slip into the conversation with journalists the existence of the Garda investigation --
A. No.
Q. -- into the sexual allegation?
A. No.

147 Q. But I had understood you to indicate you had told her about the smear campaign?
A. Yes.

148 Q. Were they not the core of it?
A. That Sergeant McCabe was driven by revenge and revenge was motivated in the investigation that had been conducted into him.

149 Q. And you withheld from her the detail about the sexual allegation, did you?
A. I didn't know the intimate details of the sexual allegation.
Q. No, no, not the intimate details, the fact that he had been investigated?
A. Yes, that they investigated him in 2006.

151 Q. In relation to a sexual, an alleged sexual offence on a child; did you mention that to Michelle?
A. Well, I would probably have mentioned it was a member's daughter. I don't know if I said a child, but definitely a member's daughter.

152 Q. Right. A member's daughter?
A. Yeah.

153 Q. And what was her reaction?
A. I can't state what her reaction was.

154 Q. Was she not taken aback by this?
A. No.

155 Q. Was she not surprised that you were spreading this information?
A. Just an order of the Garda Commissioner.
Q. But did she not pass some comment on whether that was an appropriate or fair thing to do?
A. As I said, my wife is not a member of An Garda Síochána, so, em, she wouldn't be making any comments.
157 Q. I'm sorry, I didn't quite --
A. She wouldn't be making any comments in relation to that.
158 Q. But you were telling her quite startling information, were you not, important information, salacious information perhaps, you were telling her of a plan to discredit a serving member by reference to a sexual allegation involving a child; did she not express concern?
A. No.

159 Q. Other than Michelle, did you ever te11 a Garda colleague or anyone in Garda management?
A. I spoke to, as I say, Commissioner Callinan, o'Sullivan and Andrew McLindon.
160 Q. Other than those three?
A. Hmm .

161 Q. Did you tell anyone else?
A. No.

162 Q. Any retired Garda?
A. No.

163 Q. Any friend or acquaintance not in the Guards?
A. No.

164 Q. When did you first approach Mick Clifford of the Irish Examiner?
A. I think it could be June 16 , or May '16 I can't --

165
Q. May 2016?
A. Yeah.

166 Q. What was your purpose?
A. He had written an article in which he had mentioned me favourably and I just thanked him for it.

167 Q. He had written an article concerning what, sorry?
A. Concerning me.

168 Q. And what did it say?
A. I can't recall the article, but I understand it was, you know, that I'd been out of work over a year or something at that stage and it was going on a long time, do you know, something like that. I can't remember the exact, at this stage.
169 Q. But what was your purpose in contacting him?
A. Just to thank him for such an article, do you know. 11:20

170 Q. Was he not, I think did you use the expression "persona non grata", did I see that in some material somewhere?
A. Yes.

171 Q. So he wasn't in the friendly camp in terms of you --
A. well, that was --

172 Q. -- your side?
A. That's when I was part of, when I was serving.

173 Q. That's when?
A. That's when I was serving, when I was part of the Press office.

174 Q. No, no, in May 2016 you're on suspension, but you're still a serving member of An Garda Síochána?
A. Yes, but I'm not an active member of An Garda Síochána.
Q. So you rang up a journalist who was previously off
limits to you, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you ring him up?
A. Yes.

177 Q. And your purpose in ringing him up was to thank him for an article that he had written about you?
A. Yes.

178 Q. Did you discuss anything in relation to the negative briefing campaign?
A. No.

Did you meet Mick Clifford at this point?
A. No.
Q. What's your understanding as to when you, your recollection as to when you first met him?
A. It could be a few months later, I don't know the exact date.
Q. We11, this contact in May of 2016, are you telling us, was that wholly unrelated -- well, sorry, in May 2016 when you contacted mick Clifford, at this point in time had you, I've used the expression, "had your epiphany"; 11:22 had you come to the realisation that the smear campaign was wrong?
A. As I said, my mindset was evolving, as I said, and I decided to make a protected disclosure in September 2016.

182 Q. No, no, you're doing something unusual here now; you phoned up Mick Clifford, who was previously off limits - he's the other side. All right? we're agreed about that, isn't that right, on your case?
A. Well, we didn't -- I didn't, I'd no engagement with Mr. Clifford when I was in the Press office.
Q. No, but he was so off limits to you that he didn't appear on your list of nine or even on the supplemented list. You never even attempted to debrief him negatively about Maurice McCabe, isn't that so?
A. That's right.

184 Q. Right. You're now doing something, you're breaking from that, you're contacting him, it's May 2016 and I'm wondering is it connected with your epiphany?
A. I can't say it is.

185 Q. Did you make any arrangement to meet him in that phone cal1 --
A. No.

186 Q. -- at a later date?
A. No.

187 Q. So how did it come to pass that you did meet him in the summer that followed? who contacted who?
A. I can't remember whether he contacted me or I contacted him.

188 Q. And can I ask you this: where were you meet and for what purpose?
A. I think he called to my house.

189 Q. Out of the blue?
A. We11, as I said, I can't remember if I rang him or he rang me, but an arrangement was made to meet.
190 Q. Did you know the purpose of it?
A. Em, I understand he was writing a book at the time.

191 Q. Was the book not much later?
A. I think -- it was much later, but I think I understand he was writing a book or in the process of writing a book in relation --

192 Q. And was it not in your -- did you not know why he was calling round?
A. As I say, we'd arranged to meet and when he came around I think he was telling me he was writing a book.
Q. And was it at his prompting that this meeting happened?
A. As I said to you, I don't know whether I rang him or he rang me. I just, I can't give you that clarity.

194 Q. Al1 right. We11, I'm going to come back to that, if you don't mind. Deputy John McGuinness.
A. Yes.

195 Q. When did you first approach or contact him?
A. I didn't approach him. He contacted my wife.

196 Q. He contacted your wife?
A. Yes.

197 Q. And can you recall when was that approximately?
A. I think it was in late 2016.
Q. And did you become aware as to why he contacted your
A. Maurice McCabe had told my wife that John McGuinness was anxious to meet us.
Q. Did your wife have any connection with Deputy McGuinness?
A. No.
Q. Is your wife in Fianna Fáil?
A. I think it's unfair on me to ask what my wife's political persuasion is.

CHA RMAN We11, I'm tending to agree with you. But I suppose was there a connection --

MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes.
CHA RMAN -- in terms of party membership or anything of a similar kind -- anything of a similar kind makes it broader. Was there any kind of connection in terms of membership of any organisation, just let's say any organisation?
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes, I don't mean to inquire into prurient detail.

CHAL RMAN No, and I appreciate that. And I appreciate there's nothing wrong with being in Fianna Fáil, there's nothing wrong with being a deputy. All of that kind of stuff, we take that as a given. But was there a connection of any kind, if you wouldn't mind just answering?
A. My wife is a member of a political organisation.

201 Q. MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Right. Just it's relevant to how they had a connection or if they had a connection.
A. They had no connection personally. But they shared a similar membership.

202 Q. Right. And your understanding of matters is that Deputy McGuinness rang your wife, indicating that Maurice McCabe wished that they'd meet, was that it?
A. Yes.

203 Q. Right. when did you first approach or contact Maurice McCabe?
A. Maurice McCabe rang me, I never approached him.

204 Q. A11 right. And when was that?
A. I would imagine he rang me out of the blue some time in Ju7y '16.
Q. And how are you able to put a time period on that?
A. Well, I just, I recall receiving a phone call from him.

August/September, right. Superintendent, I'm going to ask you to deal with a chronology and I'm going to ask you some questions by reference to a chronology that I've done out for myself actually just to help my own understanding of matters.
CHA RMAN Mr. O'Higgins, I'm sure you're not going to trespass on privilege, but I imagine, I would assume, Superintendent, that from 28th May 2015 when you were arrested, suspended and a discipline process began, that had you immediately thereafter started to consult a solicitor, perhaps --
A. Oh, yeah, that was ongoing --

CHA RMAN -- perhaps through your association with your Superintendents Association or --
A. That's correct. Even prior to my --

CHA RMAN Even prior to that time. Yes, all right.
208 Q. MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: A11 right. But the date that
you offered initially there as to a solicitor, was that in relation to --

CHA RMAN I thought we were speaking about the specific matter, so that's why I -- but it's a fair
question, Mr. O'Higgins. Were we talking about the conscience matter, the campaign or were we talking about matters which had occurred previously, your suspension, being off duty for a year and more there?
A. Yeah, it was an ongoing consultation I had with my solicitor. It was a number of years at that stage.
Q. MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: A number of years?
A. Yes. It started in December '14 is my first consultation with my solicitor and I remained in regular contact all the way through.
210 Q. Right. But can I just ask you this: Did you attend your solicitor in relation to the smear campaign issue, and if so, when?
A. I made the protected disclosure with consultation with my solicitor.
Q. No, but --

CHA RMAN Well, you'd first had a phone seized on 8th September -- sorry 18th December 2014.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN So that must've given you an idea that there 11:30 was a problem.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN There was a train coming down the tracks.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN So would it be fair to place it in around that time?
A. When I first consulted with my -CHAI RMAN Yes.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN About any of this stuff?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Yes, all right.
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: well then, dealing with the chronology that I'm going to try and frame my questions around, October 2013 was the initial incident involving the Roma children being taken into Garda custody, isn't that so?
A. Yes.

213 Q.
The journalist's article that was, if I may say, suspiciously wel1 informed appeared the next day, 22nd October 2013, on1ine, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

214 Q. And in the period after Martin Callinan's departure on 25th March 2014, am I right in my understanding from the materials that you felt isolated and excluded from that time onwards?
A. Well, I was never in the Commissioner's office again after that, after the night that Mr. Callinan left. So does that mean yes, you felt isolated and excluded by Nóirín O'Sullivan?
A. Well, as I said, I was no longer a lead role in the Press office.

216 Q. And in June '14, 10th June '14, your role, your duty in the Press office came to an end and you started in the Traffic section in Dublin Castle?
A. That's correct.

217 Q. And nothing particular may turn on it, but am I right in my understanding that in fact you were in the

Commissioner's office discussing an issue about your transfer on one occasion subsequent to 25 th March?
A. No. I was never in the Commissioner's office.

Al1 right. Nóirín o'sullivan informed you, didn't she, prior to June '14, she informed you in fact in May of her proposal to move you out?
A. Yeah, she rang me up by phone and informed me over the phone I was moving out. moved out of the Press office?
A. I was disappointed to move on. angry?
A. I was disappointed to move on. I'd given a lot of work to the Press office, I felt I'd done a good job, and I was in the middle of my Master's studies at that stage in relation to media and that. So I was disappointed to move on.

221 Q. And your Master's was in communications?
A. In political communications.

222 Q. Political communications. And that was in DCU?
A. That's correct.

223 Q. And you were putting a good lot of effort into that?
A. I was.

224 Q. Was that a Master's by thesis or Master's by exam or what was it?
A. A Master's by thesis.
Q. By thesis, right. And you were doing it whilst continuing, obviously, to be a serving member of an

Garda Síochána?
A. Yes, I was doing it on a part-time basis over two years.
Q. Right. And you received this news in May, formaliseed in June then with your departure from the Press Office?
A. That's right. You're not suggesting it was on a purely acquaintance or friendly basis? You were providing them with disclosures and material, isn't that right?
A. We11, that matter was dealt with as part of a comprehensive investigation. And as I said. I remained in touch with the media after I left the Press Office because I had built up good relationships with them.

231 Q. But isn't this proof positive you were not at all
pleased to be put out of the role of Press Officer, so much so that you continued to conduct a class of private Press Office yourself from Dublin Castle?
A. That's not true. As I said, I had the availability to me to challenge my transfer if I wished, and I didn't take that availability, which is within in our regulations, $I$ took my transfer and I left. Do you ever recall indicating to a colleague, in a text or otherwise, 'I'm currently in the dungeon in Dublin Castle awaiting parole'?
A. I can't recall such a text, but I'm sure you -- Did one of your colleagues indicate you weren't sleeping? Did you see any of that? You weren't here for the evidence, but did you see on transcript a reference to you not sleeping, you weren't taking wel1 the move?
A. Em, you'11 have to refresh me with that, Mr. O'Higgins, I --
Q. Was it Chrissie Fitzpatrick?
A. AS I said --
A. Yeah, I --
Q. Were you sleeping at this time? Were you having difficulty sleeping?
A. As I said, the departure and the events surrounding the departure of Commissioner Callinan were very traumatic. 11:37
239 Q. We11, are you being fair in limiting it to that? You see, just if we broaden it out to the wider chronology, just looking at it for a moment, that affected you personally, the Commissioner is gone in March '14, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

240 Q. Chief superintendent Frank Clerkin's investigation commences in August 2014 and he compiles his six-man team, or six-person team, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

241 Q. If we move it on from there, you were called upon to give a statement to Frank Clerkin's investigation on the 21st November 2014, isn't that so?
A. That's right.

242 Q. I wonder if we could have page 2351 put up on screen please? It's Volume 9, Superintendent, for your benefit there. And this is the statement of yourself taken on 21st November 2014. Just if we scroll down slightly: "At Dubl in Castle by inspector David

Gal I agher of Santry Garda station." Do you remember giving this statement?
A. Yes.

243 Q. And if we could turn over then to the next page, page 2352, page two of the statement, if we could scroll down to where there's a blacked out spot and J24 is within -- that's it there, yeah. So just underneath that deletion mark, halfway along the line the following is stated in your statement:
"The first know edge that $I$ had of this incident at Tallaght on 22nd October 2013" -- that's the taking into care of the Roma children, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

244 Q. "WAs when it was brought to my attention that it was becoming a news itemthat was attracting redi a attention. I can't recall the time became aware of this. I immedi at el y cont acted the Commissi oner and spoke with himwith regard to this inci dent becoming a medi a event."

Just pause there. That's a false statement, isn't it?
A. No.
Q. I beg your pardon?
A. No.

246 Q. So it's not false for you to have told the Clerkin investigation that the first knowledge you had of the incident in Tallaght on 22nd October was when it was brought to your attention that it was becoming a news
item that was attracting media attention, that's not false?
A. No.

247 Q. You see, Chief Superintendent Clerkin, when giving his evidence, was brought through this statement.
A. Yeah.

248 Q. And he confirmed from his analysis of the phone records and his knowledge of the investigation that in fact this was incorrect, it was false, because you had seen the patrol officer's report at an earlier time.
A. No, I did not.

249 Q. And you see, the reason I mention this is that he was not challenged in giving that evidence by your counsel.
A. I did not see that report. And there's no evidence in the report to suggest that I got that report.
250 Q. Al1 right. You see, I'd understood you to indicate, and perhaps it's my error, but I'd understood you to indicate that in point of fact you were accepting you had made all the disclosures as set out in the clerkin investigation report.
A. And that's correct in that situation. I have made my position clear on Monday and Tuesday, Mr. Chairman. But in relation to that, I did not get the, for clarification, the patrol officer's report.
CHA RMAN We11, it may be simpler to cut to the chase, 11:41 and forgive me if I'm doing so wrongly, Mr. O'Higgins, I don't mean to intervene unnecessarily. But there was an article in the newspaper about the seizure of this child who happened to have blonde hair, it's just one
of these genetic quirks that come along, but it caused a lot of controversy when it did come out because people thought - that's before anyone doing any DNA tests or anything - that this could be a kidnapped child. But I mean, that was a big brouhaha about nothing and the unfortunate Roma suffered over the brouhaha in the press, presumably the child suffered as we11. It was all going to be sorted out and the right thing done. And were you, at least in part, the author of that coming into the newspapers?
A. No, not that part.

CHAN RMAN what part?
A. I wasn't of that part, of any part of that.

CHA RMAN So you didn't give any information --
A. No.

CHAN RMAN -- on the Roma child --
A. No.

CHA RMAN -- or the Tallaght incident to any newspaper?
A. No.

CHA RMAN And when Superintendent Clerkin told me that he ascertained who had got reports from that, you were one of the people who got reports he told me and that something very similar to the report that you had then appeared in the newspaper the next day.
A. There was two statements taken from Superintendent Duff in which he -- the first statement he never said he sent me an e-mail, in the second he said he did, but an examination found there was no connection of e-mails
between me and Superintendent Duff. So that report came the day after.

CHA RMAN Anyway, you'd nothing to do with --
A. No, not --

CHA RMAN -- with the blonde Roma child thing appearing in the newspaper?
A. No.

CHAN RMAN A11 right.
MR. MCHEÁL O H GG NS: You were aware, were you not -well, have you any explanation as to why you didn't organise it for your legal team to challenge this evidence when it was given by Frank Clerkin?
A. I think any discussion $I$ have with my legal team is privileged.
A11 right. We'11 move matters on then; 18th December 2014, your phone is seized. And I suggest to you the evidence has been, uncontested, that your first move after this happens is to contact a journalist.
A. I contacted my association President and General Secretary and then I contacted my solicitor.
253 Q. And you contacted the journalist who had written the initial story that caused all the brouhaha?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAK Well, what are we talking about here? what's the brouhaha?
MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: The October, the disclosure of the Roma child --

CHA RMAN The Roma child incident. Yes, all right. So I'm sorry, I interrupted, would you just -- so you
contacted your solicitor, the President of your Superintendents Association and did you also contact the journalist who --
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN -- broke the Roma child story? You did.
A. Yes.

254 Q. MR. MC CLEÁL O H GG NS: And at this point in time this was a difficult thing for you, I take it - your phone was seized?
A. Yes, my phone was seized by Chief Superintendent

Clerkin. I was very concerned about it. The next day I sent an e-mail to him just querying the basis for taking it. And he sent me back an e-mail to say he was investigating the Roma and Athlone situation, and he assured me in his e-mail that I was not under criminal investigation.

255 Q. We11, are you suggesting that at the time of the phone being taken -- we11, first of al1, I think, in fairness to the chief superintendent, he indicated you gave it up --
A. Yes.
Q. -- you voluntarily gave it up --
A. Yes.

257 Q. -- when asked?
A. Yes.

258 Q. Right. And are you suggesting you were left in the dark as to Chief Superintendent Clerkin's purpose in asking you for your phone?
A. Well, he told me it was in relation to the Roma and

Athlone, those two cases were simultaneous --
Yes?
A. And he said to me explicitly in the e-mail that $I$ was not the subject of criminal investigation into matters, he would progress matters as quick as possible.

260 Q. Yes. But isn't it the case - and you're aware of this, aren't you - that this investigation did not start out as an investigation into Superintendent David Taylor, this investigation broadened once the records were obtained and you became a person of interest; you're aware of that?
A. Yes, it started with, the Roma children was the centre, was the start and then yes.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

264 Q. And any suggestion to the contrary that there was a targeting of you by dint of this investigation is wrong?
A. Well, I was the person -- I think I'm the only Garda whose phone was seized or taken I think.

265 Q. Was it not the case that your colleague in Tallaght also had his phone examined?
A. Em, I've seen that now from the file. But as I said, I was -- outside of that I think --
A. I took legal advice, Mr. Chairman.
you're not actually obliged to follow advice you're given.
A. Yeah. well, that's --

CHA RMAK I mean, someone could advise me to have my heart changed tomorrow; I'm not obliged to do that. You get legal advice, but you can do whatever you want in consequence of it.
A. I took legal advice and I accepted that legal advice. the process that was going to follow from that?
A. Yes.

273 Q. Namely that a file would be prepared and would go to the DPP, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

274 Q. And that that process could -- might take some time?
A. Yes.

275 Q. You were also aware, I take it, of the possibility of disciplinary, Garda disciplinary proceedings also
following down the tracks at some point?
A. Yes.

276 Q. Moving the timeline on, I think on 19th December -well, actually, before that didn't something significant happen in your 1ife on 25th November 2014, ahead of that now - sorry, I'm going back in time a little bit. 25th November 2014, Nóirín O'Sullivan was
A. That's right.

277 Q. How did you receive that news?
A. How do you mean how did I receive it.
Q. No, I've asked you did your congratulatory text reflect your view or views on the Commissioner getting the job? Did you welcome her appointment?
A. I sent her a text congratulating her on her appointment.
CHA RMAN We11, I think the question you're being asked is a bit different. Let's suppose so and so is appointed to the Supreme Court, take it me, and you think I'm the biggest muppet on earth and you think it's a really, really stupid decision and I've got there by soaping people's backs; that's what you're being asked about, how did you feel about it?
A. How I felt about it is they wouldn't be my number one choice. But that's just me.
Q. MR. MCHEÁL O HGG NS: And does it go further than that?
A. Well, as I said, it wouldn't have been my number choice 11:52 to be appointed Commissioner, and that's my personal position.
Q. Did you not tell a colleague you were gutted?
A. I can't recall saying that. But if you're telling me --
Q. We11, does that reflect how you felt; you were gutted?
A. We11, as I said to you, she wouldn't have been my number one choice to be Garda Commissioner.
Q. I think it's capable of a straightforward answer; does that reflect, broadly speaking, how you --
A. I can't say whether I was gutted or not. I'm just saying to you, Mr. O'Higgins, that she wouldn't have been my number one choice to be Garda Commissioner.
Q. It wasn't good news for you, was it, in terms of your career? And you knew that?
A. Well, as I said, my career is in the lap of other people.
Q. Yes, that's the point of my question. As you perceived it, this wasn't a good development for your career, was it, Nóirín O'Sullivan getting the top job?
A. We11, as I said, the promotion and advancement of people is a matter for other people.
Q. A11 right. Moving the timeline on, we were in 2015 and we were at the point in time when you were arrested in

May 2015. 19th December 2015, Chief Superintendent Clerkin enters your office and, the evidence was, seized your laptop and another phone?
A. Mm-hmm.

291
A. Yes. Sorry, what date was that again? CHA RMAN You're varying between 18 th and 19th now. I
think it is in fact the phone was analysed up to 19th, CHA RMAN You're varying between 18 th and 19 th now.
think it is in fact the phone was analysed up to 19 th, I thought maybe it was the following day. But it doesn't matter, it's certainly there or thereabouts. 11:54

11:53

292 Q. MR. MCFEÁL OHGGN: It's just prior to Christmas of 2015 we're talking about.
A. 18th December 2014 my phone was taken.
Q. But was there not, in December '15, a laptop and, I thought, another phone seized?
A. No. No.
Q. Was your laptop seized?
A. In February '15.

295 Q. In February '15?
A. Yes.

296 Q. All right. I stand corrected, excuse me.
A. okay.

297 Q. You've a good timeline in these events, have you?
A. Well, you just asked me to clarify something and I clarified it.
298 Q. I'm not challenging you on it --
A. Yeah.

299 Q. -- I'm just commenting, you seem to have a good memory for these dates?
A. We11, I just know the dates that matters, that phones were taken off me, I just seem to know that.
Q. Yes. Perhaps it's in contrast to your ability to remember other dates?
A. Well, they're significant dates in anybody's career. 11:55
A. That's correct.
Q. And I think the papers for that are in the materials that have been distributed, isn't that so?
A. That's right.

Would you mind looking at those for a moment please? It's in Volume 1, Superintendent, beside you there. CHA RMAN I just want to be clear about this if you wouldn't mind, Mr. O'Higgins, before we move on.
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes.
CHA RMAN The complaint that your wife made about your phone is in fact the phone that I never got, that Garda Headquarters never got, but which you kept in your possession --
A. No, no, no --

CHA RMAN -- after changing your phone and which was then given to your daughter.
A. No.

CHA RMAN Is that right or wrong --
A. No.

CHA RMAN -- maybe you'd just help me on it?
A. I'11 just he1p you. In November 2015, Chairman, a neighbour came around to our house --

CHA RMAN No, I know that story --
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN -- but what I'm interested in is what phone we're talking about.
A. It would've been the phones I did -- that were seized from me.

CHA RMAN Not the one you kept?
A. No. No.

CHA RMAN And you're sure about that?
A. Well, we were trying to get the technical expertise on it.

CHA RMAN I'm just wondering how you could be sure about that, that it was not the phone that you kept, but one of --
A. No.

CHA RMAN -- the ones that the Gardaí had?
A. These were phones, the last three phones that I did have, that were seized.

CHA RMAN Well, could you be sure it wasn't the one that you kept?
A. Well, without the technical --

CHA RMAN Yeah. Well, if it's of any consolidation you seem to think this is significant - I actually get weird messages from people every day -- well, not quite every day, but most days, from lay litigants etcetera.
A. But this was a phone that I didn't have in my possession.

CHA RMAN A11 right. And sometimes I get messages from people who were former professors of mine in college who never sent the message.
A. Well, this is a phone $I$-- the last time I had a Garda phone was 28th/29th May 2015. So I'd no possession or control of that phone. And in November ' 15 my
neighbour came to me --
CHA RMAN No, I know all about that.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN I know a11 about that. But these things happen, you know? So it's not SMO --
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN -- which is what I am calling the phone from 11:57 October 2013 --
A. No.

CHA RMAN -- when you were in the Garda Press Office, which you kept?
A. Yes.

CHAN RMAN Which was never handed to Garda Headquarters, which I never got --
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN -- which has somehow disappeared. It is not SM3, which is the phone you had up until 18th December 11:57 2014 which you surrendered. It is not SM2, which is the phone you had up to 15th February 2015, which was seized in your office --
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN -- pursuant to a search warrant?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN You don't know which phone it was?
A. I don't know which one of those three.

CHA RMAN But you made a -- your wife made a complaint 11:58 nonetheless?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAK why your wife?
A. I can't make a complaint. Because as I said, it caused distress to our neighbours in relation to -- they were quite distressed over this message request that suddenly came from my own to their phone.

CHA RMAK Saying what?
A. They wanted to join a viber group that was in relation to their elderly father.

CHA RMAK okay.
A. Which was rather strange.

CHA RMAN Yes, all right. So we go back to that then. So we were at the point where Michelle Taylor, February 2016, makes a complaint about your phone to the Garda Síochána Ombudsman's Commission.
A. Yes.

305 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: And I think, just as a detai1, Superintendent, you're aware that that was discontinued, the investigation by GSOC, in
circumstances where the people nominated by your wife declined to provide a statement, is that right?
A. They provided a statement, but they wouldn't sign it because GSOC wouldn't give them a copy of the

306 Q. And it was discontinued by GSOC?
A. It was, yes.

307 Q. Yes. I mentioned the judicial review; could I ask you to look at page 24 of Volume 1 please, which gives the index of the Book of Pleadings for your judicial review proceedings?

CHA RMAN And maybe in going there, as we've been so particular about dates, Mr. O'Higgins, you'11 just tell me, I know there was never leave granted for judicial review --
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes.
CHA RMAK -- but there was an occasion when it first appeared in court.
MR. ḾCHEÁL O HGG NS: That's right. We11, Chairman, I suppose the first document then would be page 87. CHA RMAN Yes. And what date do you say that is? MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: And so there's an order of 29th February 2016.
CHA RMAN Yes, okay. So that's it.
MR. ḾCEÁL O H GG NS: Is Judge Noonan's order at the time of, as I understand it, of the ex parte application for leave to issue judicial review proceedings.
CHA RMAK And he was saying 'I'm not going to give

MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Exactly.
CHA RMAN Yes, all right.
308 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: So, Superintendent, there was
an application moved on 29th February 2016 for leave, or for permission to issue the judicial review proceedings and Judge Noonan, who took the list, directed that the application should be brought on notice to the Commissioner of An Garda Síochána and the 12:00 DPP.
A. I'11 take your word for it. I'm not an expert in these type of things, I would be operating on my legal advice, so I can't --
309 Q.
Right. Well, can I ask you this - we're talking now about February 2016.
A. Yeah.

310 Q. At this point in time you're bringing judicial review proceedings against the Guards?
A. Mm-hmm.

311 Q. Had you had your realisation, your sort of epiphany moment that the smear campaign was wrong, had that occurred at that point?
A. As I said earlier on, the evolution in my thought process that led me to make a protected disclosure in February -- or in September '16.
312 Q. Well, does it not assist you, you've taken a fairly solemn step, a step that one doesn't take every day, you've gone to the trouble, and undoubtedly expense, of instructing lawyers to bring a High Court proceeding on 12:01 your behalf, it's against An Garda Síochána and the Director of Public Prosecutions, and I'm suggesting to you that you should be in a position to tell us if at that point in time you have or you haven't formed a
view that the smear campaign was wrong. So can you tell us has the issue tumbled for you at this point?
A. As I said, it was an evolution in my mind, in my process that led me to make a protected disclosure in September '16.
CHAN RMAN No, but what Mr. O'Higgins is asking you about is this: There's a lot of significant things happening; your wife has decided to make a complaint to GSOC; you've commenced a judicial review proceeding, which is very difficult, because you've got to give your solicitor instructions, there has to be an affidavit written out, you have to check that affidavit, you have to swear it on the bible or you have to affirm, and then you have to go into court and then you're awaiting the outcome. So what he's asking you about is - those are very significant things - by that stage had you come to the conclusion 'Look, what I was involved', as you say, at the behest of Commissioner Callinan, 'in was actually a really terrible thing, a really wrong thing'?
A. Well, as I said, $I$ can't give a definitive date and time, Mr. O'Higgins.
313 Q. MR. MCFEÁL OHGGN: But this doesn't help you with locating whether by this point in time you had come to your realisation?
A. No.

314 Q. Right. We11, if we'd look at a point there raised by the Chairman; you did complete an Affidavit of Verification, didn't you? we see it there referred to
on page 24. You provided an affidavit confirming the factual matters set out in your statement of grounds, isn't that so?
A. Yes.
A. Yes.

316 Q. And I think if we turn to page 43 of the papers please for a moment. And I think that is the first page of your verifying affidavit for these proceedings, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

317 Q. And if we can just scroll down there a little bit. Do you see there it says, you say in the first paragraph that you're a member of An Garda Síochána holding the rank of superintendent and then the applicant, and:
"I make this affidavit fromfacts within my own know edge, save where ot her wi se appears and where so ot herwi se appearing I bel ieve those facts to be true."

That's something you swore to, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

318 Q. And in the next paragraph you aver that:
"I have read and I have caref ully consi dered the
statement requi red to ground application for judicial revi ew. Insof ar as the statement refers to my own acts and deeds, 1 bel ieve those acts and deeds to be true and accurate and insof ar as they rel ate to the acts and
deeds of any other person, l believe those acts to be true."

And presumably it was explained to you the significance of averring as to that, was it?
A. Yes.

