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CHA RMAN Just a couple of comments, if I may. First of all, there is another lecture in the Hardiman lecture series which indeed I have been organising for the last eight years, it is notified to the Bar Council and to the Incorporated Law Society, so they are invited, it won't come as a surprise, which means I am not sitting beyond five or ten past four. Secondly, I just ask people to remember that this is not about whether people are in favour of Maurice McCabe or against Maurice McCabe. And then, third7y, that the task which the Tribunal actually faces today is whether Commissioner o'Sullivan used briefing material prepared in Garda Headquarters in relation to the broadcasts on RTÉ of the 9th May 2016. MS. LEADER: I think there was a problem in hearing you, Chairman, at the back of the hall.
CHA RMAN Yes, the microphone was just turned up a wee 10:03 bit too loud. Thanks. The term of reference that we are actually looking at now, and it's part of obviously the overall conclusion of the Tribunal on all of this, is whether Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan, using briefing material prepared in Garda Headquarters, influenced, or attempted to influence, broadcasts on RTÉ on the 9th May concerning the o'Higgins Commission report. That's what it's actually about. It's not about whether people like Maurice McCabe or don't like

Maurice McCabe. After all, that would be strange if that were to be the case because we live in a free country.

## MR. PAUL REYNOLDS CONTI NUED TO BE EXAM NED BY

MS. LEADER: Yesterday evening, sir, we finished listening to the radio broadcasts that were broadcast by RTÉ on 9th May 2016, and now it's the intention of the Tribunal to play the RTÉ television broadcasts which were on the News at One, the Six One News and the Nine O'Clock News on the 9th May.

## RTÉ TELEV SI ON BROADCASTS PLAYED

ME. LEADER: A11 right. Now, Mr. Reynolds, they are the reports as they appeared on RTÉ Radio news on the 9th May 2016, and I just want to first of all refer to term of reference [k], I don't know if Mr. Kavanagh can get it up on the screen in front of you, which is what we are actually looking into today. It's to investigate whether Commissioner O'Sullivan, using briefing material briefed in Garda Headquarters, influenced or attempted to influence broadcasts on RTÉ on the 9th May 2016, purporting to be a leaked account of the unpublished o'Higgins Commission report in which Sergeant McCabe was branded a liar and irresponsible.
A. That didn't happen.

2 Q. Yes. All right. So that's your general reaction --

## A. It didn't happen.

3 Q. Yes -- to that. Now, first of all, I wonder could we establish what did happen out of that term of reference. First of all, the broadcasts on RTÉ on the 9th May 2016, insofar as you compiled them, where did your information come from?
A. My information came from the o'riggins Commission report.
4 Q. All right. And that report at that stage wasn't published, it wasn't published until the 11th May 2016, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

5 Q. Okay. So by definition, the information came from a leaked copy of that report, isn't that right?
A. Copies.

6 Q. Copies. A11 right.
A. Some of the information was so sensitive, I had to be sure that I actually had the final report. So, I wasn't satisfied with one source, it was too big a story, so I had to make sure that I had seen a number of copies and that I had cross-referenced the contents of each report to make sure it was the same final report that I was looking at.
7 Q. Okay. Now, I understand that you are claiming
privilege over where you got the copies of the reports, but in very general terms, did you satisfy yourself that they were the same report that you were looking at?
A. Yes.

8 Q. All right. And they were multiple copies of the same report, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

9 Q. And were they -- have you satisfied yourself, and beforehand did you satisfy yourself, that they were copies of the final o'Higgins Report?
A. Yes.

10 Q. A11 right. If we can take it one step further; can you te11 us when you got the first copy or second copy or maybe the last copy, if you give us the first date?
A. I can't be specific in relation to those kind of details, but in the run-up to it, and you can see from my notes that I submitted to the Tribunal, that this was a work in progress, that this was a development.
A. And as -- I won't say how I compiled it, I can't say when I got the first, second, third, fourth or whatever number of copies I had, but I think that the reports speak for themselves and I think if you compare the broadcasts with the final published report, you can see that the content in the broadcasts corresponds to the detail in the report.
12 Q. A11 right. We11, for instance, we know, the Tribunal is aware that Mr. Justice O'Higgins sent a copy of the final report to the Department of Justice on the 25 th April 2016. So, do you think it was after that date that you got the first copy of the final report?
A. I am not prepared to say.

13 Q. All right. Okay. Was it the beginning or end of April, or are you prepared to say?
A. I am not prepared to say.

A11 right. okay. Now, insofar as you compiled your broadcasts, which were broadcast on 9th May 2016, where 10:40 did all the information compiled in those -- which appeared in those broadcasts, come from?
A. All the information came from the o'Higgins Commission report.
okay. And did you have any other information, other than the -- and I know I'm asking the question in a number of ways -- other than the information which appeared in the o'Higgins Report, when you were compiling the reports?
A. I did. I spoke to a number of people as well and I got 10:41 various information, but the only information that I put in the public domain and the only information I published was based specifically and directly on the contents of the O'Higgins Commission report.
16 Q. All right. So in relation to the other information which you got from speaking to other people, did that in any way influence what you put into the final broadcasts which appeared on the 9th May 2016 ?
A. No.

17 Q. Okay. You are absolutely --
A. I am 100 percent certain because you can compare -- I mean, $I$ think $I$ submitted a note to the Tribunal whereby you can look at my scripts and I think in brackets beside them there is actually the references
to the chapters and the paragraphs in the o'Higgins Commission report.
18 Q. okay. So as I understand your answer, you are saying everything which appeared in the broadcasts on the 9th May, you can pinpoint the source of that information by 10:42 reference to a specific line in the O'Higgins Report?
A. Yes. Now, I'd have to qualify that in relation to the live questions and answers on television, where $I$ was asked for an assessment, and I was asked to make a judgement, on the basis of the information, and for
example, where I used the words that Sergeant McCabe had been vindicated, I don't think it specifically says that he had been vindicated, but I thought it was a fair assessment to make on the basis of the information. So, in the live question and answer sessions which you have seen on television, I am asked for my opinion, I am asked, for example, is this the end of it, by Sharon Ní Bheoláin --
19 Q. Yes.
A. -- I obviously couldn't answer that and if it was we wouldn't be here today.
Q. Yes, I understand. I think really what I'm asking you is a slightly different question in relation to what influenced you in coming to the final script of the broadcasts on the 9th May. I understand your answer insofar as you say everything that appeared bar the matters you have just referred to there in the live television broadcasts, you can reference it directly to something that appears in the final report of

Mr. Justice O'Higgins, okay? You follow me so far?
A. Yes, yeah, yeah.
A. Yeah.

So what I'm asking you is, did you take anything from the other information that you had, from speaking to various people prior to -- in your information-gathering phase, if I can put it that way, did you allow any of that to influence what you picked out from the report -- and I don't mean that in any accusatorial way.
A. No.

But what I'm essentially asking you, and I think in the very last broadcast, which was the Nine O'clock News on the 9th May 2016, you have come to the view at that stage that there is something in the report for everyone, if I can put it that way?
 published on the basis of it being newsworthy. And I took an approach to it when I got the report that specifically, for example, what are we looking at here?

So for example, in relation to the eight criminal investigations which were identified to have serious flaws and serious failings, I said well what actually happened here? That was the first -- and look at those and say well, what happened? And then we had the second -- my second point on that was, well okay, we'11 te11 people what circumstances were of each of those investigations. Then we'11 have to tell people what the Commission found. And then Sergeant Maurice McCabe was identified in the report as the central figure, so his role or any comment or criticism or compliment that the Commission had paid to him in relation to each of those investigations also had to be examined. They were the factors that I felt were very important. And nobody before had looked at the failings and the flaws in the criminal investigations. I also thought the issue of Garda corruption was a huge issue, there was an allegation made against the highest ranking officer in the State, that the Garda Commissioner was corrupt, not only was the Garda Commissioner corrupt but there was four other senior officers who were also corrupt. And we had to look at this and see what this true; did we have a corrupt police force? And that is what the Commission was set up to investigate. I identified those factors and I felt they were also newsworthy as we11. A number of people had lost their jobs, the former Garda Commissioner, the Minister for Justice, the confidential recipient, there was dossiers that had been supplied to the Fianna Fáil leader Micheál Martin
which included claims that murders hadn't been properly investigated and there was a dossier supplied to the Taoiseach, and these were very, very serious matters and we had to look and see what Mr. Justice Kevin O'Higgins had found in relation to these. So all these 10:46 factors, $I$ thought that these were all hugely important issues in the public interest, that we had to explain to people, and publish.
A11 right. And I just want to put this to you in a very general way: Insofar as it could be suggested, if it is being suggested, that a view was taken by you, influenced by Garda Headquarters, that you were in some way minimising what went wrong in Cavan-Monaghan and also drawing attention to the exaggeration line in the report and totally dismissing the corruption issue, do you have anything to say in relation to that?
A. We11, first of all, I don't think Garda Headquarters knew what I was doing. I think the first they heard of it was when they heard it on the news that morning. And I have heard evidence given to this Tribunal that Garda Headquarters, and particularly Commissioner O'Sullivan, was very unhappy with the report, that she didn't like the reports. So the fact is that Garda Headquarters had absolutely no influence over me. And I wasn't -- I wasn't working alone; whatever I was
preparing was being seen by my news editor, by the programme editors who were responsible for the broadcasts for each individual programme. So, there was a different editor for Morning Ireland who looked
at the material there, there was a different editor for the radio News at One who looked at that material, there was a different editor online who looked at the material before it was put online, there is a different programme editor for the one o'clock television news, the six o'clock television news and the nine o'clock television news. There is a chief news editor who I was corresponding with all week and all weekend in relation to this, and as I said, there was the managing editor of news above him and then there was the acting director general. So all of the material that $I$ was putting in was being scrutinised and was coming back to me, so it wasn't my viewpoint; it was the O'Higgins Commission report's findings.
25 Q. All right. And I wonder if you wouldn't mind identifying the individual editors that I suppose vetted your work in order to make sure that it was accurate and reported fairly on procedures.
A. Sure.

If you could go through them one by one, please.
A. Sure. The main chief news editor was Ray Burke, he has overall responsibility for news, he was the chief just editor. Above him is the managing editor of news, Hilary McGouran, and above him is the director of news Kevin Bakhurst but at that time he was the acting director general, so he was the most senior person in the organisation and the editor-in-chief of RTÉ. So he was also seeing the reports and reading them before they were broadcast. In relation to the individual
programmes, there are two programme editors in Morning Ireland, one the night before and one in the morning, both of them would have been across it. And the issue would have been discussed in a conference call which Morning Ireland hold I think it's at eight o'clock at night to decide what they were going to do the next day. Brendan Fitzpatrick I think was on that night and Vincent Murphy was on the following morning. The News at One editor for the radio programme was Michae1 o'Kane. For the television one news, I think it was Lindsay Keeley, but I am not 100 percent sure, I stand to be corrected. The Six One is edited by Anthony Murnane and Dympna Moroney. I think Dympna Moroney was in charge that day. I think the Nine o'clock News that day was Bethan Kilfoil.

27 Q. Right.
A. There was a producer who worked with me throughout the day, that was Tanya Sillem, and she was privy to the reports over the weekend when we were finalising them as well, so she saw them prior to broadcast.
A11 right. So you got the draft reports, a number of them, and you worked on the reports --
A. No, I got the O'Higgins Commission final report. A number of copies of them, yeah. So you got a number of copies of the final reports and you worked on them and produced a script which turned into your broadcasts on the 9th May 2016 --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- is that correct? When did you first submit those
scripts to your various editors and producers, do you think?
A. I think the first one went in on Friday, as far as I know.

31 Q. And that would have been the 7th May, is that right?
A. The 6th.
Q. 6th May, al1 right.
A. Yeah.
A. I was conscious, for example, that there had been previous reports and no journalist wants to feel that they are recycling news or giving secondhand information. So I was looking at the aspects that I thought were new in relation to this report, that hadn't been reported before, but he, quite rightly, pointed out that we really had to put in more of the -more of the information that had already been published because it was still relevant.

35 Q. A11 right. So when you are referring to previous reports, what exactly are you referring to there?
A. Well, it had been published first of all by John Mooney in the Times Ireland.

36 Q. When you say "it"?
A. Sorry, he had a report which he said was based on the
o'higgins Commission report.
37 Q. All right. So the first --
A. That was the first report of it.
A. John Mooney. And then Micheál Lehane of RTÉ followed up on that and he broadcast a report on that evening, on the Tuesday, on the six and nine o'clock news.
39 Q. When you say "that evening", the evening of what?
A. Was it -- whatever -- I don't have the date of Mr. Mooney's report, but it was in April I think, wasn't it?

40 Q. Yes.
A. The first report, I think, as I said. But it was in April, and the same day then Micheál Lehane, of our political staff, followed up on that and he published some more details in relation to it.

If I could stop you there. In some of your earlier notes there is a reference to RTÉ having a positive report in April, is that what that references?
A. I presume that is what it refers to, yes, yes.

42 Q. Al1 right. Okay.
A. And in fact, I think I would have looked back on that report as well, and in my thinking I would have said, okay, well, we've done that stuff, so there's 360 pages here, we have a lot to get through.
43 Q. Al1 right. Okay. And was there any other report that you can think of at this stage? we have referred to the times and we have referred to Mr. Lehane's report?
A. I'm not sure was there any other reports? There may
have been. I don't know did --
44 Q. They were the ones in your mind?
A. They were the ones in my mind, anyway.

45 Q. Okay. You compiled a draft and you think you sent it in on the 6th May, and if I could just bring you to an email which Mr. Burke sent to you on the 7th May, which appears at 5975 of the materials in Volume 23. So we could just first of all -- I know you have mentioned Mr. Burke already but if you can identify his position in RTÉ?
A. He is the chief news editor.

46 Q. okay. And is he the person who has overall editorial responsibility?
A. No. Kevin Bakhurst would have had that. But Ray has chief editorial responsibility for the newsroom.

47 Q. For the newsroom. Okay. And you were reporting directly to him?
A. Yes.
Q. And he is the person who could have said no or yes directly to you?
A. Yes, yes.

49 Q. A11 right. Do you think this is the first feedback you got from Mr. Burke in relation to it?
A. Yes, I think so, yes.

So he sent you an email just after half past nine on the 7th May 2016, and what he says to you, and you have already sent him a draft at that stage:
"Paul, this is excellent, well done."

And then he refers to some personal matters. And then he says:
"You have done the work, but you cannot let this take over your day. I don't see anything wrong with going with it first on Thi s Week and RTÉ and onl ine and TV froml unchtime tomorrow."

That would have been a Sunday broadcast, is that right? But ultimately it was Monday you went ahead with it.
A. Sorry, can I just interrupt?

51 Q. Yes.
A. Chairman, could I ask that the reference to the ... not be included publicly?
CHA RMAN We11, that is why we haven't done it. I am sure the media will --
A. That nobody sees, because I don't like people -- you can understand the position.
CHA RMAN No, I do. And that is the reason Ms. Leader ${ }_{10: 56}$ didn't read it out and I am sure the media will be responsible. It's entirely personal to you and no interest to me.
A. No, and I accept that, but it's that I don't want it published in relation to the matter. Thank you.
CHA RMAN Well, it's not the worst thing in the world, Mr. Reynolds.
A. No, no, but there are a people who have an interest in knowing my business and they mightn't always have a
positive interest.
52 Q. ME. LEADER:
"Froml unchti me tonor row but because you would need plenty of graphics it might be a tall order to do a good I unchtime TV package tomorrow Lets park that."

