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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FQLLONG, ON YEDNESDAY, 13TH JUNE 2018:

MR. FANN NG Just before Mr. Mallon is recalled to resume his evidence, from yesterday evening, there was one observation I wanted to make if now was a convenient time to make it. And it arose out of a questioning or line of questioning engaged in by Mr. McDowell with Mr. Mallon yesterday and then an intervention on your part, Chairman, and it's to be seen in the transcript from yesterday, day 90 at page 206, if that perhaps could be put up on the screen. And your intervention, Chairman, was in the middle of the page:
"Gentlemen, gentlemen, there is a question here which I may or may not be reporting on which is how responsible was it to publish the article because I take it, Mr. MEDowell, that that is your particular line here? Mr. MEDowelI: Yes."

Now just arising out of that, two observations: I have looked closely at the terms of reference overnight, Chairman, and it seems to me that the question of how responsible it was to publish any particular article is 10:08 not an issue that falls within any of the terms of reference, and if there is to be a disagreement about that we can put in perhaps a written submission or deal with it in a more elongated way, but I would simply
offer the proposition that it's not captured by any of the terms of reference. And the consequence that I say follows from that is that it's an illegitimate line of questioning for Mr. McDowell to pursue with that witness or with any future witness, whether or not a piece of journalism was responsible. And similarly, Chairman, it's not a matter which the Oireachtas has asked you to report upon. And I'm putting down that marker at this stage for fear that it's an issue that could arise again with future witnesses.
CHAN RMN Mr. MCDowe11, would you like to say anything?
MR MEDOWELL: Wel1, I was only trying to be agreeable. But my line of questioning was as to the degree of knowledge of the witness as to what was on the tapes and the importance he attached to it. That was the main thrust of my questioning. And I fully accept that it's not a term of reference of this Tribunal to work out whether people were responsible or not responsible. CHA RMAN We11, I actually wonder, Mr. McDowel1. I actually wonder. Because you have raised that point before when Mr. Williams was in the witness-box on day 11 and it was specifically raised with him as to what he checked, what he didn't check, was it the right thing to do to publish this, wouldn't people know, wasn't it the right thing to ask for Sergeant McCabe's point of view, which wasn't done. And furthermore, reading the terms of reference, obviously the main issue is whether there are directions or instructions
by the commissioners to contact the media to brief them negatively, to draw the attention of journalists to an allegation of criminal misconduct, what the commissioners knew in relation to an allegation of criminal misconduct and to investigate contacts between members of An Garda Síochána and media and broadcasting personne1. That's what the terms of reference say. Now, in the event, and this is one of the things that's actually on the table, that from within An Garda Síochána that interview was arranged, which it was, who arranged it? was it responsibly arranged? was it right or was it wrong for journalism to respond in that context? That is how I see it at the moment. Now -MR. MEDOVELL: But there is another slight angle to it and maybe Mr. Fanning would concede the following. That, if there was a campaign to denigrate Sergeant McCabe, and if a newspaper determined to publish that article without going to Sergeant McCabe about it, it indicated that there was abroad a feeling that he was fair game for that kind of article. And that might weigh in your mind, Chairman, as to whether there was a campaign to, I don't want to use the term smear him, but a campaign to denigrate him in public by reference to the D allegation.
MR. FANN NG If I could respond to that.
CHA RMAN Yes, of course you can, Mr. Fanning, and I am not going to cut you off, but in due course. It's just, I tend to worry about this, Mr. McDowe11, because we spent actually a lot of time and it hasn't helped me
in terms of actually focusing on the issues as to whether people were for or against Sergeant McCabe. I mean, I think I stated my view before by quoting my friend who says vis-á-vis music critics, they build you up and then they cut you down. If you are a public
figure people are entitled to take a view. That doesn't necessarily mean there is anything malicious behind it. But what really worries me and what concerns me is the contacts between members of An Garda Síochána and media and broadcasting personnel, whereby anything negative came out against Sergeant McCabe in a way, in particular, that referred him to the D allegation, and this is the only -- these four articles are the only such four articles that exist in that regard. Now, we know that Chief Superintendent o'Reilly had a hand in it, we know that the member of the D family who is a member of An Garda Síochána, had a hand in it, and then the details become blurred and there are certain statements and there are certain denials, but --
MR MEDONELL: Chairman --
CHA RMAN No, the reason that I mentioned that yesterday was specifically that line of cross-examination was pursued by you on day 11, and that's what I assumed you were doing yesterday.
MR. MEDOVELL: Wel1, Chairman --
CHA RMAN It's not a criticism at all, Mr. McDowell, you know.
MR MEDONELL: -- I do ask the -- I mean, there is a
big danger, and I am going to say this at the end of my final submissions, if $I$ can, there is a big danger of silo thinking in relation to the various modules here. The fact is that the Tribunal has now evidence which it may accept or may reject, that the Commissioner -- the former Commissioner of An Garda Síochána was disseminating disparaging material about Sergeant McCabe in the months of December to February of 2013, 2014. The fact is that a relatively senior member of An Garda Síochána seems to have played a pivotal role in the Williams articles. These things may be seen by the Tribunal as entirely separate and unconnected events, or the view might be taken that there was a general disposition to raise the Ms. D allegation against Sergeant McCabe with a view to discrediting him 10:14 in the public eye and that the williams articles in particular and the manner in which they were arranged by way of interview, tends to support that proposition. That is all I am saying.
CHA RMAN Yes. We11, at the moment I have no view but 10:14 the reason that I intervened and said what I did was because I had remembered what you had said on day 11 and I am not saying you did so irresponsibly, but Mr. Fanning you wanted to add a submission and I am very anxious to hear it.
MR. FANN NG Very briefly, just to say I believe there is a clear dichotomy. Mr. McDowe11 and the Tribunal are clearly entitled to inquire into the factual circumstances in which newspapers came to write
articles concerning Sergeant McCabe to the extent that they bear on the terms of reference. So, in particular the interview conducted by Mr. Williams with Ms. D, the circumstances in which Mr. Williams was contacted, how that story came to him, all of that is entirely legitimate and I've never raised any issue about that. But insofar as Mr. McDowell is now veering into, as it were, the editorial decision within the newspaper as to the publication of articles, the editing of articles, what prominence to afford them, whether or not to name Mr. Williams, those are editorial decisions in the newspaper and absent any evidence that An Garda Síochána had anything to do with those issues, they are not really the subject of the Tribunal's concerns, it seems to me.

CHAN RMAN I just don't know at the moment, Mr. Fanning. I am not sure you are right about that. I just look at term of reference [h]:
"To i nvesti gate contacts bet ween menbers of An Garda Sí ochána and medi a and broadcasting personnel, rel evant to whether there was a campai gn to cont act the media to bri ef them negativel y, whet her Superintendent Tayl or was di rected to draw journal ists' attention to an allegation of criminal misconduct and whether they had know edge of any allegation of criminal misconduct."

I think it's on the table, I'm afraid, Mr. Fanning. I really do. Now, unless -- I don't know,

Mr. McGuinness, did you want to say anything about it?
MR. MEGI NNESS: We11, Chairman, 1 think it's fair to say that in terms of any explicit term of reference relative to whether an article was reasonably published or not, which is the way Mr. Fanning couched it, I don't think it's necessarily implicit in the terms of reference that the Tribunal can, as it were, adjudicate on the appropriateness or otherwise of the publication of an article, which may be the subject-matter of a private law dispute between Sergeant McCabe. And it may not be, perhaps I'm wrong in that. But in the context of what Mr. McDowe11's inquiries were, which were related to the factual basis for different matters, what witnesses knew, it is obviously relevant for the Tribunal to inquire into the state of knowledge, the motivation of different parties, whether they were manipulated in any way, I'm not obvious7y asserting that as a fact at the moment, but the extent to which the Gardaí may have had some background involvement or not is clearly part of the terms of reference. So I think there is a division there. CHA RMAN Yes. I mean, the other thing that worries me, Mr. Fanning, is that there has been evidence to the effect that Irish News and Media effectively act at the behest of the Garda Commissioner vis-á-vis their employees, a particular employee in question who called to the door of the Garda Commissioner, and then says she was dismissed. Now, there has to be a limit to the extent to which I go into that, there has to be. But
nonetheless, that is the allegation, and the inference that I'm being asked apparently to draw out of it is that the Garda Commissioner rings and says jump and they say how high? Now, that is what is there. I'm not saying that $I$ place any credence in it, I'm not saying that $I$ am going to actually rerun this employment dispute again or the apology or what it means or anything else like that. But I just want to see where it gets us. I can't cut it off, I really don't think $I$ can cut it off.

MR. FANN NG Yes, save for the fact that the very question that was posed yesterday as to whether or not an article was responsible is a nebulous and subjective standard, it's not a legal standard and that does clearly go beyond the terms of reference. But I'm not going to press the matter any further, Chairman. I have made my observations at this point. If you think it would be helpful to have further submissions at a later stage in a more controlled way we will deal with it that way.

CHA RMAN You have made your observations and I do note what you say and I think I would benefit from submissions at the end, yes, on that particular point.
MR. FANN NG Very good, Chairman.
MR. ḾCEÁL O H GG NS: Chairman, can I say, just in
relation to the point you have just made in relation to the Gemma O'Doherty aspect of matters, could I simply ask you to simply note that we might simply reserve our position on behalf of An Garda Síochána in making
appropriate submissions in relation to the relevance, if any, of that set piece, as it were. Can I just simply say, you used the expression that "there was evidence that", and it ultimately be our submission that there has been an opinion offered by Ms. O'Doherty 10:20 which in fact does not amount to evidence within the acceptable meaning of that term but ultimately that will be a matter for submissions in due course.

CHA RMAN No, I take your point. I mean, the plain reality is this: There was a call to the Garda

Commissioner's door, that did create some disturbance within Irish News and Media, there was a meeting and that is to say with David Taylor and certain higher executives, but the role played in that regard by the Garda Commissioner is one where it would take, I would imagine, quite firm deductions to be made to enable one to get to the conclusion that he was necessarily behind it. So that may help.
MR. MĆCÁL OHGGN: Yes. we would say particularly, chairman, in the circumstances where the INM executives appear to be at one to indicate An Garda Síochána in fact did not play any role in directing whatever steps they chose to take.
CHAN RMAN Well, yes.
MR. HARTY: Chairman, there is a witness under
cross-examination about this precise issue and certainly the suggestion from Mr. O'Higgins as to the evidence that witness is going to give, while that witness is under cross-examination, is inappropriate at
this stage. Submissions can be made later as to the evidence that is heard, but in the circumstances whereby the witness is currently under cross-examination in relation to precisely this issue, the suggestion from Mr. O'Higgins as to how exactly steps were taken and why, I would suggest is inappropriate at this stage by way of submission and the matter should be left open to a later stage. CHA RMAN We11, the best thing to do is to get on with things.

MR. HARTY: Yes.
ME. LEADER: Mr. Mallon, please.

## MR. I AN MALLON CONTI NUED TO BE CROSS- EXAM NED BY

## MR. HARTY AS FOLLONS:

1 Q. MR. HARTY: Mr. Mallon, yesterday you gave evidence that you called Gemma O'Doherty and you asked her to desist and move away from the house, just get away from the house, just go home and we can discuss it the following morning, that is your recollection, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

2 Q. What discussion did you have with her the following morning?
A. Sorry, sir, can you repeat the question?

3 Q. What discussion did you have with her the following morning?
A. I'm not sure about -- I received an email off Ms. O'Doherty the following morning with regards to
discussions. I know the matter was raised then to the managing editor, Michael Denieffe, and I think he may have had the discussion with her then.

4 Q. I see. And did you have any other part in relation to any of that?
A. Not that I'm aware of, bar maybe there was an email exchange, but, no.

5 Q. And you are absolutely clear about your recollection of the conversation you had with her on the night?
A. I am, absolutely. there.

7 Q. Yes. But she wasn't there when you spoke to her.
A. Sir, I wasn't aware of whether she was there or not. My assumption when I rang her was I asked her, I said, Gemma, are you at the Garda Commissioner's house or words to that effect and if so, please can you move away and we'11 just discuss this tomorrow or discuss the proper protocols that are in place. And there are protocols in place when it comes to matters of, as it's
called, door-stepping, particularly senior, you know, particularly the head of the police, that she could have gone through the Garda Press office or at the very least with all reporters when they are sent on a doorstep or when they volunteer to go on a doorstep, 10:24 that it's run through the senior editorial figure at the time or the head of news, as I was then. And I wasn't aware that she had planned to do that that night.
8 Q. But the difficulty with it is, is that she wasn't there 10:24 when you spoke to her and surely she told you that straight away?
A. I don't have a recollection of whether she was there or not. I assumed, I suppose, when I spoke to her that she had still been there, but whether she was there or not the fact is she went there and I wasn't aware of it, was my primary concern.
9 Q. Did you ask her what she was there for?
A. I don't -- I don't think so, I'm not sure. I'm not sure, sorry.
10 Q. Surely if you are ringing up a journalist who you believe to be hanging around the front door of the Garda Commissioner's house, surely you'd ask her why she was there?
A. No, as I said, my primary motivation was that fact that 10:25 she had not gone through the proper protocols of trying to make contact with the Garda Commissioner, not that I was aware of, i.e. vis-á-vis through the Garda Press office first of all, or at the very least discuss the
matter with me first, where she comes to me and says, look, I am thinking of going to the Garda
Commissioner's house because there are very serious issues I believe which need to be answered and then we would have taken steps to put in place the appropriate provisions.
11 Q. Mr. Mallon, what are the protocols in relation to the contact of various different people in INM?
A. Well, somebody who is contactable through a Press officer directly, one would take that step first of all and I wasn't sure whether Ms. O'Doherty had tried to interview the Garda Commissioner or speak to him through the Garda Press office.
12 Q. But you should have asked her surely whether or not there was a personal matter or a matter in his function 10:26 as Garda Commissioner that she was at his door?
A. Well, I didn't believe that she was at his door on personal matters.
13 Q. In respect of a matter that related to his personal car, for example, driving his own car on the day in question?
A. I didn't get into the nuances of the story at that particular time.
14 Q. Why didn't you get into the nuances of the story?
A. Because, sir, as I said, I didn't agree that any of our 10:26 reporters, Gemma O'Doherty or anybody, should go to the house of the Garda Commissioner at that time. I absolutely -- and I stand over that.
15 Q. And does that apply to everybody?
A. It would apply to all senior figures; you know, Chief Justices, Taoisigh, Government Ministers, anybody who has been infrastructure set up where they can be contacted and contactable through spokespeople or Press office, that would be the normal channel of inquiry, first of all.

16 Q. Where does that stop? In relation to a company that you'd have to go through the Press office of a company in relation to the personal affairs of a director of that company?
A. That would generally be the way, sir. But I mean, if that option was blocked off well then, we would discuss further options or further possibilities.
17 Q. And is that protocol printed anywhere?
A. Sorry?

18 Q. Is that protocol printed anywhere?
A. Is that protocol printed anywhere?

19 Q. Yes.
A. I am not sure, I will have to check that.

20 Q. And did you --
A. But it's a given for any news reporter or journalist that they do know these protocols.

21 Q. How can they know protocols? Did you tell Ms. O'Doherty what the protocol was in relation to contacting the Garda Commissioner about his own personal driving offences?
A. Well, it's just a normal thing within journalism that journalists would know that if there was a doorstep to be had or to be done that they would come true the
Q.

And when ou spoke on the phone did you give Ms. O'Doherty any opportunity to explain why she was there?
A. Sir, I have already said this, I wasn't interested in why she was there, I was just interested that there was some concern by the wife of the Garda Commissioner, who I believe was the distressed or $I$ was told was distressed, and my immediate concern was look, let's get out of here and we will talk about it morning.
Q. It wasn't your evidence yesterday that the wife of the Garda Commissioner was distressed?
A. I am sorry, sir?

24 Q. It wasn't your evidence yesterday that the wife of the Garda Commissioner was distressed?
A. I think I gave about two minutes evidence on this yesterday evening before proceedings were drawn to a close, so I didn't get into this.
Q. Tom Brady was the person who called you? Tom Brady was the person who called you?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. And who called him?
A. I'm not sure.

What information did Tom Brady give you?
A. If it was Tom, somebody spoke to me, I think it was Tom Brady, he would have said, I believe he would have said Gemma O'Doherty is at the Garda Commissioner's house, I said leave it with him $I$ will give her a call.

28 Q. Did you ask him who told him that?
A. I didn't, sir. As I said, this was kind of an emergency situation where we were asked could we get our reporter away from the Garda Commissioner's house. You see, where I am having a difficulty is, you are employed at the time in a news gathering organisation, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You seem remarkably disinterested in information?
A. That's a very disingenuous -- I mean, I have already outlined, $I$ got a very late call about one of my reporters --
Q. How late?
A. -- who was at the home of the Garda Commissioner, whose wife was distressed, could I please get her away from there. That was my on7y --
A. Fair enough. I got the call --
Q. Nobody said she was at the house, except you and it wasn't put to Ms. O'Doherty when she gave evidence that she was at the house when you rang her?
A. I assumed, I have already said this, I just assumed she was at the house the way $I$ got the call.

36 Q. And what I am saying to you, you are remarkably disinterested in the facts when you phone

Ms. O'Doherty?
A. I was interested in one fact and the --

37 Q. Just one fact?
A. At that particular time the fact being that one of my reporters was at the home of the Garda Commissioner.
Q. And why was that fact the only fact that you were interested in?
A. Because I'd received a call saying that the wife of the Garda Commissioner was distressed. And I am sorry, I didn't have time to go into all other aspects or all other facts and that is why I outlined to Ms. O'Doherty look, we will pick it up tomorrow.

39 Q. And you didn't pick it up the tomorrow, following day?
A. I would have raised it with the managing editor, Michael Denieffe, at the appropriate channe1.

40 Q. You didn't mention anything about Ms. O'Doherty ruining everything?
A. I certainly did not. And before you ask, I certainly didn't use the phrase that I would -- RTÉ would be on to her. I have no idea where she is coming from with those statements.
Q. Why didn't you instruct your counsel or your lawyers that that didn't happen?
A. We11, I am telling you -- because I am giving you now that in testimony, it certainly did not happen.

42 Q. At no stage was Ms. O'Doherty questioned about the details of that conversation.
A. Sir, I'd like to just maybe wonder a little more why Ms. O'Doherty wasn't probed on that particular phrase
that, number one, she had ruined everything, as I was purported to have said or the RTÉ reference, because I have no idea where that is coming from and I don't know what she means, what she means when she said I had said to her that she had ruined everything. I just don't -- $00: 31$ that doesn't compute.
She gave her evidence, she wasn't questioned on your behalf or on behalf Independent News \& Media in relation to that. It was taken without question. She said she was at dinner with her husband, that was taken 10:31 without question.
A. Say that again.

44 Q. She said she was at dinner with her husband in o'Conne11's Restaurant in Donnybrook when you phoned her. She said she came down -- that you spoke to her in an extremely angry manner, that was taken without question.
A. Sorry sir, that is not correct. I was not extremely angry. Absolutely incorrect.
45 Q. You weren't extremely angry?
A. I think you will see by the content of her email the following morning which was rather friendly, it didn't -- it wasn't the email of a person who was in conflict with me and if you want to pull up the email again itself for the Tribunal, Chairman, I have no whatsoever.
46 Q. Really?
A. She was a colleague.

47
A. I was senior to her, yes.

49 Q. And you had phoned her that evening, you say without even checking the facts, to give out to her, to get away from the Garda Commissioner's house?
A. No, not in those terms. Without checking the facts, the facts as I received them from somebody whom I trust, had been told that she had been at the Garda Commissioner's house.

50 Q. Did you not trust Gemma O'Doherty?
A. Are -- is it not correct Ms. O'Doherty had been at the Garda Commissioner's house?

51 Q. Do you not trust Gemma O'Doherty? I will ask the questions.
A. That is not the issue here.

Well, it is the issue, because you got one piece of information from one journalist, you then phone another journalist. You say you trusted the information that you got from Tom Brady, I'm asking you did you not trust the information you could receive from Gemma O'Doherty?
MR. FANN NG with the greatest of respect to assists any inquiry of the Tribunal.

CHA RMAN Mr. Harty, perhaps if it were somewhat more concise we might get there. I'm sure you are pursuing
a line because you feel it's relevant, at the moment it's not completely apparent as to why, so --

53 Q. You might not be able to assist us any further, Mr. Mallon.
A. Sorry, sir?

54 Q. Ms. O'Doherty says that things went downhill for her effectively in Independent News and Media after that evening, were you involved in the decision to make Ms. O'Doherty compulsorily redundant?
MR. FANN NG Chairman, I am objecting to that question. That clearly cannot be anything to do with the Tribunal's concerns.
CHA RMAN Well, I think if the question were at the behest of anyone in Garda Síochána or in consequence of ruining a relationship with An Garda Síochána, did you seek to terminate, if that is -- now, obviously there may well be an assumption there, Mr. Fanning, but if the question is asked and the answer is no or the answer is yes, then we see if there is anything else which may support it.
MR. FANN NG Very good.
MR. HARTY: I am simply trying to round off
Mr. Mallon's involvement in it. If he wasn't involved in the decision to make Ms. O'Doherty compulsorily redundant the matter ends with his evidence at that point.

CHA RMAN Mr. Harty, are you pursuing the line that Irish News and Media decided to get rid of

Ms. O'Doherty because she had infringed on a relationship which was very valuable and are you in a position to produce any evidence that even if they thought that, that it was pursuant to any suggestion from Garda Headquarters?
MR. HARTY: well, in relation to Mr. Mallon -CHA RMAN I am just saying that, and if you want to ask any questions along that line, I have no problem with that.

MR. HARTY: I suppose the question is, if Mr. Mallon wasn't involved in the decision in relation to Ms. O'Doherty's employment then there is no further questions to ask Mr. Mallon in relation to that.
CHA RMAN We11, he may know something about it; he may know that it's accurate, he may know that it's
inaccurate, he may know that there was no such talk in the office, for instance. He may know that, I don't know.
55 Q. MR. HARTY: Mr. Mallon, the first question before we get to that point: In relation to the decision to send 10:35 two editors to Harcourt Terrace to meet with an assistant commissioner and Superintendent Taylor, were you involved in that decision?
A. No, I wasn't.

56 Q. Do you have any idea how that decision came about?
A. No, I don't.

57 Q. In relation to the decision as to who was to be made redundant -- compulsorily redundant or offered voluntary redundancy in Independent News and Media,
were you involved in those decisions?
A. I was involved in many of the voluntary redundancy processes with INM. When those situations became involuntary, if you like, I was not part of those decisions or that process.