319 Q. And then in the third paragraph you proceed to verify the Statement of Grounds and you exhibit the relevant materials, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

And you refer to a booklet of the relevant materials that is in your possession. And they are exhibited, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

321 Q. And then if we turn to the Statement of Grounds itself, Superintendent, I think that's to be found initially on page 28 I think it is -- page 29, excuse me. We won't go through it too extensively, but in fact I suppose we might take it up from page 35 of the materials, which is paragraph E21 of your Statement of Grounds. So page 35 please, if we could have that on screen. And you see there about halfway down there's paragraph 21 -CHA RMAK It possibly would help you if you took out Volume 1 there Superintendent.
A. I can see it.

CHA RMAN And I know it's on the screen.
A. Oh, yes.

CHA RMAN If you wouldn't mind just taking out volume 1. If you turn to page 35 of it it's better, because we're only getting half a page and you can see the
whole thing.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN If you want to make any contradiction or qualification, you can see the whole text there.
322 Q.
MR. MCHEÁL O HGG NS: So just to assist you, superintendent, if you turn in the booklet to page 35.
A. Yes.

323 Q. And there's paragraphs 19 down to 22 on this page, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

324 Q. And do you see paragraph 21 there?
A. Yeah.
Q. You're saying the following:
"Having regard to the appl icant's position as a menber of An Garda Sí ochána, his rank, his record of service to the State, his age and family circumstances, the arrest or, any suggestion of it, was made excl usi vel y for the purpose of exerting further and additional pressure and/ or was for the purpose of causing embar rassment to the applicant and/ or was for the purpose of inflicting emotional pain and suffering upon the appl icant and/ or was for the purpose of hol ding the appl icant up to public ridicule and contempt."

Can we take it, you gave your lawyers instructions to make that case on your behalf?
A. Yes, I consulted my lawyers.

326 Q. And you verified the correctness and accuracy of that
averment, isn't that right, in your affidavit?
A. That's right.
Q. So is it your position that your arrest in May of 2015 and any suggestion of it, was made exclusively for the purpose of exerting further and additional pressure upon you?
A. Well, as I say, it was a very significant moment in my career, very public moment in my career.
CHA RMAK Superintendent, you have to try and answer the question if you don't mind.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAK I appreciate it is a difficult thing to be giving evidence, but what Mr. O'Higgins is asking you about is this. You were indeed arrested and suspended on the 28th May 2015.
A. That's correct.

CHA RMAK And in your affidavit to the High Court on the 29th May 2016, made under oath, you're saying I wasn't arrested for any genuine reason by my colleagues in the Garda Síochána, I was arrested because they wanted to humiliate and ridicule me, in other words it's an abuse of public office. That is what you are saying. So that is what he is actually asking you about.
A. Yeah. I'm not disputing, as I said, the arrest. As I said, it was a traumatic event.
328 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O HGG NS: Can I take it from that answer that you're abandoning the claims made in paragraph 21 there?
A. I'm just saying it was a huge embarrassment to me, it was -- it inflicted a lot of emotional pain and suffering upon me, as a serving superintendent with an unblemished service to now find myself in Garda custody.

12:09
Q. Are you abandoning the claim that your arrest by the arresting Gardaí was for the purpose of causing you embarrassment?
A. Well, I'm saying it did cause me a lot of embarrassment.
Q. That's not what the paragraph says.
A. What I'm just saying is that in my --

CHA RMAR Let me give you an example. And sorry, for intervening, Mr. O'Higgins, but it may help.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAK Let's suppose, and there's a great deal of talk about it, you are a policeman and you don't like, for instance, Chinese people and so, you just go out and you arrest a Chinese person or someone who looks like a Chinese person, they may indeed be Irish people, just for the purpose of annoying them.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN That'd be a wrong thing to do.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN On the other hand, if you have information that a particular person, perhaps of Chinese origin, may have been involved in some crime, which is arrestable, let us say drug dealing, or whatever, and you go and arrest them, we11 then, you're doing the
right thing. So that is what Mr. O'Higgins is asking you about.
A. I'm not disputing the right of the Garda Síochána in this matter.

MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: No, but this paragraph and elsewhere, as we will look at in a moment, there is a suggestion that the investigation team, Chief Superintendent Frank Clerkin's team were doing something improper; namely, in this case, they were arresting you for the purpose of exerting further and additional pressure upon you and for the purpose of causing you embarrassment.
A. I'm not suggesting they did anything improper. I'm just suggesting it caused me a lot of embarrassment and inflicted a lot of pain and suffering upon me. I'm not 12:11 impugning their integrity.

332 Q. So, insofar as that paragraph would suggest that you were making an allegation against the guards concerned, are you withdrawing that allegation?
A. I'm just merely saying that I'm not impugning their integrity, I'm not impugning their rights, I'm just saying that event caused me a lot of embarrassment, pain and suffering.

333 Q. Would you mind turning over to paragraph 24 , page 37 of the materials. In paragraph 24 you state, or it is stated on your behalf:

[^0]autocratic and oppressi ve and they failed to afford to the applicant a reasonable level of courtesy and respect."

If we could just pause there. That's very clear, isn't 12:12 it? It's an allegation that the investigators were disrespectful towards you, acted in an autocratic fashion and acted in an oppressive fashion. Those are allegations against interviewers and Gardaí involved in the investigation, isn't that so?
A. Yes.
Q. You've an opportunity now, if you'd like to avail of it, do you wish to withdraw that allegation or do you wish to stand over that allegation?
A. Well, as I say, you've read the full file, I take it, Mr. O'Higgins, it was very robust questioning. I was placed in a ce11, which I think was pretty oppressive.
Q. So, can I take it from that, that you're standing over what is in paragraph 24 ?
A. I'm just saying how I felt in the sense of, I had turned up at Balbriggan Garda Station by appointment, I wasn't a flight risk, I wasn't any other risk. I had been a station house officer myself when I had cause to detain people and saw it wasn't always necessary to put people in police cells.
336 Q. Are you saying that the guards were heavy handed with you and treated you in a disrespectful fashion?
A. I'm just saying the way -- as I said, it's not always necessary to place people in police cells.
Q. Would you mind reading on the balance of the paragraph where it says:
"Throughout the course of these events, incl uding the deci si on to arrest and detain the appl icant, the i nvestigators were heavy handed. During a period of time bet ween the decisi on to arrest, the making of the arrest and the detention of the applicant information was once agai $n$ leaked whereupon tel evi si on camer as and crews arrived at Bal briggan Garda Station. Thereafter the arrest and detention recei ved very si gni ficant medi a cover age."
A. Yes.

340 Q. So can I ask you, are you standing over the allegation that the Gardaí with whom you had dealings on this occasion were heavy handed towards you, the investigators?
A. All I'm saying is that $I$ turned up by appointment, I was stripped of my shoes, belt, placed in a ce11, as I said information about my arrest appeared in the paper the night before $I$ was due to turn up.
341 Q. I'd understood there to have been evidence from -- not
contradicted again, by Gardaí involved in your questioning, that you made a point of thanking them for the professional manner in which they had conducted their task?
A. As I said, I always conduct myself and I treat people with civility and courtesy at all times in my life. We11, do you regard making allegations against fellow officers of heavy handedness and acting in an oppressive and autocratic fashion, do you regard that as civility if you are not willing to stand over those allegations?
A. As I explained to you, Mr. O'Higgins, I have been a station house officer, it is not always necessary to place people in cells, they turn up by appointment. I always deal with people with civility. Even the worst of criminals that $I$ have dealt with down through my 1ife, when they are released from custody I'd shake hands with them. It's the way I do my business.
343 Q. Would you mind turning over to paragraph 29, superintendent, you make a separate allegation, page 38 12:16 of the materials. And paragraph 29 is a short two-1ine paragraph, do you have that there?
A. I do, indeed.

344 Q. And it says:
"On a date unknown evi dence obtai ned in the course of the af orementioned investigation was tampered with or interfered with."

And you've sworn that as a fact before the High court. Now, I've the same question for you: Are you standing over that or are you withdrawing that?
A. That relates to the viber requests that was sent to my neighbour's phone to which, to this day, I've never got 12:17 any satisfactory explanation as to why it happened.
345 Q. Well, you see, at paragraph 31 you deal with your allegation concerning the viber platform?
A. Yes.

346 Q. Isn't that right?
A. That's right.

347 Q. Two paragraphs down?
A. Mm-hmm.

348 Q. And you say in paragraph 31, on the same page:
"On a date unknown, possi bly on or about 14th Novenber 2015, the devi ces, and in particular the SIM card, became live, the number --"

And we needn't call it out.
"-- attempted to enter private chat on the Vi ber platform Vi ber is a mobile application which allows users to make phone calls to send text messages to ot her Vi ber users, using wifi or 4 G . The Vi ber app
provi des and supports conversation galleries that permit or facilitate public and private chat."

And you go on to say in paragraph 32 you have been
informed "the Garda mobile number tied to the SIM card sei zed in the course of the investigation became live and attempted to enter and/ or communi cate with the private chat group of whi ch one of the applicant's nei ghbour was a menber. This is a closed group. In the circunstances, evi dence has been interfered with or has been tampered with or has otherwi se becone insecure. It has been accessed by third parties and it has been used as af orementioned. "

Now, you were not present but on your behalf I had understood there to have been a concession made by your counsel during the course of last week, I think it was, that you were no longer pursuing this business about the viber being interfered with. That is my recollection.
A. I don't --

349 Q. And that instruction was obtained with an opportunity afforded by the Chairman for counsel, I think it was mr. Ferry at the time, to take instructions expressly from you.
A. Well, as I said, I've never got an explanation as to why the viber requests came live.
350 Q. Well, do you recall getting a phone call from Dublin Castle, from your lawyers, for instructions on this
allegation concerning interference with the viber?
A. Yes.

351 Q. And did you instruct that it was to be indicated on
your behalf you weren't pursuing that?
A. I think, if I am correct, the Chairman was seeking some clarity on the matter and I was providing clarity via my counsel back. That's the reason I think there was confusion as to was it whatsApp or viber, so that was 12:20 the --

352 Q. Al1 right. I'm suggesting to you the following exchange took place. Mr. Ferry said:
"Mr. Chai rman, I just have clarified those
instructions. So, Superintendent Tayl or's instructions is that he has never said the phones were tampered with by Superint endent FI ynn."

And the Chairman asked you:
"Well, by Superintendent FI ynn or by anyone?"

And Mr. Ferry said:
"Well--"

And then the Chairman pressed him:
"Anybody?"

And Mr. Ferry responded:
"Anybody in that department. His concern arose in
rel ation to --"

And Then the Chairman intervened:
"Can we just say by anybody or is he still saying the Garda tampered with his phone, somebody in the Garda tampered with his phone?"

Then Mr. Ferry responded on your behalf:
"No. His concern arose and his evi dence will be that a WhatsApp invitation went live on a phone at a particular time and that al armed himand he was unaware as to how that occurred. And that was the onl $y$ issue that he had in rel ation to any issue that was unusual in rel ation to his phone."

And that was day 69 , page 83 of 101 .
A. I think that situation arose, was I making an allegation against Superintendent Flynn, which I wasn't.

CHA RMAN No, but I suppose we can clarify it now --
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN -- if we couldn't clarify it then. which is, do you think, are you actually saying that someone in the Garda Síochána technical department or the Garda Síochána generally having possession of three of your phones actually tampered with them with a view to framing you or simply tampered with them at a11?
A. I'm merely saying, Mr. Chairman, that that phone sent out a request that was not in my possession in November.

CHA RMAN Sure I know that.
A. I don't know.

CHA RMAN I mean, I know that. And, you know, I live in the real world and I know how phones and emails and a11 the rest of it operate. I mean, I have spoken about people who haven't sent me messages, getting messages from them or saying there's a photograph that may interest you and such and such a site, I get this message and it apparently comes from somebody who is a cousin of mine in Canada, and of course they never sent it at a11. That happens to everybody. I'm asking you a straight question: Are you saying that the Garda Síochána tampered with your phone with a view to manipulating evidence or tampered with your phone at all? Any of your phones.
A. As I say, I can only just say that what happened to the phone and I have never found out what happened to it, how -- maybe there is a legitimate reason why it came alive and sent out a request. I don't know.

CHA RMAK Do you want to answer the question or do you not want to answer the question, superintendent?
A. Well, I can't answer --

CHA RMAN Because I will read the question out to you again. Just listen to it, if you wouldn't mind, please. So, are you saying the Garda Síochána tampered with your phone, any of your phones, with a view to
manipulating evidence or tampered with any of your phones at all?
A. Well, I am just saying I can't answer that question, I don't know whether it is. I just brought my concerns in relation to the phone, that the phone sent out a whats -- or a viber request and I don't know and we tried to establish how that happened. I had concerns in relation to that.

MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: We11, superintendent --
CHA RMAK The concerns could be, you know, some chap in Moldova who is sending out messages generally and manipulating the internet, etcetera, you know it happens, or is your concern -- do you believe, do you believe that the Garda actually interfered with any of your phones? Do you actually believe that? And if the 12:23 answer is yes what is the basis for your belief?
A. I haven't the evidence -- we requested permission by Garda Síochána to get permission to go to Viber in order to establish it. We were never given that permission. That we would pay the expense of obtaining 12:24 the information. Maybe there could be a legitimate reason.

CHA RMAN I mean, look, are you accusing anyone in the Gardaí of actually doing anything to your phone?
A. I can't accuse any single person. I am just bringing the concern.

CHA RMAN You're not answering any of my questions, superintendent.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAK Literally none of them. You're avoiding every single one. If you don't want to answer the question, that's fine.
A. Well, I'm only trying to give the rationale why I raised the concern.

CHA RMAN No, I appreciate that.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN And I appreciate that is why you raised the concern, but I suppose from the point of view of Mr. O'Higgins it may be a wider thing as to whether people in the Gardaí are manipulating your phone in the context of you being arrested and investigated and you're entitled to think, yes, they were.
A. But, as I said, Mr. Chairman, I had deep concern when my neighbour brought this to my attention and the only people that had my phone was Garda Síochána, so I was going to establish was that a possibility.
CHAN RMAN That is fine.
354 Q. MR. MCHEÁL O H GG NS: You're aware, aren't you, that there was a replying affidavit provided by Chief Superintendent Clerkin --
A. Yes.

355 Q. -- where he set out his position in relation to that allegation and explained that viber can be accessed from, not just from one particular phone, it's a platform that can be accessed from a range of portals, isn't that right, or devices?
A. Yes. I take your -- I hear what you're saying.

356 Q. In other words, he explained the position and ought to
have put your mind at rest?
A. Eh, as I said, I still had the concerns and through my solicitors we wrote asking for independent access to the platform.
CHA RMAN Have we spent long enough on this phone now, 12:26 Mr. O'Higgins?
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes.
357 Q. Just before we move off that finally, superintendent, can I ask you to turn to the allegations that were particularised on your behalf on page 39 of the papers 12:26 and these are the legal grounds upon which you were seeking judicial review reliefs from the High Court.
A. Yeah.

358 Q. And do you see there on page 39, it's divided down into roman numerals, do you see $i$, about half way down page 12:26 39:
"The i nvesti gation into the alleged breaches of di sci pline and into the alleged breach of the provi si ons of section 62 of the Garda Sí ochána Act 2005 12:26 have now been tai nted beyond redemption."

That was said on your behalf, isn't that right?
A. Yes. and vi, it is stated:

[^1]v. The investi gation is lacking into credi bility."

Over the page then to page 40 , vii:
"The actions and activities as they have so far been conducted amount to an interference with the admini stration of justice. "

And in viii:
"The actions or activities are manifestly irregul ar."

So you were saying there, were you not, that the Clerkin investigation amounted to an interference with the administration of justice, isn't that right?
A. I was saying I had concerns in relation to, as I said, the phone that raised my concerns.

360 Q. Al1 right. Can we move matters on then and move on to the spring of 2016 and I think it's the case, superintendent, that, am I correct about this, your wife, Michelle, has indicated in a statement that her contacts with Maurice McCabe commenced some time in April or May of 2016, isn't that right?
A. I think it could be later than that. I think. Is it?

361 Q. We're going to hear from her --
A. Yeah.

362 Q. -- but my understanding of matters is that that is her position?
A. It's definitely later. I think I'm certain it's later
than that.

We might come back to that. What prompted your wife to make contact with Maurice McCabe?
A. Maurice McCabe had rang me out of the blue. I said I'11 ring him back. I wasn't going to ring him back. And my wife decided to ring him.
Q. Well, can you just help us, in terms of -- and I'm not asking for precise dates, but was that before or after you had had contact with Michael Clifford?
A. After.
Q. After that?
A. Yeah.
Q. And did you know then or later why Maurice McCabe or how Maurice McCabe came to contact you?
A. No.
Q. We11, do you have any views on that as to how it might have happened or who prompted it?
A. I can't, I can't speak for anybody else.
Q. He didn't discuss with you, did he, when you did get to speak to him, you didn't discuss with him --
A. Does?
Q. -- what prompted him to ring you?
A. No. He decided to ring me unsolicited. I didn't ring him. He rang me.
Q. What I am suggesting to you, that your wife has indicated in her statement that her contacts with Maurice McCabe commenced some time in April/May of 2016, you think that's a little bit later?
A. Oh it's later than that, yeah. . . 4
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Q. But I mean, did it suddenly all crystallise for you on the 20th September or was it weeks or months before that?
A. I decided to meet Maurice McCabe on the 20th September. 12:31

377 Q. We11 other than your wife, Michelle, had you told anybody about the smear campaign prior to the 20th September?
A. I had spoken to a priest.

378 Q. You'd spoken to priest?
A. Yes.

379 Q. And apart from the priest?
A. Nobody else.

380 Q. Had you told Michael Clifford for, instance?
A. No.

381 Q. Had you told Deputy McGuinness?
A. I had never met Deputy McGuinness at that stage.

382 Q. At this point you had no contact with John McGuinness?
A. No.

383 Q. Al1 right. So is it your recollection you had told nobody but your wife and a priest?
A. Yes.
Q. When did you tell your wife that you realised it was wrong?
A. As I said, I can't give you an exact date.

385 Q. We11, do you recall telling her?
A. I would have told her, yeah.
Q. This is now when you realised this is morally wrong and not an appropriate thing to do at all?
A. Yes.

387 Q. What was her reaction?
A. As I said, my wife is fully supportive of the actions of me making a protected disclosure.
388 Q. No, that is not remotely my question. what was her reaction when you told her of the smear campaign and you told her in the context of you indicating it was wrong, very wrong?
A. You're asking me to give an opinion of somebody else's reaction. I can't do that.
CHA RMAN I suppose, the kind of question you're being asked, forgive me for making it humorous, she didn't throw the frying pan at you or anything like that?
A. No.

CHA RMAN I mean, there was no dramatic explosion?
A. No.

CHA RMAN And you didn't explode or anything like that?
A. No.

CHA RMAN So, it was a question of kind of conversations evolving --
A. Conversation, yeah.

CHA RMAN -- over time and perhaps a bit of --
A. Normal discussions between husband and wife.

CHA RMAN Yes. So it was a bit of this, a bit of that.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN And the thing came out over time.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Is what you are saying to me.
A.
Q. She wasn't? She didn't indicate anything to indicate her disfavour or unhappiness that you had done this?
A. Mr. O'Higgins myself and my wife have long discussions about long matters that you're asking me to go into, which I can't.

391 Q. We11, she makes the point, around this time, September '16, she makes the point that you were in a bad place, your mood was low at this time?
A. Yeah.

392
A. Yes.
Q. Or worse?
A. Yes.

397 Q. So the pressure was very much on you, isn't that right?
A. But I made my disclosure notwithstanding those factors.
Q. And at some point in time in the summer of 2016, is that right, you reached out to Mick Clifford?
A. Yes.

399 Q. Did you tell him about the smear campaign?
A. No.
Q. Well then, in what sense did you reach out to him?
A. As I said earlier, he had written an article that was complimentary or supportive and that's why I reached out to him.

401 Q. So was the purpose of that reaching out, was it to open up a bridge to him so that there'd be further discussions?
A. No.

402

Did you offer information or tell Mick Clifford anything relating to the fact that Nóirín O'Sullivan's husband headed up the investigation into your activities?
A. I don't -- I don't recall saying that specifically. We11, do you not recall imparting to him your unhappiness with that matter; that Superintendent

McGowan was involved with the investigation?
A. I don't recall saying that.
Q. Did you tell Mick Clifford that you denied being the party that leaked the patrol officer's report to the journalist Mick McCaffrey?
A. I had never anything to do with the Roma leak.

411 Q. Again, that's not my question, if you don't mind me saying. Did you te11 to Mick Clifford that you denied being the party that leaked the patrol officer's report?
A. I think I would have said I had nothing to do with the Roma leak.

412 Q. Did you convey to him that you had become something of an outcast once the criminal investigation began?
A. I didn't say I was an outcast. I was -- as I said, it 12:37 was a matter -- I was away from An Garda Síochána, what, over a year, $I$ think, at that stage.
413 Q. Did you in any way indicate to him that an acquaintance of Sergeant McCabe was in contact with you in early June 2016?
A. No.

414 Q. Right. I wonder if we could have page 6618 up on screen, which is an extract from Mr. Clifford's book. Superintendent, for your benefit I think it's Volume 25. Actually Mr. McGuinness has already brought you you over, it may have been Mr. Quinn for the Examiner publications. We might actually, sorry, have page 6617 , the page before it, up on screen. This is an
email from the journalist Mick Clifford to you, as I understand $i t$ ?
A. That's correct.

415 Q. It's actually an email of Mick Clifford to Carl Ryan, the investigator for the Tribunal, forwarding to him documents that Mick Clifford had found and was providing by way of assistance to the Tribunal, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

That's the context of it. On this document at page 6617 towards the bottom, we have the email that he sent to you, requesting that you'd check his book, a chapter of his book for accuracy, isn't that so?
A. That's right.

417 Q. And the email reads:
"Dave, this is the chapter I was telling you about where you enter the McCabe story. See what you think, particul arly in terns of factual accuracy."

Isn't that right? That was the gist of his request.
A. Yes.

418 Q. So have a read of this and see what you think of it, particularly in terms of its factual accuracy. And did you understand that request, which is fairly clear from 12:40 that email?
A. I understand the email, yes.

419 Q. Right. And then if we go over the page then, we have the extract from Mr. Clifford's book, and there's very
positive things said about you there, the second paragraph down, on page 6618, it gives a quick profile of yourself, you'd agree with me it's in positive terms, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

420 Q. Do you recall at the time reading it and you were pleased enough about it, understandably, if may say?
A. As I say, I didn't forensically read it as I said yesterday, but --

421 Q. And it indicates towards, halfway down that page:
"Wth a varied and well regarded career he --"

Being yourself.
"-- was an obvi ous choi ce for promtion to superintendent in 2012 assi gned to head up the Garda Press Of fice."

And it makes reference to the fact that:
"All of the most recent occupants of the of fice did thei $r$ few years and left with promotion to chi ef super."

Do you see that there?
A. Yes.

422 Q. And if we go over the page to page 6619, halfway down, the following narrative is set out:
"On the evening Callinan retired --"
well actually, we can take it up a few lines down, because it cuts to the chase of it. It says:
"Wbrse was to cone. Within weeks Tayl or was moved out of the Press Office. He wasn't totally surprised but he was di sappoi nted that the move wasn't accompanied with what he had regarded as the requi site promotion."

If we pause there. Is that something you relayed to Mick Clifford?
A. No.

423 Q. Well --
A. As I say, promotion is not within my gift. Promotion is, as I said, a matter for other people assessing your ability.
424 Q. Ah, superintendent! Maybe I haven't been clear in the way I have asked it. Did you relay to him your disappointment at not being promoted?
A. No. I relayed my disappointment at being moved from the Press office.
Q. And you didn't convey to him any disappointment that you hadn't been promoted once moved?
A. No.
Q. Al1 right. It goes on:
"I nstead he was shifted to Traffic Management."

Then it says:
"Meanwhile in the background another controversy was brewing. The previ ous year there had been an er roneous 12:42 but near hysterical reaction to a story invol ving children being allegedly ki dnapped by Roma families."

And if we turn over the page to 6620 , about a third of the way down -- well sorry, I take it up from the bottom of page 6619. So the bottom of page 6619 we have the last two lines read as follows:
"On foot of that, the Commissi oner I aunched an
i nvesti gation to determine whet her somebody in the force was responsi ble for the I eak."

Do you see that there?
A. Yes.

427 Q. "She appoi nted her husband, Detective Superintendent 12:43 JimMEGowan, to head up the investigation."

Now, there has been sworn evidence before this Tribunal
that that is not correct. Do you stand over that sentence in the book that I'm suggesting to you you
proofread - "She appoi nted her husband, Detective Superintendent Jim McGowan, to head up the i nvesti gation"?
A. A detective superintendent investigating another
superintendent would not happen without the full knowledge of the Commissioner of the day.
CHA RMAN I appreciate that is true.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAK And look, it's understandable that perhaps even in relation to the phone, $I$ have no view on the matter, you may have a particular view that you find very hard to move from. Whether that is accurate or not, I have to think about it. But it was Chief Superintendent Clerkin who was heading up the investigation. It so happened that Detective Superintendent McGowan was also involved.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN But I suppose the question is put in the context of, look, doesn't it make it look as if Nóirín 12:44 O'Sullivan was pulling strings, including getting her husband onto an investigation against you, in fact heading it up? I think that is the import of counsel's question.
A. Well, put it this way, it was unprecedented that a Garda Commissioner would have her husband investigating another officer.

CHA RMAN Well, I suppose you've got to be married to somebody if you are married at all.
A. I understand that.

CHA RMAN So it may be that there may be other precedents knocking around places, I have no idea.
A. But as I said, it was unique in this situation. CHA RMAN Look it may be an appropriate time to break
for an hour. Is it quarter to one, is it? So quarter to two. Just an indicative time if you wouldn't mind please, Mr. O'Higgins? Another hour and a half? MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Chairman, certain7y finish today.

CHA RMAN Al1 right. I'm thinking about Mrs. Taylor, and I don't necessarily want her hanging around here. I'm sure Mr. Barnes can make arrangements if she wants not to be hear that she would be made comfortable in another room, but if you give us some kind of an indication it might be of assistance. Do you want to say three o'clock perhaps?
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: I think it may be ambitious to get to her today would be my sense of it. But if she is reached it would be certainly after three.
CHN RMAN We11, if she does come and it's not long, I'd imagine it wouldn't be long, Ms. Leader, would I be right in thinking?
ME. LEADER: Yes.
CHA RMAN If it was a question of, we could -- I'd prefer that she wouldn't be kept waiting around.
MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Chairman, I have absolutely no objection to that at all.
CHA RMAN No, but if you try and finish then by four o'clock we could call her at four o'clock. Will you try and do that?
MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes. or if you prefer that she is interposed, Chairman, that is fine as well. CHA RMAK No, No.

MR. MEENRO: I would be very grateful, Chairman. CHA RMAN I don't accept thanks or blame but I think that is the right thing to do.
MR. PFELAN Chairman, David Phelan from Hayes
Solicitors representing Irish Times and Conor Lally. There is one very brief matter I would like to put to Superintendent Taylor at the appropriate time. I would like to mention it now.
CHA RMAN You will certainly be given that opportunity, that's no difficulty whatsoever.
MR. PrELAN I just thought I should mention it now. CHAN RMAN All right. It's quarter to two and that gives two and a quarter hours, and I really think that should be enough, Mr. O'Higgins, not to try and interrupt but if it can't be done please tell me closer 12:46 to that time, just in terms of arrangements. Thanks.

## THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED FOR LUNCH

## THE HEARI NG RESUMED AS FOLLONS AFTER THE LUNCFEON

 ADJ OURNENTCHA RMAN Could I just say, Mr. O'Higgins, I'm not going to rush you. I mean, I appreciate it's important 13:49 and this is the centre of things. I'm sorry, superintendent, you may have to spend some time tomorrow. But I intend to call michelle Taylor at half past three and we'11 just intervene. A11 right?

MR. ḾCHÉL OHGGN: Certainly, Chairman, yes.
CHA RMAN Because that would mean we show appropriate courtesy and secondly that you won't be rushed.
MR. BERRY: Chairman, before the witness resumed if I could say that I --
CHA RMAN you could. If you sit down we'11 get the microphone on you, thank you, Mr. Geraghty.
MR. BERRY: Thank you, Chairman. My name is John Berry. I am instructed by Mr. Darragh Mackin, KRW Law, and I am here to represent Ms. Gemma O'Doherty.
CHA RMAN All right. Well, that's fine. I'm sure you will have a few questions at the end. So, that's grand.
428 Q. MR. MCHEÁL OHGGN: Superintendent, we were looking at page 6620 of the materials, which are the extract from Mick Clifford's book on Sergeant McCabe. And perhaps if we turn over then to page 6621, the next page, Mr. Clifford deals with the period from June 2016 onwards. So do you have that there in front of you, superintendent?
A. No, I haven't got it.

429 Q. Well, just to help you, in terms of the hard copy, it's the same volume, volume 25 and it's page 6621.
A. Yes.

430 Q. And we'11 just wait for it to come up on screen there. So it says there:

[^2]standard of living suffered as a result, at a time when hi s two daughters were going through second and third I evel education."

If I can just pause there. Superintendent, I'm not going to ask you any questions, needless to say, about your children, but the situation in relation to your pay, that was a difficult circumstance, wasn't it? You were not just on reduced pay, as I understand it, but in point of fact, because you weren't on duty as you continued under suspension you weren't earning any increased allowances or expenses, which can comprise a significant part of a member's income, isn't that so?
A. That's correct.

431 Q. And again I do not want to in any sense pry into your financial arrangements, but just in terms of giving the Tribunal an idea of how difficult it was for you, as I understand the position, it was your practice to attend, for instance, a lot of crime scenes, quite properly in your role as Press officer, and that would have involved mileage, for instance, mileage allowances and because you were under suspension, all of those would have been lost to you, isn't that so?
A. That's correct.

432 Q. And you were also on reduced actual pay, apart
altogether from not getting any allowances or expenses?
A. That's correct.

