TRIBUNAL OF INQUIRY INTO PROTECTED DISCLOSURES MADE UNDER
THE PROTECTED DISCLOSURES ACT 2014 AND CERTAIN OTHER MATTERS FOLLOWING RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY DÁIL ÉIREANN AND SEANAD ÉIREANN ON 16 FEBRUARY 2017

ESTABLISHED BY INSTRUMENT MADE BY THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE AND EQUALITY UNDER THE TRIBUNALS OF INQUIRY (EVIDENCE) ACT 1921, ON 17 FEBRUARY 2017

SOLE MEMBER: MR. JUSTICE PETER CHARLETON, JUDGE OF THE SUPREME COURT

HELD IN DUBLIN CASTLE ON FRIDAY, 14TH JULY 2017 - DAY 9

Gwen Malone Stenography Services certify the
 following to be a verbatim transcrịpt of their stenographic notes in the above-named action.

GWEN MALONE STENOGRAPHY SERVICES

| SOLE MEMBER: | MR. JUSTICE PETER CHARLETON, JUDGE OF THE SUPREME COURT |
| :---: | :---: |
| REGISTRAR: | MR. PETER KAVANAGH |
| FOR THE TRIBUNAL: | MR. DIARMUID MCGUINNESS SC <br> MR. PATRICK MARRINAN SC <br> MS. KATHLEEN LEADER BL <br> MS. ELIZABETH MULLAN, SOLICITOR |
| FOR MS. D: <br> INSTRUCTED BY: | MR. NIALL BUCKLEY BL <br> MR. KIERAN KELLY <br> FANNING \& KELLY SOLICITORS <br> HATCH HALL <br> HATCH STREET LOWER <br> SAINT KEVIN'S <br> DUBLIN |
| FOR SGT. MCCABE: INSTRUCTED BY: | MR. MICHAEL MCDOWELL SC MR. PAUL MCGARRY SC MR. BREFFNI GORDON BL SEAN COSTELLO \& COMPANY HALIDAY HOUSE 32 ARRAN QUAY DUBLIN 7 |
| FOR THE COMMISSIONER: INSTRUCTED BY: | MR. MÍCHEÁL P. O'HIGGINS SC <br> MR. CONOR DIGNAM SC <br> MR. DONAL MCGUINNESS BL <br> MS. KATHY DONALD <br> CHIEF STATE SOLICITOR'S OFFICE <br> OSMOND HOUSE <br> LITTLE SHIP STREET <br> DUBLIN 8 |
| FOR THE HSE: <br> INSTRUCTED BY: | MR. MICHAEL CUSH SC <br> MR. JON LEGORBURU <br> MR. SEAN O'DONNELL <br> MR. REDMOND SCANLON BYRNE WALLACE 88 HARCOURT STREET DUBLIN 2 |
| FOR TUSLA: | MR. PAUL ANTHONY MCDERMOTT SC <br> MS. SARAH MCKECHNIE BL |
| INSTRUCTED BY: | ARTHUR COX TEN EARLSFORT TERRACE DUBLIN 2 |
| FOR ALAN SHATTER: | MR. BRIAN GALLAGHER GALLAGHER SHATTER SOLICITORS 4 UPPER ELY PLACE DUBLIN 2 |


| FOR RTE: | MR. SEAN GILLANE SC <br> MR. EAMON KENNEDY BL |
| :--- | :--- |
| INSTRUCTED BY: |  |
| MS: PATRICIA HARRINGTON, SOLICITOR |  |

## INDEX

WITNESS PAGE
MS. CLAIR TOBIN
DIRECTLY EXAMINED BY MR. MCGUINNESS ..... 5
CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. MCDOWELL ..... 42
QUESTIONED BY THE CHAIRMAN ..... 66
MS. LINDA CREAMER
DIRECTLY EXAMINED BY MR. MARRINAN ..... 69
CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. MCDOWELL ..... 103
RE-EXAMINED BY MR. MARRINAN ..... 108
MS. EILEEN ARGUE
EXAMINED BY MR. MARRINAN ..... 110
CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. MCDOWELL ..... 152
CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. DIGNAM ..... 191

 THE HEARING RESUMED, AS FOLLOWS, ON FRIDAY, 14TH JULY 2017:

1 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: Thank you, Ms. Tobin. Yesterday I was 10:01 asking you about when you commenced your review of the file.
A. Yes.

2 Q. And I think at that stage you had told me that, just quoting your answer here "Review is, like, social work speak. So when I get the file my practice would be to read the file, to look at what information is on the file and that would be relevant in terms of my work going forward. I suppose it's an undocumented review. So it's to take note of what information is on file."

Just arising out of that, we were talking about August at that time, but did you take the file away with you in August?
A. From? The file was in our office in the Nexus Building 10:02 in Blanchardstown at that time, yes.
3 Q. Okay. But I had understood you to be describing and talking firstly about a meeting that you had with Mr. Cunningham, where he showed you the files in the

Cavan office, am I mistaken about that?
A. No, no. That's correct. We would have met with Michael to go through some of the cases on that date, I think it was 28th June, and at that point we would have reviewed some of the files on site and taken away what we had gone through with Michae1 to review the rest of the files.

4 Q. Okay. And did you take away the Maurice McCabe file?
A. We did, yes.

5 Q. And did you take away the Ms. D file?
A. No, we didn't.

6 Q. Did you ever take possession of the Ms. D file and bring it to Blanchardstown or anywhere else for the purpose of your review?
A. No. We would have read through it on the day that we 10:03 were there. Any ex-reference files we would have gone through on that day.
7 Q. okay.
A. They weren't our business. It wasn't our role to have those files on our site.
8 Q. Okay. And just to be clear then, you didn't go to Monaghan and do a similar review of the CSA file that related to Ms. D there?
A. No.

9 Q. And you never saw that?
A. No.

10 Q. Okay. And perhaps there may be some confusion about the nature of your review, so I'm just keen to clear that up. Did you, on the day that you reviewed the

Ms. D file, did you take note of what was on it?
A. The audit form I spoke about yesterday, that was furnished in some of the documents, Chairman, I think they were in volume 9, it was were the files had been copied, there's a handwritten document audit and I think I raised a few queries in terms of Ms. D's file there, in terms of perhaps a credibility assessment not being on file. There just being a plain
straightforward no prosecution from the DPP, sometimes I suppose we would ask for further clarification around 10:04 that from the Gardaí as to what the reason for the no prosecution was. There were a couple of other things on that audit file.
11 Q. Yes. we will come to that. And that's on the Maurice McCabe file?
A. That's correct, yes.

12 Q. Okay. We will come to that, obviously. Another important question: did you -- I quoted the last answer to you here, you say "So it's to take note of what information is on file". Did you document what was on the Maurice McCabe file when you received it from Cavan?
A. Well, when I reviewed it on the day that I was allocated to it, I wouldn't have documented exactly what was there, but I would have taken note of it in terms of when I read through the file, what was there.
13 Q. okay. It's just yesterday you made reference to some documents that you hadn't seen?
A. Yes, that's correct.

14 Q. Which now appear to be on the file?
A. That's correct, yes.

15 Q. And can you account for that in any respect?
A. I can't, no.

16 Q. When you're conducting an audit or a review, would it not be commonplace to make an immediate contemporaneous note of what you have been given, as it were, document by document?
A. I suppose within social work departments the standard practice is if you are aware that a file is going to be 10:06 transferred out of your office and you're aware that another team is going to be taking over, you ensure that everything is on file. The teams that we would have visited would have been aware that we were coming to take the files, so we would make sure that the files 10:06 were up-to-date, that everything is on file, so we would have trusted that everything that should be on file was on file.
17 Q. okay.
A. So to answer your question in terms of would we document it, clearly no.
18 Q. So obviously best practice would be an expectation based upon an instruction, perhaps, that everything should be on the file?
A. Definitely, yes.

19 Q. And then obviously you made them aware that you were going to be looking at this file and you expected that they would have everything on the file that was relevant?
A. That's correct, yes.

20 Q. okay. Now we had -- at the time the Tribunal rose yesterday, I had been asking you about a note, which was a handwritten note on the Ms. D file. It's to be found at page 256, and it preceded the minutes of the meeting that we looked at yesterday of the 21st April 2007, where it was recorded on the case management meeting that there was no prosecution as a result of the file having been sent to the DPP. But this is a handwritten note, we think it's from Ms. Emer O'Neill. 10:07 I hope it's on screen there.
A. Yes, it is.

21 Q. And it's dated 24/4/07, and the fourth line down it says:
"4:15 phoned Ms. D. Mrs. D said that Garda Inspector Noel Cunningham called out to their house today, informed herself and Mr. D that DPP have come back and said there would be no prosecution in relation to Ms. D's statement she made in relation to Maurice McCabe. Reason/explanation according to Mrs. D statement not enough for criminal prosecution."

Then she is quoted as making a comment there. But do I understand that you never saw this?
A. I don't recall seeing that, no.

22 Q. okay. It appears, therefore, it's twice in the file, in which it's noted the DPP's decision, and does that affect your view as to the correctness of the review
that you had engaged in?
A. I suppose in my review I -- like, if it's on the file and I didn't see it, that explains why I have in my review that we didn't see, or I didn't see that a criminal offence had not taken place, but I don't recall seeing that. I would have recorded on the audit that that was the purpose of doing it, but if it was on the file I missed it.
23 Q. All right. And in terms of the purpose of your review, I was asking about this yesterday, you may recal1, and 10:09 I think you want to clarify perhaps what the purpose of the review was?
A. Yeah. My sense from the Tribunal is that mine was a formal internal review of everything that had gone wrong. I suppose the role of SART was to look at how the case had been managed in terms of assessing the allegations. So the review was to look at what had happened in terms of how the case had been managed by the Cavan team in line with our section 3 policies in responding to allegations. It wasn't to look at the overarching picture in terms of everything that had or hadn't been done by staff, looking at staff issues or personne1 issues.
24 Q. Yes.
A. If that makes sense.

25 Q. Yeah.
A. I know there is an internal review that's been directed by Jim Gibson, as far as I'm aware, and that would be the more formal review for somebody to do that is more
experienced than me.
26 Q. Yes, yes. And is that concluded?
A. I don't know. Linda Creamer, the service director, will be able to answer to that, Chairman.
27 Q. Yes. She will be giving evidence today. So obviously, 10:10 on the one hand, there is a wide variety of different processes that can happen in relation to any particular -- I mean, you obviously weren't conducting a disciplinary review?
A. No, no.

28 Q. You weren't conducting a file management review?
A. No, no.

29 Q. You weren't conducting a look-back sort of retrospective inquiry into what errors have been made or how they could have been avoided. You were looking at it from the point of view of progressing an unallocated retrospective disclosure case?
A. That's correct, yes.

30 Q. And nothing more?
A. That's correct, yes. And I suppose the purpose of it was trying to identify how the social worker managed to get to a point of sending a letter to Maurice McCabe with the wrong information in it, given the information that was on file.

31 Q. Or ought to perhaps have been on file?
A. That's correct.

So, I mean, it follows from that, that whatever conclusion you come to wasn't designed to either reveal or conceal any errors that weren't relevant to your
review about progressing the unallocated case in this instance?
A. No.

33 Q. We11, perhaps we could have a look at the file as the Tribunal had received the full file in the form in which it was in, in this year. Could we go to, it's in Volume 9, it's 2016 edition of the file, if I could put it that way, commencing at 2309. I hope you see that on the screen there?
A. Not just yet. The wrong number is on --

34 Q. 2307, I beg your pardon, perhaps. That's the file cover, is that correct?
A. My recollection is that the cover was a pink file, but I can't be a hundred percent sure on that, we did take a lot of files, but it is quite possible that it was blue.

35 Q. Okay. The next page was stapled to the inside of the cover. It's got only the details recorded on top there. Was that of any concern to you in your review?
A. No.

36 Q. Okay. The next page is 2309 and I think this is your review?
A. That's correct, yes.

37 Q. Signed off by your team leader?
A. Yeah.

38 Q. Perhaps we'd look at that. It states at the top that it has a two-fold purpose, in fact, in this case. It's to assist the legal in their response to McCabe's legal team and outline how the case has been managed since

> re-opening.
A. Mm-hmm.

39 Q. And just in terms of the referral to the legal team, did you conduct any interviews or consult formally or otherwise with anyone who had dealt with the file?
A. No.

40 Q. okay. It's not immediately clear when the first contact made by, as it were, management in Cavan was with a legal team or otherwise, but did you consider the speediness of the response of local management to Mr. McCabe's solicitors as an issue for you at all?
A. Most definitely, yes.

41 Q. Can you help the Tribunal in terms of the file relating to Sergeant McCabe? when was the first contact made by management, as it were, with the legal side of Tusla, to seek assistance or otherwise, without going into any advice?
A. My understanding is that when we took files from the local areas our -- my team leader, Lisa o'Loghlen, arranged a sit-down meeting with our legal representative, Tara Downes, to go through and address some of the issues that she had noticed on file, to get her advice. It was very early stages of us setting up this team and getting our heads around the policy and how we should be implementing it. I think there's a note on the file. That meeting might have taken place around the end of July, is my understanding.
42 Q. okay.
A. I can't recall exactly the date.

43 Q. A11 right. Anyway, it's several months, obvious7y, after Mr. Costello's first letter?
A. That's correct, yes.

44 Q. okay. And you say:
"On reviewing the file that led to --" sorry, just go back to the first sentence, you use the word "re-opening" there.
A. That's correct, yes.

45 Q. What did you mean in that sense?
A. Well, the allegation had come forward and was brought to the attention of the HSE Social work Department back in 2006, so, to me, it was re-opening that issue again.
46 Q. okay.
A. Because there was no new information in terms of what had been said in 2006, according to the referral that was correct, that came in.
47 Q. Yeah. So, I mean, it just raises two questions. was it part of your review to determine whether a file should have been opened on Mr. McCabe or Sergeant McCabe back in 2006? Because are you referring to the re-opening of Ms. D's case and her file, or are you implying that a file should have been created back in 2006 in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. Like, I'm not implying that the file should never have 10:16 been opened back in 2006. What it is is that the matter concerning the allegation was re-opening, Chairman, and that, to me, to my recollection, Maurice McCabe had never been approached or didn't know
anything about it. I don't know -- I don't know, I don't think a file was open on him back in 2006.

48 Q. Yes.
A. The man was never approached in terms of the allegations that were made then. So, I suppose, managed -- you know, probably since the matter re-opening, probably could have been a better turn of phrase.
49 Q. Yeah. You see, that's what I am wondering. Obviously the file was actually created in relation to
Sergeant McCabe in 2013, and you're not referring to the re-opening of any part of that file at different stages between then and 2016 ?
A. No, no.

50 Q. There's no suggestion it was closed at any stage in that period, and it wasn't closed until after your review, isn't that correct?
A. The 2013 file?

51 Q. Yes.
A. It was never closed, no evidence on the file that it 10:17 had closed.

52 Q. The bullet-points that you say were established. You say:
"With regard to the allegation made by Ms. D in 2006, the HSE Social work Department at that time did not complete a child protection investigation into the allegations made by Ms. D."

Was that your view of the state of affairs as you found it?
A. Yeah, that's correct. A child protection investigation would gather information from all relevant parties, being the person who is making the allegations --

53 Q. Okay.
A. -- and those --

54 Q. But is it clear from what you said to me that you reached that conclusion without either taking away Ms. D's file, the '05 file, and without taking away the 10:18 CSA file and never reviewing it?
A. Well, I had viewed Ms. D's file and had seen that it had closed and seen that Mr. Maurice McCabe had never been contacted in relation to the allegations, so that is not a complete child protection investigation, in my 10:18 view.

55 Q. Yeah. It's just I am concerned to understand how you think you could establish that without, in fact, having seen the CSA file, taken possession of it or even reviewing it?
A. I didn't know that file existed.

56 Q. Sorry, okay. And Mr. Cunningham or Mr. Lowry never drew your attention to that?
A. Sorry, Chairman, my screen has gone blank.

57 Q. Perhaps if we get that back. 2309.
CHAIRMAN: Is volume 9 there in front of you?
A. Yeah.

MR. MCGUINNESS: If you would prefer to follow it on paper.
A. Yeah, it might be easier, thanks.

58 Q. Please do so. It's two-thirds of the way into the volume, 2309. The second sentence in the bullet-point then:
"There is no evidence on the file to indicate that they met with Mr. McCabe to discuss what had been alleged and to subsequent7y give him an opportunity to respond to what had been alleged."

And I think that is factually correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

59 Q. But isn't it also correct to acknowledge that there was, in fact, no evidence on file that there were any child protection concerns made known by the HSE to Sergeant McCabe at that point in time?
A. That's correct, yes.

60 Q. Or indeed until he received the letter from Ms. McLough1in in early January 2016 ?
A. That's correct, yes.

61 Q. The next bullet-point:
"A standard report was then received by the Child and Family Agency in August 2013 which outlined allegations made by Ms. D of historical child sexual abuse. It would appear from the file the case remained on a waiting 7ist unallocated following that referral."

Now, are you referring to the written report there?
A. The written report by Ms. Brophy?

62 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

63 Q. You seem to be, as it were, I don't mean gliding over it, but you haven't drawn a distinction between what was in fact her report as made to Ms. Tinnelly and as corrected at that stage. You do go on to refer to it. But you do say in the next bullet-point:
"The referral made in 2013 contained information that was not correct and which was subsequently amended by the referral made in 2014 and forwarded for the attention of the Social work Department. Accordingly, the case remained unallocated."

Can I just raise this issue with you: You've seen the intake form signed off by Ms. McG1one on the 9th August?
A. Yeah.

64 Q. And she put "Duty to notify query previous7y known". was it part of your function to consider whether the issue of duty notifying the guards should ever have arisen at all?
A. I think I recall saying yesterday there was no Garda notification on file, so $I$ would expect if a Garda notification had been made, that that would be on file, particularly in a case like this where the allegation is made against a garda, I think it's something that we need to deal with sensitively and my understanding from
the file was that a decision perhaps had been made in the meantime, that wasn't documented on the file, not to proceed with a Garda notification, because that's dissemination of information to an employer before somebody has even an opportunity to respond to the allegation that is made.
65 Q. Yes. But I'm perhaps asking you to address a different issue. If, as you make clear in bullet-point 2, that it contained allegations of historical child sexual abuse and if the Gardaí had previously notified the HSE 10:23 of that and if the Gardaí had investigated from the point of view of their concerns to a conclusion, that there would be no prosecution, would you agree that there was no obligation or need to refer the matter to them at all?
A. Oh, I'd agree, yes.

66 Q. Your third bullet-point is:
"The file was reviewed on the 7th May 2015. A decision was made to respond to the referral received in line with the aforementioned policy. This led to Ms. McLoughlin's correspondence to Mr. McCabe on 29th December 2015."

Now, we'11 come back to it obviously when we look at the later documents, but you make no reference at all to any of the draft Garda notifications or to the signed one that is on this file that was sent, which was erroneous. Were you aware of any attempt to or
draft that was produced in order to notify the guards on the basis of the erroneous complaint?
A. I was aware from the intake form and I think there perhaps was a draft that was unsigned that contained wrong information, that possibly was on file. But there was no signature, there was no date on it, but there was no other Garda notifications on file. But just we will come to the actual document in a minute, but did you not see a version that was, in fact, signed by Mr. Deeney and seems to have been dated 10:24 2nd May?
A. For the purposes of this Tribunal I have seen it, but I didn't see it at that time.
68 Q. And are you saying it wasn't on the file?
A. I am, yes.

69 Q. Have you concerned yourself about how it came to be on the file then as presented to the Tribunal or when it came back on the file or where it was?
A. We would send the files back to the local areas for archiving, and I note that there's a Freedom of Information request, so perhaps the file, anything that was relevant to the file was put on it at that point. I can't -- I can't answer that question.
70 Q. okay.
A. I don't know.

71 Q. Well, I mean, I am concerned to establish did you, in fact, send the file back from your office to Cavan?
A. We did, yes.

72 Q. And do you know when that was done?
A. It would have been after we made a decision to close the file, in September.
73 Q. So it's after September 2016. The next bullet-point:
"There is no evidence on file to indicate Ms. D was met 10:25 with by the Social work Department to corroborate the information received in 2013 and subsequently amended in 2014. Ms. McLough7in's letter to Mr. McCabe detailed information that was contained in the initial referral in 2013. It is not clear whether
Ms. McLough7in relied on that referral information as opposed to the amended information sent in 2014. It is also not clear why a decision to proceed with the allegation was made without cooperation and corroboration of the alleged victim and without having formed some opinion with regard to the credibility of the allegation that was referred."

Now, in terms of your review, you have said it is not clear whether Ms. McLoughlin relied on that as opposed to the amended information. Did you not consider if this was a mystery or something that lacked clarity, that you should perhaps speak to her and find out how she had included that, in fairness to her?
A. My team leader, I don't know if she spoke with Ms. McLough1in, but I didn't.
74 Q. okay.
A. If you are making a decision to proceed, you document it on the file.

75 Q. Okay. Another matter you don't appear to deal with, certainly insofar as the sequence in here is set out or I think at all, is the issue of the intake forms that Laura Connolly created in relation to the McCabe children. Were they on the file when you got it?
A. I believe they were, yes.

76 Q. And is there any reason why you don't refer to it in your review?
A. Well, they don't concern what our role was in terms of the allegation and what we were trying to update in terms of how the wrong information -- it was a separate issue, I suppose, in terms of the intakes being made, but it wouldn't be unusual to see intakes where allegations of a historical nature are made. I'm not saying it is correct, but it is not unusual to see them 10:28 on a file.

77 Q. Yeah. I'm not at this moment questioning the issue as to whether they should have been created, but were they not within the scope of your review? Because you're deciding whether and in what manner this unallocated case should be progressed at the time you get it, isn't that right?
A. With regard to the allegation that has been made, yes.

78 Q. Yes. And the whole point of it is in the context of child protection concerns?
A. That's correct, yes.

79 Q. And in that context, therefore, why do you not include reference to the four intake forms?
A. The intake forms are -- my understanding is, the
purpose is for just recording basic information that has come in. It would only be at the end of a Section 3 assessment that you would make a decision as to whether, or possibly halfway through a section 3 assessment if you become concerned, but with the information that's on the intake form, you don't proceed with an initial assessment, or you don't open a file, if that makes sense --
80 Q. Yes, well I was going to --
A. -- in terms of --

81 Q. -- explore that issue with you. Is it a sort of provisional decision that this may need to be looked at, depending upon the initial assess.
A. That's my understanding, yes.

82 Q. And is that your understanding of why it might -- those 10:29 forms were never in fact signed off by a team leader?
A. Possibly, I don't know.

83 Q. Okay. Was that within the scope of your review, to try and see what the status of those intake forms were and why they hadn't been progressed in the context of child 10:29 protection?
A. What we're doing from SART is managing the Section 3 assessment and we're very clear with the duty intake teams that they would need to take responsibility for any child protection concerns that are identified throughout our assessment. So when a case progresses or if there are any concerns, we would feed back to that duty team. At this point, it was not relevant to consider the intake forms.

84 Q. okay. It says:
"While it has been presented as information of significance from the correspondence of Mr. Séan Costello dated 28th January 2015, most 7ikely a typo, 10:30 meant to be 2016 given the timeline, the DPP directed no prosecution and the DPP clearly stated that no criminal offence had been described or disclosed referring to the allegation made by Ms. D in 2006. There is no evidence on file that this information was communicated to the HSE Social work Department at that time by An Garda Síochána. Withstanding that, the HSE wil7 continue to have a statutory duty under the Children First policy to investigate all allegations of child abuse referred to its department."

Again, is that premised upon your understanding that they were never told that there would be no prosecution?
A. Sorry, can you say that again?

85 Q. I'm sorry. You're saying there's no evidence on the file that this information was communicated to the HSE, that there would be no prosecution, but I think you're accepting that's not correct?
A. Yeah, the specifics in terms of my understanding -- I 10:31 didn't see that, that no criminal offence had been described or disclosed. I suppose that's important information for us to consider when we're conducting a Section 3 assessment.

86 Q. Okay.
A. So I was aware that there was no prosecution, because that's quite clearly documented in the first audit I would have done on the file, but that detail in terms of clearly stated that no criminal offence had been described --

CHAIRMAN: I am just wondering about that, Ms. Tobin, because, I mean, I have been told earlier on that even noncontact sexual abuse has to be investigated.
A. That's correct, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Well, it's not a criminal offence, as far as I know, to show a child a pornography film.
A. That's correct, yes.