So I think from that it would appear that the intention was to publish it on Sunday at some stage.
A. Yeah, we had talked about it and we had talked about it with the editor of This Week as well, we had mentioned to the editor of This Week, because This Week is the Sunday radio programme it goes on for an hour and it does have the space to deal with large, meaty, comprehensive reports. You know, anybody who listens to it knows some of the interviews goes on 20 or 30 minutes, so they can give time to issues. And we felt that because this was such a big report it did need time and we originally thought about putting it out on This week, but it would have been -- we came to the conclusion it was too rushed, really.

53 Q. Al1 right.
"I thi nk your draft is excellent but because it is certain that you and RTÉ news will be subject to suspi ci on, that we are favouring the Gardaí and ther ef ore bi ased agai nst MkCabe, I thi nk you should rewrite some of the top paragraphs so that they cont ai ned the mai n concl usi ons. I know these were
reported the week before last but people forget before ret urning to Ser geant MkCabe."

So I think we can take it from that that from the very beginning there was a huge amount of care given by RTÉ and consideration in relation to what way it would look at the end of the day.
A. oh, very much so.

54 Q. Whether a side had been taken.
A. Yeah. In fairness to Ray his antenna were up. We 10:58 could see -- I mean, I was anxious to get the new stuff out, I didn't want to recycle old stuff but he said no, hold on a second, this has to be fair, this has to be balanced to everybody, and he was right.
Yes. And I think, just I may have skipped over it but, ${ }^{00: 58}$ you had sent your draft to him the night before, just before half past ten, on the 6th may. I think the email went on 6th May at 22:27.
A. That's correct.
Q. Yes. So had you discussed the element of favouring the 10:58 Gardaí and bias against Sergeant McCabe other than in this email with Mr. Burke, do you think?
A. No, I don't think so. I was working away on the reports, you know, trying to get some stuff together, trying to, you know, pull out all the news lines out of ${ }^{10: 59}$ it, trying to see what was in it and trying to put it together and this was the first draft by that Friday -finished that on Friday night, sent it off to Ray, he read it and he came back and saying, look, we really
have to get the other stuff in as well to make it -you know, this is great but we need to start looking -so we started then working on that.
57 Q. Okay. And just for completeness, he made a number of suggestions, but none of them on the scale of things were that huge, isn't that correct? Or do you agree with that?
A. Oh, well, I mean, I think he was correct.
Q. Yes. Yes. So what he says is:
"Your first par is fine."

Is that paragraph, do you think?
"Your first par is fine."
A. Yes, that is paragraph, yeah.

59 Q. "I suggest the second paragraph is something like this: The Commi ssi on was establ i shed by the Government after serious compl ai nts by Garda whi stlebl ower, Maurice McCabe, were rai sed in the Dáil by Fi anna Fáil leader, 11:00 M cheál Martin, and others. It's a 360-page report that was del ivered to the then M ni ster for Justice Frances Fitzger al d nearly three years ago."
A. Three weeks ago.

60 Q. Three weeks ago, I beg your pardon.
"She said it would be published after she and the Attorney Gener al had studi ed it, but the del ay in publ ishing it has been strongly criticised by the
previ ous Justice M ni ster, Al an Shatter. The report, a copy of whi ch has been seen by RTÉ News, found no evi dence of corruption but poor management, et cetera. It al so found that former Garda Commi ssi oner Martin Callinan, who resi gned controversially after a late ni ght visit to his home by the Secretary General of the Department of Justice, was fully entitled to have his reputation vi ndi cated and that there was not a scintilla of evi dence to Sergeant MtCabe's --"
A. Claim.

61 Q. Claim, sorry. Thank you.
"-- of corruption. It al so found that M ni ster Shatter did the right thing and that the deal ings bet ween the Department of Justice and the Garda Commi ssi oner were right and proper at all times, etcetera, etcetera. Now after presenting the main concl usi ons --"

> of the report that is, isn't that right?
"-- you can go back to Sergeant MkCabe."

And he also points out on line 3:
"You should say "are unf ounded" and not "and unf ounded". Your line 4 should say --"

And it's fairly minor matters. And it was left at that, at that stage. And those changes were made to
your first draft, is that correct?
A. Yes.

62 Q. Now, I think you replied to Mr. Burke later on that day at half past ten, later on that night, and you just said in relation to the issue of putting it out on Sunday that that didn't really seem to be something that would happen.
A. It wasn't an option.

63 Q. Yes. It wasn't an option. Now, if we can then go to the 7th May again, at page 5982 of the materials, you reply to Mr. Burke's email with the suggested amendments, and what you say is:
"Thanks, Ray.
I suggest we leave This Week and do it all Mbnday,
break it into two parts for radio. First Mbrning Irel and report on the cases, the probs with
probationers, could have been resol ved with one i nspector, prai se for McCabe but al so the lie, the rape and the poi soni ng.
Second, News at One, Callinan accused of corruption but vi ndi cated, Shatter, AC Derek Byrne, Chi ef Superintendent McGinn, Superintendent Mchael Cl ancy and Inspector Cunni ngham
And do the lot for TV starting at one with graphics,
Tanya, et cet era.
Tal k tonor row. "

So is that the genesis of the idea for the Morning

Ireland, first of all dealing with the individual chapters and then the News at One dealing with the allegations of corruption against senior guards?
A. Yes.

64 Q. And that comes from you?
A. Yes.

65 Q. Okay. Did anybody in Garda Headquarters have any input into that idea?
A. No.

A11 right. okay. Now, just in relation to that particular decision, $I$ suppose it could be said at one o'clock, broadcasting that, that there was nothing to the claims made in relation to corruption against a number of senior guards, that that presented a very negative view of Sergeant McCabe's claims and a very -- 11:03 maybe not, $I$ wouldn't go so far as to say positive view but it certain7y took a lot of negative publicity from the senior guards which one might see that it was a garda-inspired line. Do you have anything to say in relation to that?
A. I can only report what was in the report. I mean, if the report had found Martin Callinan guilty of corruption or that he was corrupt or Alan Shatter or any of them, we would have reported that. But we could only report what the report said.
67 Q. And in relation to the timing of it and taking it together -- say, for instance, if somebody hadn't heard Morning Ireland and switched on the News at One o'clock, maybe the impression might be given to
them that there was nothing in this at all - and I don't say that that is necessarily what conclusion they would have come to - and that may have been very much in ease of Garda Headquarters, do you have anything to say in relation to that?
A. No, that is not true, because we repeated the positive remarks or findings that had been made about Sergeant Maurice McCabe for a third time there in the News at One as well, and we consistently, we kept repeating that so that there would be no perception that we were being unfair to Sergeant McCabe or that we were being unbalanced in any way.
68 Q. Now, if I could just go to the 8th May and you get an email from Ms. McGouran, and that is at page 6088 of the materials. Now, if you could just refresh me again 11:05 in relation to --
A. She is the managing editor of television news.

69 Q. A11 right. And so, was she the person who said yes or no in relation to your broadcasts on RTÉ news on the 9th May?
A. No, Kevin Bakhurst was the man.

70 Q. A11 right. Did she have any input?
A. I presume, I presume they were all, the editors were consulting amongst themselves --
71 Q. Al1 right.
A. -- and if there was any feedback it either would come from them directly, like, as this email did, or it would come back via Ray through the chain, if you know what I mean.

72 Q. If we go to what this email says. She says, it's sent on 8th May, so late enough on the 8th May, just after quarter past eight, and it says:
"Re O Hi ggi ns, strict enbar go, 6: 00am Mbnday morning. "

And that refers to releasing it, is that right?
A. That's correct, yeah.

73 Q. "Hey Paul
Well done on getting the report. You have clearly put a lot of work into this.
As you know, it's a tricky one so be conscious of your tone and del i very so it doesn't sound Iike you agree or ot herwi se with the various findi ngs.
You don't want to sound pro or anti anyone!!"

So just there, what did you take from that?
A. I thought it was good advice. I thought it was vitally important that I not be seen to be on anybody's side and that $I$ just report factually and fairly and accurately the findings of Mr. Justice Kevin O'Higgins.

74 Q. All right. And then what she says is:
"The cases will take time to go through on air and are worth going through as they give the public a real
insi ght into what this thing was all about. Tell Mbrning Irel and toni ght they need to give it time to breat he on thei r run down."

She finally says:
"Al so it's going to be a tricky one to tell for TV so maybe Tanya could hel p with it."

And she signs off at that stage in relation to the matter. So I just need to ask you this: Did you at any stage, in relation -- did you discuss it with Ms. McGouran other than this email do you think?
A. No. I might have had a conversation with her that night but it would have been along the same lines. I don't think I did. I don't think I did.
75 Q. Al1 right. In relation to anything that you might have heard from your various other sources on checking it out did you at any time speak to her about that?
A. No.

76 Q. Okay. Now, I think later on, on the 8th May, there was a further exchange between yourself and Mr. Burke, so I think you had sent him back a revised draft, is that correct, arising out of his earlier email on the 7th?
A. Yes.

Am I right about that?
A. Yes, yes.

78 Q. Yes. And Mr. Burke then sends you an email at -sorry, if I could get the page 6158 of the materials, 11:09 sends you an email at just before half past nine on Sunday, and he ccs it to Mr. Bakhurst and Ms. McGouran, who we have been talking about in the previous email, and the subject is:
"Re: O Hi ggi ns 2, News at One enbar go 1: 00pm Mbnday. " Do you see that?
A. That's correct.

79 Q. And then, what he says is:
"Paul, very well done and sorry for my del ay."

Now, I just want to be clear in my own head. You have at that stage, as I understand it, made the changes as suggested by him in his first email, is that right?
A. Yes.

80 Q. You have sent them on to him and he has gone through them, is that where this email is coming from?
A. At this point we are working on the second broadcast.

81 Q. The second. which is the?
A. News at One.

82 Q. The detailed one in relation to the various chapters -in relation to corruption?
A. The allegations of corruption and the resignation of various senior figures.
83 Q. Okay. So this is specifically in reference to the News at one broadcast --
A. Yes.

84 Q. -- is that right? what he says is:
"Re Kevin's point and the error in paragraph 4, I thi nk it's just that the word "and" should not be there
bet ween the words McCabe and exaggerated.

A couple of smallish things:

1. I thi nk that the morning audio should starts with the words 'a commission established by the Government' rather than 'the O Hi ggi ns Commission'. You can start the second paragraph with 'the Hi gh Court Judge O Hi ggi ns' .
2. On the News at One piece I thi nk we can avoid any accusation of bias."

And again I just want to stop there. Is that something you had discussed in the intervening period with Mr. Burke?
A. Yeah. Well, we would always be conscious that we have to be fair to all parties, in any report.
85 Q. All right. So, what he is dealing with there:
"We can avoid any accusation of bi as if you started by
sayi ng the O Hi ggi ns Commi ssi on has said that the former Garda Cormissioner Martin Callinan "is entitled to have his reputation vi ndicated" and that allegations made agai nst hi mby Gar da whi stlebl ower Ser geant --"

I think it should be Maurice
A. That is a typo.

86 Q. "-- Maurice MECabe were "unfounded and deeply hurtful"."

Then what he says is:
"I think a lead-in like that above does not put the boot into McCabe strai ght away."

And I just want to ask you about that line and your reaction to it and what you understood from it.
A. And you see, when you are dealing with a situation, Chairman, where you are trying to revise scripts, you know, the language can be unparliamentary, it can be robust, it's certainly not language that is prepared to be poured over by teams of lawyers at a tribunal of inquiry. And I knew exactly what Ray Burke meant there. What he was saying was that we have to be conscious to be fair to all parties, we can't be seen to be biased or to be seen to be putting the boot into any party or into Sergeant McCabe. He had already referred in previous emails to the fact that we could be accused of being seen to be biased towards Sergeant McCabe and we have to be conscious of that. He wasn't referring to RTÉ as such putting the boot into Sergeant McCabe, he was referring to the fact that there were very strong criticisms here, inherent criticisms in the fact that the most serious findings hadn't been --
seen to be the ones that were making those criticisms, that this was in the report.
87 Q. All right. And insofar as we are dealing with the term of reference here in relation to influence or an attempt to influence the broadcasts, is there any way that the reference to putting the boot into Sergeant McCabe here came from Garda Headquarters, that you had been asked to deal with this report in a particular type of way?
A. No.

88 Q. A11 right. And did that enter your head when you saw that email?
A. No. I mean, I knew exactly what Ray meant.

89 Q. All right.
A. I mean, it was in the context of all the other previous $11: 13$ emails where we were conscious of being seen to be biased, where we had to be balanced, we had to be fair, we had to get the tone right, we had to make sure that everything we put on air had to be straight from the Commission's report.
90 Q. Okay. And then he just refers to relatively minor matters:
"I would just change the top paragraph to my wording. After that, carry on with your own wording. By the
way, for onl ine, l'll get it up onl ine as soon as it goes out on Mbrning Irel and, and I mi ght do a push notification to say it's coming up on Mbrning Irel and. Speak of onl ine, is it Maurice McCabe --"

And that refers to a spelling issue.
"You have done great work on this and I amsorry to be a little late with these suggestions."

And I think those matters were attended to, is that correct --
A. They were.

91 Q. -- in your script as it appears? Now, if I could just 11:14 turn to, $I$ think you sent some emails to yourself on the 8th May, working on the draft that you had started working on, is that right?
A. Yes.

92 Q. It would appear. We11, maybe we wil1 look at the first 11:14 one, it's at 6183 of the materials. It will come up in front of you now. And you see there, it's an email to yourself, and I think that was working on the drafts?
A. Yes. These were all works in progress. These are initial things.

93 Q.
A11 right. I just want to ask you about one or two things in that, and if we could turn to page 6188 of the materials, halfway down the page, you've gone through your working on your script, and then if we could scroll down, please, Mr. Kavanagh, you see there: 11:15
"Wap anal ysis, PTC. "
what does that stand for?
A. Piece to camera.

94 Q. "Al legations rel ate to inci dents that occurred in 2007 and 2008. The findings in today's report of failures in Garda investigations had al ready been identified in previ ous reports. Files had been sent to the DPP, GSOC 11:15 had been i nf ormed and the Gardaí had been di sci pl ined. "

And you see in brackets there it says:
"(Check is this in report.)"

And I wonder could you explain to me please.
A. It's a note I wrote to myself.
A. And you can see the question-marks "Wap anal ysis, PTC. " What are we going to do? what are we going to say? Can we make this point? Is it in the report? Can we safely say that?
Q. A11 right. where I want to clarify, Mr. Reynolds, if I could is, is this an example of you being careful that 11:16 everything you say has come from the report itself?
A. Yes.

97 Q. All right. okay. If we could then turn to page 277 of the materials, as I understand this, it's another email to yourself or perhaps notes that you made to yourself which have been included in the materials.
A. okay.

98 Q. And if I could -- it's 6200, I think. Yes, 6200. If we could scroll down to the -- yes. You see there --
A. Yes.

99 Q. -- you say: "My vi ew car ef ul ????"
A. Yeah.

100 Q. I wonder if you could explain that please?
A. I have got to be careful that I don't take a personal 11:17 view on this that is not reflected in the report. I have to be a 100 percent sure that I'm working on the report, that $I$ don't end up sticking any views that I may or may not have. Just warning to self, you know, be aware.