433 Q. And I think broadly speaking had it gone down to 70\% but then subsequently was brought back up to $90 \%$ of
your salary?
A. 75\% initially and then brought back to $90 \%$.
Q. 75, excuse me. And presumably this is something that -- wel1, I think we have already heard evidence from other witnesses, I'm thinking of Deputy McGuinness and possibly others, who indicated that your earnings situation was an area of considerable concern for you and indeed for michelle your wife?
A. That's correct.

435 Q. You were telling people this at the time?
A. Yes.

436 Q. In any event, the book continues by June 2016 your 1ife had been completely transformed, reduced pay, family's standard of living suffered. Then it goes on:
"Si nce he had entered the force he had enj oyed an extremel y busy working life. The clock craw ed as he spent endl ess hours at home. He enrolled in education courses but all the time he battled agai nst the spectre of what had become of his life.

One minute a well regarded seni or Garda working in cl ose proxi mity to commi ssi oners and presi dents, the next something of an outcast to whom even former colleagues were wary of associ ating with."

Is that a reasonably accurate description?
A. I was suspended from duty, so I wasn't in the company of my former colleagues, so that is a simple fact.
Q. It goes on:
"Those colleagues who were investigating hi mith what Tayl or consi dered excessi ve zeal were, as he had once been himself, only following orders. That was Dave Tayl or's station when he came into contact with Maurice McCabe. In early June an acquai nt ance of McCabe's had been in cont act with David Tayl or on a separate matter."
who is that?
A. I don't know.

439 Q. But you -- at the request of the journalist, you had read over this chapter, did it not --
A. No.

440 Q. Did you not want to ensure everything was correct and query with the man what's that about?
A. I said I did not give it a forensic perusal.

441 Q. It was just a couple of pages you were sent. I mean, it wasn't whole swathes of the book.
A. As I said, I did not go through it line-by-line.

442 Q. It goes on:
"In the course of a conversation Tayl or expressed
regret for what had been visited on MECabe by seni or management over the years."
well, forget about the proofreading aspect, did you have a conversation with somebody other than Maurice McCabe in which you expressed regret for what had been caused, what had been visited on McCabe by senior management over the years?
A. As I said in this morning's evidence, I spoke to a priest.

443 Q. So the acquaintance here is a priest, is it?
A. I'm not saying that. You asked me did I speak to somebody else and I did, I spoke to a priest.
"Some weeks I ater --"

The book indicates.
"-- this was conveyed to McCabe in a casual manner."

Well, that's hardly the priest now, is it?
A. Well, I'm only saying Maurice McCabe rang me and I did not seek Maurice McCabe and then subsequently I met him on 20th September. That is the first time I ever met him.
Q. Well, I mean, who might this person be?
A. I can't say who that person is. I can only tell you who I know.
Q. The book continues:
"Sone weeks later this was conveyed to McCabe in a casual manner but the latter found it interesting. Where was this guy coming from MLCabe had known Tayl or only by reputation and by sht from TV pi ctures on the numerous occasi ons he was seen at the shoul der of Martin Callinan. Now this guy was sounding as if he was on McCabe' s si de. "

Then it goes on, we needn't read out all of the extract, if we go on to page 6622 it narrates that, at ${ }_{\text {13:57 }}$ the top of page 6622 it relates to your wife's contact with Maurice McCabe, and it says:
"The call took David Tayl or by surprise."

This is the call to you now from Maurice McCabe, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

447 Q. "He felt agitated when the call ended. What didthis fella want? Unprepared as he was, Tayl or coul dn't face ${ }_{13: 57}$ into a conversation with McCabe. He didn't ring the following morni ng, but his wife did. Mchelletold MECabe that Dave was in a bad pl ace and not really up to meeting."

Is all of that correct?
A. Yes.

448 Q. "It was true that he was feeling enotionally fragile but al so the case that he had great trepi dation about
faci ng McCabe. I nstead $M$ chelle suggested that she meet him A few days later they met in the Skyl on Hotel on the Swords Road, near the Tayl ors' home. M chelle reiter ated that Dave was in a bad place and sent his apol ogi es. She poured out to McCabe all that her family had to endure since Dave's ejection fromthe i nner sanctum and subsequent suspension. It soon becare obvi ous to Maurice McCabe that she was sussing hi mout, checking whet her he mi ght har bour any ani mosity towards her husband. Through it all she di spl ayed a burning sense of grievance at what had bef allen her husband. "

Did you feel yourself a burning sense of grievance at what had befallen you?
A. I felt for my family, who had, do you know, as a result of my wage being cut, had made it very difficult for us.

449 Q. But you were aggrieved, were you?
A. I was very concerned for my wife and my two children. My income had been severely cut.

450 Q. But you had a grievance. What was your grievance?
A. As I said, I was very concerned for my wife and my two children. As I said, my wages were cut, which was putting, as I said, difficulties with paying bills.
451 Q. But this is going further than that. A grievance, I suggest to you, is a feeling that you're being unjustly dealt with or unjustly treated.
A. No, I'm suggesting -- you're asking me what I felt, I'm
telling you what I felt. I felt I was deeply concerned for my wife and children.
But if your wife said this to Sergeant McCabe, was she correct to say it, that you -- sorry, that she had a burning sense of grievance at what had befallen you?
A. But you are asking me to comment, Mr. O'Higgins, on something that somebody else has written. This is a third party.
Q. That's right, I am.
A. I can't comment on that.

454 Q. Well, just more straightforwardly, did you at this time harbour a sense of grievance at the treatment of An Garda Síochána of you?
A. As I said, I was deeply upset and concerned for my family at the loss of our income and the pressure of paying, of keeping the day-to-day life of my family going.
CHA RNAN It may be appropriate to kind of summarise it by putting it this way, by saying, did you feel you were a victim in the sense that someone who has
something done to them which is unfair and is wrong and is unwarranted?
A. I didn't feel a victim, Chairman. I felt, I was concerned for my family, I had genuine concern for the plight my family was now in.
CHA RMAN Yes. Insofar as some people have described you ringing the Garda Press office and being bitter about what you saw as your demotion or what they said was your demotion, would that be accurate or not?
A. I wouldn't accept those comments, Chairman. As I said, I was concerned for my family. I had taken a substantial and very substantial drop in my income. CHA RMAN No, appreciating the financial issue, you weren't thinking of yourself as a victim of this?
A. No, I was thinking for my family. It's -CHA RMAN No, but I mean, you weren't thinking of yourself as a victim?
A. No.

CHA RMAN A11 right.
455 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Moving matters on, superintendent, the balance of the page treats of your conversation with Sergeant McCabe on 20th September, isn't that so?
A. Yes.

456 Q. of 2016. And the second paragraph down, it attributes to you words in quotations:
"We want to destroy you, Tayl or told him Over the course of $t h r e e ~ a n d ~ a ~ h a l f ~ h o u r s, ~ a s ~ t h e ~ s u n ~ w e n t ~ d o w n ~$ and the ni ght drew in, David Tayl or unbur dened himsel f to Maurice McCabe in the Tayl ors' front room He went into detail of how he had been invol ved in a campai gn of bl ack propaganda agai nst McCabe in his role as head of the Garda Press Office. The objective was to destroy McCabe's credi bility by any means available and in particular to spread false and scurrilous rumours about his character. It should be noted that the seni or of ficers whom Tayl or cl ai med were ei ther privy
or directing such an operation deny any know edge what soever of its exi stence. Yet Taylor is adamant he is speaking the truth."

Then the next portion deals with the strands of the smear campaign, as you relayed it:
"There were a number of strands to the campai gn, he tol $d$ the incredul ous McCabe. The most basic was the conveyance of hundreds, if not thousands, of text messages to media and Garda personnel casting MkCabe in a dark light."

I think you have told the Chairman that you reject that you said that to Sergeant McCabe?
A. That's correct.

457 Q. It goes on:
"J ournalists were briefed that MECabe was a person who had a record of sexually abusing children, excuses were 14:03 invented asses to why there was no official record --"

Did that form part of the strands?
A. No.

458 Q. It didn't?
"-- of these crimes or allegations."

We11, do you mind me asking you, why did you not
correct that? why did you not make sure Mick Clifford took that line out?
A. As I said to you, I did not forensically examine it.

459 Q. But you did read it?
A. I scanned through it very quickly, I did not forensically go line-by-line, word-for-word.
Q. I understand his position is that you rang him back a week later.
A. Yeah, I accept that.

461 Q. And obviously you were careful to make a change which he -- dealing with the correction that you weren't interviewed by the Logan inquiry, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

462 Q. You brought that correction to the attention of Mick clifford, isn't that so?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you gave him to understand that was the only correction that needed to be made.
A. I corrected that part. I did not, as I said today or yesterday as well, I did not go through this chapter word-for-word or line-for-line. I scanned it very quickly.

464 Q. But you corrected that detail. I'm not suggesting that's insignificant or is something you shouldn't have corrected, but you read it sufficiently well to ensure -- to pick that up and ensure that that was corrected.
A. As I said, I did not forensically go through it line-for-line.
Q. So the two details that are wrong here is of course the
texts as a method, as a primary aspect of the smear campaign and also this line that "excuses were invented as to why there was no official record" with respect to the briefing journalists; you didn't correct that either, we're agreed about that?
A. As I said, I did not forensically go through this chapter line-for-line.
All right. Over the page then at page 6623 there's again matters attributed to you in this draft extract. Top of page 6623:
"He told McCabe that an intelligence file had been created on MECabe in Garda HQ. The file was kept under a Christian name which coinci ded with the name of the offspring of a seni or officer. An intelligence file is onl $y$ created if the subject is suspected of serious crime, usually invol ving vi ol ence. Yet HQ, according to Tayl or, saw fit to place MECabe in such company."

Did you give that detail?
A. No. I said there may be a file in Garda Headquarters. I now know from direct evidence that has been given there isn't.
467 Q. "Twi ce as he poured out his confessi on Tayl or broke down. He was in a hi ghly enotional state confronting his past, when he was doi ng his job following orders as he sawit. McCabe was si mply regarded as the enemy."

Is that accurate, that twice during the 20th September conversation with Sergeant McCabe you broke down?
A. It was a highly -- it was an emotional couple of hours, yes.
Q. Were you unburdening yourself of this?
A. Well, I was telling Sergeant McCabe the knowledge that I have.

And this was, aside from the priest that you've mentioned this was the first time you were unburdening yourself of the smear campaign?
A. This is the first time I have ever met Sergeant McCabe person-to-person.
Q. But this was the first time you'd unburdened yourself of the smear campaign to anybody other than your wife?
A. Yes.

471 Q. You're clear on that?
A. Yes.
Q. And it was a cathartic experience where you were letting go of the dark matter that you needed to get off your chest?
A. Well, as I said, I'd come to the decision to do the right thing.
Q. And did that pretty well happen, do you think, on 20th September?
A. Yes.

474 Q. It was on 20th September 2016 that you realised this was wrong, what I have been commanded to do, what I had done, and you were now unburdening yourself and coming clean for the first time?
A. Well, I was in -- I met Sergeant McCabe and told him
and then subsequently followed up with a protected disclosure.
475 Q. But am I right, this was the first time you were coming clean to anybody other than your wife and you say the priest?
A. Yes.

476 Q. Now, on the next page, page 6624 -- we11, perhaps at the bottom of page 6623:
"The foll owing day McCabe rang Tayl or and arranged to meet himagai $n$. There were a coupl e of $t$ hi ngs he wanted to cl arify."

And on page 6624:
"They met at Tayl or's home the day after that. McCabe asked hi magai $n$ about some of the detail rel ated to the text messages. Then he informed Tayl or that he was obl iged to make a protected disclosure on the matter."

Is that correct?
A. We never spoke about -- it was a very quick meeting, a very short meeting, we never spoke about the texts. He just came to inform me that he was going to make a protected disclosure.
477 Q. Then there's a quotation:


#### Abstract

"You' ve told me this stuff and if l don't pass it on l could be accused of being compl icity."


Sergeant McCabe told you, according to the book.
A. No.

478 Q. A little bit further down it's recorded that:
"The two di scl osures were handed into Department of Justice on 29th Septenber. The story broke in the Irish Examiner the following Tuesday, October 4th, al though the identities of the Gardaí invol ved was not made known in the initial report." kem in the initial report. mek

That is correct, is it?
A. My solicitor handed the protected disclosure to the appointed person outside Garda Headquarters. That's the route my protected disclosure took.
479 Q. All right. You see, Superintendent Taylor, one difficulty I have with your account that you've given us before lunch and just now since lunch, concerns this idea that the 20th September meeting with Sergeant McCabe was indeed a truly cathartic moment and that you 14:10 were unburdening yourself for the first time of the dark secret concerning the smear campaign. Because I wish to suggest to you that in fact you have said elsewhere that you disclosed the smear campaign to Mick clifford on an earlier occasion.
A. No.
Q. Well, would you mind turning to page 3278 of the materials please?
A. Is that still volume?

481 Q. Volume 13.
A. Is it Volume 30?

482 Q. Sorry, Volume 13. One three.
A. Oh, sorry.

483 Q. Page 3278. So this now is your statement provided, your interview that you provided to the Tribunal investigators on 8th March 2018. It's the most recent statement --
A. Yes.

484 Q. -- as I understand it. And it commences at page 3251. 14:12 And the relevant portion is on page 3278. And we might just go straight to that.
A. Yes.

485 Q. Question at line 447:
"In respect of the above, I have been asked whether the content of the above extract --"

And that's from the book.
"-- as attributed to me by Mck Cliffordis accurate and if not I have been asked to detail what is i naccur ate. "

Then you are recorded as saying:
"I had a conversation with M chael Clifford before I met Maurice McCabe. This was late summer 2016. I told M chael Cl ifford about the campaign to negativel y brief
journalists about Maurice McCabe. I told himl was to bri ef journal ists negatively about Sergeant McCabe in respect to the ME. D 2006 allegation on the instruction of Martin Callinan and that this was al ways done verbally."

Do you see that there?
A. I see that, yeah.
Q. Is that capable of being reconciled with what you've told the Tribunal a few minutes ago?
A. Well, I didn't go into the exact terminology of what $I$ said of the instruction that $I$ was given, of what I was saying to the journalist, that $I$ would tell the journalists about the motivation and the revenge. I did not go into the actual word of what I was saying.

487 Q. So do you want to just read it there just so you --
A. I've read it, yes.

488 Q. Take a moment to consider your position there. It says in your statement:
"I had a conversation with M chael Clifford before I ret Maurice McCabe. This was late summer 2016. I told Mr. M chael Clifford about the campai gn to negatively brief journalists about Maurice McCabe. I told himl was to brief journalists negatively about Sergeant MECabe in respect to the Mb. D 2006 allegation on the instruction of Martin Callinan, and this was al ways done verbally."
A. We11, I didn't go into the exact terminology of what I
was saying, the exact wording that I was using. 489 Q. But you see you told us, not only after lunch but before lunch, you told nobody about the smear campaign except michelle and the priest?
A. Yeah, but I didn't tell them about the exact methodology or the exact wording that I was saying. And it has suited your purposes to have people believe that the 20th September 2016 was a cathartic experience where you were unburdening yourself of the dark sin, the smear campaign, and you broke down.
A. No, I said that it was an evolution, I got to the point and 20th September was the first time I told -- the first time I met Sergeant McCabe and told him about what had gone on.
491 Q. You see, superintendent, I'11 just read out to you the answers you gave on page 74 of today's transcript before lunch. All right? And the question was:
"So, for how I ong before 20th September had the point occurred to you?"

The point being, it was wrong, the smear campaign was wrong. The answer you gave was:
"I can't give you the exact period of time. As I said,
it evol ved and had to that point."

Then I asked you:
"But I mean, didit suddenly all crystallise for you on 20th September or was it weeks or months bef ore that?"

And you decided -- you answered:
"I decided to meet Maurice McCabe on 20th Septenber. Q. Well, ot her than your wife, M chelle, had you told anybody about the smear campai gn prior to 20th Sept enber?
A. I had spoken to a priest.
Q. You'd spoken to a priest?
A. Yes.
Q. And apart fromthe priest?
A. Nobody el se.
Q. Had you told M chael Clifford , for instance?
A. No. "
A. I hadn't told Michael clifford the exact detailed information that I told the priest and told michael -or told Sergeant McCabe.
492 Q. Is there a reason as to why you were or you are anxious ${ }_{14: 16}$ to withhold the fact that you made your disclosure, apparently, apparently, to Michael Clifford weeks or months before 20th September 2016?
A. No.

493 Q. Well, is it possible that that slipped your mind?
A. No. As I said, I told the full information to the priest and to Sergeant McCabe.

494 Q. Well, perhaps we might just look at Michael Clifford's position on this. We might go to page 4881 of the
materials. Or perhaps take it up from 4880, please. So in this part, just to orient yourself, superintendent, this is the statement of Michae1
Clifford which commences at page 4878 and it is dated 3rd April 2017. So it's as recent as last month. And the Tribunal investigators are putting to him the passage from your statement that I've just read out?
A. Yes.

Al1 right? And line 32 , we'11 just read out from there on page 4880 , the extract is read out:
"I, Superintendent Tayl or, had a conversation with M chael Clifford when I met Maurice McCabe. This was I ate summer 2016--"

Sorry.
"I had a conversation with M chael Clifford before I ret Maurice McCabe. This was late summer 2016. I told M chael Cl ifford about the campaign to negativel y brief journalists about Maurice McCabe. I told himl was to bri ef journalists negatively about Sergeant McCabe in respect of the ME. D 2006 allegation on the instruction of Martin Callinan and his was al ways done verbally. In rel ation to the reference to texts in the above extract, I would have told himthat there would have been texts in respect to updates or briefings as per my protected di scl osure. I have subsequently di scussed my meetings with Maurice MLCabe on 20th Septenber 2016 and

21st September 2016 with M chael Clifford. I am not the source, as referred to in the above extract."

And then -- sorry, I misread that.
"I never subsequently di scussed my meetings with Maurice McCabe on those dates. I am not the source, as ref erred to in the above extract."

So that's the quotation from your statement, and he says the following:
"In respect of the foregoing extract, I have been asked whet her I agree with Superintendent Tayl or's account of his di scussi on with me and the date he says this occurred, I ate summer 2016. If not, I have been asked to provi de details and all attendant circunstances of what I recall of my meetings with Superintendent Tayl or."

Then his answer is the following, on page 4881:
"I had a notion it was earlier, but 1 do not have an issue with Superintendent Tayl or saying it was around the time late summer 2016. My first contact with
certainly later in the summer when l met him In rel ation to the meeting, my recollection is that Superintendent Tayl or pl aced a lot of emphasis on text
messages being part of the issues around Sergeant MECabe particularly, in rel ation to cormuni cation within the seni or management of the Gardaí and in contacting journalists. One issue I certainly recall is that at one point he certai nly mentioned to me, Reilly, that l had feat ured myself in a number of texts and el aborated. He said, for instance, if l was tal ki ng about the MECabe story on the radio he would have circul at ed that among seni or management with a comment. I did not take notes. I don't recal I specifically what he said but he was placing a lot of emphasis on text messages. That was the impression that I got. I have a recollection of Superintendent Tayl or saying that he would reference the sexual abuse allegations in communi cations by text with journalists. I have no specific recollection of Superintendent Tayl or saying that former Commissioner Martin Callinan scripted specific texts and that he passed them on but I do recall himsaying that often former Commi ssioner Martin Callinan would contact himand then he would contact journalists to brief negatively about Sergeant MECabe in rel ation to the allegation bei ng made by ME. D. I don't recall whether Superintendent Tayl or used ME. D's name when speaki ng about this, but I do recall himsaying that we, Superintendent Tayl or and hi s wife, Mchelle Tayl or, bel ieved the allegation. I can confirmthat Mchelle Taylor was present when I met Superintendent Tayl or. I met Superintendent Tayl or on a second occasion in very early October 2016. Agai $n$ he
was with his wife, M chelle.

On a second occasi on l met himl do recall asking him about text messages being part of the campai gn agai nst Ser geant McCabe because it was one of three or four specific things l wanted to ask hi mabout. He confirmed that text messages were part of the campaign agai nst Sergeant McCabe. My overall impression, and my first meeting in particul ar being the crucial one, Superintendent Tayl or did put an emphasis on text messages."

So that would suggest -- not just suggest, that would indicate it's his position, he agrees he met with you prior to your meeting with Sergeant McCabe on 20th September 2016 and you gave him considerable detail about the smear campaign. That appears to be his position.
A. Well, that's his position, it's not my position.

496 Q. And are you saying that that's just wrong?
A. I agree I spoke to him, but in relation to text messages and a lot of that issues that he's -- that is not correct.

497 Q. Well, what was your purpose in meeting him?
A. Which date now, Mr. O'Higgins?

498 Q. In this. First of all, in ringing him at this time.
A. As I said to you earlier on, he had written an article that was complimentary -- or not complimentary, but was favourable and I just rang him to thank him.

499 Q. Superintendent, I think you know I'm talking about the phone call and meeting you had with him where you discussed the smear campaign, on your evidence.
A. I agree I rang him. I rang him first.

500 Q. When was that phone call?
A. When was that phone call? I think it's summer '16, I can't give the exact date, but May $I$ think.
Q. You wouldn't differ with May, Mr. Clifford's --
A. I wouldn't. As I said, I wouldn't differ. CHA RMAN Mr. Clifford says late May, so it is kind of 14:23 two weeks hence.
A. Yeah, around that time.

502 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Right. So what was your purpose in placing that phone call to Michael Clifford?
A. As I said earlier on, he had written an article, he had 14:23 mentioned me and I rang to thank him.

503 Q. In that phone call did you discuss the smear campaign at all?
A. No, I didn't discuss the substance of the smear campaign and what I was directed to do.
504 Q. Did you ring him subsequently?
A. I said $I$ could have rang him subsequently to meet. I don't know whether he rang me or $I$ rang him, I can't --
505 Q. Right.
A. Yeah.

506 Q. So did you ring him, do you think, to set up a meeting with him?
A. A meeting happened, yes. That was later on, a number of months later on.

507
Q. And your purpose was -- wel1, first of al1, did you ring him?
A. As I said, I can't recall whether I rang him or he rang me. I just can't, I can't give a definitive answer to that.
Q. But your purpose was to meet with him to discuss the smear campaign?
A. No, the purpose was to talk about the book, I think, the upcoming book, he was writing a book.
509 Q. But --
A. And the disclosure had come out at that stage.

510 Q. Pardon me? The what?
A. I think it was October I think I met him. I think.

511 Q. No, no, no, no, I'm talking about --
CHA RMAN It's very easy to get mixed up, I appreciate, with the chronology, but as I understand it, Mr. Clifford had written some kind of an article in the Examiner saying look, here's another person who is suffering in consequence of Garda mismanagement or whistleblowing or whatever and he mentioned you.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN And that was supportive of you as you felt --
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN -- at the time or as you wished to have initiated a line of communication and you're not sure how the next thing happened, but he certainly called to your house --
A. That's right, yes.

CHA RMAN -- in the late summer, as you said, of 2016, which puts it prior to the autumn, which is when you met with Maurice McCabe on 20th September 2016.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN So that is as I understand the sequence.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Are we all getting it right?
A. I think we're getting it right, yeah.

512 Q. MR. MC CHEÁL O HGG NS: Al1 right. So then, using that 14:26 temporal timeline, the meeting of the summer where you're discussing the smear campaign with Mr. Clifford, what did you tell him? First of a11, what was your purpose in meeting him?
A. As I said, the purpose of meeting him was to discuss my own situation, the situation that $I$ had found myself in, that I had been out of work nearly what, $16,17,18$ months at that stage.
513 Q. And he was very obviously in the -- well, obviously he is an independent journalist, but he had written articles in support of Sergeant McCabe?
A. I'm aware of that, yeah.

514 Q. And what were you hoping he would do on your behalf?
A. I wasn't hoping he would do anything. I never asked him to do anything for me.

515 Q. We11, I mean, did you use the language reaching out or maybe you agreed with my language reaching out, I can't remember which, but were you reaching out to him?
A. I was talking to him, yes, and, as I said, it was
mostly in relation to my own story that I was in. I said I had been out of work 17, 18 months at that stage.
What was your thinking or hope in making contact with him at this time?
A. I hadn't any expectation or thinking or hope. Do you know, I wasn't asking for anything, I wasn't expecting anything from him.
517 Q.
Well, is there a reason you're being coy about this?
A. No, no, I'm just being honest with you. As I said, I wasn't ringing him up to ask him to do something for me. As I said, it was as simple as that. It was, I just met him and I asked him for nothing. I think he will confirm that. I didn't request anything from him. Well, did the conversation come onto the smear campaign?
A. I don't recall talking about it. But obviously we would have talked about Sergeant McCabe because he was heavily involved in the Sergeant McCabe situation.
519 Q. Yes. And did it come onto the smear campaign?
A. I have no recollection of it coming onto the smear campaign, because I wouldn't -- I never gave any detail in relation to exactly what $I$ said to journalists in my briefing to journalists, that was said to the priest and to Sergeant McCabe and subsequently in my protected 14:28 disclosure.
520 Q. Your statement says you had a conversation with Michael Clifford before you met Maurice McCabe, this was late summer 2016. "I told $M$ chael Cl ifford about the
campai gn." That's what it says.
A. We spoke about Sergeant McCabe, but I didn't go into the detail of campaign, because 1 never gave that detail to anybody until I actually gave it to Sergeant McCabe in person.
"Tol d M chael Clifford about the campaign to negatively brief journalists about Maurice McCabe. I told himl was to brief journalists negativel y about Sergeant McCabe in respect of the Ms. D 2006 allegation on the instructions of Martin Callinan."
A. I said I never went into the detail and I said that detail was not done until subsequently I met Sergeant McCabe and the protected disclosure.
522 Q. So just, can we just try and have clear your position? Do you accept that you discussed -- forget about to what extent, but you discussed the smear campaign and, as it were, you discussed your role in the smear campaign to Michael Clifford in this conversation?
A. No. We discussed Sergeant McCabe. Because obviously he was heavily involved in Sergeant McCabe and I think it was coming out of --
CHA RMAN You will perhaps excuse me for intervening. Just from the point of clarification. As I understood the way things had happened, it was as this: You would not have bothered to brief Michael Clifford negatively against Sergeant McCabe?
A. No, I wouldn't have, no.

CHA RMAN Because he and Katie Hannon had nailed their colours to the mast --
A. Yes, yeah.

CHA RMAN -- effectively. And I am not saying anything against them or in favour of them, I am sure they are great people and they are independent. But that was the view taken --
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN -- in Garda Headquarters. But I had understood that Maurice McCabe had wondered about this campaign and had spoken to Michae1 Clifford and Michae1 Clifford had indicated to him that maybe you would know something about it, hence he made contact with your house and spoke to your wife and in due course a meeting was set up.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Now that is what I understood it to mean. I also understood from Michael Clifford that you had indicated that in the meeting that took place prior to you meeting with Maurice McCabe, that you had told
Mr. Clifford that you had -- negative briefing was going on from Headquarters and that you were involved in that. Now, that's what I had understood.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Now, if it's different from that you should perhaps clarify.
A. I said I didn't go into the detail of the campaign. I sympathised with the plight that Sergeant McCabe was in, I said that to Michael Clifford and, you know,
obviously he had been dealing with Sergeant McCabe, I had never spoken to Sergeant McCabe and he would have taken his impression that I was sympathetic to Sergeant McCabe.

CHA RMAN But I mean, what you're saying is you didn't 14:31 on that occasion tell him that --
A. No.

CHA RMAN -- there was any kind of a campaign at a11?
A. No, I didn't go into any detail of a campaign.

CHA RMAN No, but I mean, did you tell him there was some kind of a campaign?
A. No, I didn't.

CHA RMAN You know, what people call a whispering campaign, that kind of thing?
A. No, I didn't. I didn't mention any words like that.

CHA RMAN No, forget about the words whispering campaign.
A. No, I didn't go into any detail. I said I was
sympathetic to Sergeant McCabe. I certainly made that
clear. I sympathised with the situation that Sergeant McCabe was going through.

CHA RMAN So to be definitive about it, you didn't say look, there is a this campaign --
A. No.

CHA RMAN -- or I'm involved --
A. No.

CHA RMAN -- or Commissioner Callinan or Deputy Commissioner O'Sullivan is involved?
A. No.

CHA RMAN Al1 right.
523 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Mr. Clifford appears to be clear, judging by his statement, which continues on page 4881 of the materials, that you discussed the campaign with him in this conversation during the summer of 2016 and you were placing a lot of emphasis on the methodology concerning texts - he didn't use the word methodology, that's my word - but you emphasised the role that texts played in what was a smear campaign, that's his position, and you say that's wrong, do you?
A. Yeah. Because in all the statements I've made and my protected disclosure I've never said that. I've always said that I followed up, I sent texts to Commissioner Callinan and Deputy Commissioner o'sullivan as updates about Sergeant McCabe all the time. I've always said that.

We11, you see, he -- but did texts come up in your conversation?
A. They could have came up, but, as I said, anything I said in relation to texts it was always about texts to the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner.

525 Q. We11, how did texts come up if you weren't discussing the smear campaign?
A. We11, I said I didn't go into the detail of it, you know. I was always updating. Because in relation to him, I mentioned to him that he would be in the texts that I would send to the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner.

526 Q. Superintendent, did you tell him the fact there was a smear campaign?
A. No, I didn't.

527 Q. He indicates that, at the bottom of page 4881, that Michelle Taylor was present --
A. Yeah.

528 Q. -- when he met you and he says, at the top of page 4882 , that he met you on a second occasion in early, in very early October 2016.
A. Yes.

529 Q. And again you were with your wife?
A. Yes.

530 Q. So does that help?
A. That happened, yes.

531 Q. And on the second occasion he indicates he met you and he recalls asking you "about text messages being part of the campai gn agai nst Sergeant MLCabe, because it was one of three or four specific thi ngs I wanted to ask hi mabout".
A. That was after the protected disclosure had gone in and 14:34 I had always -- I've always said texts, I would never -- were never part of the campaign. Texts went to the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner as part of updates.
532 Q. Well, he says otherwise.
"He says he confirmed --"

Being you.


"-- that text messages were part of the campaign agai nst Sergeant McCabe."
A. Well, I can only give you my evidence, what I've always given.