CHAIRMAN: Well, that, nonetheless, has to be investigated.
A. And I suppose that is why I went on to say withstanding that, that we would have to investigate any child protection concerns that come to our attention, Chairman.
CHAIRMAN: And is that a different thing?
A. With regard --

CHAIRMAN: Child protection concern is different to the commission of a criminal offence?
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Well, they can be the same, usually are, you 10:32 are saying, but there can be situations where the child protection concern without a criminal offence?
A. Yes, that's correct Chairman.

87 Q. MR. MCGUINNESS: It's just having regard to the state
of your knowledge at the time of your review, you don't appear to have taken any step to communicate with the Gardaí in relation to the basis of the DPP's decision, is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

88 Q. Is there any reason then why you didn't do that in the state of your knowledge at the time?
A. There's no reason, no.

89 Q. Okay. The next bullet-point, you say:
"It is important to note at this point that a Garda investigation and a child protection investigation are two separate investigations, although both agencies work collaboratively in responding to allegations of child abuse. The outcome of one agency's investigation does not dictate the outcome of the other agency's investigation. In summary, it is clear that Mr. McCabe was not afforded fair procedures with regard to the allegation made by Ms. D initially in 2006 and which was re-referred to the Social work Department in 2013 as a result of a standard reporting procedure."

And I take it you'd accept that that conclusion, that's the responsibility, wholly, of the HSE?
A. That's correct, yes.

90 Q. "The Child and Family Agency under Children First had a duty to respond appropriately to all allegations of child abuse received into its department, current and historical. While it was appropriate to respond to the
concerns that were referred in 2013, given that they were not previous7y addressed by the HSE Social work Department, this is an assessment that should have been completed in 2006/2007 when the allegation was first made. The file does not present any evidence of a credibility assessment with regard to the allegation made in 2006/2007. This should be completed prior to any contact being made with Mr. McCabe in December 2015. The case was reviewed by the Sexual Abuse Regional Team in Dublin Northeast which was established in April 2016 under responsibility for retrospective child sexual abuse cases. The Sexual Abuse Regional Team offered Ms. D an appointment to meet a member of the Sexual Abuse Regional team to discuss the allegation made."

And I think that was part of your responsibility?
A. That's correct, yes.

91 Q. "The purpose of the meeting was to corroborate the information received and the standard report form
amended version sent in May 2014, to gather further relevant information and assess the credibility of the allegation being made, explain the role of the Sexual Abuse Regional Team and the process the team follows when responding to allegations of abuse to establish her wish to proceed and engage in the process.

Ms. D failed to attend her scheduled appointment. She later made contact with the Social work Department and
advised that she did not wish to pursue the matter further."

Did you think it appropriate -- I mean, that was, in effect, the first step prescribed by Mr. Deeney in his five-step process, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

92 Q. And did you think it appropriate to proceed beyond the first step when that hadn't proved successful?
A. No.

93 Q. "In the absence of Ms. D's cooperation and the inability of Sexual Abuse Regional Team to complete the assessment with regard to the credibility of the allegation being made, the case will now close to the Sexual Abuse Regional Team and the Child and Family Agency.

It should be noted at this point that in the event Ms. D comes forward in the future to make a complaint with regard to the allegation initially made in 2006, the Child and Family Agency will be obliged to re-open the matter and follow the necessary procedures as are outlined in the policy previously referred to."

Just in relation to the second-last point, is that the policy of the agency, as it were; that, in the absence of cooperation, a case will be closed, or is that too crude a way of putting it? Obviously a judgement has to be made.
A. Yeah, with regard to the information that is on file, sometimes referrals are quite detailed, sometimes there might be historical information that you might be able -- if you are reasonably concerned, you could possibly proceed with, but in this case the information $10: 36$ did not warrant an assessment.
94 Q. Right. The last bullet-point, I think that was not included in the final letter to Sergeant McCabe, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

95 Q. Were you responsible for that letter or did you have any hand, act or part in that?
A. I suppose the purpose of completing this form and this review, as we refer to it, was to inform our legal team as to how we would like to respond or for Mr. McCabe to receive a response, and $I$ expected that they would consider all bullet-points in responding to Mr . McCabe.
96 Q. All right. In other words, this was obviously provided for them as information relevant to their response. However they chose to respond thereafter is a matter for them, is that it?
A. Sorry?

97 Q. However they chose to respond thereafter was a matter for Tusla legal?
A. That's correct.

Page 2312, these are your notes preceding the completion of the review we've looked at, is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

99 Q. At different stages, in chronological order. These are not the notes that you are talking about, that you made when reviewing Ms. D's file?
A. No.

100 Q. The next document at 2314, is this one of your documents?
A. It's not, no.

101 Q. Have you seen that before?
A. It was on the file. It's Lisa O'Loghlen's handwriting.

102 Q. It's Lisa O'Logh1en's. It's created by her then, is it?
A. That's correct, yes.

103 Q. And was that considered by you at the time?
A. Yes.

104 Q. At part 17 she notes "Action", this is on page 2318. 10:38
A. This is a document $I$ was referring to that I completed in the beginning.
105 Q. Yes, that's what I was wondering. Is this your handwriting?
A. Sorry?

106 Q. Is this your handwriting?
A. Yeah, that's my handwriting.

107 Q. At 2318?
A. Yes.

108 Q. 2318?
A. Yes.

109 Q. Right. So you record there:
"Section 3 initial 7etter sent by Kay McLough7in
on29/12/2015. Response to amendments see lega1 team on 28/1/2016. Response of Kay McLoughlin to legal team on 20/6" -- is that right -- "2016"?
A. That's right, yes.

110 Q. "No evidence on file of SW interview of AV. Last attendance" --
A. That's "Last statement to Gardaí 2007."

111 Q. "Last statement to Gardaí 2007. No prosecution directed from DPP. Discuss --" what's that?
A. "With team leader retro."

112 Q. "Discuss with team leader retro"?
A. Yes.

113 Q. "Based on new referral does $A V$ need to be interviewed by SW as no credibility assessment has ever been completed. Is it proper to proceed section 3 if SW has 10:40 not met with alleged victim following new referral even though referral relates to same allegation in 2007."

And is that the conclusion of that form?
A. That's the conclusion of that form, yes.

114 Q. Okay. So obviously these are all created by you after you get the file. So the next document that was on the file that the Tribunal had was this document, 2319. was that document on the file when you got it? It's headed "Cavan-Monaghan Social work Department Case Review Form." It's got the file reference number MTP at the top. It sets out the reasons for referral. We know now it's in Louise Byrnes' handwriting. It says:
"Garda notification corrected in May '14 due to misinformation from Rian."

Under the heading:
"Please Give Reasons: Query regarding files for his children."

So can you recollect having seen this on the file?
A. I don't, no.

115 Q. okay. If it was there, it would appear to be capable of conveying to you that, in fact, a Garda notification had gone out?
A. Yeah.

116 Q. And had been corrected?
A. Yeah, that's correct.

117 Q. It also -- it also therefore appears to have been created after the Garda notification had been -- the corrected one had been sent, and therefore in the month or perhaps even much later after the intake files for the children had been signed off by Laura Connolly but not by a team leader. But it seems to be querying, a query regarding the files for his children. Do you recollect any query being considered by you as a result of this?
A. Did I query why there would be files on his children?

118 Q. Yes.
A. I knew there were intakes. I didn't know if there was anything further than an intake.

119 Q. Yes.
A. As I say, that doesn't necessarily mean that the file would be opened for initial assessment.
120 Q. Yes. So just, I mean, just in technical terms, it is correct, I think, that no files were, in fact, ever 10:42 opened in relation to the children. The intake records were on Sergeant McCabe's file. May the Tribunal take it you have never, in fact, seen evidence of a file on all or any of the children?
A. That's correct, yes.

121 Q. But in terms of the review that you were undertaking, the recommendations here are numbered:
"1. Awaiting allocation.
2. Case discussion to inc7ude Rhona or Keara." 10:43
3. Contact -- "

I think that is "TL" - is that "team leader contact guard re decision 2007 clarification'?
A. I don't know. Sometimes I -- it looks like shorthand 10:43 for Garda - gda.
122 Q. Are you looking at the handwriting over the figure 3, is it?
A. Yeah. Oh, over the figure 3, that took like TL, yeah.

123 Q. "Contact Garda re DPP."

Would that have put you on inquiry that perhaps you might seek clarification from the guards before finishing your report?
A. Well, my understanding was that the DPP had directed no prosecution, there was no further clarification needed.
124 Q. okay.
A. And Mr. Costello had clearly outlined that in his 1etter.

125 Q. Yeah. But, you see, you have raised a query on it in your own conclusion, that we have looked at, that there was no evidence on the file that the information was communicated to the HSE at the time by An Garda Síochána?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

126 Q. But were you not concerned to nail that down, as it were?
A. Perhaps should have been at the time, but no.

127 Q. okay. The next page is a part of the file. Then there 10:44 is the risk escalation report. I think you told us already yesterday you didn't see that. Do you think it wasn't on the file at the time?
A. Lisa possibly put it on the file at the time the file was closing and ready for archive. As I explained yesterday, Lisa would have kept risk escalations in a folder in her office.

128 Q. Okay. Page 2325, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 2331, they're the file intake referral forms relating to the children. Did you see those at the time?
A. Yes, I did.

129 Q. And can you say they were on the files that you were given?
A. Yeah.
Q. 2332 , that is the original intake record relating to Sergeant McCabe. Did you see that at the time?
A. Yes.

131 Q. The next page is just a file cover. Now, at 2337, this is a draft, it would appear, unsigned, dated 2nd May, of the corrected notification. Did you see that?
A. I recall seeing one, one Garda notification that was unsigned and undated. I don't know if it was that particular one.

132 Q. Okay. We11, we will come to that. The next one is at 10:46 2340, that is dated 2nd May, signed by Mr. Deeney on the 2nd May. It's date-stamped "Child and Family Agency, Social work Department, Cavan", and it's also marked -- stamped "file copy". Was that on the file when you saw that?
A. No.

133 Q. Pardon?
A. No.

134 Q. Are you sure about that?
A. I'm pretty sure, yeah.

135 Q. Okay. The Tribunal has evidence that this, in fact, was sent to the Gardaí in May. Is there any reason why this document which would inform you that Cavan had sent the erroneous allegation on to the guards, wasn't on the file?
A. I can't explain that. I don't know what their practice is. But standard practice is if a Garda notification is made, you put it on the file.

136 Q. There's a third document relating to notification 2342.

This has no date, no signature and has no other stamp on it.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

137 Q. It would appear to be a draft of one of the previous -the previous actual notification sent by Mr. Deeney which contained the incorrect allegation. was that on the file when you saw it?
A. I think that's possibly what I recall seeing, is that it was undated, excuse me, undated and unsigned. I think that's possibly the one that I saw on the file. 10:48
138 Q. okay. Just so there's no confusion at all in my understanding of your evidence and indeed in your own evidence yourself, you don't think you saw the one at 2337?
A. No.

139 Q. You're positive you didn't see the one at 1340 signed by Mr. Deeney?
A. Yes.

140 Q. Without a doubt?
A. Without a doubt. I don't recal1 seeing a signed Garda 10:48 notification.

141 Q. And you think the one you did see is this undated draft at 2342?
A. Yes.

142 Q. Okay. The next document, 2344, that is Ms. Dewhirst's 10:48 email enclosing a draft, it would appear, as of $30 / 4$ to Linda Dewhirst. The next two pages are just file covers. 2348, this appears to be your case note record, is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

143 Q. And did you put that on the file in this position?
A. I did.

144 Q. You did.
A. It's hard to tell because there's different tabs.

145 Q. Yeah.
A. And the tabs are -- I can't really --

146 Q. Yes.
A. No, I wouldn't have put it in CCS forms, no.

147 Q. But you think you did put it in the file?
A. I did, yeah.

148 Q. And then you got an email from Julie Flood which proceeds that, 20th August, at 2349?
A. That's correct.

149 Q. And would you put that on the file?
A. I would, yes.

150 Q. These appear to be in the nature of contacts, and some of the preceding documents are contacts as we11. 2350, that's dated 15/5/16. Can you recollect whether that was on the file?
A. It was, yes.

151 Q. The next page, 2351, it's a record that Ms. McLough1in has made and she has given evidence about. Was that on the file?
A. It was, yes.

152 Q. There's another one from Ms. McLough1in, 21/1/15, which is, we think, a mistake as to the date. Was that on the file?
A. It was, yes.

153 Q. And that recorded that Maurice McCabe did not attend the appointment as requested and says "Offer second appointment". There's a note then, 2353, that the Tribunal has evidence about from Ms. Connolly about the intake records and a direction from Eileen Argue. Was 10:51 that on the file?
A. I recall that being on the file, yes.

154 Q. okay. 2355, there's a note, it's a copy of an email from Laura Brophy in the first instance to Ms. Argue, that Ms. Argue asks Ms. Armitage to print. Was that on 10:51 the file?
A. I don't recall it being on the file. There's a number of email threads, Chairman, that I saw for the purpose of this Tribunal that weren't on the file.
155 Q. okay. And do you think this is one of them?
A. I think so, yeah. My understanding -- apologies. My understanding of the error being corrected was through the written sent by Laura Brophy.
156 Q. Sent by Laura Brophy?
A. Yeah.
$10: 51$
157 Q. okay. Is it possible that this and the next email were on the file? 2356 records at the bottom the email from Pamela Armitage to Eileen Argue about Laura Brophy's phone call.
A. No.

158 Q. You don't recall seeing that?
A. I don't recall seeing that.

159 Q. There's a number of sort of file folder bits, and then at 2539 there's the amended report from Ms. Brophy. Do
you recall seeing that?
A. Yes, I do.

160
Q. 2362 , that is a file note from Ms. Armitage created after your review had been completed, relating to a Freedom of Information request, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

161 Q. And the documentation in relation to that goes on to 2368. So if we go to 2369.
A. Yes.

162 Q. I think this is a letter of the 22nd September 2016, sent to Mr. Costello, Sergeant McCabe's solicitor, and it refers to his letter of the 8th September 1ast. Now that is signed by, is it a Rachel Browne?
A. It looks like Rachel Browne to me, yes.

163 Q. And that concludes by recording that:
"The agency will not be proceeding with its assessment of the allegation made by Ms. D and in this regard we closed our file. We confirm there are no outstanding allegations or findings recorded against your client and the agency's file reflects this position."

And that was issued presumably as a result of your review?
A. That's correct.

164 Q. As signed off by your team leader as we11, is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

165 Q. Right. A lot of the rest of the file at this point
contains all the correspondence with Mr. Costello that preceded that. Was all of that on the file when you saw it?
A. To the best of my knowledge, it was. Probably, I think we would have had to put the correspondence from Kay McLoughlin on file, I think this was forwarded -because we had the file at that point, if that makes sense. So when we took the file, some of the --
166 Q. Yes.
A. Like, that would be the end of June, so the July stuff that would have been forwarded to Kay McLoughlin, she would have forwarded it on to us to put on the file.
167 Q. Yes. So, in any event, that sequence of correspondence was on the file or made available to you from Ms. McLoughlin as it was coming in to her?
A. It was, yes.

168 Q. All right. 2380, it's a letter from Emer o'Neill of the 3rd February 2016 enclosing Ms. D's statement. Was that on the file?
A. It was, yes. I remember seeing Ms. D's statement.

169 Q. Yes. We don't need to go through that. There's a number of drafts of letters prepared by you in relation to Ms. D at 2397, 2398, 2399, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

170 Q. 2403, it's an email from Ms. McLoughlin to Emer O'Neill 10:55 in relation to that statement, presumably that was on the file?
A. I don't recall it.

171 Q. okay.
A. But I'm not going to say it wasn't.

172 Q. All right. okay. There's a draft of the letter that Ms. McLoughlin sent to Sergeant McCabe at 2404. Do you remember seeing that?
A. Yes.

173 Q. There's an email from Ms. McLoughlin to Gerry and Seamus, that's Seamus Deeney and Gerry Lowry, dated 7th May. Do you recall seeing that?
A. I think that was on the file, yes.

174 Q. At 2407 is the letter from Fiona ward to Eileen Argue of the 16th May. Do you recall seeing that?
A. I do, yes.

175 Q. 2408, there's Mr. Deeney's five-step procedures set out to Ms. McLoughlin on the 8th May. Do you recall seeing that?
A. I do, yes.

176 Q. 2410, there's a reply from Mr. Lowry in May, thanking Ms. McLoughlin for the update and bringing the matter to his attention, et cetera. Did you see that on the file?
A. No.

177 Q. There's Ms. Brophy's letter to Ms. Argue of 14th May 2014. Do you recall seeing that on the file?
A. I do, yes.

178 Q. The next one is 2413 , Ms. McGlone's letter to Superintendent Cunningham of the 15th August. Was that on the file?
A. I think it was, yes.

179 Q. That was placed on both Ms. D's file as well. Did you
note that from your examination of Ms. D's file when you saw it?
A. I have no clear recollection of noting that, no.

180 Q. A11 right. And the file appears to conclude with the acknowledgment that was sent to Ms. Brophy in August. So that's the file as the Tribunal received it. Is there anything that you saw that isn't on this file that you can recollect?
A. Not that I can recollect at this moment in time. MR. MCGUINNESS: Thank you, Ms. Tobin.

## END OF DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. MCGUINNESS

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

181 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: My name is Michae1 McDowe11 and I'm one of the barristers representing Sergeant McCabe.
A. Hello.

182 Q. Yesterday you said in evidence that when you saw the file and examined it, you were horrified by the management or lack of management that it disclosed, is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

183 Q. And today as I follow your evidence, it seems that quite important aspects of the file had been -- had not 10:59 been forwarded to you when the file was sent to you in SART, is that right?
A. That appears to be the case, yes.

184 Q. And in respect of the material that you now believe was
deleted from the file when it was sent to you by somebody, does that make you more or less horrified about the manner in which the file was handled under Mr. Lowry's management?
A. I can't be certain that the file -- I can't comment or speculate whether the information was deleted or just not put on the file, but either way --
Q. It's a bit unfair of me to use the term 'deleted'. But not sent forward to you is perhaps a more neutral way of putting it, isn't that right?
A. As I said earlier, standard practice, when you are transferring a file, particularly out of your office, Chairman, you would ensure that everything is on that file that needs to be on the file.

186 Q. And you have told the Tribunal -- so, having looked at the file now and testified about it to the Tribunal, in respect of material that you consider was not sent to you, does that make you more or less horrified about the management of the file under Mr. Lowry's management?
A. It makes me more concerned and more horrified, I suppose, yes.
187 Q. Yes. Could I ask you in relation to your function, this was to go through the file for a number of purposes, to review how it had been dealt with, and secondly, because Séan Costello \& Company were writing letters, to get a handle on it from a legal point of view, to see how to manage it in that respect, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

188 Q. And can we take it then that you'd have been very careful or as careful as you could be going through the file, $I$ 'm not saying this critically of you at all, but looking at it from a legal perspective you really had to have a good picture of what had happened insofar as the file disclosed any picture to you, is that right?
A. Yes.

189 Q. And the reason I ask you that is, that when you say that some things were not on the file when it was sent 11:02 to SART, it's fairly evident from the report that you did that they couldn't have been on the file at the time or else that you were just skipping through the file, and you say you weren't doing that, you weren't skipping through the file just to get a vague impression of what was on it?
A. Can you give me an example.

190 Q. Well, I mean, some of this material that you say today you have never seen before, or you hadn't seen at the time, it couldn't have been there and you just were, you know, rushing through the file and ignoring it or not picking up on it?
A. In my review, I was of the --

191 Q. I'm not trying to trap you at all.
A. Yeah.

192 Q. I'm just saying --
A. For me --

193 Q. If this was being looked at from a legal point of view, you wouldn't just have ignored papers that were in
front of you, would you?
A. No, no.

194 Q. No. I'm saying that in your favour.
A. Yes. The reason I'm saying I don't recall it is because, to me, it doesn't add up.
Q. Yes.
A. Because I felt like the case hadn't been managed through the dates --

196 Q. Yes.
A. -- that were -- or not responded to. So with the dates 11:03 that are on those emails, I can't say that I recall seeing them on the file.

197 Q. I'm not trying to trap you in any way. What I am trying to underline to establish very clearly, is that when you say that material wasn't on the file when you 11:03 were looking at it in SART, your evidence is to be taken as, you know, considered evidence. You are speaking as somebody who was examining it carefully from a legal point of view, isn't that right?
A. My practice, I am very careful and I would make sure 11:04 that I read everything that is on the file, and given the gravity of what was on the file and the concern and nature, I would have made sure I read exactly what was on the file.

198 Q. And it strikes me, and I would ask you whether you agree with this proposition, that what's quite extraordinary about the file as it now exists and as it was sent to you, is that at no point under Mr. Lowry's management was a single page set out on this file
saying this file has gone wrong for the following reasons, these are the mistakes we made, I have spoken to all of the officers, $I$ have now assembled a picture of what happened with this file. There's nothing like that whatsoever on the file, isn't that right?
A. No. I don't believe we would have accepted the file had that been on the file.
199 Q. Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Sorry, how do you mean by that? what do you mean by that?
200 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: If there had been a report of the kind I'm talking about, you would have said, what am I doing with this file, is that what are you saying?
A. Yeah, I don't think we would have -- at that point we were in the very early stages of SART and we were very careful about what we were accepting and why we felt that the file needed a response in terms of how interactions had been managed with Maurice McCabe. There's quite clearly, and was clearly, a bigger issue that we weren't made aware of.
201 Q. Yes. I mean, if it was a self-confessed disaster area, you'd have said, why are we being sent this? why don't you deal with it yourselves?
A. As we moved through the file, I felt that way, yes. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. McDowel1, I'm just not quite 11:06 understanding the point that is being made. It's my fault, but I don't understand the point you're making, I don't understand the point the witness is making.
202 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: The Chairman is asking you why you would
have been reluctant to take it in in SART if it was a complete disaster area and acknowledged by HSE to be a disaster area. Why would you have been reluctant to take it on then?
A. Well, I think with something that's as concerning as the area manager was aware of, it required a response from someone more senior than myself. I was a basic-grade social worker on the team. And I think it only appropriate, given all the errors that had occurred, that it would be most appropriate for someone 11:06 more senior to deal with the matter.
203 Q. So you'd have expected somebody senior in your area or in Cavan to have effectively summarised the errors that had been made and acknowledged the need for accountability in respect of that all of that, is that 11:07 what you are saying?
A. Yes, someone who could provide an appropriate response.
Q. And it appears that Mr. Lowry was the man in charge of this file, the manager of the process, and there was no evidence on the file that he was, as you saw it, either 11:07 admitting that something had gone very, very badly wrong, or accepting his role in that, or anything like that, is that right?
A. That's correct.

205 Q. Now, could I ask you to go to page 1385, please. You've probably never seen this document before in your life?
A. No.

206 Q. But I can tell that you it is a three-page document
which is the minute of a meeting of the Gardaí in respect of Mr . McCabe which, according to the minute, took place in Mullingar Garda Station on the 16th July 2014. And we're told Assistant Commissioner Kenny was there, Chief Superintendent Sheridan was there, superintendent McGinn was there and Sergeant Karen Duffy were present at this meeting.
CHAIRMAN: Mr. MCDowe11, you did say 1385.
MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, 1835, I think.
CHAIRMAN: You said 1385.
MR. MCDOWELL: I am sorry. It's in Volume 7, Judge.
207 Q. This document records the actions being taken in the summer, or proposed to be taken in the summer of 2014 in respect of the cut-and-paste error as it had emerged.
A. I can only see the top part of that document.

208 Q. It's meeting --
CHAIRMAN: You can open it up. It's probably better if you just take out volume 7.
A. Can I?

CHAIRMAN: If you look there beside you. It's pretty close to the end, about a quarter of the way from the end. 1835.
A. Thank you, Chairman.

209 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: You have it now, have you? 11:10
A. Yeah.

210 Q. And Assistant Commissioner Kenny is recorded as saying:
"We need to deal with this matter given the people
involved. It's unbelievable that the HSE completed the referral via copy and paste. He outlined that he doesn't accept that the referral passed through three different people in the HSE and it was not noticed. Chief Superintendent Sheridan outlined that the counsellor completed the referral and that the names were on7y changed by the HSE and the details of the incident were forgotten, overlooked and had passed through a few hands before it was picked up."

Now, they go on then to discuss Garda involvement, but at the bottom of the next paragraph is a statement:
"The incident was not recorded on the PULSE system and the matter was not referred to the HSE."

That was the state of mind of the Gardaí, that the HSE had not been involved at that stage. But you know that the HSE was informed back in early 2007, isn't that right?
A. of the allegation?