101 Q. A11 right. And insofar as you have a view, okay, which you are entitled to have, everybody accepts that, what I'm asking you is, was that view ever informed by anything that you heard from Garda Headquarters and, in particular, Commissioner o'Sullivan?
A. No, I mean, it was -- I was reading the report, I was -- you know, you would draw conclusions, you'd see things and you'd say how did this -- you are thinking why did this happen or how did this happen, and you'd write something down and then you'd come back to it a couple of hours later and say where did I get that, is this my view or where is this in the report? So you are checking and cross-checking and just making sure that you have got it right.
102 Q. Al1 right. If I could go down to the next paragraph, 11:18 you see here:
"Questi on of why he made those compl ai nts."
A. Yes.

103 Q. A11 right. So, we know Mr. Justice O'Higgins at the beginning of the report, and I think it was chapter 3, said Sergeant McCabe's motivation had been wrongly questioned?
A. Mmm.
A. Did you say wrongly? Did he say that? I thought he said he had genuine and legitimate concerns.
Q. Yes, yes, the motivation --
A. Yeah, he had genuine and legitimate concerns and courage, yeah.

106 Q. So where was that coming from, that line, Mr. Reynolds, the question of why he made those complaints?
A. This is me jotting down why did he make those complaints. It's clear he believed there was
widespread -- it's almost me talking to myself.
107 Q. All right. We will continue on so with your notes.
A. These are just ideas in my head, you know.

108 Q. Yes. "Cl ear he bel i eved there was wi despread corruption. Commi ssi on's report dismisses that. Finds 11:19 he exaggerated some and got st uff wrong, etcetera. Even though his heart was in the right place, facts did not support his bel iefs. However consequence of that bel ief, the actions he took, the exaggerations and errors he made, the fact that he convi nced so many peopl e, Cl ai re Dal y, Mck Wallace, M cheál Martin, Enda Kenny and lots of reporters, that there had to be somet hing wrong in the Gardaí, reality was that he hadn' t convi nced Der mot Ahern, Facht na Murphy, the
former Garda Cormissioner, Al an Shatter, Martin Callinan, Derek Byrne and Terry McGinn."

Where do you think all of that came from?
A. These are -- these are all the things that are -- I'm reading this, I'm jotting stuff down, things are coming into my head, I am thinking, you know, there's clearly various viewpoints on this; Claire Daly, Mick wallace, Micheál Martin, Enda Kenny had one view, Fachtna Murphy, Dermot Ahern, Alan Shatter, they had another 11:19 view. What's going on? why is he doing this? People -- you know, the questions -- they speak for themselves, I am trying to get a handle on it really, you know.
109 Q. All right. Just in relation to the question of why he made those complaints, did you know or did you think you know why he made those complaints?
A. No. I was reading through the report. These are things I was looking out for.
110 Q. okay. So I wonder could you expand on that, please. so you got the final report in a number -- from a number of different people, and you were reading it and one of the things you were looking out for was why he made the complaints.
A. Yeah.

111 Q. Am I correct in saying that?
A. Yeah. Well, I was thinking, I'm reading the report and thinking do we have to look at why he made those complaints? Do you know what I mean, is this an issue
here? I am not saying we have to, but things are popping into my mind. Do we have to look at why he made these complaints? Do we have to see who agreed with him? Do we have to see who disagreed with him? Do we have to see what the report says about that?

112 Q. And did you think you knew the answer to that?
A. No, there's question-marks all over the place.

113 Q. All right. Okay. we will leave it there for a minute. Now, just if we could just continue on in your notes, you referred earlier on to the earlier reports and you knowing about those, that was the Mr. Mooney one and the RTÉ one, and I think if we could turn to page 6235 of the materials, these, again, as I understand it, are your notes and you see at the bottom of the page, 6225, I think. I think that -- the bottom. Right. You refer there to the Times story?
A. Yes.

114 Q. So you obviously had that when you were working?
A. Yeah. Well, I had looked it up online or something I presume.
115 Q. Yes. And it appears there, continues on. And if we can keep going down to 6237 -- 27, sorry, there are two numbers on my -- you see there:
"MECabe positive from RTÉ report in April."
A. Yeah.

116 Q. Is that what you were referring to there?
A. Yeah, yeah.

117 Q. All right.
A. And I imagine all those -- I mightn't be the neatest worker, I tend to be a little bit chaotic, Chairman, I can jot bits here and bits there, some of the notes were written on the back of envelopes and things like that, you know. Something comes into my mind I will jot it down.

118 Q. Al1 right. Okay. So that was the work you did leading up to the reports on the 9th May, and I think it's your position, you have made it fairly clear, that you worked from the reports, there was no outside influence, you were as careful as you could be to work from the reports, which were all the same in actual fact, and everything in them you can stand over it by reference to a particular quote in the report?
A. Yes.

119 Q. A11 right. And in relation to any allegations that they may have been influenced by anybody else, you reject those, is that correct?
A. Yes, totally.

120 Q. A11 right. Now, we know that morning when the Morning Ireland -- I should have asked you as we11: I think the night before you may have been in contact or tried to contact Sergeant McCabe in relation to the forthcoming broadcasts?
A. Yes, that's correct.

121 Q. I wonder could you tell us about that, please.
A. Well, I rang him the night before. when we had a handle on what we were finally going to do, and as you can see we were going right up to the wire, once I had
a fair idea of what we were going to publish I rang him and I left a message to say that we were going to do something on the o'Higgins Commission report and if he wanted to call me back and make a comment I would tell him. I was going to tell him what we were doing and if he wanted to say anything he could.
122 Q. All right. And I don't think -- was there a reaction to that?
A. No. There was a reaction the next morning.

123 Q.
All right. If we just turn to that. So, we have gone through the actual broadcasts themselves. So I think the next morning, at this stage there had been a 7:00am broadcast, an 8:00am broadcast and a reference to the various chapters in the o'Higgins Report, in or around the half eight mark, is that correct?
A. I think it started about twenty past eight and it went through the news bulletin and it finished at about twenty five to nine or nearly twenty to nine.
124 Q. Just maybe I should, before I just come to this, I think you referred in particular to the following chapters in the reports, I think it was to chapter 4, $5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12$ and 13 , is that correct?
A. Eleven of the 15 chapters we incorporated into the reports.
125 Q. Yes.
A. We left out the introduction, the methodology, the recommendations and the chapter on Pulse.

126 Q. Was left out as well?
A. Yeah.

127 Q. Yes. A11 right. So most -- the chapters from 4 to 11 were specific Garda investigations, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

128 Q. And they were the ones that were particularly spoken about on the broadcast on Morning Ireland?
A. Yes. I tried to condense them down and make them as straightforward as possible.
Q. All right. And you left out the Pulse one?
A. Yeah.

130 Q. And you dealt with the investigations and policing in Bailieboro, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

131 Q. A11 right. So that's what you dealt with in around the half eight mark?
A. On the Morning Ireland programme, yes.

132 Q. On the Morning Ireland programme. And then there's an email, which we see at 6240 of the materials, if it could be got up, 6240. So you receive an email from Mr. Burke, who you'd been working with over the weekend on compiling the reports, and he sends it to a number of people, and the text of it is:
"I pi cked up a news desk phone shortly after 8: 00am The caller sai d he was Garda Ser geant Mauri ce McCabe. He said he had been contacted by peopl e saying that an RTÉ onl i ne report was saying that the O Hi ggi ns Report had said he had Iied. He said this was "shocking stuff" - "

And the "shocking stuff" is in quotes
"-- and he was gi ving us an opportunity to take it down. I told himthat my understanding was that the report says that he uttered an untruth and that he had made a fal se statement and this was unacceptable, although his motivation was genui ne. He asked me where in the report it said that. I said l would try and find out and would ring himback as soon as possible. I rang Paul --"

That is you, is that correct?
A. Yes.

133 Q. "-- and got himto mail me the rel evant paragraph. I then rang Sergeant MECabe and told himthis. He said 11:28 it was amazing that Paul had not quoted the full context. He said he had not lied, that a deliberate false report is a lie."

And then there is a reference to the dictionary meaning 11:28 of "lie".
A. That's correct.

134 Q. Now, I wonder could you deal with, first of a11, the reference to lie in your broadcast.
A. Well, I mean, we noticed that, we -- I saw that in the ${ }_{11: 28}$ report. Chapter 10.86, I knew it would be controversial because it's a big step to accuse somebody of telling a lie. I hadn't accused Sergeant McCabe of telling a lie; Mr. Justice Kevin O'Higgins
said that he'd told a lie. I read that a number of times. I read it that Sergeant McCabe had told an untruth -- the report said that Sergeant McCabe had told an untruth, that he was aware it was an untruth, that he had told it for a specific reason and that the report found -- Mr. Justice Kevin O'Higgins found that this was unacceptable. And the word used in the report was "untruth". But because of those four factors I said that is a lie, and I said it to Ray Burke and he agreed it was a lie and it went up the RTÉ editorial chain. I have an old Collins dictionary on my desk at home, I took it out and looked up the word "untruth" and the first word that came up was "lie". I thought back to my catechism when $I$ was in first class when it said no lie is either lawful or innocent and I thought, if we have any responsibility, we have to tell people what is in the report. And $I$ know this is unpalatable, but, as I said, I talked to Ray Burke about it and it went right up to Kevin Bakhurst and right through the editorial chain and it was decided that yes, we had to say that this was -- this was a lie and that a lie was told. I made very sure that we put it in the context that we also reported the finding that Mr. Justice Kevin O'Higgins said that Sergeant McCabe was nothing less than truthful in his evidence to the Commission, and I stressed that as well, but in this particular case he had told an untruth for a specific reason, it was found to be unacceptable and that was a lie. And I felt we had a responsibility to say that and we said
it.
135 Q. All right. So can I take it from that that this was a considered matter before it went into the broadcasts?
A. Yeah, we wrestled with it.

136 Q. Yes. All right. Now, if I can just maybe read out to you what paragraph 10.86 of the report actually says. It says -- I think chapter 10 of the report was dealing with an incident which happened in a public house, is that correct, Crossan's public house?
A. Yes, that is my understanding, yes.

137 Q. And that is the particular chapter of the report that this appears in?
A. Yes.
Q. And paragraph 10.86 it says:
"In a report of the 3rd March 2008 Sergeant McCabe informed Superintendent Cl ancy of the compl ai nts whi ch had been made to hi mby --"
A. I don't have it in front of me. That is okay. That's fine.
139 Q. If you are okay with that.
"-- whi ch had been made to himby Mr. and Mrs. R. He reported that a compl ai nt had been made to GSOC al though he was aware that this was not the case. He
tol d the Commissi on that the reason for this untruth was that he felt Mr. and Mrs. R had been badl y treated and that he knew that the reference to GSOC would ensure that the matter would recei ve attention."

You see -- well, you don't see it, but you are very familiar with that paragraph I presume?
A. Yes.

140 Q. "Wile his concern was genui ne and commendable it is unacceptable to furnish fal se information in a report."

## A11 right?

A. That is Mr. Justice Kevin O'Higgins's finding.

141 Q. Yes.
A. That is not mine.

142 Q. Yes. And you reported that as a lie, having thought about it, having looked it up in the dictionary?
A. Two dictionaries.

143 Q. Two dictionaries. Now, if I can just -- this may or 11:32 may not in your notes be a reference to this. If we could get page 5905 of the -- 5905. If we go to the bottom of the page, it says, you see there at 9 , and then, I:
"Truthful to the Commission in his evi dence he lied to a seni or officer (lied)."
A. Yes.

144 Q. Does that note refer to the eventual appearance of "lie" in your broadcast?
A. Yes.

145 Q. All right. And if I could just then turn to page --
A. This is a typed copy of my handwritten notes.

146 Q. Yes, yes. Sorry, I should have identified that. And
if we can turn to page 5950 of the materials, which is included with your handwritten notes at the very back of it, is this the dictionary that you referred to?
A. Is that -- that might be -- there's two dictionaries; one was Ray Burke's dictionary and the other was mine. So that could be Ray Burke's dictionary.
147 Q. Okay. So it does appear to be that Ray Burke's dictionary consulted?
A. Yes, yes.

148 Q. All right. And was that after the telephone call from Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yeah.

149 Q. That was done in RTÉ?
A. Yeah.

150 Q. All right.
A. And I think that's my -- oh, no, that is Ray Burke's.

151 Q. Yes. All right. So that appears appended to your report.
A. I think my dictionary is report -- is appended as well.

152 Q. I'm sorry. Yes, it's the next page, thanks.
"My home Collins English di ctionary."
A. That is my late father's dictionary, yeah.

153 Q. And I think the reference to untrue is highlighted in that, just at the bottom of the page. So I suppose what I'm really asking you is why did you just not say "untrue"? why did you change the word "untrue" to "1ie"?
A. Because I think the responsibility of journalists is
not to use diplomatic or parliamentary or polite language that they are given. I mean, I read press releases every day and in many way they are written in a particular language which many people don't understand and I think the duty of a reporter is to tell it like it is and to very often get behind the words and explain it for what it is and that is why I felt we should use the word.

All right. Well --
MR. GLLANE: Chairman, I am loath to interrupt
Ms. Leader because I know we heard this yesterday, but could I just point out on this broadcast that when Mr. Reynolds uses the word "1ie" it's immediately followed by a clear description of what Mr. Justice o'Higgins called it, which was an "untruth". So, he 11:35 does put the two together in the same sentence. CHA RMAN No, I do get that. ME. LEADER: And just finally in relation to that, there may be a view taken that the word "lie" is a stronger word than "untruth" or a more direct way of saying things. Was the choice of the word "lie" inspired any way by matters which came from Garda Headquarters or Commissioner o'Sullivan?
A. No, it was my decision and it was -- I was supported by that at the highest levels in RTÉ because they felt, yes, we had a duty and a responsibility to tell the truth.

156 Q. Okay. Now, I think shortly afterwards, after that email was sent to you, which was at half eleven, you'd
spoken to Mr. Burke beforehand?
A. Well, when the call came in Ray Burke rang me and said Sergeant McCabe has been on the phone, he said that we are after saying this about him and I said, tell him it's in the report. And I gave him the reference number, 10.86. And then I understand that Ray called him back and said it's in the report, it's 10.86.
157 Q. okay. I think RTÉ received a letter from Seán Costello \& Company, and that's at page 6245 of the documentation.
A. Yeah, that came in at one minute to broadcast time.

158 Q. At one o'clock?
A. One minute to one. 12:59.

159 Q. A11 right. And the one o'clock broadcast was in relation to the senior officers and the --
A. The corruption allegations.

160 Q. The corruption allegations. Okay. And what it says is:
"Dear Si r/Madam
We have been consulted by Ser geant McCabe in rel ation to your Mbrning Irel and programme thi s morning.

We are instructed that Paul Reynol ds was intervi ewed and spoke on the programme concerning the report of the $\mathrm{O}^{\prime} \mathrm{Hi}$ ggi ns Commi ssi on and spoke of and concerning our $\mathrm{cl} i e^{2}$ and i n so doing grossly def amed our client.