533 Q. And that's line 62 on page 4882.
A. Yeah.

534 Q. And he can give his own evidence in due course.
A. Hmm.



Now, that would be significant, wouldn't it, if in fact 14:34 that's not correct on your part that there was an unburdening or what I've been terming a cathartic experience of 20th September, that would be significant, you'd accept, if in fact the true position was you'd already told a journalist about the smear campaign several weeks earlier?
A. As I said, I told -- I met Sergeant McCabe on 20th September and I told him all the knowledge I had and subsequently followed up that with a protected disclosure.
536 Q. Would you agree with me that you embarked or there commenced something of a media and political campaign at this point in time with the making of the protected disclosure and this involved an objective of bringing down Nóirín O'Sullivan as Garda Commissioner?
A. Absolutely not.

537 Q. But weren't you anxious to bring her down? You were bitter about what you perceived she was doing, directing a targeting of you by dint of the criminal
prosecution?
A. I was a suspended Garda superintendent. I didn't -- I could not have any ability to do such a thing.
We11, let's look at what transpired after these. Firstly, before we move to October, can I ask you in relation to the protected disclosure, did you share that, did you coordinate that with Sergeant McCabe --
A. No.

539 Q. -- or with his legal advisors?
A. No.

540 Q. Or, did your legal advisors coordinate it with Sergeant McCabe --
A. No.

541 Q. -- or his legal advisors?
A. No.

544 Q. I'm right in that, aren't I? Mr. Mulligan is the protected disclosure manager, isn't that right?
A. Yeah, Mr. Alan Mulligan of HRM.

545 Q. We might turn to his statement for a moment, it's on
page 1, I think, of Volume 1 in the booklet, if that could be put up on screen. And this is a letter from Alan Mulligan, we see from page 2 , HR Director, dated 3rd October 2016. And it's a letter addressed to Frances Fitzgerald, then Tánaiste and Minister for Justice and Equality. And it's headed: "Two protected di scl osures under the Protected Di scl osures Act." And he indicates that:
"I amone of two protected di scl osure managers empl oyed
 by An Garda Sí ochána. In my role as a PDM I was contacted I ast week by separate legal advi sors for two current serving members of An Garda Sí ochána. The details are as follows.

A legal advi sor for Sergeant Maurice McCabe cont acted me to state that his client wi shed to make a protected di scl osure to the Tánai ste and $M$ ni ster for Justice and Equal ity whi ch alleges wrongdoing by, amongst others, the Garda Commi ssi oner. While aware that the I egi slation provi des that the PD can be sent directly to the Tánai ste, Sergeant McCabe wi shes me, as his employer's PDM to ensure the PD is recei ved by Tánai ste.

On the eveni ng of Wednesday, 28th September I was handed his PD. I was requested to del iver the PD to the Tánai ste and $M$ ni ster for Justice and to nobody el se and not to di vul ge his identity to any ot her
person. Sergeant MECabe and hi s I egal advi sors have requested that all communi cation and correspondence from your office in this matter should be to his sol icitor, Sean Costello, Sean Costello \& Company. "

And the address it given in Dublin.
"On Friday, 13th September I was cont acted by the sol icitor for Superintendent David Tayl or and was advi sed that he wi shed to make a PD to the Tánai ste and M ni ster for Justice and Equal ity. The PD is alleging wrongdoi ng agai nst, amongst ot hers, the Garda Commi ssi oner. Superintendent Tayl or's solicitor. Mr. Carthage Conl on, Hanahoe Solicitors, handed me the PD and stated that the PD was for the Tánai ste and I was not to gi ve the PD to anyone el se nor was l to di vul ge Superintendent Tayl or's identity to anyone el se. Mr. Conl on instructed that all correspondence and communi cations by you in this matter are to be conducted through this of fice."

And obviously, superintendent, known nobody is making any allegations against the legal advisors concerned.

It continues:
"I can confirmthat Sergeant Maurice McCabe and Superintendent David Tayl or are both serving members of

An Garda Sí ochána. I attach Ser geant McCabe' s PD and Superintendent Tayl or's PD for your attention. As both officers and thei $r$ legal representatives have advised that all comminication and correspondence in this matter fromyour office is to be sent directly to their respective solicitors, I will not be keeping a copy of ei ther PD. I wi sh to state that I will not divul ge the i dentity of either officer or any details of either PD to any other person. However, after del ivering the PDs to your office l will advise the Commissioner's office that I have recei ved two PDs addressed to Tánai ste which l have passed onto your office. Both officers and thei $r$ sol icitors have been advi sed of $m y$ intentions in this regard."

I think that was dated 3rd October 2016, isn't that so?
A. Yes.

546 Q. So it would seem that the PDs, we needn't look at them, but it seems they were dated the Wednesday and the Friday of the previous week and then sent on on 3rd October, being the Monday, is that right?
A. I accept what's on the correspondence.

547 Q. Well, what I'm wondering is: what were you doing on Monday, 3rd October as your next step?
A. How do you mean what was I doing?

548 Q. Didn't you meet two parliamentarians, two deputies of Dáil Éireann, to further propagate your story?
A. They rang my wife and asked to call to my house.

549 Q. I beg your pardon?
A. They rang my wife's number and asked to call to my house.
Q. We11, aren't I correct that on 3rd October 2016 you and your wife met Deputy Clare Daly and Deputy Mick Wallace in the Italian Quarter -- sorry --
A. No.

551 Q. -- I beg your pardon, Maurice McCabe met them earlier on 3rd October and that evening you met the two deputies in your home?
A. They rang to call to my house.

552 Q. Right. So well, yes, we should view it from your perspective. You got a call from --
A. No, I didn't get a cal1. My wife got a call.

553 Q. Your wife got a call?
A. Yes.

554 Q. From who?
A. It could be Deputy Daly I think, or wallace.

555 Q. Right. And on foot of that, you and your wife met the two TDs?
A. Yes.

556 Q. In your home?
A. Yes.

557 Q. On the evening of 3rd October?
A. Yes.

558 Q. Which I think was a Monday, is that right?
A. No.

560 Q. Are you clear on that?
A. Yes.

561 Q. We11, did you know that Deputy wallace and Deputy Daly -- and no criticism is made whatever of them in 14:43 this regard, but did you know that they would raise whatever allegations you were bringing to them on the floor of the Dáil?
A. I didn't know what they were going to bring to the floor of the Dáil.

562 Q. Well, what was the plan in meeting them?
A. There was -- they asked to meet and I met them. There was no plan.
563 Q. We11, did you say, for instance, to Deputy wallace that it was wrong that Nóirín O'Sullivan's husband would be appointed to investigate you and your mobile phones?
A. I thought it was very unusual, yes, that a Garda Commissioner would appoint her own husband to investigate another officer.
564 Q. So you did say that to Deputy Wallace?
A. Yes, yeah.

565 Q. Did you make derogatory remarks about Nóirín O'Sullivan saying words to the effect that she was a liar?
A. No.

566 Q. And that you can tell when she's lying by the way she's 14:44 sitting and moves from her seated position?
A. No.

567 Q. Did you say the allegations being investigated by the Clerkin team were trumped up charges?
A. No, I didn't.

CHA RMAN Is there a particular page you're referring to here? It may be that you are referring to a page, Mr. O'Higgins, are you?
MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes, Chairman. Well, I suppose 14:44 if we could get page 6854 up on screen.

CHAI RMAN Yes.
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: And this is Deputy wallace TD's statement or interview to the Tribunal investigators, which commences at page 6848 and it was made on 4 th April 2018. So again, last month. And if we might go to page 6854 -- sorry, we might start at page 6852. I'11 just give you a chance to read that, superintendent, so you know where I'm coming from. You see, I'11 be suggesting that you portrayed yourself as 14:45 somebody who was being unjustly treated and in fact was a victim. Contrary to what you've indicated earlier, you portrayed to the deputies that you were the victim in this piece and that it was unfair what was happening. A11 right? Amongst other things.
A. I don't accept that.

568 Q. Right. On page 6852, 1ine 62, Deputy Wallace says:
"I have been asked to detail all contacts/ meetings I had with Superintendent Tayl or following his protected di scl osure whi ch was made on 30th September 2016. I have been asked to detail how such contacts/meetings came about, when such contacts/ meetings occurred, who attended any such meetings and what was di scussed."

And he gives as his answer on line 66:
" Cl are Daly TD and I went to the arranged meeting at ei ght o' clock in the eveni ng and met Superintendent

Davi d Tayl or and his wife M chelle at their home.
There was a bit of small talk. Initially Mchelle was doing a bit more of the tal king that David. We were obvi ously looking to listen to David more. He confirmed that he had been part of a campaign to destroy Maurice and that he was very sorry for having done that. He said he had apol ogi sed to Maurice for this. He said it had been eating himand his family up for a long time and that they were struggling to deal with it. He said the tipping poi nt came a few weeks previ ous when they had a family traum whi ch was rel ated to the stress of the situation."

We needn't go into that.
"-- surrounding the role in the effort to destroy Maurice McCabe. After he expl ai ned to us that he was the Garda Press Officer and that he would have been feeding the media, and he told us that he would have been working hand-in-hand with the Commissioner Martin tol d us about the allegations of sexual abuse that Maurice was investi gated for years bef ore that and he sai d that he actually bel ieved that Maurice was not a
good pi ece of work. He al so told us that seni or management in An Garda Sí ochána were convi nced that Maurice's motives weren't good and that his efforts to expose things goi ng on in An Garda Sí ochána were I inked to his own grievances with the force."

Just pause at that there. Is that something you said to Deputy Taylor -- Deputy wallace, that last piece?
A. Well, I said -- that's not exactly in the same words. But yes, that I was briefing against Sergeant McCabe on 14:48 the direction of Commissioner Callinan with the knowledge of Deputy Commissioner O'Sullivan.
569 Q. Yes. What I am asking you about specifically, superintendent, is that last piece where he says "he al so told us seni or management of An Garda Sí ochána were convi nced that Maurice's motives weren't good and that his efforts to expose things going on in An Garda Sí ochána was linked to his own grievances with the for ce. "
A. Yes. That Sergeant McCabe's motivation for bringing these matters forward were borne in the investigation in 2006.

570 Q. So that's not a reference to you, that is a reference to Sergeant McCabe, is it?
A. Oh, yeah.

571 Q. As to the grievances?
A. Yes.

572 Q. I see. It goes on:
"Davi d spoke about sendi ng derogat ory texts about Maurice to the Commissioner who would share them with Nói rín and that she would often reply to Davi d Tayl or with one word "perfect". He didn't say that it was the reply every time, but that it was the regular reply from Nói rín O Sul Iivan he recei ved. We di dn't query hi $m$ on exactly what was in the derogatory texts sent to Callinan. Cl are and I are sorry that we didn't. He tol d us only that they were derogatory texts about Maurice and did not go into detail. As we had met Maurice McCabe earlier on in the day, we were making the assumption that Tayl or, Callinan and O Sul I ivan were fabricating texts about Maurice of a derogatory nat ure. "

So in fairness to your position, he is offering the possibility he assumed that I think?
A. Yes, as I said, I've always said consistently, Mr. O'Higgins, that the texts to Commissioner Callinan and Deputy Commissioner o'Sullivan were always by way of updates.
573 Q. Yes. Nonetheless then, and I don't want to airbrush out bits, I want to be fair, so he does allow of the possibility that he made an assumption and he comes back to it at line 89, he says:
"But I understood fromhimthat he fed to the media derogat ory comment ary about Maurice but I cannot say that it was being done by text. He may have done it
ot herwi se. But he said he was feeding the media this der ogat ory comment ary about Maurice McCabe."

Then if we go over the page, he says on line 94 on page 6854, third line down from the top:
"Davi d Tayl or would have appreci ated that Cl are and I were raising the matter on the floor of the Dáil and I do not recall himever contradicting what I would have said in rel ation to himin the Dáil chanber."

Is that correct; you would have realised he was going to raise these matters in the Dáil?
A. No, I didn't know he was going to raise the matters in the Dáil. It was never the purpose, asking him to raise any matter in the Dáil.

574 Q. It goes on:
"It is my understanding that he watched everything that Cl are and I said in the Dáil in rel ation to the matter and we sai d a lot. Much of the rest the meeting David Tayl or concentrated a lot then on what they, the Gardaí, were doing to hi mand the lengths they were going to. He said they were out to shaft himnow in a manner he regarded not dissimilar to what they had done 14:51 to Maurice McCabe. "

Is that correct?
A. No. I would never for a second put myself in the same
position as Sergeant McCabe. I was talking about my own financial situation as you will see there, that my wages had been cut, I'd be in severe difficulties.
575 Q. We11, that's not what's being said here. It's being said that you were -- you said the guards were out to shaft you in a manner that you regarded as being not dissimilar to what they had done to Maurice.
A. This is what Deputy wallace says, not what I said.
Q. Oh, I know that.
A. Yes.

577 Q. But he is saying what you said.
A. I know, but I'm not -- but I didn't say that. You're asking me to comment on something that somebody allegedly said about me. I'm just saying what I know.
578 Q. Right. So he has this wrong, you didn't say these things?
A. Well, as I said, that's not my recollection, so that's his words, not my words.
579 Q. And then if we move it on to page 6855 , on line 112 , four lines down:
"After the meeting --" He says.
"-- I spoke regul arly with David Tayl or and I met him on a number of occasions but l don't recall di scussing whet her he actually sent the der ogat ory texts regarding Maurice di rectly to the media or not, except when I
phoned him as outlined bel ow, when the matter was coming into the publ ic domai n. "
A. Hmm .

580 Q. Then at the bottom of the page he provides the investigator with his handwritten notes. Do you see that in line 121?
A. I see that, yeah.

581 Q. And he says:
"I have provi ded a copy of my handwritten notes, three pages in total, to the investigators today and they have exhi bited these. The notes were as follows: Protected di scl osure to Mister."

That's fine. Actually we might turn to page 6872 , where the actual notes themselves are to be found. And as I understand it, these are Mick Wallace's notes, not Clare Daly's, but I am open to correction on that. Do you see there in the right-hand side, superintendent -well, on the left-hand side, second line down "Thel ma Waters - si deki ck of Jim MkGowan"?
A. Yeah.

582 Q. And then about a third of the way down there's a date, "14/11/ 15 Vi ber j oi $n$ request". And then again Jim McGowan's name. "Jim MEGowan had his phone." Is that 14:53 what you told to Mick Wallace?"
A. Yeah, Jim McGowan had seized my phone from my office in February '15.
583 Q. Then at the bottom of the page do you see "Appoi nt ed
her husband to take three phones"?
A. Well, he was in charge of the investigation, he would have had the phones.
584 Q. So that would be Nóirín O'Sullivan appointed her husband to take three phones, is that the suggestion?
A. Well, that's his notes. I'm just saying that it's a matter of fact that Superintendent McGowan was involved in my operation -- involved in my investigation and I know he came to my office in February ' 15 with Chief Superintendent Clerkin and took my phone.

CHA RMAN It's a bit of an irrelevancy really, at the end of the day. You know, there had to be somebody there and he is a well known investigator.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Did you think at the time that this was part 14:54 of a campaign to discommode you, undermine you --
A. It was --

CHA RMAN -- personalise the thing by having the Commissioner's husband involved in the --
A. It was certainly unusual, it was certainly --

CHA RMAN Forget about it being unusual and all the rest of it. It's always going to be unusual. Someone is going to be picked after all. So, do you think it was part of a campaign to annoy you or personalise matters --
A. Well, it --

CHA RMAN -- through the Commissioner?
A. It was certainly, as I said, a close connection, the Commissioner had --

CHA RMAN We11, of course it was. She was married to the man.
A. But, as I said --

CHA RMAK I am saying, did you think it was done out of a sense of some kind of purpose or some kind of deliberate vendetta that she had against you?
A. I can't say that for certainty. But as I said -CHA RMAN Can you say it as a probability?
A. It's probability, yes, that --

CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, that's fine. We've got 14:55 the answer.

585 Q. MR. MCHEÁL O H GG NS: Staying with the note then for a few more minutes if we may, superintendent. over the page on page 6873, the handwriting says "When she moves she' s I yi ng". I think Mr. McDowe11 brought you through 14:55 this in his cross-examination. Is that a notation taken of something arising from something you said to Mick wallace about Nóirín O'Sullivan?
A. No.

586 Q. Because you see, that's what Mick wallace says in his statement, if we go back to it. Do you want to go back to it?
A. Well, as I said, that's his words, not my words.

587 Q. So do you deny speaking pejoratively about the Garda Commissioner at this time and saying that she is a liar 14:56 and that when she moves she's lying?
A. I don't recall saying those things. As I said to you earlier on, she would not have been my number one choice to be Commissioner, that's --

CHA RMAN I know, but that's neither here nor there.
A. No, I didn't say that -- yeah.

CHA RMAN I mean, there could be a dozen people running --
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN -- all of them wonderful people and the one you don't like gets the job.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN I mean, that happens in life.
A. Yes, exactly.

CHA RMAN I mean, did you te11 Deputy wallace that you thought that she was a liar and --
A. No, I didn't say she was a liar.

CHA RMAN -- that she had agendas and in a particular an agenda against you?
A. No, I didn't.

CHAN RMAN That is the question really being asked.
A. No, I didn't, Chairman.
Q. MR. MCHEÁL O H GG NS: So that didn't come up at all, did it?
A. We11, Nóirín O'Sullivan and her husband came up, yes. That certainly came up. Her husband being involved in my investigation.
Q. Weren't you venting about Nóirín O'Sullivan and her husband?
A. Was I, sorry?
Q. You were venting, you were blowing off?
A. I wouldn't say -- I was just pointing out a fact that it was going on, that her husband was involved in my

591 Q. But you were using pejorative language about her, calling her a liar?
A. I didn't say I said that. I said these are Deputy wallace's notes. I am just saying I was just pointing out the fact that her husband was involved in my investigation.
592 Q. Do you see two lines beneath that: "Frank Cl erkin and husband took investigation"? That's a reference to Superintendent McGowan, isn't it?
A. Yes.

593 Q. Halfway down the page again Jim McGowan's name appears, "Pl us di sci plinary criminal ", do you see that?
A. Yes.

594 Q. Bottom of the page: "Pulled six people out of Traffic 14:57 l ooking for some bad stories."
A. Yeah, on the day that $I$ was in custody in Balbriggan the investigation team arrived to Traffic department here and requested to interview six members of the Traffic department in relation to my engagement with them.

595 Q. So were you telling the two deputies that you were being targeted because the investigators --
A. No, I was just telling them what happened on that day.
Q. But what was the import of that story, of that detail?
A. Just that, as I said, on the day I was in custody an investigation team arrived here to Traffic department and interviewed six of my colleagues.
597 Q. Yes, and did you convey the impression to the two Dái1
deputies that the investigators were looking for some bad stories against you?
A. I didn't say that. I just said that they were, as I said, questioned in relation to their phoning and texting me.
Q. You see, because Deputy wallace is really quite clear, if we need to go back to his statement, it fills in the blanks in these notes.
A. Hmm .

It is clear from his statement his position was you were giving off about Nóirín o'Sullivan and her husband and giving them to understand that you'd been targeted improperly by dint of this criminal investigation.
A. I never said I was targeted improperly. I just said it's a matter of fact that her husband was involved in my investigation, you've taken my phones, he had -- you know, I'd been brought to Balbriggan, I'd been there for 21 hours, six members of my colleagues had been interviewed on the day of, on the day $I$ was in custody.
600 Q. And is it your evidence that you were giving the deputies these details in a neutral fashion as neutral statements of fact?
A. Yes, they were matter of facts. Like, I mean, those things did happen.
601 Q. Over the page then, page 6874: "Padrai g Lynch, no evi dence to continue hol di ng him" Is that a reference to your detention under section 4 on the day of your arrest?
A. There was a sergeant out there that day, there was a
second sergeant and I'd heard that the sergeant didn't want to detain me, but the one sergeant was kept on duty, I'd heard that.
602 Q. So tell us about that. You fee1 that somebody in the station was against you being detained, is that right?
A. Well, not necessarily being detained, I think there was a second sergeant came on duty, I was told, and they were questioning whether I should be detained and that's what I'd heard. And they were not made station house officers, so it's the one sergeant stayed on for all the day as a result of my detention.

603 Q. So was that person overruled, is that the point you were making to the deputies?
A. I am just saying that I had heard a second sergeant had raised concerns in Balbriggan that day.
CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, that's hearsay. There is a kind of fundamental point here if you don't mind me just raising it with you.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN It may save a lot of dialogue. Let's leave the Roma children out of it. I mean, there was an investigation into your activities after being Press officer and there is a very detailed report by chief superintendent clerkin and appended to it there's about 15 volumes of statements --
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN -- and that would appear to show that there were situations which emerged whereby you were not entitled to give out information and whereby indeed you
were asked about information, you contacted people who would know and then you didn't send that information on by text - and I know you've explained to me about your manual dexterity - but you immediately rang that person back and that person indeed then published that information which had not been officially given out in the newspaper.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Now, I don't know whether you accept that that happened and whether you accept that you were in fact at the least in breach of the Garda Press and Public Relations Office Guidelines?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN You do?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN So there was a legitimate expectation.
A. Oh, I don't -- I'm not denying that, Mr. Chairman. I'm just stating some facts that I'd heard. I'm not denying, $I$ 'm not questioning it.
CHA RMAN But I mean, there's all these rumours that float around.
A. As I said, I'm just -- you know, I was asked the request was there a rumour and that is the rumour I heard.

CHA RMAN Yes, I know, but I mean, we can all hear things.
A. Yeah, I know, I accept that.

CHA RMAN Yes. It's a bit of Garda talk, it seems to me.
A. Well, possibly, yeah.

CHA RMAN Like talk in the Law Library, you discount it immediately.
A. We11, as I say, it was --

CHA RMAN Anyway, there it is, you accept there was a 15:02 legitimate investigation --
A. I do, yeah.

CHA RMAN -- for a legitimate purpose?
A. Yes, I do, yeah.

CHA RMAN That is fine.
604 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: And just finally, before we finish off the notes, do you see there on page 6874, halfway down, there is again a reference to Nóirín o'sullivan?
A. Yes.
Q. Where it says: "N O Sullivan [arrow] the most unaccount abl e Commi ssi oner." That is what Deputy wallace has taken down arising from your conversation.
A. Well, that's a fact $I$ would never state. That's not my words.

606 Q. Those weren't your words?
A. No.

607 Q. Then on the right-hand side: "MEGowan hand pi cked them No adverti sement." And on the left-hand side at the bottom of the page I think a reference to Nóirín
o'Sullivan as I understand it: "Bl each everything, destroy what she likes." That's an allegation, or certainly it was picked up by Deputy wallace that you were making an allegation that she bleached phones.
A. I never said that. I wouldn't know how -- as I said, that's a fact I couldn't know and didn't know.
Q. You see, I must suggest to you, superintendent, that anybody reading this notation and perhaps more particularly anybody reading Deputy wallace's statement, which doubtless you've read, would form the impression that you're making a number of allegations against the Commissioner O'Sullivan that are rather wild, unrestrained and quite extreme. Do you understand the point I'm making?
A. I understand what you're saying, but I do not accept that.
Q. At this point in time, in your particular personal circumstances - and I do not in any sense belittle pressures you're under - but in your circumstances, the 15:04 poor financial straits in which you found yourself as a result of your difficulties, the walls were closing in around you and you were, I suggest to you, you were fixated on Nóirín O'Sullivan and her husband's role in this investigation.
A. I do not accept that.

610 Q. And you were lashing out.
A. (Shakes head).

611 Q. And you're keen to paint yourself not as a wrongdoer, but as a victim and to draw parallels with your own situation and that of Sergeant McCabe.
A. I don't accept that.

612 Q. And I'm suggesting to you, you were intent, because you were bitter towards her, you were intent on undermining
her situation, hence not just the legal front that you'd opened up with your protected disclosure, but the political front that you'd opened up with your contacts with journalists and media.
A. I don't accept that.

613 Q. Mick Clifford, it seems, had the detail of the protected disclosure for an article on 4th October.
A. Yes.
Q. Did you provide your PD to Mick Clifford?
A. Absolutely not.

615 Q. Did you provide its contents in summary form or otherwise to Mick Clifford?
A. Absolutely not.

616 Q. But didn't you meet him in early October?
A. But I did not supply him any copy of my protected disclosure.

617 Q. But did you not give him the gist of what was in it?
A. As I said, I did not provide him the details of my protected disclosure.
618 Q. Did you discuss with him that you had made a PD?
A. It was a known fact at that stage I had. It had broken out in the media at that stage I had made a PD.
619 Q. But you see, as I understand it, Mick Clifford broke the story in the media that there had been --
A. Hmm .

620 Q. -- protected disclosures made?
A. Yes.

621 Q. You weren't named.
A. Yes.

622 Q. But another Garda other than Sergeant McCabe had made one.
A. Yes.

623 Q. Right. He had that story.
A. Yes.

624 Q. As I understand it, he had some detail on it as wel1, because he gave a radio interview in which he outlined, broadly speaking, what was being contended by this new entrant into the situation.
A. Well, all I can say to you is I did not supply him with 15:07 a copy of my protected disclosure.

625 Q. We11, whatever about supplying him with a copy of it, I just want to have clear, did you at all give him any idea as to what you had said in your PD?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Why not?
A. Because the protected disclosure was a protected disclosure. I did not disclose it.

627 Q. Well, what was the purpose in going to politicians and to media but for the purpose of publicising your situation?
A. I didn't go to politicians, they came to me. I wasn't publicising -- I made a protected disclosure.

628 Q. But you didn't send them from the door.
A. I know, but I didn't seek their -- I didn't go and purposely seek their calling me. They rang my wife.

629 Q. You see, I'm suggesting to you, superintendent, that you are opening up more than one front now, not just the legal, media and political, but you had a
difficulty, because you were anxious, I'm suggesting to you, to do down Nóirín o'sullivan, but you also had to involve Martin Callinan in the matter because he was the Commissioner when you were Press officer; isn't that right?
A. Yes.

630 Q. And I'm suggesting to you, you came up with the retrospective allegation to cover a period 2013/2014. which was the period you were the Press officer. And Martin Callinan, as we know, was the Commissioner of An 15:09 Garda Síochána?
A. I reject that.

631 Q. And nobody would have believed an allegation purely against Nóirín o'Sullivan, she was deputy at the time, it would seem you had a closer relationship with Commissioner Callinan, you had to involve him in the whole story. Do you see the point I'm making?
A. I do not accept the point you're making.

632 Q. Can we look at your PD for a moment? And we can do this very quickly, because it's been gone over in reasonably exhaustive detail already, but I just want to ask you one or two questions about it. And it's in volume 13, possibly also in other volumes, but volume 13 , the one I've marked up, page 3375. And do you see there on page 3377, if that could be put up please for a moment, you treat of, in your PD, the press conference in Dundalk?
A. Yes.

633 Q. This now is on 23rd -- sorry, 24th January 2014, the
day after the PAC meeting in Dáil Éireann, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

And we'11 come to, in a few moments we're going to come to the dispute that's between yourself and Martin

Callinan concerning the remark that you attribute to him on 23rd. But if we're dealing, if we stay with your PD for a moment, you say at the bottom of the page:
"I had to detail the press conference as the Cormi ssi oner deci ded to leave Dundal k and to i mmedi at el y travel to meet Mr. MEGui nness."
A. Hmm .

635 Q. "The Commi ssi oner ret urned I ater that day, perhaps
about 4: 00pm or after, and the press conference was hel d then."

Perhaps it's just a matter of detail, but that's actually wrong, isn't it?
A. Well, my recollection is that the Commissioner left Dundalk and went to Bewley's Hote1 to meet Deputy McGuinness and then came back and conducted and conducted the interview.
636 Q. You see, there's been evidence that the press conference was broadcast on the radio, a clip from it, and the evidence, including from Andrew McLindon and others, was that the press conference took place prior to Martin Callinan departing for Dublin.
A. Well, my recollection, it happened after he came back. Because I met Commissioner Callinan when he arrived back in Dundalk at the front of the station and escorted him to the interview area.
Well, I just want to simply give you an opportunity, do -- maybe you don't, do you accept now that you're wrong about that?
A. I do not accept I was wrong, because -CHA RMAN I'm not sure the details of it actually really matter, Mr. O'Higgins. I mean, there's a lot of 15:12 detail in this case, but that particular one about the press conference, the service, the lot.
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Al1 right.
CHA RMAN The definite thing is he went up and down and presumably Superintendent Taylor had some knowledge 15:13 of the comings and goings. But it's easily gotten wrong.
638 Q. MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes. No, no, I suppose, superintendent, I should really indicate why I'm bringing it up at a11. Presumably your protected disclosure went through a number of drafts and you were anxious to ensure everything was correct in it?
A. Yes.

639 Q. And I think you've told us you got help, as you'd expect, from your solicitor?
A. Yes.

640 Q. Were you working from notes when you prepared it?
A. I was working from primarily memory and recollection.

641 Q. Well, did you go back to diaries or --
A. I would have consulted diaries, yeah.

642 Q. -- Garda notebooks, whatever?
A. A diary, yes.

643 Q. Just there appears to be, apart from the core issues that the Chairman would be rightly more concerned with, there appears to be a number of details that are just simply factually wrong. Would you agree or disagree with that?
A. In what sense?

Well, this detail, you are differing with this detail being wrong, that's one point. If we move perhaps to page 3379, you claim in the final paragraph, for instance:
"I am aware that Crime and Security have a separate stand al one computer systemisol ated from Pul se and not accessi ble to any other part of An Garda Sí ochána except Crime and Security. This computer systemis called Oisin. This hol ds national intelligence i ncl uding phone taps, phone records and material on subversive or gani sations. I am aware that there are al so files kept in Crime and Security on members under i nvestigation. These files are colloqui ally known as the corruption file. I would be certain there are files in there on me and al so on Ser geant McCabe."

And this is something you were aware is going to the Tánaiste and presumably to the Taoiseach, to the government of the 1and.
A. Yes.

645 Q. And you're expressing yourself to be certain about a pretty serious allegation: There's a file on you in Crime and Security and there's a file on Sergeant McCabe.
A. I believe that.

646 Q. Right. You've been here, or at least you're aware, aren't you, of the comprehensive evidence given by Chief Superintendent Kirwan?
A. Yes.