58 Q. Not part of the decision-making as to who would be selected --
A. Sorry, sir, as I stated already, voluntary redundancy programmes I was involved with, with HR, when those situations became involuntary for people didn't want to 10:36 go I had no hand, act or part in that process.

59 Q. Okay. Ms. O'Doherty has said that she was -- that the attitude to her changed in the newsroom after that. I am going to allow you the opportunity -- after that evening -- I am going to allow you the opportunity comment on that, her view in relation to that.
A. That's absolutely incorrect.

60 Q. But she was in fact made compulsorily redundant?
A. Not that day -- was it?

61 Q. No.
A. No.

62 Q. I appreciate that.
A. Sorry?

63 Q. I appreciate that. I have no further questions. Thank you.
CHA RMAN A11 right.

## THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. Ó MU RCHEARTAN GH

64 Q.

MR. Ó MI RCHEARTAV G! Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, Mr. Mallon, my name is Fíonán
Ó Muircheartaigh. I represent Alison O'Reilly. I just want to ask you a few questions about the video that was taken of Paul Williams' interview with Ms. D. Now, it's just to try and, first of all, tie down some dates. I think there is agreement that Mr. Williams had his interview with Ms. D on Saturday the 8th March 2014 , and Ms. Dearbhail McDonald, in her evidence yesterday, explained how she was furnished with information a number of days before the 14th March, which happens to be the following Friday, at which there was a meeting she attended, I think she said with yourself and Stephen Rae and I saw it somewhere in the papers yesterday that on that occasion the video was downloaded by Caoimhe Gaskin. Now, it's just to try and nail down some facts. There was evidence the day before that, I think it was on Monday, that we had Eavan Murray, and she had gone up and met the $D$ family and she said it was immediately, it was in very close proximity to the interview with Paul Williams and when she was speaking, she said that the D family, that was probably Mr. and Mrs. D and not Ms. D, that they were very concerned about the situation that had arisen. And I asked her what exactly they were concerned about, and they said they were particularly concerned about the video. Now, what I'm trying to track down is, who had access to this video? who was responsible for the
video? Have you any idea of that? In the period between the 8th March and 15th March -- or 14th March, sorry.
A. well, sir, with any sensitive information -- sensitive material such as a video of an interview which a decision has yet to be taken as to whether to publish or not, very few people would have -- and nobody really would have access to that video except for the digital editor and obviously the videographer in this case Caoimhe Gaskin.
65 Q. So, is Caoimhe Gaskin digital editor?
A. No. Fionnuala o'Leary is the digital editor.

66 Q. And what is Caoimhe Gaskin's role or status in the organisation?
A. That is a videographer. That is like a photographer except a videographer.
67 Q. So she obtained this video. I mean, was this a tape or was it a digital file or what was it?
A. I would imagine it was a digital file.

68 Q. You see, without going into the meeting on the 14th March, which we understood that, among other things, you discussed the legal review of Dearbhail mcDonald, the question really is, were there other issues in relation to the publication of this material discussed at that meeting?
A. I think, sir, from my statements yesterday, I don't have great recollection, I don't have much -- any recollection of that meeting, let alone the content of it.

69 Q. But you see, what is troubling me is that in the evidence of Ms. D given on day 10 of this Tribuna1, we understand that the premise on which this whole process took place was that she wanted her side of the story to get out in a controlled way, and yet two or three days after the interview took place, the family were very concerned about the video, and I'm just wondering if the family shared that concern with Eavan Murray, would they not have shared the concern with Independent Newspapers?
A. Sir, I think it's important to understand that any person or persons who volunteer themselves to be part of a story, i.e. to be interviewed, in this case to be interviewed on video, their immediate motivation is for that story to be published. Now, I just want to finish that point because this is very important. And the amount of people, back to my own reporting days over the years where I would have gone and interviewed people, would ring you the following day and ask why the story hadn't appeared in the paper, because they would have a very preconceived notion as to how the story would evolve and that is usually always immediately. And obviously the steps were taken and the checks were made and the decision ultimately not to publish that video was made. And I can see the concerns of anybody who has, as I say, you know, lent themselves to be part of an interview process and then for the interview not to be carried, would feel somewhat disenfranchised by the whole process, but that
is not my concern.
70 Q. I think that is not quite the question, maybe I didn't put it clearly, but you haven't had the benefit of being here when Ms. D gave her evidence, but certainly the sense I have of that and the sense I have of Mr. D's evidence in relation to this entire process, was that an interview would be held and an article prepared that would give her perspective of matters, and there was no suggestion that the video was for anything other than a record for the journalist concerned, and what concerns me about this really is that, first of a11, there is the question of who had access to the video, who knew about this interview, who knew how long the interview was, who knew that there was a very troubled lady at the centre of this thing, there was physical evidence of this interview.

MR. FANN NG Chairman, firstly, this isn't a question, secondly I don't understand why it's being put to this witness, and thirdly, I don't understand how any of the question, if it ever becomes a question, is related to any interests of Alison O'Reilly.
CHA RMAN Well, I'm just trying to tease it through and I am thinking to myself, if one agrees to appear on video in the context of an interview, why does one do that? I suppose, Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh, that is the main point. I mean, lots of people change their minds and we have had a discussion of it may seem like a good idea today but in five years' time to, I suppose, out yourself, let us say, as a rape victim, which is
something that occurs frequently in the Central
Criminal Court, that people have these thoughts. But maybe you would be so kind as to just ask a question which is pertinent to the point because I'm not sure that I'm there. The evidence certainly of Mr. Mallon has been pretty straightforwardly that people agree to be interviewed because they want to get things in the newspaper. And people agree to be videoed, I would assume, it's either for the purpose of verification but why would that be needed? A tape-recorder would do. And why would one start worrying about it if you have set up circumstances so that you can't be seen or there are guarantees as to whether an actor's voice is used? I am not sure I am getting your drift at the moment.
71 Q. MR. Ó MU RCHEARTA Gt well the point, first of all, Chairman, is that at least four people had seen this video by the 14th March. Isn't that the case? Because there were three people and Caoimhe Gaskin at the meeting on 14th March?
A. Correct.

72 Q. And so, at least four people had seen it, and the video editor, whoever was responsible in the organisation, also had access to it?
A. I think Caoimhe Gaskin may have edited it also, but I am not sure of that.

So the point is that -- and to answer one of Mr. Fanning's questions, the reason I'm interested in this is because my client was told of an interview. Now, there was an interview. My client was told of the
general order of the length of this interview, and without somebody having seen that tape or without somebody having been told about the tape and its contents, her informant could not have known that. And that is why I am concerned about the fact that this tape was doing the rounds with at least four people in Independent News \& Media. And it would appear from the evidence of Eavan Murray that this was after the parents had expressed their concern about the video. CHA RMAN So, Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh, just before you answer that question, is the point, the relating of the detail that she was sitting on the couch and hugging herself? Is that the point you are making?
MR. Ó MI RCHEARTA GH It is the point. And the point that there was an interview for an hour or thereabouts. 10:47 CHAN RMAN All right.
MR. Ó MU RCHEARTAI GH And how could anyone know that if they didn't see or heard about this video?
CHA RMAN Yes. All right. Do you see the point, that the video was widely discussed, that its contents if it 10:47 wasn't widely watched would have been widely discussed in the office?
A. Yes, Chairman. And I disagree that it was widely seen. I mean, it would have been seen by the reporter obviously who did the interview, the videographer, the 10:47 head of news, as I was then, the chief -- the editor-in-chief and the head of digital and I think, according to the statements, also in the room would have been the editor of the Irish Independent, and that
really isn't widely discussed and seen around the place. That is a small group of very, very senior editors who would always have meetings and discussions and would view materials in-lodge, which would be absolute. So I think it's important also maybe to go back to your clients or if your client has in any way indicated how she got this information, because any detail of the video would not, I can say that most confidently, would not have come from any senior executive within INM. And I think there was a view that your client or someone close to your client had mentioned that the alleged victim in this case had sat huddled and on a couch and all that, when my belief, having indicated yesterday that I couldn't remember seeing the video but having spoken to somebody who said that she was quite erect and she was quite confident and eloquent in the video, so I don't know where your client has got that information from but it's not correct.
MR. Ó MI RCFEARTA GH Just on that point. My client has told this Tribunal what she was told. She has not said what was on the video. She was told that there was an interview. But this is really about what happened then. The second point I want to try and establish is: I mean, even if people other than the four people we have mentioned in Irish News and Media hadn't seen this video, is it possible that other people in Irish News and media knew there was a video to back up Paul williams' story, to authenticate it,
for example? Would that be knowledge that was, other than with the four people concerned?
A. I would doubt that. I would say it would be very much in-lodge.
75 Q.
And my last question really is: whatever the truth is about the video, did Irish News and Media know at the time on the 14th march, or any time before the publication in April, of the concern that we have heard here that was expressed by the D family in relation to this video and what was coming from it, and did they publish regardless?
A. Sir, the video wasn't published.
Q. The video wasn't published but the articles of Mr. Williams were based on that interview, which was a video.
A. Sorry, what were the concerns of the family in regard to the articles?

CHA RMAN We11, Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh, that may well be a point, but certainly no one in the D family expressed any concern about those articles and furthermore the follow-up was to continue contact with Mr. Williams for the purpose of arranging a political interview and indeed they were meeting in a hotel and having tea and buns and then going to Leinster House together. So it wouldn't appear to me that there is any evidence that the family were concerned. Quite the opposite; it would seem that they were quite pleased. I use that in the lowest possible sense. Quite content that the articles had been published. In line with what

Mr. Mallon said, that people generally contact newspapers in order to see something in print. MR. Ó MURCHEARTAIGt Chairman, I was just trying to reconcile it with Ms. Murray's evidence she gave on Monday in that regard.
CHA RMAN What was that, remind me?
MR. Ó MU RCHEARTA GH Well, on Monday she said when she went to meet the $D$ family.
CHA RMAN Oh, they were concerned.
MR. Ó MU RCHEARTAI GH They were concerned. And I said 10:51 what were they concerned about and she said particularly about the video. That is my recollection. Now, I could be wrong in this.
CHA RMAN No. I understand where you are coming from, thank you.
77 Q. MR. Ó MU RCHEARTA GH My very last question, you wil1 be glad to hear, Mr. Mallon, is: whatever the context in relation to the views of the $D$ family or the content of the interview, would you accept that, and this touches on the point that was discussed at the very outset of this meeting, would you accept that the sequence of articles had the effect of propagating unwarranted speculation in regard to the character of Maurice McCabe and wasn't that the most likely outcome of publishing these articles?
A. Sorry, sir, could you just repeat the last bit of your question?

## 78 Q. Certain7y.

CHA RMAK I think the point is this: If you look at
the articles, it may be some time since you saw them, I don't know whether it is or not, but I mean what they say is a girl who says she was sexually assaulted by a serving garda wants her case to be reinvestigated because she feels the investigation wasn't proper. That indicates the subtext is, no one is saying it's a cover-up, but that a less good job was done because it was a Garda member than if it was, say, an ordinary person at a discotheque. So Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh's question is: By publishing an article like that did it 10:52 not focus attention on Sergeant McCabe or speculation as to whether it was Sergeant McCabe, because as you wi11 appreciate several people have given evidence to say we11, when I read the article I assumed it was Sergeant McCabe being talked about or I deduced it was? So that is the question.
A. At the time I did not see that -- no, I didn't. On the basis that Sergeant McCabe wasn't named in the article. But I mean, that was at the time.
79 Q. MR. Ó MI RCHEARTA GL would you accept that anybody in 10:53 the know would know that this must be a whistleblower?
A. No. Absolutely not.

CHA RMAN Mr. Lehane, I think yesterday you were perhaps unnecessarily shortened, and the reason I am coming back to you is I am not exactly sure as to the point you wished to make to Mr. Mallon, that is not your fault, it's pressure of time, $A$, and secondly, because at the end of the day I didn't completely understand it, so if you wished to put a couple of
points I would be very glad to hear them.
MR. LEHANE: I am grateful for that, chairman. I think the point I was trying to make to Mr. Mallon --
CHA RMAN You can put it to him, if you wish.
MR. LEHANE: I am going to address you first because I don't think it's necessary for me to ask Mr. Mallon any further questions. It was simply directed to the use of terminology surrounding the allegations in Independent News and media at the time and I have ascertained his evidence in relation to that. And it will just be a submission to you at the end of the day, Chairman, in relation to the differences between my client, Ms. Harris, and Mr. Mallon, and it will be a matter for you to resolve.
CHA RMAN Yes. But I had a difficulty yesterday with 10:54 saying that paedophilia was in any way, if you like, an improper word because it is a word used in scientific circles.
MR. LEHANE: Exactly. Chairman, paedophilia, and I think the word yesterday, the Greek word -- but the point is, is that if the word -- there is a dispute as to whether or not the word was used to describe this activity by another witness who is going to come to this give evidence to this Tribunal, whereas Ms. Harris says it was used and the other individual denies it would be used. And my submission would be it would nothing to unusual to find the word paedophile used or the words kiddie fiddler used. Mr. Mallon has given his evidence, $I$ was just probing in relation to whether
he had heard this given that the allegations were being discussed in a very open way according to his evidence in Independent News \& Media.
CHA RMAN we11, your evidence yesterday was that there wasn't any question of you discussing Sergeant McCabe and paedophilia and there certainly was no question of you being shut down by Anne Harris and said, well, this is nonsense and no one is to talk like that in my presence? I don't mean it as strongly as that, but that being the general message.
A. That's correct.

CHA RMAN Yes. Al1 right.
MR. LEHANE: Thank you, Chairman.

## THE WTNESS MAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR M CHEÁL

## O H GG NS:

80 Q. MR. MCHEÁL OH GG NS: Just one question, Mr. Mallon, arising from this morning's questions. Mícheál
o'Higgins on behalf of An Garda Síochána. Do you
happen to know was Ms. D given or did she seek a copy
of the video file or video of the interview?
A. I don't know, I have no knowledge.

MR. ḾCEÁL OHGGS: Thank you.
MR. FANN NG Chairman, just a couple of short issues arising for mr. Mallon.

## THE WTNESS WAS EXAM NED BY MR. FANN NG

81 Q
MR. FANN NG Mr. Mallon, on a number of occasions in the course of your evidence, in particular in relation to the viewing of the video, you've had to tell the Chairman that you can't recollect certain matters, and just to put your inability to recollection certain matters from 2014 in its proper context for the Chairman; $I$ think you are no longer working in journalism?
A. That's correct.

82 Q. When did you leave the employment of Independent News \& Media?
A. August 2015.

83 Q. And I think you took up a position with the Football Association of Ireland?
A. That's correct.

84 Q. And what was that position and how long did you hold it for?
A. I was Director of Communications for two-and-a-half years, up until March of this year.

85 Q. And in March of this year I think you have moved on to different role?
A. Yes, Mr. Fanning, I am now a communications consultant working with UEFA.
Yes. So it's fair to say arising out of that, that really for the last three years you haven't worked in journalism and whilst in this hall a lot of people's focus has been very much on Sergeant McCabe for many years, what would you say about your own focus or
interest in affairs concerning Sergeant McCabe in the last three years?
A. At the time, and I did state this yesterday, at the time it was -- it had the potential to be a big story, it wasn't a story that was primarily on my focus with all the other stories that I would have been working on or working with reporters about. In the intervening years away from journalism, looking at how the whole Maurice McCabe story has evolved, it has been quite -you know, it's been an extraordinary thing. I would say, I would say, Chairman, that in relation to me not recollecting a number of matters yesterday, none of those were particularly difficult matters had I recollected them or recalled them. And unfortunately just because of time, and as Mr. Fanning has pointed out career changes, I just have no -- had no recollections of them. But I mean, as I say, as I sat looking back at the story over the last couple of years, it has been an extraordinary evolution.

Ms. O'Doherty and the line of questioning that Mr. Harty pursued with you, I just want to put certain information to you that was put to Ms. O'Doherty when she gave evidence. It's in the transcript of day 82 , page 209. And this may or may not be something that but insofar as Mr. Harty was pursuing this issue with you, at page 209 of day 82 , I put to Ms. O'Doherty certain facts concerning Independent Newspapers in 2013
and a round of redundancies, and I'm not sure if it's -- it's just about to come up on the screen, perhaps. And you'11 see that the long question, 558, sets out that:
"It was a matter of public record that INM was heavily indebted in 2013, that it sold its South African busi ness to pay down debt, that it rai sed money from its exi sting sharehol ders, it formed a cost-cutting pl an for a redundancy programme whi ch was announced in a circular to all staff by the then chi ef executive of INM Vi ncent Crow ey, on 26th April 2013, and that the round of redundancies ultimatel y incorporated 43 j ob Iosses in INM 29 of which were editorial and six of which were initially non-vol untary. "

And I ultimately put it to Ms. O'Doherty that she was the only person who challenged the legality of a redundancy. Now, Mr. Mallon, what do you say about those facts that were put to Ms. O'Doherty?
A. Sorry, specifically, Mr. Fanning?

CHA RMAN I think what you are expected to say is those are the statistics, that is what was happening, if that indeed be the case.
A. Yes. I mean, the figures would appear to tally.

88 Q. MR. FANN NG And would accord with your recollection.
A. Yes.

MR. FANN NG Thank you, Mr. Mallon.
ME. LEADER: Just, sir, I want to clarify one thing.

The recording of the interview with Ms. D was made available to the Tribunal. It hasn't been circulated as yet.
CHA RMAN Yes. And it won't be circulated.
ME. LEADER: Yes. It was made available through Mr. Williams' solicitor.

CHAI RMAN Yes.
M5. LEADER: There are two questions I wanted to ask you, Mr. Mallon.

## THE WTNESS WAS RE- EXAM NED BY MG. LEADER:

89 Q. MG. LEADER: The Tribunal has heard that Superintendent John O'Reilly was the person who facilitated contact between the D family and Mr. Williams. Do you know Superintendent O'Reilly?
A. No, Ms. Leader.

90 Q. A11 right. And the next question: we have heard from Eavan Murray who at the relevant time was a journalist with The Sun and also called to the D family, that she was aware that Independent News \& Media were about to do a big story in relation to this matter. Did that -does that surprise you in any way?
A. No. does it surprise me? I don't know where she would have got that information from. I mean, the story which appeared wasn't a big story per se --
91 Q. All right.
A. -- at the time, so...

92 Q. Okay. You didn't speak to her?
A. No, I don't know her. No.

93 Q. And are you aware of anybody speaking to Ms. Murray in relation to the upcoming story?
A. Absolutely not. Not within INM.

MS. LEADER: Thank you very much.
CHA RMAN Mr. Mallon, I was thinking of asking you whether it's easier to deal with footballers or journalists, but I don't think it's within the terms of reference so I won't. Thank you.
A. I'11 answer that privately, sir.

CHA RMAN Thank you.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MR. MEGI NNESS: The next witness is Mr. Paul williams.
CHA RMAN It will be appreciated that Mr. Williams is being recalled because of certain new things that have come up and it's necessary, therefore, to bring him back. We have been over obviously a great deal of it, it perhaps would help if Superintendent Taylor were here or if you have up to date instructions, Mr. Ferry, 11:02 in that regard?
MR. FERRY: Well, he is not in a position to be here this morning, Chairman.
CHA RMAN We11, I can't insist obviously that he should be here. It just may be helpful to you. In the 11:03 event that you have clear instructions, that's fine. I am sure the Garda would allow him to attend from his other duties in the event that he wished to attend. But I obviously can't require anyone to attend apart
from to give evidence.
MR. FERRY: He is actually abroad, he is on leave today, and that's --
CHA RMAN No, that's fine. If he is not here, he is not here. But once you are happy you have instructions 11:03 in the event that anything that comes up that is necessary.
MR. FERRY: We11, in the event of something arising we will be limited to contacting him by phone.

CHA RMAN That is perfectly fine.
MR. FERRY: Thank you.

## MR. PAUL WLLI AME, HAM NG BEEN SWORN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NNESS:

94 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Mr. Williams, you gave evidence on day 11:04 11, on the 18th Ju7y last, and you are probably familiar with the evidence that you've given --
A. Yes. Most of it, yeah.

95 Q. -- on that occasion. I don't intend to go into it in any detail again, but a couple of matters do arise from 11:04 that and then arising out of other information. But can I just ask you something that wasn't touched on on the previous occasion: what was your knowledge of Sergeant McCabe in relation to different issues over the years? Did you take an interest in Sergeant 11:04 McCabe's story, and if so, from when?
A. No. When the whole Maurice McCabe story kicked off with the Public Accounts Committee I think that was the time when he went public, I think that was the first
time.
96 Q. And had you written anything about him up to that point in time?
A. No.

97 Q. Okay. Can I just ask you to look at page 7547, and this is an article, it's in volume 27, an article written by Mr. Mooney in The Sunday Times in November 2010, and if we just scroll down to the first couple of paragraphs. It relates to the Byrne/McGinn inquiry and sergeant McCabe is identified there in the second paragraph and in the third paragraph.
A. Yes.
A. I would have been aware of that as well, yeah. That was in the public domain. Whatever was in the public domain at the time $I$ was aware of.
99 Q. So you'd be up to date, as it were, about matters, in that regard at the time?
A. Yes, the same as everybody else.

100 Q. And at the bottom of the page then there is reference to:

[^0]of the out come of Byrne's investigation. "

And then over the following page, is says:
" McCabe I odged a compl ai nt agai nst Byrne all eging
assault and fal se imprisonment after Byrne ref used to let himleave the hotel with the files and attempted to call in the Gardaí. It's understood McCabe I ater surrendered the files."

And it records that Nacie Rice was to investigate that. And presumably you were aware of that at the time?
A. You have reminded me of it there now. Just, there has been so much material about this.
101 Q. Yes, yes. Now, the following year, some material came to appear in public through pub7ic representatives, of Pulse records that had been leaked?
A. What year are you talking about, sorry?

102 Q. 2011. I don't know if you remember a controversy involving members of the Dáil disclosing names of people who had had penalty points --
A. Are you referring to me?

103 Q. -- quashed.
A. I was named in the Dáil, with Ronan O'Gara, yeah.

104 Q. You were one of those named?
A. Myself and Ronan O'Gara, yes.

105 Q. And there was a reference I think to an unnamed judge at that time and --
A. I just recal1 who was named.

106 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

107 Q. And ultimate7y, obvious7y the O'Mahony inquiry started and presumably you were aware that that was going on at the time?
A. Again, it was whatever was in the public domain.