211 Q. of the original allegations?
A. Yes.

212 Q. So you go on then two paragraphs down:
"Chief Superintendent Sheridan out7ined that the injured party went for counselling in August 2013, at which stage he was an adult. He outlined that no referral was made to the HSE in 2006 and 2007, nor did
any meeting take p7ace with the HSE in 2006/2007."
of course, we know that that's completely wrong now, isn't that right?
A. Well, the HSE were aware of the allegation.

213 Q. Yes. And that they were interacting with the guards and they had -- they were corresponding with Superintendent Cunningham, seeking reports from him; that's right, isn't it?
A. Yes.

214 Q. It then says:
"Chief Superintendent Sheridan raised the issue of do we need to have a meeting with the HSE now? Assistant Commissioner Kenny outlined that he had concerns that 11:12 the injured party went for counselling and a referral was made -- the HSE, and a referral was made then to An Garda Síochána. He outlined that he was of the view that this referral should be dealt with as a new referral, that we can't just take it as the same incident."

So that's the way they're thinking of it, even though he was aware for two months that it was the same incident. Isn't that right? It appears so.
A. That's what appears from the document.

MR. O'HIGGINS: Chairman, I wonder just in relation from this witness's point of view, these are notes dealing with a meeting that took place in respect of
which evidence is going to be given, $I$ understand, next Thursday, or certainly next week, from the three persons concerned, or possibly the four persons concerned. And I just wonder from the point of view of this witness, is there any value and what is the purpose of putting to this witness --
MR. MCDOWELL: There is some value in it.
MR. O'HIGGINS: Just, if I may. I might just finish out the point before --
CHAIRMAN: I am imagining where the question is going to go, and perhaps my imagination is more vivid than yours, but I think we may get there. And insofar as it is irrelevant and this is a witness commenting on, you know, internal Garda matters, $I$ 'm just going to ignore it. But if we get to a question that is important, I will hear that, and if we don't get to it, I understand your objection, $I$ note it.
MR. O'HIGGINS: May it please you, Chairman.
215 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: At the top of the next page there's a statement attributed to Assistant Commissioner Kenny:
"Safety issues don't appear to be on the HSE's radar."

And two paragraphs down -- one paragraph down:
"Chief Superintendent Sheridan said that if there are safety issues, An Garda Síochána didn't do anything for the last six or seven years and Superintendent McGinn raised the issue that the suspect" -- I presume he's
referring to my client as that -- "has access to kids in relation to his job. Is there a risk?"

The reason I am asking you is, if you come to the last page:
"Chief Superintendent Sheridan outlined that he would liaise with the HSE to establish what their intentions/strategy is."

Right. In any of your investigations did you find any attempt by the Gardaí to interact with the HSE to determine what they were doing with the file from June 2014 onwards? Is there any trace of any inquiry made by the Gardaí of the HSE as to what was happening with 11:15 this file?
A. No.

CHAIRMAN: And forgive me, I'm not getting that point. Maybe if you go on a bit.
MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, no, I am saying that on a number 11:16 of occasions in this document it is stated -- for instance, at the bottom of page 1836, Judge.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: "Assistant Commissioner Kenny raised the question: what would we do if this was a new referral? 11:16 Superintendent McGinn outlined that a criminal investigation would commence and An Garda Síochána would meet with the HSE."

And on the next page:
"Superintendent MCGinn outlined that the suspected offender was not arrested at the time and this may be an issue."

And he's talking about other concerns, obviously, at that point.
CHAIRMAN: well, he was met and interviewed.
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes, he was of course.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: But, I mean, I take what Mr. O'higgins is saying, this is for another witness to deal with.

CHAIRMAN: Sure.
MR. MCDOWELL: But the paragraph that we're dealing with here:
"Chief Superintendent Sheridan" --

It's the fifth paragraph on the last page.
" -- outlined that he would liaise with the HSE to establish what their intention/strategy is."

And did you find any evidence that they had done anything of the kind?
A. No.

216 Q. And if you look at the last paragraph:
"Assistant Commissioner Kenny outlined that he will make contact with Mr. Ruane and that Chief Superintendent Sheridan will liaise with the HSE to establish what their intention/strategy is."

Is there any evidence anywhere that that was done, right up to -- on the file or when it went to SART? Did anybody from the Gardaí at any point --
A. There's no evidence on the file.

217 Q. CHAIRMAN: At the same time, Mr. McDowell, it is seven 11:17 years since the allegation, and $I$ don't know how long files are kept, but this strikes me as being floundering around and wondering what's going on? MR. MCDOWELL: We11, indeed. But, you see, Judge -CHAIRMAN: And at some stage there is a communication, 11:18 isn't there, to the effect we've investigated this already, because it is sorted out, and I'm not sure of the date, but Assistant Commissioner Kenny is written to and it is said, look, this is what has happened in this case.
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Somebody eventually gets the file. I don't know whether it was buried at the bottom of Monaghan Garda Station or something like that, do you know? MR. MCDOWELL: well, the interesting point, perhaps, Judge, in relation to that is that Superintendent sheridan, who attended that meeting, if the Tribunal looks at page 1723 of that volume --
Chairman: yeah, yes.

MR. MCDOWELL: -- he had written to the Commissioner for the Northern Region, Assistant Commissioner Kenny, on the 22 nd May, and he said:
"The previous referral contained incorrect information and should therefore be withdrawn and replaced with the attached. This is a referral made by Tus7a" -- as it is described -- "relating to an incident which was reported to and investigated by the Gardai in 2006/2007. The Director of Pub7ic Prosecutions directed that there would not be a prosecution in the case. The attached referral does not disclose any new information/evidence in relation to these matters and therefore at this time does not require any further action by An Garda Síochána."
CHAIRMAN: Yes. No, I see that. But I'm not sure -it doesn't seem to note, oh, look, by the way, we told Tusla about this way back in 2006.

MR. MCDOWELL: Exactly.
CHAIRMAN: Tusla didn't exist, but social work.
MR. MCDOWELL: It doesn't deal with that. But the Tribunal will see the extraordinary contrast in the approach of Chief Superintendent Sheridan when he says this is old hat, we have investigated.
CHAIRMAN: Yeah.
MR. MCDOWELL: DPP said it doesn't require any further investigation. That's in May. And when we get to July, they're taking the exact opposite view of the affairs.

CHAIRMAN: There could be a point in it, Mr. McDowell, yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: That is probably for the other witnesses.

218 Q. But I am trying to ascertain if anybody at a senior
level, Commissioner Kenny or Chief Superintendent Sheridan, took any steps, of which you are aware, to find out what was happening to the child safety aspect of the inquiry. Is there any evidence of that anywhere?
A. There is no evidence on file.

219 Q. And just in relation to -- could I bring you to page 3092. This is the letter which was eventually sent to Séan Costello \& Company. Do you see that?
A. I see it, yes.

220 Q. And it was drafted by Tara Downes. Is she a solicitor, is that right?
A. She's in our legal office in Tusla, yeah.

221 Q. In your legal office. And I think on the following page, 3093, you're sending an email to Lisa O'Loghlen, 11:21 is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

222 Q. You're expressing some impatience:
"Is this what we have waited all this time for?"
A. Yes.

223 Q. "We could have written this ourse7ves."

But then you note:
"She has not outlined that we may be obliged to investigate in the future if the complaint comes forward."

That was a view of yours, that if Ms. D came again, there could be a complaint, isn't that right?
A. The frustrating part of our --

224 Q. Or a professional investigation, rather?
A. Well, the frustrating part -- I think it is really $\quad 11: 22$ important; the letter, to me, lacked a certain level of transparency.
225 Q. Yeah.
A. Because I suppose --

226 Q. It was saying it's all over, wasn't it? 11:22
A. Yeah. And I think it was really important for Mr. McCabe to know that if a further referral came in in relation to that matter, we would have to --
227 Q. And you would, in fact, put that in writing in the document that Mr. McGuinness was asking you to do, your 11:22 very last bullet-point in your SART review document was:
"It should be noted at this point that in the event Ms. D comes forward in the future to make a complaint with regard to the allegation originally made in 2006, the Child and Family Agency will be obliged to re-open the matter and follow the necessary procedures as outlined in the policy previously referred to."
A. That's correct.

228 Q. So that was your state of mind, and your email is saying: by the way, the letter doesn't reflect that possibility?
A. I was quite frustrated because it didn't reflect an awful lot. It didn't answer the questions that were asked of us from Mr. McCabe's solicitors.
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. I think I will leave it at that. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN: Maybe you would help me by summarising the point you wanted to make there, and given that it's only a point for investigation --
MR. MCDOWELL: No, it's just that this witness had, in her SART review, said that the procedures hadn't been complied with and if a fresh referral was made, it should be understood that nothing -- that in closing off the investigation, it was without prejudice to the possibility that it might be reopened at some point in the future, and she had noted that down carefully. CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: And she was, she was -- I don't think I am being unfair to you, you were expressing surprise that the letter wasn't being transparent on that point?
A. That's correct, yes.

CHAIRMAN: On what point, Mr. McDowe11? I'm sorry, I 11:24 am a bit dense this morning, but I'm just not getting it.

MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, Judge, that this witness had, in her SART review, concluded it by saying:
"In the absence of Ms. D's cooperation and inability" -- this is on page 1458, Judge -- "In the absence of Ms. D's cooperation and the inability of the SART team to complete an assessment with regard to the 11:24 credibility of the allegation being made, the case will now close to the SART and the Child and Family Agency."

So this was, the curtain was coming down.
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: But she was making the point in the next bullet-point:
"It should be noted at this point that in the event that Ms. D comes forward in the future to make a complaint with regard to the allegation made in 2006, the Child and Family Agency will be ob7iged to reopen the matter and follow necessary procedures as outlined in the policy."
CHAIRMAN: Yes.
229 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: And you were surprised that that wasn't flagged up to Sergeant McCabe in the draft letter?
A. Yes, that's correct.

230 Q. Bringing everything to an end?
CHAIRMAN: We11, I mean, I suppose that's a potential problem. Indeed, it seems Assistant Commissioner Kenny seems to make the same point at the meeting at page 1836.

MR. McDOWELL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: "What will we do if this is a new referral?" MR. McDOWELL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: I mean, I don't know.
MR. MCDOWELL: We11, I mean, we will deal with
Assistant Commissioner Kenny when he's giving evidence, 11:25 and I don't want to -- I just wanted to highlight that there seemed to have been a high-level decision in An Garda Síochána to find out what the Child and Family Agency was doing in respect of child protection issues, and there seemed to be a resolve to contact them and find out what they were up to, because they were mystified as to where it had gone in respect of protecting children, and there seems to be no trace of any follow-up by them thereafter. That is all I am saying.

CHAIRMAN: Sorry, Mr. McGuinness.
MR. McDOWELL: On this matter.
MR. MCGUINNESS: He is only asking the witness about this file.
CHAIRMAN: It's the file again. Right.
231 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, there is one thing, and Sergeant McCabe just wanted -- on the file it noted that he had failed to attend a meeting, but, in fact, he had -- his solicitor had written saying he wouldn't be attending the meeting, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

END OF CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MCDOWELL.

CHAIRMAN: That is the famous first response, I'm not going to your meeting.
MR. McDOWELL: Sorry, Judge?
CHAIRMAN: It's the famous first response to the 1etter.

MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. But, I mean, in handwriting Ms. McLoughlin had written down "failed to attend meeting".
CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes, it's the same meeting.
MR. MCDOWELL: Same meeting, yes.
CHAIRMAN: Lack of meeting.
MR. MCDOWELL: Lack of meeting, yes.
CHAIRMAN: Thanks. Is there any other questions for Ms. Tobin? Mr. McDermott?
MR. O'HIGGINS: Just one matter of clarification, but, 11:27 in fairness to the witness, it's of no certain or in relevance to her, but in relation to the matters that have been raised by Mr. McDowe11, it is our understanding that there are, in fact, matters on file indicating that Chief Superintendent Sheridan requested 11:27 his clerk to make contact with the HSE and he did make contact with the HSE, and that is on file, and we are happy to deal with that at the appropriate time.
MR. MCDOWELL: I'm sorry, I stand corrected if that is the case. If there is some other evidence --
CHAIRMAN: If there is, maybe now is the time so I can just make a note of the page, Mr. O'Higgins. Your microphone isn't on. would you mind pressing it. MR. O'HIGGINS: I think the relevant documents,

Chairman, from the perspective of that inquiry, is page 347, which is a communication from Pat O'Connell, Inspector Pat O'Connell to Fiona Ward, where he refers to previous telephone conversations regarding Ms. D and requests that she would contact him. That's page 347 . 11:28 And then there's a --
CHAIRMAN: Just let me get it out, if you don't mind. So it is Patrick o'Connell, Garda.
MR. MCDOWELL: But Fiona Ward is, as I understand it, she's in Rian, is she not?
CHAIRMAN: Well, it says "HSE" here.
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes, but, in fact, it is the Rian service.
MR. O'HIGGINS: which is part of the HSE.
CHAIRMAN: I mean, I suppose the point is, are they looking for information.
MR. MCDOWELL: She was in charge of counselling, not child protection.
Chairman: Let's see what it says. It just says:
"I refer to our conversation regarding Ms. D and I would appreciate if you would give me a call at..." The number. So I presume they actually do answer the 1etter.
MR. MCDOWELL: Ms. Ward was in the Rian Counselling Service.
MR. O'hiGGINS: Yes.
MR. MCDOWELL: she was not a child protection officer at all.

MR. O'HIGGINS: Yes, but insofar as the point was made that there was a criticism to be made of chief Superintendent Sheridan for not following up on the meeting in Mullingar, that seems to be misplaced.
Because if one looks then at page 349 there's further 11:29 treatment of the inquiries Inspector Pat O'Conne11 was requested to make, where there is a note on page 349 of what appears to be Fiona Ward's note of her conversation with Inspector o'Connell.
CHAIRMAN: okay. will we go on to that then?
MR. MCDOWELL: Again, Chairman, I was talking about following up with the HSE about what they were doing about child protection.
CHAIRMAN: I know, I appreciate that, Mr. McDowell. But as we know from this Tribunal, I suppose information can come from various sources, and the question is, are they looking for information or did they not want information.
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: So, I'm sorry, you were referring to that, 11:30 Mr. O'Higgins, what, at that stage?
MR. O'HIGGINS: It's a little bit difficulty to read, Chairman, but at page 349 there's the handwritten note of the telephone conversation, it appears to read "spoke to Pat."
CHAIRMAN: "Email to contact Patrick O'Conne71."
MR. O'HIGGINS: Sorry, from the top "Email to contact" --
CHAIRMAN: "Phone call to Patrick O'Connell. Spoke to

Pat." Is it "Chief asked"?
MR. O'HIGGINS: "Chief asked to phone regarding..."
CHAIRMAN: "... aged referra7."
MR. O'HIGGINS: "Aged referra7".
MR. MCDOWELL: Original, is it?
MR. O'HIGGINS: So pausing there. We understand that to mean chief superintendent -- she is noting that Pat O'Connell is indicating that the chief superintendent has asked him to phone regarding the aged referral.
That is my understanding of that note.
CHAIRMAN: Yeah.
MR. O'HIGGINS: And then it says something "acts being followed up". The next line is a little bit difficult to decipher, but the line beneath it appears to read:
"I informed Inspector Pat O'Connel7 that such acts would be the remit of the Social work Department. We would not be involved this follow-up", I think it says. "I agreed to..."
CHAIRMAN: "Obtain contact".
MR. O'HIGGINS: "... to obtain contact details for" social work, "for SW and to pass these on to Inspector o'Conne77."

CHAIRMAN: okay.
MR. O'HIGGINS: And then over the page at page 250, Fiona ward appears to be good to her word and seeks, from Laura Brophy, the contact details.

CHAIRMAN: Yeah. And is there anything else then? MR. O'HIGGINS: And then on page 352 indicates that
they were forwarded on, Laura Brophy forwarded them on to Fiona ward. And then page 353 indicates that Fiona Ward sent them on to Pat O'Conne11, and on page 353 there's an email from Fiona ward to Inspector 0'Conne11 and it outlines:
"Further to our telephone conversation regarding your query as to what, if any, action has been taken by the HSE in relation to Ms. D's case, as I mentioned, the National Counselling Service made a report of retrospective abuse to Tus7a Social work Department. It is the role of the Social work Department to assess what, if any, risk arises from the allegations made. As such, the Social work Department (see contact details below) are best placed to advise you on what action has been taken regarding the report."

That is the end of that email. It's our understanding that further inquiry was not made, but of course we don't formally act for Inspector 0'Conne11, but I can indicate to you, Chairman, that the firm instruction of An Garda Síochána, the three officers who participated in the Mullingar meeting is that the realisation was, this was not a fresh matter, there was no decision made to initiate a re-opening of the 2007 investigation and there was no decision made to initiate a fresh criminal investigation into the 2003 referral relating to the entirely incorrect detail concerning a rape allegation. CHAIRMAN: The 2006 referral?

MR. O'HIGGINS: Yes, excuse me.
CHAIRMAN: And did they know that there had been a referral in 2006 by the Garda to the social work? MR. O'HIGGINS: No, they were unaware that, in fact, An Garda Síochána, Sergeant Fraher, had made the notification to the HSE; that is to say, the three participants in the Mullingar meeting did not know that.

CHAIRMAN: Fine.
MR. MCGUINNESS: Just one matter of correction.
Mr. McDowel1 referred to Ms. McLough1in's note as recording that -- she recorded that Sergeant McCabe failed to attend. In fairness to Sergeant McCabe, his solicitor made it clear that he wasn't attending and, in fairness to Ms. McLough1in, she simply noted, as has 11:34 come out in the evidence, that he did not attend.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. No, I did understand that, Mr. McGuinness. Did you want to ask any other questions?

MR. MCGUINNESS: No.

## MS. TOBIN WAS QUESTIONED BY THE CHAIRMAN:

232 Q. CHAIRMAN: I just have two things. You have been through a very, very detailed exploration of this file 11:35 and you are a person who seems to regard detail as important. Given you know what you now know, do you regard yourself as having been sent a sanitised version of the file as opposed to the file with all of the
warts, all of the defects, all of the incompetence showing clearly and plainly?
A. Yes, Chairman.

233 Q. CHAIRMAN: Pardon?
A. Yes, Chairman.

234 Q. CHAIRMAN: why do you think that happened?
A. I don't know if it was through intention. I can't explain it. Stuff wasn't put on the file when it should be. It's not unique to this case, unfortunately. There would be stuff missing from files, not unique to the Cavan region. People fail to put things on file. Unfortunately, the things that weren't put on this file were quite significant.
235 Q. CHAIRMAN: Well, you know the phrase 'covering yourself in paper'?
A. Yes.

236 Q. CHAIRMAN: Sometimes covering yourself in paper can mean removing paper that would be embarrassing, and is that what you are talking about here?
A. I don't know whether it was just professional
negligence to not put it on the file or whether it was intentional, I can't comment. I don't know the people in Cavan well enough in terms of their professionalism, in terms of how their practice is on a day-to-day basis. I just know from my own practice if a file is 11:36 transferring out of the region, particularly out of your office, no matter where it is going, if it's going to a new team, if you are going from a duty team to a child protection team to a children in care team, you
make sure everything is on that file that needs to be on file, and anything that you come across in the meantime you forward on to the team that has that file.
237 Q. CHAIRMAN: Well, there are perhaps two aspects to this. The worst aspect would be a cover-up?
A. Yes.

238 Q. CHAIRMAN: The second aspect, perhaps not as bad, would be an instinctive reaction to circle the wagons and to pretend that things weren't as bad as they were, or, in other words, to pretend to yourself as opposed to other 11:37 people, and I don't know where you place this particular incident on that or maybe you have another category that you see as probable in this context?
A. I really don't know. I think it's really poor management of the file. I think it should have been allocated perhaps to someone to deal with straightaway when it came through the door. we would consider any allegations against a member of An Garda Síochána, a teacher, someone in our own organisation, the need for that to be dealt with extremely sensitively. And I know our practice now in SART, if such referrals come in, they're immediately allocated and responded to.
239 Q. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thanks, Ms. Tobin.
A. Thank you.

## THE WITNESS THEN WITHDREW.

MR. MARRINAN: Sir, the next witness is Linda Creamer, please. This is in volume 10, sir, page 3063.

## MS. LINDA CREAMER, HAVING BEEN SWORN, WAS DIRECTLY EXAMINED BY MR. MARRINAN:

CHAIRMAN: Is it Kray-mer you pronounce it?
MR. MARRINAN: Yes, Kray-mer.
CHAIRMAN: So that is the second mispronunciation.
240 Q. MR. MARRINAN: I think that your professional qualifications are that you qualified with a bachelor of social science, a national qualification in social work in 1998, is that right?
A. I did, indeed, yes.

241 Q. I think in 2008 you qualified with a master's in business administration in the National college of Surgeons?
A. Yes, that's correct.

242 Q. And I think you have been working with the HSE/Tusla since 1998, initially as a professional qualified social worker and then you progressed to team leader, is that right?
A. Yeah, team leader, then principal social worker. Area manager to service director now.
243 Q. And I think that you currently hold the position of service director for Dublin Northeast?
A. Dublin Northeast, that's correct.

244 Q. Now, in that regard you once held the role that Mr. Lowry had as area manager, isn't that right?
A. I did indeed, for many years, yes.

245 Q. And I think that subsequently, from July of 2015, he
was reporting to you, is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

246 Q. And I think that that's the time when you took up your post as service director for the Dublin Northeast, is that right?
A. That's correct.

247 Q. And even though its title states the Dublin Northeast, it includes Cavan-Monaghan?
A. Cavan-Monaghan and Louth-Meath.

248 Q. I think that during the course of your role as the service director, you identified difficulties within the region in relation to the management and assessment of what is called the retrospective sexual abuse allegations under the Tusla Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Abuse and Neglect 2014 ?
A. Absolutely, yes.

249 Q. I think that that is September 2014, isn't it?
A. Yes. I can just clarify that, as an organisation, Tus7a did an audit in 2015 around all unallocated cases across the country and the numbers were significantly 11:41 high, but, out of that, we identified the number of retrospective cases and it was at that point we decided that we would take them out of the general unallocated cases and look at them specifically under the section 3 Act, the Section 3 policy.
250 Q. Those guidelines, and the Tribunal has been provided with a copy of them, and indeed they were put to Mr. Lowry when he was giving evidence?
A. Yes.

251 Q. He indicated that in relation to some of them he didn't agree --
A. That's correct.

252 Q. -- with the procedures. Was there debate at the time?
A. There's definitely some debate in the operational side 11:42 of the house. In terms of, we had implemented -- it was implemented overnight by email and that was absolutely incorrect and there wasn't proper training provided for the staff. But from the very start we were doing it with all CSA cases and all serious physical abuse cases. Where the challenge was and debate was, where it fits in with the neglect cases. And that's an ongoing debate.
253 Q. So, I mean, I suppose the guidelines and the policy document that was published by Tusla for the benefit of 11:42 its managers and for staff --
A. Yeah.

254 Q. -- and for their guidance, it wasn't simply plucked out of the air; presumably there was some discussion in relation to the policies over a period of time?
A. The policy was developed over a period of time, certainly. It was a result of a lot of the cases being managed under the Barr judgment but done very inconsistently and the procedure wasn't followed correctly, which wasn't fair to the people we were working with. But certainly we needed a consistent approach to how we were working with these cases.
255 Q. And one might assume that the better practices that had been in existence up until then --
A. Yes.

256 Q. -- were incorporated into the document?
A. Absolutely.

257 Q. And were there any particular areas that were identified as problematic in relation to retrospective 11:43 allegations of sexual abuse?
A. Well, the difficulty was at the time, and to acknowledge the front-line staff, given the demands in the services certainly they were left and they did drift and that's consistent across the country as we have identified recently. But in relation to how it should be done, the Barr judgment was there previously, the letter to the person of concern was there previously, it should have been done, that's not anything new. Confirm doing a credibility assessment, 11:44 meeting the complainant, that's not new, that would be something that we would do all the time. And this procedure was to support --
258 Q. Well, that is what I was going to come to. I mean, it's all good and well to say that new procedures come 11:44 into play in September 2014 ?
A. We would have certainly done it previously.

259 Q. Yeah, that they're not implemented consistently across the HSE divisions or Tusla divisions, but a lot of these practices were in place already?
A. They were. Certainly in my experience on any team that I managed and certainly I did five years in Mountjoy Square as team leader, I would expect that the complainant would be brought in and interviewed.
Q. Well, in a general way in terms of how a referral is dealt with --
A. Yes.