647 Q. And you're also aware of the evidence given by the FSNI representatives, Mr. McConne11 and Ms. Strachan?
A. Yes.

648 Q. And that appears to suggest, that last paragraph, particularly Chief Superintendent Kirwan's evidence, which again went unchallenged, that last paragraph is plainly wrong, isn't it?
A. I accept that there isn't a file. I accepted that yesterday or whatever day it was, I accepted that.
649 Q. Al1 right. Now, I want to just put a few details to you before we move towards wrapping up, superintendent. Martin Callinan --
A. Yes?

650 Q. -- am I right in my understanding that you called to Martin Callinan's home around the end of June 2014 and again around October 2014?
A. Yes.

651 Q. Is that about right?
A. Yes.

652 Q. And in those visits -- and it was unusual, because I do not think you'd been at his home before, before June '14?
A. I had.

653 Q. You had, had you?
A. Yes.

654 Q. On one occasion, more than one occasion?
A. He doesn't live too far away from me. So, in my capacity as Press Officer sometimes at the weekends I'd have to go to his house with documentation and seek consultation.

655 Q. A11 right. Did that happen a lot? My understanding is that that's not correct --
A. It is correct.

656 Q. -- but you are clear on that?
A. Oh, I am clear, yes.

657 Q. Al1 right. In any event, in your visit, certainly across the two visits of June 2014 and October 2014, you were critical of Commissioner o'sullivan and you were giving out about you having been transferred out of the Press office for no reason effectively.
A. No, I didn't say that to him.

658 Q. We11, were you critical of -- in case there was a misimpression or a misunderstanding between the two of you --
A. I was disappointed, it's we11 known I was disappointed to leave the Press office.
659 Q. Did you indicate you felt you were doing a good job and that the only reason you were being transferred was
because Nóirín o'Sullivan wanted you out and she wanted to put in her own person?
A. I felt I was doing a good job, I think it was well recognised I was doing a good job and that Nóirín o'Sullivan had moved me out.
660 Q. Did you indicate to the Commissioner, to the former Commissioner that you were concerned it would be viewed by colleagues in a bad light from your point of view, as it would be regarded as a sideways move given the high profile of the role of Garda Press officer --
A. Well --

661 Q. -- and you resented this?
A. I wouldn't say I resented it. I would say it was certainly viewed as a sideways move to go from the Press office to Traffic department, yes.
Q. Commission Callinan instructs me that he advised you to get on with your job and to go out and do your best to make an impression and there were plenty of opportunities for success in the role you had in traffic management, which was an important job for An Garda Síochána.
A. And which I did and you can seek any inquiry from my Chief Superintendent Traffic that I have got on with my business and conducted my business to the highest standard since.

663 Q. All right. I am not suggesting otherwise. But I want to just ask you, you are confirming that's what the Commissioner said to you?
A. Just say that again to me, Mr. O'Higgins.
A. I did.
Q. And you described -- and you were more agitated on this occasion. You described how badly you'd been treated when you were arrested and you were giving out about having been put in a cell and your shoes and belt removed.
A. I've said that already. I found it a very unpleasant experience.
668 Q. You were giving out about cameras, and your position, waiting for you when you arrived at Balbriggan Garda station and Commissioner Callinan discussed with you why you'd been arrested and you said you were accused of leaking to the media --
A. Yes.

669 Q. -- when all you were doing was doing your job?
A. We11, I said I was arrested for, in the sense of leaking to the media and $I$ think that's a matter of fact.

CHA RMAN okay. I'm just going to rise now for five minutes and then we'11 interpose Mrs. Taylor.
A. Okay, thank you.

## AFTER A SHORT AD OURNMENT THE HEARI NG RESUMED AS

## FOLLO/S

CHA RMAN Right, so five minutes is five minutes.

MRS. M CHELLE TAYLOR, HAV NG BEEN SUDRN, WAS DI RECTLY
EXAM NED BY MG. LEADER
MS. LEADER: Mrs. Taylor's interview with the investigators is at volume 13 at page 3386 of the materials.
A. Thank you.

670 Q. Now, Mrs. Taylor you're obviously married to
A. That's correct, yes.

671 Q. Isn't that right? And you have a grown-up family at this stage, isn't that right?
A. A 20-year old and a 14-year-old.

672 Q. Now, I want to start with your knowledge of the campaign Superintendent Taylor said that he was running in relation to disseminating information in relation to Sergeant McCabe. When did you first find out about
that campaign?
A. I think it was after my husband was suspended that I realised there was a campaign.
Q. A11 right. And how did you find out about it?
A. I think Dave said to me, he said there was a campaign to smear Maurice McCabe.

674 Q. Okay. Now, I think your husband was suspended in or around may 2015?
A. That's correct, yes.

675 Q. Do you think you had any knowledge or inkling of the campaign before then? Because you seem to have indicated to our investigators --
A. Yeah.

676 Q. -- that you might have.
A. Yeah, I knew that there was negative feelings towards Sergeant McCabe, because my husband had said that, you know, the penalty points was an issue. So I would have been aware that there was, you know, feelings over the penalty points, that they kept coming up all the time.
677 Q. All right. When you say you knew there were negative feelings towards Sergeant McCabe, did you think that it was your husband had the negative feelings or anybody else had negative feelings?
A. I got the impression it was coming from Garda Headquarters.

678 Q. A11 right.
A. And that he obviously was believing that there was negative feelings towards Sergeant McCabe, because the penalty points kept coming up and coming up and coming
up.
679 Q. All right. And Garda Headquarters who you are talking about there who it was coming from?
A. Well, it would be, yeah, the Garda Commissioner would have instructed him.

680 Q. Would have instructed him about what?
A. Well, that Sergeant McCabe had -- he was on revenge because of an incident that had happened and that the penalty points, he was using the penalty points to get back at the guards.

681 Q. Okay. And you think you knew about that -Superintendent Taylor was appointed to the Press Office in 2012?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

682 Q. And he was there from mid-2012 unti1 2014. So that
obviously change his working day?
A. Yes.

683 Q. Insofar as it impacted on you?
A. Yes, very much so.

684 Q. So if we could time it that way, in relation to your knowledge of negative feelings towards Sergeant McCabe and your knowledge of any campaign, when do you think those two things came about?
A. We11, I can't say a specific day or a time, I just think it was ongoing. Because they were constantly on about penalty points, penalty points. I just would have heard him saying oh, the penalty points issue again. And I suppose from that perspective there was no specific date I would have become aware of it, but I
would have known it was an issue for him.
685 Q. All right. So if we put it this way, and I understand that you have no particular knowledge of penalty points and matters like that, but we know the penalty points became an issue in mid-2013, so does that help you at all in timing things?
A. I don't understand.
Q. Does that help you in timing your knowledge of?
A. Well, it would have -- yeah, well, it was ongoing. When he went to the Press office it was just constantly 15:31 there about the penalty points.

687 Q. Okay. And in relation to a negative campaign, did your husband ever tell you about it?
A. Well, he said to me that I've been instructed to brief journalists that there's a backstory here, that McCabe
is -- you know, is going on malicious and revenge
because of an incident that happened and that I've to brief the media negatively that there's a backstory here.

688 Q. okay.
A. So I would have been aware of that.

689 Q. Yeah. And you say that what your husband said to you was I have to brief the media negatively here.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

690 Q. So do you think that was when he was in the Press office?
A. That was when he was in the Press Office, yes.

691 Q. Okay, al1 right. So we can take it that your husband told you sometime when he was in the Press office that
he had a job to do and that was to brief the media negatively in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. It wasn't just all about though that, there was so much else going on.
Q. Yes?
A. It wasn't kind of the pinnacle of my life, to be honest.
693 Q. Yes?
A. It was just, I knew it was part of his job.

Okay. So what I want to ask you about is: Did you ask him about what he was meant to say to the media?
A. No, I didn't ask him. To be honest with you, I didn't really pay an awful lot of attention to it, because it was just, it was there all the time, so it was just rolling on.
695 Q. Okay. Did you ask him why Sergeant McCabe was full of revenge and malicious?
A. Well, it was just to do with penalty points and that there was an accusation that had gone to the DPP and that the Sergeant had been cleared and that he had been investigated by the guards and that his motivation then was revenge to get back.
696 Q. okay. So do you think you asked your husband what was the negative briefing, what exactly was he to be briefing the press about?
A. That there was a backstory.

697 Q. Yes.
A. That, you know, there was a reason for this, there was a backstory, there was more to this than just penalty

698 Q. And did
698 Q. And did you ask him what the backstory was?
A. I didn't actually. I wasn't really paying an awful lot I have attention to it. It was just constantly there and I was aware of it if $I$ saw it on the television or anything.

699 Q. But you didn't see on the television the Ms. D story?
A. No.

700
Q. No?
A. No.

701 Q. So you must have found it out somehow?
A. I found it out later on. I never went into detail. I found it out later on.
702 Q. okay. When do you think later on was?
A. I can't specifically say when I became aware of it. 15:34

703 Q. Okay. We11, was it before his meeting with Sergeant McCabe in September?
A. Oh, definitely before his meeting with Sergeant McCabe, yes.
704 Q. Long before that?
A. Yes.

705 Q. Was it before his suspension?
A. That I found out about it? Yeah, it would have been
before his suspension.
Q. Before his suspension?
A. Yeah, before his suspension.

707 Q. Do you think it was before he left the Press office?
A. Definitely before he left the Press office, yeah.

708 Q. Okay. And do you think the on1y place you could have
found out the Ms. D story was from your husband?

709 Q. You think so?
A. Yeah.

710 Q. Okay. We11, for instance --
A. Well, I would have, because I didn't hear it anywhere else.

711 Q. You didn't hear --
A. No.

712 Q. You're happy about that?
A. Yes, yeah.

713 Q. Okay. Now, did you ask him what journalist he was briefing?
A. I didn't actually ask him what journalist he was briefing.

714 Q. A11 right.
A. Because he was always speaking to some journalist.

715 Q. Okay. Did you ask him how he was to conduct this campaign?
A. I didn't really go into details with him about it, about how he was to conduct it, it was just there was a backstory here.

716 Q. okay. Were you a bit shocked about the whole thing?
A. I was shocked, yeah. I was shocked. I didn't know how to -- I was numb.

717 Q. With the?
A. With what was going on, that there was, you know, a campaign or, you know.

718 Q. okay.
A. And that this was going on.
Q. All right. And you never thought to -- and I'm not being critical of you, Mrs. Taylor, but did you ever think to tease it out with him as to --
A. I didn't, because to be honest with you, I believed him, what he was doing, I believed what he was doing and I think he believed what he was doing was the right thing.
Q. So you believed what he was doing?
A. I believed my husband, yeah.
A. He said he'd to brief the media negatively on it because there was a backstory.
Q. But you still thought it was wrong to do so?
A. I didn't really think about it to be honest with you at 15:36 that stage, I didn't give it an awful lot of thought.
Q. Okay. Because leaving aside -- we're not members of An Garda síochána, so possibly lots of people might think it is shocking for somebody to, on purpose, brief the media about something that may or may not have happened 15:36 many years ago but nothing came of it. Do you understand?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

724 Q. So that's why I was interested in asking you did you tease that out or --
A. I didn't, to be honest with you. I didn't tease it out. I just didn't tease it out. I didn't give it a huge amount of thought.
Q. All right.
A. Because my husband was just constantly working.
Q. Yes. And did you at any time ask him, how are the journalists reacting to that or how are the media reacting to the backstory?
A. I didn't ask him that story, I didn't ask him that.
A. No.

728 Q. Al1 right. Now, did you ever hear him brief the media --
A. No.

729 Q. -- in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. No.

730 Q. A11 right. We11, I think you, and I understand it may be hard to give evidence, but I think you may have suggested the opposite to our investigators. You'11 see, maybe it could be brought up in front of you, at page 3406 of the materials at the very bottom.
A. Is it on this screen here?

731 Q. Yes. Or you can get the hard copy. It's in volume 13 at page 3406 .
A. Yes.

732 Q. Do you see the question at line 342:
"I have been asked whet her I ever overheard my husband, Superintendent David Tayl or, during his tenure in the Press Office negativel y briefing any journalist or any ot her person about Sergeant Maurice McCabe. If so, I have been asked to provi de det ails, including all attendant circunstances, frommy know edge. "

You see that question? And if you turn over the page:
"Answer: I woul dn't have known who he was tal king to in this respect, as he was tal king to so many and due to the nature of his role he was on the phone all of the time. However, I would have heard hi mbri ef negativel y agai nst Maurice McCabe to the effect I have descri bed above --"
A. I have.

733 Q. Yes. You see that? Yes. And "described above" is the Ms. D allegation.
A. Okay, yeah.

734 Q. "-- as he would have taken and made calls in our home and he was al ways on the phone. I cannot be specific as to names or dates, it was when he was Garda Press Of ficer."

Do you see that?
A. Yes. Yeah.

735 Q. So I was just wondering about that. Did you actually hear Superintendent Taylor on the phone to journalists?
A. As I said earlier, he would say there was a backstory.

736 Q. Yes.
A. There was a backstory. So in briefing negatively that 15:39 way, yeah, that there was a backstory to McCabe.

737 Q. okay. And did you actually hear him on the phone to journalists?
A. I've heard -- yeah, but I can't be specific with what
journalists, but he said, yeah, that there was -738 Q. Al1 right.
A. -- a backstory.

739 Q. Al1 right. Just in the preceding paragraph, we understand you're not used to giving evidence, but you do seem to say that, and just if you turn back to page 3406, at line 334 onwards:
"My perception of it was that he was carrying out an instruction that he believed in. As far as he was concerned, he felt he was doing the right thing. । would have known that Dave was bri efing negatively to the media agai nst Maurice McCabe in rel ation to the 2006 ME. D allegation and that he was motivated by revenge due to the investigation against him Dave did 15:40 not knowit was untrue. Frommy know edge, the negative briefing entailed that Maurice McCabe was driven by revenge because of the sexual allegation made by Mb. D agai nst hi $m$ and the Garda investigation into himin that respect. I understood that this had resulted in Maurice trying to get back at the Garda Sí ochána by making complaints in rel ation to the penalty points. This is what I was aware that Dave was sent to brief the media about in respect of Maurice McCabe. "

Then you're asked did you ever hear him briefing any media about it and you say yes?
A. Yeah, because there was always a backstory.

740 Q. Is it the case that you actually heard --
A. Yes, yes.

741 Q. -- him on the phone?
A. Yes. That there was a backstory to the penalty points.

742 Q. All right. And when he was on the phone did he say backstory or did he refer to the Ms. D allegation?
A. Backstory.

743 Q. okay. Was it as general as that?
A. Pardon?

744 Q. Was it as general as that?
A. We11, I think it would be as general as that, yes.

745 Q. Yes. Because I could imagine if one was on the phone to a journalist and one said there was a backstory in relation to the penalty points, the very next question would be, what is the backstory, if you understand me?
A. I wouldn't have asked him. I wouldn't have paid --

746 Q. I know you wouldn't have asked, but you would have been on the phone overhearing this, do you understand what I'm saying?
A. Yeah.

747 Q. Yeah. So do you think there was, you heard something about the Ms. D allegation, overheard?
A. I could have overheard it, but I can't be specific on a certain day or a certain time. But I would have been aware that's what it was over, the Ms. D allegation.
748 Q. Al1 right.
A. That's what the backstory was to the media. There was a backstory because of the incident with the Ms. D allegation.

749 Q. All right. And I don't know if you're able to help the Tribunal any further as to any specific telephone calls?
A. No, I wouldn't be aware of specific telephone calls.

750 Q. Because one could imagine, it's a fairly dramatic statement to hear somebody on the phone in an official capacity dispensing information to a journalist which is uncomplimentary, to say the least, about somebody else who's in the media, do you understand? It's fairly dramatic. So you might remember the first time you heard it on the phone.
A. It was just ongoing, so $I$ can't specifically say I remember a certain time. It was just ongoing because he was always on the phone.
751 Q
A11 right. And you may not know this, but a number of people here have given evidence from the Press office to the Tribunal and no member of the Press office ever heard Superintendent Taylor on the phone or even was aware that he was conducting a campaign in relation to Sergeant McCabe in relation to disseminating negative information about him. So you would seem to be the only witness to the negative briefing, do you understand what I'm saying?
A. Well, I just heard that there would have been a backstory.
752 Q. okay.
A. And that's what I would have been aware of.

753 Q. A11 right. And you were aware that backstory was --
A. Well, in relation to Ms. D.

754 Q. Ms. D.
A. Yes, and the investigation.
Q. All right. And did he ever talk to you about Commissioner Callinan's attitude in relation to what he was doing or in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. Well, I think basically, I think it was driving Mr . Callinan mad because it was constantly, constantly going on.
Q. okay.
A. And Dave would say, you know, it just won't go away, it 15:44 just keeps coming back up all the time, the penalty points.
757 Q. okay. And it was specific to the penalty points --
A. Yeah.

758 Q. -- and not policing in Cavan-Monaghan?
A. No, to the penalty points.

759 Q. To the penalty points?
A. To my recollection, what $I$ just remember is the penalty points.
760 Q. Okay. Now, in relation to your meeting with Sergeant McCabe which happened on 20th September 2016, could you te11 the Tribunal in your own words how that meeting came about?
A. Sergeant McCabe had contacted, had rang Dave before that and we had visitors in the house and Dave came out 15:45 when they had gone and he said Maurice McCabe is after ringing me. And I went, wow. It was kind of a bit of a shock. And I said, what did you say? And he said, I told him that I'd call him back. I said, okay, are you
going to call him back? He said, I don't know. So the next day I said, are you going to call Maurice McCabe back? And he said, I don't think so. And I said, I think it would be kind of rude if you didn't. I said, I believe he's out sick and you're suspended, I said, he obviously wants to ring you, I said, so maybe you should return the call. And he said no, I do not want to. And I said look, I'11 return the call. So I rang him back.

761 Q. Okay. And I think you put this around Apri1 or May?
A. I think roughly, yeah.

762 Q. Around April or May?
A. Yeah.

763 Q. And what happened then?
A. Well, I rang him back and he said he'd love to meet Dave or to meet up and I said I don't know if Dave is in that space at the moment, he's not in a very good place, and I said, but I'd be happy to meet you for a coffee if you're in Dublin. And he said yeah, that'd be fine.

764 Q. And were you a bit worried about it considering what your husband had been up to when he was in the Press office?
A. We11, I suppose I was wondering if he was going to ask any questions or if he was looking for something, so I suppose I would have been a bit apprehensive.

765 Q. A11 right.
A. But I didn't not want to meet the man, because he had rang. And I suppose because Dave was suspended as we11
and he rang, $I$ thought it was maybe a nice cal1. But I wasn't sure. I was unsure.

766 Q. Al1 right. And I think that led to a meeting with Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes. Yeah. I think the meeting on 20th wasn't the first time to meet him. That was the day he came to our house.

767 Q. Yes, yes.
A. I think I met him for a coffee before that.

768 Q. Yes.
A. I can't remember the date offhand.

769 Q. Okay. So you'd met him on your own?
A. I met him on my own for a coffee in the skylon Hotel.
Q. Yes. And were any matters in relation to the campaign discussed at that?
A. Nothing at a11. It was just, it was very polite, he was asking me how Dave was and I was telling him, I said I'm very, very worried about him and he asked him how he was and I asked him how his wife and his children were and I said, it's an awful time for everybody. He was very pleasant, he was very nice. He had to take a phone call then and then he came back and he had to head off to a meeting.

771 Q. A11 right. And I think you had another phone call with him and another meeting --
A. Yes.

772 Q. -- in the same place?
A. Yes, yes. I went home and I said to Dave, God, he's very pleasant man, he's a very nice man.
Q. All right. And the second meeting with Sergeant McCabe was in the nature of a chat as well?
A. Yes, it was much briefer.
Q. All right.
A. Because I suppose I couldn't give any more that Dave would meet him.
776
Q. Okay. All right. And I think ultimately it was arranged that Sergeant McCabe, yourself and Superintendent Taylor would meet on 20th September?
A. That's correct, yes.

777 Q. And that meeting was slightly delayed?
A. Yes.
Q. But ultimately it happened --
A. Yes.

779 Q. -- in your house?
A. But I had told him I wasn't sure if Dave was going to be there, because Dave had not really decided if he was 15:48 going to meet him.
780 Q. okay.
A. So I had said that to Sergeant McCabe; I'm not sure if Dave will be there, but you're welcome for a coffee anyhow and if he's there.
781 Q. okay. So was it a matter of you persuading your husband to meet Sergeant McCabe? was it a little bit like that?
A. No, not really know. It was just, I knew Maurice

McCabe was anxious to meet Dave and I said maybe you should meet him to see what -- you know, to have a chat or whatever.
okay. So you were putting him on that path, is that right? There's nothing wrong with that, I don't think. 15:49
A. Well, I wasn't really putting him on any path. I just said Maurice has made contact with us and, you know, he's rang us back and he's rang us back, I said I don't want to be rude if he's asked to meet you, I don't see any problem with meeting him.

783 Q. A11 right. And if you could tel1 us what happened during that meeting?
A. Sure, yes. I'11 just take a drink of water.

784 Q. Yes, take your time.
A. Maurice arrived to the house that day. I had to change 15:49 the time. And he came to the house. I was apprehensive and Dave was apprehensive. Dave had decided he would meet him. And he came to the house and I answered the door and brought him in and shook his hand and said you're very welcome. And then Dave
came and shook his hand and we sat down and they started to chat. And Dave said to him -- I knew Maurice at that stage. You know, the two of them were there together, it was the elephant in the room. And Dave said to him look, Maurice, I have to be honest with you, there was a campaign against you and I was part of it.

785 Q. Al1 right. And how long did the meeting last?
A. Roughly maybe two and a half, three hours to the best

786 Q. And I think in your statement you describe an immediate, more or less immediate admission from your husband --
A. Yes.

787 Q. -- in relation to a campaign?
Q. Then?
A. It was quite emotional actually. I was actually shocked, I didn't think he was going to --

789 Q. Jump into it --
A. Yeah.

790 Q. -- like that? And were the details of that campaign discussed?
A. Well, basically Maurice understandably was curious to know what had happened or what went on. Dave was very emotional, because I think the fact that he'd been away from the job for so long, maybe he had clarity in his head and he had even said it to me at that stage, when he was suspended, he said I can't believe, you know, there was a campaign and I was part of it. And he said I can't believe it. And then I said -- because I believed initially it wasn't a campaign as such, that they were trying to do whatever, that I felt for him, I felt, you know, this is awful.
791 Q. Okay.
A. So then Maurice asked the question, what was done? And that's when Dave told him.

792 Q. okay. And what did Superintendent Taylor -- in your
memory of what happened, te11 me?
A. My memory, Maurice said what actually happened and Dave said basically if I was speaking to any media at a crime scene or if I had any contact with media I was to brief them negatively about you and tell them that there was a backstory to you, that basically because of the Ms. D allegation, investigation, that you were motivated by revenge. And I could see he was probably a bit upset and Dave was upset. It wasn't pleasant. And Dave said that any time there was anything negative 15:52 or anything about you on the TV or the radio or Prime Time, that I would text the Garda Commissioners and inform them there was something negative or there was a programme on tonight featuring Maurice McCabe and the penalty points debacle again. So he said I would inform them everything that was going on in the media in relation to you.
793 Q. A11 right. And was there any suggestion of texting journalists?
A. He never texted journalists negatively about him.

794 Q. Okay. And how are you so sure about that? If you could just explain that.
A. Well, $I$ don't think he'd put anything in a text, to be honest with you.
795 Q. Yes.
A. Basically, it was that he would text the commissioners texts in relation to whatever was coming up in the media re Maurice McCabe.

796 Q. A11 right. I just want to go through Sergeant McCabes' protected disclosure with you.
A. Mm-hmm.

797 Q. And there are a number of areas I know you don't agree with. So if we could go to page 3421 of the materials, it will come up on screen. He says:
"Our meeting -- "

Have you got it? Sorry.
A. Yes, I have it.

798 Q. "Our meeting --" that's the meeting in your house on 20th September "-- I asted over three hours.
Superintendent Tayl or spoke at great length of how when he was the Garda Press Officer he had a sustai ned campai gn to destroy my character and reputation by di sseminating fal se, scurrilous and danaging allegations about me to persons of influence and persons in the media, acting on orders and instructions from Garda management."

That more or less accords with what you're saying. Now, in Garda management, was it restricted to the two commissioners, do you think?
A. To the best of my knowledge, yes. But I couldn't be $100 \%$. But that's to the best of my knowledge.
799 Q. All right.
"He stated that he was now bei ng targeted because he knew too much."

Do you see that sentence?
A. $M m-h m m$.

800 Q. And do you think that was the gist of some of the
things that were discussed; Superintendent Taylor being 15:54 targeted?
A. No. No.

801 Q. A11 right. We11, maybe I can ask you this way: Do you think it was discussed that Commissioner O'Sullivan at that stage was being unfair to your husband?
A. I don't understand what you mean by being unfair to him.
Q. In relation to the criminal investigation into him.
A. Did I think or did he think?

803 Q. Yes. Was it discussed at the meeting?
A. The criminal investigation?

804 Q. Yes.
A. Oh, yeah, it was discussed. Yeah, it was just that he was under criminal investigation because he had been arrested.
805 Q. All right. And was Commissioner o'Sullivan's role in relation to that criminal investigation spoken about?
A. Not really, no. It was just the criminal investigation in general and the pressure it was causing.
806 Q. A11 right.
A. And the worry financially and --

807 Q. Okay. Because I think your interview may say something slightly different to that with the investigators. I just want to find the reference to it. If you to turn
to page 3393 of the materials. This is your own interview.
A. Sorry, I'm trying to find it.

808 Q. No, take your time. And it's in or around line 113.
A. 3393, is it?

809 Q. 3393, yes.
A. Okay.

810 Q. You see: "After di scussing this --" Have you got that line 113?
A. 3392, is it?

15:56
811 Q. 3393, just over the page.
A. 3393, okay.

812 Q. Line 113 at the very top.
A. oh, yes, sorry.

813 Q. You have it? "After di scussing this we di scussed our 15:57 own situation --"
A. Sorry I see it now, yes.

814 Q. "-- about Dave's suspension and the fact that Nói rín O Sullivan was very anxi ous to get a charge on Dave and that we found it quite upsetting that she had appointed ${ }^{5: 57}$ her husband to lead the investigation teamin Dave's case. We told Marice how unfair we felt all of this was. He said what chance would you have agai nst the Gar da Conmi ssi oner and her husband or words to that effect. And we empathised with Maurice about the Cal I inan. "

So, do you think that was discussed now?
A. No, it was discussed. I was concerned that the Garda Commissioner's husband was involved in it.
Q. Yeah.
A. And I had said that to Sergeant McCabe, that I was concerned that he would be, you know, primary in the investigation because she had moved him and then I suppose $I$ probably didn't think it was fair.
816 Q. All right.
A. Or we would get a fair hearing.

817 Q. Okay, in relation to the --
A. The investigation.

818 Q. -- the criminal investigation?
A. Yeah. Or to disciplinary, whatever was --

819 Q. A11 right. Now, if we could just go back to the protected disclosure, page 3421.
A. Yes.

820 Q. If you go down to, if you go to the first bullet point and there is a reference to the Commissioner being in Dundalk and going to meet Deputy McGuinness in the car park. You see that? And the very last line of that records - this is Sergeant McCabe's words:
"Deputy McGui nness was war ned agai nst bel i evi ng any evi dence that I would gi ve at the PAC on the basis that I was a serial sex abuser who abused my own children and ni eces."

```
Do you see that?
```

A. Yes.

821
Q. Do you think that was said?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Yeah. You're convinced of that?
A. Well, I'm actually positive of that.
Q. Okay. But the fact of the McGuinness/Commissioner
A. That was discussed. Yeah, that was definitely discussed. Because Dave had told Sergeant McCabe that the meeting had to be delayed, the mass had to be delayed -- or the press conference, I beg your pardon, had to be delayed because Commissioner Callinan had to meet John McGuinness.
Q. A11 right. The next bullet point - this is in relation to Commissioner o'Sullivan's knowledge of that meeting - and you see the first line:
"Superintendent Tayl or stat ed that Commi ssi oner O Sullivan woul d have known about the meeting because Commíssi oner Callinan al ways kept her informed of such matters."

Do you think that was discussed?"
A. I'd say it was, yeah.
Q. You think it was?
A. Yeah.
Q. I'm just pointing out the differences as I see them and I just want your memory.
A. Okay.
Q. Then the next bullet point:
"Superintendent Tayl or then informed me of the sustai ned campai gn by ex- Gar da Commissi oner Cal I inan, Garda Cormis ssi oner O Sullivan and ot her seni or mentbers to destroy my character."

Do you think there was a reference to other senior members there?
A. Em, I don't recall.

That's all right.
A. I don't recall that.

829 Q. If you don't remember, that's fine. And it continues on then:
"He admitted that he hi nself was al so invol ved in this campai gn to destroy me and the common intention was to bury MzCabe. "

There is another sentence then:
"He conti nued by stating that Commi ssi oner Nói rín O' Sullivan knew everything and she was the pusher in the campai gn to di scredit me, not Martin Callinan."

What's your memory of the reference to that?
A. Well, we didn't use the word pusher.
Q. A11 right.
A. But I do recall that Dave said that Commissioner O'Sullivan would have been aware of what was going on,
because herself and Commissioner Callinan worked closely together.
Q. All right. And was there any significance in relation to the pusher comment in relation to Nóirín
o'Sullivan's role in your husband's criminal
A. well, the word pusher wasn't used.

832 Q. Yes.
A. But I believe that it was a case that we felt that Commissioner o'Sullivan was anxious to get a charge against Dave, so we would have said that to Sergeant McCabe; that we felt she was very anxious to get a charge against him.
833 Q. And that was both yourself and your husband felt that?
A. Yes.

834 Q. Okay. Now, the next thing I want to ask you about is the next bullet point:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "He said that he, David Tayl or, was invol ved in sending } \\
& \text { hundreds of text messages about me to the then Deputy } \\
& \text { Commissioner O Sullivan and ot her seni or officers and } \\
& \text { nembers of the media. He stated that Commissioner } \\
& \text { Martin Callinan usually provided the text of the vile } \\
& \text { messages about me and my family and sent themto } \\
& \text { Superintendent Taylor's mobile. Commissioner } \\
& \text { Callinan's orders and instructions were to forward on } \\
& \text { the messages to the above persons, which he al ways did. } \\
& \text { Commissioner o Sullivan usually replied with one word, } \\
& \text { "perfect"." }
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, your memory of that exchange I think is different?
A. It is different, yes.
Q.