Firstly, we must point out that this report has not
been published and is still with the M nister for Justice, yet this is in the possessi on of RTÉ. The report having not been published is subject to the restrictions in respect thereof pursuant to Part $V$ of the Commi ssi on of Investi gations Act 2004.

Mr. Reynol ds contacted Ser geant MkCabe I ate I ast ni ght asking for his comments in the ful know edge that our client is a serving member of An Garda Sí ochána and asking for his comments in rel ation to this as yet unpubl ished report.

We do not have a transcript or recording of this morning's programme but it is clear to us that the coverage of what is a report whi ch runs to over 350 pages is utterly unbal anced, incorrect and grossly def amatory of our client. In fact, Mr. Reynol ds said this morning that our client "Iied during this case" and this is simply not correct.

It appears that Mr. Reynol ds has the report and has taken a briefing frominterested parties which cul minates in your broadcast this morning. It is clear that the briefing by any such parties is done with a vi ew to destroying the reputation of Ser geant MLCabe and fundament ally represents the findings of the O Hi ggi ns Commi ssi on of I nvesti gation.

The purpose of this letter is to request your
confirmation by return that this broadcast will be i mmedi at el y renoved from your website and RTÉ Pl ayer and is not repeated again.

We understand that Mr. Reynol ds proposes to broadcast 11:39 further excerpts fromthe report in a programme at 1: O0pm today and it is clear that the repetition of any of the def amatory--"

I am sorry, I am missing the next page, but the -thank you.
"-- and any comments of thi s morning's broadcast will aggravate further the damage al ready suffered by our client.

We await hearing fromyou as a matter of urgency. Yours faithfully."

So you see there is the reference to briefing from interested parties there.
A. Yes.

161 Q. That's where it comes from. Now, first of all, I don't think the reference to lie was taken down, is that correct?
A. No.

162 Q. okay. And it was left there having -- could you explain how that came about, please?
A. Well, I was about to go on air when that letter came
in. It was taken over by Ray Burke, the chief news editor, and Kevin Bakhurst, so it was -- the senior editors looked at that, they immediately made a decision we were going to proceed as was and then the lawyers were brought in and we left it between them.

163 Q. Okay. And I just want you to deal with the fact that, on behalf of sergeant McCabe it is being suggested that you had taken a briefing from interested parties; what do you say to that, Mr. Reynolds?
A. No. The contents of our broadcasts are based on the contents of the report. I spoke to people beforehand but my broadcasts were based on the o'Higgins Commission report and the findings of Mr. Justice Kevin o'tiggins.
164 Q. All right. And just, maybe I have asked you this question already: Insofar as it could be suggested that an impression could be taken from your reports on particularly maybe the one o'clock broadcast and the Morning Ireland broadcast, that Sergeant McCabe was somewhat of a crank and making complaints without checking them out, exaggerating them and they came to nothing in the end or what problems they were could be fixed very quickly and were more on the minor end of the scale, do you have anything to say in relation to that?
A. No --

165 Q. That that may be something that would favour Garda Headquarters?
A. No, because we said -- we said he acted out of genuine
and legitimate concerns, we said he performed a public service, at considerable personal cost, we said he was a dedicated and committed member of the Gardaí and we said that the Commission believed that he was due the gratitude of the public and the Garda Síochána, and in my live television reports I went further and said that he had -- if it wasn't for him none of this would have come out, we'd have learned nothing about all the failures and the flaws in the criminal investigations in the Bailieboro division.

166 Q. All right. And insofar as it could be said that an impression could be taken from your broadcasts that look, the appointment of an inspector in Bailieboro Garda Station, if that had happened when the guards wanted an inspector and had made a business case for an 11:43 inspector, none of this would have happened in the first place?
A. But that's what Mr. Justice Kevin O'Higgins said in his report.
167 Q. Well, I wonder did he exactly say that, Mr. Reynolds?
And I know you don't have the report in front of you now, but it would appear in paragraphs 14.59 and 14.60 that when Mr. Justice O'Higgins is concluding his report and dealing with policing in Bailieboro, what he says is:
"The conditions in Bailieboro Garda Station were depl orable and were not conduci ve to either good policing or good morale. However, those conditions
were not the cause of the deficiencies and failures in the investigations found by this Cormission. They were due to failures of individual s to carry out their duty properly."

You see what I'm saying to you?
A. Oh, we did, we also did refer to the failures of the individual probationer gardaí, we did refer to that. But he did make -- he did make that point, that if an inspector had been appointed perhaps this all could have been avoided.

168 Q. We11, I suppose he did make that point but he also made the point that if people had done their job in the first place, which sergeant McCabe was complaining about, that maybe none of this --
A. Yeah. I accept --

169 Q. And that maybe isn't -- and I'm putting this to you as a suggestion, Mr. Reynolds, that maybe isn't the impression that could be taken from your broadcasts?
A. I mean, people will take -- as I said in the Nine o'Clock News, people will take what they will from it. If I can put it to you this way: Marty Morrissey commentates on a hurling or football match which lasts 70 minutes and when he does a report afterwards it will only last a minute. There is 360 pages in this report, 11:45 we devoted 25 minutes on radio and another 15, 20 minutes on television, to what was effectively a reading, a public reading of the report. If we were to start at page 1 and go to page 360 , it just wouldn't be
possible to incorporate everything. We had to give people a flavour of it. And I tried to be as accurate, as honest, as fair and as impartial as I could be with the material $I$ had and with the time that was available to me. And I tried to give people, the public, I tried 11:45 to give them an accurate reflection of what was in the report. And I know that nobody seems to have been happy with it and so be it. I know Sergeant McCabe was deeply unhappy about it, I know Nóirín O'Sullivan said she was very unhappy about it. So be it.
170 Q. okay. And if I could just turn again to the term of reference and perhaps Mr. Kavanagh will get it up for us. It's [k], and you will see here:
"To i nvesti gate whet her Commissi oner O' Sul I i van, using briefing material, et cetera, influenced or attempted to influence broadcasts on RTÉ purporting to be a leaked account of the unpubl ished OHi ggi ns Commi ssi on report in whi ch Sergeant McCabe was branded a liar --"

Which we have dealt with, I hope
"-- and irresponsi ble."

Do you see the reference to "irresponsible" there?
A. I never said that Sergeant McCabe was irresponsible, I never said that anywhere. And Mr. Justice Kevin O'Higgins never said that Sergeant McCabe was irresponsible. And I never reported that he was
irresponsible. And I never branded him a liar.
Al1 right. But maybe we'11 deal with -- I think you have said what you have to say in relation to the liar part of it. But insofar as branded irresponsible, it could be said, Mr. Reynolds, that in conveying to the public on the national broadcasting authority that a lot of complaints were made that nothing came of, and in particular in relation to very senior officers in An Garda Síochána, that Sergeant McCabe, in complaining as he did, was irresponsible in so doing; do you see what ${ }^{11: 47}$ I mean?
A. There was no implication from our broadcasts that he was irresponsible. Quite the contrary. We said, and I know I'm repeating myself but we did say, we repeated ad nauseam that his concerns were genuine and legitimate and that he was courageous and that he had carried out a public service and we did say, in my analysis, that if he hadn't done what he had done we would never have found out about all of this.
172 Q. Okay. But there may also be a flavour from them that 11:47 he shouldn't have been complaining about things that he wasn't able to follow through?
A. But we said because he complained this is why all of this came about.
173 Q. All right. And insofar as an echo of anything, if it 11:48 could be put that way, and they are my words, when you put the press release in relation to the o'mahony inquiry in relation to the cooperation issue, it was the following through of complaints again that was
highlighted and the not following through of complaints. I don't know if you wish to say anything in relation to that?
A. I'm sorry, I don't -- the o'Mahony inquiry? This is --

174 Q. The 24th May issue -- 24th February, I beg your pardon --
A. Okay.

175 Q. -- 2014. Insofar as it was suggested there that Sergeant McCabe didn't cooperate with the o'Mahony inquiry, do you see what I mean?
A. Yeah.
Q. Yes.
A. That was the direction?

177 Q. Yes.
A. That is what the Garda Commissioner said.

178 Q. And maybe an inference could be taken --
A. That is what the Garda Commissioner said.

179 Q. Exactly.
A. Okay?

180 Q. That is the point.
A. So?

181 Q. So maybe here there is an echo of that coming through?
A. So are you telling me that people are going to listen to my report on 9th may 2016 and then they are going to think back two years and say, ah?
182 Q. I am just asking you that. I am asking.
A. I don't see it.

183 Q. And maybe --
CHA RMAK No, I think the question put by Ms. Leader
is more like this: It's not that the intelligent reader with a phonographic memory will actually immediately go back two years, it's that what's on the website in relation to the cooperation with o'mahony is very pro-Garda and this is very pro-Garda, and that is a question being put, I am not saying that, and that therefore, if you put the two of them together it seems that the general trend is pro-Garda and then the inference to be taken from that is perhaps you are being influenced by the Garda. Now, again I am not saying that, I am just saying that is the question put. M. LEADER: Yes, thank you, Chairman.
A. Well, first of all, I don't accept that it's pro-Garda. I think all the contents of the broadcasts are based on the findings of Mr. Justice Kevin O'Higgins. He is the 11:50 person who made these findings, who compiled the report, and we just reported that.
184 Q. All right. Now, if I could just go back to yesterday, to your answers to me in relation to the D allegation. All right. As I understand it, you said you first heard of it in 2013, is that correct?
A. That's correct, yeah.

185 Q. And it was an association with the penalty points issue?
A. I believe it was in the context of the penalty points.

186 Q. The penalty points issue. And at that time -- I don't know if it was made clear yesterday, but did you know the complainant was related to a guard?
A. No.

187
Q.
okay. And I think you excluded the possibility, and again correct me if I am wrong, that this was conveyed to you by Martin Callinan, former Commissioner o'Sullivan or Superintendent Taylor?
A. Yeah.
A. I was in the company of other journalists at various times but I think I did have a word with him at one stage, yeah.
allegation of sexual misconduct, I wonder did you have any such conversation with the Commissioner that day?
A. No, no.

Okay. We11, just what were you talking -- were you talking to him about Sergeant McCabe? It would be a natural thing to do --
A. I think I already said this on the day Commissioner Callinan retired, that he had -- I met -- I met him in the bathroom outside, I was washing my hands and he said to me --

195 Q. This is where? In the Public Accounts Committee?
A. This is in the Public Accounts Committee. And he said, he shook his head and knew he shouldn't have said the word disgusting.
196 Q. So that was after he came out?
A. Yeah.

197 Q. A11 right.
A. And that was it. I was, if you like, going in and he was coming out and I caught his eyes and he just said -- that was it.

198 Q. Did you speak to him any more?
A. No.
Q. So that's when -- when you are referring to talking to the former Commissioner?
A. Yeah, it was just sort of a -- you know, he just knew -- he knew he shouldn't have done it.

200 Q. Al1 right. Okay. And you'd no further conversation with him that day?
A. No, no.

201 Q. So you were following the story at that time, you were covering it on some level anyway, insofar as you were at the Public Accounts Committee that day?
A. The whistleblower story?

202 Q. And the penalty points story.
A. Oh, yeah, yeah. I covered the release of the O'Mahony report as well.
203 Q. A11 right. And what I want to ask you: In view of the fact that you actually knew Commissioner Callinan, did you ever discuss Sergeant McCabe with him?
A. I never discussed him in a negative way with him, no. 204 Q. okay.
A. In relation to terms of reference, no, I never did. I mean, I covered him -- I covered these issues while they were in the public domain, while they were on the record. For example, I covered the penalty points when the O'Mahony report was out, I covered the whistleblower allegation when the Public Accounts Committee hearings were underway. And in fact, I was really conscious as well, as was RTÉ, that we had to get the balance on this one, that we also had to hear from the whistleblowers as well as hearing from the Garda's point of view. And after the PAC meeting, we had heard Commissioner Callinan's view on the actions of the whistleblowers, and I wanted to get a reaction from the whistleblowers and John wilson would -- he talked to me, Sergeant McCabe wouldn't talk to me and that was fine, it was his right, but John wilson talked to me and he took phone calls from me and I interviewed
him and I put him on television a number of times. And on that occasion I asked John wilson to give us a reaction and from my television packages I put John Wilson's reaction as a whistleblower to Commissioner Callinan's claims at the Public Accounts Committee, I put them all into the one television package. So I was -- when I covered these events I cover them on the public record. When I covered of the inspectorate's report into the penalty points that was a report that was being covered. I also covered the Guerin Report, but again that is a report that was published. So if you understand what I mean? My reports on these issues were in relation to either documents, published reports, Oireachtas hearings or in the case of the former Minister for Justice, Alan Shatter, he made a detailed statement to the Dáil in February of 2014 in relation to Sergeant McCabe's allegations and I covered that as well.

205 Q. Okay. We11, I suppose if we were to look at, say, for instance, the evidence Mr. Boucher-Hayes has given to the Tribunal when he was bringing up the matter of penalty points, and this is his evidence, not Commissioner Callinan's evidence, when he was trying to bring up the issue of penalty points, his evidence to this Tribunal is that the former Garda Commissioner spoke about Sergeant McCabe in very derogatory terms, all right? So what $I$ 'm asking you is, in view of all of that, that these conversations with the former Commissioner seem to be linked in with a mention of
penalty points, and I hope I'm being fair to everybody in that regard.
A. To be simple, he never, Commissioner Callinan never spoke to me in any way derogatory about Sergeant Maurice McCabe. Never.

206 Q. All right. Okay. And just to deal with his retirement from the guards, we have heard evidence from Superintendent Taylor that he made available to you a letter which the former commissioner had sent to the Department of Justice in relation to the bugging of Garda stations, you are familiar with that evidence, are you? I think Mr. McGuinness asked --
A. The bugging of Garda stations?

207 Q. Well, taping.
A. This is the phone recordings issue?

208 Q. Yes. Yes. I should have said it that way, yes. You are aware of that evidence. And in Superintendent Taylor's protected disclosure, this is the way he explains it, at page 7, and it will come up on the materials in front of you. So we have:
"On Tuesday morning, 25th March --"

Do you see it?
A. Yes.

209 Q. "-- l was sitting in the kitchen of the Press Office readi ng the morning newspapers when the Commi ssi oner rang me and same l'm gone. I i nqui red as to what he meant and he replied that I have resi gned, get it out
qui ckly to the media, tell Paul. This meant Paul Reynol ds. "

A11 right? So that as I understand it, the -- that it's a reference to Commissioner Callinan conveying, through his Press officer, that something dramatic had happened and he was getting it out to the media before other people who he refers to in less than friendly terms, do you see the reference there on the screen in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. So the suggestion is being made there, and it is only a suggestion, that you were happy or you would facilitate, you would facilitate the conveying of a message on Commissioner Callinan's behalf to the media generally? I don't know if you want to answer that?
A. We11, I know nothing about conversations between Superintendent David Taylor and Commissioner Callinan.
211 Q. All right. Did Superintendent Taylor actually convey to you what had happened that morning?
A. I'm not prepared to comment on that, but I can -- I can confirm that I reported the retirement of Commissioner Martin Callinan because it was a major issue of public interest.
212 Q. What time did you report on it?
A. I think we reported at ten o'clock that morning.