261 Q. -- once it's allocated, I might return to that shortly, but once it is allocated to a social worker, it would appear, and it's highlighted in the policy document of 2014, that the most important part of the whole procedure is the initial assessment of the allegation, is that right?
A. Well, if you get past the preliminary inquiry part. You know, you do a preliminary inquiry and then you'11 decide at that point if you need to do an initial assessment.
262 Q. We11, you don't move on if it is determined that it is unfounded?
A. That it is unfounded or that there isn't any credibility in it.
263 Q. And the first step in relation to that initial assessment is to meet with the complainant?
A. Absolutely, yes.

264 Q. And we know that that wasn't done --
A. That's correct, yes.

265 Q. -- in the case --
A. On this occasion.

266 Q. And it wasn't done over a period of three years when there were perhaps opportunities when that first step could have been undertaken?
A. Yes.

267 Q. Is that right?
A. In my experience, certainly there are times when you wouldn't interview the complainant, but that would depend on the allegation. Where you have something really serious, that you would do a joint interview with the Gardaí.

11:46
Q. There is absolutely no reason that has been offered to the Tribunal and none from practice that you would be aware of --
A. None --

269 Q. -- as to why the complainant wouldn't have been met within the first instance as part of proper procedures, is that right?
A. In the first instance back in 2006. When we're working with teenagers, again I'm saying this in a general sense, that when we're working with teenagers, we need to meet with them and see what's going on with them, and particularly young teenagers, they've a lot of challenges in life, they're going to secondary school, they've a lot of changes, they're coming to terms with their sexuality, so we would spend a lot of time getting to know them and then dig deep into their allegation then, you know.
270 Q. Well, can the Tribunal take it that in terms of the procedure that was in existence certainly in 2013, that the preliminary step before any action is taken is that 11:47 the complainant would be met with as part of a process for assessing the credibility of the allegation?
A. Absolutely, yes.

271
in relation to the implementation of the guidelines of 2014?
A. That and the number of unallocated at the time was over 500 retrospective.

272 Q.
I think the management team decided at that stage to establish the Sexual Abuse Retrospective Team?
A. Yes.

273 Q. which are referred to as SART, is that right?
A. That's correct.

274 Q. And that that was set up with a view to ensuring that 11:48 there would be consistent implementation of the policy?
A. That's correct.

275 Q. How was that to be achieved by SART?
A. Well, we had the policy, and what we wanted them to do was really to review all the files - when I say review 11:48 the files, again, you know, in social-work spiel, it's basically doing a chronology of all the files, identify what has been done and if there's any gaps or any concerns.

276 Q. Was it envisaged that SART would take all the retrospective abuse cases --
A. No.

277 Q. -- that were in --
A. They wouldn't have enough resources to do that. But they would have oversight of all the files throughout 11:48 the region. A lot of those files, you know, of the 500, were shut down very, very quickly because there was no further work to be done, so they brought it to a manageable caseload.

278 Q. I am not really understanding what SART was about --
A. Okay.

279 Q. -- Ms. Creamer. Was it a general review that was to take place by SART or was it specific to files that had been troublesome?
A. No. It was a general review of unallocated cases, because we needed to know what the content of the unallocated cases were, prioritise them in terms of getting them allocated and getting them worked as quickly as possible.

## 281 Q. All the unallocated cases?

A. Yeah, of which there was over 500.

282 Q. So they were set up and then there was to have been a review of all files, including Ms. D's file?
A. Yeah, including all files, yes.

283 Q. And how was the request put in to Cavan-Monaghan? Were 11:50 they just simply asked to produce a list of all unallocated cases?
A. Yeah, I meet my management team every month, and as part of the development of this team this was done at these meetings, so al1 the area managers, four of which 11:50 I have, were aware of what we were doing, and in terms of supporting the team, developing their processes and procedures, they were working alongside me with the team to do that, so all the area managers were aware
that SART would look at their unallocated cases, identify where gaps were if work hadn't been done.
They would take as much as possible and allocate it within the team itself with their new resources, but they wouldn't be able to meet the demand of them all, 11:51 but that they would be reallocated back into the areas but would have oversight by the SART team. So the SART team would be developing an expertise around the management of the policy and monitoring that the work is getting done.
284 Q. Sorry, so if I understand you correctly, the procedure was to be, and we will deal with Cavan-Monaghan, Mr. Lowry was part of your management team, isn't that right?
A. He was indeed, yes.

285 Q. And this matter had been, as you say, discussed with him at management meetings?
A. Several times.

286 Q. So the procedure for SART was that they were --
A. Initially, they were to review all the unallocated cases, shut down what needed to be shutdown, because there was no further work to be done, and action or identify gaps on cases where the work wasn't done and what needed to be done next, and in as far as possible they would allocate them within the SART team or they might allocate them back out within the region to the duty social work teams. And they would have oversight --
287 Q. If you could just stop there and bear with me for a
moment because I want to be very clear in relation to this. Cavan-Monaghan --
A. Yes.

288 Q. -- were handing over all their unallocated cases of retrospective abuse to SART?
A. That's right.

289 Q. SART were then going to review those files?
A. That's correct.
Q. If they could identify files that should be closed, they would do so?
A. They would do so.

291 Q. And no further action would be taken. And if there were other files identified where there had -- there was work to do, they would then identify that work and refer it back to Cavan-Monaghan for the social workers 11:52 to deal with those?
A. On some cases, yes.

292 Q. Yes.
A. But then the SART team would have oversight of those actions.

293 Q. And that they would have oversight of them. Was it ever envisaged that SART would actually conduct the inquiries themselves?
A. Oh, absolutely, on some files.

294 Q. On some files?
A. They allocated within their -- they had four social workers. They had been allocated cases within those four.

295 Q. So in any event, when you were discussing this at these
meetings, how often did you have the meetings?
A. I have management meetings once a month and I meet my area managers once every six weeks on a one-to-one.

296 Q.
A. No. Unfortunately not. He didn't. There were plenty of opportunities for him to do that, but no. He hadn't. He hadn't discussed the case with me at all. The file was handed over, we're not clear, and I don't expect you to know whether or not the complete file was 11:54 handed over to SART, but if documentation was withheld for improper reasons I presume you would be very disappointed in that?
A. Well, yes. Absolutely. It's totally unacceptable. We transfer files quite a lot from one part of the service 11:54 to the other, and everything should be on those files. It should be a full comprehensive file.
298 Q. And indeed we have heard from Ms. Tobin this morning indicating that it is proper practice and best practice that the entire documentation on a file would be included when it was handed over and particularly from one region to another?
A. Absolutely. From one team to another. Absolutely.

299 Q. Have you wondered why Mr. Lowry may not have discussed with you the significant problems and errors, and
A. Yeah.

300
Q. -- that had arisen in relation to the Maurice McCabe?
A. I have wondered and I am very, very disappointed and
it's shameful, the evidence that has been presented this week, and I have no explanation for it. I certainly meet my managers very often. Like, an area manager is a very responsible job. It's a very high level job and you would expect that your managers and your principal social workers are able to implement our guidelines, such as Children First, effectively, and share information. Like, at our one-to-one meetings we'd have quite a comprehensive agenda, it would range from budget management, to staff management, but it does get into case specific, and I certainly would be in conversations with my area managers around different cases, specifically around we'11 say the District Court, when they're particularly challenged on certain areas, and I would certainly talk about complaints and I talk about any kind of case reviews that we might be engaged in. So it is a very comprehensive agenda, and since this happened, this case has never been put on that agenda.
301 Q. Well, I mean it could have been put on the agenda in the first instance because it was a case that ultimately ended up with high priority from SART, isn't that right?
A. It did. And certainly of the cases that went to SART I had risk escalations, one of which this case was. I had several -- 30 risk escalations on the reviews of those files. At my level, I suppose I'm looking more at the themes related to the risk escalations and data breaches, like putting information on the wrong form or
a file being left in a bathroom or letters going to the wrong address, data breaches. Those kind of things are always brought to my attention. on this occasion it wasn't. And I saw it as information that had gone on the wrong form.

302 Q. Yeah. We11, it's perhaps a little bit more significant than that?
A. oh, it is. It is now. Yes.

303 Q. I think that SART, one of the reasons -- and we can come to it and I will open it, I would prefer to deal with it in a general way for the moment.
A. Yes.

304 Q. We can be more specific by reference to the documents, but I don't think there's any need for that. But one of the reasons that it became high priority when the matter was reported to you in September 2016 by Ms. O'Loghlen was because of the nature of the case --
A. Yeah.

305 Q. -- the fact it was Maurice McCabe and the fact that there was a lot of media attention --
A. Yeah.

306
Q. -- in relation to Maurice McCabe, isn't that right?
A. Yes, that's correct. But again, I didn't know the actual allegation. The actual mistake that was written, I didn't know that at the time, but -well, I appreciate that but I'm not really dealing with that.
A. okay.

308 Q. I'm just dealing with the referral from -- in the first
instance the referral from Mr. Lowry of the file to SART.
A. Yeah.

309 Q. One might have expected that in circumstances where the case was causing enormous problems --
A. Yes.

310 Q. -- you're aware of the fact that Kay McLoughlin sent a letter to Sergeant McCabe dated 29th December 2015?
A. I'm very aware of that. And even the timing of it is totally unacceptable.
311 Q. Yeah. You're also aware the response now from that came from Sergeant McCabe and from his solicitors?
A. Absolutely.

312 Q. And you're aware of the discovery by Kay McLoughlin of, as I have described it, a litany of errors and she was 11:58 indeed part of that herself --
A. Yes.

313 Q. -- and I think acknowledged that, is that right?
A. Yes.

314 Q. And it would appear that it's not just really a matter 11:59 of cut and paste.
A. No.

315 Q. These errors stem from a failure of people to actually sit down and review a file from cover to cover, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

316 Q. And it perhaps shows a practice within Tusla at the time of maybe just scanning files as opposed to actually getting down into them and reading them, isn't
that right?
A. Well, on this occasion that's absolutely what has happened here. But my expectation from my staff, and certainly my principal social workers, who manage the duty service, is that they know those files back to front.

317 Q. Yeah. And they brief theme into their allocated case?
A. But even if they're on a waiting list and a principal social worker is managing a waiting list they should know what is in the content of those files.

318 Q. Indeed. And it would appear that 2015, when Kay McLough1in came upon the case and discussed it with Mr. Deeney --
A. Yes.

319 Q. -- and also Mr. Lowry --
A. Yes.

320 Q. -- that they had a five-point plan as to how to proceed, is that right?
A. They did.

321 Q. And it appears that she took on the task of investigating the referral, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

322 Q. And on the face of it, it would appear, even though Mr. Lowry was quarreling with the use of the term allocation, but it would appear that in reality she had 12:00 been allocated to deal with the case by Mr. Lowry and Mr. Deeney, isn't that right?
A. Well, absolutely. But she would have responsibility for the waiting list. Principal social worker again is
a very high grade and she would have responsibility for the waiting list. Whether you want to use the word allocated or not --
323 Q. Leave aside the issue of waiting list --
A. Yes.

324 Q. -- I mean, this case had been actioned on.
A. It had been actioned on by Kay.

325 Q. We know that a letter had been sent to Ms. D?
A. Yes.

326 Q. And we know that a letter had been sent to Sergeant 12:01 McCabe?
A. That's correct, yes.

327 Q. So effectively the case in reality had been
allocated --
A. That's correct.

328 Q. -- to Kay McLoughlin, is that right?
A. Yes, I accept that, yes.

329 Q. And so, you know, it wasn't really a matter for SART at all because this was a case that in reality had been allocated to Kay McLoughlin. It had got to a stage 12:01 there were solicitors letters coming in and it had got to a stage where an apology had been sent to Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes.

330 Q. So really, this wasn't an unallocated case for SART to 12:01 be dealing with --
A. No.

331 Q. -- isn't that the reality?
A. Yes. The reality is, this case should never have ended
up with SART. It wouldn't be my expectation that our frontline staff are involved in legal letters. That is an area manager's responsibility.
332 Q. So in reality here this case should never have been on the list from Cavan-Monaghan --
A. It never should have been on the list.

333 Q. -- going to SART?
A. Absolutely not.

334 Q
A. In my opinion Mr. Lowry absolutely would have known that, yes.
So really what was happening here was the case was being -- I use the expression, had become a hot potato and it was being handed over to SART with a view to, perhaps a fresh view of the whole matter, I don't know. 12:02
A. Well, they believed that SART had more skills and more specialist skills than they have, which on my view, and would be the view of my own management, would be that the principal social worker and the area manager should be well able to manage a file like this.
336 Q. So, insofar as handing it over for that reason, that would not be a valid reason to hand it over?
A. That would not be a valid reason.

337 Q. Right. So, then one comes to the actual handing over of the file?
A. Yes.

338 Q. Would you have expected in the circumstances, and bearing in mind the history of the McCabe file, that somebody in Cavan-Monaghan, probably Mr. Lowry, if not

Ms. McLoughlin, would have either included a report on the file highlighting the difficulties that had occurred up until then --
A. Yes.

339 Q. -- or had sat down with the new team coming in to deal with the file and explain to them the problems that had arisen?
A. Yeah. I would expect that there would be some sort of due diligence report handed over with the file. Having said that, it shouldn't even have got to that level.
It should have been more towards me. The file should have been discussed with me rather than SART.
340 Q. So it would appear from the Lisa O'Loghlen report to you and we have a copy of that and I don't intend --
A. Yeah.

341 Q. -- to go through it again, but it would appear that, as the Chairman has used the expression, that it may be the product of a sanitised file, do you understand?
A. Yes, I do understand that. Yeah.

342 Q. Because we have already highlighted certain aspects of the form where the report from Lisa o'Loghlen perhaps identifies a statement made by Ms. D in 2006 to the Gardaí as being the reason for the problems on the file. But we know that that is not so?
A. Yeah. No. I don't think there's something -- my sinister going on. I do believe that it is incompetence in terms of the governance of the file.
343 Q. And perhaps an effort to cover up that incompetence?
A. Well, an effort to pass it on to somebody else to take responsibility, yeah.
344 Q. So, in any event, you receive a report in September of 2016 --
A. Yes.

345 Q. -- in relation to the matter, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

346 Q. And that's in the risk escalation report --
A. Format, yes.

347 Q. -- that was prepared by Lisa O'Logh1en.
A. Yeah.

348 Q. As I said, I don't see any reason to open it. The Tribunal already has it. As far as matters are concerned we know the history of the matter is that subsequently Sergeant McCabe was written to, that there 12:06 were attempts made to contact Ms. D and to engage her in the process and effectively the file was closed, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

349 Q. Had anybody, at the time that that happened, identified 12:06 to you the problems that had arisen during the course of the Maurice McCabe file?
A. No. Not the extent of the problems, no. Other than the fact that it had drifted over time and that this wrong information was circulated. But I didn't have the detail of the wrong information unfortunately.

350 Q. Was there any internal review at that juncture?
A. At that -- No, we have done an internal review, which was just completed last week, and that's under our Risk

Management Policy, and it is, it started around April time.
351 Q. April of this year?
A. April of this year, yes. But no, I hadn't initiated a review, because I hadn't got the full picture of the extent of the difficulties on the file. I was looking at the 30 risk escalations that $I$ had and in terms of the learning from them.
352 Q. Okay. Just, if you could be shown page 530 please. This is a letter to the Tribunal. I think that you -- 12:07
A. Could you go back up, please?

353 Q. -- you attended a meeting, you see at paragraph 1 there on the 13th February 2017?
A. That's right. That was soon after the Prime Time programme.
354 Q. And Josephine McGuinness, who is the business manager, Jim Gibson, who is the chief operating officer, was in attendance --
A. Yes.

355 Q. -- as was Gerry Lowry?
A. That's correct.

356 Q. And Tara Downes from Tusla legal, is that right?
A. That's correct.

CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Marrinan, it must be a -- 530 is a letter from Arthur cox in mine.
MR. MARRINAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN: Is it?
MR. MARRINAN: If you look at paragraph 1, sir.
Chairman: oh, I see.

MR. MARRINAN: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN: Right. I was expecting a different format, thank you.
357 Q. MR. MARRINAN: I think that the meeting concerned the examination of the inaccurate information in Cavan regarding Sergeant Maurice McCabe and decisions about how to manage is that, isn't that right.
A. Yes, that's correct.

358 Q. At that time had Gerry Lowry sat down with you and told you --
A. No.

359 Q. -- about the history of the file and difficulties that had arisen in it?
A. No. He hadn't discussed it with me at a11. From Jim Gibson's point of view and my own point of view, the first we heard of the detail was on the Prime Time programme.
360 Q. During the Prime Time programme?
A. Yes. The extent of the mistakes.

361 Q. That's the first that you heard of the --
A. Yeah. The opening of files on children, the no credibility assessment completed.
CHAIRMAN: So, just to get this right, maybe you will just go over that again, Mr. Marrinan, would you please, because $I$ don't know if anyone can give me a date for the Prime Time programme. We have a date here of a meeting of the 13th February 2017.
A. It was soon -- it was that week I think. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Marrinan, maybe --

MR. MARRINAN: Yeah, I wil1 just check it now, sir. Ms. Leader is going to check the actual date.
CHAIRMAN: Maybe the witness will go through her week, that particular week it might help, Mr. Marrinan, I don't know.

MR. MARRINAN: Do you --
A. Yeah. What day is the 13th February? I know the Prime Time was on the Thursday evening.
MR. MARRINAN: It's actually the 9th February --
A. Okay.

362 Q. It was aired. So it's 9th February that it's aired and this meeting arose out of the Prime Time programme, is that right?
A. Yes, and it was about --

363 Q. And prior to the 9th February you hadn't heard of any 12:10 difficulty?
A. No, I heard from -- I did know through the risk escalation that the wrong information was put on, on file, the detail of that wrong information I didn't know until the Prime Time. I didn't know about all the 12:10 other errors, like notifications being sent and files being opened on children of Mr. McCabe.
364 Q. Just if could just be very clear in relation to it so there is no misunderstanding. The risk escalation --
A. Was in August.

365 Q. -- document is page 511.
A. Yeah. It was in August. Early August. Yeah. CHAIRMAN: So, you were getting that off the television. But there was just one thing,

Mr. Marrinan, if you don't mind, there's been a -- it could be a different of description, but it's always been said there was no files opened on the McCabe children.
A. Sorry, yes. The intakes. But even the fact that
intakes were opened on the four children is unacceptable.
Chairman: it means that the next step is they become part of a file for the child.
A. well, no. The children wouldn't have come into this at 12:11 all, you know, in general practice and the way my expectations would be about how cases like this are managed we wouldn't have got as far as -- without talking to Mr. McCabe first, we would never do any intakes on the children, unless we had a serious founded risk.
ChaIRMAN: Unless it was kind of red light stuff.
A. Red light, and we had founded the -- we had done the assessment and we had come to a conclusion of founded, then we have a child protection concern and we need to 12:12 ensure the children are protected. But that would not happen without talking to the person of concern.
366 Q. MR. MARRINAN: If you look at page 511 there.
A. Yeah.

367 Q. This is the "Serious Incident other Than HIQA and Risk 12:12 Escalation"?
A. Yes.

368 Q. I think that this was prepared by Lisa o' Loghlen --
A. That's correct.

369 Q. -- is that right?
A. Yes.

370 Q. And it's dated 2nd August 2016?
A. Yes.

371 Q. At page 513, at the bottom there. We heard from the last witness, Ms. Tobin, that her understanding was that she was -- she wasn't as such reviewing the errors on the file. And that would appear to be the situation, isn't that right?
A. That is correct.

372 Q. So is it the situation that as far as Lisa O'Loghlen is concerned -- unfortunately she's not available to give evidence to the Tribunal at the moment.
A. No.

373 Q. And won't be until September some time. But is it the 12:13 situation that this report is put in with this heading of "Serious Incident and Risk Escalation" as a result of what they had discovered by doing a review of the file?
A. Yes.

374 Q. Al1 right.
A. And it would be on file. And what she is drawing my attention to is lack of fair procedure, which was on a lot of the risk escalations at the time, and the incorrect information. But the detail of the incorrect 12:13 information I didn't have.

375 Q. So is it Lisa O'Logh1en who has escalated the risk -A. To me.

376 Q. -- within the service as a result of what she has seen
from reviewing the file and the history of the case?
A. That's correct, yes.

377 Q. But it didn't come from Cavan-Monaghan to be reviewed in that context?
A. No.

378 Q. It became as a normal file?
A. It became -- yes.

CHAIRMAN: It came as a SART file, I presume.
A. Well, it came to the SART team, yeah, from the unallocated.

CHAIRMAN: It came as 'This is a SART'.
A. Yes.

MR. MARRINAN: Yes.
379 Q. Page 513, "Describe any interna1/externa1 investigations, investigation reviews initiated to date," it says:
"SART completed the audit in 2016 and considered it a high concern given complex legal issues and Detective Sergeant McCabe's profession and high media profile."

Do you see that noted there?
A. Yes, I do indeed, yes.

380 Q. And then the next paragraph Ms. O'Loghlen highlights:
"Fair procedures have not been followed and our investigation ten years ago proceeded without ever meeting Detective Sergeant McCabe and with no formal closure. Again we wrote to Detective Sergeant McCabe

December 2015 despite re-opening the file in August 2013 and wrong information was given and Ms. D was not met with. It is 7ikely Detective Sergeant McCabe has a strong argument that procedures have been dealt with inappropriate7y."

Isn't that right?
A. Yes.

381 Q. And then: "Anticipated completion date for overal1 management of serious incident.
SART has allocated the case high priority and so will endeavour to contact alleged victim August 2016."
A. Yes.

382 Q. Isn't that right?
CHAIRMAN: Mr. Marrinan, I'm sorry for interrupting you 12:16 but the whole point about contact the alleged victim then is the verification process, is it?
A. On this occasion it was to start at the beginning.

CHAIRMAN: Start from scratch?
A. Start from scratch, which has happened on many of the other files as well. And start, and bring in the complainant and listen to what they have to say and make a judgment on it.
CHAIRMAN: okay.
383 Q. MR. MARRINAN: And I wonder in the context and circumstances of the Maurice McCabe file and its history going back to 2007 --
A. Yes.

384 Q. -- and the failure of Ms. D to engage with Tus7a, and
we know that she didn't engage in 2015, when prompted by Kay McLoughlin --
A. Yeah.

385 Q. -- whether in fact it was appropriate or whether this was material a step that was taken in the knowledge that Ms. D was not going to engage with the service, is there any element of that in it?
A. No. I think it is simply just because it was so badly managed, there were so many errors in it, we did want to inform Mr. McCabe of what was going on and that his 12:17 file -- his name was actually on a file and that we wanted to bring her in and start at the beginning, do some level of a credibility assessment.
386 Q. There again, if we can look over the next page, page -sorry the previous page, page 502 it says:
"SART sought legal advice on this matter given the case was investigated ten years ago approximately but the information is scant and now Ms. D has come forward again given Detective Sergeant McCabe received a lot of 12:18 media attention in recent years as Garda whistleb7ower."

Have you any idea or were you able to ascertain where that piece of information came from?
A. The piece around the fact that Garda McCabe was a whistleblower?

387 Q. No. Where, a suggestion that Ms. D came forward again as a result of Detective Sergeant McCabe receiving a
lot of media attention?
A. I think that's an assumption.
Q. That's just merely an assumption?
A. Yeah. I can't answer really, yeah.

389 Q. And then the last three lines there:

# "Tusla legal have advised SART to seek to meet Ms. D to assess whether her disclosure is credible to proceed the matter to investigation." 

And then:
> "Tus7a legal will respond with Sergeant McCabe's peop7e."
A. Again, $I$ have to confirm that that is the legal advice on many of these cases. As I say, this is not the only one that was risk escalated. And we did have to start the beginning.
390 Q. So, having received that report the case was
ultimately, or the file was ultimately closed, but in circumstances where that report doesn't highlight the difficulties --
A. No.

391 Q. -- in any meaningful way --
A. No.

392 Q. -- that had arisen, in the McCabe file, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. Now again, you know, these cases,
which there was a few, $I$ think five or six particularly from Cavan-Monaghan, I did talk to Mr. Lowry in my one-to-ones about and how we were addressing them and that SART was doing this piece of work and SART would go out and do some learning exercises with his own team 12:20 in relation to managing such cases. But at no point throughout that did he go through the detail.
393 Q. If we can go just back to page 530 please, paragraph 2 of the letter:
"At the meeting there was a decision made --"

This is meeting on the 13th February.
A. Yeah.