108 Q. Yes. Can I just ask you, I think after you were named in the Dáil, was there some publications relating to you put into the public domain by journalists and newspapers?
A. It was widely reported at the time.

109 Q. Yes. And what was your reaction to that, if I may ask?
A. I was -- well, it was -- I was surprised, I didn't see -- I didn't know it was coming. I was named by, I can't even remember the TD, I think it may have been 11:08 Joan Collins, maybe.
110 Q. All right. Deputy Collins?
A. Yeah. I didn't know anything about it prior. I had -it was -- my reaction to it was that I was surprised that I was named, that I was named like that, but I had 11:08 nothing to hide. It was in relation to an incident with a fixed penalty notice that $I$ had done basically by the book, that I applied, I appealed and I wrote to whom it concerns.
111 Q. Yes. And did you respond to any interviews that were 11:08 requested of you by journalists when they were writing about the story, did you explain what had happened?
A. I don't think anyone -- I don't think I was asked for a comment.

112 Q. okay. And in terms of where the material had come from, did you associate that leak and your naming with Sergeant McCabe?
A. No, I never had any evidence that Sergeant McCabe was behind that.

Yes. I mean, obviously evidence is one thing and suspicion or speculation is another thing, but did you speculate that the so-called whistleblowers, one or other of them, had leaked that information, including about you?
A. No, because I didn't -- I didn't equate Deputy Collins with either of the whistleblowers at the time, and I didn't know who was responsible for it. It was a surprise that I was named but I had nothing to hide, I didn't do anything wrong, so it was out there in the public domain, so what?

114 Q. Yes. Yes. But there had been a press conference apparently organised by a number of deputies in Buswells, I think it made a lot of publicity at the time; they were sitting at a table with bundles of files that they had received from whistleblowers, and they were apparently about to also name names. Were you aware of that story at the time?
A. I don't recall that, no.

115 Q. All right. In any event, Ms. Harris told the Tribunal of Mr. Ryan's article on the 5th April -- or 5th May 2013 about Sergeant McCabe. Did you know Mr. Ryan?
A. I just know him like $I$ know any of the rest of people working in the Indo. I know his name, I met him once
or twice or three times. I don't work in there so I don't socialise with anybody.
116 Q. Yes. I understand it's not your practice to keep a desk or an office in there --
A. No.

117 Q. -- and you come and go and you work, as it were, from outside?
A. I rarely ever visit the place.
Q. Would that be unusual for a journalist?
A. Well, I am a freelance, I am an independent contractor so I work for other people as wel1.
Q.

A11 right. Okay. But anyway, he had apparently written a story moving the whistleblower saga along, suggesting that a number of deaths had occurred as a result of the activities of drivers who had had their penalty points quashed, and did you pick up on that element of the story at all?
A. No, no.
Q. OK. Al1 right. I think when you came here on the 10th July, last year, you told the Chairman that you hadn't 11:11 been aware of the details of the Ms. D allegation at all before you went up to see her?
A. That's correct.

121 Q. And as I recall, you told the Chairman that you hadn't heard anything other than a vague general rumour about Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes.

122 Q. But that was unrelated, as I understand your evidence, unrelated by you to any sexual assault, is that right?
A. That's correct.

123 Q. And you weren't aware, therefore, of the original allegation made against him, until sometime in 2014 ?
A. The D family made me aware of the allegations.

124 Q. And you hadn't been briefed on the allegation by any member of An Garda Síochána?
A. No, I had not.

125 Q. And I think you were very clear in your denials or your evidence in relation to that on the last occasion, and when the investigators went back to you in April of this year, that you were never negatively briefed by the commissioners, Commissioner Callinan --
A. That's correct.
-- Commissioner o'Sullivan, and in particular also by Superintendent Taylor?
A. That's correct.

127 Q. Okay. But did you become aware from a colleague of yours who had written an article in the Sunday Independent, Mr. Colum Kenny, on 2nd March 2014, where he named Sergeant McCabe, apparently it would seem for the first time, as having been the subject-matter of a serious investigation of an accusation made against him? Perhaps we could look at that, Volume 15, page 3881. This was published in the Sunday Independent, 2nd March 2014. It related primarily to the issue of the loss of a computer, but if we go down towards the end of the page, it says:
"It's understood that MECabe had al so been subjected to
a serious accusation by seni or garda that was subsequently referred by Gardaí to the DPP who found no basis on which to pursue the matter."

And then it goes back to the issue of the computer. were you aware of that story published at that time?
A. I never seen that story, no. I wasn't aware of it at a11, no.
Q. So that didn't alert you to an accusation that had been made against Sergeant McCabe?
A. We11, I wasn't aware of that story, no. I must have missed that, week of the Sunday Indo. I don't see the paper every week. you don't get a free copy sent to the house. So that wasn't then the source of any information, as far as you were concerned?
A. No. But last year, just to be absolutely clear, I laid out exactly how $I$ came involved in this whole situation from start to finish.
Q. And that's the phone call from Detective Superintendent o'Reilly, is that --
A. That Mr. D had contacted him and said that Ms. D wanted to talk to me. okay. And are you referring there to the content of the phone call with Mr. D or the visit to Mr. D? Did you receive the phone call first from Mr. D or did you
ring him?
A. Oh, I think he rang me.
Q. He rang you?
A. Yeah, yeah.

134 Q. Okay. But did he tell you in the phone call that people had been in contact with him or that people had visited him?
A. Well, I can't recall whether he told me that on the phone. I went down to see them on a Wednesday, so whether he told me when I went down there, I was certainly told that, that is my recollection of it; that two journalists had called to the house and Ms. D wanted to talk about this now. Yes. We11, you see, Ms. Murray has suggested in her evidence that she had contacted Mr. D and then subsequently visited him. Is it possible you were told a journalist had called, that is physically, or that they had, and in fact both attended the house?
A. I can't remember the specifics but my understanding would be that they both had visited the house, that is my understanding. I didn't dwe11 on it any longer. I mean, could Mr. D have simply told you that two journalists had called or called to the house?
A. No, he named the two journalists.

137 Q. He named the two journalists, did he?
A. Yeah.

138 Q. okay. And is it possible that he named them when he visited -- when you visited him on the 5th?
A. Quite possibly, yeah, but they would have given me a
brief of what was going on.
139 Q. Okay. But just going back to your state of knowledge. Is it your evidence that you weren't aware prior to the 5th march 2014 of any rumour in relation to Sergeant McCabe involving any sexual assault?
A. None, there was no specific rumour.

140 Q. You had heard nothing about the 2006 investigation at all from anyone?
A. No, because it was -- it was, as I said to you, it was a rumour out there, that he may have had a grievance with his own authorities, that he had fallen out with him, that was it. It was -- it was very, very vague.
141 Q. Yes. And you can't recall who you heard -- where you heard that first, is that right?
A. No.
A. It was a professional relationship.

144 Q. Okay.
A. I only really talked to him about that time, around 20 -- he came in, I was really only dealing with him from 2013 onwards.

145 Q. Mmm. We know, of course, that Deputy John McGuinness, who was chairing the PAC committee, he himself named Sergeant McCabe as the whistleblower relative to the penalty points issue, whose evidence they hoped to take
the following week, and so his name was out there in connection with that as of the 23rd January 2014. Had you attended Leinster House or is that the sort of set piece event you cover?
A. No.
A. No.
Q. Okay. Mr. Kenny, who wrote this article, apparently did so subsequent to an encounter that he had in the Houses of the Oireachtas where he said he got this information effectively from two other journalists who told him about it?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

149 Q. Now, Mr. Brady and Mr. Reynolds I think dispute the occasion on which that occurred or whether it occurred, but would you be surprised if there was a story going around like that and you hadn't heard about it?
A. I wouldn't -- I don't mix in the Dáil, the political circles, I don't go to press conferences, I don't go to crime scenes, so $I$ wasn't mixing with the general milieu, within the milieu, but no, I didn't hear any specific allegation before I met the D family.
150 Q. Yes. But I mean, would you presumably maintain good relations with other crime journalists who cover stories for other papers --
A. Yeah, I do.

151 Q. -- or crime correspondents, or Mr. Reynolds? Do you maintain relations with Mr. Reynolds?
A. We11, I would see Paul Reynolds if we were at a conference or something, say a Garda conference or something like that. I wouldn't see him very often, but I know him and he is a very decent guy.

152 Q. You are both very experienced, long-term --
A. A very fine journalist.
-- very fine journalists covering the same general territory in a sense, isn't that right?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

154 Q. But going back to my question. Would you be surprised if you didn't or hadn't heard of a sort of a serious story going the rounds, such as was apparently going the rounds about Sergeant McCabe?
A. I mean it wasn't doing the rounds like that, so that is why I didn't hear it, I'm sure.
Q. You would be confident that you would hear any story going the rounds?
A. Oh, look, there's a lot of journalists like to think they know everything about everything. I didn't know anything, a lot of things were going on. You know, we weren't in the know to that extent and I didn't hear any allegation like that.
156 Q. Yes. Yes. Ms. McCann gave evidence to the Tribunal suggesting that she knew you and she would have spoken to you from time to time and in this sort of period that we are talking about. Have you any recollection
of that?
A. No, this was evidence -- last week, wasn't it?

157 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah, I remember reading about that. I know Debbie McCann, yes.

158 Q. But I mean, would you talk to her about current issues, things that were going on?
A. No, I think was she asked did I tell her about the story? Absolutely not. I am 30-odd years in this business, we are in the process, from the time we went to college we were taught the most important thing in a journalist's life is to get an exclusive. It's
inculcated in my culture that you do not talk to other journalists about any story you are working on. It is treated very privately, until such time as you can publish it.

159 Q. One perhaps can understand that. Did you know Ms. Murray at all?
A. No.

160 Q. You see, in a written document which was circulated the 11:21 other day, she suggested that it was known to The Sun newsroom that the Independent were apparently intent on running sort of a special exclusive relating to the Ms. D story over --
A. I heard that --

161 Q. -- in early March. Were you surprised to hear that?
A. I was very surprised to hear that, yes.

162 Q. okay. Now, she said that that came from her news editor, Mr. Fergal O'shea. Did you know Mr. O'shea at
a11?
A. I knew him years ago when I was temporary, I was about two years with the News International, which ran the News of the World and The Sun, and I left there in 2012, so I haven't seen -- I very rarely worked with him anyway at the time, but I don't know him.

A11 right. In any event, is it your evidence you hadn't neither spoken to Ms. McCann or Ms. Murray about the D story as you were working on it?
A. Absolutely sure of that. Superintendent Taylor, I think you made your mobile phone telephone records available for a period in March, from the 4th March to the 11th March --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

165 Q. -- available to the Tribunal, in an unredacted form?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think redactions were agreed with the Tribunal investigators of any irrelevant numbers, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

167 Q. And at page 7421 of Volume 27, is the redacted version, and I think that shows a call from you to Mr. D on the 6th March, isn't that correct?
A. I don't know what day that was. Is that a Thursday, was it?

168 Q. We11, that would appear to be the Thursday, if you'd been up on the Wednesday, the 5th?
A. I was up on the 5th. The 5th I was up there, yes. So

6th, the next day, yes.
169 Q. Do you recall what that would have been about? It's a short enough call.
A. To Mr. D?

170 Q. Yes.
A. I don't recall, no. Maybe it was arranged that -- they wanted me to come back to see them to meet their daughter or something.
171 Q.
That is just one thing I wanted to be clear about, to clarify one issue. When you went up on the 5 th, obviously Ms. D wasn't there, and Mr. D and Mrs. D told you about her and the state she was in, as it were, and what she wanted to do and what she wanted to achieve, and was it clear to that you she wanted to get her story out there about what had happened to her at the hands of Sergeant McCabe?
A. She had made the decision based on the fact that, I think she said it here as well, that she was concerned there was so much publicity around Maurice McCabe. But before that, my understanding has been the reason she
always talked to me was because she was quite disconcerted, to say the least, that journalists who called to her home unsolicited, that is what they told me, the family, and knew her name, and knew her address, knew that she had made an allegation. And
they were -- they were -- she, as a result of that, said she wanted to speak out about it.
172 Q. Yes. But obviously she was able to speak for herself, but did you understand from the visit to her parents on
the 5th that she wanted to speak about everything, she wanted to tell you everything about it?
A. Well, I didn't know what she was going to talk about until I met her properly. You know, you don't know what somebody is going to say to you until you meet them.
Q. Yes. Yes. It's just Ms. Murray, in her evidence, appears to have been told that they were talking to you, which was correct?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

177 Q. And that she consulted with them when she called and seems to have had sort of a lengthy enough conversation with them about the wisdom of doing the video interview, which would suggest that she had perhaps,
after her call to Mr. D on the phone, had then visited perhaps on the 6 th or 7 th. But certainly as of the position on the 8 th, are you clear in your own mind that both Mr. and Mrs. D told you unequivocally that two journalists had actually called to the house?
A. That is my understanding, yeah.

178 Q. okay.
A. I am aware of obviously of that evidence being given, I think it was this week or last week, I am losing my track of days, but the D family themselves I am sure could clear that up. I am telling you what I remember and what I am aware of. behalf of the Ds didn't contest Ms. Murray's evidence about the nature of the conversation that she said she had with them and in fact agreed with it. So it does appear clear that --
MR. KELLY: We11, Chairman, sorry, I am reluctant intervene here but Mr. Buckley was here the last day and he put very squarely to Ms. Murray that the meeting couldn't have taken place after Mr. Williams was at the property.
MR. MEGU NNESS: I think, in fairness to --
MR. KELLY: So the conversation couldn't have taken place of that nature because the video hadn't taken place, it's self-evident.
CHA RMAN Give me the point again, Mr. Kelly.
MR. KELLY: Sorry, Chairman. I am sorry, I would have had Mr. Buckley here --

CHA RMAN You are fine.
MR. KELLY: We have to jump in and out.
CHA RMAN Tell me what is the point you are making?
MR. KELLY: Mr. Buckley put to Ms. Murray the other day
that the D family say that she called to the house
before Mr. Williams and he related it to a particular birthday in the family, which was on the 4th march. So the conversation in relation to a video having taken place could never have taken place.
CHA RMAN In other words, being worried about the video was not a conversation that they could have had? MR. KELLY: That is fair, Chairman. And I think in the evidence last year, if Mr. McGuinness goes back to the transcript, I don't have the reference here, but I think Mrs. D certainly said when Eavan Murray did call to the house, that they did sit down and a have a chat for a while and there was some discussion. But of course Ms. Murray wasn't here last year to put anything to Mrs. D.

MR. MEGUI NESS: I mean, if I stand corrected I stand
corrected on the transcript, it's there to be consulted. But in any event --
CHA RMAN I don't think you got anything wrong, Mr. McGuinness. I think the plain reality of it is, the D family's account of it is that the two journalists called and it was due to that build-up of pressure, if you like, that they said well, if there is going to be a story we need to take control of it. It wasn't in consequence of one calling. That seems to me
to be the essential fact. Now, in the event that there was a call and there was a discussion about a video, by the time -- on the timing that we are looking at, at the time that Ms. Murray called, it doesn't seem to me that there could have been either a video or an arrangement for a video.
MR. MGGI NESS: Yes. Well, I'm just exploring with the witness as to what may have been said.
CHAI RMAN I am not saying you are doing anything right, quite the opposite, yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: which may illuminate the issue.
180 Q. In any event, just touching on the video itself, obviously your solicitors and Independent News and Media made the video available to the Tribunal on a key, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

181 Q. And we have obviously seen the video and it's there for interested parties if they wish to make a request to see it, but you are the only person facing the camera in the video, isn't that correct?
A. Correct, yes.

182 Q. And the video is shot with you sitting on a chair asking Ms. D questions?
A. That's correct, yes.

183 Q. She has her back to the camera, her face is never visible, it's shot from an angle behind her left shoulder looking over that towards you?
A. Mm-hmm.

184 Q. And her profile is, I think is never actually seen in
A. I think the side of her face and her hair.
Q. The side of her head but not the side of her face. And she appears to be a sitting on a chair, is that correct?
A. I think so. It's a long, long time since I saw it, but the Tribunal have the video.
Q. Yes. And there is a white sofa in the background to your right and behind you, I don't know if you recall that.
A. I think it was in the sitting room of the house.

187 Q. Yes. Now, can you recal1, was that edited? Is that an edited version that the Tribunal has received?
A. No.

188 Q. No. It looked to me like a one-take --
A. It was a one-take.

189 Q. -- interview?
A. I was actually -- I had kept that on my 1aptop and I gave that to the Tribuna1. As far as I know it was never edited.
Q. Yes. It looks like an experienced uninterrupted flow of questions and answers --
A. Yeah.

191 Q. -- which you are controlling in the sense that you are doing the interview, is that right?
A. That's correct.

192 Q. And it's not edited then according to you?
A. No.

193 Q. You are certain about that anyway?
A. Absolutely.

Q. Now, just one point: It happens when some people make statements in the police stations, whether as witnesses or accused, they often look for a copy of their statement. Was there any discussion about giving Ms. D 11:31 a copy of the video or was there a copy given to her or sent to her?
A. No, not -- no, I don't believe so.
Q. Just going back to the phone record there, there does appear to be a text sent to her, just there, it's quite 11:31 visible, on 9th March, at five to one in the morning and then there is two more later the same day. Have you any recollection what they are about?
A. No, I don't.

196 Q. okay. And then there seems to be an eight-minute call on the next day, the 10th March, again with Ms. D. Have you any recollection?
A. That is the Monday, is it?

197 Q. Pardon?
A. Is that Monday the 10th?

198 Q. That would seem to be the Monday, if the 8th was a Saturday. Have you any recollection what that was about?
A. I don't have any recollection what that was about, no.

199 Q. Okay. It's followed by a call to Superintendent Taylor 11:32 on the 10th, then. Also a call for one minute thirty. That appears to be your first call to Superintendent Taylor after the interview, is that correct?
A. It looks like, yeah, that's correct, yes.
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Q. Yes. Can you recollect what that was about?
A. I do recollect what that was about. It was about another story I was working on where somebody had been arrested. It was to do with fraud and the person had been arrested. It was a much bigger story for me at the time and there was solicitors' letters flying around about it. And al1 I can say about that is, yes, 11:34 I do recall around that time we got a solicitor's letter, $I$ think on the Friday, and I do remember that story, yeah.
207 Q. And why would you be talking to Superintendent Taylor
about that?
A. On that occasion the person had been arrested for fraud, it was a very serious -- potentially was a very serious story, nothing happened from it. But it involved a well-known receiver and it was very serious allegations of fraud, the person was arrested and I wanted to confirm was the person arrested.

208 Q. okay.
A. That is what I can recall about that.

209 Q. And it was to confirm an arrest, is that it?
A. Yes.

210 Q. Okay. And did he confirm the arrest?
A. I think so. I can't recall, I remember working on the story. I had a copy -- I had a note of it in my diary.
211 Q. okay. It's just if we go to page 4847, which is in Volume 18, we see a five-minute call on the 6th March at 17:52, which is obviously the day before that short call we looked at. So do you recollect what that call was about, when he phoned you?
A. Pardon?

212 Q. He phoned you on that date?
A. Yeah. I would say it was perhaps to do with that. There was a lot of things going on at that time.

213 Q. But you see, there is no other -- there was no other ca11 from Superintendent Taylor in the few days before that.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

214 Q. In fact, a week or so, more than a week before that. So he's phoning you, in fact, the day after you had
first being up to the D family.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And I am wondering is it possible that you could have told him on that occasion that, you know, guess where I have been?
A. No.

216 Q. Okay. Does that resonate in any way with you in terms of any of your conversations with Superintendent Taylor --
A. No.

217 Q. -- about telling him where you'd been? Because you are admitting on your own evidence that you certainly did tell him when you phoned him on the 10th, the following week, isn't that right?
A. Yes, yes.

218 Q. So I mean, is there any reason why you wouldn't have in fact told him, look, this is on the 6th now, in this five-minute phone call, look I have actually been up there to the Ds and I have got an interview and I am going to do a piece to camera with her?
A. No, I didn't have that conversation with him. I didn't have that kind of relationship with him to tell him something like that. It would have been none of his business until such time as I had something to ask him about.
okay. I mean, that is a logical enough explanation. But we go from the 6th to the 7th on Superintendent Taylor's records here, you have had the six-second message perhaps at 14:48:52 that we saw on page 7421
and now you have got this two minute 22 call on the afternoon of the 7th, which is then -- that is the Friday before you go up?
A. Yeah.
Q. So what do you think that call was about?
A. The reason I know it was about the fraud was because I'd discuss it with my solicitor at the time.

221 Q. okay.
A. Because we got a solicitors' letters in at that time in relation to this individual and it was moving to a critical stage. Okay. Would you have any problem writing down the name of the arrested person on a piece of paper?
A. I don't want -- I don't want to go into any further about it because my solicitor knows the name of the person, but I don't -- it's not -- it's to do with sources and other information. I have volunteered as much as I can to you about that.
224 Q. I am sorry, Mr. Williams, I must have misunderstood you. I thought you had got the solicitor's letter person?
A. No, no. Because I was asking questions, I called to this person's office on a number of occasions.
Q. A11 right. We11, in any event, just staying on this record -- well, in fact, perhaps going back to your record at 7421. It does show a one minute 30 second cal1 from you to Superintendent Taylor on the 10th, and it's helpful to have that, obviously. That seems to, as it were, fortify your evidence in the sense that your recollection was that you had phoned him the following week with your request for information?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And you told the Tribunal what you asked of him the last time and you are clear in your recollection of that, and you're pinning that to this phone call, is that right?
A. Yeah, but that was when I contacted him, when I came back the following working week.
Q. Yes. We11, did you give him -- did you explain to him why you were looking for the various bits of information that you told the Chairman about the last time?
A. Yes. I said I had interviewed Ms. D, I wanted to know 11:40 had an investigation taken place, had there been arrests, there was an issue about Noe1 Cunningham, I think was the guard's name who was in charge of it, that she had a number of issues in relation to that original investigation and I needed to check them to find out did this actually happen.

228 Q. Yes. I think you also told him, or am I wrong about this it, you asked him about a Pulse entry at that time or was that on a subsequent call?
A. Pardon, sorry?
Q. Did you ask him on that call about a Pulse entry?
A. No, I think that came up subsequently.