213 Q. okay. All right. And --
CHA RMAN Mr. Reynolds, I really don't see how journalistic privilege can possibly arise if someone
makes a phone call to you from the Garda Press Office, the actual Press officer, and says something that is a fact; namely, that Commissioner Callinan is resigning or has resigned or he's gone or whatever. I just don't see how it can possibly arise. Now, if something that is added to that off the record, well there may be a different situation involved. But you will appreciate in relation to everything that I am looking into which includes this --
A. Sure.

CHA RMAN -- any question of privilege has been waived. But I would assume, I would always assume that when the Garda Press office is ringing you to tell you a fact that they are actually telling you a fact, they are not telling you a secret or they are not trying to put a spin on things. I don't see why you suddenty jump and say, press privilege, press privilege.
A. It's a fair point, but why -- what is the necessity to know the source of information? I mean, the fact is that the Garda Commissioner retired and we reported it. CHA RMAK We11, I tell you why: Because you know, an awful lot of people are saying that David Taylor is lying. And at the end of the day, it's doesn't require the brain of Einstein but I need to sit down with that thing and say what has been proved, what has not been proved, what has been contradicted by other people, what has been supported by other people. It's a basic job that every single judge does. And you are frankly standing in the way and I don't see any good reason for
you doing it.
A. Okay, well look, I will grant you that and because he was the press officer and if he says that he called me, I'11 accept it.
214 Q.
MS. LEADER: And it was reported later, in or around the 10:00am mark that morning, is that correct, by RTÉ?
A. RTÉ reported it, yeah.

A11 right. Now, if I can just turn to page 7608 of the materials, and this is a report from the FSNI in relation to the mobile phone of former Commissioner Callinan, all right? It will come up in front of you, where certain texts are recorded on it. I just want to explain to you that these texts are recovered texts, Mr. Reynolds, so we don't know the direction they are travelling in but you can make certain inferences from them. So it records a text but we don't know whether in fact it was sent by the former Commissioner or received. Now, if we first of all turn to text number 18, and this is something that former Assistant Commissioner O'Mahony commented on in his evidence and he said that wasn't him. All right? So it's on the 22nd March 2014 at just before half eight in the evening.
"Yes, just thi nki ng so much pressure bei ng exerted from 12:02 Labour riding on Varadkar's opener. Hope Kenny can control the PAC on Tuesday and you would need a pl an B if needed in a hurry. I mean what you were putting together -- I mean what you putting toget her yesterday.

Si milarly, if you were door-stepped or at an official function. Reynol ds would be able -- would help out if an intervi ew arose sonewhere. Just thoughts and not recommendati ons. "

So what I want to ask you in relation to that is, would you help out if an interview arose somewhere? would you help the Commissioner, former Commissioner? Somebody seems to think that you would.
A. No, I wouldn't -- I wouldn't -- I mean, I wouldn't help 12:03 him but I would interview the Commissioner and I would ask whatever relevant questions we needed to ask.
216 Q. All right. Now, if we could go down to text 30 --
A. Can I just add a rider to that?

217 Q. Certainly.
A. Like, I mean, I think if anybody looks at my work in relation to my interviews with commissioners, particularly the former commissioners Callinan and o'sullivan, I mean Commissioner o'sullivan walked off on two interviews that I conducted with her on a live
camera while we were asking her difficult questions, and RTÉ broadcast the footage of her walking away. I think it's a lazy assumption, I think it's a very unfair assumption to say or to think that you can say that I would be soft on people. I think there are a number of interviews that have gone viral online where I have asked people difficult questions and I think my record speaks for itself that I will ask the hard questions when they need to be asked.

218 Q. A11 right. And if we could go down to text 30. Now, this is sent on -- well, we don't know if it was sent or not, but we are making the presumption, text 30 , on the $26 / 3$, so just after the former Commissioner's retirement:
"It seens pretty clear to me and it's not right. If you want to set the record strai ght let me know. Meantime, take it easy."

And the next text that is recovered from the phone is at 22:34:50 on the same day:
"Thank you, Paul."

Do you see that?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

219 Q. Now, I just want to ask you: Did you send the text on 23rd March 2014 at 22:34?
A. To be honest with you, I don't know. It could have been me but I don't know.

220 Q. okay.
A. I mean --

221 Q. There is a reference to "thank you, Paul " after that?
A. Yeah.

222 Q. Okay. So it would appear from the billing records of the former Commissioner that it probably was -- it doesn't exactly tally with the time, but it does seem that a text was sent from the former Commissioner to
you very close to 22:50?
A. Look, it could be me and if it is, I think it's pretty clear, it's two days after the Garda Commissioner has retired, there is major political controversy, there is controversy in the guards, and this is the man who's gone, who knows what's happened and obviously as a journalist you want to seek an interview with him.
223 Q. A11 right. So just to clear it up, Mr. Reynolds, insofar as a suggestion can be taken or an inference can be taken from those few texts and in relation to what David Taylor said in his evidence in relation to giving you a document in relation to the former Commissioner's retirement, are you rejecting any suggestion that you were in any way acting as a media link for the guards at that particular time?
A. Totally.
Q. All right. okay. Now, if I could just then go back to the 9th May, the D matter. You heard it in 2013, you don't think you knew that the complainant was the daughter of a colleague and you don't think you knew about that until maybe matters closer to this time, closer to this Tribunal being set up, is that right?
A. Yes.

225 Q. A11 right. And you say you heard it and I think it was kind of not an issue for you because you knew there would be a procedure thereafter if there had been anything to the complaint, isn't that right, there would have been a court case?
A. Yeah, I mean, I have covered cases where guards have
been arrested, they have been charged, they have been prosecuted, they have been jailed, there is a process --
A. -- and the process becomes public very quickly.
Q. Yes?
A. -- I never heard that. And as I said yesterday, that didn't make sense to me.
Q. Yes. Exactly.
A. Do you know what I mean? So that never made sense to me. The motivation issue was a separate issue, wasn't it, in relation to an exchange between legal teams at the commission of investigation. That was a separate issue.

231 Q. Well, as I understand what the Superintendent Taylor is
saying, is he is saying he was asked by the former Commissioner, Commissioner Callinan that is, to brief the media in relation to Sergeant McCabe that he was driven by agendas and he was asked to draw the media's attention to the allegation of sexual assault made against Sergeant McCabe and that was the root cause of his agenda in making these complaints?
A. And that didn't happen.

A11 right. So insofar as there was any linking, and this is my question to you, of the $D$ allegation and Sergeant McCabe's agenda in making complaints --
A. I never saw that link.
Q. You never saw that link?
A. And I never -- you know, as I said yesterday, I heard it and then it was dismissed and I forgot about it.
Q. Yes.
A. You know.
Q. You heard of the $D$ matter, is that correct?
A. Yeah, I mean, I heard an allegation, it was investigated, file to DPP, no prosecution, move on.

And when Sergeant McCabe was bringing his concerns to the public, my belief was that his motivation was genuine and legitimate and he was pursuing these cases.

236 Q. A11 right. And I think yesterday you said to me you didn't hear anything in relation to the questioning of Sergeant McCabe's motivation in 2015 when the o'Higgins Commission would have been an ongoing matter. Do you remember I drew your attention to an email from Mr. Burke of July 2015, Mr. John Burke?
A. Oh, sorry, yes, yes.
Q. You didn't know anything of that?
A. No.

A11 right. So as I understand your position to be, is the first you heard of the questioning in the O'Higgins 12:10 Commission was when there was a Prime Time programme, is that correct, in relation to the matter, the leaks?
A. Oh, yeah, the transcripts -- the initial transcripts, yeah.
Q. All right. Now, I have checked that out, and it would seem that on the 9th May 2016 RTÉ ran several TV and radio broadcasts, including discussions of what was purported to be a leaked account of the unpublished o'Higgins Report. That is your broadcast?
A. Yeah.
A. Yes.

A11 right. So that was a week after the publication of the report and over a week after your broadcasts on the 9th May, obvious7y?
A. Okay.

242 Q. A11 right. And I think the day after there were reports in the Examiner in relation to the leaked transcripts?
A. Okay.

243 Q. All right. So am I correct in saying that your first
knowledge of Sergeant McCabe's motivation being questioned, all right, by the guards, must have been the 17th may 2016?
A. I need to check did I do the same reports, did I do similar reports on the same day of the 17th May.
A. Because I also saw transcripts from the o'Higgins Commission which showed that the judge had clarified -the matter had been clarified to Mr. Justice Kevin O'Higgins' satisfaction and that might be the same day. 12:12
245 Q. All right. So in the run-up to the 17th May, you had done your own research in relation to the motivation issue in the o'Higgins Commission?
A. Yeah, I mean, there was a question -- yeah, I mean, this issue came up and I just said, well, what's it about? And I started making inquiries and I found that it had been dealt with at the o'Higgins Commission by Mr. Justice Kevin O'Higgins.
246 Q. So is it correct to say then, the Tribunal can discount any possibility that any guard told you that sergeant McCabe was ill-motivated and the reason for all of this was -- or the start of all of this was that he had been investigated back in -- a complaint had been made in 2006, investigations started which concluded in early 2007?
A. Yeah, as I said, that didn't make sense to me because he had been exonerated.

247 Q. All right. okay. Now, if we could just turn to your notes, so, that you -- your own notes that you made
when you were preparing the 9th May broadcasts. I think you made those available to the Tribunal at a very early stage, and they were, thereafter, typed up for the Tribunal. And the first page of them in typewritten form is at page 5898 of the materials, and I think that's in volume 20. So if you could just -"Start of Rel evant Notes", and you see there April 2016 notebook?
A. Yes.

248 Q. So can we take it that it must have been in April? Do you use --
A. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

249 Q. A11 right. And we see here you had the report at this stage?
A. No, I don't think -- I'm not sure if I did.
Q. A11 right. You must have known it was imminent, so, or --
A. Well, I knew -- I knew it had been received by the Minister.

251 Q. A11 right. So you see:
"Accel er at ed recrui tment
Probationers
Lots of sergeants coming and going
Wanted out of a kip
McCabe doing his job - doi ng great."
A. Yes.

252 Q. So I wonder could you explain --
A. I was speaking to people about the O'Higgins Commission
report and about the issues in Bailieboro, and this is the sort of feedback I was getting. This was, if you like, positive briefing, Chairman, in relation to Sergeant McCabe.

All right. So I wonder could you explain the positive briefing?
A. Well, the person I was speaking to said Sergeant McCabe was doing his job, he was doing a great job. And as I said in my evidence, I heard positive and I heard -- I heard complimentary and I heard criticisms of Sergeant McCabe, and that is an example of where I actually heard praise for him, that he was -- I had heard that he was a committed and diligent station sergeant.
254 Q. All right. And you see there the reference "want ed out of a kip", did that have anything to do with Mr. Justice o'Higgins' report and the state of Bailieboro Garda Station?
A. It could have, it could have, yeah.
Q. All right. So -- and is that a reference to Sergeant McCabe wanting out of Bailieboro --
A. Yeah, I didn't --
Q. -- do you think?
A. As far as I know, the sergeant asked to be transferred from Bailieboro, and he was, to mullingar, so that may be a reference to that.

257 Q. Okay. Do you think it was a reference --
A. I mean, it possibly is. I won't, you know, come down heavy on either side. But as I said, these are conversations I heard with people. I was jotting down
bits and bobs, trying to get a perspective on what was happening. This is -- I believe this is -- this would have been before I had the report. These are my first notes in April in relation to this issue.
All right. And you see here there is a reference then to:
"Sergeant in charge

- Complaint case agai nst him
- I nvesti gat ed I ocally (M stake)
(Wong) - Superi intendent Cl ancy."
A. Yeah.

259 Q. I wonder could you explain that, please?
A. The person I was talking to told me that the -- in the -- the allegation in 2006 was investigated locally and that was a mistake, it shouldn't have been investigated by the local inspector. It was kept in that division, it should have been -- an officer from outside the district or the division should have been appointed to look after that. That was what the person 12:17 told me.

260 Q. Al1 right. So, now, as I understand your evidence - I just want to give you every opportunity to explain this - you didn't know that it was the daughter of a colleague who had made the complaint -- or a guard, sorry, I should have said, who had made the complaint?
A. No, I don't -- this is 2016 now?

261
Q. Yes.
A. This is not 2014?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. I know now after all I've heard. I can't -- I don't think I did know, I don't think I did know, but with all I have heard I may have known, but again, it wasn't really a factor. I wasn't -- we weren't talking 12:18 about the victim, her family, or anything else like that. We were talking about the fact that a decision had been made to do this investigation locally and it shouldn't have been done, it should have been done from outside.
263 Q. A11 right. And then we see in brackets:
"(Wong) - Superintendent Cl ancy." what is that about?
A. My understanding is that Superintendent Clancy was the person who made the decision, that it should be -- that 12:18 it was to be investigated, and he appointed Inspector Cunningham, and that may be incorrect but that is my understanding.
264 Q. That was your understanding?
A. Yeah.

265 Q. Yes. Al1 right. So what I'm asking you really about there is, what had all that got to do with the O'Higgins Report?
A. Well, nothing really, yeah. This is the sort of thing that comes up in conversation, when you are talking 12:18 about policing in Bailieboro, the problems of the division, you know, and it would have been a conversation like that, you know, that would have been wide-ranging, where $I$ would have heard, first of all,
about -- the allegation would have come up and somebody would have said, oh, there was a complaint made in 2006 but sure there was nothing in it. And I'd say, oh, what do you mean a complaint? well, there was a complaint made, it was abuse of a minor, it was investigated, there was a file sent to the DPP and there was no prosecution. oh, right, okay.
Q. We11, I suppose what I'm really asking you is, you knew it referred to Sergeant McCabe there, am I right in that?
A. Yeah, the sergeant in charge, yeah.
Q. And was this being put -- information being given to you to explain in any way what had happened thereafter?
A. No, I don't believe so.
Q. Okay. So why were you being told about it? why did you think you were being told about it?
A. I don't know. I didn't ask. Just, if I can use the colloquialism, we were shooting the breeze.
Q. And just that particular piece of information, what I am asking you, did that particular piece of information come to you from former Commissioner o'Sullivan at that time?
A. No.

271 Q. All right. And then we continue on with your notes:
"Description of crimes in M cheál Martin dossier

- Murder
- Attempt ed murder Ki dnapping

Rape
Attempted rape."

Did that come from the report or from somewhere else?
A. No, I think I would have been talking about the report and the dossier and the -- clearly, the dossier that was given to Micheál Martin which subsequently went to the Taoiseach.

272 Q. okay. And we turn to the next page, 5899:
"- was listened to

- were i nvesti gat ed, DPP, GSOC --"

Commission, is it?
"-- Comm"
Or is that --
A. It could be Commissioner.

273 Q. Commissioner.
A. Or yeah -- could refer to him.

274 Q. "I nternal i nvesti gation - no corruption, mal practice, exagger at ed.
McCabe - not happy - M cheál Martin
Hi ggi ns Tri bunal - same concl usi ons as internal J uni or members - I ack of supervision and in bad conditions. "
A. Yeah.
Q. So you didn't have the report at that stage, you think?
A. No, no. .