394 Q. " -- decision made to delete information which was felt 12:20 to be inaccurate --"
A. Yes.

395 Q. " -- from the searchab7e exce7 sheet held in Cavan."
A. Yes.

396 Q. What was the reason for that?
A. Because there was no credible allegation there and we had no child protection concerns around Mr. McCabe or some of the other files. So their names should not be on any register or any list.
CHAIRMAN: I missed your reference, Mr. Marrinan, I'm sorry.

MR. MARRINAN: Page 530.
CHAIRMAN: 30?
MR. MARRINAN: 30?

CHAIRMAN: Oh we're back, yes, yes.
A. So, it was agreed that his name would be deleted off that excel sheet that comes from their filing system.
397 Q. MR. MARRINAN: I think that Tusla were subsequently advised in anticipation of a Commission of Investigation not to destroy any files, is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

398 Q. And you're happy that that wasn't done and that all discovery and disclosure has been made to the Tribunal?
A. Yes. I very much hope so, yes.

399 Q. And in terms of even at that eleventh hour on the 13th February -- between 9th February when the programme had been aired, the Prime Time programme had been aired on RTÉ, and 13th February 2017, had Mr. Lowry contacted you?
A. If I recollect correctly, I contacted him, yes, to discuss it.

400 Q. And did he indicate to you and outline to you the history of the case in full?
A. Well, what he said was that, the reality is there's been a lot of these difficult cases, $I$ knew it was there, I knew I needed to do something better and I didn't do it.

401 Q. Sorry, if you just give me one moment. Yes, I think while we have you here in the witness box - and you're being very helpful - you've obviously followed the evidence as it has proceeded --
A. I have indeed.

402 Q. -- at the Tribunal for the last fortnight.
A. Yes.

403 Q. Are there any aspects of the evidence that has emerged that you're concerned about and that you're surprised at, other than the matters that you've already outlined to far?
A. Well, very few surprises in it, in the sense that, you know, I was asked to prepare, so I had seen the emails from, you know, one senior manager to the other, where I was concerned. I suppose if I wanted to add something to it, and it's not really a concern, Chairman, but it's just to put into some sort of context the duty system around the country at the time and in terms of what some of the frontline staff are dealing with. I'm not sure that that has been caught as well as it could be, in the sense that they are coming on duty for that week and they would have the files that are unallocated, but they also have allocated themselves, which cases could blow up and they may be distracted to go and do something there. But the other thing is, the high priority coming in the 12:24 door is very significant. You know, if a Public Health Nurse, for example, walks into a house and we have a three-year-old in a cage that needs an immediate response. We have a lot of difficult teenagers who are suicidal. That needs an immediate response. You could 12:24 have a young girl, which would be very high priority, you know, at a sex education class in school come in and says 'My Daddy does that to me three times a week, I didn't know that that was wrong'. So that is the
kind of calibre of stuff that is coming in to them on a daily basis. They have to deal with that while on duty and they also have to go to court while on duty to take those children into care or, you know, to do whatever is next, and set up a case conference. So although this file was in the unallocated drawer, and I know what you're saying, it just got plucked out, which is unacceptable, but I can see how it drifted on duty. What I don't accept is that the management of the waiting list should have known what was in on those files. And a case such as this, which such sensitivity, should have been taken out and allocated as a priority within the service. When these kind of cases -- these are sensitive -- you know, the fact that Sergeant McCabe was in the Gardaí, but we have cases where staff of our own have allegations made against them, certainly with teachers or many high profile people within the community, that would be on the media as well, when those cases come in, there is a nervousness around them, there absolutely is, and there is a head in the sand behaviour at some time not to deal with it because it is so sensitive and it could blow in the media. But the reality is, the management should take them out and allocate them to a senior practitioner on the team to get the work done and to see the file through from beginning to end. This is a 36 -page file, the work could have been done very quickly. But in the context of the responsibility for the frontline workers I can see how errors are made
because it is such a fast pace. But I don't accept it at the management level.
404 Q. You perhaps understand the nuisances within the service better than anybody because of your experience. From your knowledge of the file, the history of the file and 12:26 from the evidence that you have heard at the Tribunal of Inquiry, are you happy to exclude the possibility of any Garda interference externally applied to the management of the file?
A. To be honest with you, it would be easier if I could say that that is what $I$ believe is happening, but it's not what I believe is happening. I believe it to be completely and absolutely incompetence.
405 Q. Sorry?
A. I believe it to be incompetence on the management of the file. I don't believe that there is collusion.
406 Q. So what you are saying effectively is that you would be more than happy to blame an external agency but it's your own agency that is actually responsible?
A. Well, I would like to think that we could -- This to me ${ }^{12: 27}$ is a file, people have seen it as a file, they have taken on tasks as it as a file, I don't see that they have a face behind it, that this is a person with a family and it wasn't seen like that, it was just seen as a file with a task as opposed to the human nature of $12: 27$ it, which is extremely disappointing.
407 Q. Just one matter, final matter, Ms. Creamer, you provided a statement to the Tribunal, it's page 3063 and it's dated 10th July --
A. Yeah.

408 Q. -- earlier this week, Monday, and in it you don't refer to the fact that you believed that this was an inappropriate referral from Cavan-Monaghan to SART?
A. No.

409 Q. Has this arisen as a result of the evidence as it has unfolded?
A. No, no. To be honest I just did that because I knew I would have the opportunity to talk through my concerns.
410 Q. Well, it may well be that if you have any additional evidence that you think might assist the Tribunal in its work you might put pen to paper and provide an additional statement to the Tribuna1 --
A. I will indeed, yes.

411 Q. -- should that arise, okay?
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. well, it is 12:30, why don't we break for an hour then.

THE HEARING THEN ADJOURNED FOR LUNCH

THE HEARING CONTINUED AFTER LUNCH AS FOLLOWS:

MS. LINDA CREAMER WAS CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. MCDOWELL AS FOLLOWS:
412 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Ms. Creamer, good afternoon, Michae1
McDowell is my name. I am one of Sergeant McCabe's counse1. Could I ask you, just very briefly, although it was the case that SART -- this should never have been reported to SART in your view, now looking back --
A. Yes.

413 Q. -- it is also the case that SART, though, did at least go through the preliminary steps to restart the process, isn't that right?
A. It did indeed, yes.

414 Q. And would have proceeded to wherever that ended --
A. Yes.

415 Q. -- if Ms. D had been interviewed and if there be found to be a basis for approaching Sergeant McCabe, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. But they didn't have the full picture 13:32 of all the errors that had been made and in terms of the correspondence with solicitors.
416 Q. Yes. And would it be fair to say, on your reading of the files, and I take it you have been following the evidence here, that Ms. D was led to believe by Ms. Brophy that Tus7a would do two things: They would notify the Gardaí and they would start their own inquiry in relation to the issue whether Sergeant McCabe was a risk to children, isn't that right?
A. Are you asking me if Ms. Brophy was saying that to Ms. D?

417 Q. We11, you saw her evidence, that she contacted Tus7a to ask would -- if she referred it, what would the consequences be.
A. Yes, she did.

418 Q. And one of them would be that it would be referred to the Guards, there would be a reference to the Guards, because everybody assumed it hadn't been done before or she thought it hadn't been done before, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

419 Q. And the second point was, though she did know there had been a DPP's investigation and the file had gone to the DPP, and so she must have thought the Guards were somehow involved, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

420 Q. And the second point is that Ms. D would have been -would have left the counselling session with the impression that there was to be a process to ensure that Maurice McCabe was not a risk to children, isn't that right?
A. She would have left that -- yes, that would be her understanding of it.
421 Q. Yes.
A. The practice in the area at the time.

422 Q. And we know that the Rian service never actually got around to offering her counselling until I think it was May of the following year?
A. Yes.

423 Q. And we know that following what happened on the 12th August 2013, nothing happened on the Tusla side until --
A. Correct.

424 Q. -- 30th of April, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

425 Q. Can I just ask you in relation to what did happen on 30th April, you weren't there, obviously, but
Ms. Connolly says that she took down the file and that she started working on -- she engaged in some way with Eileen Argue, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

426 Q. You know that?
A. I heard her evidence.

427 Q. And that she was told -- or she decided that she would compose a Garda referral document?
A. That's correct.

428 Q. And that she would prepare intake documents on the four McCabe children, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

429 Q. Now, I think you have said that that should never have happened?
A. In my experience, and certainly managing many social work teams over the last 20 years, we wouldn't do a Garda notification on somebody who is over 18, nor would we open children's files unless we had a founded outcome.

CHAIRMAN: Unless we had a which?
A. A founded outcome. After the assessment.

430 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: In other words, unless you had a very clear case, is that what founded outcome --
A. A very clear case.

431 Q. Yes. So, looking at the apparent decision of Eileen Argue in consultation with Ms. Connolly on 30th April --
A. Yes.

432 Q. -- is it fair to say that that was a very unusual step to take in the circumstances?
A. In my experience, that would be a very unusual step to take.

433 Q. And we don't know as yet whether it's suggested that Ms. Argue had read the file because she was sent two files, the Ms. D file and the Sergeant McCabe file on the day, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

434 Q. We don't know whether as yet -- whether she consulted them?
A. No.

435 Q. But can you think of any reason why somebody in her position would authorise Laura Connolly to open files on the McCabe children?
A. I genuinely can't understand why that was done, but, you know, in different areas over the years, when we were in the HSE, did different things, and they set up their own processes, which was one of my challenges in trying to achieve consistency. So that is the only explanation $I$ can give for it. It wouldn't be normal
practice, in my view.
436 Q. Well, I know that the HSE is spread across the country and it isn't a united church, maybe, on all matters of practice.
A. Yes.

437 Q. But had you ever come across -- did you ever come across a similar situation before where files were opened in such a rapid decision as that on four children?
A. Not as principal social worker or as team leader, no. 13:38

438 Q. Because we know that the excuse offered for preparing the Garda reference document was the manuscript writing from Keara McGlone, to Garda notify?
A. Yes.

439 Q. But there was nothing in it, was there, on the intake 13:38 document, which would at that point justify opening any files on the children?
A. No. No. That information, the wrong information could have been perceived as a second referral, and you would bring the client -- the complainant back in to discuss that.

440 Q. Yes. And surely, before you opened a file on the McCabe children, you'd require slightly more information than Ms. D's father's casual reference to the number of children in the family?
A. Yeah. Our role is to protect children; we open files on children in line of protecting them. We didn't have any evidence at this point that we needed to protect these children because we hadn't met with Mr. McCabe
and we hadn't done an assessment.
441 Q. I know that you can't pass judgement on other people, and I am not asking you to do that, Ms. Creamer, but I am asking you to agree with the proposition that there is something strange and highly unusual about the steps 13:39 that were suddenly taken on the 30th April in this case?

CHAIRMAN: 30th April? Year? 2014?
MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, 2014, yes.
A. Again as I say, to my knowledge it's unusual. why it was done, $I$ can't explain. Just within the culture of an area that they developed this practice.

442 Q. We11, I mean, did you discover in the SART documents any evidence that this was done in respect of anybody else?
A. No. Other children, no.

443 Q. I mean, did it emerge to you as a pattern of kind of unusual behaviour or was of this a one-off, as far as you know?
A. In terms of what was risk escalated to me, no, opening files wasn't part of it, any of them.

444 Q. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN: Mr. McDermott?
MR. MCDERMOTT: No questions.
CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. O'Higgins?
MR. O'HIGGINS: No questions, Chairman.

[^0]
## FOLLOWS:

445 Q
MR. MARRINAN: To correct one thing Mr. McDowe11 might have inadvertently put to you. There were no files opened in relation to the McCabe children.
MR. MCDOWELL: Sorry, I meant --
A. Yeah. There were no files opened.

CHAIRMAN: Yeah, no, I understood what you were saying, Mr. McDowe11, so don't worry about it.

446 Q.
MR. MARRINAN: And there was no Garda notification in relation to the McCabe children, the Garda notification 13:41 was in relation --
A. No.

447 Q. -- to the allegation made by Ms. D against Sergeant McCabe?
A. That's correct.

448 Q. Thank you very much.
MS. CREAMER: Chairperson, if I could just take the opportunity, it's -- I have been here for the week listening to the evidence and I just want to say that Tusla is in a major transition programme. I am not making that as an excuse for what has happened, but we genuinely are extremely sorry to the McCabe family. To go through such stress and receive such a letter at such a time - at any time - is completely unacceptable. And we are in the business of putting families together 13:42 and supporting families to be together, we are not in the business of trying to destroy families. And stress like this could have gone that route, so I just want to acknowledge Tusla's apology for what has happened to
the McCabes and we will cooperate with anything else in the future. Thank you.

## THE WITNESS THEN WITHDREW

MR. MARRINAN: Sir, the next witness is Eileen Argue, please. This is in volume 4 at page 1207.
ms. EILEEN ARGUE, HAVING BEEN SWORN, WAS EXAMINED BY MR. MARRINAN AS FOLLOWS:
449 Q. MR. MARRINAN: You have been mentioned in dispatches in the Tribunal and you have, your name has been pronounced Ar-gay and Ar-gue at various stages by various people, but I think the correct pronunciation, is Ar-gee, is that right?
A. That's correct.

450 Q. We11, we have sorted that out anyway. Would you just tell us what your qualifications are, please?
CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry?
A. It's Ar-gee.

CHAIRMAN: Is it really.
A. That is the pronunciation.

CHAIRMAN: okay. That is good to know.
451 Q. MR. MARRINAN: Would you just tell us what your qualifications are please?
A. I have a Degree in Social Studies and Social care from sligo Institute of Technology since 2003, and I have a Masters in Social work, which was from the National University of Ireland, Galway, in 2006, after
completing my Masters.
452 Q. And I think you qualified as a social worker in 2006, is that right?
A. That's correct.

453 Q. And at that time you started in the Cavan-Monaghan, in 13:44 the Child Protection Team in Tusla, is that right?
A. That's correct.

454 Q. I think you finished there in May of 2014, is that right?
A. I finished fully in the first week in June '14 and took 13:44 up my new post on 11th June 2014 in a different social work area.

455 Q. Yeah, on 11th June you moved to Kilkenny, is that right?
A. I moved to South Tipperary but I am presently in Kilkenny.

456 Q. Right. Now, I think during that period of time you were working in both the Monaghan and Cavan offices, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

457 Q. Now, I think you have provided the Tribunal with a great deal of information in your statement, which runs for 30 pages, dealing with how intake records are dealt with and the file management system. We have already heard a lot of this evidence from other witnesses, and you don't contradict what any of them say in relation to it, so I don't intend to bring you through that evidence, all right?
A. That's correct -- that's okay.

458 Q. But if I could just firstly ask you in terms of your role during this period of time, you were always working as a social worker, is that right?
A. That's correct.

459 Q. And there was a period of time I think after Keara McGlone left the service in February of 2014 when you took up work as team leader, is that right?
A. Yes, I took it up in an acting capacity.
Q. Did you take it up, the role as acting team leader during that period of time?
A. Yes.

461 Q. Between February 2014 and when you 1eft in June of 2014?
A. Yes.

462 Q. But other than that, your role was always as social 13:46 worker, is that right?
A. That's correct.

463 Q. And prior to taking up that role -- and we will be focusing on a date in late April of 2014 for the purposes of our work, but tell me, did you know Sergeant McCabe going back over the years?
A. I don't recall if $I$ knew him, but in the course of my work within the Cavan Social Work Department there is a possibility that $I$ may have met him at a meeting or I may have had some contact with him, but I can't recall if I did or not. But I would accept in the course of my work I could have met him.
464 Q. Al1 right. Well, it's a feature of the statement that you provided to the Tribunal, you seem to have very
little recollection of these events, is that right?
A. That's correct. All the information I would have is based on the review of the file for this process. I can't recall any piece of information specific, apart from reading the file and preparing the statement.
465 Q. Well, if we could just have page 1290 put up on the screen, please. This is a meeting conference on Tuesday, 24th April 2007. I don't expect you to recall every meeting that you had ever attended but you will see that the chairperson is Mary o'reilly and it lists the persons who were present, amongst them was Emer o'Neill, who is a senior clinical psychologist, and orla Curran, who is also a social worker, as you were at the time, but she was attached to the child sexual Assault Team, and then we see Mary Tiernan was there and Rhona Murphy, who is the social worker dealing with the Ms. D file at that time, and also then we see that you are present, all right? Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.

466 Q. And if you look down, you will see there under "Reasons 13:48 for referral," and then a bullet-point 2, there is a reference to the "File returned from the DPP, no prosecution," do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.

467 Q. And then "Actions agreed" and one of the actions, the ${ }^{13: 49}$ first one was that Mary O'Reilly was to contact Catherine Sweeney, who is the principal social worker in Meath, to ask her to nominate a member of her team to deal with Mr. McCabe. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.

468 Q. Do you have any recollection of attending that meeting where Sergeant McCabe was discussed, and apparently it was discussed in circumstances where an investigation of him or a meeting with him by the team in Cavan was deemed to be perhaps inappropriate and they were trying to get Catherine Sweeney in Meath to meet with Sergeant McCabe. Does that jog your memory in any way as to --
A. I would have sat at those meetings on an ongoing basis as a member of the Child Protection Team for Cavan-Monaghan. I don't recollect any one specific person but any child protection referral at that time would have been discussed in terms of a new referral or any case that was coming back up for a review. So I wouldn't specifically remember a case or a name, however I would remember attending these because this was a part of our development of service in relation to the Child Protection Team, that we would attend our normal referrals meeting and we would attend this child protection referrals meeting.
469 Q. Yes. We know that, but in terms of -- you see, if I could just please have page 261 brought up on the screen. This is a list that the Tribunal have compiled of child conferences and meetings where Sergeant McCabe was present, and if you could just look there, please, you will see that the third one down is 31st of October 2006. You will see that Gerry Lowry is noted, Mary Tiernan and then yourself, do you see that?
A. Yes.

470 Q. And then the third paragraph across relates to the CORE team that were assigned to deal with the case. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

471 Q. And you are mentioned there and Sergeant McCabe is?
A. Yes, I see that.

472 Q. Do you see that? Do you have any recollection of being assigned? we11, first of all, do you have a recollection of him attending at conferences?
A. I don't have a recollection. I would have been attending conferences on an ongoing basis, so I wouldn't remember every person that would be at them. I definitely recognise the names that are down from the Social work Department in relation to it, but I would have been at case conferences as part of my role within the Social work Department on an ongoing basis so I can't say that $I$ would remember every single person.
473 Q. Ah, well no, I mean, nobody is expecting you to remember every single person, but on 31st October 2006 you attended a conference that was chaired by Mr. Lowry, you were assigned as a CORE team to work with Garda McCabe and the following April you were attending a meeting where Sergeant McCabe is being discussed, and people are trying to -- or certainly there is a suggestion that because it's potentially he has been attending these conferences, that there is an effort to send it to your colleague in County Meath. You have no memory of either attending at meetings with

Sergeant McCabe, being on a CORE team with Sergeant McCabe or him being discussed at the meeting in 2007?
A. I don't remember the specifics but as I said, in the course of my work I was open to that I may have met him or I may have had some level of liaison with him, but I 13:53 can't remember specifically to any particular case.

474 Q. If we could just go on to page 262 , please, if you could be shown that. There is a meeting on 16th April of 2008. Again Gerry Lowry is chairing it and we see that you are present?
A. Yes.

475 Q. You are also on the CORE team, along with Gerry Lowry, Bernie O'Reilly, Mary Tiernan and again Sergeant McCabe, do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.

476 Q. And then the following year, on 15th May of 2009, we again see yourself at a meeting chaired by Gerry Lowry. You are on a CORE team along with Gerry Lowry and Mary Tiernan and Sergeant McCabe.
A. Yes, I see that.

477 Q. Do you see that? And this doesn't help you or jog your memory in relation to this at all?
A. No. These are, I would believe, child protection conferences or child protection reviews, so I wouldn't -- as I said already, I don't recall and I have no memory of these individual cases in relation to it. I do accept that there is names attached to a CORE group meeting that would have been convened outside of case conferences. But I don't really have a memory of
such in relation to any individual meetings or contact with people.
478 Q. In April of 2014, were you aware of or had you heard of Sergeant McCabe in the media?
A. I would have had -- remembered some mention. I don't exactly know exactly what the context of the articles or media feeds were, but I do remember hearing some level of information.
well, did you know him or the name as being somebody who was involved as, what is described in the media as a whistleblower?
A. I don't remember exactly the content of the material but I do remember there was a mention in the paper, but I don't know exactly in the context of what it was.
480 Q. Well, I don't expect you to remember the content of articles that you have read, but in the general context?
A. The general context, as I said, I would have heard his name during that time.
And when you heard of him in the media and media reports, did you link that in any way to the Sergeant McCabe who had been attending meetings or at child conferences that you had attended to -- attended at between 2006 and 2009?
A. I am not 100 percent sure if I did at that time, but now looking back on this information I can see, I can see it, but I don't -- I don't know if I would have made that connection at that time, if I would have been thinking in that kind of context of names and
associations.
CHAIRMAN: I suppose, what Mr. Marrinan is asking you is this: There would have been a time when things would be very surprising vis-à-vis allegations of child sexual abuse - for instance, the clergy - but it would stick in your mind when those ranges were rare, but here you have one in relation to a policeman and he is only down the road, and I suppose that's what is hard to understand; as to why you wouldn't have kind of said to yourself 'oh, now we have a policeman and furthermore he is down the road, I wonder which one he is' or for an alert to go off in your mind of that variety. Do you see what Mr. Marrinan is getting at there?
A. I suppose I came back to the department in May '14, I wouldn't have been aware of a referral had come in, in relation to Mr. McCabe. I was in the Monaghan Social work Department before that, so I wasn't actually actively working on cases within the Cavan team or the duty system in Cavan. So, in April if I had heard a connection $I$ wouldn't necessarily be making any direct connections during that time. It would have been a busy Social Work Department so I am not too sure if I would be putting connections together of something from a previous number of years before that and that current 13:57 time. So I can't say I did and I can't say I didn't at that time in relation to now. Looking back it's very hard to say if I did in terms of the lapse of time at this point. But as I said, I did hear his name but I
am not saying that I made connections with everyone that I would hear about.
482 Q. MR. MARRINAN: We come to April, I think the 30th April of 2014. We have heard from Laura Connolly that she was going through the Measuring the Pressure file. Can 13:58 you recall and tell us how it was that you came to be dealing with this file, the Maurice McCabe file?
A. I can't remember exactly, but what I can say in that time, we would have been reviewing cases on the Measuring the Pressure waiting list, in line with my principal social worker, and during that time there would have been a particular emphasis of looking at the intake records that were developed on cases that were unallocated. I don't know how -- what kind of system went in, in place in order to look at the particular files that would have been pulled during different -various times, but during that time it would have been the intake records and what assigned task was put on that intake record that wasn't completed and it was about checking the outstanding tasks that were assigned 13:59 in the section, the decision-making section of intake records. On that case, there was, I think "duty to Garda notify" as Ms. McGlone would have put, who was a former team leader, and it was about looking at what was outstanding and completing the tasks. So that ${ }_{13: 59}$ would have been during April 2014.
483 Q. Well, was this a task that you carried out in the first instance and then handed over to Laura Connolly or was it a task that Laura Connolly decided to do herself?
A. I can't be specific in terms of the sequence, but at that time we would have been reviewing cases from the Measuring the Pressure. A number of cases would have been assigned to the duty system to follow up on outstanding cases. Mr. McCabe could have been in that at that time, one of those cases that were identified, and would have been within the duty system and would have been un -- non-allocated in the duty system in order to complete a task, which was outstanding. There was numerous cases that would have been reviewed on an ongoing basis for whether or not the completion of tasks assigned by the team leader in the intake record was completed. So, I am not too sure if that was before the review in April or was that at April, I am just -- I can't recall exactly. But that would have been one of the outstanding tasks. So it would have been for the duty social worker -- would have worked on a week-to-week basis, a different social worker every week, so it may have been that she went through what was outstanding within the duty tasks that were assigned on that -- at that occasion.
484 Q. She has given evidence, and she is not entirely sure whether or not she just went into the filing cabinet or whether you in fact had assigned this file to her. But if you could just -- if we could have page 1255 on the 14:01 screen, please. This is a Notification of suspected Child Abuse, Garda Notification. Do you see it?
A. Yes, I do.

485 Q. This is what we now know to be the incorrect
notification, all right?
A. Yes.

486 Q. And we know that this was compiled by Laura Connolly. Can you see there, there is a post-it there?
A. I can't see.

487 Q. Can you see the writing there?
A. Yes, I can see.

488 Q. This has been shown to you by the investigators.
A. Yes.

489 Q. I think the best copy that was available. Could you read out what is there?
A. "Duty to notify allegations on to An Garda Síochána and file in the cabinet" and then my name "Eileen".