A11 right. Going back to 4847 then, there is -- from the 13th of -- there is a short message from him apparently to you on the 11th at 15:49, I don't know if you see that in the middle of the page? And you then on your records have a number of calls to him on the 11th at 15:52, which is shortly after that perhaps voice message that he left on the 11th. Do you recall him getting back to you quickly about some of the information?
A. I can't recal1 the actual, how quickly it was or otherwise. I do know that he did come back with the information but I can't help you on that.
231 Q. Yes. It's just, he appears to have a five-minute conversation with you, according to your records, at 15:55 -- sorry, 15:52 on the 11th. Do you see that there?
A. Yeah, I see that, yes.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Do you recollect why you were ringing Mr. D?
A. I can't recall, maybe I was checking something with him. I don't remember.

234 Q. It's just, if we go to Pulse inquiries, we have a record of Pulse inquiries relating to Sergeant McCabe.

I don't know if you have actually seen this in the documents but it's at 7029 and it's a record of inquiries on incidents associated with Maurice McCabe, and we need to turn that on its side.

CHA RMAN You possibly need to take out the volume and 11:43 have a look at it because it's impossible.

MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. It's very indistinct there. That is at 7029 in volume 27.

CHA RMAN Or 26.
MR. MEGU NESS: I am sorry, Volume 26.
CHA RMAN I think it's better, if you wouldn't mind, Mr. Williams, just pull out that volume 26, just to have a look at it.

MR. MEGU NESS: I think it's on the left-hand top there.
A. What page is this?
Q. 7029 .

CHA RMAN It does become readable when you take it out.

236 Q.
MR. MEGI NNESS: And in the left-hand column of the page there is a number of incident numbers, and --
A. What is this from, sorry? I am sorry, I don't know.

237 Q. It's headed: "I nquiries on inci dents associ at ed with Maurice MECabe." It's a record of people who searched Pulse in relation to Sergeant McCabe.
A. Okay, thanks.

238 Q. And it shows a number of inquiries made by Mr. D over the years. There's several in 2013, in July 2013. But there is one then, it's the seventh from the bottom.
A. The $23 / 3$ ?
Q. Yes, 23/3. So it appears that Mr. D made a Pulse inquiry at that time on the 23rd March. Had you asked him to make that inquiry in this phone call that we have just looked at?
A. No, no.
Q. Okay. And did Mr. D, irrespective of whether you asked him, did he come back to you with confirmation about what was on Pulse?
A. who, sorry?
Q. Mr. D?
A. It was he, as I said last year, told me that the incident wasn't recorded on Pulse. And I put that to -- and his daughter had an issue with that so I put that to Dave Taylor at the time. I don't know whether 11:46 I put that subsequently to him.
Q. Okay. We11, did Superintendent Taylor come back and confirm that it wasn't on Pulse?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. Yes. Okay. Now, the attitude that you took I think on 11:46 the previous occasion when you came and gave evidence was that as Superintendent Taylor had come forward as the source of these confirmations to you of this material, that you had no difficulty, because he had waived his privilege, of being able to confirm that he 11:46 had told you these things, and I think you clearly treated his waiver and his coming forward as enabling you to confirm that you got this information from him?
A. That is why I came -- that is why I cooperated with the

Tribunal; all the parties involved gave me a waiver and that is why I helped in any way I could.
244 Q. Yes. And you saw no difficulty in that from your point of view as a journalist?
A. No.

Because you seem to have had two very lengthy phone conversations with her on the 21st February and 24th February. If we could look at page 4849 --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

247 Q. -- of the phone records. And I think these were produced to you by the investigators? You have seen these before?
A. That's correct.
Q. And they show, on the 21st of February 2014, at 11:53, there is a 20-minute call from the Commissioner to you?
A. Yeah. She was the deputy commissioner at that time.
Q. Deputy commissioner?
A. She was in charge of operations.

250 Q. So what was that about, can you recollect?
A. What I can tell you about that was that it would be very well known that for many, many years I have had a very difficult personal security situation involving myself and my family and my home. At this time there was, a big issue had arisen in relation to that
security, and I had gone to her, I mean it was -- well, I suppose to put it mild7y, and I don't want to go into the specific details but there was certainly going to be a big row about it.
251 Q. Well, when had you gone to her?
A. I can't recall, it was around that time. This incident -- there was a security reduction as a result of the cutbacks in 2013 and then there was another proposed one in the beginning of '14, which I was very concerned about.
We11, what does the phone call relate to, then?
A. Trying to resolve the problem. You see, you were confronted with these phone contacts in interviews with the investigators and you didn't give the explanation that you are giving now?
A. Because I didn't want to because I didn't feel -- I felt it was confidential, and that is very confidential information.

254 Q. But on the last occasion when you were here, Mr. Williams, you may recall that you told the Chairman 11:49 just in the context of being contacted by Detective Superintendent O'Reilly and knowing Superintendent O'Reilly that it was he who had been involved in matters relating to your personal security and arranging it, because of issues that --
A. I was explaining how I knew him.
Q. Pardon?
A. I was explaining how I knew him.

256 Q. But had he not been responsible for and of assistance
in dealing with those security issues?
A. Well, the reason -- I was giving you the reason why I knew him.
Q. Yes?
A. That my mother had lived in Leitrim.
Q. Yes?
A. I explained that sligo-Leitrim was -- the part of Leitrim we were in was covered by Cavan-Monaghan. не would have been liaising, there was a number of incidents through the years that have been concerned. 11:50 Also I was a witness in a murder trial.

260 Q.
Q. But had he not had some responsibility in relation to security issues that you have concerns over at the time?
A. That would only be down in Leitrim, when I was down.

261 Q. Pardon?
A. That was only to do with when I was down in Leitrim. They would have put protection down there.
Q. But I mean, you were quite friendly with Assistant Commissioner o'Mahony who was actually the assistant commissioner in charge of crime and Security?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

263 Q. And are you saying that you didn't go to the assistant commissioner with these concerns that you had at this time?
A. I know Assistant Commissioner O'Mahony, I know him for
quite a number of years, we happen to live in the same area. I saw this was brought up last week, I think, in relation to that we would meet socially, yes, and the -- but not frequently, I might not see him for months. I decided that because he was in crime and Security, it was an awkward issue to be bringing up with somebody that you may be bumping into socially, and there was going to be a row about it and I decided I would just go to the person in charge, and it would just -- and also, by the way, in relation to John O'Mahony, the fact that I knew him socially, if you know John o'mahony, there are very -- he observes very strict boundaries.
264 Q. Yes. But I mean, isn't that all the more reason why he would be able to deal with it professionally or depute his -- a detective chief superintendent under his control to deal with it professionally?
A. A decision had been made at a very high level that I disagreed with and feel very uncomfortable talking about this because it is sensitive and I understand
everything that I say here will be reported, so I am not going to go into the specific details. But, I felt that I would talk to the deputy in charge of operations because ultimately the decision that I was concerned about was her decision. It passes up the line. And I ${ }^{11: 52}$ was very, very concerned about it and that is putting it mildly.
265 Q. Well, you see, there is a 20-minute -- or an 18 -minute -- nearly a 19-minute phone call with her the
following -- two days later there, on the 24th February, so what is that phone call about?
A. Which one is that, sorry?
Q. It's there on the 24th February, 13:52, a phone call of 18 minutes 51 seconds.
A. I don't know, I don't know -- I couldn't tell you what the specific conversations and the conversations were about, but I know what they were about -- I know generally what they were about, what I was annoyed about, what was being discussed, but I don't know the specifics.

267 Q. Okay. Well, are you saying that the Commissioner gave you some reassurance about matters, your security matters?
A. I think eventually they were sorted out.

268 Q. Or made some decision?
A. Pardon?

269 Q. Are you saying the Commissioner made some decision about it?
A. Well, I don't know if she made a decision or who made the decision, a decision was made.
Q. Yes. But was something different put in place for you, is that what you are saying?
A. I don't want to go into it specifically. Well, I am not asking you to go into the detail.
A. I was no -- there was no major favours -- there was no favours done for me. It was something I was very seriously concerned about for my family's safety particularly. There had been a lot of issues around
security around my family for many, many years. And I believe $I$ had got it resolved. That's what $I$ can say about it.

We11, was there any discussion in those conversations about Sergeant McCabe?
A. Absolutely not.

Now, the video piece that you shot with Ms. D, was it in the back of your mind, as it were, that it would be shot in such a way that it might be published on-line?
A. I hadn't thought about that because at the time we were -- the Indo group had gone sort of what we call platform agnostic, as they call it, where they -- you would -- it wasn't just a photographer anymore, it was a videographer, and when you did a story you tended to video it as well so you had -- so if, in the event you needed it, it could be used on all platforms, but also it was a very good -- particularly, this was a sensitive story, so it was a good tight record of what I discussed with her, which I gave to the Tribunal.
274 Q. Yes. Ms. McDonald gave evidence yesterday of being involved in some sort of stress-testing process in relation to the proposed article. Were you aware of that at the time or is that something that you had --
A. I was aware they were stress-testing it because I came back, I met some of the senior executives in the Indo in that week, and they decided, it's their decision to run the story, or whatever, how they want to handle it, and they -- I just understood that they were stress-testing it. I'd never had any discussions with

Derbhail McDonald about it, I don't know what she actually did until the I saw the statements only last month.

Yes. And is she correct when she suggested that the article published was different from the article proposed by you or written originally by you?
A. I can't recall the changes that were done. when a story is written, because it goes through the lawyers, it's rinsed through several layers, the story can change several times, you can change -- the nuance of the story can change, there's subtle words and that that lawyers will see to pull out. And Derbhail is a 1egally-minded journalist.
276 Q. Yes.
A. She understands these things.

277 Q. Yes, yes. It's just we haven't been provided with the story as you originally wrote it. Is there a version of that available, and can you make that available to the Tribunal?
A. I don't know if $I$ have it. I don't know.

278 Q. Pardon?
A. I don't know if I have it because my computer will change a few times since, but I don't recall. I would have given them -- I would have given them the video, I would have given them a verbal sort of briefing on it 11:56 and I probably wrote up the version. It wouldn't be a huge amount different to what appeared in the paper, because as I said to you from the beginning, it was -the story wasn't so much about her, what she claimed
happened, but it was about the investigation and her problems with the investigation.

279 Q. Yes.
A. And it was also -- always going to be heavily anonymised.

280 Q. Yes. Now, I did ask you this question the last time about your issue of notes, but I just want to be clear, did you furnish, whether it's the news desk or the editor or whoever, with a written story in advance of their, as it were, screening it, legaling it, stress-testing it?
A. We11, there was --
Q. And, if so, was that a physical copy or was that an electronic copy submitted to them?
A. I can't recal1, maybe it was printed out, but, as I say, what eventually appeared wasn't very different because the person wasn't going to be identified.

282 Q. Yes. We11, in what way was it different, in fact?
A. I can't recall the specifics.

283 Q. Okay. Now, on the last occasion I asked you whether you had any notes of any of the confirmations that Superintendent Taylor gave to you when he phoned you back with them at any stage, and you undertook to look for those notes. Have you found any notes?
A. No, I didn't find them. What I did find, I did find notes from the time I interviewed Ms. D. But I couldn't find the other notes, no.

284 Q. Yes. Now, when you were having the sort of to and fro with Superintendent Taylor, I know obviously from your
answers that you have not categorised that as being a negative briefing, but you were being supplied with information which, on one view, might be thought to be inappropriate to be supplied to a journalist, to confirm details of a sexual assault investigation against a serving member whose name is in the public domain at that time. would you not consider that provision of information to be part of a smear or inappropriate release of information to you?
A. No, I didn't. I told you last year, and I tell you 11:59 again today, that I ask questions for a living.
Q. Yes.
A. And people answer them. Otherwise -- and also, I wanted to know was this, was there this investigation, did it take place.

286 Q. Yes.
A. Was what I was being told, was it the truth.

287 Q. Yes. The Tribunal has heard from other journalists that, whether they took it as a precaution or a matter of fairness, they actually approached Sergeant McCabe, we have heard evidence from a number of them who actually approached Sergeant McCabe to get his side of the story. I am just wondering, it doesn't appear that you did that, am I right about that?
A. I didn't do that, no.

288 Q. And is there any reason why you didn't do that?
A. Because he wasn't going to be identified at the time and, like, this would have been following the editorial meeting, so, no. We were dealing with -- it was the
fact that the Garda investigation may have been flawed. Yes. we have heard from, obviously, Ms. McCann, who had penalty points quashed and was somewhat concerned that it might be -- might embarrass her if it came out. And you had penalty points quashed, that was made public for whatever motive it was made public. And the Commissioner then had penalty points published -- or that it was made public as well. It seems sort of an odd coincidence that two of you would go up to Ms. D and -- in the context of where the Commissioner had taken a very public stance against Sergeant McCabe. would you like to comment or respond to that in any way?
A. Well, you can draw a narrative from that and a conclusion from that. However, that is not the reason why I was up there.

290 Q. Obvious7y, Ms. O'Doherty in her original statement to the Tribunal suggested that there were rumours that you had had access to the investigation file. Now, we have dealt with that. She, I think, clarified it to the extent that, as far as I understand it, she wasn't suggesting that you had necessarily physical possession of it, but you appear to have received details relating to it from Superintendent Taylor. And I am just wondering, did you receive any more details, can you recall, in any of the conversations that you had with Superintendent Taylor?
A. Superintendent Taylor confirmed that there had been an investigation, he confirmed that the file was sent to
the DPP and it came back, there was to be no prosecution, which was run in that very short anonymised story.
Yes. And can I just ask you about the interest that he must have shown in it when you phoned him on the 10th March, or otherwise, and subsequently. Did you tell him -- did you give him a blow by blow of what had -how the interview had gone?
A. No, I kept it very straight. This was critical, this was critical about the guards. It was yet another allegation against the Garda organisation. was Press Officer, presumably you'd take it that he'd be anxious to know if there was some new -- some new arrow coming out of the blue alleging some Garda misconduct or a failure to investigate something properly. Did he show interest in the story you had?
A. He showed interest enough to come back with a response.

293 Q. Yes.
A. I can't recall what the -- you know, it's four years ago. I don't recall exactly what the cadence of his voice was, what his mood was, or anything like that.

294 Q. Yes. No, I understand that. You said you played it fairly straight. But, I mean, did you tell him that you'd got the interview and -- did you give him the bones of it?
A. Oh, absolutely, yes.

295 Q. And what was his reaction? You must have some sort of recollection of how he reacted to that?
A. I can't recall. As I say, my recollection was all fairly straight.
Q. We11, what do you mean by 'straight'? I am not just quite clear what you --
A. He didn't go into anything, he didn't start gossiping, or anything like that, no. To be absolutely clear, the waivers were given by all the protagonists, and that is why I cooperated with the Tribuna1. If Mr. Taylor negatively briefed me in any other regard, apart from what I've told you and what is on the record, then I would tell you, and I would also tell you if Martin Callinan had given me that information, I would also tell you very clearly if Nóirín O'Sullivan had given me that information, because they have given waivers, and I don't have anything to hide in relation to these people.

297 Q. Okay. Just going back to the phone records again at page 4847. This is sort of the period when your article came out on the Sunday, on the 12th April. There appear to have been --
A. The Sunday -- I don't think it was a Sunday. I think it was a Monday --
Q. You think it was a Monday?
A. -- the story came out. I think the story was published -- it was the Irish Independent, it wasn't the Sunday Independent.

299 Q. It wasn't the Sunday Independent. Okay. But that was just slightly confusing, because it appears on one version of it to have been dated on the 12th, which I
thought was a Sunday. But in any event, it came out in the Irish Independent, and Superintendent Taylor appears to have tried to call you on the 12 th, on the evening of the 12 th .
A. If it was the 12th -- probably -- that was possibly the 12:04 eve of publication, because it was five weeks down the road or six weeks down the road from the time I interviewed Ms. D, so -- and we were going to publish.
Q. okay. Well, do you recollect ringing him back or talking to him about the article, saying that, look, it's ready to go or it's coming out tomorrow or --
A. No, I think I was -- they were all 1ast-minute queries. Pardon?
A. Last-minute queries.
A. I can't recall, but $I$-- it's in my head, if it's the 12th, and you say it's a Sunday, it couldn't be. I would presume it was a Monday, in my mind. I don't know why.
303 Q. It's just that it would appear from the timing that those calls are after it has been published.

CHA RMAN The 12th April '14, by the way, was a Saturday.
MR. MEGI NESS: A Saturday. Thank you, Chairman.
Sorry.
304 Q. So it's the Irish Independent on the Saturday.
A. I don't know why it was in my head about the Monday, Chairman.

305 Q

306 Q
.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And what were you checking at the last minute, if I could ask you?
A. We were trying to get some more detail about, is there any more detail, was there anything else there, you know, was there any more information regarding the DPP's decision, or whatever, it could have been that. 12:06 You know, it was there for a long time at this stage.

307 Q. Okay. But presumably --
A. And was there any new developments, was there -- did he find out anything more, anything new.
But presumably he would have to know what you were including, really, to be able to comment on whether there was anything else that you ought to put in it. Did you run the copy of it by him, as it were?
A. No, no, he knew what the text -- he knew the text of the story because of the questions I asked him.
309 Q. okay. But had you filled him in after, as it were, your article had gone through the formal process, it had been looked at by the editors, it had been legaled, stress-tested and then was coming out in a form, albeit slightly different than you had written it, did you now and this is what is going to be in it?
A. No. Didn't have that kind of conversation with him.

310 Q. But, I mean, you must have said something to him?
A. We are publishing the story tomorrow, whatever, and, you know, perhaps I had last-minute questions for him. That is the only way $I$ can interpret the interaction there.
A. I don't, but I don't think it made any difference to the story.

312 Q. And you received a text from Commissioner o'sullivan on the day the article appeared then. If we perhaps just look at that, 4849. It's the second-last entry there at the bottom of the page. Do you recall getting that?
A. No, I don't.

313 Q. Okay. And can you assist the Tribunal what that might be in relation to?
A. I don't -- one thing I can tell you, though, is that Nóirín O'Sullivan never discussed the Maurice McCabe case with me.

314 Q. Okay. And the only other relevant contact then is almost a week later, where she appears to have had a short call with you on the 18th Apri1. Can you assist the Tribunal about that matter?
A. I can't recal1.

MR. MEGI NNESS: okay. Would you answer any more questions, Mr. Williams. Thank you.
CHA RMAN Mr. McDowe11, I am very familiar, as you wil1 appreciate, with what has gone before, and I just wanted to point that out to you, not with a view to foreshortening anything.
MR. MEDONELL: Chairman, I want to point something out
to you - I have no questions for the witness.
CHA RMAR All right. Well, then, Mr. Ferry, have you any questions?
MR. FERRY: Yes, Chairman.
CHAN RMAN Appreciating, again, that, just looking back 12:09 on the 11th, and again I am not trying to foreshorten you, Mr. Ferry, your client's case is that there was on7y one phone cal1, it happened on the day, or certainly it was represented as happening on the day, that is to say the Saturday the 8th March. There was no conversation about confirmation in relation to Pulse or the DPP, and that Mr. Williams had said to Superintendent Taylor that the article he was going to write was about Maurice McCabe destroying this young girl's life. Now, those are the questions that were put before on instructions.

MR. FERRY: Yes, that was back July 1ast year.
CHA RMAN No, I am happy -- I just wanted to put that in focus, and if it's of use to you, it's of use to you. If it's not, it's not.

MR. FERRY: Yes.

## THE WTNESS MAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. FERRY:

315 Q. MR. FERRY: He11o again, Mr. Williams. We already dealt with some of this matter last July. And as you know, I am John Ferry.
A. That's correct, I understand.

316 Q. And I am representing Superintendent Taylor here at the

Tribuna1. And Superintendent Taylor's position is that in relation to the matter the Chairman has just addressed, that his evidence to the Tribunal in relation to there being the one call, that that was in relation to your visit to the home of Ms. D, and that, as the Chairman has alluded to, that that was by way of you just providing information that you had been at the house and that you had conducted an interview with the lady in question. However, Superintendent Taylor has given evidence to the Tribunal that, in relation to the 12:11 issues of negative briefing, that there had been prior communications with you over a period of time and, in relation to that, that you are one of the journalists that he says that he was negatively briefing in relation to Sergeant McCabe. Now, in relation to the evidence that you have given to the Tribunal today and again last July, $I$ think you said that you put a number of queries to him in relation to the investigation and the nature of the investigation and recommendations of the DPP, et cetera. Now, Superintendent Taylor's instructions are that that conversation would have occurred but it would have occurred in the course of different conversations he had with you from the middle of 2013 onwards and that that would have been something that would have been previously discussed with you in relation to Maurice McCabe?
A. Well, I have outlined very clearly, because there is a waiver and I've made no issue about sources or not cooperating, $I$ have told this Tribunal truthfully all
my interactions with Mr. Taylor in relation to this. I am very -- al1 I can say, Mr. Ferry, is that I am very confused as to what Mr. Taylor is saying, because the reason I took the very difficult decision to sit down and go and access my phone records, which I am absolutely loathe to do, and I did it about a month ago, was because he had clearly stated that I had rang him and put in adverted commas a quote that he reports that I made to him when I phoned him allegedly from Ms. D's house, I had no choice but to break my own rules on that and go and -- my lawyer worked out a way of doing, that is why I gave you my phone records, Chairman.

317 Q. Yes. I am just trying to get a reference here, Mr. Williams. Now, yes, I appreciate what you are saying there and I saw your statement where you referred to the previous encounter where he said there was the one interaction. But what I'm saying to you is that when I got instructions from him and what we -what he provided to the Tribunal on your last day at the Tribunal, that that was specific in relation to the visit to Ms. D's house, that there was the one call from you where you told him that you had been in Ms. D's house, but that was not the limit of Superintendent Taylor's contacts with you in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe, and he is saying that there had been previous conversations, and there have been other witnesses here, and again, you have not been privy to this, but Superintendent Taylor's evidence has
been that he was instructed by Martin Callinan to negatively brief journalists in relation to Sergeant McCabe, and that the way he did that was that if an opportunity presented itself at the time when the

Maurice McCabe case was high profile and if he was in

12:15 conversation with journalists, that he would drop that into the conversation, and he says that he had done that with you on a number of occasions prior to you visiting Ms. D's house.
A. That is incorrect.