276
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Just go back to the first page, that he was "doing great", that for an unknown reason you are being referred to the D complaint, being -- and mistake to investigate it locally, there is a broad description of crimes set out. And then we go to the next page, that a11 of those have been investigated and that there hadn't been any corruption, malpractice, that everything had been exaggerated, that Sergeant McCabe wasn't happy and that the o'Higgins Tribunal came to the same conclusions and that it was all junior members, lack of supervision and bad conditions. what did you make of all of that?
A. We11, I just jotted it down. I mean, I wanted to get my hands on the report to see for myself.
Q. All right. Well, it could be said, Mr. Reynolds, that somebody was briefing you that there was nothing to Sergeant McCabe's complaints and he wanted out of Bailieboro anyway and his own investigation wasn't handled properly, and maybe, putting two and two together, this was the whole reason he was making his complaints, that could be said to you?
A. Well, I didn't know all that at the time, and I was Report.

279 Q. All right.
A. I mean, people were shooting the breeze and I was
jotting stuff down, whatever. These were my notes, but they never fed into the stories that we broadcast. I mean, if you take -- if you sit through a court case, you write down everything but you don't use it all. But surely that is the point, Mr. Reynolds, that somebody was giving you this line?
A. which line?
A. Well, I don't know if they were giving me the line he wanted out of Bailieboro. They might have been telling ${ }_{\text {12:23 }}$ me that he was -- he wanted out of a kip, yeah, he wanted out of Bailieboro, yeah, okay.
Q. Yes. And that his own investigation hadn't been -- had been mistakenly investigated locally?
A. Well, I don't know if they were saying that. I thought ${ }_{12: 23}$ that was their opinion, I took that as the person I was talking to, it was their opinion, it was a mistake, yeah.
283 Q. Yes, exactly. So maybe that would suggest that sergeant McCabe wasn't happy about that, that he was making these complaints in relation to murder, attempted murder, kidnapping, rape, attempted rape, that they had all been listened to, investigated, that nothing had come of it, that Sergeant McCabe wasn't happy, that the o'riggins Commission had come to the same conclusions. So therefore, what I'm suggesting to you is, we could take from this that somebody was briefing you negatively about Sergeant McCabe in the run-up to you doing a report --
A. I don't see that as negative briefing, I don't see it that way.
Q. All right. Okay. So you must have been thinking of doing a story on the o'Higgins Commission report?
A. Yeah, I was actively seeking to --
Q. You were seeking information out?
A. I was seeking the report, I was looking for the report, and I was talking to people and I was talking to them about the report and perhaps what was in it and what was the situation in Bailieboro, but really, I mean, you couldn't do anything with this. You know, you can see it's disjointed, it's half-baked, it's all over the place, there is a bit here and a bit there. I mean, you know, you can pull the words together and make -anybody can pull those words together and make whatever they want out of them, you can jumble them around. They are just jot, jot, jot, you know, but what I wanted was the report.
287 Q. Okay. And if we could just turn to the next page, it's your May 2016 notebook, and I won't go through it in detail, but I think it may be - you are free to disagree with me - that you had the report at this stage?
A. No, I don't think so.

288 Q. You don't think so?
A. No.

289 Q. Al1 right. So May -- " 25 th/ 2nd - All egati on Gar da
corrupt? 1st publ ic order incident - tried to take a shortcut - she di dn't want to go to court."
That is in relation to the bus incident, is that correct?
A. Mm-hmm. I think so, yeah.
Q. "Took money - approached by McCabe. He should never have been invol ved in a ci vil resol ution. "

Was that the guard who investigated it?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes.
"His description and characterisation."
"Hi s description" I think refers to Sergeant McCabe's description, is that right?
"Gross exaggeration" is underneath that.
"2 drunk on a bus - rowdy
I nvesti gated very poorly

- No corruption - He was di sci plined
- Juni or Garda - gi ven a chance.

Not a scintilla of evi dence of corruption. "
A. Yeah.
Q. So you see there that there is 4.75 .76 , is that $a$ paragraph reference in the report?
A. Yes, yes.

293 Q. So at this stage you must have had the --
A. Yeah.
Q. Well, or somebody was reading it out to you? You had the report?
A. I could have had the report. I mean, again, I'm -- the
reference is there, if it matches the report, you know. 295 Q. Al1 right.
A. But again, as I said to you, I am jotting stuff down, I'm talking to people, I am listening to what they are saying, I'm jotting it down. I will make a judgement on it afterwards, but 1 will get the information into the notebook and see what they say and take everybody's opinion on board, but really it's the hard copy I want.
Q. All right. And then I think we won't go through your notes line by line, but they continue on page 4 and there is reference to paragraph numbers there. Are you going through the report there?
A. Yeah, I know I was going through the report on bits of paper and, you know, as I said, on the back of an envelope, and stuff like that, but really, the concrete $12: 27$ stuff was the stuff that we'd put on -- that I put on the computer. That's -- you know, the other stuff was prelim, very disjointed, bits and bobs, you know, mishmash, but the real stuff was the stuff on the computer where it started to come together and then we started to work on it.
Q. So if we turn, and we will just go quickly through it --
A. You can see there is no real order to it and there is no sense to it in many ways, you know.
298 Q. There is a reference on 5902 to paragraphs again.
A. Yes.

299 Q. 5903, "j uni or Gar daí", reference to -- a page number reference there, on 5903. And if we could just turn to
page 5904 of the materials, it's page 7 of your notes:
"M cheál Martin - allegations - not a scintilla of evi dence. Description and characterisation of offences. M cheál Martin - (brought into it).
Allegations previ ously brought to Dermot Ahern - gave evi dence. Taping confidential recipient. Al an screwed, lost his job. Look at all people lost their jobs. Ball of smoke?"

And that appears again. So is that you being cynical about what is --
A. Well, again, it could be me trying to think my way through it, jot down stuff, you know, all that sort of thing. It's not to be taken as anything. I mean, it's ${ }_{\text {12:28 }}$ all over the place.
300 Q. All right. Was that coming from anybody else, Mr. Reynolds, is what I am asking you?
A. No, I think that is me talking to myself, you know.

301 Q. Okay. Do you think --
A. But I can't be 100 percent sure now, you know, and this is all disjointed.
302 Q. All right. So is there a possibility that that was coming from somebody else, that there was nothing to all of this?
A. Ah, look, I knew there was something to it. Like, I mean, it was clear there was something to it.

303 Q. All right. If we just turn to the next page quickly. At 5905 the line "not exaggerated" appears.
A. Yeah.
Q. That is a continuation of the reference to the untruth 1ine. And then there is a reference at 14.60: "No inspector in Bailieboro - if there was - prob".
A. Yes.

309 Q. That may mean that probably --
A. Yeah, probably, as we've talked about earlier, yes.

310 Q. Yes. And 14.35: "Mani festly unf ounded, i naccurate,
incorrect, not supported by the facts, unreasonable."
A. All words taken from the report, aren't they?

311 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

MS. LEADER: Maybe we'd leave it there for lunch. Yes, 12:31 I think -- sorry, sir, Mr. McGuinness was just reminding me that Stephen Rae has a particular availability problem and I think the suggestion is we interpose him after lunch.
CHA RMAN I am happy to do that. will you be much longer?
ME. LEADER: I think about 40 minutes longer, 30 or 40. CHA RMAN All right. Well, I'd ask other people to think, and maybe whether we are going to reach any other witnesses today, you can tell me that at half past one, where we stand, appreciating that problems are caused when I sit late, in any event, so -- and I can't, because of what $I$ have said.

THE HEARI NG ADJ OURNED FOR LUNCH

MR. MARI NAN Stephen Rae, please.

## MR. STEPHEN RAE, HAV NG BEEN SUORN, MAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MR. MARRI NAN

312 Q. MR. MARRI NAN I think you're the group editor-in-chief of Independent News \& Media, is that right?
A. Yes, I'm the outgoing group editor-in-chief at INM.

313 Q. Yes. And would you just give a very brief history of your career to date to the Chairman, please?
A. I think as I outlined in my statement, I'm a native of County Kerry. I studied journalism at Dublin Institute of Technology, graduating in 1985, when I was young journalist of the year, and I subsequently got a bursary to join the Irish Independent. I was at the Irish Independent from 1985 to 1987. In 1987 I was appointed editor of the Garda Review. Then I joined the Herald as security correspondent in 1994, I became a news editor in the Herald in 1999, associate editor subsequently, then deputy editor, in 2005 I was appointed editor. In 2012 I was appointed editor of the Irish Independent, in 2013 I was appointed group editor-in-chief of the group. I'm a member of the advisory pane1 of the World Association of Newspapers and platforms and I'm a member of the High Level Expert Group on Fake News and Online Disinformation at the

European Commission.
314 Q. I think that you met with our Tribunal investigators on the 22 nd November of last year, and the memo of the interview is to be found at page 3598 of the materials, which you can refer to if you wish. In the first instance, in terms of Superintendent David Taylor, do you know Superintendent Taylor?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever met him?
A. No.

316 Q. I think there was, he attempted to contact you in May of 2015, is that right?
A. Yes.

317 Q. And I think that related to you helping him with a thesis that he was writing, is that right?
A. Yes, apparently, he contacted my office, seeking my assistance, apparently, with some thesis that he was working on, but $I$ didn't see a role in me doing that so I didn't respond.
Did you think that somewhat unusual at the time, that he was contacting you in circumstances where he didn't know you?
A. It happens all the time. People in my position get contacted by people from all walks of 1ife, seeking assistance with various thesis and academic work. So it happens all the time.
319 Q. Right. In terms of the Maurice McCabe story, if I can put it that way, I'm sure you had observed it as it evolved over the years?
A. Yes.

320 Q. And with particular focus on 2013 and the first three months of 2014, had you heard anything or any rumour concerning Maurice McCabe and his character?
A. No.

321 Q. Had any journalist in INM at any time approached you in relation to any rumour that may or may not have been circulating about Maurice McCabe?
A. No.

322 Q. Had you heard reference to investigation in relation to an alleged sexual assault in respect of Maurice McCabe going back to 2006/2007?
A. No.

323 Q. I'm sorry, I'm just being told that there may be some difficulty in hearing you.
A. Oh, sorry, I beg your pardon.
Q. That is better. Thank you very much. So, as a point of reference, we have Paul williams contacting -- or you becoming aware of Paul williams having a source who had asked him to visit with Ms. D, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So we know that that was at the beginning of March 2014. Prior to that, had you any inkling that there was a Ms. D or someone like that in Maurice McCabe's past who might have to be interviewed in relation to a story in respect of Maurice McCabe?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. So can the Tribunal take it that this was totally new to you at the time?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And what information did you have from Paul williams?
A. Well, what I recollect is that Paul had approached Kevin Doyle, who was the news editor of the Irish Independent, saying that he had been contacted by a representative of the family and that they had a story to tell and that would he visit with them and talk to them.
Q. And had you any idea of what it was that Ms. D was saying at that time?
A. No. Albeit they wanted to tell us a story, I didn't know the detail.
Q. Had you any inkling that it related to an allegation of sexual assault?
A. No.
Q. Or that there had been an investigation of an allegation of sexual assault concerning her that hadn't been properly investigated?
A. Not at that stage. A11 I knew was that they wanted to te11 us their side of the story.

331 Q. What did you think that her side of the story referred to?
A. You see, I didn't know, and it would have been a few layers below me that the information would have been passing through. It would have been the news editor, the head of news, that kind of level. So I wasn't really getting involved at that stage. I would wait until -- you know, just a little bit of how the newspaper works, there are several layers below me and
the editors and the heads of department would report in to me, so I would very much allow them to do their job, and it was then in that kind of chain of command, I let them do their job and they would come to me with the information afterwards - after, let's say, there was a
little bit of fact-checking or they've checked the robustness of the story. So there's no point in them coming to me saying, oh, we think we have this, and then it didn't happen, so on and so forth. So I would only deal with hard facts or something that was presented to me.
332 Q. And the information they subsequently came to you with was what?
A. Well, I was told that Paul had videoed -- Paul and a videographer had travelled to the location, I can't remember the precise location, and recorded an interview with the young woman, and I was asked to view the video with the senior team.

333 Q. Obviously, this potentially then was a big story, isn't that right?
A. Potentially, yes.
Q. Yes. I mean, was it being presented on the basis that she was making allegations of sexual assault going back to when she was a young child --
A. Plainly.
-- against Sergeant McCabe, or was it purely in relation to an allegation that those allegations that she had previously made weren't properly investigated?
A. Plainly, it was both.
Q. Yes.
A. And it would have had to go through a whole rinsing process, a whole fact-checking process. It would have had to have gone through several iterations before anything was being presented as the final product, if you will.
Q. Well, we know that a process was undergone in that regard, and in fact you viewed the video, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. It was both. And was it being pitched to you, and that may be too strong a word, but was it being pitched to you on the basis that the story could be run in respect of both; namely, the allegation of sexual assault, coupled with the fact that, in her belief, the matter hadn't been properly investigated back in 2006 and 2007?
A. Well, I don't think anything was quite being pitched at that stage because it was very early.

And we know that Mr. Mallon, who we've heard from, and Claire Grady, was also involved in that, along with Fionnuala O'Leary and Dearbhail McDonald, who we heard from yesterday, also had an input, and I think that perhaps there had been up to six meetings in relation to it, is that right?
A. At least six, I would say.
Q. Yes. But during the discussions in relation to the contents of the video and whatever story that was to arise out of it, which would be written by Paul

Williams, at what stage was it decided that you could only run with the story in relation to the investigation and the adequacy of the investigation, rather than the actual complaints that had been made by Ms. D?
A. We11, I suppose, you know, the tenets of journalism, are the who, the what, the why, the where and the when, and then you always have to look at the motivation, why now, why us, what else is there, is this everything.
So I think once you go through all those and you fact-check, and I was also thinking, on a story like this, which was fraught, you would have had to, let's say, dare $I$ say it, take the reporter who has done the story and put them aside for a little while, because you don't want that kind of subjective contamination coming in, if you will, and you want to avoid group-think. So what we would have got was, 1et's say, Dearbhail would have pursued a certain aspect of it, the news desk would have pursued another aspect of it, the online team would have come in as a fresh pair of eyes, and all that kind of stuff. So all that was going on. And I think fact-checking is fundamental to what we do, and we are a verifiable news source, we are an authoritative news source in Ireland, so it was very important that everything was done, that, you know, we fact-checked it and that it was legally safe, where and when we did decide to carry the story, that it was legally safe. So the lawyers would have been heavily involved at all stages.
-- but at what stages this story was at at various points in the process, without going into it in any very close detail. I mean, was it originally thought that the allegation that was made by Ms. D of sexual assault against Sergeant Maurice McCabe, that that could be run as a story?
A. I don't think that was -- I think we always thought this is too -- this is too good to be true, and that's the way I would always -- even the Anglo tapes, when we carried the Anglo tapes, I always thought, are we being set up here? This is actually too good to be true. And it's only when you go through the fact-checking process that you actually arrive with a conclusion. So I think we were very early days in, we said, okay, this is what the young woman is saying, let's check it out. And that's where we're at.
343 Q. when you say it was too good to be true, could you just explain what you mean by that?
A. Well, I'm saying, like, this story was in the headlines for a long time before this offer of an interview occurred, so we were saying, as I said, why now, why us? Let's check it out.
344 Q. So was there a sense that -- we know that, on the 23rd January, that the Garda Commissioner Martin Callinan had made reference to the whistleblowers and their actions as being 'disgusting', and that was very much
in the news at the time, isn't that right?
A. It would have been, yes.
Q. And the whole penalty points issue was very much being covered by the media quite extensively, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think that at that stage Leo Varadkar may well have come out with his contribution in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe, describing him as being 'distinguished' as opposed to being 'disgusting', isn't 13:48 that right?
A. That's right, yes.
Q. So there was a sort of a debate, or a public debate in relation to these matters.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. And obviously a story that made reference to Sergeant McCabe being involved in an investigation in relation to an allegation of sexual assault was potentially very damaging to him, but also would add fuel to the debate, isn't that right?
A. Well, yeah. And I think we, as part of the fact-checking process, we were able to establish quite quickly that the DPP -- or the police force had investigated those allegations and had sent the file to the DPP and the DPP had found that no crime had been committed, or even if what had happened did happen, that it didn't establish a crime.