And if you could just tell us about your memory of what was said in relation to text messages.
A. Okay. Basically Dave told Sergeant McCabe that he would send text messages to the commissioners if there was anything related to him in the media. If there was a programme, as I said earlier, he would inform them. And that Commissioner Callinan would text back "thanks Dave" or "Davy", because he always used to laugh, he'd say Davy, and Commissioner O'Sullivan always replied back "perfect".
836 Q. A11 right. Now, you understand that a number of other people understood that what Superintendent Taylor, your 16:03 husband, was doing was disseminating text messages to members of the media which were negative in their terms towards Sergeant McCabe? Say, for instance -- and this doesn't make you wrong or right, you understand that.
A. Yeah.

837 Q. But say, for instance, Deputy McGuinness thinks that was the case and Clare Daly's understanding was that Superintendent Taylor broadly agreed with the terms of the protected disclosure. okay?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

And also in relation to Mr. Clifford, that that was his understanding; that text messages were used to deploy the -- in very general terms now, I'm paraphrasing.
A. Yeah.

839 Q. And this is something that was certainly put across in his book. And while Mick wallace, Deputy wallace wasn't quite so certain. But I was just wondering, do you think it could have been said or could have been understood by anybody to say that text messages were used to disseminate?
A. Text messages weren't used to disseminate.

840 Q. okay.
A. Because Dave actually wasn't a great texter. He wasn't a big texter.
841 Q. A11 right.
A. He'd pick up the phone and ring quicker than send a text.
842 Q. okay. But the word "perfect" was used by --
A. Yeah, that's correct.

843 Q. -- Commissioner O'Sullivan?
A. Yeah.

844 Q. Now, I was just wondering about this, because it's a rather strange reply to a text that, on Superintendent Taylor's account, was that there is another media release in relation to Sergeant McCabe, you understand?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

845 Q. On your version and Superintendent Taylor's version of events.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

846 Q. So if this wasn't a welcome thing in Garda Headquarters it would be kind of strange if Commissioner o'Sullivan was replying "perfect" to a message informing of yet another publicity event or --
A. Well, it wouldn't necessarily just be about that. Any --
Q. Yes?
A. -- text he would text here, her reply was always "perfect", not just necessarily in relation to Maurice McCabe. Like, there'd be lots of other texts going back and forward, if there was an incident or a murder, he would always send both of them a text and they would both always reply back. That was always the reply.
848 Q. So no matter what text was sent to Commissioner
A. We11, to the best of my knowledge it was "perfect".

849 Q. That's what you understood?
A. That's my understanding, yeah.

850 Q. Al1 right. So then in relation to the next bullet point:
"He stated that Commissioner Ó Sullivan would go to any level tolie. Superintendent Tayl or told me that he was so sorry for what he had done to me. He stated he contacted a spiritual person two weeks ago looking for forgi veness. Superintendent Tayl or broke down and he sai d he absol utel y destroyed Sergeant McCabe."

Now, you have a slightly different understanding about contacting a spiritual person, is that right?
A. That's correct, yes. My husband was in a very bad way, we were financially worried, my children were very traumatised and we didn't know what was going to happen
to us. I had nowhere to turn. I couldn't use the welfare because they were guards, so I didn't want to use the Garda welfare. So I was trying to think what I could do. So I thought of Father Joe. I'd never met him, I'd never had any dealings with him, but I was so desperate but I called him one night because I actually thought Dave was going to die.
851 Q. Okay, al1 right. Do you think -- your husband said that Commissioner o'sullivan would go to any level to 1ie?
A. No.

852 Q. You don't think that was --
A. No.

853 Q. Okay. Was there anything like that said?
A. No, not about lies.

854 Q. Okay. Now, the next bullet point:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "He stated that hi s three phones were sei zed from hi m } \\
& \text { under warrant and that these phones would show all text } \\
& \text { messages he got from Commi ssi oner Cal I i nan and sent on 16:07 } \\
& \text { to Deputy Commi ssi oner O Sulli van." }
\end{aligned}
$$

Do you think that was said?
A. He said that three phones were seized, yes.

855 Q. A11 right. And in relation to those phones, I think you lodged a complaint to GSOC in relation to one of those phones, is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

856 Q. And that was, I think, in or around March 2016?
A. Well, the incident happened with the phone on November 13th.
Q. So it could have been earlier?
A. It was November 17th. My neighbour came to me on November 13th to tell me about it.

858 Q. In 2015, the same year --
A. The same year.

859 Q. -- perhaps that your husband was suspended?
A. Yes. Oh yes, he was on suspension at the time.

860 Q. The same calendar year, do you think?
A. Yes.

861 Q. And just in relation to that, it was Superintendent Taylor's phone, isn't that right?
A. It was, yeah. It was my husband's phone, it was one of the three phones that was seized.
A. And my neighbour came to me and she said, just to let you know, Dave tried to get into my group chat last night. So I was a bit embarrassed and I said well actually, he doesn't have that phone. And she was there, I said to Dave that's not very nice, you don't have the phone. And I don't think he got the seriousness of it, that it was a Viber group that he was trying to become part of with his phone, that he didn't have. So I was embarrassed in front of my
neighbour in case she did think that Dave was trying to get into her group chat. So I had to explain to her that Dave didn't have that phone, he hadn't had it since he was arrested. .

863 Okay. Now, the next bullet point refers to the Oisín issue and intelligence files on Sergeant McCabe in Garda Headquarters.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

868 Q. Do you think that was said?
A. We11, Oisín was discussed, yeah.

869 Q. A11 right. And in what context?
A. We11, Dave was saying to him that there's another system in Garda Headquarters called Oisin which is separate to Pulse.

870 Q. And was that all that was said in relation to it?
A. Well, Dave said there could be a file on himself on it,

871 Q. Okay. We11, do you remember telling the investigators something, maybe not different, but certainly additional to -- if we look at page 3402 at the very top of the page?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

You see, you're asked about that particular paragraph in the protected disclosure just over the page and your answer is:
"They di d di scuss $\operatorname{Oi}$ sin, but not in that context. Dave told Maurice McCabe that his three phones were taken of $f$ himin the investigation and that they were probabl y downl oaded on to Oi sin, whi ch is a separate computer systemto Pulse, and that Dave felt they were probably files on Dave in that system"
A. Well, that's, Dave said there was probably a file on him, something on Oisin, because he'd been arrested.

873 Q. Okay. And in relation to the context Oisin was discussed in, was it in relation to downloading phones onto Oisin?
A. Not really. It was just that it was a separate system, it was a separate system to Pulse and that Dave felt there could be a file on him because he was arrested on it.

874 Q. So that answer to the investigators, are you standing over it or -- just take your time.
A. What do you mean standing over?
Q. Do you think that Superintendent Taylor said to

Sergeant McCabe that his phones, Superintendent Taylor's three phones, were taken off him in the investigation and they were probably downloaded onto Oisin?
A. I don't recall that about the phones being on Oisin. what I recall is that there would have been a file on Dave on Oisin.
Q. Well, the reason I'm asking you is that is what you told our investigators. I think this interview was in march of this year.
A. Mm-hmm. Yes. We11, my interpretation of that sentence is:
"Superintendent Tayl or told Maurice MkCabe that his three phones were taken of $f$ himon the investigation and they were probably dounl oaded onto $O$ isin."

So you're recording your husband as saying that to the meeting, the room on 20th September; that your husband thought they were probably downloaded onto Oisin?
A. Well, I'm sure he probably did, yeah. Because if his arrest was on it --
879 Q. All right.
A. -- that it was possibly that they were.

880 Q. Okay, we'11 pass from that. And in relation to dealings with Superintendent Cunningham, what do you
remember of that?
A. I remember Dave had got a call to say that Superintendent Cunningham had heard that the file was possibly back from the DPP with no charge, so we were very excited to hear that, because we'd been waiting a while. And Dave said he'd give him a call to see where he heard it from. And I said oh, please do, because it would be, you know, positive news. So he called him --
A. -- to see if he'd heard that.

882 Q. okay. And was there any conversation about being thrown under the bus? Do you remember anything?
A. Yeah, do I remember that. I think it was in the context that Superintendent Cunningham heard that I think there was a file sent to the DPP and he heard about it in the media and that he felt he'd been thrown under the bus.

883 Q. Okay. In relation to Chief Superintendent Fergus Healy, do you remember a conversation about -- touching on him?
A. Yeah. Just basically that my husband had been collecting my daughter from school in the Phoenix Park and that he had bumped into him and he came over and he shook hands with him and was very supportive and it meant an awful lot to us at the time.
884 Q. And was that the extent of that?
A. Yes, yeah.

885 Q. Was there a mention of the O'Higgins Commission at all?
A. To the best of my recollection, I can't --
A. Yeah, no, I would be happy with that, yeah. But that was never, it was never --
894 Q. Yes. So the reference there to disciplinary charges going away isn't a million miles away from the discussion; there was a reference to retiring, isn't that right?
A. Well, not with Dave. Dave wasn't --
Q. At the meeting, yes.
A. -- at the discussion. It was, his solicitors said back to him, you know, that we have no problem if you want to retire.
Q. To retire, yes. But in relation to that, that was mentioned at the meeting to Sergeant McCabe.
A. Yeah, that he could retire if he wanted.

897 Q. That he could retire if he wanted?
A. Yeah, that wouldn't be -- yeah.
Q. And he was suspended at that time, wasn't he?
A. Yes, he was on suspension. Yeah.

899 Q. So even though he was suspended he could retire in the normal way that one does?
A. Yes.

900 Q. And obviously he could no longer be suspended because he was retired --
A. Yeah.

901 Q. -- isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

902 Q. And there would be no question of disciplining him as a members of the guards who was retired, because they weren't a member of the guards?
A. I assume so, yeah.
Q. I may be incorrect, but it may be the case that you can't retire when you are under suspension. But you're certainly clear in your head that there was a suggestion that he could retire coming out of that meeting?
CHA RMAN I think you have to get consent, isn't that right? There has to be consent from the Commissioner for retirement, isn't that right, Mr. O'Higgins?
MS. LEADER: I'm being told it is.
CHA RMAR Yes, that was the Morris Tribunal situation anyway, yes. But if you're being offered it, I presume that consent is part of the offer.
MS. LEADER: Yes, that consent, it's inferred.
904 Q. But you're happy there was a reference to him being able to retire at a meeting between his solicitors and the guards?
A. Yeah, but he wasn't at that meeting.

905 Q. He wasn't at that meeting?
A. Yeah.

906 Q. Okay. A11 right. You met with Deputy McGuinness in 2017, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

907 Q. And at that meeting what was discussed?
A. We11, obviously Dave's suspension and the fact that he was out of work and the difficulties in the family. And also that, discussed Maurice McCabe and Dave said he had been involved in a campaign against Sergeant McCabe.

908 Q. Okay. And was there any reference to the meetings that had happened in Dái 1 Éireann in 2014?
A. No. It was actually a very cautious meeting. It was, I was hoping it would be a little bit more friendly, because I wanted to go a different area about our own situation, but it was quite a cautious meeting. okay. Because it may be a time, if your husband was explaining to Deputy McGuinness - and I'm just exploring this, Mrs. Taylor - that there was a campaign orchestrated against Sergeant McCabe, that it might be mentioned, well, you might remember, Deputy McGuinness, that the Commissioner said to you that Sergeant McCabe was a kiddie fiddler after the PAC meeting, sure didn't I hear him say it to you, isn't that proof of the campaign; did you hear any reference to that at all?
A. I am $100 \%$ positive that didn't come up.

910 Q. It wasn't said?
A. It wasn't said, yeah.

911 Q. By either party?
A. By either parties.

MS. LEADER: Thanks very much. If you'd answer any other questions.

## THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. MEDONELL

912 Q. MR. MEDOVELL: Mrs. Taylor, Michael McDowell is my name 16:20 and I am one of Maurice McCabe's counse1 and subject to a direction from the Chairman, I don't want to get into any adversarial argument with you, but I am obliged to put a few things to you under a ruling of the courts in

Brown v. Dunne, a case which says that I have to put my client's case to you.
CHA RMAN It doesn't have to be very long.
913 Q.
MR. MEDONELL: It doesn't have to -- I don't want to get into a minute argument with you about anything.

But I am suggesting to you that in relation to the protected disclosure, the bit of that that relates to the meeting, that Sergeant McCabe's account is correct, that's my overall suggestion to you.
A. You're asking me if Sergeant McCabe's --

914 Q. Yeah, that his account of what happened that evening in your house is correct. That's the first thing I'm going to put to you.
A. The meeting where he met Dave for the first time?

915 Q. Yes. You have the protected disclosure that he made and Ms. Leader has just put to you.
A. Oh yes, I'm thinking of the discrepancies later. 916 Q. Yeah. I'm generally just putting to you the general proposition that his account --
A. I don't have the disclosure in front of me, but to the best of my recollection.
917 Q. Well, can I ask you a few questions about it? In relation to the car park -- sorry, the meeting in the car park, can I suggest to you that that would hardly have arisen if there had not been some discussion of what was said to Deputy McGuinness? I mean, a meeting in a car park just by itself without other discussion wouldn't make any sense at all.
A. Are you asking me if we had met Deputy McGuinness

918 Q. No. Deputy MCGuinness apparently in the Dáil said that he had met Commissioner Callinan in the car park. This is in 2016.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

919 Q. And as I understand it, your husband was telling Sergeant McCabe in your house that he remembered the day that this happened.
A. I do too, yeah. No, that's correct.
Q. Yes. And I'm just putting to you the proposition that you'd hardly just discuss a meeting in a car park unless there was a discussion about what was told to Deputy McGuinness at that time.
A. The context of the meeting in the car park, Dave was explaining to him that he had to postpone the press conference --

921 Q. Yeah.
A. -- because Deputy McGuinness had requested to see Martin Callinan --

922 Q. Yes.
A. -- and he went to the meeting. And then Dave I think went for something to eat up there. And then Mr. Callinan came back and I believe the mass or the press conference took place. But there was no discussion, because Dave didn't actually know what was
that year -- we're talking about September 2016, isn't that right?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

And earlier that year John McGuinness had said openly in the Dáil that Commissioner Callinan had said very bad things about Sergeant McCabe to him at that meeting. And I've got to suggest to you that that must have been discussed, because there was otherwise no reason to discuss a meeting in a car park.
A. It definitely wasn't discussed. The context it was discussed was the fact that Dave had to cancel the meeting. And the meeting was put back. But why was this meeting important at all? why was David telling Maurice McCabe about a meeting if it wasn't the meeting to which --
A. Well, I think --
Q. -- John McGuinness had made a public reference?
A. I think it was just a general conversation that, about that. But I know Dave didn't know the context of the meeting.
927 Q. We11, I won't put it any further. But I'm putting to you it wouldn't make sense to discuss that meeting unless the significance of what was said to Deputy McGuinness was being discussed as well.
A. Well, I know that when Mr. Callinan -- Dave told me Mr. Callinan came back, the mass happened and then Dave didn't have any time on his own with him, so he didn't know about that meeting, or the contents of it.

928 Q. I see. But I think it was in the public domain that

Deputy McGuinness had claimed that Martin Callinan had slandered Sergeant McCabe at that meeting. That had happened a few months before this meeting in your house.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

929 Q. And I'm just saying that it can only have been in that context that there was a reference to the car park meeting. That's what I'm putting to you?
A. The only reference to the car park meeting was the fact that it was delayed.

930 Q. But why would that be important at all?
A. I think they were just talking about, you know, the whole, everything.
931 Q. Okay. I won't put it any further than that in relation to that issue. Could I also put it to you that I fully accept that your husband was upset and that he was emotionally upset during the meeting, but Sergeant McCabe is clear that he was told that your husband was sending hundreds of text messages about him to the then-Deputy Commissioner o'Sullivan and the Commissioner Martin Callinan.
A. The texts that were being sent were in relation to anything that was coming up in the media or anything that was on TV, he would text them to inform them what was going on. So there would have been texts about that and texts about everything else that was going on in the media.

932 Q. And that their content, the content of messages he gave to the media was decided by Commissioner Callinan.

```
A. No, that's not true.
Q. I see. And I'11 just ask you again, if it was simply news about Sergeant McCabe being on the radio or somebody saying something about Sergeant McCabe on the radio, it would be strange, as Ms. Leader said to you, that Commissioner O'Sullivan would reply using the word "perfect".
A. Well, that was the replies she always sent. Superintendent Noel Cunningham along the lines you've described, is that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And you are equally clear that whether or not your husband attended a meeting, there had been discussion involving the possibility of your husband retiring which would have brought an end to any disciplinary action against him?
A. No, Dave wasn't at that meeting.
Q. No, he wasn't at the meeting. But I mean, there had been discussion between his lawyers and himself, is that right?
A. We11, I don't know what the lawyers discussed at that meeting.
937 Q. We11, I think you did say to the investigators that you understood that such a suggestion had been made between 16:28 the lawyers?
A. I think it was that they wouldn't stop him if he wanted to retire.
938 Q. I see. And --
```

A. And require that, because $I$ had discussed it with him and I said, would that be an option to take the pressure off the family to retire?
939 Q. Yeah. Because Sergeant McCabe was clear in his -- in the note he took of the meeting that this proposition had been put up to your husband.
A. No. Because my husband wasn't at that meeting.
Q. Hmm?
A. My husband wasn't at that meeting, it was the lawyers. Yes. But that he was told that this proposition had been put up at a meeting attended by Deputy Commissioner Twomey?
A. Well, my understanding was that they wouldn't stop him if he wanted to retire.
942 Q. I see. And that was, Deputy Commissioner Twomey said that your husband's lawyers, not to your husband directly, is that it?
A. Yes. Yes. I see. And there was discussion about Chief Superintendent Healy, was there not?
A. Yes.

944 Q. And can you just tell us what that discussion was?
A. That he had bumped into superintendent -- my husband had bumped into Superintendent Healy in the Phoenix Park and that he came over and he asked him how he was and he was very sympathetic to him and asked him how he was getting on. And it meant an awful lot to Dave at the time that there was some very good people there supporting us, who were willing to come over and shake
our hand and wish us we11. Yes. And that he also mentioned to him that his phone might have been tapped.
A. I don't recal1 that, a phone tapping, no.

949 Q. I see. And I think then to conclude, what I'm suggesting to you is that Sergeant McCabe appeared to be very interested in what was being said to him and taking a note to remind himself of what happened.
A. Yeah, we told him we'd no problem with him taking notes.

950 Q. There is one last thing: You say that on the following day when Sergeant McCabe came back, having consulted make a protected disclosure and said that one of his lawyers, who he described as Michael, had advised that; Sergeant McCabe says that that is not correct?
A. Okay. We11, that's my recollection of the day. MR. MEDONELL: I see. Thank you, Mrs. Taylor.
A. Thank you.

## THE WTNESS WAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MS. BURNS

M5. BURNS: Good afternoon, Mrs. Taylor. My name is Tara Burns and I am representing your husband. Just a very few short questions. In relation to the day that Sergeant McCabe came to your house, you've referred in your interview with the Tribunal investigators to the fact that there had been a family crisis the evening before. Now, I obviously don't want to go into that, but is that the case, that there had been family trouble the previous evening?
A. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. In relation to the family issue, did that have an effect on your husband?
A. Yes. It had a profound effect.

CHA RMAN A11 right. We11, I am sorry for all that happening, Mrs. Taylor, you will appreciate. I think Ms. Burns was approaching it in that kind of way, so that it wouldn't become public knowledge, and I'm actually going to strike it from the record. A11
right. And the press aren't entitled to report that. And if they feel I don't have the authority to say that well then they can take a judicial review. But I think I'11 win. And I'm sure in any event they will behave responsibly.
ME. BURNS: I am grateful to the Chairman, I didn't mean it --
CHA RMAN Yes. I think you are really pressing her on the thing there, Ms. Burns.
M. BURNS: well, I do have an interest in terms of the effect that this had on your husband and if I could ask you in relation to that, did it have an effect?
CHA RMAN Well, let's suppose, I mean, you know, I am a human being, I am a father and all the rest of it, I can imagine. My imagination is pretty good.
MS. BURNS: wel1, once the Tribunal accepts that. CHAI RMAK No, I do. I'm saying I am sure he was devastated and terribly upset. I'd accept that as a fact. Yes, and as a leading question, I will accept that as a very good leading question and we'11 just leave it at that.
ME. BURNS: I see. Thank you very much, Chairman.
956 Q. Mrs. Taylor then, in relation to Sergeant McCabe coming to the house, we've already heard evidence from Sergeant McCabe that your husband apologised to him, is 16:33 that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

957 Q. I see. And what was Sergeant McCabe's attitude to that?
A. He said he accepted his apology.

958 Q. I see. And you've also referred to the fact that you made contact with Father Kennedy?
A. Yes.

959 Q. Now, I understand that's the chaplain within An Garda Síochána --
A. Yeah, it is.

960 Q. -- is that correct? Can you recollect when that contact was made?
A. I can't $100 \%$ recollect, but I think, I think it was before Dave met Maurice McCabe. I think it was.
Q. I see.
A. And it was just things had gone so bad for Dave and --

962 Q. And what occurred arising from that contact? Did Father Kennedy do anything?
A. Well, he spent some time with Dave, yeah, he did. I asked him to spend some time just to maybe give him some, you know, support, because there wasn't really any support.
963 Q. I see. I take it from that that he met with Dave?
A. Yes. Oh, he came to the house. He came to the house the next day.
MS. BURNS: I see. Thank you very much.
CHA RMAN Thanks, Ms. Burns. Was there any other questions? No.
MR. QUN: Chair, with a view to asking no questions, I just make the following observation. I know that the witness was at a meeting with Mr. Clifford. She hasn't been asked any questions about that and I have

Mr. Clifford's account of it, but if it doesn't come up I am happen to leave it.
CHAN RMAN Yes. But is there any contradiction of Mr. Clifford's account, do you think, Mr. Quinn?
MR. QU NE I suspect there probably would be a slight difference if we got into it. Now it's not for us to decide what is relevant, it wasn't led in evidence yet, so --

CHA RMAN No, but it's been referred to tangentially in a few places.
MR. QUNE Yes. I could do it very quickly.
CHA RMAN Yes, I think that is the thing do; just put a couple of bullet points if you wish and if there is anything left out in terms of detail 1 will take you as putting the rest of that, all right, would that be fair?

MR. QU N: Absolutely, Chair.

## THE WTNESS WAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR QU NN

964 Q. MR. QUN: Mrs. Taylor, Oisin Quinn is my name. I am 16:35 for Mr. Mick Clifford, the journalist I have heard mentioned. I think he was a meeting with yourself and your husband on perhaps two occasions during the summer of 2016; can you recall the fact that he was at two meetings? They may have been in your house?
A. That's correct, yes.

965 Q. And I just want to put to you broadly speaking what he can recollect from those meetings and obviously you can say if you agree or disagree and explain what you can
recall. So he says that at the first meeting your husband effectively laid out a case that he believed that the criminal investigation against him was motivated by the then-Commissioner Nóirín o'sullivan wanting to get her hands on your husband's mobile phones.
A. You're asking me if that was said, is it?
Q. Yeah. That's Mr. Clifford's recollection of what your husband was saying to him, and you would have been there.
A. I don't recall my husband saying that the phones, that the Garda Commissioner wanted to get her hands on the phones.
967 Q. Okay. And he also, Mr. Clifford recollects your husband pointing out that the Commissioner,

Commissioner O'Sullivan's husband, Mr., or Superintendent Jim McGowan was part of the team investigating him.
A. That's correct, yes.

968 Q. Yeah. And Mr. Clifford recalls your husband saying that the reason she wanted to get his phones, i.e. your husband's phones, was because your husband was explaining that on his phones was evidence that would link Commissioner o'Sullivan to the smear campaign.
A. Well, on the phones he was saying that he would've texted to say there was something in the media or there was something on the radio.

CHA RMAN Yeah, and Mr. Quinn is putting to you that in fact it was somewhat different, which was that the
phones would've contained actual evidence of the campaign texts between him and Nóirín o'Sullivan or --
A. Probably.

CHA RMAN -- Commissioner Callinan about the smear campaign, as opposed to about 'Someone said such and such about Sergeant McCabe on the radio' type thing.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN So do you think that that was said? Because there's a big gap between the two and it may not be understood. On the one hand, your husband had the duty 16:37 to report, keep his eyes and ears open, 'This was said about Maurice McCabe on the radio or the television' and on the other hand what Mr. Clifford is referring to, and that's Mr. Quinn's question to you was, he says that your husband was saying that there were exchanges of texts about the campaign to discredit Maurice McCabe between him and the Commissioner or the Deputy Commissioner. Do you see the difference?
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN And what do you think the answer is to that? 16:38
A. I actually can't, I can't recollect that. I can't recollect that discussion.

969 Q. MR. QUN: okay. And that during this meeting your husband put a big emphasis on how, in his view, the texts were key to everything and that he had used texts 16:38 to blacken Sergeant McCabe's name and the texts on his phone would show who was in the loop, namely Commissioner O'Sullivan.
A. No, he never said that he sent texts to blacken. I
know that. He never said that. He said that he sent texts to say there was issues in the media, but not to blacken him.

970 Q.
okay. Now, just then to put to you something about the second meeting - and this was, I think, sometime later, but again perhaps towards the end of the summer of 2016. I think again it's yourself and your husband and Mr. Clifford. And Mr. Clifford had essentially three things he was asking your husband for confirmation about - so this was somewhat in the nature of Mr. Clifford coming back to kind of check things - and those were, firstly, that texts had been used to blacken Sergeant McCabe's name, he wanted to check that with your husband. Can you recall him checking that?
A. I don't recall him asking if there was texts. CHA RMAN Are you referring to the e-mail there, Mr. Quinn, is that it?

MR. QUN: No, this is a second meeting.
CHA RMAN Oh, right, a second meeting, yes. And how long after the first meeting are we talking about?
MR. QU N: I think it is towards the end of the summer 2016, so maybe --

CHA RMAN A month or so later?
MR. QU NN A month or so, yeah.
CHA RMAN And you were there for that meeting as we11, 16:39 were you?
A. Yes, I was.

CHA RMAK A11 right, okay. So do you think that the texts came up again in that context --
A. No.

CHA RMAN -- texts being used to blacken, as opposed to texts being used to just inform what the media say?
A. Yeah, to inform, not to blacken.

CHA RMAN That's all? Yes, all right. that he recollects, and that your husband confirmed that to him.
A. No. Because it was not --

972 Q. Then the second thing he was checking was that Superintendent Taylor, that your husband had said that there was an intelligence file in HQ on Sergeant McCabe.
A. No, we just said there was an Oisin system, which was different to Pulse.

973 Q. Yes. I think that probably is the same thing. But Mr. Clifford recollects he asked your husband, 'I'm checking with you, did you believe that there was an intelligence file on Sergeant McCabe in HQ?' And your husband confirmed that to him at this second meeting.
A. Well, I don't think he did. Because he wouldn't have known, he was suspended.

974 Q. Okay. And then the third thing he wanted to check was was your husband saying that he believed a guard had been assigned to monitor Sergeant McCabe on Pulse.
A. No, never heard that. Again, Dave was suspended, so he wouldn't have known that.

975 Q. Okay. And his recollection is that your husband confirmed that as well.
A. No.

MR. QUN: Thanks very much, Mrs. Taylor.
CHA RMAN I think those are the highlights certainly, Mr. Quinn. Thank you very much for that. Was there any questions?

MR LEHANE: Yes, Mrs. Taylor, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Yes, certain7y. Maybe you'd just tell Mrs. Taylor who you appear for please.

## THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. LEHANE AS FOLLO/6:

MR. LEHANE: Yes, Mrs. Taylor, I'm down here at the back on your right. My name is Darren Lehane and I appear on behalf of Deputy John McGuinness and I just want to ask you a few questions in relation to your meeting with Deputy McGuinness in the Skylon hotel if that's okay? Now, you've given evidence to the Chairman that it was a cautious meeting, that you were anxious to discuss family issues and that Deputy McGuinness wanted to ascertain exactly what had happened factually to your husband.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm} \mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Isn't that right? And among those facts as communicated by your husband to Deputy McGuinness was the fact that he had been used by Commissioner Callinan and Deputy Commissioner o'Sullivan to brief negatively against Sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. You're asking me if my husband said --

977 Q. That's what he said at the meeting.
CHA RMAN No, I think what you're being asked - and it's easy to misunderstand - there's only you and there's only John McGuinness, presumably having a cup of tea or something in the skylon, and what you're being asked about is what did you say to him, not what your husband said to you, but just what you said to him.
A. Okay.

MR. LEHANE: Yes.
A. Well, basically I had told him our story and our situation and that, you know, we were in a bad place.
Q. Okay. Now, you're aware that Deputy McGuinness has given evidence to the Tribunal in relation to his recollection of this meeting?
A. (Witness Nods).

980 Q. And you're aware that Deputy McGuinness has given evidence that he was told that texts were used for the purposes of briefing negatively against Sergeant McCabe, you're aware of that?
A. That actually wasn't said though.

981 Q. We11, no, you're aware that that's what Deputy McGuinness has told the Tribunal in his evidence?
A. Yes.

982 Q. Could it - and I appreciate this, it's stressful giving 16:43 evidence for you here today and I appreciate it was very stressful for you meeting Deputy McGuinness in the skylon over a coffee discussing these matters - but could it have been said at that meeting that texts were
used as part of this campaign?
A. There was no texts used to send negative information out about Sergeant Maurice McCabe.
983 Q. No, no, but I'm just asking you could it have been said in the conversation between your husband, yourself and Deputy McGuinness that texts were used?
A. Oh, yeah, texts were used to say if there was something in the media or if, as I had said earlier, he would've said that to John McGuinness that, yes, he would've briefed the commissioners of a programme or a radio station that was carrying something on --
Q. I just want to be fair to you, Mrs. Taylor, and I draw the distinction between texts being used for the purpose of your husband communicating to the Commissioners of things he was doing and texts being used by your husband to communicate with other persons, for example journalists. And it's the latter that I'm interested in.
A. No, there was never any negative texts sent to journalists.
Q. I know that's your evidence, but could it have been said in the course of the conversation?
A. No, because it never happened.
Q. Okay. Could anything have been said in the course of that conversation which could've suggested that that was the case?
A. I don't believe so, because it's just something that never happened.
987 Q. Okay. I have to put to you my instructions, which are
that it was said that text messages were used to brief negatively against Sergeant McCabe at that meeting.
A. Well, that's not true. That wasn't said.