318 Q. So what I'm putting to you is that the briefing that there had been an allegation of sexual assault, that there had been an investigation by the Gardaí and that the DPP had recommended no prosecution, and that, as a result of that, Sergeant McCabe had an agenda of revenge against the Gardaí and he was motivated by maliciousness against the Gardaí, now Superintendent Taylor says that that conversation occurred with you prior to your visit to Ms. D's house. And that while you are giving evidence here today to say that that is after the visit to Ms. D's house, his instructions are that such a conversation would have taken place in relation to his negative briefing but at a time prior to the interview with Ms. D. Do you understand what he 12:16 is saying?
A. I do understand and it's totally incorrect. Because last year, I think on the instructions from Mr. Taylor, you said to me that $I$ rang him and that was the only
conversation he had with me at all about Dave Taylor -or about Maurice McCabe. That is what I think I was asked last year here.
319 Q. Yes.
A. I did not -- just absolute clarity, he did not lead me -- the whole narrative around this, from the very beginning, when the issues were conflated and I got eviscerated both on social media and by my own colleagues about this, the implication was that I was part of a smear campaign and an effort made to deliberately be directed by Dave Taylor on behalf of Martin Callinan. The reason I ended up in Ms. D's house was because for -- as I have outlined in detail, I got a call one day from John o'Reilly who said the father of this girl wanted to talk to me. I want down to talk to the family. They told me that two other journalists had visited, unsolicited; how did they know her name, where did they -- how did they know where she lived, all of these issues. And that was the reason she was talking to me. So therefore, I had no prior discussion about this at all with Dave Taylor.
320 Q. Yes. And I want to be clear from my own position, Mr. Williams, is that you are saying you were eviscerated, that you were part of a smear campaign. what the evidence of Superintendent Taylor is, is that, not that you were -- that -- he is saying that you were being used as part of a smear campaign in that you were being negatively briefed, but he is not suggesting that the journalist would have known that they were part of
a campaign or known that they were being negatively briefed deliberately, so I'm not saying that you were in cahoots --
A. Well, Mr. Ferry, what you are saying is effectively that Ms. D was working in cahoots with him then. That is the only interpretation $I$ can put on that. But why did she want to come and talk to me? why did she ring her dad and say: I am coming home from college, I want to talk to this guy?

321 Q. We11, I haven't mentioned that aspect of it yet. what I'm dealing with it is the negative-briefing element that you -- that you have said here this morning that you rang Superintendent Taylor and you'd certain queries and you put that in a context that that took place after the visit to Ms. D's house and that you were looking to clarify certain matters, but what I'm saying is that that had -- those conversations with Superintendent Taylor had already occurred in that you were aware, from talking to Superintendent Taylor from mid-2013 onwards, that there had been allegations, et cetera, against Maurice McCabe?
A. No.

322 Q. And they had been investigated. So that was something that you already had knowledge of, Mr. Williams --
A. That is untrue.

323 Q. -- that is what my instructions are. And in relation to his evidence to the Tribunal, where you say that, you know, on the last day he said that was the only conversation. when he was here, he did give evidence
and state that what he meant was that there was no further contact in relation to Maurice McCabe with you after you contacted him about the Ms. D interview, that after that -- that any contacts after that were related to different queries that you had?
A. There was a lot of things going on at that time, there was a lot of queries.

324 Q. Yes.
A. I don't understand the point you are making. The point you are making is that I contacted now Dave Taylor the following week after interviewing Ms. D, put my questions to him and then we had no further conversation about it, is that what you are saying to me? Because I am confused.
Well, you see, first of all, it's not -- it is
confusing, but it makes no sense for us to say that there was no -- that there was only one call from you to Dave Taylor, because there is phone records now have been produced and there is -- you know, there is hundreds and hundreds of contacts during the period that the Chairman is dealing with. So you were a journalist that is in contact with the Press Office as part of your work, which is natural, so -- so, on the last occasion, when we spoke about there being the one contact, what I am saying to you is, Superintendent
Taylor is saying there was one contact in relation to your visit to Ms. D's house. He did not know you were going to Ms. D's house and he received a call from you saying that you had -- you were there in the vicinity
or just recently carried out an interview.
A. He said guess where -- that $I$-- quoted me as saying: 'Guess where I am?' It wasn't a paraphrase, it was in quotes. I never had that conversation with Mr. Taylor.
But in relation to the one contact that's -- if I could 12:21 just -- do you follow me now, that he is saying there was one contact with you in relation to your visit to Ms. D's house, that you rang him?
A. I have to say, Mr. Ferry, I am, to be very fair to you, I am very confused as to what Mr. Taylor, his position is.

327 Q. We11, that is probably my fault, Mr. Williams.
A. I don't think it's your fault, I think it's the -CHA RMAN Look, I can probably summarise it, and it is this: Vis-à-vis the phone call which was either on the 12:21 day or on some day proximate to the day you were down there, he says that you called but that there was only one phone call, there was no conversation about confirmation or the DPP and that you were telling him that you were there and that you were about to write a story about how Maurice McCabe had destroyed a perfectly innocent girl's life.
A. Yes, I recall that.

CHA RMAN In other words, that you weren't seeking any confirmation or any details. But the case now being put to you is, that the reason that phone call was in that format was because he had previously briefed you about the allegation, about it going to the DPP, about the DPP saying no, there should be no prosecution, but
that Maurice McCabe had, and I am going to use the Jack Charlton phrase again, become a bitter little man in consequence of that and had agendas against the Gardaí and was driven by revenge and that he had already told you that, so there was no reason to have any conversation about Pulse or the DPP over the phone in or around the time you were down there. So that is basically the case that is being made to you.
A. That is incorrect.

MR. FERRY: And the -- but do you follow now what I'm saying or what Superintendent Taylor is saying?
A. Yeah. So my visit was a culmination of his work, basically?
329 Q. No, no, that's -- Superintendent Taylor's clear that he had no knowledge of you going to Ms. D's house prior to 12:23 that call.
A. Okay.

330 Q. Now --
CHA RMAN And that is the other -- the other part of the case is that he didn't know you going down there, he didn't direct you down there and nor did he direct anybody else down there or give out any information whereby they might go down there.
A. But he never directed me down there anyway. That is a11 I can say, Chairman.
CHA RMAN I appreciate that is your case. And in that respect, you are on the same page.

331 Q. MR. FERRY: Yes. And under cross-examination by Mr. McDowell on Day 75, Superintendent Taylor, in reply
to a question, put a time-line on when he was, as I say, negatively briefing you, and it's at page 134 on Day 75 , and it's at line 11. He was asked by Mr. McDowel1:
"। see" --

And this is in relation to you, Mr. Williams. He says:
"And as I understand your evi dence, you say that you did informhimthat there had been a complai nt of sexual assault agai nst Sergeant McCabe in 2006 and that he was motivated, his compl ai nts, his current complaints were notivated by a desire" --
A. I don't see it.
Q. Sorry, it's not on the screen.
A. You are ahead of me.
Q. I am sorry. I will wait for it to come up. It's at page 134 and it's line 11 is what $I$ was reading from. So he was being cross-examined by Mr. McDowe11. At the 12:25 top of the page, we will take it perhaps from the top, in fairness, and he says:
"Prior to the ME. Dintervi ew epi sode, what was your rel ationship with Mr. WIllians?"
A. I see that now, yes.

334 Q. And Superintendent Taylor says:
"Well, he would contact me and contact the Press Office
in rel ation to ongoi ng stories. He never turned up at any crime scenes or press conferences or formal events like that.
Q. He was a lone wolf, was he? He was not in the pack, is that it?
A. Well, he had his own di stinctive practice.
Q. I see. And as I understand your evi dence, you say that you did informhimthat there had been a compl ai nt of sexual assault agai nst Sergeant McCabe in 2006 and that he was motivated, his compl ai nts, his current compl ai nts were motivated by a desi re to have revenge agai nst An Garda Sí ochána, that's your evi dence, is it?
A. That's correct.
Q. And can you put any -- gi ven that you cl ai m that you got this instruction in mid 2013, are we to take it 12:26 that you i mparted this information to himon more than one occasi on in late 2013?
A. It would be during 2013 and, as I say, it would be various conversation pi eces around Ser geant McCabe.
Q. I see. And are you saying that you had no inkling 12:26 whatsoever that he was making contact with the D family or ME. D to investi gate her, to investi gate her story? A. Absol utely not."

So that's -- that's Superintendent Taylor's evidence to 12:26 the Tribunal, Mr. Williams. And in relation to his earlier -- the version -- or the instructions that I got in July last year and he says that you were ringing him to inform him of where you were, his instructions
are that there would have been no need for you to put questions to him in relation to had there been an allegation, had it been investigated, what was the outcome of the investigation, nor would there have been any need to follow up with a query about Pulse, because 12:27 you, as with many other journalists, had already been briefed by Superintendent Taylor in relation to that information and were fully aware of it. Do you understand what I'm saying? So there is no need for you to ring up to verify because Superintendent Taylor had already told you of all of this?
A. I understand what you are saying. I understand what you are saying.
Q. Yes.
A. He never briefed me, never discussed Maurice McCabe with me until I phoned him after I interviewed Ms. D. I am absolutely sure about that. I have no doubts in my mind in relation to that, with Mr. Taylor. I hardly new Taylor in 2013, for a start. I wouldn't have a conversation with him. He hasn't given any dates, times, places. I didn't go to crime scenes, I didn't go to conferences, press conferences, so I don't know what he is claiming.

336 Q. Yes. We11, the phone records that I have been provided with are dated from the 28th January 2013, and that's from Superintendent Taylor's contact with you, Mr. Williams, and I have been provided with four pages, and up until the start of June 2014, there is around about, on a rough guesstimate, there is about 100
different contacts?
A. 100 contacts between January 2013 and July of 2014, you are saying?
337 Q.
To -- sorry, I am wrong now in my timeline here. Just bear with me. From January ' 13 to June '13, no, there would be a lot less than that, there would be about maybe 25 or 30.
A. 25 to 30 calls?
Q. Prior to the middle of 2013, which is a period --
A. In the six months?

339 Q. Yeah. So -- but the contacts on these sheets were -these records are starting just from January 2013. I don't know if there had been contact with him in 2012, but he would have been in the Press office from that period on, you know. So there would have been -- there is records of telephone contact between you, obviously, in your role.
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. But one of the other things that you have referred to is that one of your queries was that you had then rang back to ask Superintendent Taylor was the Ms. D matter recorded on Pulse.
A. Mm-hmm.

341 Q. Now, I don't have the records, but my instructions are that Superintendent Taylor has never conducted any
query or asked for any query to be made on Pulse in relation to Ms. D or at that time or around that time, but I don't have access to those records to put it to you, Mr. Williams, but that's -- they are my
instructions in relation to that aspect of your evidence. I don't know if that could be checked out. The Tribunal, I am sure, will look into that. So, in other words, he is saying you didn't -- there was no queries, there was no queries asked of him because you already knew what was required or what the briefing had been in relation to that aspect of --

## A. That's incorrect, Mr. Chairman.

CHA RMAN All right. I don't want to rush anybody, but it's now half past twelve so I am having my lunch. Thank you.

## THE HEARI NG AD OURNED FOR LUNCH

## THE TRI BUNAL RESUMED, AS FOLLOVG, AFTER LUNCH

MR. MEGUNESS: Mr. Williams, please.
MR. FERRY: So what I finished with before lunch, Mr. Williams, was that, in effect, the decision of Superintendent Taylor is that there would have been no need for you to be ringing him with the queries that you're suggesting you had for him, because you were already aware of all those details, that's where I finished up before lunch. And I think that you have said that as part of the evidence that you gave here before, that you were reported on and you were eviscerated and it was alleged that you were part of a smear campaign, and I've already said to you that is not what Superintendent Taylor is saying. He's not saying that you had knowledge of it, but he was saying that you were one of the journalists that he was instructed that he was briefing negatively.
A. Mmm.

343 Q. And you have also -- the evidence has been that there were three journalists that attended at the house of Ms. D. And I think your evidence is that you had no knowledge -- your evidence this morning, am I correct, was that you had no knowledge of the allegation of the sexual assault prior to attending Ms. D's house. Now, we have had evidence before the Tribunal, Superintendent Taylor has given evidence that he was negatively briefing 11 journalists, 1 think, in the list, there's nine to start and then there's another
two that came into the equation. So he was saying that he was providing them all with that information, including that there had been an allegation of sexual assault. And of the three that attended at the house, the other two journalists had given evidence to the Tribunal that, prior to attending, that they had been given information about Maurice McCabe which included a negative element about him, and by that I mean that they had, in addition to being told about the fact that there had been an investigation, they were also told that there was a negative aspect to it and that there was an allegation, and both of them have given evidence, that is Eavan Murray and Ms. Debbie McCann, that they were aware that there was an allegation of sexual assault before travelling to Cavan. Are you with me?
A. Yeah.

344 Q. And we've had evidence from journalists here from a number of newsrooms, and a number of them, I think Michael O'Toole, Mr. Conor Lally, gave evidence that as 13:37 far as back as 2010/2011, that they were aware of rumours about Sergeant McCabe, including negative elements about him, that there was an issue with him. I think Mr. Lally said that he had had a falling-out. He knew about the investigation. In actual fact, they had very specific details of the allegation, the investigation. One of them even gave evidence of the guards recommending no prosecution. His information was that precise. But then went on to say that he had
had a falling-out with Garda management, and that was the start of it. So as far back as 2010/2011, they were reporting that there was rumours going around in their circles in journalism. So we have a situation
where, at the very least, in various newsrooms around Dublin, there was negative rumours about Sergeant McCabe, and, out of all those journalists, three travelled to Cavan to try and interview Ms. D. Two of them have given evidence that they were aware of the sexual allegation against Sergeant McCabe before travelling to Cavan. Now, I have to put it to you that, of all of those journalists, you're the one journalist that has the most contact with members of An Garda síochána, and that's, in fairness to you, part of your career to date and you have suffered a personal price in relation to your own, perhaps, freedom of movement, because you've referred -- I mean, I'm not going to go there, but you have taken a strong line in the journalist world in relation to crime, and that's in fairness to you. But you have given direct evidence 13:39 that, rather than talking to the people on the front line, you have a direct line of communication to the deputy commissioner and to the assistant commissioner in relation to those posts at the time in question, 2013/2014, so rather than talking directly to your on the phone to the deputy commissioner and to an assistant commissioner if you needed to, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

345 Q. Yeah. And prior to travelling up there, and again, this morning, you replied to me when I said that, I wasn't suggesting that you were in cahoots with Superintendent Taylor, with the guards, I think you replied by saying, we11, what I was saying was that Ms. D was working with -- was in cahoots with Dave Taylor and that the only interpretation you could put on it was that, and you said: "why did she come and talk to me? why did she ring her dad and say: I'm coming home from college, I want to talk to this guy?" We11, as I understand the evidence before the Tribunal, the reason why she wanted to talk to you or ended up talking to you was because a local detective superintendent had put her in contact with you.
A. Do you want me to answer that?
Q. Yeah. Am I correct in my understanding?
A. I stand over my evidence that I gave last year and what I have given today. And the D family have given that evidence as well.

347 Q. So when you said earlier on in reply to me, you said, "Why di d she come and tal k to me?", you've already given evidence as to why she came and talked to you, it was because a local detective superintendent who knew all the parties had put them in contact with you and had phoned you in advance of the interview with Ms. D.
A. I explained the whole run-up to that incident. Ms. D had -- her home had been visited by two journalists, she was concerned about it. I've made this -- it's all
there on the record, what $I$ have said, in relation to my testimony last year and this year. There's no point in going over it again. Sorry.
CHA RMAK You've nothing to add? what you are saying is --
A. I don't have anything more to add, no, Chairman.

348 Q. MR. FERRY: Yes. But you had received a call from a detective superintendent in that area?
A. I said last year, to be absolutely clear, absolutely clear to that detective superintendent, he didn't want to know about this. What he told me was that I had been asked, this man here, his daughter wants to talk to you, is it okay if I give him your number, he is going to -- they just want to call you and have a chat with you, it's something to do with Maurice McCabe. I made it very clear last year, and it would be very unfair to him to try and drag him into the middle like he was some conspirator as we11. He was not. And that is the truthful account of what happened. And that is all --

349 Q. Yes.
A. On7y one account can take place. That's it.

350 Q. Yes. But in fairness to my client, you replied earlier on to me with those questions back, that, in other words, the only interpretation you could put on it was 13:42 that, according to what I was saying, was that Ms. D was in cahoots with Dave Taylor and that's why they rang you. So I'm representing the interests of my client, who's position is that he had no knowledge of
your visit to Ms. D whatsoever, and what I am putting to you, that while you have asked that question back towards Superintendent Taylor, why did you come and talk to me, the evidence to the Tribunal is clear, that there was a direct chain of communication as to why Paul williams went to speak to Ms. D and that involved a Detective Superintendent Reilly phoning you and then you arranging to go to the Ms. D's. So while you've asked that question, it's clear that Superintendent Taylor -- there's no evidence Superintendent Taylor had 13:43 anything to do with you going to the Ms. D household. Do you understand? And isn't that the position, Mr. Williams? Isn't it the position that Superintendent Taylor had nothing to do with your visit to Ms. D's household?
A. You're right, my evidence was that Superintendent Taylor did not know I was going up there.
351 Q. Yes.
A. And I did not know until I rang him afterwards with the queries $I$ had. That's it.
352 Q. Yes. And taking everything into the equation, of the three journalists that travelled to Ms. D's house, two of them have admitted that they knew what the allegation was before they went there, that there was an allegation of sexual assault. So, in circumstances
where you had been talking to the local detective superintendent, that you're a journalist of very high standing in crime journalism in Dublin, that it appears to have been widespread in newsrooms about the
allegations around Maurice McCabe, isn't it very unusual that the one man who gets the interview knows nothing about the allegation whatsoever?
A. I've explained all of this, Mr. Chairman.

Yes. And just in conclusion, I put it to you that whatever about those other sources, Superintendent Taylor had previously briefed you in relation to the allegation.
A. That is Superintendent Taylor's position, and I have my own position. Our positions are irreconcilable at the moment and there's nothing more $I$ can do or say about it.

MR. FERRY: Thank you, Mr. Williams.
CHA RMAN Are there any other questions?
MR. HARTY: yes.

THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. HARTY:

354 Q. MR. HARTY: Mr. williams, my name is Mark Harty. I am here on behalf of Gemma o'Doherty. I have some brief
questions to ask you. You said earlier on today that you don't give away -- journalists don't give away an exclusive, they don't reveal it to other journalists, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

355 Q. But journalists do share information, don't they?
A. Sometimes they do, sometimes they don't. It depends if they are working together on a story.

356 Q. But in terms of, if you, for example, are working on a
story that somebody else had reported on a number of years earlier, sometime earlier, you would contact them to get information from them in relation to it?
A. Sorry, the acoustics, I can't hear very well.

CHA RMAN I'm sorry about that, Mr. williams. It's also difficult to pick you up.
A. Sorry. Is that better, Chairman?

CHA RMAN Mr. Harty, if you wouldn't mind, just if you would put the microphone pointing upwards a wee bit and maybe you would just ask that question again.
MR. HARTY: Yes.
357 Q. It is the case that if you are working on a story and there had been previous stories written about it sometime earlier, you would contact the journalist who'd written the earlier story, wouldn't you?
A. Contact who? Sorry, I can't --
Q. If you are working on a story --

CHA RMAN It's a hypothetical kind of question. In other words, it's a question about journalistic procedure.
MR. HARTY: Method.
A. Sorry, I don't get who --

CHA RMAN It's not directed specifically to any particular person; it's just about how journalists operate. That's the question at the moment.
A. Oh, right. I understand, Chairman. If you were working on a newspaper and there was a couple of people working together on the same story, yes, you would be co11aborating.
Q. MR. HARTY: But also if somebody had worked on an earlier story, for example, and that was related to your story in some way, you would check with them in relation to their facts, wouldn't you?
A. I don't know. It'd have to be a specific example. I don't know.
Q. Have you ever contacted another journalist about a piece that you're writing which might have referenced a piece that they had written some years previously or sometime previously?
A. I can't recall off the top of my head, but that's the wonders of the Internet now; everyone's stuff is on-line so you can look up what they wrote before.
361 Q. And you wouldn't check with them?
A. Probably wouldn't be any need to.

CHA RMAN I suppose you're going back -- I think this is Mr. Harty's question. Let's suppose, there was a thing many years ago called the Dowra scandal. Now, I don't know was it a scandal or not, I'm forming no view on it, but $I$ do know it happened a long time ago, and it was about a sergeant who was supposed to be a sound man, or whatever. Now, if you were visiting that story or some aspect of that - again, I am making no comment on it one way or the other - and you knew a journalist had written about it, let us say, 20 years
previously --
A. Of course, yes.

CHA RMAN -- and you wanted to check a few facts.
A. Yes, of course.

CHA RMAN I think that is all Mr. Harty is asking you.
A. Yes, of course.

362 Q. MR. HARTY: Yes. And that wouldn't be uncommon?
A. Probably not. It depends -- as I say, it depends from incident to incident.

Of course. Similarly, in relation to a story that, for example, there was no mechanism for publishing it because of the difficulties with it being a matter which is under investigation - in other words, an exclusive that you couldn't publish, for whatever reason, that information could have been shared between journalists as wel1, couldn't it?
A. I don't know.

Right. Gemma O'Doherty contacted you, isn't that correct, in relation to a story that she was writing?
A. Gemma O'Doherty contacted me about, Chairman, about seven/eight years ago, yeah.
Q. About the Fr. Niall Molloy story?
A. It was about the Fr. Niall Molloy, yes.
Q. She was writing about the Fr. Niall Molloy story and it 13:48 featured to a very small extent in a book that you had written?
A. Yeah, it was a book I published, yeah. It featured aspects of the Fr. Niall Molloy case, yeah.
367 Q. And she contacted you about that. She also wrote -when did you move to Independent Newspapers or when did you start contributing to Independent Newspapers as your principal?
A. I was -- I started working sort of freelance, in the
absence of a contract, around the beginning of 2013, and before that --

368 Q. And as freelance, you didn't maintain a desk in Independent News?
A. I didn't work inside there. I had no real reason to go 13:49 there. I work alone, I work from home. And I have other outlets that I work for as well.
369 Q. But you would attend -- in terms of pieces that you were proposing to submit to Independent News \& Media, I take it you would attend editorial meetings in relation 13:49 to those?
A. I attended one editorial meeting about this case, yeah.
Q. I'm just talking about in general?
A. Pardon?

371 Q. In general, would you attend editorial meetings?
A. No, no, no, I wouldn't, no. Not in general, no, no.
Q. You wouldn't ordinarily attend editorial meetings?
A. I attended a conference that -- I recall attending a news conference between the senior executives about this case after I interviewed Ms. D.