490 Q. Yes. 2229. We have actually a colour version, you can see it better there?
A. Yes.

491 Q. That seems to be a direction that is given by you, isn't that right, in relation to the file?
A. Well, it's a Post-it for duty, so $I$ suppose in relation to it, it was a task that was identified. I am not too sure whether it'd been put on a notification, I think I did question at the time with the investigators was it there originally, because the notification already had been completed, but that is my handwriting and that is me, my signing of my name.
492 Q. Well, you are making the assumption that the Notification of Suspected Child Abuse notification had already been compiled at that time. There is no doubt that this is a Post-It and it's in your writing, isn't
that right?
A. That's correct.

493 Q. It's on the file, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

494 Q. It's done before there is any Garda notification, isn't 14:04 that right?
A. I would take it that it was, but there is no date so I can't be 100 percent sure but I would take it that it was a direction in my handwriting.

495 Q. We11, it had to be before the Gardaí were notified because it identifies a duty to identify the Gardaí, isn't that right?
A. "Duty to notify", yes, that's correct.

496 Q. To notify, sorry. So this was done before notification was sent to the Gardaí, isn't that right?
A. I would expect it was. But again --

497 Q. We11, can there be any doubt about it? I mean, you are hardly going to put a Post-it identifying a duty to notify the Gardaí and ask for it to be put on file in cabinet, if that had already been done?
A. No, I am not disputing that. What I was saying is, I am not too sure was it there or at the start of the file. It is my handwriting, it is a direction in relation to it for duty to complete the Garda notification.

498 Q. We11, it would appear on the face of it, wouldn't it, that this was a direction given to notify the allegations to the Gardaí?
A. Yes. And that would be in line with outstanding tasks
that was known from the intake record that was incomplete. So that would be following up.
499 Q. And that instruction would then be followed up with the notification actually being done, isn't that right, and then sent to the Gardaí?
A. Yes.

500 Q. So we know from Laura Connolly that she filled out the notification. Can we take it that in fact this Post-It was on the file prior to her doing that?
A. I would expect that it was on the file. I can't be 100 percent certain but I would expect that it was the direction in completing the outstanding tasks that was in connection with the intake record in August 2013.
so I expect it was there beforehand.
501 Q. So it would appear that this file was on your desk, so to speak, before it went to Laura Connolly, isn't that right?
A. It possibly was, I can't recall exactly, but I can definitely say that was my handwriting on the post-It with the direction.
502 Q. Yes. No, we know that, but we are just trying to establish when it was that this file was on your desk and whether or not you had referred this file to Laura Connolly to do a notification for the Gardaí. It would appear that that is the situation?
A. It does appear to be way. And, as I said, in reviewing the cases for measuring the Pressure it was looking at the outstanding tasks, so it more than possibly was one of the cases that were reviewed in that process.





Q. But if you had reviewed the Maurice McCabe file -well, you must have reviewed the file, isn't that right, at that time, if you were giving instructions?
A. I don't recall if I read the file. It more looks like I would have looked at the intake record that was on file, looked at the task, it wasn't completed and then asked for the task to be completed. I have no recall of reviewing the file, but in line with the intake record and the incomplete task it would be -- it was more likely that at that time that that is possibly what would have happened. I can't be 100 percent certain on it but that is what I would foresee.
504 Q. We11, I suppose the first thing you are going to do is you are going to -- if you are looking at the file you have to go and look for the intake records, isn't that
A. That's correct.

505 Q. And we know that Keara McGlone did the intake record and she highlighted a duty to notify Gardaí, and that's written on the intake record. But there is also a letter on the file from Keara McGlone to Superintendent Cunningham, you know that now, don't you?
A. I know that now from reviewing the file for this process.
506 Q. And that would tend to suggest that there had been some 14:08 communication between the Social work Department and Superintendent Cunningham, isn't that correct?
A. That would suggest that.

507 Q. And that really needed to be followed up at this
juncture because it may wel1 be that Keara McGlone had met with Superintendent Cunningham and hadn't recorded the meeting on the file, she may have overlooked it or otherwise. But looking at the file there had been a reasonable expectation, would there not, that she was going to meet with the superintendent to discuss the case?
A. I don't recall seeing the letter at the time. I seen it in the process of review. There was no amendment of the task that was being requested to be undertaken by the duty social worker, so we proceeded to complete the outstanding task.
508 Q. So, as far as you are concerned, your position is that this -- you would have been going through the measuring the Pressure, you'd have identified a file, you would have looked at the file, looked at the intake record, identified a task to be done and you would have sent that to Laura Connolly with the Post-It on it identifying the duty that existed, is that the position?
A. That would be my position, yes.

509 Q. And you had absolutely no knowledge of Sergeant McCabe or that this file referred to Sergeant McCabe, is that your position?
A. At the time starting in the Cavan Social work Department replacing Keara McGlone, I wouldn't have been aware that the file was there until my principal and I would have sat and reviewed the Measuring the Pressure list. At that, we would compile all the cases
that are unallocated in the Social work Department. As I stated, I don't know what system was put in place in order to review what certain files there were.
Mr. McCabe's file appears to be one of the files that would have been reviewed during that time. We would have looked at the intake record of what was incomplete and then the direction was to complete the outstanding task on it, and that would have been what I foresee would have happened during that time.
510 Q. Would you just mind addressing the question that I asked you, which was: were you aware that this file related to Sergeant McCabe?
A. In relation to the intake record, it refers to Mr . McCabe in his occupation and in being a member of the Gardaí. It refers to that in the original intake record that was completed by the duty social worker in August '13.
511 Q. Would you have linked the Sergeant McCabe here to the Sergeant McCabe that you were reading about in the newspapers?
A. I think there would have been definitely correlation at that time in relation to it. And when $I$ was reviewing task completed with my principal social worker I would give her an update in relation to cases that were completed and connections in relation to any case, and looking at it now, there definitely would be connection.
512 Q. And your principal at that time would have been?
A. It would have been Louise Carolan. She would have been
the duty principal at the time in Cavan-Monaghan Social work Department for duty in intake and Séamus Deeney would have been responsible for all Garda notifications in Cavan-Monaghan at the same time.
513 Q. So in any event, you think that there may -- as you put 14:12 it, some correlation between the Sergeant McCabe file that you had taken from Measuring the Pressure and the Sergeant McCabe who was in the media, is that right?
A. Looking back at it now, there is definitely a correlation. I can't say if I made the connection at 14:12 that moment in time, as I looked at the intake record to complete.
514 Q. Ms. Argue, that is what we are interested in; the state of your knowledge at the time. We all know that it was Sergeant McCabe's file that you were dealing
with. What was your state of knowledge at the time?
A. In relation to it, on Measuring the Pressure it would have been: His name would have been referred to as Maurice McCabe. At the time that it was reviewed from an intake record it made reference that he was stationed in the Garda station in Bailieboro at that time. The information that I would have known at that time, he was a member of An Garda Síochána, from the intake record.
515 Q. Was there any talk at all in Cavan in the Social work 14:13 Department about Sergeant McCabe, did you hear any rumours or talk or chat?
A. I don't -- I wouldn't remember specifically. I covered both Cavan and Monaghan so $I$ was in both departments at
both times -- or at different times. So I wouldn't -I wouldn't proceed to say there was any conversation. Conversations tended to be on very much personal issues people would talk about, not particularly what was going on in the newspapers.
516 Q. Was the answer to my question no?
A. No, well, I can remember I wouldn't have heard conversations in relation to him during the time that I was there.
517 Q. If we could just come back and look at the Garda notification at page 1255. If you could just go over to 1256 , please. You see here that:
"Ms. D informed her parents of this alleged abuse when she was aged 11/12 years of age. Ms. D made a statement to An Garda Síochána at the time. A file was sent to the DPP, however no prosecution was directed."

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

518 Q. In the circumstances where that was known and was on the intake record that you have referred to and that you would have examined, would there have been any need in those circumstances to do any notification at all to the Gardaí where they were already aware and had investigated the same complaint?
A. I go back to, the intake record had made the direction for duty to Garda notify and I suppose I looked on the balance of, that was what the direction was by the
previous team leader and it was that we completed the task as assigned in relation to that.
519 Q. In other words, you didn't read the file, you just read the intake record, is that what you are telling us?
A. I would -- I don't -- I can't recall if I read the file, but $I$ would say that $I$-- at the start, the focus would be the intake record. But I have no knowledge that $I$ read the file or done any review of the file. And in fact, you would have only read one portion of the intake record because there wouldn't have been any need to notify the Gardaí if there had been a previous investigation and that investigation file had been sent to the director of pub1ic prosecutions, who directed no prosecution, sure there wouldn't?
A. I suppose I looked -- looking back at the intake record, it makes reference to that, but equally, the direction on that day by the team leader who was in post was "duty to Garda notify" and that was the completion of what was directed at that time.
521 Q. In any event, you were then asked by Laura Connolly, and she seeks further direction from you in relation to whether or not to do intake records in relation to the McCabe children, isn't that right?
A. Yes. I seen -- as a part of the investigation $I$ seen the document that I was provided with. I don't recall giving any direction. But I did see the document in which Ms. Connolly had completed.
522 Q. If we could have 1239 up, please. This is a note Laura Connolly, it says:
"Eileen, have checked system and we have re-read --" Sorry.
"-- we have no record of file on Maurice McCabe's two children at the time. Based on Ms. D file I suspect these two children are --"

And then it identifies.
"I deduce that these two girls are now aged 18-plus, based on notes on Ms. D file. Maurice has two other children now who weren't born at the time of the alleged incident.
A. Could you just pull down the screen?

523 Q. Sorry?
A. I can only see the first part.

524 Q. 1239, and then just scroll down on the screen so that 14:18 you can see that. And then it goes over the page.
"Deduce that these two children are under 18 years now. How do you want to proceed regarding the McCabe chi7dren?"

Right. So that would confirm that in fact you had dealings with this file and had an involvement in handing it over to Laura Connolly because she is acting
on the basis that she is reporting back to you in relation to the file, isn't that right?
A. I suppose what she is writing for is looking for direction in relation to how to proceed in relation to following on from the notification.

525 Q. Yes. But in terms of the note itself, it's quite clear that you had already dealt with the file because there is no introduction, she is operating on the assumption that you know about the file and she is reporting back in relation to a search in relation to children, isn't 14:19 that right?
A. That's what it appears to be, but I feel it would have been still in reference in connection with the follow-up from the intake record, that she would have seen the content of the information and was coming back 14:20 then looking for direction. That is the way I would read it in relation to it. I don't recall seeing this, only through the process for the -- for this process, actually.
526 Q. In any event, it reads: "Case direction from Eileen: 14:20 Complete intake records x 4 on the children."
A. I see that is what it says. I suppose I don't have recall of giving that direction. At the time in our department, the process, the common process for managing similar circumstances and dealings would be that intake records would be opened on children who were under 18 if there was an allegation received by a parent or carer or someone known to the children who had contact. So, I suppose the policy at that time,
which would have been orientated into when I started in the department until I left, was that there would be intake records open on children under 18 . we wouldn't open intake records on children who were over 18.
527 Q. Why was it done in Sergeant McCabe's case?
A. I can't recall --

528 Q. Here we have a direct question that is being asked by Laura Connolly to you, as the team leader. She is asking, look -- she is identifying, first of all, that there are four children, two of them are adults now, two of them weren't born at the time of the alleged incident, and she is querying whether or not she should be opening intake records, and you are advising her to open intake records in relation to two adults, why are you doing that?
A. I can't recall having any discussion or of seeing of this two-page document before me prior -- prior to looking at it due to the process. It would not have been my practice at that time to open records, intake records on children who were over 18. It was the practice of the department at that time in that area, in Cavan-Monaghan, to open records, intake records of children who were under 18 , who had contact -- there was a parent or carer who had an allegation against them, that was the policy of that department at that time. I would only be adhering to policy. I do not believe that $I$ would have directed for two intake records to be open on two young people who were over 18.

CHAIRMAN: But somebody did it, you know.
A. Sorry?

CHAIRMAN: Somebody did it. I mean, we have heard lots and lots and lots about policy, procedures, etcetera, but, for that to happen, I am not saying you did, but somebody had to.
A. I can stand by working in that department, that was our procedure from the time I started in 2006 until I left. But on no occasion has files been opened on children over 18. And I certainly do not believe I would give a 14:23 direction of that.

CHAIRMAN: We11, unless they are perpetrators themselves I suppose.
A. Yes. But a young person who is over 18 who has contact with a parent or person with an allegation, because it would come under child welfare concern, we wouldn't open it.
CHAIRMAN: Is there any explanation for it then?
A. Like, I have no explanation to give because I don't have any understanding of why that would have happened.
529 Q. MR. MARRINAN: So what you are saying is that you doubt Laura Connolly's evidence that you gave this direction to her, even though she has noted it down and provided us with a note of it at the time?
A. What $I$ am saying is: I don't recall having a discussion or seeing this document prior to the process of preparing for this. I don't believe I would give any direction to open a referral on someone over 18 in this case. Equally, the policies and procedures of the
department at that time in Cavan-Monaghan was to open intake records on children who were under 18 who had contact with someone who had an allegation against them. And that's what I am clearly saying.
530 Q. When did you first become aware of the fact that the Garda notification was incorrect and tell us the circumstances in which that happened?
A. I would have received an email from Ms. Pamela Armitage, who was the social work administrator, who outlined that she had received a phone call from the psychologist from Rian who outlined that there was factual errors in the record, that she would have sent in the written record. And I would have then subsequently notified it on to the area manager and the two principal social workers and I think that was roughly around 14th of may, 2014.
531 Q. If we could have page 1259 up on the screen. You see there at the bottom there, it's an email from Pamela Armitage to you?
A. If you can just bring it down.

532 Q. 14th May 2014 at 11:05 a.m. "Dear Eileen --"
A. I actually can't see it. It's not down.

533 Q. Can you see it now?
A. Yes.

534 Q. "Laura Brophy, Rian, just called to say that she has 14:25 made an error in a report to us re Ms. D. The line that "this abuse involved digital penetration, both vaginal and anal" is an error and should not be in the referral. It is in fact a line from another referral
on another adult that has been passed in error. Laura has apologised and is sending us an amended report as soon as possible."

What did you believe that this was in reference to?
A. In relation -- this email here?

535 Q. Yes.
A. In relation to the notification that would have been sent by our department.
536 Q. It only refers to Ms. D, that Ms. D's name would have been there by an initial at that stage, isn't that right, or two initials?
A. That's correct.

537 Q. How did you know this referred to Sergeant McCabe at all?
A. I suppose during that time when I received the email the common practice in the Social work Department, if a call had been received from an agency, the secretary either would have wrote or at times Pamela Armitage or whoever was the secretary at the time would have also verbally notified us as well. I can't recall if that happened or not. But I remember receiving that information and sending it up. I can't say exactly how I knew it was that, but I suppose from it, I'm considering whether or not I would have had a conversation with Pamela Armitage after receiving the email, and then sent it up, but I can't be 100 percent sure.
538 Q. Because if we then just look above that, some eight
minutes later you are sending an email now to Gerry Lowry, copied to Louise Carolan and to Séamus Deeney?
A. Yes.

539 Q. "Dear Gerry
I hope this finds you well. Please see information below. This information is in relation to MMCC."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.

540 Q. Mr. Lowry has told us that he was all too familiar with 14:28 the Maurice McCabe file at that juncture and knew immediately who this was a reference to. He also ventured the view that you would have known as well and you would have known that those initials would have meant something to him. Do you understand?
A. Yes, I understand.

541 Q. Is that the situation?
A. We11, given the fact that I would have made the direction of the file, review that intake record, I would have -- I would have seen the name and the name of the other person, and yes, I would have known that name from the intake record.
542 Q. So "Allegations were made against him by an adu7t, Ms. D, who alleged that she was sexually abused as a child by him." where were you getting that information 14:29 from?
A. I suppose the information we would have received on the intake record would have been characterised under sexual abuse as a child protection concern from the
intake record when she made the allegation against him, and I would have notified him of the -- then following on from that, what the Garda notification we sent in relation --
543 Q. Sorry, I just want to be clear about this. You don't know anything about this -- I understand you to say that you knew nothing about this case at all, that the file -- you came across the file in measuring the Pressure, that you gave it to Laura Connolly to deal with to do a Garda notification. You have doubts whether or not you gave her the directions in relation to the McCabe children. She then went off and dealt with the matter and you'd no dealings with it at all, and that you hadn't in fact read the file at any stage, you hadn't read the intake record, you had merely looked at the intake record and seen Keara McGlone's direction to duty Garda notify. Am I right, has that not been the thrust of your evidence?
A. No, I would have felt that, in terms of looking at the intake record I would have looked at the subject content in relation to it and then looked at it. I would have looked at the intake record. I didn't go to just page 2, I would have looked at it, I would have seen the information, looked at it and looked at the direction and then checked whether that had been completed.
544 Q. And then when this lands on your desk you get an email from Pamela Armitage, she refers to an error in a report by Laura Brophy in relation to Ms. D, and at
that time you were able to advise Mr. Lowry that this has been an allegation in relation to, you identify Maurice McCabe, you identify that the allegation has been made by somebody who is now an adult and it refers to an allegation when she was a child, and none of that 14:31 material is contained in the email that had been sent by Pamela Armitage to you, but you had recalled it and those details from having viewed the intake record back at the end of April, is that what you are telling us?
A. I can't recall from the time I got the email, and there $14: 32$ is a short number of minutes in between sending it on to Mr. Lowry, whether or not I looked at that file again, which was in the duty room, and looked at the information and sent it on. I can't say what happened. What I can say is, I received the information and then 14:32 I forwarded on the information of what $I$ knew at that time in relation to reviewing the file or from the intake record. I can't say, but what I can say is I notified it on from the information that $I$ received in.
545 Q. Well, it's unlikely that you reviewed the file, because ${ }^{14: 32}$ as I indicated the email is sent on some eight minutes after you received the email from Pamela Armitage.
A. Mm-hmm. I am not saying I reviewed the file in its entirety. I may have reviewed it or looked at it again in relation to the information that was on the intake 14:33 record. But I can't actually say if I did or didn't do that.
546 Q. All right. In any event, you go on in your email to say:
"A Garda notification was forwarded by our department based on the information received from Laura Brophy Rian services. As stated below, Laura Brophy contacted our department today in relation to her referral and the content of same. She advised that there was information provided which did not relate to Ms. D and was in relation to another person against another man and not the man MMCC. This notification needs to be amended as soon as possible and the relevant superintendent needs to be updated with regard to same."

So that was sent by you on the 14th of May. You then receive an email from Laura Brophy at page 1260. And this sets out the details and the circumstances. we have already opened it. Do you need to read it there?
A. Yes, I just will take a moment to read it.

547 Q. We will read it so.
"Dear Ms. Argue
I am writing to inform you that it has come to my attention that a report I made to your service on 9th August 2013 contained an administrative error which I wish to address.

On page 1 of the original report $I$ sent on behalf of Ms. D under the title "Description of Abuse" the sentence which begins "Ms. D informed me" and ends with
"she said anything" is incorrect information and should be disregarded. I have amended the report to include the correct information as given to me by Ms. D and I have enclosed the correct report with this letter.

I would like to take this opportunity to apologise for this error and any confusion or inconvenience caused. I would ask that the original report containing the error and any copies made or distributed be retracted and replaced with the correct version of the report enclosed.

If you have any further queries in relation to this matter, please don't hesitate to contact me."

Do you recall receiving that letter?
A. I don't recall seeing it, only at the preparation for this process.
548 Q. You have no recollection of receiving the letter at all?
A. No, I don't.

549 Q. Do you doubt that you did receive the letter?
A. No. I am not saying I didn't receive it, I just can't recall seeing the letter.
550 Q. The next action that I want to refer you to is at page 1263. And this is from your email address, do you doubt that this is your --
A. No, that is my email address.

551 Q. Yeah. And you seem to have some issue with the
investigators as to whether or not, in fact, this was your own notification, but I think you accepted that it was, because it was sent from your email address and it's directed to Linda Dewhirst, is that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.

552 Q. And it has an attachment, you refer to it:
"Dear Linda
This is an amended Garda notification. Pamela, please print a copy for file."

That is a direction that was given to Pamela Armitage, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

553 Q. If we turn over to page 1264, this is the amended Garda 14:37 notification. If you go to 1265 , at the end there, we will see "The designated social worker with this matter is --" and your name there and your telephone number, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

554 Q. And you are referred to as the "social work team leader". Did you prepare that amended Garda notification?
A. I would take it, if it was sent from my email account, that I did. I can't be fully certain but I accept that 14:37 it was sent from my email account, so more than likely I did complete that, yes.
555 Q. That would have entailed studying the file, would it not?
A. I can't recall if I studied the file again in relation to it. I just can't actually give any understanding of whether $I$ read the file from page-to-page or whether I read the original Garda notification and the updated information from Ms. Brophy and compiled it from that. 14:38

556 Q. This amended Garda notification has the correct description of the alleged abuse?
CHAIRMAN: It has the threat in it as well, doesn't it? MR. MARRINAN: Yeah. If you look at page 1264, you will see:
"This abuse is alleged to have occurred on one occasion in 1998 to 1999. Ms. D reports being aged six or seven years old at the time of this alleged abuse. Ms. D alleges that the alleged perpetrator of this abuse threatened her father if she said anything."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.

557 Q. Where did you get that from?
A. I think that was in the original notification that would have been sent. So the notification that was amended contained the information that was sent previously and then an update of the correct information to reflect the whole information that would 14:39 have been sent.

558 Q. Ms. Argue, would you accept that this is a very sloppy amendment of the Garda notification?
A. In what way?

559 Q. In the way that it includes material in it that isn't, in fact, or doesn't relate to Ms. D at all?
A. I suppose the Garda notification compiled of the information that was originally sent to show the sequence of -- that this was sent, this was the amendment that we received and this is the conclusion of that information. So it was showing it from start in terms of the initial referral -- the initial Garda notification.
560 Q. Te11 me, at that time, were you aware of the significance of what had happened in terms of a notification had been sent to the Gardaí in relation to Sergeant McCabe, indicating that there was an allegation against him of a rape offence?
A. I suppose at the time the Garda notification was sent by the social worker I didn't have oversight of that notification, so $I$ wouldn't have been aware until -- of everything that was in it at the time because it wasn't sent to me in oversight. In our department at the time the procedures would have been that the person, the social worker would have completed it, sent it to the administrator and then it went to the principal. So I didn't have oversight of Garda notifications.
561 Q. So you also received a letter from Fiona ward. This is at page 1269, please, on 20th May 2014. It's headed:
"Re: Administrative error on report of retrospective abuse pertaining to Ms. D.

Dear Ms. Argue
It has come to my attention that due to an
administrative error a report relating to allegations
of retrospective abuse which pertained to the
above-named containing incorrect information was sent to your department 7ast August. I have been advised by the Regional Data Controller HSE Dub7in Northeast to request that all copies of the incorrect report be returned to me as director of the service as soon as possib7e. I would, therefore, appreciate if you could arrange to have all copies of the incorrect report, including any copies made as part of Garda procedures in following up on this report.
I enclose a stamp addressed envelope for return of the report."

Did you arrange for that to be done?
A. I don't have a recall of whether or not the information was sent back or how it was dealt with because at the time I would have notified my area manager and principals of the concern that had occurred in relation to the Garda notification, and I don't -- I don't recal1 any instruction or direction to completely -- to send back the information. In matters such as this, given the enormity of the situation $I$ would have, the normal practice would be to liaise with the principal social worker in relation to looking what the next step would be, but I don't have a recall whether that was -that occurred or not.

562 Q. Did you reply to Ms. Ward's letter?
A. I can't recall if I replied to her or not.

563 Q. Now, prior to that, we know that Laura Brophy had phoned you on the 15th May 2014. Do you recall having a phone conversation with Laura Brophy?
A. I don't recall, but from my review of the file $I$ have seen that she sent me an email and she makes reference to the phone call.
564 Q. Well, if we could have page 1270 on the screen, please. It reads:
"Hi Eileen
Following our phone conversation yesterday, I am contacting you to inform you that $I$ had another call in relation to the retrospective report which, as you are 14:44 aware, contains a clerical error.
I was informed that the superintendent in the jurisdiction referred to in the report was not yet aware of the clerical error and has been asked to meet with the Garda Commissioner in relation to the case.
I have agreed to send the superintendent the amended report and correct report by registered post today. If you have any queries relating to this, please don't hesitate to call me."
would that not have indicated to you in the clearest possible terms that, in actual fact, this was quite a serious matter?
A. I suppose, when I received the information from

Ms. Brophy through Ms. Pamela Armitage I would have notified it to my area manager and principals, given the serious nature of it, and I would have sent it to them.
565 Q. Did you have any other dealings with the file at all?
A. I don't recall if I did. My information -- as I said, my contact with the file, I wouldn't have been aware how much contact I had until I reviewed it for this process, so everything is based on what is on the file that refers to myself.