CHA RMAN We11, I think what you're saying is that you were taken up wrong?
A. Well, I don't know how this is gone in, because there was never any negative texts sent to journalists about Maurice McCabe.

CHA RMAK A11 right. No, I understand that. Thank you very much, Mr. Lehane. Mr. Whelan, did you want to 16:45 ask anything?

## THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. WFELAN AS FOLLOV:

988 Q. MR. WFELAN Mrs. Taylor, I appear and I have some questions on behalf of former Commissioners Martin Callinan, Nóirín O'Sullivan and, relevantly, the Director of Communications Andrew McLindon of An Garda Siochana. And just a few factual matters you may or may not be able to assist us with; obviously for the period 2013 and 2014 when the Garda, as a Press officer, your husband was very busy, being married to Press Officer, in the home of a Press officer, the media being always on, he was always busy, as it were?
A. Mm hmm.

989 Q. And it often intruded in phone calls on his mobile or whatever in the house, is that correct?
A. That's correct, yeah.

990 Q. And he, in his evidence, has not been able to specify the circumstances of any particular occasion when he gave the journalists what you described as a back story about Maurice McCabe and the sexual allegation. You say you overheard that on one or more occasions, do I understand?
A. Well, it would just be a case, 'oh, here we go again', you know, 'It's back up again'.
Q. And did you know on any given occasion which journalist he was talking to or whether it was a journalist or a work colleague, or did you just overhear the conversation?
A. Just overheard the conversations.

995 Q. But you can't put particulars, as it were?
A. I'm sorry?

996 Q. You can't be specific about any specific occasion where you say you heard Dave talk in this way about Maurice

McCabe?
A. No, I can't be specific, no.

997 Q. okay. Can I ask you then, you were, and I suppose unhappily for you because it means you're here this afternoon, as it happens you were present for some of the meetings that are relevant to your husband's involvement or account of what occurred. Did I understand you to say that you had had, was it one or two meetings with Maurice McCabe before your husband -before Sergeant McCabe came to your house on 20th September 2016?
A. That's correct, yes.

998 Q. Was that one or two?
A. It was two.

999 Q. And were they both in the skylon Hotel?
A. They were, yes.
Q. And were they both short meetings?
A. The first one was a little bit longer, but if I can recollect, maybe 15 minutes, no more.
Q. And what was the purpose or content of each of those meetings?
A. It was very much family, we didn't discuss anything else, it was very much I was asking him about his wife and his children and asking him how they were coping with him being out. So that was what the conversation was about. And he was, I knew by, he would've liked to meet Dave he told me.
Q. Was he at these meetings seeking, as it were - I think he had in the phone call - to meet Dave, is that
A. Well, I'm sure he didn't really want to meet me.
Q. Sorry?
A. I'm sure it wasn't really me he wanted to --
Q. You're sure he didn't want to meet you. But as I say, 16:48 having the meetings with you, you agreed to meet him?
A. I agreed to meet him.
Q. And from those meetings, you took that he was anxious to meet Dave?
A. I did, yes.
Q. And Dave wasn't in a frame of mind to meet Maurice at that stage?
A. No, absolutely. He did not want to meet him.
Q. And what was your view in that regard as to whether Dave should or should not meet Maurice?
A. Well, I wanted him to do what he was happy with.
Q. okay.
A. I said 'The fact that he's come into your life and he's rang you', I said, 'It's up to you what you want to do with it'.
Q. Did I understand you to say then that while Dave, your husband, was a Press officer, you were aware that he was doing this smearing, if we call it that, about Maurice McCabe?
A. I wasn't aware it was a smearing at the time, I just knew it was negative. Because it was the penalty points and it looked like Sergeant McCabe was winning the media --
Q. But you were aware that he was telling the back story

1012 Q.
of Sergeant, as you've described it, of Sergeant
McCabe's --
A. We11, when I say of "aware of it", it was because 'Oh, there was an incident up there over Ms. D'.
Q. No, but I'm saying -- exactly; you were clear that your husband was telling journalists a back story, as you say, about -- that Sergeant McCabe had faced a sexual assault allegation --
A. Mm hmm .
-- which the DPP had directed no charges in. And were you aware that -- he says that he was directed by Martin Callinan, the Commissioner at the time, to do that. And are you saying you were aware of that, that he'd been directed by the Commissioner to do that?
A. Well, at that stage he believed what he was doing was right. I think he believed this was the right procedure he had to follow.
Q. And what was your view of it?
A. Of? Well, I just --
Q. What he was doing at the time.
A. Well, I believed what he was doing was right, because he was doing his job and I didn't kind of pay an awful lot attention to it. I wasn't in it, you know, I just wasn't --
Q. Were you shocked or appalled to hear him doing it?
A. I didn't really have any feelings on it, to be honest with you.
Q. Your husband's evidence was that it took him a year or so to be out of what he described as the hothouse or a
hot atmosphere, the atmosphere of the Gardaí before he came to a realisation that what he was doing in terms of filling journalists in with this back story about Maurice McCabe was wrong. Did you come to any such realisation, and when?
A. I came to a realisation of that personally for me when he was suspended.
Q. oh, obviously you came to a realisation it had an impact, but when did you come to a realisation of what he had done, what he had been doing was wrong?
A. I believed he was doing his job. I never gave too much thought into whether it was right or wrong. He was just acting on a brief from his, you know, from the Commissioner.
Q. You now agree at that your husband, that if it happened, it was wrong presumably?
A. That to brief negatively?
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah, it was, yeah.
Q. And when did you come to that view?
A. I suppose when Dave said 'what I did was wrong'.

1021 Q. When he came to that view?
A. When he said that to me. Not that I have to be led by my husband, but I just wasn't really paying too much attention to it. You know, I knew it was going on, but ${ }_{\text {16:51 }}$ there was a lot else going on in my life. Because Dave was just constantly on the phone. I was doing everything on my own.
Q. In April, May and across the summer you met Sergeant

McCabe a couple of times for coffee, you said that you were concerned for Dave and that's why you, as it were, were engaging with Sergeant McCabe rather than Dave directly, is that correct?
A. Yes, yeah.
Q. And Dave was, and he's told the Tribunal about it himself, it was obviously a traumatic event for the family, the circumstances in which, firstly, he'd been moved from the Press office, but more importantly, when the criminal investigation began, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And you've said that -- did I understand you to say that about two weeks before he met Maurice McCabe you first made contact with Father Joe Kennedy?
A. I can't be $100 \%$ specific with the dates, but to the best of my recollection it was before he met Maurice McCabe. I can't be $100 \%$.
Q. Okay. If it helps, there's no issue on that, your husband told us this morning that he thought it was some weeks before he met Sergeant McCabe.
A. Mm hmm .
Q. He did say that he didn't tell anybody else, apart from what we now know to be Father Joe Kennedy, before he told Maurice McCabe - and he told you obviously, he told Father Joe Kennedy and he told Maurice McCabe on 20th September 2016. Were you aware, however, that he had also told Michael Clifford, the journalist?
A. Told him?
Q. Were you aware that David had told Michael Clifford, the journalist about the smear campaign he says he was required by Martin Callinan to conduct?
A. I can't actually recall if --
Q. You were present at the meetings with Mr. Clifford in June or July of 2016.
A. No, I think Dave did say that there was a campaign --
Q. Sorry?
A. I think, you know, Dave did acknowledge there was a campaign, to the best of my recollection.
Q. Sorry, I didn't hear that answer. Tell me it again.
A. I think he did say there was a campaign, like that he was part of a campaign.
Q. He told Michael Clifford he was part of a campaign?
A. Yeah, I think so. To the best of my knowledge, yeah.
Q. That was at the meetings in June or July?
A. Well, in our house.
Q. In June or Ju7y?
A. I can't remember which, but --
Q. Well, they were before he met Maurice McCabe for the first time?
A. Yeah, they were before Maurice McCabe.
Q. Okay. Now, Maurice McCabe, you've dealt with and the other barristers have dealt with the conflict, as it were, of how Maurice McCabe described some aspects of the conversation that he had with you and Dave on the night of 20th September, and you say that on 21st September you were contacted again by Mr. McCabe by phone, that he wanted to call out again to the house, isn't that correct?
A. I think it could've been on 20th when he left, he rang later on.
Q. Okay, that's fine.
A. If he was in Dublin the next day --
Q. But in any case, I think he attended for what you
A. Yes.
Q. -- in the house again, $10 / 15$ minutes, $I$ think you said you didn't even get time to offer him a cup of tea?
A. Yes.
Q. On 21st September?
A. Yes.
Q. And you tell the Tribunal that you were taken aback when Maurice indicated to you that he was going to make a protected disclosure?
A. (Witness Nods).
Q. Isn't that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And that he had been advised by his lawyers --
A. Mm hmm .
Q. -- to make a protected disclosure and that his lawyers were of the view that David should make a protected disclosure also.
A. No, he didn't say his lawyers were of the view, he said to Dave 'You know, maybe you should make a protected disclosure'.
Q. Okay. I think what you told the Tribunal was:
"I remenber himsaying that he and $M$ chael felt it was
very i mportant that Dave al so made a protected di scl osure".
A. Yeah.
Q. And did you understand who that Michael was? I don't think --
A. No, I didn't. And I wasn't familiar with a protected disclosure either, to be honest with you.
Q. I think you make that point, that in fact this was why you were surprised, because you had no you understanding of what a protected disclosure involved?
A. Yeah.
Q. But was there any restriction put on the conversation the night before when Dave was telling Sergeant McCabe the account, as he described it, of a smear campaign that he was, he alleges, instructed to do by Commissioner Callinan, was there any restriction put on whether this would be kept private or confidential or at this stage or anything like that?
A. We11, I think when Sergeant McCabe was taking notes, we knew that obviously the information he was going to receive, he probably would have to do something with it. That's why I think Dave never wanted to meet him.
Q. Okay. And I think we know from previous evidence Sergeant McCabe took a page of notes that evening, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then after you left, you told Sergeant McCabe, as he was leaving, that you would ring him again later, that Dave needed to talk to his solicitor,
isn't that correct?
A. Mm hmm , yes.
Q. And I don't want to get into any conversation you, or indeed David, or you indeed, had with the solicitor, but it seems that over the course of the following few days the protected disclosure was prepared, isn't that correct?
A. To the west of my knowledge, yeah.
Q. Okay. And your husband, I think, met with Mr. Clifford, Michael Clifford the journalist about that time as we11, in the early days of October?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. Were you at that third meeting?
A. The third meeting?
Q. The story appeared on 4th October, so it might've been the very first weekend of that October.
A. The protected disclosure story?
Q. The protected disclosure, I think your husband's protected disclosure went in on Wednesday 28th if I'm correct and the weekend then would be the first weekend of October.
A. Mm hmm .
Q. Did you meet Mr. Clifford with your husband that weekend?
A. I actually can't, I can't recall that meeting.
Q. Okay. Did your husband tell you, whether you were at the meeting or not, whether or not he was going to share any of the contents of the protected disclosure with any journalist?
A. No, definitely not. Because he even said to me 'This has to be kept very tight'.
Q. Had to be kept?
A. Very tight.
Q. Were you shocked then when it appeared in the Cork Examiner on 4th October, the following Tuesday, was raised in the Dáil that Tuesday afternoon and became a big massive news story on 4th and 5th October?
A. We11, yeah, I was shocked. It was upsetting to see it in the papers.
Q. It was upsetting to see the protected disclosure in the papers?
A. Mm hmm .
Q. Okay. And te11 me then, you got a call on the Monday afternoon, after that weekend, which was 3rd October, it seems from Deputy Mick Wallace.
A. Yes.
Q. And you were surprised to get that, were you?
A. Yes, I was, yes.
Q. And I think his account is that he had met Mr. McCabe for lunch that day and asked Mr. McCabe if he could talk. Mr. McCabe -- Sergeant McCabe, sorry, had told him about his conversation the previous day with David and yourself and Deputy wallace asked to meet directly and he was provided with your phone number and that's how Deputy wallace came to ring you. And did he suggest to you then that himself and Deputy Daly would call out to the house?
A. He did, yes.
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Q. Or he asked to meet you and you said to call out to the house?
A. Yes, he asked to meet, yeah.
Q. And you had a somewhat lengthy conversation that evening with Deputies Wallace and Daly together?
A. Yeah, my daughter was there and there was kind of --
Q. Coming and going a bit?
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. But I think you'd accept -- were you conscious or was it obvious to you - and I doubt they would make any effort to hide it - that both Deputy Daly and Deputy wallace were taking notes at that meeting?
A. I can't recal1.
Q. Okay. Just to say both of them have provided notes that they took at that meeting in your home with yourself and David. It was just the four of you apart from the family?
A. Yeah, there was my two daughters were being introduced -- but I can't recall notes being taken. I'm not saying there wasn't, but I just don't recall.
Q. But there's no suggestion Sergeant McCabe or anybody was there, it was just yourself and David and the two deputies?
A. Yes.
Q. And they were taking some kind of notes?
A. I can't recollect whether they were or not.
Q. Okay. And again about that meeting on the Monday 3rd, was there any restriction or confinement put that you were sharing in information confidentially at this
stage or were you conscious -- I mean, you may or may not be familiar yourself, once you're talking to a Deputy that this could be Dáil content tomorrow or could be published or whatever; do you recall any of that?
A. Yeah, no, I understand --
Q. There was no saying to them 'Come back to us before you publish this' or 'Don't say anything about this' or 'We're just talking to you one-on-one at the moment'? There was no restriction put on what they could say?
A. I actually don't recall that.
Q. You don't recall?
A. Yeah.
Q. Oh, yes, sorry, correct me if I'm wrong, but did I understand you to accept that your husband had said at your meeting with Maurice McCabe on 20th September 2016 that his view was that Nóirín O'Sullivan was anxious to get a charge on him?
A. Yes.
Q. And can I ask you, was it your husband's sense and indeed was it your own sense that the criminal investigation into him was personalised in that way or personally driven by the Commissioner in that way?
A. Well, personally speaking, I suppose when I saw her husband involved in it, $I$ just got a bit upset.
Because I just felt it was, it wasn't objective.
Q. Yes, I suppose as the first woman Commissioner she'd be the first person to have a husband, as it were, and the first in this case to have a husband --
A. But she had moved him from his position.
Q. Well, again the Tribunal knows more now about the circumstances in which Superintendent McGowan came to be appointed to the investigation and I don't need to contest that with you. But I just want to understand, would it be correct to say that David and yourself and/or yourself developed somewhat of a fixation about the involvement of Superintendent McGowan in the investigation?
A. I wasn't fixated on anything, I was just fixated on keeping my children healthy, because we were in a very dire financial situation.
Q. And in the notes taken by Deputy wallace and Deputy Daly and in such conversations, Superintendent McGowan is referred to and the census seems to be communicated that this was a criminal investigation personalised against David Taylor by the Commissioner personally.
A. No, I wouldn't --
Q. Was that your sense?
A. No, that wasn't my sense.

1079 Q. It wasn't your sense?
A. No, it wasn't my sense.
Q. You didn't have a sense or communicate a sense to anybody else that Nóirín O'Sullivan had it in for your husband and/or was anxious to get a charge on him?
A. No, I just felt that the fact that her husband was leading it, I was just hoping we could get objectivity on it. So I wouldn't --
Q. And did you have a sense that David Taylor, your
husband, had a sense that this was personalised against him by the Commissioner personally?
A. No, I don't think he thought it was personalised.
Q. And whether he was anxious, as it were, to do harm to the Commissioner or her standing as a result of this sense that she had personally, she was personally driving this criminal investigation against him?
A. No, definitely not.
Q. well, what did you mean by indicating that she was anxious to get a charge on him?
A. Because I suppose because her husband was on the team.
Q. So because her husband was on the team, she herself personally, you felt, was anxious to get a charge against your husband?
A. Well, I personally felt that it was awkward for us if her husband was leading the investigation.
Q. Let me ask you one general question then, and it's one the Chairman put to your husband earlier and I'11 put it in different terms perhaps; did you have a sense that your husband was unjustly or unfairly the subject of a criminal investigation, that he was a victim and being unjustly treated, rather than that the investigation was appropriately commenced?
A. I don't really have an opinion on that.
Q. Sorry?
A. I don't really have an opinion on that.

MR. WFELAN You don't really have an opinion on that? Thank you very much, Mrs. Taylor.
A. Okay.

CHAN RMAN Mr. McEnroy, I think?
MR. MEENROY: No, I was just anxious the witness would be, at an appropriate juncture, released, Judge.
CHA RMAK I know, yes. But do you have any questions? MR. MEENROY: No.

CHA RMAN Okay. A11 right. We11, that's all I was asking. Ms. Leader, do you have any questions?

## THE WTNESS WAS RE- EXAM NED BY ME. LEADER AS FOLOVG:

Q. MS. LEADER: In relation to the criminal investigation, did your husband explain to you why he was being investigated?
A. He did, yes.
Q. And what was that for?
A. For the alleged leaking of the information in relation to the Roma children.
Q. It was just the Roma children was your understanding?
A. Just the Roma children, yeah.
Q. Okay. Did he say anything to you about anything else in relation to information that was released to the media?
A. No, it was just in relation to the Roma children.
Q. Okay. And in relation to the Roma children, did he ever say to you that he had released the information?
A. No, he was very upset, because he said being a father and children's names were released, that upset him. Because he said, you know, it was children that were involved, that made it more upsetting for him.
Q. All right. And in relation to Deputy McGuinness, do you recollect at any stage Deputy McGuinness telling your husband what had happened in the car park on the day he left Dundalk?
A. I'm $100 \%$ sure that was not discussed.

MS. LEADER: A11 right. Thanks very much.
A. Thank you.

CHA RMAN There's just one thing. I ask you please not to mention a name, but you said, you know, the Ms. D case was discussed at home; I'm presuming that the name, the family name at least, if not more, was also mentioned at home?
A. Well, I never heard the name. CHA RMAN You never heard the name
A. I never heard it.

CHA RMAN A11 right, that's grand. Thank you very much. You might like to sit down, because I've a few things to go through then, thank you. A11 right, the few things to go through.

Secondly, $I$ can't sit before 10:30 tomorrow. Again, if I'm going to be very late I'11 send a message. I have a meeting again in the Four Courts.

Then lastly, I know Mr. Phelan is here for the Irish
Times and Mr. Berry is here for Gemma O'Doherty and wish to ask questions, but $I$ am not stopping anyone who has said they fee 1 they don't want to ask questions at this point from asking any questions. I gave the
example earlier today, and this is of course not about me, but I do recall, and I said I'm going to repeat it, a situation where a person bound by privilege, as I was at the time, had a list of persons who were constantly in the media - and this is going back decades - in relation to a supposed scandal and a conversation coming up in my presence about a particular individual and I did not break privilege by saying that person's name is not on the list, because I have the list in my office, but I did say that much. If it was a question of perhaps there being only potentially four or five people on the list and ruling out a particular person I could have been breaking privilege, but this was just someone who was being generally spoken of, indeed I think door-stepped on the television in relation to 17:07 that allegation. And I don't believe that's a breach of privilege, but of course I will look forward to any submissions that there are in relation to press privilege and I'm conscious of my obligations under the European Convention on Human Rights in that regard. But that may be an example which helps people or maybe it doesn't, maybe there's something else here that I'm not aware of. We'11 see. Thank you.
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|  |  | $144: 22$ <br> ACTIVITY ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 61:1, 61:9, 61:17, |  | $78: 14$ |
|  |  | $\text { ACTIVITY }_{[1]} \text { - }$ | 64:1, 64:17, $76: 20$ | $6: 14,6: 18,6: 25$ $7: 10.7: 17.8: 20$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 76:26 } \\ & \text { accessible }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 4:1 acts [4]-61:27, | Affidavit [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 10,7: 17,8: 20, \\ & 9: 20,10: 9,21: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $53: 8$ analysis [1] - |
| aback [2] |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Affidavit[1] - } \\ & \text { 60:28 } \end{aligned}$ | 9:20, 10:9, 21:21, $21: 28,22: 9,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { analysis [1] - } \\ & 44: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $29: 25,224: 13$ <br> abandoning [2] <br> - 64:28, 65:6 <br> ability [4]-54:3, | 153:17 accompanied | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 28,61: 29, \\ & 62: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 60:28 | 22:13, 28:19, | $44: 7$ |
|  | [2] - 84:11, 88:9 | actual [4] | afford [1] - 67:1 |  | 217:9 |
|  | according [2] 104:17, 107:2 | $94: 25,109: 15$ | afforded [1] - | 29:10, 29:12, | AND [1] - 3:4 |
|  |  |  | 71:19 aforementione | 30:12, 66:1 |  |
| 88:18, 126:3, | accords [1] - | 138:16, 210:1 <br> adamant [1] |  |  | Andrew [16] - <br> 8:1, 11:6, 11:25, |
| 157:9 | 178:21 <br> account [13] - | 102:2 <br> additional [4] - | d [2] - 69:27, 71:9 |  | 8.1, $11.6,11.25$, |
| able [6]-36:3, |  |  | AFTER [2] - | 68:21, 69:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:17, 14:4, } \\ & \text { 20:19, 21:21, } \\ & \text { 22:2, 22:9, 22:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 170:1, 190:10, | 10:14, 20:5, | $63: 19,64: 5$ | 92:21, 158:10 | 70:8, 71:27, |  |
| 196:16, 216:21, | 107:17, 113:14, | $66: 11,191: 4$ | aftermath [1] | 73:20, 76:24 |  |
| 217:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 186:20, 198:8, } \\ & \text { 198:11, 198:19, } \end{aligned}$ | address [1] - | 14:11 | 109:3, 109:2 | $23: 4,30: 18$ |
| about" |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:7 } \\ & \text { addressed [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | afternoon [4]- | 114:26, 120:11, |  |
| 124:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 208:1, 208:4, } \\ & \text { 218:7, 225:14 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 205: 6,218: 5 \\ & 227: 7,227: 15 \end{aligned}$ |  | angry [1] - 39:13 animosity [1] - |
| abruptly |  | $127: 4,129: 11$ |  | $150: 8,150: 13$ |  |
| 12:3 | 227:20 <br> accuracy [4] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { adjacent }[1] \text { - } \\ & 21: 2 \end{aligned}$ | afterwards [3] - | 154:3, 167:12, | 99:10annoy [1] - |
| abse |  |  | 16:21, 24:27, |  |  |
| 17:20 | $\begin{gathered} 63: 29,86: 13, \\ \text { 86:19, 86:24 } \\ \text { accurate [6] - } \end{gathered}$ | ADJOURNED[2] - 92:18, 234:25 | 40 | 169:6, 169:22, | 139:24 <br> annoying [1] - |
| absolutely [8] - |  |  |  |  |  |
| 91:22, 125:26 |  | ADJOURNMEN |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:25, 169:29, } \\ & 177: 7,217: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 21 \\ & \text { answer [22] - } \\ & 9: 19,14: 9,52: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| 148:10, 148:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:29, } 90: 8, \\ & 95: 27,100: 29, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{T}_{[2]}-92: 22, \\ & 158: 10 \end{aligned}$ | age [1] - 63:17 |  |  |
| 182:2, 187:23, |  | 158:10 <br> administration | agenda [1] - | 220:8, 234:16 allegations [14] |  |
| 208:17, 219:13 | 104:29, 108:21 |  | $141: 15$ |  | 64:9, 64:27, |
| abuse [8]-6:14, | accusation [1] - | [2] - 78:7, 78:15 | agendas [2] | $-20: 19,28: 18$ | $74: 23,74: 24$ |
| 6:25, 7:10, 7:16, | $162: 19$ <br> accuse [1] - | admission [1] - | 8:19, 141:14 aggrieved [1] - | 67:9, 69:7, 69:11,77:9, 102:27, | $75: 16,76: 2$ |
| 9:19, 64:22, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 176:3 } \\ & \text { admitted }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 114:14, 133:27 | $75: 25$ |  | $99: 19$ | 114:15, 128:24, |  |
| abused [1] - |  | $183: 15$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:27, 147:7, } \\ & 178: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:4, 133:2, } \\ & \text { 140:11, 167:4, } \\ & \text { 191:9, 191:26, } \\ & \text { 197:21, 210:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 181:25 | $106: 29,157: 28$ | advancement | $\begin{array}{r} \text { agitated [2] - } \\ 98: 19,157: 18 \end{array}$ |  |  |
| abuser [1] - | accusing [1] - | [1] - 52:26 | ago [6]-8:22, |  |  |
| 181:25 |  | adversarial [1] - |  |  |  |




| 25:27, 26:25, | 52:14, 109:9 | caused [6] - | 45:18, 45:21, | 141:1, 141:3, | change [4] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27:4, 27:25, 28:3, | capacity [2] - | 45:1, 46:22, 57:9, | 46:3, 46:5, 46:8, | 141:6, 141:9, | 24:27, 103:10, |
| 28:16, 29:3, 32:9, | 155:9, 170:7 | 66:14, 66:22, | 46:24, 46:28, | 141:11, 141:14, | 160:16, 175:15 |
| 32:21, 37:2, | car [11] - 181:19, | 97:7 | 47:5, 49:29, 50:4, | 141:17, 144:16, | changed [2] - |
| 37:12, 59:17, | 198:23, 198:24, | causing [4] - | 51:23, 53:7, | 144:20, 144:27, | 23:9, 50:5 |
| 60:1, 80:10, | 198:27, 199:3, | 63:20, 65:7, | 54:18, 54:21, | 145:9, 145:14, | changing [1] - |
| 80:22, 81:21, | 199:11, 199:14, | 66:12, 179:24 | 54:26, 54:29, | 145:16, 145:20, | 54:26 |
| 83:20, 101:23, | 200:9, 201:7, | cautious [3] - | 55:2, 55:5, 55:7, | 145:25, 145:28, | chap [1] - 75:10 |
| 102:6, 102:8, | 201:9, 233:3 | 197:3, 197:6, | 55:11, 55:13, | 146:2, 146:5, | chaplain [1] - |
| 104:2, 105:9, | card [2]-70:17, | 213:19 | 55:16, 55:20, | 146:8, 146:10, | 207:5 |
| 105:13, 107:22, | 71:1 | Cavan [1] - | 55:23, 55:26, | 152:9, 152:14, | chapter [5] - |
| 107:24, 108:29, | care [2]-16:10, | 171:15 | 56:3, 56:10, | 158:6, 158:12, | 86:12, 86:17, |
| 109:23, 110:3, | 43:13 | Cavan- | 56:12, 56:15, | 196:7, 196:11, | 96:19, 103:20, |
| 110:10, 110:22, | career [7] - | Monaghan [1] - | 56:18, 56:21, | 198:3, 205:25, | 104:7 |
| $111: 8,112: 20$, $115: 4,115: 7$ | 52:20, 52:21, | 171:15 | 56:24, 57:1, 57:3, | 206:8, 206:13, | character [3] - |
| 115:4, 115:7, | 52:24, 54:5, 64:8, | ceased [1] - | 57:5, 57:8, 57:13, | 206:17, 207:24, | 101:28, 178:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:17, 116:3, } \\ & \text { 116:17, 116:20, } \end{aligned}$ | 87:12 | $24: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 57:16, 57:18, } \\ & \text { 58:8, 58:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 208: 3,208: 9 \\ & 208: 12,209: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 183:5 |
| 117:7, 118:12, | 103:10 | 68:7, 68:26 | 58:17, 58:20, | 210:4, 210:8, | 139:2, 180:19, |
| 119:16, 119:20, | carefully [1] - | 157:21 | 58:25, 58:28, | 210:20, 211:16, | 184:10, 184:13, |
| 119:22, 120:1, $120: 3,120: 8$ | 61:25 | cells [3]-67:25, | 60:6, 62:22, | 211:19, 211:23, | 193:4, 229:18, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:3, 120:8, } \\ & \text { 120:18, 120:20, } \end{aligned}$ | Carl [1] - 86:4 | $67: 29,69: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 62:25, 62:27, } \\ & \text { 63:3, 64:9, 64:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 211:25, 211:28, } \\ & \text { 212:2, 212:5, } \end{aligned}$ | 230:25, 231:10, |
| 121:11, 121:27, | carry [4] - 14:21, | $230: 15$ | 64:17, 65:13, | 213:3, 213:7, | charges [4] - |
| 122:8, 122:9, | $25: 17,25: 27$ | centre [2] - | 65:16, 65:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 214:2, 216:4, } \\ & 216: 9.232: 1 . \end{aligned}$ | 131:29, 194:3, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:11, 122:14, } \\ & \text { 122:17, 122:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $27: 3$ | $48: 12,92: 26$ | 65:25, 73:22, $73: 24,74: 4,74: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 216: 9,232: 1, \\ & 232: 4,232: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $195: 3,220: 10$ |
| 123:5, 123:10, | carrying [2] - | certain [7] - | 74:23, 74:26, | 233:8, 233:14, | $\begin{array}{r} \text { chase [2] - } \\ 44: 25,88: 5 \end{array}$ |
| 123:24, 124:2, | Carthage [1] - | 154:2, 169:24, | 75:10, 75:23, | 233:16 | chat [8] - 70:22, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:17, 124:22, } \\ & \text { 125:2, 125:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 128:15 | $170: 13,186: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 27,76: 1,76: 6, \\ & 76: 8,76: 18,77: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chairman [35] - } \end{aligned}$ | $70: 27,71: 4,$ |
| 125:22, 133:10, | case [32] - $10: 21,11: 12$ | certainly [22] - | 81:26, 82:1, 82:3, | $49: 28,55: 3,$ | 174:5, 175:2, |
| 139:16, 139:24, | 13:1, 21:4, 22:3, | 91:15, 92:9, 93:1, | 82:6, 82:9, 82:11, | 58:15, 60:28, | 189:27 |
| 158:27, 159:1, | 22:20, 26:7, | 113:27, 114:4, | 82:14, 82:16, | 71:19, 72:2, | chats [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:3, 159:5, } \\ & \text { 159:11, 160:22. } \end{aligned}$ | 27:29, 32:29, | 114:5, 117:28, | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 3,90: 5,90: 14, \\ & 90: 23,90: 26, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 10,72: 15, \\ & 72: 23,73: 3,74: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 12:13, 12:15 |
| 161:12, 164:19, | 48:6, 48:28, | 122:19, 139:20, | 90:29, 91:6, | 72:23, 73:3, 74:1, 76:14, 91:4, | check [5] - |
| 164:28, 170:19, | 63:27, 66:9, | 139:28, 141:22, | 91:16, 91:20, | 91:22, 91:28, | 60:12, 86:12, |
| 173:14, 175:26, | 152:11, 155:23, | $156: 14,186: 1,$ | 91:24, 91:29, | 92:1, 92:4, 93:1, | $212: 23$ |
| 176:6, 176:13, | 169:1, 180:22, | 191:3, 196:4, | 92:2, 92:9, 92:12, | 93:4, 93:8, | checking [5] - |
| 178:15, 180:26, | $184: 9,185: 22$, $189 \cdot 26,196 \cdot 2$ | 213:3, 213:7 | 93:11, 100:18, | $102: 14,132: 5$ | 99:9, 211:14, |
| 183:3, 183:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 189:26, 196:2, } \\ & \text { 198:1, 198:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { certainty [1] - } \\ & \text { 140:7 } \end{aligned}$ | $100: 26,101: 4$ | 141:18, 145:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 212: 6,212: 10 \\ & 212: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 183:23, 196:28, | $205: 13,209: 2$ | cessation [1] | 101:7, 101:10, | 153:5, 197:27, | chest [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 197:9, 197:15, } \\ & \text { 204:4, 209:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $215: 26,217: 7$ | $12: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:10, 117:15, } \\ & \text { 117:22, 117:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 206:6, 206:22, } \\ & \text { 213:6, 213:18, } \end{aligned}$ | 105:19 |
| 210:2, 210:5, | $224: 5,229: 29$, $233: 10$ | chair [1] - | 118:2, 118:6, | $231: 18$ | Chief [15] - 18:9, |
| 210:16, 215:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 233:10 } \\ & \text { cases [1] - 48:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 207:26 } \\ & \text { Chair [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 118:8, 120:24, | Chairman's [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 4,47: 10, \\ & 47: 27,53: 1,66: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| 223:9, 223:11, | casting [1] - | 208:17 | 121:9, 121:17, | challenge [3] - | 76:20, 90:9, |
| 223:12, 223:13, | 102:11 <br> Castle | CHAIRMAN [215] $9: 12,9: 15$, | $121: 25,122: 5,$ | 40:14, 41:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:9, 144:23, } \\ & \text { 154:9, 154:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 225:14 } \\ & \text { can' [1] - 18:19 } \end{aligned}$ | 38:26, 41:3, | $18: 25,19: 9,35: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:8, 122:10, } \\ & \text { 122:13, 122:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 46:11 | 156:23, 193:18, |
| Canada [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 10,41: 15 \\ & 42: 29,71: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 4,35: 11 \\ & 36: 14,36: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 122:22, 122:25, | $44: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 203:19 } \\ & \text { chief }[4]-42: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 74:13 } \\ & \text { cancel }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | casual [2] - | $36: 24,36: 28$ $37: 17,37: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & 122: 27,123: 1 \\ & \text { 126:22, 132:2, } \end{aligned}$ | challenging [1] - $53: 26$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 19,49: 8 \\ & 87: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 200:11 } \\ & \text { cannot }[2] \text { - } \\ & 135: 28,167: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { cathartic [5] - } \\ \text { 22:25, 105:17 } \\ \text { 107:20, 110:8 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 23,37: 25, \\ & 37: 28,38: 1,38: 3 \\ & 44: 25,45: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 132: 7,139: 11 \\ & \text { 139:15, 139:18, } \\ & \text { 139:21, 139:27 } \\ & 140: 1,140: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { chamber [1] - } \\ & \text { 136:10 } \\ & \text { chance [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { child [11] - } \\ \text { 29:17, 29:19, } \\ 30: 12,44: 29 \end{gathered}$ |