373 Q. And that was the only editorial meeting you have attended in Independent News \& Media?
A. Sorry?

374 Q. Is that the only editorial meeting you have attended, you ever attended --
A. Oh, no, I would have had --

375 Q. -- in Independent News \& Media?
A. No, I would have had -- like, we would have had -- when we did the Anglo tapes, for example, we were on that
for months, and there was only three of us knew about it, and we did have a number of conferences, but that was a very, very comprehensive and involved situation. So I would have been for that. But by and large, no. If I could avoid going into the Indo, I would avoid it. ${ }_{\text {13:50 }}$ 376 Q. You said in your evidence on Day 11, you questioned whether or not Ms. O'Doherty was a journalist.
A. Sorry, can you say that again. The acoustics --
Q. Mr. Williams, when you were giving evidence on Day 11 --
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. -- you were questioned by Mr. Dignam about Ms. O'Doherty, and he said, at page 87 of that:
"Statement of Gemma O Doherty, I think she is a fellow ${ }_{\text {13:50 }}$ journalist, a reporter?"

To which you responded:
"If she is a journalist."
A. Mm-hmm. That's correct.
Q. Are you telling this Tribunal that you did not know or still do not know whether Gemma o'Doherty is a journalist?
A. That was in the context of ms. O'Doherty had left the business some years earlier and I believe she wasn't working as a journalist.
Q. No, you then went on and said:
"I don't know her."
A. I don't know her, that's correct.

381 Q. "I have never worked with her."
A. I have never worked with her, that is also correct.

382 Q. We11, in fact, you had, because she had contacted you about the Fr. Niall Molloy story, isn't that correct?
A. Well, I can explain that to you if you want.

383 Q. Go ahead.
A. She contacted me, Judge -- I brought out a book called 'Bad Fellas' in 2011. It was a sort of a comprehensive 13:51 history of the evolution of organised crime in Ireland from the '60s to the present day. There was a piece in it about John Traynor in the context of that gang with Martin Cahill, 'The General', and John Gilligan and the murder of Veronica Guerin, and Traynor was a player in all of that. And there was this part where I told the story again about the return of a file on Fr. Niall Molloy. Gemma O'Doherty rang me about that in 2011, I can't recall when, but it was after -- it was post the time the book came out. So the book came out I think for the Christmas market, so it was probably late 2011.

384 Q. So are you saying to this Tribunal that when you said "if she's a journalist", you mean if she is still a journalist, is what you meant to say?
A. I understood her to have left the business in 2014, 2013, some time around then.

385 Q. That's not what you said. You said "if she is a journalist". Are you saying to the Tribunal that when Gemma O'Doherty was giving evidence -- or making a
statement to this Tribunal about her recollection while she was working as a journalist, that your question "if she is a journalist" was whether or not she still remains working as a journalist?
A. That's correct.

Yes. She had been a journalist for, I think, 18 years, 17, 18 years in Independent News \& Media, isn't that correct?
A. I never worked with her. I don't know the woman. I spoke to her twice on the phone. I don't know how long she is a journalist or anything, Judge.
CHA RMAN It seems a distinction is being drawn between answering a query and working on a story jointly together.

MR. HARTY: Yes.
CHA RMAK That is, it seems to me, what is being said, Mr. Harty.
MR. HARTY: yes.
388 Q. She wrote articles, in fact, which featured you, isn't that correct?
A. I beg your pardon?

389 Q. She wrote an article which featured you as part of the subject matter about the penalty points?
A. When did she do that and what was the story?

390 Q. When she was -- it was -- I don't have a copy of it in front of me. She referenced it in her own evidence
that she had mentioned you in one of her stories about the cancellation of penalty points.
A. She may have. I don't recall it.
okay. But anyway, you do accept that Gemma O'Doherty was a journalist for all relevant times for all of this, isn't that correct?
A. I don't know, I'm not familiar with Gemma O'Doherty's CV as a journalist or otherwise at the moment so I can't help you on any of that. I thought at the time she was no longer a journalist. You're saying she is a 13:54 journalist, I accept she's a journalist.
392 Q. Lone-wolf reporters who don't go to offices, I presume they still read newspapers?
A. They do.

393 Q. Are you saying to this Tribunal that you've never read Gemma o'Doherty's by-line in a newspaper?
A. After she left the Irish Independent, I didn't, no.
Q. She did, in fact, have other articles after that, Mr. Williams. They've also been referenced here.
A. I don't know.

395 Q. Right.
A. I didn't see it.
Q. Is the Irish Independent the only newspaper you read?
A. I scan through them. You don't get to see the papers every day, unfortunately. You look at them on the app. 13:54 You will scan through what's the main headlines, you know. I don't have the luxury of sitting down and reading the papers cover to cover every day, and you miss the Sunday papers if you are away or something
like that. No.
397 Q. So I take it you know very little about Gemma O'Doherty then?
A. That's correct.

398 Q. Right. So I take it that when you're saying, commenting on people and their relationship, you're not suggesting that Gemma O'Doherty is a politician?
A. Gemma O'Doherty and politicians, what, sorry?

399 Q. Yes. Were you suggesting that she's a politician?
A. Sorry?

400 Q. You gave evidence, Mr. Williams --
A. Yeah.

401 Q. -- that the only people who were spreading the narrative that you were too close to An Garda Síochána were politicians, criminals and subversives, so I am just asking you which of those categories do you believe Gemma O'Doherty falls into?
A. She's a journalist. She's not a politician, she's not a terrorist.

402 Q. Yeah.
A. I said that that narrative was developed by this particular group, with the assistance of some of her colleagues. I'm not thinking of Gemma O'Doherty at all. This started back in 2006, 2005. The crime journalists in particular have been consistently since demonised by colleagues in the business as well, in a very unfair way. People who do -- I'm thinking of Mick O'Toole or Paul Reynolds or any of these guys. And that is the comment $I$ was making. I was asked a
general -- it was a general comment about the state of the business, or whatever, last year.
But you now accept that Gemma O'Doherty doesn't fall into those categories and she is, in fact, a journalist, and wasn't one who was spreading an unfair narrative about you?
A. Pardon?

You accept that Gemma O'Doherty doesn't fall into those categories, was in fact a journalist and was not one who was spreading an unfair narrative about you?
A. Gemma O'Doherty I didn't include when I was making that comment to the Tribunal last year, Chairman. I can't answer it any further than that.

MR. HARTY: Thank you very much, Mr. williams.
CHA RMAN Yes, Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh.

## THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. Ó MU RCHEARTAI GH

MR. Ó MU RCHEARTA GL Thank you, Chairman.
405 Q. Mr. Williams, my name is Fíonán ó Muircheartaigh and I represent Alison O'Reilly. And there are just three topics where you might be able to give us some information to clarify points that have arisen where there may be some conflict of recollection about dates and things. The first is a relatively small matter, but whether you can cast any light on your recollection in relation to were you told anything about Eavan Murray's visit to Cavan. And just to give you a bit of context on that. On Monday of this week, Eavan

Murray's direct evidence was to the effect that she was instructed to go to Cavan by her news editor because there was a big story breaking in Irish News \& Media. She further said, I think, that, having phoned the D family in advance, she met the parents, the parents of Ms. D, and they expressed concern about a video that formed part of your interview. Now, that was strongly suggestive of, and it's not for me to determine, that her visit was after your visit to Cavan. Now, we know, and everybody is agreed, Debbie McCann visited before you went to Cavan. And the question is, simply: were you told by Mr. and Mrs. D that they had been visited by Eavan Murray prior to your going to Cavan?
A. Yes.

406 Q. You were told that?
A. My evidence is as it was last year and what I have said today. They told me that two journalists had called to their home, the D family. As I say, that is an issue that only the D family can clarify. I'm only telling you what I was told by them when I went to --
407 Q. And did they give you the two names at that stage, Mr. Williams?

CHA RMAN Did you get the two names, is what you are being asked? Did you get two names?
A. Yes, I did. Yeah.

408 Q. MR. Ó MI RCHEARTAIGH And those names were Debbie McCann and --
A. Debbie McCann and Eavan Murray, yeah.

409 Q. And just one last point on that: You visited Cavan
twice? You visited Cavan twice, you visited on the 5th March and 8th March, or something of that order?
A. That's right.

410 Q. And were you told that on the first visit or the second visit?
A. oh, the first visit.

411 Q. That you very much. That clears that up. Now, the second point is about the video. Now, were you aware that concerns were expressed by the D family to Ms. Murray about the video? That is her evidence.
A. No, Chairman, they never expressed any concerns about the video. In fact, they agreed to the recording of the interview.
412 Q. To your knowledge, did Ms. D or her family ever ask for a copy of the video?
A. No, they did not.

413 Q. Now, the last point I'd like to touch on is in relation to David Taylor's confirmations to you. And this is more about general process and procedure when you're dealing with the Gardaí and the Press office, but if someone is arrested, would it be the norm of the Press office to confirm the identity of someone about whom a complaint is made?
A. It can do, yes.

414 Q. I know they can do, but would it be the norm of the Press office to confirm the identity of someone about whom an allegation is made?
A. We11, I put the queries - you're talking about these specific queries - I put those queries, I asked those
questions of Superintendent Taylor and he answered them. I don't know what -- and that's the specific case I'm talking about. So I can only answer in that. Mr. Williams, I'd like to understand, this isn't addressed to you, this is about the way the Gardaí handle these kind of things normally and what they may do and what they do do and what they should do. Now, would it be the norm for the Press office to confirm in relation to anybody in this room that an allegation had been made about them, a file had gone to the DPP, is that the norm? Is that acceptable?
A. Well, that's a big question to ask me, if that is acceptable or not. I'm telling you what happened in this case, and the questions $I$ asked and the responses I got. That is all I can talk about, is this case. Because the reason I'm asking these questions is that an interpretation could be put on it that if information is released that an allegation which was found to be baseless was made about somebody in this room, and it's confirmed to anybody, press or otherwise, that such an allegation was made, and that it was of the level that a file went to the DPP, that that, in itself, would constitute negative briefing, particularly if it related to something as heinous as a sexual assault?
A. People, well-known people are being arrested all the time, and supposed to be, you know -- it's supposed to be an investigation that wasn't supposed to be in the public domain, you see their names in the papers all
the time in relation to these things. So it depends, I suppose, on who the reporter is talking to. I don't know.

MR. Ó MU RCHEARTA GH Thank you very much, Mr. Williams.

CHA RMAN I think we are in the position, I think, where it is clear that whatever conversations that there were with Deputy Commissioner o'Sullivan, were in relation to a security matter. She has given evidence to that effect as well. Any conversations with Martin Callinan seem to have been perfunctory and there was certainly no negative briefing, to use that awful phrase, in relation to Sergeant McCabe. That's where I am at the moment. I'm not saying I accept it, but that's the evidence at the moment.
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes. We11, Chairman, that will dispense with half of the very short few questions I was going to ask.
CHA RMAN Yes, I'm not trying to -- it may be helpful you understand where I am at at the moment, but I can't 14:03 say that I accept anything. That is just the evidence, yes.
MR. M CHEÁL O HGG NS: Of course. I'm obliged, Chairman. That is of assistance.

THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. M' CHEÁL O H GG NS:

417 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Mr. Williams, Mícheá 1 O'Higgins

Micheál on behalf of An Garda Síochána, in particular former Commissioner Nóirín o'sullivan and former Commissioner Martin Callinan. Can I ask you just now, I'm going to ask you a couple of questions about the Ms. D articles upon which a considerable amount of focus has been placed. In your view, would it have been responsible journalism to say to the young woman who approached you to publish her perspective, would it have been responsible journalism to say to her, I'm not going to entertain you, I'm not going to interview you, because, for instance, as it has been put, sergeant McCabe is a national hero, would that have been a responsible position?
A. You have to listen to everybody who comes to talk to you. If somebody comes to talk to you about allegations, you're not going to tell them to go away because there's a certain public narrative going on. You talk to the person and you listen to them.
418 Q. Well, as part of the same issue, can I ask you this: would it have been responsible journalism, in your view, to have said to Ms. D or to her family members who approached you initially, I'm not going to interview Ms. D or I'm not going to entertain her request because what she is seeking to do is to make a complaint against the Gardaí concerning misgivings she has in how her complaint was investigated back in 2006, would that have been a responsible journalistic position to adopt?
A. No.

419 Q. Can I ask you then in relation to the -- well, are you satisfied that it was truly the position that Ms. D wanted her perspective explored and actually an article published about it?
A. She certainly wanted to tell her story. It's all very obvious in the video of the interview I gave to the Tribunal. It's all there.
420 Q. Yes.
A. She makes it very clear and I challenge her on that, I challenged her about her motives in that interview.
421 Q. Yes. And, in particular, she was anxious, was she, to voice her criticism of the Garda conduct of the investigation into the original complaint?
A. That's correct.

422 Q. And she also wanted, didn't she, to voice a follow-up 14:06 criticism she appears to have had, or perhaps her family member had, concerning the fact that An Garda Síochána did not put up on Pulse the initial details?
A. She felt that was very serious.

423 Q. Right. So far as you are in a position to do so, are you happy to, if I could use this term, debunk the suggestion that your articles on Ms. D were in any way commissioned or instigated at Garda Headquarters?
A. They were -- the protagonists in this case have all signed waivers, that is why $I$ have had no issue in relation to privilege. If anybody briefed me negatively about Maurice McCabe, I would say it. Number two, one thing that hasn't been said is that if -- when you go back to the editors, you say where
the story came from, you tell them what it is about, who you talked to. If it had come from the guards, you would have to say that, and it wouldn't pass muster, because 'they would say that, wouldn't they' would be the response. Here, we had the principal, the primary source of the allegation, coming forward wanting to express her concerns about the investigation.
424 Q. Yes.
A. So it had nothing to do with Garda Headquarters, good, bad or indifferent.
425 Q. Were you aware or did you subsequently become aware that Sergeant McCabe's side appeared to have been told about the proposal to write the articles on Ms. D prior to their actual publication, is that something you knew?
A. I only discovered that in April gone by when I met with the -- or I think when my solicitor was furnished with some statements from the Tribunal.
CHA RMAN I'm actually missing something there. How do you mean now, Mr. O'Higgins? It's the detail I'm missing. where --
MR. M CHEÁL OHGGS: I'm referring there to the earlier evidence of Ms. McDonald, Dearbhail McDonald, in that she made contact with a representative of Mr. McCabe's side to, as it were, fact-check the story that is yet to be published.
CHA RMAN okay. All right. I see what you mean. I thought it was kind of more in the way of -MR. MCEÁL OHGGN: And she says that in her
statement and confirmed it in evidence.
CHA RMAN Yes, yes. No, I understand. That was a perfectly legitimate exercise as opposed to taking sides, or anything like that.
MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: oh, no, there is no suggestion whatsoever that there was anything illegitimate or improper in that.

CHA RMAN All right.
MR. ḾCHÉL O H GG NS: or improper in the party from whom she sought confirmation engaging in that process at al1, nothing improper suggested.

CHA RMAN Okay.
426 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: And lastly then, Mr. Williams, can I ask you this: You, as well as being a print journalist, it is the case, isn't it, that you also present a radio show on Newstalk Radio currently?
A. I do, yes.

427 Q. And you have been doing that for a number of years?
A. About exactly 20 months. I remember every day of it.

428 Q. I beg your pardon?
A. I remember every day of it.

429 Q. It's an early-morning start?
A. $4: 30$ every morning, Chairman.

430 Q. Yes. During the week or -- just during the week?
A. Oh, Monday to Friday.

431 Q. Yes. Can I ask you this: Insofar as it might be suggested that -- we11, can I put it bluntly: You have directed criticism, have you not, not only at An Garda Síochána on that programme, but, quite routinely, you
are directing criticism, in fact, in the direction of former Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan, right up until the time she retired?
A. And Garda management and also in the Irish Independent.

And it would be fair to say you are not a cheerleader for the guards or for Nóirín O'Sullivan?
A. Absolutely not.

MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Thank you.
CHA RMAN All right. Mr. McGuinness, was there anything else?
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.

## THE WTNESS MAS RE- EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NESS:

433 Q. MR. MEGU NNESS: Mr. Williams, you may recall this
morning I was asking you about a couple of phone contacts that you had with Superintendent Taylor on the 6th and 7th March, and you explained that by reference to an arrest and solicitors letters, and can you confirm that, in fact, you instructed your solicitor to offer the Tribunal the facility of seeing those 1etters, which he has on his computer, to verify those facts, if necessary?
A. I discussed that with my solicitor at lunchtime. I think he may be able to help you on that.
434 Q. Yes. And he has made that offer to the Tribunal.
A. Yes. The letters came in around that time.

435 Q. A11 right. Thank you. Secondly, Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh was asking you about the video, and obviously just in
the context of your contacts with Ms. D after the 8th March, there is, I think, five texts and three or four phone calls within the space of three days?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

436 Q. Have you any recollection what the texts or the phone 14:11 calls were about?
A. I can't, I can't.

437 Q. A11 right. Can I ask you this question then: In the context of the video interview, did you ask her to sign any document in connection with that or what it would be used for?
A. No.
Q. Or did you explain to her who might see it or where it might go or who might have access to it?
A. I explained to them that -- well, first of all, it wasn't going anywhere, and it didn't go anywhere as far as I'm concerned, but that, you know, it would be all down to what we would find out afterwards. There was no guarantees that anything was going to be published or that any story was going to make it anywhere into the public domain.

439 Q. Yes. But did she ask for it to be shot on an anonymous sort of basis, if you know what I mean, without revealing her face?
A. When you're talking to people who are making an
allegation like that, that would be the intuitive way of doing it anyway.

440 Q. I'm just wondering then, can you exclude the possibility that some of the texts or phone calls
afterwards might have related to some discussion about what might happen it or concerning a worry in relation to it?
A. The D family, Ms. D didn't express any fears to me about anything like that, and then I'm sure you can ask 14:13 them yourself, whatever.
441 Q. All right. And just one final matter. The investigators asked you about this and you were shown a document, if we could look at page 4852. This is a letter dated -- purported to be dated the 26th February of 2014, and Sergeant McCabe, when being interviewed by Mr. Guerin, read a fragment of it to Mr. Guerin in connection with an allegation of sexual assault of a minor.
A. I'm aware of this, yeah.

442 Q. So that was on the 1st April. And he told Mr. Guerin that his counsel had got it from the Irish Independent --
A. I read the statement --

443 Q. -- a couple of weeks earlier than that?
A. He told Mr. Guerin that he got it -- that his counsel, Mr. McDowell, got it from Dearbhail McDonald in the Irish Independent. I read that. In 2014, this was?
444 Q. Yes.
A. I saw that, yeah.

445 Q. And Sergeant McCabe then made a statement explaining his understanding of it. But the relevant portion is on page 4855 , if we could perhaps just look at that. we've also been informed that Prime Time received this
at the end of February.
And we belatedly received a copy of that, a version of that letter from them since.
A. Prime Time received it when?

446 Q. In February 2014.
A. Is this the same document?

447 Q. Yes.
A. oh, right, okay.

448 Q. But just in the context of this issue as to whether it came to the Independent, did you ever see this letter before?
A. The first time I ever heard about this document was in April when the Tribunal contacted my solicitor, and I saw it then the next day. I had no knowledge of it, never saw it before in my life.

449 Q. And you heard no talk of it, about having been received or --
A. Never heard of it.

450 Q. -- going the rounds --
A. No.

451 Q. -- or going to any other news organisations --
A. No.

452 Q. -- or chitchat. Ms. Hannon referred to it in a broadcast in July 2016 on a Prime Time programme.
A. No.

453 Q. Did you pick up the reference from that at any stage?
A. No.

454 Q. In any event, this played no part in your knowledge or information or decision-making?
A. No, and I also am very cognisant that my colleague Dearbhai 1 McDonald made a very unambiguous statement stating that she never saw this document and never gave it to Mr. McDowell.
455 Q. No, I understand that, but I am just --
A. So I don't know the provenance of it, I don't know where it came from.

MR. MEGU NESS: I'm just anxious to get your evidence on the matter to advance matters. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams.

CHA RMAN It's kind of important maybe, Mr. McGuinness, given that this is on the screen, to note that, in fact, the details there are completely at variance with the complaint as such, just in case anyone takes it at face value, it's a poison pen 1etter.

MR. MEGI NESS: I'm not asking about the detail. CHAN RMAN No, no, I appreciate that, but I'm just thinking from the point of view of people looking at it for the first time, they may jump to a conclusion. MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. CHA RMAN Thank you very much.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MG. LEADER: The next witness, sir, is Mr. Paul Reynolds. Mr. Reynolds' interview with the Tribunal investigators is in volume 18, beginning at page 5088 of the materials, and Volume 20 onwards deals with the
broadcasts on the 9th May 2016.

## MR. PAUL REYNOLDS, HAV NG BEEN SUORN, MAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MG. LEADER:

MR. REYNOLDS: Good afternoon, Chairman.
MG. LEADER: Mr. Reynolds, you're the crime correspondent with RTÉ, and I think you've held that position for over 20 years, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

457 Q. If you would outline your career in journalism and how you got to that position, please, in summary, for the Tribuna1.
A. I have been a journalist for almost 30 years. I have been employed by RTÉ for about 27 years, and I have been their crime correspondent since 1996, since the murder of Veronica Guerin.
458 Q. Okay. And I think you know former Commissioner Callinan and former Commissioner o'sullivan, and if you would explain briefly, please, how that association, if 14:17 we can call it association, developed?
A. Well, I know them because they're senior gardaí and I have interviewed them on the record on television, on radio, plenty of times, and I have a personal -- or, I beg your pardon, $I$ have a professional and personable relationship with them.
459 Q. And I think, in particular, former Commissioner O'Sullivan said that, I think the phrase was, you went up through the ranks together, is that roughly correct?
A. No, I wouldn't dispute that.

460 Q. And what about Commissioner Callinan, would he be more senior, perhaps?
A. Well, he was more senior.

461 Q. Yes.
A. Perhaps we did go up through the ranks together, but --

462 Q. You'd know him on the same basis, is that --
A. Pretty much so. I would have dealt with him at court cases. He was at some high-profile cases in the Special Criminal Court.

463 Q. Okay. And Superintendent Taylor?
A. Yes.

464 Q. How long do you know him?
A. I first him when he was appointed Press officer.

465 Q. Okay. And that was in 2012?
A. That is correct.

466 Q. Did you have any previous knowledge of him in any way?
A. No.

467 Q. All right. Now, just, obvious7y you've long dealings with the Garda Press office, and if you could just outline generally did the way the Press office worked vary from press officer to press officer?
A. No, not particularly.