349 Q. So when you say that it was too good to be true, was that on the basis that you were suspicious that you
were being fed this by An Garda Síochána?
A. I think you're naturally -- as an editor, you're naturally sort of -- you want to get to the bottom of the story, and often times what is presented isn't what it appears to be. So it is important that, you know, you retain that objective outlook.
Q. That doesn't really answer the question.
A. Mmm.
Q. I mean, did you have suspicions at the time that this was being fed to you by An Garda Síochána or somebody in An Garda Síochána?
A. Not by An Garda Síochána. I have to say, I didn't think that, because Paul had been contacted by the family directly, so I have to say it never occurred to me that the police were behind it.
Q. A11 right. It's just that we have a statement from Claire Grady, who was there, that she was suspicious that this may have emanated from An Garda Síochána or that it may have been very convenient for them that this story was emerging at this particular time.
A. Mmm .
Q. I think you can see that, just looking at the timeframe of everything, isn't that right?
A. Well, she would have been right to be sceptical, yes.

354 Q. Be. But did you share that at the time or was that communicated between you?
A. We11, as I say, you know, you are skeptical, but -- and you'd have to say, why us, why now? And we would have said that. But I didn't think, because of the way the
story arose, that it originated with the police.
355 Q. So you looked into the circumstances in which the story came to Mr . Williams at the time?
A. Yes. And he told us, and he has told the news editor, that he was approached by the family directly.

Yes. No, it's just that initially in your statement you refer to the fact that he had information from a source.
A. Yes.

But you looked into that at the time and it turned out that, in fact, the request had come from the D family. Who it came through is -- would have been, I suppose, irrelevant, but it came from the D family and that they had initiated contact, is that right?
A. That's correct.

358 Q. We've also heard some evidence from another journalist at the time, Eavan Murray, that these -- the fact that INM were considering publishing a story in relation to Ms. D had filtered out of INM. Would that surprise you, that other media organisations would have picked up on the inner workings of INM in relation to such a major story?
A. Yes, it did surprise me.

359 Q. I mean, is it a possibility that you can exclude?
A. No, you can't exclude anything, but it did surprise me. 13:52

360 Q. Yes. So, in any event, you have up to -- maybe more than six meetings, but the matter is considered very closely and eventually a decision was run to run with the story as it referred to the investigation and the
adequacy of the investigation, is that right?
A. Yes.

361 Q. And there was a decision not to name Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yes.

362 Q. Now, just finally, there are two matters that I just want you to deal with. A suggestion has been made that the INM were really just simply anti-McCabe and were pushing the Garda line in relation to stories that they were pushing. what do you say in answer to that?
A. I say it is completely untrue. I had oversight over four national newspapers and the biggest online site in Ireland and I would say $98 \%$ of the content we carried would have been, if you will, pro Sergeant McCabe. I think maybe this, if you will, was probably unusual in the sense that it was a different type of story, but I would say the Sunday Independent, Irish Independent, independent.ie. I would say the Herald and the Sunday World wouldn't have covered it, if at all, not comprehensively, but the other three titles would have covered the story comprehensively. And I would say if you were to do an analysis of it, and I think there may be some analysis done, but $98 \%$ of it would have been, if you like, positive towards the sergeant.
363 Q. I think the Tribunal has newspaper articles from all the major media outlets during the relevant period of time and your organisation has provided us with articles for the relevant period of time. Just finally then in relation to Superintendent Taylor's protected disclosure that he made in October of 2016, how did you
receive that news? Did it come as a surprise to you that he was making the allegations that he was making?
A. Gosh, I don't know. I can't recollect. I suppose, yeah, I probably was surprised, yeah.
Well, I mean, had you heard anything within INM indicating that Superintendent Taylor had been pushing a particular line with journalists or with editors within INM?
A. No.

Is that something that you think you would have heard?
A. I think so, yeah.

366 Q. It's been suggested that that might be a story in itself, that the Garda Press officer was entering into the arena, as it were, and plugging a particular line against Sergeant McCabe?
A. I have to say it didn't -- if it was happening, it certainly didn't reach my level and I had not heard about it.

MR. MARRI NAN Would you answer any questions, please.
A. Thank you.

MR. MEDOVELL: No questions, Chairman.
MR. FERRY: No questions.

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

MR. HARTY: Mr. Rae, my name is Mark Harty, and I am counsel on behalf of Gemma O'Doherty. I am instructed to ask you a few questions in relation to the evidence that she gave. And perhaps if we start just with
general questions about your dealings with An Garda Síochána in general. You were editor of the Garda Review from 1987 to 1994, is that correct?
A. Yes.

368 Q. And can you just te11 me, where is the Garda Review based? where does it work out of?
A. Certainly when I was there it was based in Phibsboro Tower.
Q. Phibsboro Tower. So it is connected. And is it paid for through -- how does it come about? Can you just explain to me what it is?
A. We11, when I took over in 1987 it was in poorly shape. I think the Garda membership paid $12 p$ a week towards subscription of the magazine, so I'd set about raising the subscription levels to make it successful. So I'm proud that I raised the subscription levels. I think we almost doubled it, because the magazine would have done its time. So we made it into very much more a newsy kind of feature-driven magazine. And that's how it was paid for, through the subscriptions of the members of the police force.

370 Q. And is it a monthly, weekly?
A. It's a monthly magazine.

Monthly magazine. And was it paid for -- did it receive any budget from the Garda Síochána budget?
A. I think originally when it was established in 1923 the Garda Commissioner was on the editorial board, and the police force at that stage did contribute towards the -- towards the publication. Thereafter, I don't
think the Commissioner was involved, but the police didn't contribute other than through their weekly wages, on a subscription basis.
And was that a mandatory subscription per member?
A. No, it was very much a voluntary subscription. As I say, it wasn't doing that well and we had to improve its circulation.
Q.

I take it you say Phibsboro Tower was connected to the office of the GRA then?
A. It would have been on the same floor as the GRA, yes. ${ }_{\text {13:58 }}$

374 Q. And in terms of its content, I presume it didn't cover daily news, as such; I presume the pieces were all directly related to the workings of An Garda Síochána, or indirectly?
A. It was a monthly magazine so it didn't cover daily news.
Q. I presume in terms of its editorial content, the content was aimed expressly in relation to matters of direct interest to Gardaí in their employment?
A. Well, it was kind of a current affairs magazine, if you will, for law enforcement in Ireland.
Q. And after you left that, you then moved, am I correct in saying, it was the Evening Herald, was that --
A. In 1994 I was recruited to be the security correspondent with the Herald.
377 Q. Security correspondent. And did that include -- when you say security correspondent, I take it that is crime and security effectively?
A. It would have been essentially crime, defence matters,

I would have travelled to Lebanon, Syria, places with the defence forces. I would have covered ongoing crime issues, court reporting, ongoing murder cases, so on and so forth.

And I would assume that, in that regard, having had a protracted period of contact of seven years with An Garda Síochána membership, that that was of assistance, building up relationships with those guards?
A. Oh, I would say it gave me an informed view of the police force, yes.
But you also would have built up a relationship with members of the force?
A. Well, I would have had sources within the police, but I also -- you know, during the Guerin investigation I would have been the reporter who reported on the bent cops, if you will, in the police force. So there were some officers, you know, who were connected with criminal elements, and I would have been the reporter who first reported on those matters. So corruption in the police was one of those issues that I reported on, on that beat.

380 Q. I take it those members were less friendly towards you?
A. We11, I wouldn't say friendly or not friendly, I would just see it as a professional -- as part of my professional role as to report on, you know, courts, crime, defence.

381 Q. Okay. Now, Ms. Molloy has -- in relation to your dealings, you came into the --
A. Sorry, who?
Q. Sorry, I was about to say Ms. O'Doherty. In fact, I will put the question in -- you became editor of the Irish Independent in 2012, is that correct?
A. Yes.

383 Q. And during that time, Ms. O'Doherty has given evidence that you had had possession or sight of the Fr. Niall Molloy file. Do you recall having sight of that file?
A. I'm not going to say.
Q. You're not going to say?
A. No.
Q. Okay. I take it you're not going to tell me how you came into possession of that file either then?

CHA RMAN Maybe, I'm going to intervene here, and I don't want to speak personally in relation to my experience, but there was an inquest. The relevant Garda statements - you can say the file, or whatever was produced at the inquest, it was copied multiple times. The inquest was shortly after the death. So in the event that people had it years later, it'd be no surprise, indeed you might have even found it in my study, Mr. Harty.

MR. HARTY: A11 right.
386 Q. The situation then in 2013, as editor of the Irish Independent you came into possession of the Anglo tapes, isn't that correct?
A. I didn't come into possession of the Anglo tapes. One of our reporters did.

387 Q. Sorry, the Irish Independent came into possession of it?
A. Insofar as one of our reporters did, yes.
Q. And insofar as there was the, shall we say, the major scoop for 2013 and perhaps the months of Apri1, May and June of 2013, that scoop was the Anglo tapes, isn't that correct? There was a lot of work being put into those tapes at that stage?
A. Yeah, it depends on your outlook. It could have been the story of the generation from a subjective point of view. In another way, it could have been the story of the year or maybe the story of the summer. That would have been a very subjective opinion, but -CHA RMAN We can all agree it was a big story.
A. It was a big story.
Q. MR. HARTY: Now, did you contact An Garda Síochána in relation to your possession of those tapes?
A. I wouldn't have thought -- I certainly didn't, and I wouldn't have thought anybody else on the team did either.
Q. Irish News \& Media were, in fact, found in contempt for publishing those tapes, isn't that correct?
A. After -- not first time round. I think second time round, yes.

Do you recall the incident which involved Ms. O'Doherty on the 11th April 2013, where she called to the Garda Commissioner's house to confirm that that was his address?
A. I recall the incident.
Q. How did you first become aware of that incident?
A. I was told the following morning that she had gone to
the house of the Garda Commissioner at 10pm the previous night.
393 Q. Who told you that?
A. It would have been, I would say, probably the managing editor.

Who was the managing editor of the Independent News \& Media at the time?
A. Michae1 Denieffe.

Because it's just the time -- the hour keeps moving later and later. Her evidence was, and indeed the
evidence of the Garda Commissioner, was that it was earlier in the evening.
A. No, I received a memo from Michae1, from Tom Brady, who was the security editor of the Irish Independent, saying that he had taken a call from somebody in the police force. Tom said he took the call at 10:15pm and that the officer he spoke to, the senior officer in the police, said that Gemma had been at the Commissioner's house 15 minutes earlier, which would have made it 10pm.
Q. I see. Now, you see, Mr. Mallon was of the view that the information from Mr. Brady was that she was still at the house when the call was received.
A. I don't know. I was talking to Michae1. I don't know what Ian's opinion was.
Well, somebody -- Mr. Brady asked Mr. Mallon -- or informed Mr. Mallon, who contacted Ms. O'Doherty, in the firm view, he says, that she was still at the house at the time.
A. I'm not sure about the sequence. A11 I know is what I was told the following morning. And the memo I received from Michae1, from Tom.
Q. Right. And what did you do about that?
A. Well, look, I formed the view that going unannounced to 14:05 anybody's house at 10pm is not professiona1. And I thought, you know, the Irish Independent is a trusted media source, that somebody going unannounced to somebody's house at 10 pm wasn't the proper way to do things and it wasn't the professional way to do things. 14:05 399 Q. Ms. O'Doherty's evidence is that it wasn't 10pm. She was contested on that evidence.
A. We11, all I'm telling you is what the memo I received, and that is what it said.
400 Q. Were you then, I take it, involved in the decision to send Mr. Denieffe and another member of the editorial team in INM to Garda management at Harcourt Street?
A. I don't think so. I think Michae1 took the view that, you know, look, this shouldn't have happened, Gemma should have gone through the news management process, should have told somebody in the building what she was doing, and that, you know, the Garda Commissioner's wife was distressed and that we should sort of make some effort to say, look, it shouldn't have happened, there are other ways of doing this. And I suppose from 14:06 a news management point of view, a news editor or somebody in the building should have known that Gemma was going to the Commissioner's house late at night and doing this, because there are other ways of doing it,
first of all. You know, you go through -- there is a process for doing this, everybody knows it. And this was outside of that process.
401 Q. We11, see, there are many different ways of doing it --
A. Sure.

402 Q. -- isn't that correct?
A. Well --

403 Q. They were his personal penalty -- a fixed penalty notice in respect of driving of his personal car, isn't that correct?
A. There are many ways of doing it, there are the right ways and the wrong ways, and the right way is to do it the right way.
404 Q. Really? Are you saying that if somebody is -- an issue arises in relation to somebody's driving of their
personal vehicle, that that should be brought to the attention of the organisation for which they work?
A. What I'm saying is that you don't arrive on somebody's doorstep unannounced at 10pm, whether that is the Garda Commissioner or Joe soap or Mrs. Soap, you just don't do it that way. You do it within -- you know, it is a hierarchical structure, reporters report to news editors, news editors report to deputy editors, deputy editors report to editors, editors report to editors-in-chief, then editors-in-chief then report to group editor-in-chief. So there is a structure there and the structure is there for a reason.
405 Q. The situation is, though, that she was simply checking that she had the right address.
A. Yeah, but 10pm at night is not the time to do that, I would have thought.
406 Q. It wasn't 10pm at night.
A. okay.

407 Q. And there is no evidence to say that it was 10pm at night.
A. No, what I'm saying is that the memo that was sent to me said it was 10 pm .
Q. So I take it you then spoke to Ms. O'Doherty to confirm that it wasn't, in fact, that case?
A. Excuse me?

409 Q. I take it you spoke to Ms. O'Doherty to confirm the details?
A. There are memos on record and I think the Tribunal has them, so there is a chain of --
410 Q. I'm asking did you speak to Ms. O'Doherty to clarify?
A. I spoke to Ms. O'Doherty. She apologised for what she had done. She said she was chasing a hot story and that she should have thought about it, and that, now that she had thought about it, maybe she should have done it in a certain way. And what I'm saying is, nobody is saying the story was a bad story, I'm just saying the way she went about the story was wrong. And, look, it was a good story, we published it on the front page of the Irish Independent, it got good traction, we made -- the story had to be legally checked, but once it was legally checked and once we had gone through the procedure of checking with the Garda Press office, so on and so forth, then we ran it,
and we thought it was a very good story and ran it on page one.