566 Q. There was a question asked in relation to the printing of -- the instruction to Pamela Armitage to print a document and save it to file. You told the investigators that you'd no ink in your printer and that might have been the reason why you did that. Do you recall saying that to the investigators?
A. I do. They asked me, and that is what I could only wonder; if I had no ink I wouldn't have been able to print it. I couldn't recall whether or not that was the case, but generally if I had no ink I would send it 14:47 on to the administrators to print for file on all files, not just this file, but all files and they would put it on file for me.
567 Q. Pamela Armitage gave evidence to the Chairman also saying and making a reference to the printer being out 14:47 of ink. I am just wondering, and it's quite curious that both of you have a recollection of whether or not a printer was working in 2014, May of 2014. Had you discussed this with her at all?
A. No. And I didn't say for definite that was the reason, I said that could have been a possibility. At that time, and like every time, in the social work office I continuously run out of ink and $I$ have to send things on to administrators to print it for me. It's a very basic printer that we all have in relation to Social Work Department in the offices, so that was my on7y rationale of sending it forward for her to print, that it could have been that $I$ had no ink in my printer.
568 Q. So, obvious7y when Laura Brophy had sent the letter to you, and asking that the document be returned and that a11 incorrect notifications and information and the intake record would be removed from the file and had identified the problem, it was your responsibility then to make sure that that happened, is that right?
A. I suppose at that time when I received that information I sent it forward to my area manager and principals looking to seek what they had recommended to do next in relation to it.
569 Q. So you are saying that, again, you simply referred this 14:49 on to your area manager, Mr. Lowry at that time, is that right?
A. That's correct.

570 Q. But are you saying that you referred on a decision as to whether or not to check the file to ensure that the 14:49 incorrect information was excised from my documents that had been used -- which had used the intake record which was wrong? Were you referring to him to --
A. No. I would have been looking at the time that I would
have notified on it, the concern of the Garda notification that was sent in relation to the incorrect information. I would have looked in terms of looking for advice of what needed to happen, the following steps needed to be happening in relation to -- in relation to the file.

CHAIRMAN: Well, can I just intervene for a second, if I might. Let's suppose you have a file on somebody because, let's say, their teenage daughter is out of control, so you have got a file on the family, let's call it Smith or o'Neill or whatever.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

ChAIRMAN: And someone sends in an incorrect notification to the effect that the father of this teenage girl has murdered two of his children and then a wee bit later the social worker emails you and says, well, that is completely incorrect, what was happening was, I was reading The Irish Times newspaper and pasting some things in relation to an essay $I$ was creating and this got in by mistake; what possible direction would you need to remove all references to this father being a murderer beyond receiving the information?
A. I suppose I would always look for advice and guidance from either my principal or another person in relation to something I wasn't 100 percent sure of in relation to. In this case, I wasn't sure if we could just remove the information or should we amend it, remain it and amend it. So I would have looked for advice and
guidance in relation to that.
CHAIRMAN: No, but I mean, I think what is perhaps missing here is that, as we know, once the file was created on Sergeant McCabe it was a ticking time bomb. And I have just used the analogy of somebody says you have a file on somebody already and then someone else mistakenly says that they committed a murder, perhaps a sexual murder of two of their children, that is going to have very serious consequences.
A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN: What possible direction is needed to say 'okay, there is a mistake, let's destroy every single copy that makes any reference to the sexualised murder of children and let's then read the file and make sure there is no implications to this that these mines are not left in the ground for other people to step on'? That is basically what Mr. Marrinan has been asking you. I am sorry, I have put it in very dramatic terms but it's perhaps understandable.
A. I suppose I would have still sought for a direction from a principal, because I suppose I would want to be clear of what we needed to do in respect of that, but I can't recall if I did anything thereafter.
CHAIRMAN: Okay.
571 Q. MR. MARRINAN: Did you make -- there is no record that 14:52 you sought a direction. You didn't email Mr. Lowry seeking a direction as to what to do with the documents, isn't that right?
A. I don't recall seeing anything and I have no memory if

I did or didn't contact him in relation to same.
572 Q. Well, you see, you have got a letter from Fiona Ward and it's very clear and it's very clear indicating that the Garda notification is incorrect, that it arises out of an incorrect referral being made in August of 2013 which contained the incorrect information, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

573 Q. That, the intake record, was also on the file, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

574 Q. So we had a number of pieces of information that were on the file that were potentially incorrect, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

575 Q. We had the intake records in relation to four of the McCabe children which you had directed be done, and they would have been done in relation to the intake record and the referral, isn't that right?
A. I still don't -- I still haven't got a recall if I directed that, but there would have been information in that that wouldn't have been correct.
576 Q. So potentially, not only was there the Garda notification but also the written referral had to be changed, the intake record in relation to the McCabe children had to be changed, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

577 Q. And have you any explanation as to why that wasn't done?
A. I don't. I can't recal1. I actually have no explanation for why that wasn't done.

578 Q. Now, I think the investigators also asked you, and we are asking all the witnesses, to whether or not you have any contacts in An Garda Síochána that might have influenced your decision-making in this process, have you any?
A. I would have told the investigators, I have a cousin who is a guard.
CHAIRMAN: A second cousin?
A. First cousin.

CHAIRMAN: Oh, sorry.
579 Q. MR. MARRINAN: And I am assuming that he didn't seek to influence any of the decisions that you made in this case in relation to the McCabe file?
A. It's in relation to a female cousin, and no, I wouldn't have discussed the case with her and nor would she be -- have any contact with me. I wouldn't have contact with her in general, so I wouldn't discuss anything with anyone.
580 Q. And Ms. Argue, just finally in relation to your evidence and your dealings with the Tribunal, you will appreciate that over 30 pages of interview, and a lengthy interview with our Tribunal investigators, you appear to have had virtually no independent that right?
A. That's right. I would have said that the information I had would have been from reviewing the file for the
process.
581 Q. And even today now, in terms of your evidence, it appears that you say that you have absolutely no independent evidence or recollection, should I say, of these events, isn't that so?
A. That is so. I can't remember anything independent from the review of the file. And $I$ have read my statement numerous times, but at no time do $I$ feel that that has triggered or prompted me in any way, but I just don't -- I can't recall information apart from what I 14:57 have read on the file.

582 Q. Can you offer us any explanation as to why you have no recollection of these events?
A. No, I can't. I just don't remember in relation to this. At that time it would have been a busy department, $I$ have subsequently moved as well, I am in a different -- in a different area with a different team and I can't reca11. I just can't remember. I have tried to remember by the reading of the file and also with the reading of my statement but I just can't 14:57 recall the information.

583 Q. We11, in any event, at the end of May the beginning of June, you left and took up your new role, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

584 Q. Okay. Thank you very much.
A. Thank you.

[^1]
## FOLLOWS:

585 Q.
MR. MCDOWELL: Ms. Argue, Michae1 McDowe11 is my name and I am one of the barristers for Sergeant McCabe. You made a statement in this matter on 21st March 2017 and -- or on 22nd it's dated, and it's at 1237 in the book. Have you got that?
A. Yes, I have got that.

586 Q. You say to the best of your memory "which was assisted on reading the file on the 2nd of March 2017 and on the 20th March 2017, this is an accurate recollection of my 14:58 contact with this file between the dates of February 2014 and May 2014." And you recite that:
"On 30th Apri7 Laura Connolly comp7eted and sent an email with an attachment of a Garda notification of Ms. D."

Was that email sent to you?
A. No, it was sent to Ms. Linda Dewhirst.

587 Q. I see. "This email is on the file and was sent on the 14:59 same date, the 30th April 2014, to Ms. Dewhirst, social work administrator. As this file was on the waiting 7ist the procedure at that time in operation in the department was that all notifications to An Garda Síochána would be signed off under the acting social work team leader or the social work team leader due to being unassigned to a social worker. This was the case as my name is printed in typed form on the bottom of the notification and Mr. Séamus Deeney, principal
social worker, signed same off."

Did you intend by that to convey that you had nothing to do with the Garda notification?
A. No. It was in reference to looking at the reviewing of 15:00 the file, which I would have seen an email which was sent to Ms. Dewhirst on it that I wasn't copied on.
588 Q. Sorry, you knew, when you made this statement in March of this year, Ms. Argue, you knew full well that you yourself had been consulted in relation to this file by 15:00 Laura Connolly on that day. Isn't that right?
A. When I reviewed those files that --

589 Q. Sorry, did you know that you had been consulted by Ms. Connolly on that day, yes or no?
A. I don't remember in relation to that. I was asked to complete a statement from reading the file.

590 Q. Yes.
A. That is the information that was on the file at that time when I reviewed it.
591 Q. And there was a memo, was there not, of an interaction between yourself and Laura Connolly where she was seeking directions and recording that you gave her directions?
A. I don't remember at that time of seeing that or making reference to it.

592 Q. Was that not on the file when you looked at it?
A. I can't recall whether that was at that time or maybe I missed it on the file when I was --

593 Q. Let's take those two in two steps. It either was on
the file or it wasn't?
A. I can't recall was it on the file at that time.

594 Q. We11, you are not suggesting that somebody removed it, gave you the file to look at and then put it back on again? You are not suggesting that?
A. No, I am not suggesting that.

595 Q. So, in all probability it was on the file, isn't that right?
A. It possibly was on the file and I may have missed it on the file.

596 Q. In all probability it was on the file, because nobody would take it off the file to show it to you, to show the file to you, isn't that right, unless it was a malicious person?
A. I didn't suggest that anyone had took it off the file. 15:01 I don't remember, $I$ don't have a recall of seeing it at that time on the file when $I$ was preparing this statement.

597 Q. We11, do you think Ms. Connolly may have put it on to the file after you studied it, is that it?
A. No, I am not making any suggestion of that.

598 Q. Well then, can we take it -- I mean, the Tribunal has to work on what is probable, Ms. Argue. Can we take it from your evidence that that was probably there when you reviewed this file?
A. Yes, I would accept that.

599 Q. And that you must have known that day that you had interacted with Ms. Connolly in relation to how the file was dealt with on that day?
A. In relation to --

600 Q. How the file was dealt with on that day, you must have known that you had an interaction with Ms. Connolly when you finished reading the file on those two days?
A. I read the file in relation to references to me throughout the file, because $I$ had to collate it in relation to me, I can't recall if I seen that on the file. The probability is that it was on the file, I am not suggesting it was removed from it, but I can't 100 percent recall from it. I took it down from what I seen at that time.
601 Q. Well you see, you have told the Tribunal or you have claimed in your evidence that you have a very defective memory in relation to all of these events, you can't remember anything of significance, isn't that right?
A. I can't recall and from reading the file helped me to have the knowledge in relation to completing this.
602 Q. And you were reading this file to see what, what -- and
we will use the phrase, what contact you had with the file during that period of February to May of 2014, that was your purpose in reading the file, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

603 Q. And are you saying you overlooked a two-page memorandum
which was addressed to you on the file?
A. I don't recall seeing it. I must have missed it when I was reviewing the file.
604 Q. We11, I have --
A. Otherwise I would have referenced it in my statement.

605 Q. I have to suggest to you that that is not the case, and I have to suggest to you that the real explanation of the first paragraph in the statement you made on the 22nd of March was that you wanted to avoid all personal involvement in this as far as you could and to produce 15:04 a misleading account to whoever read your statement?
A. No, I don't accept that. I wasn't trying to mislead anyone in relation to my statement.
606 Q. So in relation to this issue, and there are many others, Ms. Argue, you are saying now that you read that file through in all probability but that you are asking the Tribunal to say that you missed the on7y reference to yourself on the 30th April?
A. I can't recall seeing that on the occasion, otherwise I would have completed it as part of my statement.
607 Q. You now accept that you did have an interaction with Ms. Connolly on that day, isn't that right?
A. I accept from the information that she has on the file in reference to it, but $I$ can't recall having a conversation or a discussion in relation to it.
608 Q. Sorry, either her note is a fabrication or you had dealings with her in relation to this file on the day?
A. I can't recall having a discussion with her on that day in relation to the case.
609 Q. But do you -- I asked you, do you now accept that you must have had dealings with her on that day? She didn't invent a document to get you into trouble, did she?
A. No, I am not suggesting that. what I am saying is, I
don't recall having a conversation. I have seen it, it was an article that was given to me through the investigation, $I$ have read it, I accepted that document. But I just can't recall on that day did I have a discussion with her or conversation in relation to the case.

610 Q. You can stick to your wel1 worked out mantra that you don't recall things, but I am asking you --
CHAIRMAN: Mr. MCDowe11, honestly, seriously, I am afraid I am the one who makes the judgements, not you. 15:05 MR. MCDOWELL: Very well.
CHAIRMAN: Mantra is nice, it conjures up images of nice people in saffron robes.
MR. MCDOWELL: We11, Judge, it has been said so many times.

611 Q. Anyway, you can repeat as much as you like here that you can't recall things, but I am asking you do you now accept that you must have had dealings with Ms. Connolly on that day? Now sitting where you are under oath, do you accept that you must have had dealings with her?
A. I do accept it, but I can't recall the exact -- if there was conversation or discussion, I can't recall it. I do accept that this is what she has given in evidence, and this is an article which was generated by 15:06 her in relation to it. But I cannot recall any conversation in relation to or seeing this.
612 Q. Okay. Now, do you accept as a matter of probability that the Post-It that has been referred to in your own
evidence and Ms. Connolly's, was a direction by you to her to do something with the file?
A. No, I do accept that Post-It was in my handwriting, signed off by myself, it was a direction in relation to it, and it was for a duty to follow up.

613 Q. Yes. And can you just assist the Tribunal as to how you could have come to write that Post-It?
A. In terms of the Post-It, we would have been reviewing cases from the measuring of the pressure and a part of that would have been following through on the direction 15:07 that would have been placed already on the intake record. So I would have completed a Post-it with that same direction for it to be completed.
CHAIRMAN: Mr. MCDowell, is there a particular significance you are placing on the Post-It that you want to put to the witness? Because I am just a wee bit unclear. No, no, don't worry about me, I mean if you just want to ask her.
614 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: I am suggesting to you, Ms. Argue, that you directed Laura Connolly, via that Post-It, to carry 15:07 out a Garda notification in or about the 30th April 2014.

CHAIRMAN: In other words, what Mr. McDowell is saying is the Post-It proves it, that you were the directing mind on that.
A. I am clear that that was a direction for a duty to Garda notify. I am very clear that that was my writing and that was a direction, and that would have been followed from the intake record where it would have
been a prior direction and I was seeking for it to be completed and that's what the Post-It would have been making reference to.
615 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: You were here when Ms. Connolly gave evidence.
A. No, I wasn't.

616 Q. You weren't. We11, are you aware that she questioned whether that Post-It might not have referred to the file at all?
A. No, I wasn't aware of that.

617 Q. Do you doubt that it was related to the file?
A. I can't say for 100 percent that it was relating to that file or not but what I do accept, it was duty to Garda notify the allegations and file in the cabinet. That has a clear correlation with on the intake record for "duty to notify". There doesn't have a name, there isn't a date, but I can't say one way or the other whether it was for that file or another file, but I accept that it was on that file.
618 Q. I see. Now, at page --
CHAIRMAN: Yeah, just a matter of practice and common sense, I mean, I use these things all the time and the small ones, I actually haven't coming across them falling off but the big ones $I$ have never come across them falling off. So, I am not sure that this notion - 15:09 and it's not you that floated it, Ms. Argue - that these large Post-Its somehow migrate or flap around like butterflies and flies in files, it just doesn't work for me. So, I think if it's there it's there,
unless there is another explanation to offer.
A. True. And I suppose I can't say either way but it was on that file, it was the same direction as what would have been on the intake record, so $I$ do accept it was there and it's the same correlation. The only thing I 15:10 would say, there wasn't a name or date on it, but I am not saying it fluttered --
CHAIRMAN: Sure.
A. -- in any way.

CHAIRMAN: I would never put a date on a Post-it, because otherwise there would be no point in having them. They are to mark out things for yourself, you know.
A. Yes.

619 Q. MR. McDOWELL: Ms. Argue, I would ask you to go to page 15:10 1239 and look at that memo that you say you may have overlooked when you were looking at the file. You would have, $I$ take it, been familiar with Laura Connolly's handwriting.
A. Yes.

620 Q. Was there any other Eileen to whom it might have been written?
A. No, I believe I was the only Eileen in the Social Work Department at that time.
621 Q. Yes. So either you just simply passed it by in reading 15:11 the file or you didn't realise its significance and didn't read it, is that the point?
A. No. I have said, $I$ don't recall seeing it at that time.

622 Q. We11, it's dated 30/4/14 and it's headed "McCabe children", isn't that right?
A. Yes. If you can pull it down, yes. That is the case.

623 Q. And she says:
"Eileen
Have checked system, and we have no record of file on Maurice McCabe's two children at the time. Based on the $D$ file $I$ suspect these two children are [b7ank] and [blank]. I deduce these two girls are now aged 18-p7us years based on notes on Ms. D file. Maurice has two other children who weren't born at the time of alleged incident, [b7ank] and [b7ank].
Laura Connol7y."

And the next page is:
"Deduce that these two children are under 18 years now. How do you want to proceed regarding the McCabe chi7dren?"

Do you accept that she must have had a conversation along those lines with you that day?
A. We11, what $I$ can say is $I$ don't recall having a conversation with her on this day in relation to what she has put out there. I just don't have a recall of it.

624 Q. And she notes underneath that:
"Case direction from Eileen: Complete intake records x 4 on children."

She says she had dealings with you on that day, have you any reason to doubt the correctness of her testimony?
A. It's not that I am doubting her; it's I can't recall myself in relation to having a conversation or a discussion in relation to this case on that date. I just don't have a recall of it.
625 Q. I don't want to get stuck into your powers of recall again with you. I am accepting -- do you accept that you must have had that conversation with her that day, now, looking at that file?
A. Looking in relation to what her ending is, is case direction from Eileen, she is referencing that I gave her direction. I do not have the recall that I had a conversation about direction. I accept that what she has put on it is "case direction from Eileen", I accept she has that on it. But I don't have recall of having that same discussion in relation to the case.
626 Q. Are you some way unwilling to accept that although you have a poor memory, you may have done things on the occasion that other people say you did?
A. As I said, I accept that she has referred to case
direction from me. I just can't recall having a discussion with her on that day but I accept that she has said "case direction from Eileen".
627 Q. We11, I am going to put it to you that on the
assumption that did you have such a conversation, your direction to her was very irresponsible and wildly wrong in the circumstances. What do you say to that?
A. In relation to completing of intake records, as $I$ have already stated, the policy at the time in
Cavan-Monaghan Social work Department was children who were under 18 had an intake record completed in relation to them, and that was the policy and procedures of that time.
628 Q. You heard the evidence of Ms. Creamer.
A. Yes.

629 Q. And you heard her say that she hadn't come across something like this happening anywhere else. Are you saying this was standard practice in Cavan?
A. This was the practice in which I was orientated into in 2006 when I started in the Cavan-Monaghan Social work Department. That, the practice at that time was: If there was an allegation against someone who was an adult and they had children and the children were under 18 intake records were opened. And that was the practice in which I would have been in that department at that time.
630 Q. That was not put by any counsel to Ms. Creamer, that that was a standard practice in Cavan at that time?
A. That was the local practice in that department at that 15:15 time.

631 Q. She expressed the view here to the Chairman that it was very unusual.
CHAIRMAN: Well, there is a divergence in the evidence,
in fact, Mr. McDowe11. Because, as I understood it from earlier on, the practice in Cavan - and it's only with Ms. Creamer that $I$ am realising it's totally wrong - was once there is an allegation and the person has children you open an intake record, you automatically set in train these events, you automatically write to the person. Now I have been told something different today, which is: First of all, you have got to verify, which I was wondering about, which I had been told days ago wasn't necessary if someone had made a Garda statement. I was also told that you bring the person in and verify them, that all these things go back, but I mean --

632 Q. MR. McDOWELL: If I continue with Ms. Argue, I accept the point, Chairman, but could I put it to you that for all you knew Lorraine McCabe and her four children were now living in England and had split up with Maurice McCabe, for all you knew at the time?
A. I suppose I refer back to the practice at the time in that department was as I outlined and that was the practice which was adhered to in this case.

633 Q. We11, why was she seeking a direction if that was the practice? If that was the practice why would she come to you and look for a direction on the matter?
A. I don't have an explanation of that. What I can say is, again, that the practice at that time in that department was as I outlined. I can't give an explanation of why she sought direction in relation to this case, but that would have been the practice across
the two counties.
634 Q. She says that she sent you that note and the two files, left them for you to look at. Do you think that could have happened?
A. I can't recall whether or not I looked at the files in relation to it because I don't recall seeing that note at that time, but I do accept that I gave that case direction to Ms. Connolly in relation to it as outlined.

Well, could I ask you this: was it the practice, the normal practice, for somebody to give a direction of the kind you appear to have given here, without looking at the file?
A. In relation to the practice, once a referral or a concern came in to our department, intake records were opened thereafter and it could have been at the same time or it could have been afterwards in relation to children under the age of 18 , and that was the -- and that was the practice at the time within that department.
636 Q. I didn't ask you that. I asked you, would it be norma1 practice for somebody to give a direction of the kind you appear to have given without looking at the file?
A. Given that I have explained that that was the practice of the time, if someone is looking for the direction I would be going back to the practice that was in place at that time.

637 Q. We11, would you answer the question now? would it have been normal practice for you to give such a direction
without even looking at the file?
A. I can't say that I looked at the file or didn't look at the file. I would adhere to the practice in the department at that time and the practice in the department at that time was to open intake records on children under the age of 18 . And that's what Ms. Connolly has referred to; that case direction was to open intake records. I would adhere to the practice at the time in the department.

638 Q. And what about children -- sorry, adults over the age of 18 ?
A. In the case in relation to these children two of them were over 18, I would not believe that I would give a direction for two children over the age of 18 for intake records to be opened on them.

639 Q. But Ms. Connolly records that you gave precisely that direction on the day?
A. I suppose from my own normal practice at that time, I wouldn't have opened intake records on children over 18 in similar circumstances.

640 Q. We11, would you read what she records you as directing.
A. The screen has now gone blank, so --

641 Q. It's page 1239 and page 1240.
A. I see she has "Comp7ete intake records on four of the chi7dren".

642 Q. And she says that was your direction?
A. But again, I would refer back to the practice at the time was children under 18. I wouldn't have opened intake records -- my belief of myself wouldn't be that

I would open intake records on children who are over 18.

643 Q. She told you in that memo that two of them were adults. It's written there in plain, big writing.
A. I accept it has been written there in relation to four children, but I still go back to the practice at the time, was children under 18 . So I wouldn't see how I would diverge to have intake records open on two older children.

644 Q. So are we to take it then that Ms. Connolly misunderstood you on the day?
A. I can't say whether she misunderstood me or not. what I can say is, I will go back to the practice of the time in the department, and I do not have a belief in myself that I would have directed that two children over 18 in a similar case or in this case would have had intake records open on them.
645 Q. But nobody has suggested to Ms. Connolly that she was fabricating this or misunderstanding you. She was clear in her evidence that this was the direction you gave her and that she noted it at the time. So are you now saying that this record that Ms. Connolly has created is not to be relied on?
A. I am not saying that. I am going back to my own point, that I don't -- I didn't have a recall of having a conversation or discussion about this case. I accept that the case direction is what she has put down that I have given her. However, at that same point, I do not foresee that I would have directed that two children

646 Q.

over 18 would have had an intake record open on them.
646 Q. So just to be clear about where we are now, the Chairman, as far as you are concerned, is to doubt the truthfulness of the record created by Ms. -- of Ms. Connolly of your conversation?
A. As I don't recall the conversation $I$ had or the discussion I had in relation to the matter, I am going from what I believe in relation to myself. I don't believe that I would direct for two people over 18 to have an intake record open on them.

647 Q. I see. Well now, we know that shortly after these events it became apparent that the Garda referral form was seriously untrue, isn't that right?
A. Yes. We were aware that the information was provided to us by Ms. Brophy in relation to the allegations were --

648 Q. At that point, at that point, did it occur to you to have a conversation with Laura Connolly and ask her how this had happened?
A. I don't recall if I had, if I thought of that or had a $15: 23$ conversation. Immediately when I received it I went and I notified it on to my area manager in relation to the concern which had occurred.
649 Q. Because Ms. Connolly said that nobody ever, ever questioned her about what she had done on 30th of April until this Tribunal was established.
A. I don't recall if I had a conversation with her or not in relation to it.