468 Q. A11 right. And if you could explain to me how your dealings with the Press office worked, so with Superintendent Taylor, it was the same with every other --
A. It's pretty straightforward: If something happens or if I hear about something and I need to check
something, I just contact them and they give me the official line or the details that they have available, and that's it.
And when you're contacting the Press office, is it in any particular way? Is it by phone? By email?
A. Usually by phone.
Q.
okay. And in relation to meetings, face-to-face meetings, do you have any face-to-face meetings with the Garda Press office?
A. You'd meet press officers at particular scenes, press conferences, murder scenes, that sort of thing.

471 Q. All right. When Superintendent Taylor was appointed to the Garda Press office, did you make it your business to introduce yourself to him, or anything like that?
A. Yeah, I met him when he became the Press officer and I made him aware of me and he became aware of me, because he is the Press Officer for the Garda Síochána and I'm the crime correspondent for the national broadcaster, I needed to have a relationship with him as much as I needed to have a relationship with every other press officer.

472 Q. And was that arranged in a formal way or was it more --
A. No, actually what happened was, the previous press officer, John Gilligan, when he was leaving the post, he made an arrangement for a number of crime reporters to meet Superintendent Taylor in an informal setting. So that is where I first met him.
473 Q. Right. Now, in relation to Sergeant McCabe, have you met him other than in the context of this Tribunal?
A. No, I have never met him.
Q. All right. And obviously never --
A. At least I don't think I have.

475 Q. A11 right. I think you may have phoned him on occasion, is that correct?
A. Yes.

476 Q. We will come to that in due course.
A. okay.

477 Q. Right. Obviously you were aware he was a person of interest in Garda circles and media circles?
A. A person of interest?

478
Q. Sorry, yes. Maybe a public figure, somewhat public figure?
A. We11, he became a public figure when his name was first mentioned, as far as I know, in the Public Accounts Committee.

480 Q. okay. When do you --
A. January 2014.

481 Q. A11 right. Were you aware of him before that?
A. I think I would have been aware of him probably from the middle of 2013. Now, I know, and I've only become aware of this at this Tribunal, there was an article in The Sunday Times in 2010, and I think I would have read 14:21 that article at the time.
Q. Right. That is the article --
A. By John Mooney, where he was first named in public.

483 Q. Yes.
A. But I had forgotten about that. I may have read it, but I wouldn't have connected it, if you know what I mean? I may have recognised the name at the time but I'd forgotten about it. But the only time I became aware of him was really in relation to the penalty points issue, and that would have been around 2013.

484 Q. Okay. And did you know anything about the Byrne/McGinn investigation?
A. I didn't really. I just knew it was ongoing, but I wasn't really aware of the details of it.

485 Q. A11 right. And were you aware of any association Sergeant McCabe had with that investigation?
A. No, not at the time. Obviously, since, the o'riggins Commission has reported.
486 Q. Al1 right. Now, I think, I won't open them unless you want to, but you're aware that former Commissioner Callinan, former Commissioner O'Sullivan and Superintendent Taylor have signed waivers in relation to --
A. Yeah.

487 Q. -- any contacts they had with the media in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. I'm aware.

488 Q. And you've no reason to think that they were signed otherwise than freely, isn't that right?
A. I don't know.

489 Q. We11, do you have?
A. Well, I don't know, I don't know. Well, I mean, they signed the waivers.

490 Q. Yes. And you're aware of Superintendent Taylor's wish that journalists would cooperate with the Tribunal and speak freely to the Tribunal in relation to any dealings he said that he had with journalists in relation to Sergeant McCabe?
A. I'm aware he has expressed that, yes.
A. Mmm .

492 Q. Now, if I could ask you what knowledge you had in relation to the $D$ allegation and how that came about, please, and when?
A. I think I first heard that there had been an allegation some time around 2013, but I heard it all together, if you know what I mean, I heard there had been an
allegation but that there was nothing to do it, and then I heard four facts in relation to it: I heard the fact that there was an allegation, $I$ heard the fact that there was an investigation, $I$ heard the fact that a file had been sent to the DPP and I heard the fact that there was no prosecution. And that's it.
493 Q. okay. So you think that was in or around --
A. I think it was in around 2013.

494 Q. And can you be any more precise than that?
A. I can't, to be honest with you, because once I heard that the DPP had decided there was no prosecution, it was -- as far as I was concerned, it was nothing to do with me as a reporter.

495 Q. okay. So just to recap on that, you heard four facts.

Now, you knew it was Sergeant McCabe, is that correct?
A. I think I did, yeah. We11, yeah, I did.
Q. Yes. Was that said to you, do you think or --
A. Yeah, I think it was in the context of the penalty points when the issues were being raised and that this had emerged.

497 Q. A11 right.
A. It had emerged that there was -- there had been an allegation, but there was nothing in it.
498 Q. So there was an allegation?
A. And there was nothing in it.

499 Q. Nothing in it. And the nature of the allegation --
A. And then I became aware -- child abuse, as far as I understand. There was an allegation of abuse made against him.
500 Q. And at that time did you know it was child abuse or an allegation --
A. Sexual abuse, I think.

501 Q. And did the word 'child' or --
A. Perhaps 'minor' or 'child', yes.

502 Q. And file went to the DPP?
A. File went to the DPP. Investigated, file went to DPP, no prosecution.
503 Q. A11 right. And you say that was in or around 2013?
A. Mmm.

504 Q. Did you hear it again after that?
A. I don't think I heard it -- I may have, but I always heard it in the context where there was no prosecution. I mean, it was always -- I can't -- I can't really say

I did, because I wasn't particularly concerned with it, but I can't really say I didn't either. But if I did, it was always in the context that there was nothing in it, that everybody seemed to know there was nothing in it. Anybody I knew, knew there was nothing in it.

505 Q. We11, what you say in your statement is:
"I heard of an allegation of sexual wrongdoing had been made agai nst Sergeant McCabe. It would be impossible to recollect when or wherel first heard about it, but I do know that the allegation was circulating for a time in media, Garda and political circles."

I knew I wasn't the only one that was aware of it.
506 Q. All right. So just to break that down a little bit, did you hear it in media circles and then differently in Garda circles and in political circles?
A. I knew it was in the -- I knew that people knew about it.
507 Q. Yes.
A. I knew politicians knew about it, I knew journalists knew about it, I knew Gardaí knew about it, but I also knew myself about it and I knew there was nothing in it.
508 Q. Okay. Did you make any further inquiries about it in relation to satisfying yourself that the DPP had directed no prosecution?
A. Well, once I was told that, once I was told there was no prosecution, that was the end of it.

509 Q. okay. And you're happy to take that without checking that out further?
A. Oh, yeah, because, we11, I believed then and I believe now that if there was something in it, I would have heard about it because it would have gone through a process.
A. There would have been a charge, there would have been a court case, there would have been something public and on the record that $I$ would have been able to identify, and there was nothing like that.
511 Q. And that was your thought process?
A. Yeah, I knew once -- once I was told the DPP had said there was nothing, I knew there was nothing, because there was nothing in any formal sense. We would have known if there was a court case, we would have known if there was an arrest.
512 Q. Right. And when you heard about it, was that linked in any way to Garda McCabe's supposed motivation?
A. No.

513 Q. Okay. Was it ever suggested when you heard about it at that time in 2013, that Sergeant McCabe was somewhat embittered as a result of the investigation?
A. No, I've never heard that, and that didn't make sense to me.
514 Q. All right. And why do you say that?
A. Because he was exonerated.

515 Q. A11 right. And that's your thought process --
A. Yes.

516 Q. -- with that. A11 right. Now, if I can just deal with what Superintendent Taylor says in relation to you and give you an opportunity to respond to it. If I could first of all go to Day 74 , it will come up on the screen in front of you, it's at page 122. And Superintendent Taylor is being asked about a list of nine journalists he provided to the Tribunal here, and what he is saying is, at line 13:
"Here's a list of ni ne there--"

That is the question to Superintendent Taylor, do you follow me?
A. Yes.

517 Q. "-- isn't that correct? The context of that is these are the journalists identified by you as having been brief ed negativel y about Maurice McCabe in the terns you' ve told us you recei ved your instruction."

And further down there, he refers to you at line 25:
"Mr. Reynol ds there, that's Mr. Reynol ds of RTÉ, is it? A. That's correct."

So he's nominating you as one of nine journalists at that stage that he briefed negatively in relation to Sergeant McCabe.
A. Mmm.

518 Q. That is what he says there. Now, in relation to you in
particular, it's at page 126 of the transcript, again, at line 12:
"Q. Can you hel p us perhaps as to how you say you bri efed Mr. Reynol ds or not?
A. I did.
Q. Can you hel p us as to how you said you did it on any particular occasion?"

And the answer is:
"As I have said previously, it was opportuni stic, where the situation would present it, it would be at scenes, at press conferences, cormi ssi oner conferences, where we'd have conversations on the margins and the matter would come up. I cannot identify specific dates but it was opportuni stic."

Al1 right. You see that there?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

519 Q. And in relation to the matter of negative briefing, what Superintendent Taylor says, that constituted telling people about the D allegation and linking it in to Sergeant McCabe's motivation in making complaints in relation to low Garda standards and penalty points.
All right. And what do you say in relation to negative briefing generally or specifically in relation to Superintendent Taylor?
A. well, that didn't happen. And anybody who knows how
reporters work in the field, knows that that, you know, couldn't happen the way it is explained there. If I can give you an example, Chairman. For example, I go to a lot of murder scenes. They're busy places. I arrive with a camera crew or a satellite van. I get at 14:31 the scene. I have to find out what is going on, what happened, what are the details. I'm moving around, I'm trying to identify if there are any eyewitnesss. I'm trying to -- we're trying to, you know, for everything, to try and find parking for the satellite van and trying to find location for a live view. You're trying to find out what happened, who the victim is, what the situation is, what the circumstances are. You're waiting for the guards to arrive, you're waiting for, is there going to be a press briefing, there may be a press briefing and whether it's at the scene or whether it's at the Garda station, and the senior officer wil1 arrive and that is usually when the press officer will arrive. So the press officer will be in the company of the senior investigating officer. But when Dave Taylor 14:32 was the Press Officer, more often than not he would do it himself. I would be just one of a number of journalists there. There's a thing called the huddle, where the microphones are set up, we're in a group, and in many cases $I$ tend to be asking all the questions because I have responsibility both to television and radio, so we tend to try and put an elongated interview on the radio, and you're asking questions about the murder and the circumstances, you're getting as much
information as you can so you can broadcast it. Once you have that information, you're gone to the satellite van, you're trying to get the stuff together. The idea that someone would come in, or, you know, that a press officer would sidle over to you and -- in the middle of a particular story and try and talk to you about something completely innocuous, completely different, you know, it doesn't make sense, really, and it's not -- it wouldn't happen. And how was I separated, you know, the goat, how was I separated from the sheep within the huddle, that we're all there, we're all trying to work on this story, so how was I separated for this particular negative briefing, how were journalists separated, how were other journalists not separated? It just doesn't make sense to me. I can't see how it is possible.

520 Q. Okay. Well, I think Mr. O'Toole, when he gave evidence, seems to be of a similar view. Maybe he didn't expand on it as much as you have.
A. Probably didn't go on as long as I did.

521 Q. I think, yes. Well, what about commissioner conferences, so, would there be an opportunity there for negative briefing?
A. Journalists tend to move in a herd.

522 Q. Yes.
A. So, I mean, the idea that he would introduce this particular issue completely out of the blue within a situation and within a context, just doesn't make sense. And the idea that, from his previous evidence,
that he would say that people like me would just -- you know, we might be animated and chatting away and then suddenly he would introduce this Sergeant McCabe story and we would freeze and we would just listen and we would take it all in and we would say nothing and we wouldn't respond, as if we just sort of went into a daze or -- and soaked in all this information, and then when that was finished we could go back to normal, being animated and chatty, you know, it doesn't -- it just doesn't make sense to me.
All right. Now, I don't think he specifically says he spoke to you on the phone in relation to the matter, but if I can just maybe go through the phone contacts Superintendent Taylor had with you. They begin at page 5127 and they start on the 3rd August 2012, and I think they go on until page 5139 of the materials in relation to you. They stop in June 2014. So there are a lot of contacts there.
A. Yes. There was a lot of things happening.

524 Q. Yes. And maybe if you could explain how those contacts, what are they about? And not every one of them, but just in general terms. Were any of them in relation to --
A. I'm the crime correspondent for RTÉ.

525 Q. Yes.
A. I cover crime stories, justice stories, for radio, television, on-7ine, and I cover it on a 24 -hour basis. And there are organised crime feuds, there are murders, there are drug seizures, there are gun seizures.

There's a crime story nearly every day of the week. Some media outlets, some newspapers, almost focus solely on crime, and there's a crime story on the front page of the newspapers nearly every day. So there's always a crime story to be covered. I think in relation to -- I do, on average, 200 television stories every year and they're all crime and justice stories. And as regards that contact with the Garda Press office, is a necessity in my business.
Right. So can I take it from that, you weren't speaking to Superintendent Taylor in relation to the D matter?
A. No.

527 Q. You're happy to confirm that?
A. I'm sure of that. I don't even know who Ms. D is.

528 Q. All right. If I could just turn page 5140, it's a list of your contacts -- no, I should say Commissioner o'Sullivan's contacts with you. From September 2012 there's some, October 2012, December 2013, January 2014, February 2014, March 2014, April 2014 and May 2014. You see that? It's reasonably regular contact with the former Commissioner?
A. I had no contact with the former Commissioner, either former Commissioner in relation to the terms of reference of the Tribunal.
so in relation to Commissioner Callinan's contacts, I think they were also --
A. The same applies for him.
Q. Page 5141 of the materials. You see there, they're

November, December 2012, January, February, May, August, December 2013, February 2014 and March 2014. And you can confirm in relation to the terms of reference --
A. Not related.

531 Q. All right. Did you ever speak to the Commissioners about Sergeant McCabe?
A. I'm not sure. I don't -- I don't believe so. Certainly not in relation to any negative connotation.
532 Q. okay.
A. Definitely not.

533 Q. And when you say 'negative connotation', are you specifically referring there to motivation for making complaints?
A. Sure.
Q. Being otherwise than a genuine concern for low Garda standards?
A. Sorry, could you repeat that.
Q. Well, his motivation being otherwise than being genuinely concerned about low standards in An Garda Síochána?
A. Oh, no, he was genuinely concerned.
Q. Yes. And did any of the Commissioners suggest otherwise to you?
A. No, no, no.
or suggested to him that he should talk to the boys up there in relation to Sergeant McCabe, and he took it that it meant Cavan-Monaghan. All right. And he has specifically suggested that this took place sometime around a committee meeting in the Dáil and, in particular, one in February 2014, 19th February 2014.
A. We11, the first time I heard about this was when this was brought up last week. And when I was given the detail of the statement, I was able to check -- of Mr. Kenny's statement, I was able to check, and I wasn't at the committee meeting where he says this conversation took place. I wasn't detailed on duty that day for that committee meeting. I wasn't there that day, I was $i 11$ that afternoon. And the conversation that he alleges didn't happen.
okay. well, he seems very sure that he spoke to you in particular in relation to Sergeant McCabe, and he's not suggesting that it was by way of spreading gossip about Sergeant McCabe, or anything like that; he's suggesting that he specifically sought out information in relation to Sergeant McCabe, looking for the benefit of your experience, long experience in reporting crime-related matters.
A. I never spoke to him about Sergeant McCabe.

539 Q. Okay. Well, how can you be certain of that?
A. I know it didn't happen. wel1, I mean, to be honest with you --

540 Q. Leaving aside the date, the date is wrong --
A. Well, if you look at his statement, first of all. I
mean, it is factually incorrect, first of a11, that I wasn't there at that time.

541 Q. okay.
A. Secondly, I was here for some of his evidence last week when he said that his corroboration for the conversation was that the fact that he, quote, took immediate steps to check the veracity of this conversation that he was supposed to have with me and he said he went straightaway to Sergeant McCabe and that Sergeant McCabe showed him the DPP's directions, and it was pointed out to him at the Tribunal that Sergeant McCabe couldn't have done that. So not only was the -- did the conversation not happen, but the corroboration that he used for the conversation didn't happen.
Al1 right. So you're pointing out that it couldn't have happened on that particular date, is that correct?
A. well, it definitely didn't happen on that particular date.
543 Q. okay. And I am suggesting to you perhaps Mr. Kenny got 14:42 the date wrong. Could it have happened on any other date?
A. We11, first of all, the conversation didn't happen.

544 Q. Yes.
A. That's the first thing.

545 Q. Yes.
A. I cover a lot of Oireachtas committees, particularly in relation to the justice and crime matters. It is possible that Mr. Kenny was at one of those meetings
and it is possible that he came over to me. But if Mr. Kenny came over to me, I would have acknowledged him and had no further conversation with him. I have no wish to cast any aspersions on Mr. Kenny or get into any dispute or spat with him. The man is mistaken.

546 Q. Okay. And you seem to be very sure that you wouldn't have any conversation with him, why is that the case?
A. Well, now, you're pushing me on this, and I don't wish to speak negatively of him.
547 Q. Yes.
A. But I can give you a simple answer.

548 Q. Yes.
A. For the last five years, Mr. Kenny has been writing disparagingly and factually incorrectly about me.
549 Q. Yes. Okay. Well, you have made yourself clear in relation to that.
A. And I have no wish to criticise the man.

550 Q. Yes. Now, if I could just take you to the O'Mahony inquiry and Sergeant McCabe's cooperation or non-cooperation with the o'mahony inquiry. If page 7381 of the materials could be brought up on screen, please. Now, as $I$ understand it, this is the text of an RTÉ script.
A. That's my copy, I wrote that.

551 Q. That's your copy?
A. I wrote that.

552 Q. A11 right. If we just go through it, what it says is:
"The Garda Commi ssi oner wrote to the whi stlebl ower,

Ser geant Maurice McCabe, 14 months ago and tol d himto cooperate with the investigation into allegations that penalty points had been cancelled. Martin Callinan issued a direction to the sergeant on the 14 th Decenber 2012 to cooper ate with the investigation bei ng carried out by the Assistant Commi ssi oner John O Mahony and di recting hi mto bring any information or concerns he had to the i nqui ry. The Garda Sí ochána is a di sci pl ined force and members are requi red to comply with di rections issued by the Commissioner. It is understood that Ser geant McCabe may have been on sick leave for a number of months from December 2012 and did not contact the assistant commi ssi oner until April 2013, by whi ch time the investigation had been compl et ed. "

And then it goes on and refers to the evidence Assistant Commissioner O'Mahony gave to the Public Accounts Committee in relation to his contacts with Sergeant McCabe once the report had been completed. Now, where did you get your information for that? CHA RMAN Just going to that question, Ms. Leader. ME. LEADER: Yes.

CHA RMAN I know it's been mentioned umpteen times, but if you would just put a date on it, if you wouldn't 14:45 mind, this particular thing.
MS. LEADER: Maybe the writer could tell us, because it's not specifically --
A. It's 24th February, isn't it, 2014?

```
553 Q. 24th February 2014?
    A. Yeah, that's correct.
554 Q. You wrote it on that date?
    A. Yes.
555 Q. Is that correct? And where did you get your
        information for that?
    A. I had sight of the direction.
    556 Q. The direction?
    A. And I wrote it on the basis of the direction.
    5 5 7 \text { Q. Okay. And was it on the basis of the direction alone?}
    A. Yes.
    558 Q. Okay. Did Superintendent Taylor give you the
        direction?
    A. No.
    559 Q. Okay. It was somebody else?
A. Yes.
560 Q. Okay. Now, I think it was suggested to Sergeant McCabe that you tried to contact him after writing this?
A. Can I give you the chronology of this, just to clarify it, because it's been spoken a lot about.
561 Q. Yes.
A. This is a report that went on-1ine.
562 Q. If you just take your time.
A. Yes. No, this is a report that went on-1ine at 14:28.
563 Q. On the 24th February?
A. On the day.
564 Q. Yes.
A. I saw the direction, I reported the fact that the direction had been given to Sergeant McCabe.
```

CHA RMAN We're talking now about the direction of the 14th December 2012.
A. That's correct.

CHA RMAN Yes.
A. That's correct, Chairman, yes. But I had also sought a 14:46 response on the record from Garda Headquarters and I had also sought a response from Sergeant McCabe. I got a response from Garda Headquarters an hour, hour-and-a-half later.
ME. LEADER: If you just stop there. was that on the phone or was it --
A. It was on the phone.

566 Q. On the phone?
A. From Superintendent Taylor, who gave me the official line -- as the official Garda Press Officer, he gave me 14:47 the official Garda line, that the Garda Commissioner said this was a direction, and I changed -- I updated the story with this development. And if you look at then the copy from four o'clock on, the story was that the Garda Commissioner says he told Sergeant McCabe to cooperate with the inquiry, and continued in that vein. I also sought a response from Sergeant McCabe. I didn't speak to him until later that evening and he declined to give me a response, which is his right. He told me he was giving his response to Prime Time, which 14:47 he did. Prime Time broadcast that response. And when I saw that response, $I$ incorporated it into -- I updated the report again to include his comments and his view of the situation, and that was broadcast that
night and on to the next morning into the Morning Ireland programme on the radio bulletins. The story never appeared on television.
567 Q. Okay. So just in relation to this particular text, the Garda Commissioner wrote to the whistleblower Sergeant McCabe, that was the first time you wrote it, is that correct?
A. That's the first --

568
Q. Draft?
A. Well, no, it's actual a copy.

569 Q. okay.
A. It's the first story. But the stories, you know, they change and develop throughout the day.
570 Q. And when you say it's the first story, so it appeared at what time?
A. It appeared on-line --

571 Q. On-1ine.
A. -- at twenty-eight minutes past two.

572 Q. Twenty-eight minutes past two.
A. And it was changed, I think, before four o'clock.

573 Q. Okay. So that is your first --
A. Report.

574 Q. The first report. You spoke to Superintendent Taylor after the first report, is it?
A. I may have spoken to him before it, looking for a

```
576 Q. All right. So a second version --
    A. Yeah.
    577 Q. -- appears. And the Garda Commissioner writing doesn't
        appear in the second version?
    A. It does.
    Q. It does?
    A. Yeah, it begins with -- the second version begins with
        "The Gar da Commi ssi oner sai d -- "
    Q. Said. okay.
    A. "-- that he wrote to the whi stl ebl ower Sergeant MLCabe
        14 mont hs ago and tol d hi mto cooperate."
    Q. Al1 right. And that appeared?
    A. From four o'clock on.
    5 8 1 ~ Q . ~ F r o m ~ f o u r ~ o ' c l o c k ~ o n .
    A. And then it also appeared -- I did what is called an
        audio, which is a radio report.
    Q. Yes.
    A. And it appeared in the radio reports from five o'clock
        and six o'clock.
    583 Q. And that was the Garda Commissioner said he wrote?
A. Yes.
584 Q. Yes. And then it was corrected later on?
A. Well, it wasn't wrong.
Q. Yes. No, from Sergeant McCabe's point of view. It wasn't wrong because you got the information from earlier on?
A. I had seen the direction.
586 Q. Yes.
```

A. I got a response from Garda Headquarters. I saw the response from Sergeant McCabe, which he declined to give me, but which went out on Prime Time, and then I incorporated it as soon as I possibly could.
587 Q. I wonder could you, at some stage this evening, furnish 14:50 the later reports to the Tribunal?
A. Sorry, I thought the Tribunal already had them.
Q. It may be possible we have.