| complicity [1] - | 151:26, 151:28, | 234:19 | contacting [4] - | Convention [1] - |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:29 } \\ & \text { complimentary } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 152:12, 182:10, } \\ & \text { 199:16. 199:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { consent [4] - } \\ \text { 196:7, 196:8, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 14,33: 9 \\ & 114: 4,187: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 234:20 <br> conversatio | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 83:3, 86:3, 89:24, } \\ & 94: 14,94: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| [3] - 83:24, 115:28 | confession [1] - | $196: 13,196: 14$ | contacts [3] | [43] - 11:21, | 94:27, 95:9, |
| complying [1] - | 104:24 | consequence | 78:22, 79:26 | 11:24, 12:26, | 96:21, 98:26 |
| 18:11 | confided [2] - | [4] - 50:7, 117:19, | 148:3 | 17:6, 18:6, 22:27, | 100:4, 102:16, |
| comprehensiv | 25:3, 27: | 194:18, 194:25 | tacts | $23: 5,23: 6,28: 7,$ | 103:1, 103:13, |
| e[3]-18:8, 40:25, | confidence [1] - | consider [2] | meetings [3] | 28:26, 70:26, | 103:16, 104:4 |
| 154:8 comp | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 77: 29 \\ \text { confidential }[1]- \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:18, 194:10 } \\ & \text { considerable }{ }_{[2]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 132: 24,132: 27, \\ & 132: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 8,96: 29,97: 5, \\ & 98: 21,101: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:21, 107:12, } \\ & \text { 115:23, 125:11, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 94:12 | 225:17 confid | - 95:7, 115:16 | contained [1] - 210:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:1, 108:27, } \\ & \text { 109:21, 112:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 130: 3,136: 12 \\ & 136: 28,152: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| 153:16, 153:18, | [1] - 228:29 | 61:25, 96:9 | contaminated | 112:18, 119:15, | 155:13, 155:14, |
| 191:15, 204:9 | confiding [1] - | considering [1] | $[1]-22: 20$ | 119:27, 120:20, | 157:13, 158:22, |
| concentrated | $27: 13$ | - 172:21 | contempt [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:5, 123:19, } \\ & \text { 146:18. 193:11. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:9, 174:13, } \\ & \text { 186:15, 187:27, } \end{aligned}$ |
| [1] - 136:22 <br> concern | $\begin{aligned} & \text { confinement }[1] \\ & -228: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { consistently }[1] \\ & -135: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 63:24 } \\ \text { cont } \end{gathered}$ | $193: 19,194: 5$ | 188:28, 196:23, |
| 30:13, 7 | confirm [3] | consolidation | 149:8 | 200:18, 215:5, | 198:8, 198:12, |
| 73:11, 75:13, | 114:27, 119:14, | [1] - 55:26 | content [5] | 215:22, 215:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 199:9, 202:12, } \\ & 204 \cdot 3204 \cdot 29 \end{aligned}$ |
| 75:26, 76:5, 76:9, | 128:28 | constantly [8] - | 108:17, 201:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 217:15, 217:24, } \\ & \text { 218:25. 223:25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 204:3, 204:29, } \\ & \text { 206:26, 206:27, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $76: 14,95: 7$ | confirmation [1] | 160:25, 161:10, 163:4. 166:1. | $218: 20,229: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 218:25, 223:25, } \\ & \text { 225:12, 226:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 206:26, 206:27, } \\ & \text { 207:8, 208:26, } \end{aligned}$ |
| concerned [15] - | confirmed [8] | 171:7, 221:27 | 148:11, 199:28, | $227: 23,228: 4,$ | 209:19, 216:28, |
| 47:11, 66:18, | $44: 7,50: 26$ | 234:4 | $200: 28,226: 28$ | 234:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 216:29, 218:12, } \\ & \text { 219:1, 222:4, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 99: 20,99: 23 \\ & 100: 1.100: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 115: 7,124: 27 \\ & 133: 10,212: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { consult [2] } \\ 36: 6,36: 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { contest [1] - } \\ & 230: 5 \end{aligned}$ | [6] - 15:3, 16:2, | 222:10, 222:11, |
| 100:24, 101:2, | 212:20, 212:29 | consultation [4] | context [13] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:22, 82:7, } \\ & 217: 25,230: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 223:29, 224:17, } \\ & \text { 224:18, 225:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 128:24, 153:5, | confirming [2] - | $-37: 5,37: 9$ | $76: 12,81: 22$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 217:25, 230:14 } \\ \text { convey [3] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 224:18, 225:25, } \\ & \text { 226:1. 226:7. } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 156:7, 168:11, } \\ & \text { 181:1, 181:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 61: 1,156: 27 \\ \text { conflict [1] - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 37:14, 155:11 } \\ \text { consulted [5] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 86:10, 90:15, } \\ & \text { 190:24, 191:11, } \end{aligned}$ | 85:13, 88:24, | 226:20, 229:14, |
| $222: 2$ <br> concerning [8] - | $223: 23$ <br> confronting [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 10,37: 27, \\ & 63: 28,153: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 191:19, 193:14, } \\ & \text { 199:14, 200:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:29 } \\ & \text { conveyance [1] } \end{aligned}$ | 230:6 <br> corrected [5] - |
| 31:6, 31:7, 70:8, | 104:25 | 204:25 | 200:19, 201:7, | $-102: 10$ | 53:21, 103:19, 103:23, 103:25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 71: 27,107: 22, \\ & 123: 7.130: 28 \end{aligned}$ | confusion [1] - | consumed [1] - | 211:29 | conveyed [2] 97:18, 98:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:23, 103:25, } \\ & \text { 103:26 } \end{aligned}$ |
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| 134:1, 134:15, | 110:8, 110:12, | 174:23, 174:27, | severe [1] - | sick [1] - 172:5 | 149:21, 180:16, |
| 183:4, 183:7, | 110:19, 111:2, | 177:29, 181:4, | 137:3 | side [7]-31:21, | 196:11, 197:6, |
| 184:21 | 111:6, 111:9, | 181:21, 182:8, | severely [1] - | 32:28, 98:7, | 214:12, 230:12, |
| sense [33] - | 111:23, 112:29, | 184:11, 185:6, | 99:21 | 138:19, 138:20, | 234:3 |
| 11:28, 12:17, | 113:1, 115:16, | 185:18, 186:21, | sex [1] - 181:25 | 146:23, 146:24 | situations [1] - |
| 14:19, 15:20, | 118:4, 125:13, | 187:23, 190:19, | sexual [18] - | sidekick [1] - | 144:28 |
| 18:5, 67:20, | 125:18, 127:26, | 192:1, 195:13, | 6:14, 6:25, 7:10, | 138:21 | six [6]-42:18, |
| 83:22, 84:1, | 128:9, 132:26, | 196:28, 197:10, | 7:16, 8:20, 9:19, | sides' [1] - 58:26 | 42:19, 142:15, |
| 91:14, 94:15, | 163:17, 171:21, | 197:12, 198:8, | 28:23, 28:29, | sideways [2] - | 142:19, 142:28, |
| 99:11, 99:14, | 174:12, 178:12, | 198:10, 199:7, | 29:9, 29:11, | $156: 9,156: 14$ | $143: 18$ |
| 100:5, 100:12, | 192:22, 200:1, | 200:6, 201:2, | $29: 16,30: 11$ | $\text { sight [1] }-98: 4$ | six-man [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 100: 20,140: 5, \\ & 147: 14,153: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 218:11, 222:26, } \\ & \text { 223:26, 223:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 201:17, 202:3, } \\ & \text { 202:4, 203:4, } \end{aligned}$ | 114:14, 133:27, | sign [1] - 57:28 | 42:18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 147:14, 153:9, } \\ & \text { 158:3, 198:28, } \end{aligned}$ | 224:11, 229:16 | 204:2, 204:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 168: 18,217: 4, \\ & 220 \cdot 7 \end{aligned}$ | significance [3] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { six-person [1] - } \\ & 42: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 200:22, 229:20, } \\ & \text { 229:21, 230:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sequence [1] - } \\ & \text { 118:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 204:8, 204:19, } \\ & \text { 204:25, 204:29, } \end{aligned}$ | sexually [1] 102.20 | $\begin{aligned} & -62: 3,184: 3, \\ & 200: 23 \end{aligned}$ | Skylon [6] 99.2 173.13 |
| 230:20, 230:21, | Sergeant [151] - | 205:9, 205:17, | 102:20 <br> shaft [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { significant [12] - } \\ & 41: 19,50: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 2,173: 13, \\ & 213: 17,214: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| 230:22, 230:23, | $6: 22,7: 12,9: 9$ | 206:23, 206:25, | 136:24, 137:6 | 54:5, 55:27, 60:7, | $214: 28,218: 15$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 230:29, 231:1, } \\ & 231: 6,231: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 21,10: 18 \\ & \text { 11:15, 17:28, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 206:28, 210:6, } \\ & \text { 210:26, 211:13, } \end{aligned}$ | shake [2] - | 60:16, 64:7, | slandered [1] - |
| sensible [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 15,17: 28, \\ & 19: 28,23: 1,23: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 212:12, 212:19, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 69:17, 203:29 } \\ \text { shakes [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:18, 77:28, } \\ & 94: 13,125: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 201:2 <br> sleeping [4] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:28 } \\ & \text { sent }[32]-45: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 17,29: 6 \\ & 85: 19,93: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 212:25, 213:28, } \\ & \text { 214:19, 215:3, } \end{aligned}$ | 147:23 | $125: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:26, 41:28, } \\ & 42: 7,42: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 47:12, 47:13, | 100:3, 101:13, | 216:2, 218:10, | $126: 6,135:$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SIM [2]-70 } \\ & 71: 1 \end{aligned}$ | slight [1] - 208:5 |
| 51:3, 51:21, 56:5, | 102:15, 105:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 219:27, 220:1, } \\ & \text { 220:7, 221:29, } \end{aligned}$ | 226:28 | similar [4] - | slightly [4] - |
| 70:4, 74:1, 74:9, | 105:5, 105:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 220: 7,221: 29, \\ & 222: 3,222: 20, \end{aligned}$ | shared [1] - | $35: 5,35: 21$ | 42:29, 174:14, |
| 74:13, 74:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:29, 107:2, } \\ & \text { 107:19. 109:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 222:3, 222:20, } \\ & \text { 225:13, 225:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $35: 20$ | $45: 24$ | $179: 28,187: 25$ |
| $75: 5,86: 11$, $96: 24,99: 5$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:19, 109:2, } \\ & \text { 109:25, 110:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 225:13, 225:19, } \\ & 225: 24,225: 27, \end{aligned}$ | sharing [1] - | SIMON [2] - | slip [2]-28:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 96: 24,99: 5 \\ & 123: 14,127: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:25, 110:13, } \\ & \text { 111:19, 111:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 225: 24,225: 27, \\ & 227: 22,228: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 228:29 | 3:21, 3:21 | $28: 25$ |
| 129:5, 129:20, | 112:22, 114:1, | sergeant [7] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shifted [1] - } \\ & 88: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { simple [3] - } \\ 84: 3,95: 29, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { slipped [1] - } \\ & \text { 111:25 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 135:7, 137:28, | 114:21, 115:5, | 143:29, 144:1, | shock [3]-12:2, | 119:12 | SMO [1] - 56:13 |
| $168: 24,184: 24$, $187: 10,188: 20$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:8, 115:15, } \\ & \text { 118:21, 119:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:2, 144:7, } \\ & \text { 144:10, 144:1 } \end{aligned}$ | 12:17, 171:28 | simpler [1] - | SM2 [1] - 56:26 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 187:10, 188:20, } \\ & \text { 193:15, 201:22, } \end{aligned}$ | 119:19, 119:25, | sergeants [1] - | shocked [7] - | 44:25 | SM3 [1] - 56:25 |
| 202:8, 210:29, | 120:2, 120:4, | $15: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:23, 164:24, } \\ & \text { 176:10, 220:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { simply }[6] \text { - } \\ 73: 29,104: 27, \end{gathered}$ | small [1] - 133:7 <br> smear [66] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 211:1, 215:19, } \\ & 216: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 120: 10,120: 14, \\ & 120: 21.120: 22 \end{aligned}$ | serial [1] - | $227: 5,227: 9$ | 126:17, 152:5, | $6: 12,6: 21,7: 1,$ |
| sentence [4] - | 120:28, 121:28, | serious [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shocking [1] - } \\ & 165: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:7, 202:2 } \\ & \text { simultaneous } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 23,10: 4,10: 21, \\ & 12: 1,12: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 89: 25,179: 2, \\ & 183: 19,192: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:1, 122:2 } \\ & \text { 122:3, 122:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 104:16, } 154: 3 \\ \text { seriously }[1] \text { - } \end{array}$ | shoes [3]-68:6, | [1] - 48:1 | $13: 29,14: 5,14: 6$ |
| separate [9] 69:20, 96:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:20, 123:16, } \\ & \text { 124:17, 125:3, } \end{aligned}$ | 19:26 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 68:26, 157:21 } \\ \text { shook [3] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i n }}[1]-110: 9 \\ & \text { single }[4]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:14, 14:18, } \\ & 15: 1,20: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| 126:20, 127:12, | $125: 17,126: 7$ | $-18$ | 175:19, 175:21, | 19:22, 19:26, | 22:10, 22:29, |
| 153:15, 190:27, | 126:11, 127:16, | service [3] - | 193:24 | $75: 25,76: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:10, 23:28, } \\ & \text { 24:9. 25:17. } \end{aligned}$ |
| 191:14, 191:22, | 127:22, 128:1, | $63: 16,65: 4$ | 69:21, 106:23, | $216: 20$ | 25:27, 26:24, |
| 191:23 | 128:28, 129:1, | 152:12 | 205:8, 218:17, | sit [3] - 93:6, | 27:3, 27:25, 28:3, |
| separately [1] - | $134: 10,134: 20$, $134: 24,137: 1$ | serving [8] - | 224:6 | $233: 17,233: 21$ | 28:16, 29:3, |
| 54:9 | $134: 24,137: 1$, $147 \cdot 26,149: 1$ | $30: 11,31: 22$ | SHORT [1] - | site [1] - 74:11 | $32: 21,37: 12$ |
| September [49] - | $147: 26,149: 1$, $153: 25,154: 4$ | 31:24, 31:27, | 158:10 | sitting [1] - | $59: 17,60: 1$ |
| 20:7, 20:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:25, 154:4, } \\ & \text { 158:29, 159:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $39: 29,65: 3$ | shortly [1] - | 131:26 | 80:10, 80:22, |



| 156:26, 198:6, | 9:13, 18:9, 20:5, | suppose [24]- | 178:14, 183:3 | tangentially [1] - | 213:8, 213:13, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 204:19 | 21:26, 36:16, | 35:2, 51:24, | swathes [1] - | 208:9 | 215:12, 216:16, |
| suggestion [10] | 42:26, 44:4, | 58:16, 62:17 | 96:25 | Taoiseach [1] - | 230:17, 230:29, |
| - 48:23, 63:18, | 45:21, 45:26, | 65:16, 73:22, | swear [1] - | 153:28 | 231:28 |
| 64:4, 66:7, 139:5, | 46:1, 47:10, | 76:9, 81:26, | 60:13 | tapped [1] - | Taylor's [14] - |
| 177:18, 196:5, | 47:27, 48:8, 49:8, | 90:14, 90:23, | Swords [1] - | 204:16 | 72:11, 93:28, |
| 198:9, 202:25, | 49:13, 53:1, | 132:5, 152:18, | 99:3 | tapping [1] - | 96:11, 106:16, |
| 228:21 | 54:17, 57:24, | 160:28, 172:24, | swore [1] - | 204:17 | 113:14, 128:14, |
| suited [1] | 58:29, 62:15, | 172:26, 172:29, | 61:21 | taps [1] - 153:20 | 128:18, 129:2, |
| 110:7 | 62:23, 66:8, | 174:8, 181:7, | SWORN [1] - | Tara [1] - 205:7 | 158:16, 184:25, |
| summarise [2]- $19.6,100 \cdot 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 11,72: 13, \\ & 72: 17,73: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 206:13, 218:3, } \\ & \text { 221:21, 229:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $158: 14$ | targeted [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 186:20, 186:23, } \\ & \text { 189:13, 192:2 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 19:6, } 100: 18 \\ \text { summary } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 17,73: 20, \\ & 76: 21,90: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 221:21, 229:24, } \\ & \text { 229:27, 231:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sworn [2] - 70:1, } \\ & \text { 89:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:23, 143:12, } \\ & \text { 143:14, 178:28, } \end{aligned}$ | 189:13, 192:2 <br> Taylors' [2] - |
| 19:13, 148:11 | 90:12, 92:7, | supposed [1] - | sympathetic [3] | 179:6 | 99:3, 101:22 |
| summer [21] - | 107:16, 112:12, | 234:6 | - 122:3, 122:19, | targeting [2] - | TD [1] - 133:4 |
| 25:11, 33:18, | 113:14, 113:18, | Supreme [1] - | 203:26 | 48:24, 125:29 | TD's [1] - 132:8 |
| 49:15, 80:2, | 113:24, 113:26, | 51:25 | sympathised [2] | task [1] - 69:4 | TDs [1] - 130:19 |
| 83:17, 108:28, | 113:29, 114:13, | surely [4]-12:4, | - 121:28, 122:20 | TAYLOR ${ }_{[5]}$ - | tea [2]-214:5, |
| 109:22, 112:14, | 114:16, 114:23, | 12:14, 16:3, | system [10] - | 4:6, 5:3, 5:6, 6:4, | 224:9 |
| 112:19, 113:16, | 114:25, 114:28, | 17:25 | 12:2, 12:17, | 158:14 | team [14] - |
| 113:25, 113:27, | $\begin{aligned} & 115: 10,128: 14, \\ & 128 \cdot 18 \text { 129.? } \end{aligned}$ | surprise [2] - | 153:16, 153:18, | Taylor [89]-6:7, | 42:19, 46:11, |
| 116:6, 118:2, $118: 11,119 \cdot 29$ | $\begin{aligned} & 128: 18,129: 2 \\ & \text { 132:25, 139:10 } \end{aligned}$ | 16:29, 98:14 | 190:26, 191:15, | $48: 8,57: 19,88: 7$ | 46:13, 48:17, |
| 118:11, 119:29, <br> 123:6, 208.23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:25, 139:10, } \\ & \text { 144:24, 152:15, } \end{aligned}$ | surprised [5] 16.28 29.27 | 191:16, 191:22, | 91:6, 92:7, 92:28, | 66:7, 66:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:6, 208:23, } \\ & \text { 211:6, 211:21, } \end{aligned}$ | 154:9, 154:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:28, 29:27, } \\ & 88: 8,225: 9, \end{aligned}$ | 191:23, 212:14 <br> Síochána [35] - | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 9,96: 13, \\ & 96: 29,98: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:29, 142:18, } \\ & \text { 142:27, 180:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 221:29 | 156:23, 160:12, | 227:18 | 21:15, 30:4, | 98:14, 98:20, | 209:17, 231:11, |
| sun [1] - 101:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:22, 170:18, } \\ & \text { 174:1, 174:12, } \end{aligned}$ | surrendered [1] | 31:27, 31:28, | 101:19, 101:21, | 231:12 |
| super [1] - 87:24 SUPERINTEND | 176:29. 178:13 | - 56:26 | 40:1, 49:24, | 101:29, 102:2, | tease [4] - |
| SUPERINTEND ENT [2] - 5:3, 6:4 |  | surrounding [3] | 57:21, 59:5, | 104:18, 104:24, | 165:4, 165:25, |
| ENT [2] - 5:3, 6:4 superintendent | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:5, 182:17, } \\ & \text { 183:2, 184:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -19: 25,42: 9, \\ & 133: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 59:26, 61:14, 63:16. 64:20. | 106:10, 106:18, | $165: 26,165: 27$ |
| superintendent [55] - 36:9, 42:17, | 185:15, 185:23, | 133:21 <br> suspect [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:16, 64:20, } \\ & \text { 66:3, 73:26, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:16, 112:12, } \\ & \text { 113:19, 113:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $55: 14,55: 25$ |
| 47:19, 49:24, | 186:19, 186:23, | 208:5 | 73:27, 74:16, | 113:26, 113:29, | 73:26 |
| 61:15, 63:6, 64:9, | $187: 19,187: 22$, $189 \cdot 12,190 \cdot 2$ | suspected [1] - | 74:28, 75:18, | 114:14, 114:17, | telephone [2] - |
| 65:3, 69:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 189:12, 190:2, } \\ & \text { 191:29, 192:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 104:16 | 76:16, 77:20, | 114:23, 114:25, | 170:2, 170:4 |
| 74:24, 75:9, |  | suspended [19] | 85:16, 100:13, | 114:26, 114:27, | television [6] - |
| 75:28, 77:8, | 192:17, 193:18, | - 24:23, 36:17, | 127:11, 127:13, | 114:28, 115:10, | 40:12, 40:13, |
| 78:20, 84:29, | $\begin{aligned} & 203: 20,209: 17 \\ & 212: 11,230: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 64:14, 95:28, | 129:1, 134:2, | 124:5, 128:10, | 68:16, 163:5, |
| $85: 24,87: 17$, $88: 19,89: 20$, | $230: 8,230: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 4,126: 2 \\ & \text { 159:2, 159:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 134:4, 134:15, <br> 134:18, 150:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:29, 132:25, } \\ & 133: 6.134: 8 . \end{aligned}$ | 163:7, 234:15 television' [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 88: 19,89: 20, \\ & 89: 27,89: 29, \end{aligned}$ | Superintenden | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:2, 159:7, } \\ & \text { 172:5, 172:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 134:18, 150:11, } \\ & \text { 153:17, 156:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 133: 6,134: 8, \\ & 135: 3,135: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { television' [1] - } \\ & \text { 210:12 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 90:1, 92:27, | ts [2]-36:22, 47:2 | 176:20, 189:8, | 165:18, 168:22, | 136:7, 136:22, | temporal [1] - |
| 93:14, 93:20, | supplemented <br> [1] - 33:4 | 195:17, 195:19, | 207:6 | 137:26, 152:15, | $118: 11$ |
| 110:15, 112:3, | supplied [1] - | 212:22, 212:26, | T | 158:21, 158:27, | tending |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:1, 124:1, } \\ & \text { 126:2, 128:10, } \end{aligned}$ | 19:1 supply [2] | $221: 7$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:12, 165:3, } \\ & \text { 166:25, 167:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $35: 1$ |
| 128:23, 128:29, | 148:15, 149:10 | - 31:26, 37:4, | table [1]-13:3 | 170:18, 174:1, | 166:25 |
| 132:14, 133:5, | supplying [1] - | 94:11, 94:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tactless [1] - } \\ & 66 \cdot 29 \end{aligned}$ | 174:12, 176:29, | terming [1] - |
| 134:14, 138:19, | 149:12 | 99:7, 157:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 66:29 } \\ & \text { tainted [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 178:13, 179:5, | $125: 12$ |
| $142: 10,147: 3$ | 118:21, 207:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 163: 22,163: 24, \\ & 163: 25,163: 26, \end{aligned}$ | 77:21 | 184:19, 185:15, | terminology [2] <br> - 109:11, 109:29 |
| 149:27, 152:19, | 207:19 | 180:18, 189:9, | Tallaght [4] | 185:23, 187:19, | terms [20]- |
| 154:21, 158:21, | supporting [1] - | 195:18, 196:3, | 43:12, 43:28, | 187:22, 190:2, | $31: 19,35: 4,35: 6$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 158:27, 166:25, } \\ & \text { 192:29, 193:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 203:29 } \\ & \text { suppor } \end{aligned}$ | 196:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45:18, 48:28 } \\ & \text { tampered }[11] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 191:29, 192:17, } \\ & \text { 197:9, 197:25, } \end{aligned}$ | 52:19, 79:7, |
| 193:14, 202:10, | 81:18, 83:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { suspiciously [1] } \\ & -38: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $69: 27,71: 7,$ | 205:2, 205:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 86: 19,86: 24, \\ & 87: 4,92: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| 203:23, 203:24 | 117:22, 193:24 | sussing [1] - | 72:12, 73:6, 73:7, | 205:26, 206:23, | 93:22, 94:16, |
| Superintenden | supports [1] - | 99:8 | 73:28, 73:29, | 208:20, 212:11, | 126:17, 185:17, |
| t [85]-6:6, 8:9, | 70:26 | sustained [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 74: 16,74: 17 \\ & 74: 28,75: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 213:2, 213:6, |  |


| 206:10, 208:14, | 215:19, 216:7 | 91:15, 92:29, | 220:28, 225:24, | treatment [1] - | 69:14, 77:9, 89:9, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 217:9, 221:2, | thanked [2] - | 101:20, 108:3, | 228:15 | 100:12 | 93:17, 126:29, |
| 231:19 | 31:5, 117:26 | 115:5, 124:18, | top [7] - 52:25, | treats [1] - | 138:15, 167:2, |
| TERRACE ${ }_{[1]}$ | thanking [1] - | 138:10, 139:1, | 98:11, 104:10, | 101:12 | 168:6, 179:29, |
| $4: 4$ | 69:2 | 139:5, 175:29, | 124:7, 136:5, $\text { 180:13, } 191: 5$ | trepidation [1] - | 188:1 |
| 60:20 | 65:23, 172:19 | 188:24, 189:15, | tal [1] - 138:11 |  | $67: 21,68: 25$ |
| terribly [1] - | THE [16]-3:25, | 191:12, 192:2, | totally [1] - 88:8 | 36:15 | turning [4]-8:6, |
| 206:18 | 3:29, 4:1, 4:2, | 192:18, 211:8 | touch [2] - | Tribunal [29] - | 66:24, 69:19, |
| tests [1] - 45:4 | 6:1, 92:18, 92:21, | throughout [1] - | 40:20, 40:26 | 8:10, 8:16, 9:3, | 107:27 |
| text [43]-41:8, | 158:10, 197:24, | 68:11 | touching [1] - | 9:27, 10:14, | TV [3] - 98:4, |
| 41:11, 51:3, 51:4, | 205:5, 208:19, | throw [1]-81:28 | 193:19 | 12:21, 20:11, | 177:11, 201:24 |
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[^0]:    "During the course of the applicant's detention the i nvesti gat ors were tactless, they were unnecessarily

[^1]:    "There now exi sts a si gni ficant breach of trust and confi dence.

[^2]:    "By J une 2016 Tayl or's Iife had been compl etely transformed. He was on reduced pay and his family's