650 Q. But you certainly knew on the 14th May that a fortnight
earlier, Laura Connolly had drafted the incorrect Garda referral notification form, isn't that right?
A. Well, I knew when I received the information that, first of all, she had completed it and received information, but again, I can't recall if I had a conversation with her thereafter.
651 Q. You must have -- I know, you have a problem with your memory, but would you just come with me this far: That you must have known on the 14th of May that it was Ms. Connolly who generated the Garda notification form with the allegation of digital penetration in it, you must have known that? Is that not so?
A. Looking back at this moment in time, I would take it that it was Laura Connolly that I would have been aware of who had generated it.
652 Q. And at the time, surely -- is there any reason why, at the time, you wouldn't have said 'who exactly filled out this form and at whose direction was it done?'
CHAIRMAN: Well, it seemed to be -- I mean, Laura Connolly, not to be blamed for filling out the form, seeing as that was the information that came in, you know.
653 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: I appreciate that, but I am asking this witness: Two weeks later you know that an almighty mess has been reality created for Sergeant McCabe, in that he has been reported to his own superiors as a man who digitally penetrated the anus and vagina of a young girl, you knew that that was false at the time, and I am just asking you, are you asking this Tribunal to
believe that it never occurred to you to go to Laura Connolly and to discuss the circumstances in which she created this Garda notification form?
A. I don't recall having a conversation with her. on receipt of the information I followed through to notify 15:26 to my area manager because I felt that that was the most appropriate steps taken at that time given the serious nature of it. But I can't recall in the interim period before that or after that did $I$ have a conversation with her, because initially when the information came in the line that I would have took was to notify the area manager and the principals.
654 Q. Yes. So, I mean, I take it she worked in the same corridor as you?
A. Yes, we were based in the same office.

655 Q. And you are saying you never mentioned -- you have no recollection of ever mentioning this to her?
A. I can't recall if I had a conversation with her or not in relation to this.
656 Q. Now, when you realised from the email that came in to you that something had gone badly wrong, you contacted your area manager, is that right?
A. That's correct.

657 Q. And did you do it solely by email or did you have a conversation with them?
A. From a review of the file, it appeared to be by email correspondence.

658 Q. Because if you look at page 1259, it says: "Dear Gerry, I hope this finds you well." That is the first
remark on it.
A. Yes.

659 Q. Now, that's not the kind of email you'd send to somebody who you were going to bump into in the corridor, is it?
A. I would generally put in all my emails "I hope this finds you we77".

660 Q. I see. And you were sending him on Pamela Armitage's email to you, isn't that right?
A. That is correct.

661 Q. And we know that Pamela Armitage's email had been sent to you at 11:05 on the morning of the 14th May and that you relayed this on to your area manager, to Louise Carolan, to Séamus Deeney and also to Pamela Armitage on a few minutes later at $11: 13$, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

662 Q. Now, can I ask you, do you think it is probable or improbable in that time that you had an opportunity to check the files?
A. My office would have been in close proximity to the duty room, it would have been one office in between the two of them, $I$ could have checked the file. I can't say 100 percent because $I$ don't recall whether I did or not. But I would have been in close proximity to be able to check it if I required to.
CHAIRMAN: No, I think Mr. McDowell is asking you about the timeframe. It's eight minutes.
A. I could have --

CHAIRMAN: And I know there are some people who sit on
their email account all day long and you are probably not one of those. So, let's say the email comes in, you notice it and you are doing something, you've got to open it, so it's probably much less than eight minutes and then you send this on to Gerry Lowry straight away, I think that is the point that Mr. McDowell is making.
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.
A. I can't be certain that on that day I wasn't sitting in front of my computer and I just received the email and I responded there and then and looked at the file.
CHAIRMAN: But you would have had to go out of the room to get the file.
A. I would have went out of the room. We were in close proximity, so I am here [INDICATING] and the duty room 15:30 is probably at the Irish flag. It's very close in proximity to my room.
663 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: But you did -- in the message from Pamela Armitage to you, the redacted and blacked out space conceals the two initials of Ms. D's actual name, 15:30 isn't that right?
A. Yes, I believe so.

664 Q. And I know them, you know them, we needn't deal with them now. But you immediately understood that that was a matter involving sergeant McCabe, is that right?
A. That's correct. Because I would have made reference to his name in the email to Gerry Lowry.
665 Q. Mm-hmm?
A. Further up on the email I would have made reference to
his initials.
666 Q. Did you -- but I mean, once you saw her initials, you knew that this involved Sergeant McCabe, is that right?
A. In relation to her, yes. I am not sure if $I$ had a conversation with Ms. Pamela Armitage in between that 15:31 or not, but I would have referenced Mr. McCabe's name --

667 Q. Yes.
A. -- in his initials.

668 Q. And you knew at the time that if you used the words -or the letters "MMCC" to your area boss he would know immediately what this was all about, isn't that right?
A. I believed he would have, yes.

669 Q. So had you ever discussed the case with him?
A. I am not aware if I did or not. I would discuss my cases with my principal social worker, who would be supervised by Mr. Lowry.
670 Q. But you assumed -- you knew that MMCC would immediately trigger in his mind the thought of Maurice McCabe, is that right?
A. I can't say for 100 percent but I presume that when I put it in initials that $I$ would have been of the belief that he would have.

671 Q. And therefore, I have to suggest to you that you were aware that he had background knowledge of this file at the time?
A. I can't say for definite that he did or didn't know, but I would have been -- my line management, would have been my principal social worker who would have been
supervised by him. I know they would have had discussions of cases which were on the waiting list, so I would have -- I don't know whether it was a presumption or a belief that he knew the name.
672 Q. Are you saying that you would have -- either you believed that he knew about the background of this file or that you were assuming that Louise Carolan would have informed him of the background of this case at the time?
A. I suppose $I$ can't be certain in relation to if he did or didn't. I can't say if I made an assumption that he would know or not, or a belief that he would know who the initials were.
673 Q. But you had a working assumption that he was conversant with the case and he knew which one it was?
A. Yeah, I would have believed that he did.

674 Q. And I have got to suggest to you that you would have only made that working assumption if either Louise Carolan or he had somehow intimated to you that they knew about the background to this particular matter.
A. I can't say for definite but as my principal social worker would have been involved in the Measuring the Pressure and of the cases allocated, I would have been of the view that they would have known the cases that were on the waiting list.

675 Q. We11, you heard Mr. Lowry saying that --
A. I wasn't here for Mr. Lowry.

676 Q. Well, sorry, are you aware that Mr. Lowry gave a -claims to have given a direction to somebody, and he
wasn't 100 percent sure who it was, that this case was to be dealt with in the normal way in the context of knowing that it concerned Maurice McCabe?
A. I wasn't aware of what he had said.

677 Q. Did anybody, did Louise Carolan ever say to you that there was a direction from the top that this case was to be dealt with in the normal way?
A. I don't recall having a conversation in relation to this case or the management of this case.
678 Q. Why do you think that this case was dealt with on the 30th April of 2014?
A. I don't recall why on that exact date it was dealt with, but at the time the practice would have been reviewing the waiting lists of Measuring the Pressure of cases that were unallocated in the department. I don't know what the system was in place in order of deciding what case would be the cases that would be taken from the unallocated waiting list and for tasks to be done. I can only be of the view that it was the reviewing of the intake records and outstanding tasks that were assigned to be completed. But I can't say with any degree of certainty why on that day rather than any other day.
679 Q. On the assumption that the post-It was in fact a direction from you to prepare a Garda notification form, would you accept that it is more than likely that you were the moving party on the 30th April in getting that file progressed to the next stage?
A. I would say more than likely what would have happened
in terms of the practice at the time was, we were reviewing cases on the waiting -- the waiting lists through the Measuring the Pressure, and it would have been through the intake records of outstanding tasks. And that file would have been one of the files that had 15:36 an outstanding task to be completed. And that's what led to the direction.
680 Q. And the direction was that the direction from you, is that right?
A. The direction from me was in response of what the outstanding task was to be completed.
681 Q. So now we are agreed on one thing: That you probably read the file, prepared the Post-It and gave it to somebody to complete the Garda notification?
A. I suppose I am not saying I read the file. What I am saying, I am making reference to intake record of the outstanding tasks and I would have checked the Garda notice section, which is the section after the intake records. And the post-It very clearly refers to a direction for a duty to Garda notify and that would be the same direction which was outstanding in the intake record.
682 Q. Now, when you wrote to Mr. Lowry "This notification needs to be amended as soon as possible and the relevant superintendent needs to be updated with regard 15:37 to same," that, I take it you can recall sending that email, can you?
A. Yes, that is from my email account so I would accept I sent that.
Q. Can you recall sending it?
A. I can't recall sending it, but I do accept that it's my email account and it is -- it's signed off by me.
684 Q. This was a very, very serious matter. And within two weeks its seriousness was very apparent to you and are you seriously offering as evidence in this Tribunal that you can't now recall the sending of that email?
A. I can't recall that $I$ sent it but I accept it, that it's my style in email and it's signed off by me and it's from my email account, I have no difficulty accepting it.
685 Q. And you have no memory of sending it, of alarm bells ringing: this is serious, you know, we have to contact the Gardaí, we have to amend all the files to deal with this issue? You are telling the Tribunal that even though the matter came to crisis point within the next two weeks, you have no recollection of sending that email?
A. I don't recall sending it, but $I$ very much am very clear that I accept that I sent the email. It's the way I would set up an email. I have signed it off, and I fully accept that that is from my email account and I would have sent it.
686 Q. Okay. So we move to the next point, that you receive a letter from Laura Brophy, which is at page 1260. Now, 15:39 can you help the Tribunal, do you recall receiving that letter?
A. I don't recall seeing that letter prior to the preparation of the -- for this process.

687
Q. I see.
A. But it shows that it was stamped and received by our department. I can't see the date that it was received, but it's stamped with the stamp that would have been of the department at the time.
Q. Do you think you would have noticed that on the file when you examined it?
A. In preparation for the Tribunal?

689
Q. Yes.
A. If it was on the file, I definitely would say I would have seen it.

690 Q. Because the second bullet-point in your helpful statement of the 22 nd of March 2017 says:
"On 14th May 2014 a letter was received from Ms. Laura Brophy, Rian Service, with regard to the inaccurate information on the notification which she sent to the Social work Department on the 9th August 2013."
why didn't you say, 'it was sent to me'?
A. I don't know why I didn't say that.

691 Q. Everything is done in an impersonal way, events take place, but the fact that these emails are being sent by you, to you, letters sent to you, you just simply don't refer to that in your text, isn't that right?
A. Well, the statement is prepared by me, and maybe I just didn't put my name to it, but it is my statement that was prepared for the process.
692 Q. Hold on a second. Are you saying that this, the
statement of the 22nd of March, was composed by somebody else for you?
A. No, I am saying it was composed by me, but I just don't make the reference that $I$ received that letter, but it's -- very clearly, it was sent to me, but $I$ just didn't make that reference in that statement, but I prepared that statement.
693 Q. We11, you do say that, on the same date, an email was received from Ms. Armitage. And then the next bullet-point you say:
"After receiving same, I forwarded the thread of the email and notified Mr. Gerry Lowry."

Is that right? So you do accept some involvement in the matter?
A. I do, but I actually can't see my statement at this moment. I just see the letter from Laura Brophy.
694 Q. I see. And the next bullet-point says -- this is 1237. The next bullet-point says:
"A Garda notification was sent with regard to the amended information on that date, the 14th May 2014, to Ms. Dewhirst, for same to be provided to Mr. Séamus Deeney for approva7."
A. Yes, I see that.

695 Q. Did it ever occur to you to assist the Tribunal by saying, I sat down and I wrote that Garda notification and I am responsible for the -- for its contents?
A. I suppose when completing that statement I can see from the statement that I didn't make reference to myself, but it was sent from my account and I would take it that I did send it.
696 Q. Do you recall sending it?
A. I don't recall sending it, but it is from my email account, so I would take it that I did prepare it and send it.
CHAIRMAN: So you sent the amended notification?
A. The amended notification.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Obviously that is a good idea, but you left out the thing about the threat to the father in the sense of leaving it out because it says that in the letter from Laura Brophy, but that is wrong, but you did include that in the notification to the guards?
A. I included it from the perspective that that was -- if I was part of the original notification that was sent, so I included all --

CHAIRMAN: No, but, I mean, she had corrected that.
A. okay.

CHAIRMAN: It says "Description of Abuse", the sentence begins with "Ms." and then there is a blank. That would have said, actually, Ms. Y, as we are calling her. And then "informed me", that goes on to say "digital penetration with vagina, anus, and ends with... she said anything -- would threaten her father if she said anything." That is what that means, that bit.
A. okay.

697 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: Could I ask you, Ms. Argue, do you think it was a very serious matter that an allegation of a rape offence was sent to the Garda superiors of Sergeant McCabe?
A. I think it was a very serious child protection concern that was received, and thereafter, when we received, that it wasn't accurate information. I notified it up on the basis of how serious it was. And in terms of notifying it up, it would have been to my area manager, given how serious it was.
698 Q. Well, I mean, do you believe it was a very serious matter that Sergeant McCabe's superiors had been notified that it was being alleged that he had committed a rape offence?
A. Yes, it was a very serious matter.

699 Q. And is there any reason why, because you were involved in the events which led to that notification, why it doesn't stick in your mind?
A. I can't say if it's the passage or the absence of time, but I don't recall it, and, as I said from the outset, my information is based on reviewing of the file.
700 Q. Because as I said earlier to you, and again I have to repeat it, within a fortnight a crisis situation had emerged and you were one of the central figures in it, isn't that so?
CHAIRMAN: Well, I mean, was it a crisis?
MR. McDOWELL: Well, it was, I presume it was a crisis that they decided -- well, maybe it wasn't a crisis -CHAIRMAN: It didn't seem to be treated like a crisis.

MR. MCDOWELL: No, that is the point.
CHAIRMAN: I mean, a crisis is kind of people running around and shrieking. There didn't seem to be an awful lot of this happening.
MR. MCDOWELL: Indeed, Judge.
701 Q. I am describing it as a crisis that your agency realised it had accused a man of rape in the wrong to his own superiors in An Garda Síochána and set in train a series of events which could have been extremely damaging to him. You don't think that is a crisis, do you not?
A. I didn't say I didn't think it was a crisis. I thought it was a very serious incident when it had happened and received information that was sent out, and then when we received that the information was inaccurate, I did attempt to address it through my area manager and then forward a Guard notification. I am not minimising the level of seriousness that that brought to it.
702 Q. I am asking you why none of this sticks in your mind? I presume it was a most abnormal and unusual event?
A. I can't give a recollection why -- I can't give an account why it doesn't stick in my mind in relation to 2014, but I can't recall it, and through the process of the Tribunal $I$ have read the file in relation in preparation, but $I$ can't give an explanation why this information did not stick in my mind from that time. But I have read my statement on a number of occasions in an attempt to try and remember, but I just haven't been able to remember the information, and that's why,
in preparation for it, I have read the file, but I just can't give an explanation for that.
703 Q. I see. And could it be that somebody somewhere reminded you on the 30th April that nothing had happened with this file for, at that stage, nine months?
A. I would go back to, at that time we would have been, myself and my principal social worker would have been reviewing cases from Measuring the Pressure that were unallocated. I don't believe anyone said to me that I 15:47 want you to deal with this file. I believe in the context of measuring the Pressure and reviewing cases that were waiting allocation, would have been the process in which...
704 Q. If you can't recall the events at all, how is it that you can discount the idea that somebody might have said, the -- 'Nothing has happened on the McCabe file for nine months, what is happening there, Eileen?'
A. I can't say one way or the other, but I don't have a recall of someone coming with any regard to a specific file.

705 Q. But you have no recall of anything?
A. My recall is not I don't have a recall. I am basing everything on the information that was on the file.
706 Q. Yes. So therefore, it's quite possible that somebody said, 'What has happened to the McCabe file? we have had it since August of last year and nobody in this department has done a tap of work on it or progressed it.
A. I suppose as I don't recall it, I can't say if I did or didn't have a conversation with someone who may have or may not have come to me, but what I can say is, during that time we would have been looking at cases and reviewing them.

707 Q. I am suggesting to you that it is not merely possible but quite probable that somebody had a conscience about the state of the -- about the inaction of the file. I am suggesting to you that it's quite possible that somebody actually did jog your elbow on -- on -- in April of 2013?
CHAIRMAN: But, I mean, to what effect, is there -- I mean, is there -- is there something here we are trying to uncover, I mean, apart from what we have uncovered already?
MR. MCDOWELL: The Tribunal is being asked to accept that this file lay dormant until a random event on 30th April when it just came up again in some way for review, and I am putting to the witness that it's quite possible that somebody said to you, 'what has happened to the McCabe file? Nothing appears to have happened for the last nine months'.

CHAIRMAN: Okay.
708 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: what do you say to that?
A. I suppose I go back, I don't have a recall of somebody approaching me querying about the McCabe file. During that time, we would have been reviewing cases through Measuring the Pressure that were unallocated cases, and that was one of the cases that would have been
unallocated.

709 Q.
Q. But we do know that your area manager regarded the file as one of significance, we do know that Maurice McCabe's name was all over the newspapers in April 2014, and I am asking you, is it not entirely possible that somebody said, 'By the way, what has happened with this significant file? It doesn't seem to have gone anywhere in the last nine months.'
A. I can't say whether it was possible or not because I don't recall having a conversation. But my recall is, is not there in relation to whether or not there was any such person who has come to me and I can't actually say one way or the other. What $I$ can say is, we review cases through Measuring the Pressure of unallocated.
710 Q. Ms. Argue, could I just ask you to look at page two hundred and --

CHAIRMAN: Just before we go back to that point. MR. MCDOWELL: This is my last point.
CHAIRMAN: I appreciate that, Mr. McDowe11. But just, we are talking about the 30th of April and then the duty social worker in Cavan reviews the Ms. D case, and what you are being asked about is, what inspired that? It's just a couple of random events. So 19th February, the Taoiseach, Enda Kenny, was furnished with Sergeant McCabe dossier by the leader of the opposition; 24th February 2014, the Government announced its decision to hold a review of the allegations made by Sergeant McCabe; 5th March, Paul Williams went to Ms. D's home; 8th March, met and interviewed Ms. D by Paul williams;
$\qquad$
$15: 50$


24th March, former Commissioner Martin Callinan resigns; 12th April, article by Paul williams entitled "Girls wants new probe into alleged sex assault by Garda" is in the Irish Independent; 15th April, another article by Paul williams; 29th April, Ms. D makes a complaint to GSOC that her original allegation in 2006 was never dealt with properly; in other words, that it was a really poor investigation. Now, GSoC said that it wasn't, there was absolutely nothing wrong with her [sic]. And lo and behold, the next day is when there is this inspiration to pull out the file. So that is basically the context in which Mr. McDowell is asking you.
MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. And I am adding to all of those circumstances the fact that your area manager, Mr. Lowry, regarded this as a file of significance, and all of you, at least you and Mr. Lowry and other -- and Ms. Carolan were apparently aware that Sergeant McCabe, the same man who was in the headlines, was the man who was the subject of this complaint. So I am asking you, in all of those circumstances, is it not entirely, not merely possible but likely that somebody in your organisation realised that nothing had happened with this file for nine months and started the process which leads to the generation of the false Garda report?
A. I can't say one way or the other whether or not a person said to me that they wanted to know what was happening on that file at that time and the length of time. What $I$ can say is, and again it's nearly
repetition of, Measuring the Pressure of the unallocated waiting list. I can't say that what system was put in place, that his file was one of the files that would have been reviewed, I can't say because I can't remember, but what I do say is that it was looking at unallocated cases, and whether it was done in any particular system I can't say for any degree of certainty. But his file was one of files that were pulled. I can't say that they were pulled on the 30th of April, they could have been pulled before that and just been in the filing cabinet in the duty room in -for duty tasks to be completed, because $\operatorname{I}$ can't give a time-line in relation to that. But equally, I can't say that someone, you know, inquired about what is happening that case and where it was at, I can't give any kind of degree of explanation or certainty on that.
CHAIRMAN: Well, you see, a lot of people, for instance, would read the Irish Independent. That is the point that Mr. McDowell is making to you. I am sure the Irish Independent would like if everybody read 15:55 the Irish Independent, but I am sure somebody in your office reads the Irish Independent, and, I mean, it's not so difficult to put two and two together because --
711 Q. MR. MCDOWELL: We do have evidence, Ms. Argue, that Pamela Armitage believed that that file was on your desk at the time, that she spoke to you about it. And I just wonder, you know, you are an intelligent woman and you knew that Sergeant McCabe's name was in every headline and being talked about on television
programmes and the like at the time, and I am just asking you, do you not think that instead of Measuring the Pressure, that a little bit of pressure came in -on you to query why this file hadn't budged in nine months?
A. I can't say whether there was any internal pressure to look at that particular file on that particular time-1ine.
712 Q. Fair enough. If we leave it at that. And can I then ask you simply to look at page 21 -- 208 in volume 1, please. We11, if we go to 207 to start with. That's a notification of suspected child sexual abuse to a health board, received in Monaghan on 2nd January 2007 by the childcare manager, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

713 Q. And it had been sent on the -- from the Gardaí on 6th December 2000, and it went -- left the -- sorry, on 18th December 2006 it had left the superintendent's office, apparently. And at page 208, there is a Health Service Executive form in relation to that notification, isn't that right?
A. Yes, there is a standard reporting form.

714 Q. Yes.
A. It makes reference to Ms. D.

715 Q. And at page 210, there is a note -- a contact sheet of a telephone conversation between yourself and Garda James Fraher of Cavan Garda Station in relation to it, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

716 Q. And the purpose was "To clarify the information on the Garda notification received from Garda James Fraher."
A. That's correct.

717 Q. And you say the outcome of the discussion was you 1eft a message "for Garda Fraher to contact the duty social worker re Garda notification," and that is your signature on it?
A. Yes, that is my signature.

718 Q. And you were the duty social worker?
A. On that day, yes.

719 Q. So you were involved in this, not merely at the conference in 2006 but you were involved in it before that. You were the person who first dealt with the Gardaí when they put this into the hands of the HSE, isn't that right?
A. I was responding to, more than likely, a task that was assigned on duty to follow up with Garda James Fraher, which would have been completed on the duty day.
720 Q. I see. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN: Are you happy?
MR. MCDOWELL: I am finished.

## END OF CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MCDOWELL

MR. DIGNAM: One or two questions -- I will take no more than one minute, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: We could sit tomorrow if you like!
MR. DIGNAM: I will do it in 30 seconds, Judge. I will be very, very brief, Chairman.

MS. ARGUE WAS CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. DIGNAM AS FOLLOWS:

721 Q. MR. DIGNAM: Ms. Argue, could I ask you to look at page 1222, which is your interview with the investigators. And at the very bottom of that page, it's page 16 of your statement, at the very bottom of that page you say that:
"The normal procedures in the Social work Department at 15:59 that time were that any referral of serious child protection concerns were notified to the Gardai through the formal notification process".

Is that your understanding of the procedures that were in place in 2013 and 2014?
A. Yes, that would have been the procedures.

722 Q. And that is in Cavan-Monaghan, is that right?
A. That would have been in Cavan-Monaghan, yes.

723 Q. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN: Would you give me that point again, please. The point you are making is, I beg your pardon, what? MR. DIGNAM: There appeared to be some evidence or some suggestion, Chairman, earlier on today from Ms. Creamer that Garda notifications weren't or shouldn't be sent out as a matter of course. In fact, the evidence that has been given by Ms. Argue, and indeed by Ms. McLoughlin yesterday and I think by Ms. Murphy, although I haven't found the section in the transcript,
was that it was almost an automatic step that Garda notifications --

CHAIRMAN: No, I agree, there is contradictory evidence on the matter and there are apparently two sides and apparently regional variations and things. That seems to be the case. Thanks.

MR. MARRINAN: Nothing arises. Thank you very much, Ms. Argue.

THE WITNESS THEN WITHDREW

MR. MARRINAN: That concludes the evidence for today, sir. We are very much on schedule. We have occupied -- our witness-1ist to date is spot on and we finish the first two weeks on schedule. I understand it's 12:00 on Monday?
CHAIRMAN: Yes, I am afraid it is, and it may be not before 12:00 on Monday, so I think we will try and do four hours straight through, if possible.

THE HEARING WAS THEN ADJOURNED TO MONDAY, 17TH OF JULY 2017, NOT BEFORE 12PM.
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