MR. G LLANE: I think this came up on a previous occasion. I indicated to you, chairman, it's available 14:50 on-line, and you indicated that is enough. But if there is any difficulty, I will speak to Ms. Leader and make sure --

CHA RMAK Thank you, Mr. Gillane. The problem about things being on-line is, we don't know what bit it is.
MR. G LLANE: No, I will clarify whatever needs to be clarified with Ms. Leader.
CHA RMAN Yes. No, I appreciate you will, yes. MS. LEADER: okay.
A. Sorry, I presumed you were aware of that to -- the legal team.

589 Q. That is fine. So it was an on-the-record confirmation --
A. Yes.

590 Q. -- from Superintendent Taylor as the Garda --
A. An official on-the-record confirmation from the Garda Press officer.

591 Q. We will be able to track those changes once we have the -- seen it.
A. Yeah, yeah.

593 Q. That may be my fault.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN Ms. Leader, I'm sorry, just going back, you said, and it may be that I didn't make a note properly, I got the -- 'I had sight of the direction', which is the direction of the 14th December 2012, 'and I didn't get that from', and I'm sorry, I failed to write down who you didn't --
A. From David Taylor, Superintendent Taylor.

CHA RMAN A11 right.
594 Q. MS. LEADER: I just want to bring up page 5368 of the materials, which is an email to your colleague, Mr. Burke, from Tony Connaughton in the Garda Press Office. You see Mr. Burke -- and I appreciate this isn't your email now, and I think Mr. Burke, even though he works in RTÉ, may not work with you in that kind of context?
A. No, he doesn't.

595 Q. And what Mr. Burke is saying is -- to Superintendent Taylor, and it's four days later, on the 28th February:
"I hope thi s email finds you well. In light of
st at ements gi ven --"
A. Sorry, I don't have --

596 Q. Sorry, I beg your pardon. It begins at the end of the
page.
"In light of statements given in the Dáil during the week and the statement by Garda Ser geant Maurice McCabe with regard to whether Sergeant McCabe cooper ated with the O Mahony i nquiry into penalty points, can you pl ease inform RTÉ's Thi s Week programme whet her the Gar da Commi ssi oner wi shes to add or amend any remarks he has put into the public domain or whi ch have been attributed to himwith regard to this matter."

You see the email?
A. Yeah.

597 Q. And Sergeant Connaughton's reply to that is:
"The Garda Commi ssi oner wi shes to confirmthat he did not put any remarks into the public domain. Any comments that the Garda Commi ssi oner wi shes to put on the public record will be by way of official statement issued by the Garda Press Office or face-to-face i nterviews quoting what the Garda Commi ssi oner wi shes to convey. The Gar da Sí ochána Onbudsman Commi ssi on have been appoi nted to investigate this matter, and therefore it is inappropriate to comment."

So, as far as you were concerned, it was the Garda Commissioner who was putting those --
A. Well, it was his spokesperson.
Q. Yes.
A. I didn't speak to the Garda Commissioner. I spoke to the Garda Press officer.
Q. Which is the same thing, as I understand it?
A. We11, I mean, I spoke to the Garda Press Officer, I wrote up the story, it went on-line at four o'clock, there were no complaints from the Garda Press Officer, and I had spoken to him a number of times later on that evening and there were no complaints from the Garda Commissioner or the Garda Press Office in relation to the inaccuracy of the story.
A11 right. And insofar as you have Sergeant Connaughton saying to Mr. Burke that the Garda Commissioner wishes to confirm that he did not put any remarks into the pub7ic domain, that is contrary to your understanding?
A. We11, yeah. I mean, I only saw this email now, so, but --
Q. Yes.
A. -- Tony Connaughton whatever -- is a matter for Tony Connaughton. I know I got an official statement from the Garda Press Office. I put it on the record and I attributed it.

602 Q. Yes.
A. So if there was any problems with it, I would have heard.

603 Q. A11 right. If we just turn to page 5 of the materials, which is the protected disclosure made by Superintendent Taylor. You will be familiar with this. And if we go the second-1ast paragraph of it, that
page, please. Maybe if we start at the third-1ast paragraph. what he says is:
"I spoke to various journalists on foot of the instructions as gi ven to me by the Commissioner to encour age themto write negativel y about Sergeant MkCabe and to brief agai nst him"

The next paragraph down is:
"One particul ar example was the report of Assistant Commi ssi oner John O Mahony into the allegations made by Sergeant McCabe. I was instructed by the Commi ssi oner to brief the media that Sergeant MECabe had ref used to cooper ate with Assi stant Commissi oner O' Mahony. I I ater found out that this was untrue."

So I know you have nothing to do with whatever went on between Superintendent Taylor and instructions he may or may not have gotten from Commissioner Callinan at that time. But what $I$ am suggesting to you is, it would seem to be that at least Superintendent Taylor was making it clear to you, as I understand it, that Sergeant McCabe had not cooperated with the O'Mahony inquiry.
A. First of a11, I was never briefed by Superintendent Taylor that Sergeant McCabe refused to cooperate.

604 Q. Yes.
A. I never reported that he refused to cooperate. I was
given a statement from Garda Headquarters that said the Garda Commissioner said he didn't cooperate.
605 Q. okay.
A. And that is what I published.

606 Q. And that is what you were saying in relation to the whole matter of cooperation?
A. Yes.

607 Q. And the press release?
A. Yes. Well, I'm not saying anything.

608 Q. Yes.
A. The direction stands for itself.

609 Q. Yes.
A. The Garda Commissioner, he makes his point, and Sergeant McCabe then made his point, and we reported all three.
610 Q. Now, if I could just go forward to 2015, and I want to bring you to another query Mr. Burke made to the Garda Press office, and it's at page 5376 of the materials. And this is an email sent in July 2015, and under the second point on it -- and as I understand it, you don't work with the RTÉ This week programme, but I just want to ask you about this. It says:
"Secondly and separate to the above, RTÉ Thi s Week understands that at a recent session of the Justice Kevin O Hi ggi ns inqui ry, counsel for the Garda Commissi oner raised questions over the motivation of Sergeant MECabe for bringing certain matters regarding alleged Garda misconduct to attention."

And Mr. Burke is asking:
"Does this amount to the view of the Garda
Cormi ssi oner --"

Who at that stage was Commissioner o'Sullivan.
"-- in terns of her view as to why Sergeant McCabe rai sed these issues in the first instance."

Did you know anything about that?
A. About this question to the --

611 Q. About, first of all, the issue of motivation in the o'higgins Commission?
A. No, it became a controversy when the selected sections of the transcript were released.
CHAI RMAN And if you wouldn't mind just giving me the actual date.
ME. LEADER: The actual date for that is --
CHA RMAN I know it's 2015.
MG. LEADER: -- the 4th July 2015.
612 Q. Did you know anything about the questions that were being asked of the Garda Press office?
A. No, they ask their own questions and they get their own 14:59 answers.
613 Q. okay. And in relation to the leaking of the transcripts, what time do you put that about?
A. When they appeared on, is it on Prime Time and in the

614 Q. In 20 --
A. I beg your pardon?

615 Q. 2015, is it?
A. I don't have the dates of those stories.

616 Q. Yes. The year, perhaps, can you remember?
A. No. But I can look it up.

617 Q. Yes.
A. You know, when they were published, they're a matter of public record.

Were you surprised at that or did you pay any heed to it?
A. Well, I did pay heed to it because there was an issue over this, whether or not -- it became a public controversy in relation to whether Sergeant McCabe's motivation was questioned at the O'Higgins Commission and there were selected transcripts leaked.
619 Q. Leaked.
A. And it became a story. So I made my own inquiries and I then discovered there was more transcripts and that actually Mr. Justice Kevin O'Higgins had dealt with the issue, and at the end of the transcripts I saw, that the whole issue had been ventilated and outlined and that the last word on it was Mr. Justice O'Higgins' word, which was, that's fine, and he called

620 Q. Later on in the year?
A. Later on in the year.

621 Q. okay.
A. And I did a report to that effect, that the matter had been clarified --
Q. A11 right.
A. -- at the o'Higgins Commission.

623 Q. Okay. And was that while the Commission was ongoing
or --
A. No, no. Well, didn't these transcripts come --

624 Q. Yes.
A. I mean, I think this was 2016 --

625 Q. 2016.
A. -- or 2017, actually, wasn't it? Wasn't it after publication of the --
626 Q. Yes, that is exactly what I was asking you.
A. Yes. Anyway, the O'Higgins Commission report was published.
627 Q. At that stage.
A. The findings were made.

628 Q. Yes.
A. They were reported on. And then subsequently this issue came up in relation to selected parts of the transcript.

629 Q. Yes. In 2016.
CHA RMAN As I understand the dates - and I'm sorry for being so obsessive about dates but it is so easy to get mixed up - the 25 th April '16 was, the O'Higgins
final report was actually presented to the Minister as I understand it, on the 6th May '16 the leaked report was discussed in RTÉ. And I know you're going to be asking about that, Ms. Leader.

ME. LEADER: Yes.
CHA RMAN And on the 11th May the official report was published on the Department of Justice and Equality website. On the 17 th May '16 some limited transcripts of the O'Higgins Commission report as to an issue concerning credit were discussed on Prime Time and I think it seems to be accepted by everybody, that these were very, very limited matters.
MS. LEADER: Yes.
CHAL RMAN Then the next thing that happens of significance is 26th May 2016, when John McGuinness TD mentioned the car park meeting with Commissioner Callinan and vile allegation. So that is the chronology insofar as I am trying to anchor it to something solid.
M5. LEADER: Yes. what I was trying to establish Mr. Reynolds was: Did you know about the issue of motivation in July 2015 or was it when --
A. No.

631 Q. -- the transcripts were leaked in 2016?
A. Yeah. The first time I knew about that was when the transcripts were leaked and became a story.

632 Q. Yes. And that was very close in time to when the report was published?
A. Well, it was a month after it, is that correct?
A. So the transcripts then became an issue and then $I$ had a look at it and to see well was this, was this actually true and I got some further transcripts and on
the basis of them I could clearly see as far as I could see that actually the whole issue had been clarified by Mr. Justice Kevin o'higgins. At least that was my understanding of it.
634 Q.
So in July 2015 you had --
A. No.
-- idea in relation to the motivation issue?
A. No.
Q. All right. You must have known so in 2016 that the D matter was linked in some way to the motivation issue when it came -- if you saw the transcripts of the O'Higgins matter?
A. No.

637 Q. When do you think that happened?
A. I don't think the transcripts referred to -- at least, correct me if I am wrong now, but I don't think -- I don't know if there was a link. Was there is a link in the transcripts with the D and motivation?
638 Q. Well, I'm asking you what your knowledge of it at that time.
A. No, I don't -- that's what I'm saying, I don't think there was that link.
639 Q. Did you make a link --
A. No.

640 Q. -- in relation to the D matter and the motivation matter?
A. No, I never reported on the D matter at all.

641 Q. That is what I want to establish.
A. I know, but you made the link there and I --

642 Q. It's okay. If I can go to the broadcasts of the 9th May 2016, the report had been released by the -- had been sent to the Department of Justice at the end of Apri1 2016 and you did a number of broadcasts in relation to it on the 9th May?
A. That's correct.

643 Q. And that was prior to publication, the date it was published was 11th May?
A. That's correct.

644 Q. okay. Where did you get the report from?
A. I can't tell you where I got the report from.

645 Q. If you just establish the basis of why you're not telling the Tribunal where you got the report from; is it privilege you're asserting?
A. Yeah, I mean, what I can say to you was, that the source for my broadcasts was the actual O'Higgins Commission report.
646 Q. All right. And it was the final report, is that correct?
A. It was the final report.

647 Q. And in relation to where you got the report from, you're not telling the Tribunal that and on what basis are you asserting a privilege?
A. Well, I'm exercising privilege over that, yes.

648 Q. What form of a privilege? Is it journalistic privilege?
A. Yes.

649 Q. Okay. A11 right. I think if I can just quickly go through the broadcasts, and it's the intention of the

Tribunal just to play them but I just want to maybe go through them first of all with you. There were a number of RTÉ broadcasts on the 9th May, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct, yeah.

650 Q. Okay. And not all of them were your broadcasts, isn't that correct?
A. I presume so, yes. Yes, yes.
Q. So if I just go through the radio ones first.
A. Sure.

652 Q. There was a Morning Ireland one I think at 7:00am?
A. That's correct. That's the radio report.

653 Q. That's the radio report. There was a second Morning Ireland one at 8:00am, is that correct?
A. That's another radio report.

Radio report. Then there was a longer, long Morning Ireland report and I think it started in or around half past eight mark or slightly before that?
A. It was the second item on Morning Ireland after michael McGrath, the Fianna Fáil spokesman. There was an
interview with him and then there was a question and answer session with myself and the presenter, Fran McNulty, it was scripted and pre-prepared and it ran for about 15 minutes until about 25 to nine. It crashed the sports news. And then the half eight headlines.

655 Q. And I think that is the one where you got into the various separate chapters of the o'Higgins report?
A. That's correct. Nine chapters.


656
Q. Sorry?
A. Nine chapters.
Q. Nine chapters. There were certain ones you didn't. And I will deal with that later on.
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. Okay. Then there was an item on the Séan O'Rourke programme, is that correct?
A. Yes. But I had nothing to do with that.
Q. You had nothing to do with that. And that was an interview with Lorcan Roche Kelly. It's the first one on it. And then Mr. Clifford gave an interview. okay. So that's the fourth RTÉ, the radio broadcasts that day. Then there's the News at One?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were the person on the News at One?
A. Yeah.
Q. And then at Drive Time, later on that day, Mr. Boucher-Hayes did a piece about the --
A. Okay, I didn't hear that and I had nothing to do with that.
Q. You had nothing to do with that. So, just in relation to the Séan O'Rourke matter, which is the fourth and the last matter on radio that day, which is the Philip Boucher-Hayes, did you share the report with your colleagues so as they could do a piece?
A. I may have. Conor Kavanagh was the producer of the Today with Séan O'Rourke programme, which that day was presented by Keelin Shanley. He may have asked me for the material and I probably would have sent it over to
him. But this was material which was already in the public domain at this stage, and was already on the public record. So I didn't share the actual hard copies of the report, but I did share whatever --
A. Whatever work I had done, yeah. Up to that point. There was fresh work to be broadcast at one o'clock. All right. In relation to the Drive Time matter, did you share the report with Mr. Boucher-Hayes?
A. I never shared the report with anybody. He didn't contact me looking for any of it, so I would presume no. But it would have been from whatever, News at One, Morning Ireland, it was all publicly available at that stage.
665 Q. And then if I can just go through the TV reports?
A. Sure.

666 Q. There was the News at One?
A. One o'clock television news.

667 Q. And did you a piece on that?
A. I did. I wrote a television report and a live ingest.

668 Q. Then you did the six o'clock news?
A. Yeah.

669 Q. That was the same?
A. Same; a package and a live.

670 Q. A package and a live. And then there was one for the 15:09 nine o'clock news?
A. For the nine o'clock news, yeah.

671 Q. I don't mean to be disrespectful in any way, but they were --
A. They were repetitive, were they?

672 Q. Well, a little bit. They mostly covered the same ground, whereas the radio matters were different to each other?
A. Well, it's the nature of the beast really.
A. Sorry, it's, radio allows for broader, more time, different type of discussion. Television packages are usually limited to one minute 45 seconds. And I know particularly my packages might seem longer to people but the reality is they're only usually about 1.45, two minutes.

674 Q. I think we're now going to hopefully listen to the radio broadcasts first and I think the sound engineer is organised so as to play them.
CHA RMAN Okay, Ms. Leader. There seems to be some misunderstanding as to the hours of the Tribuna1. I know I have sat late in relation to some people because I felt it was right to get their evidence done on $a$ particular day and that's a matter of courtesy, and sufficient onto the day is the evil thereof and any remark made in relation to my courtesy, but we are going to finish with whatever broadcasts there are and then I'm going to rise. Because it's then after four o'clock and there's no compelling reason why I should stay on.
MS. LEADER: I think maybe all of them together is slightly longer than an hour, but we will see how we get on.

CHA RMAN Yes, we will get to the end of them and that is fine. And I don't really think there is any need for --
MS. LEADER: The stenographer.
CHA RMAN -- yes, Ms. Kelly to take these down. It's 15:10 a block. It can be put on to the -- anyway. It's really not necessary to take it down. I really don't think so. Unless Ms. Kelly you feel you ought to. M5. LEADER: I suggested to the stenographer earlier on --
CHA RMAN That she shouldn't.
MS. LEADER: -- that there is no necessity. CHA RMAN Yes, I don't think there is.
MS. LEADER: All of this material has been circulated in an electronic format to the parties before the
Tribunal.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MS. LEADER: If we deal with the radio broadcast first of all.

## AUDI O RECORDI NG PLAYED TO THE TRI BUNAL

CHA RMAK Ms. Leader, I'm not sure I really want to listen to the news from two years ago or how many years.
MR. LEHANE: There is an overrun.
CHA RMAN No. I do appreciate that.

## AUDI O RECORDI NG PLAYED TO THE TRI BUNAL

CHA RMAN Again I'm sorry, I don't want to sit here, I'm not trying to -- goodness knows, as I said, the bit that actually matters. If we could go on a bit. Have we marked it? Ms. Ní Ghabhann, maybe you will help out 15:16 down below, if you wouldn't mind. I listened to all this before.

MS. LEADER: I think I'm being told we just have to listen to it.

CHAI RMAN We just have to listen it. So let's just 15:16 listen to it.

## AUDI O RECORDI NG PLAYED TO TRI BUNAL

MS. LEADER: The next section is the RTÉ broadcast. So $15: 30$ maybe it is appropriate to break at this stage.
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48:16, } 62: 13 \\ & \text { represented }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 98:4, 100:11 } \\ & \text { review [1] - 30:22 } \end{aligned}$ | 26:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 143:5, 152:21 } \\ & \text { screening [1] - } 82: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 125:24 } \\ & \text { seem }[11]-22: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 90:9 | Reynolds [11 | rumour [4]-51:2 | script [1] - 152:2 | $32: 27,36: 27,52: 20$ |
| representing [2] - | 56:18, 57:2, 57:3 | $55: 4,55: 6,55$ | scripted [1] - 170:23 | 64:4, 66:21, 75:11 |
| $90: 29,108: 28$ | 57:4, 119:28, 133:27, | rumours [4]-84:18, | $\text { scroll [1] }-47: 8$ | 124:11, 152:6, |
| request [3]-64:18 | 134:7, 143:22, 144:5, | 105:22, 106:3, 106:6 | se [1] - 44:25 | 162:22, 173:10 |
| 71:8, 125:24 | 167:17 | run [5] - 18:6, 80:27, | SEAN ${ }_{[2]}-2: 11,3: 1$ | seizures [2] - 147:29 |
| requested [1] - 49:26 <br> require [1] - 45:29 | REYNOLDS [3] - | $85: 2,88: 18,107: 27$ | SEANAD ${ }_{[1]}-1: 6$ | selected [4]-28:7, <br> 164:16, 165:17 |
| require [1] - 45:29 required [2] - 103:6, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 6:18, 134:3, } 134: 6 \\ \text { Reynolds' [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | run-up [1] - 107:27 | searched [1] - 73:24 SEBASTIAN ${ }^{11]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:16, 165:17, } \\ & \text { 166:20 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 153:9 | 133:27 | $[1]-10$ | $3: 17$ | self [1]-62:26 |
| rerun [1] - 14:6 | Rice [1] - 48:11 | Ryan [1] - 50:2 | second [15] - 35:24 | self-evident [1] - |
| reserve [1] - 14:28 | rid [1] - 26:29 | Ryan's [1] - 50:26 | $47: 10,47: 23,69: 28$ | \| 62:26 |
| RESOLUTIONS [1] - | ring [5]-31:19, 54:1, |  | 71:3, 89:10, 122:4, | send [1]-27:20 |
| 1:5 <br> resolve [2]-39:14, | $\begin{gathered} 95: 7,101: 10,107: 10 \\ \text { ringing }[6]-18: 21, \end{gathered}$ | S | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:8, 157:1, 157:4, } \\ & \text { 157:7, 161:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { senior [16]-11:9, } \\ \text { 18:1, 18:6, 20:1, 25:4, } \end{gathered}$ |
| 76:12 | $72: 23,72: 25,87: 9$ |  | $163: 20,170: 1$ | 25:5, 35:2, 35:9, 53:1, |
| resolved [1] - 80:2 | $100: 28,104:$ | safety [1]-79 | 170:19 | $80: 25,114: 19$ |
| onate [1] - 69:7 |  | saga [1] - 51:13 | second-last | 134:22, 135:3, 135:4, |
| respect [3]-19:19, | rinsed [1] - 81:9 | SAINT [3]-3:8, 3:13, | 89:10, 161:29 | 145:17, 145:20 |
| 25:25, 98:27 | rise [1] - 173:24 | $5: 12$ | secondly [5] - 32:18, | sense [13]-32:5, |
| respond [6]-9:12, | RIVERSIDE [1] - | $\text { sat }[3]-35: 12,42: 17,$ | $38: 27,129: 28,151: 4,$ | 36:28, 57:11, 65:24, |
| 9:25, 49:25, 84:12, | 4:31 |  |  | 71:6, 96:16, 142:15, |








[^0]:    "A second internal investigation was I aunched I ast nonth after Sergeant McCabe disclosed he had dounl oaded hundreds of files and reports fromPulse, the Garda
    computer system And McCabe produced two boxes of files at a meeting with Byrne and the inquiry team mentbers at the Hillgrove Hotel in County Mbnaghan on Oct ober 11th. The meeting was called to inform MECabe