And the situation is that all she had done was call to the house to get the address. Why are two senior editorial members of Independent News \& Media going to meet an utterly unaffected assistant commissioner to explain their position?
A. Well, I think, it's not that they were -- I think it was the whole way the story was handled. They were going along, they said to the guards 'hello', shouldn't 14:09 have been done this particular way, we're sticking to our guns, though, we're still going to carry the story and we did publish it. But they went along as a courtesy, I would say, because the guards were viewing it as a big security breach. Callinan's house, so why was the apology and why were you going cap in hand to an assistant commissioner in Harcourt Street?
A. Well, there was no apology, and we went along as a courtesy because they asked us, they asked Michae1 to courtesy call because they were saying it was a huge security breach.
413 Q. So they were summonsed to an assistant commissioner?
A. I wouldn't have thought so. Michael Denieffe is a strong guy, he has been through the ropes, he's a strong advocate for an independent, free, objective, disinterested press, so he wouldn't have been going cap in hand to anybody.

414 Q. I mean, it was an important story, that the man who was apparently overseeing the penalty points issue from the point of view of An Garda Síochána, had himself had a fixed penalty notice quashed, isn't that correct?
A. That's right.

415 Q. And anybody dealing with that story, the fact that they have had fixed penalty notices quashed, it's relevant, isn't it?
A. Start again.

416 Q. Anybody who -- in dealing with that story and the breaking news in relation to it, anybody who had penalty notices quashed who were involved in that story and how it was dealt with, that was relevant, wasn't it?

MR. FANN NG I'm just wondering, Chairman, what the relevance of that question is to anything this Tribunal is investigating.

CHA RMAN I presume it is to try and draw a link between Irish News \& Media and the Garda, so we will see where it goes, Mr. Fanning.
417 Q. MR. HARTY: It is relevant, isn't it?
A. I've lost your track.

418 Q. Sorry. Okay. It was utterly relevant and, in fact, on one viewpoint, very important to know that the man who
was overseeing the quashing of fixed penalty notices from the point of view of An Garda Síochána, had himself had fixed penalty notices quashed?
A. And that is why we put it on page one.

419 Q. Yeah. And can you explain to me then, in view of having come to you with a page-one scoop, that, within two weeks, Gemma O'Doherty is given her marching papers?
A. Well, I think that was outlined by Mr. Fanning earlier in the week.
Q. No, I would like you to tell me why Gemma o'Doherty -because many of us are lawyers in the room, we know the basic rules of redundancy, it's usually last in, first out. Gemma o'Doherty had been in Independent News \& Media for 17 years, so can you explain to me how it is that Gemma O'Doherty was selected, having been the person who had presented you with that front-page scoop two weeks earlier, was selected as the person for redundancy, compulsory redundancy?
A. I think what happened was, Independent News \& Media was 14:12 going through a pretty tricky time. We were having to sell off our assets in South Africa. The chief executive of the company, Mr. Vincent Crowley, wrote to all staff members saying that there would be a round of redundancies, we had to tackle the cost base and that there would be redundancies.
421 Q. Yes.
A. In effect then what happened was, there were 43 redundancies, 29 of them in my own editorial
department. Hard decisions had to be made. The Human Resources department were involved. Human Resources would have come to me with, having done analysis of the various departments, who they thought, you know, should probably be voluntarily made redundant -- or be made redundant.
422 Q. And a number of people took voluntary redundant [sic], but only one journalist was made compulsory redundant?
A. Yes.

423 Q. And that was a journalist who had been in Independent News \& Media for 17 years, full-time employment?
A. We11, I suppose what happened was, Gemma was working in the features department, she was the travel editor of the Irish Independent. We had to prioritise, you know, how the company should evolve. What was clearly necessary was, the company would have to pivot towards being a digital entity. We had very much been left behind by our competitors, and it was important that we, sort of, pivot all our resources into a central content hub that was digitally -- where digital was at its very heart. So that meant hard decisions had to be made involving all the titles, that was the Irish Independent, Herald and Sunday Independent at the time, and we had to put all resources behind independent.ie. So I think the hard decision was, did we have -- could we keep on a full-time slow journalism features writer and travel editor, and I think the decision was made we couldn't, and that's why we said that's a role that should probably be outsourced.
A. She was told -- well, I think as regards door-stepping the Commissioner, she was told to go through the phases, so that, you know, before you actually go to the Commissioner's house and at 10pm, you actually ring 14:15 the Press Office first, or, dare I say, go to Tom Brady, security editor, and confirm that was the Commissioner's address.

430 Q. And this is the same Tom Brady who apparently was aware
in 2012 and 2013 of the allegations against Sergeant McCabe, isn't that correct?
A. I've no idea.

431
Q. In his own statement?
A. I have no idea.

432 Q. The situation is that the compulsory redundancy of Ms. O'Doherty was the subject of an unfair dismissals action, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

433 Q. Also what was said about her actions on the night were the subject of a defamation action, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

434 Q. And Independent News \& Media settled both of those actions, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

435 Q. And published an apology?
A. It published an apology. Independent News \& Media --

436 Q. Well, sorry, an apology in court -- had an apology read out in court?
A. That's right.

437 Q. Accepting that she had done nothing wrong?
A. Em, I'm not clear on what -- but it was something like that.

438 Q. There is just one other question, which is that the meeting in Harcourt Terrace, Michael Denieffe was one of the people there. Who was the other editorial member?
A. I can't recall.

MR. HARTY: Thank you very much.
A. Thank you.

MR. LEHANE: Mr. Chairman, I appear on behalf of Anne Harris. I have just one question for this witness, if that's okay.
CHA RMAN Yes, please, Mr. Lehane.
14:17

## THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. LEHANE:

439 Q. MR. LEHANE: Mr. Rae, I am down here at the back. My name is Darren Lehane, and I appear on behalf of Anne Harris. When Ms. Harris was here, she was asked a number of questions about her relationship with Independent News \& Media, particularly after she left, and I just want to clarify one thing with you. Ms. Harris instructs me that after she left INM, she had attended a lunch with you and that following that lunch you suggested that she might like to work in a variety of consultancy jobs with INM advising as an editorial consultant on certain issues, is that correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.

MR. LEHANE: Thank you very much.
CHA RMAN Mr. Lehane, just help me on this. where does it fit into the jigsaw? If I am to take something out of it, what is it?
MR. LEHANE: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I probably should have prefaced my remarks.

CHA RMAN No, it helps, but I'm just a wee bit lost. MR. LEHANE: Yes. Ms. Harris was cross-examined on the
basis that she was motivated by a grudge in the evidence that she gave here as a result of her relations with her former employer, and I just wanted to clarify with this witness what she had instructed me; namely, that when she left, that she left -- that she was offered a series of jobs that she basically didn't leave on bad terms.
CHA RMAN she left in good standing --
MR. LEHANE: Yes.
CHA RMAN -- and remained as a valuable contributor, ${ }^{14: 18}$ would that be fair to say?
A. Well, I certainly offered her a contract as a mentor for young journalists and for some of our young managers.
CHA RMAN Yes. so you had good time for her?
A. Yes.

CHAl RMAN I understand. Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh?
MR. Ó MI RCLEARTA GH No questions, chairman.
MR. MC CFEÁL OHGGNS: No questions.
MR. FANN NG Just a few short matters, chairman, that I might put to Mr. Rae in light of questions put by Mr. Harty.

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

briefly because I think they were put to Ms. O'Doherty and I just want to give you an opportunity to comment upon them, Mr. Rae. The first is, I believe, at page 7450, and it's an email from you to Ms. O'Doherty at six minutes past one on the 12th April. It begins:
"Thanks for your note bel ow."

And her note, just to put this in context, her note came to you at five minutes past noon, saying:
"Stephen, just so as you are correctly informed about the events of yesterday."

And she set out in her note her description of what occurred at the doorstep with Commissioner Callinan's wife. But it's your response I want to focus on, which is lunchtime the day after the incident. She emails you at five past twelve. You reply to her almost exactly an hour later:
"Gemma, thanks for your note bel ow. I do, however, need to set out a number of clear gui del ines. All news stories that any journalist is working on require to be coor di nated with the news executive or seni or manager. Where approaches are made to indi vi dual s, particularly door-steps, these al so be must be cleared and coor di nated with the news desk. Mbreover, where a reporter is approaching a prominent official, it is
even more of a priority to coordi nate and clear it with the news desk. Irrespective of the merits of a story, I cannot have journalists operating outside the accepted news management chain. As you know, we are al I motivated journalists who del ight in generating excl usi ve stories. Nonethel ess, we all have to operate within the news structure that is in place and that means operating to the news desk or the editor. I have no probl emwith hol ding prominent people to account, but that cl early has to be done within the gui del ines outlined above.

I hope this clarifies the matter. I al so bel ieve that a debrief with the operations editor and managing editor is in order in this case.

Si ncer el y,
Stephen Rae."

Now, Mr. Rae, that is obviously your email, it speaks for itself. When Ms. O'Doherty was in the witness-box, I put it to her that that was indicative of a measured and temperate response to her calling unannounced at the Commissioner's house and that it was to be contrasted with a picture that she was seeking to
ton of bricks. Do you want to make a comment in light of the content of your own email?
A. I think so. I just thought, you know, it's important
to reiterate there is a news management structure and people need to operate within that structure. I think it is important to say that, you know, we, for the most part, had an adversarial relationship with An Garda Síochána. There wasn't a moment when -- or a week that 14:22 would pass by that they weren't on complaining about this, that or the other. And I have to say, it wasn't just the police that were complaining; you'd have political parties, government officials, State bodies, companies. So, you know, our job was to report objectively, dispassionately and disinterestedly on current affairs and news. I think I myself was black-listed on one or two occasions by the Garda Press office, some of our crime reporters would have been, you know, so our relationship was an adversarial
relationship for the most part with the police. So what I would say is, you know, where we were doing a big story like this, and it was a big story, and it was big enough to put on page 1 , it was important that we did it in the right way and that all our reporters were 14:22 clear in how to conduct themselves, and that was the reason for the memo. And, yeah, I think it was written in a courteous manner and it was received in a courteous manner.
441 Q. All right. And just an email four days later, just to 14:22 look at it, just to give the Tribunal a sense of your personal relationship with Ms. O'Doherty around this time. At 7454 she sends you an email four days later, on the 16th April, and at one level it's apropos
nothing, but just the first two lines of her email:
"Stephen, I have been approached by the country's I eadi ng cancer specialist, Professor John Reynol ds, to join a di ssemination for the Irish Cancer Soci ety."

And she sets out a little bit about the role, the time commitment, and then she asks:
"Wbuld you mind letting me know if I have your permission to join the board."

She sends you that email at 12:50 on the 16th Apri1. And just scrolling up to your response, at the top of the page. I think twelve minutes later you respond by saying:
"Gemma, I have no probl emwith you joi ni ng such a laudable board."

So four days later you are having, as can be seen there, a courteous email exchange, and she has no difficulty in coming to you, is that so?
A. That's correct.

442 Q. And just finally then, one further email I'd like you to look at, just to give the Tribunal a picture of your relationship with Ms. O'Doherty at the time, is the email at 7457, and this is an email from you confirming the intended publication of the story on the 18th April
at nine minutes to six:
"Gemma, just to reiterate it's a cracking yarn, no doubt. I just want to give it the best show on our bi ggest circul ation day. I hope you understand this, and pl ease convey this to your source. Very best, SR."

Any comment you want to make in relation to the tone of that email, Mr. Rae, in terms of how you were dealing with Ms. O'Doherty in the week after she had attended at Commissioner Callinan's door?
A. No, it's just the importance of having, you know, a professional news management system in place, albeit, in this case, this was a very good story, I remained courteous and I received courteous emails from Gemma and we did realise the import of the story and that is why we put it on page 1 . I wanted to put it on page 1 of the Saturday edition, which was our greatest circulation day, but Gemma said she was coming under pressure from her source to do it earlier, so that is circulation day, it's not as big as Saturday, which is our biggest, by far, circulation day in the Irish Independent.
MR. FANN NG Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAK Yes, I'm just a wee bit confused now as to what I am to make of all of this. On the one hand I'm being told that there was a bad relationship, on the other hand I'm being told it is more or less
love-bombing. Even if it something in between or one extreme or the other, how does any of this assist me in determining whether the Garda Commissioner engaged in a campaign to destroy one of his sergeant's characters?
MR. FANN NG well, I am very glad you've asked me that 14:26 question, Chairman, because it gives me an opportunity to explain where I think this fits in, and the answer is, not at all. Ms. o'Doherty, unfortunately, in her evidence and through her counsel, is seeking to make a case in this Tribunal that her termination of her employment within Independent News \& Media is in some way related to the fact that she called at Commissioner Callinan's house and that the reaction in the newspaper to that was such that it influenced the decision to dismiss her. In response, we say a couple of things. Firstly, she entered into a settlement which is confidential in its terms in respect of her claim that she was unfairly dismissed. But insofar as the Tribunal can look at objective evidence of what the response was internally in the newspaper to the incident, the emails that are contemporaneous, and we've just looked at three of them, in the week after the incident, don't point the newspaper coming down on Ms. O'Doherty like a ton of bricks. They are very mild and restrained insofar as she is chastised for and the Tribunal has seen the article, the article was published on the front page approximately a week later. CHAN RMAN Yes. I take it, Mr. Harty, your case is
that this is some kind of an exercise of Garda power, is that fair enough?
MR. HARTY: That is precisely the case and that was precisely the basis of the action, they were brought in relation to unfair dismissal and defamation, which were 14:27 settled.

MR. FANN NG The difficulty with that, Chairman, just to respond to Mr. Harty, is that there is not a whit of evidence been given by any witness that Ms. O'Doherty's dismissal had anything to do with any members of an Garda Síochána.

CHAL RNAN we11, I am asked to put things together. But, I mean, the plain reality is, Ms. O'Doherty was called, and, at the end of the day, I make a decision as to who is called or not, so if it doesn't turn out to be germane, well there's a lot of things in court cases that don't turn out to be germane, but I am making no decision for the moment. Thank you for your submissions.
MR. HARTY: May it please you, chairman.
MR FANN NG Thank you, Chairman.
MR. MARI NAN Thank you very much.
A. Thank you.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MR. MGGU NESS: If Mr. Reynolds could come back to the witness-box, please.

MR. PAUL REYNOLDS CONTI NUED TO BE DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY
MS. LEADER:

443 Q.
MS. LEADER: Now, just before lunch we were going through the notes you made in relation to the o'Higgins report and we were at page -- if we just start again at page 5905, at the bottom of the page, please. And you will see there, I high1ighted it earlier on when we were dealing with the reference to the lie, but just you see it there in context.
"Truthf ul to the Commi ssi on in his evi dence - He lied to a seni or of ficer (lied)."

And you have already set out your position on that. And if we just generally go through these notes. 5906, again this was:
"No evi dence supervi si on Noel Cunni ngham Fal se report to Super. Reported to GSOC and hadn't found fal se report, untruth."

That's that there. And then the reference to there being "No inspector in Bailieboro - if there was probl em "
A. "If there was - probably."

444 Q. Sorry?
A. "If there was - probably".
A. I think "probably" is the word from the o'Higgins Commission report.

446 Q. Yes. O'Higgins, yes. And then there is reference to paragraph 14.35 in the O'Higgins report. If we just go to 5907.
"07/ 08 I nvesti gat ed. "

What do you think that is a reference to?
A. I think it is possibly a reference to Byrne/McGinn, is it? I'm not 100 percent sure, but that the allegations -- again, you know, jotting things down.
A11 right. So it refers to Sergeant McCabe's complaints being investigated, you think, is that right?
A. I think it does, yeah.
Q. A11 right. And then we have:
"2012 exagger at ed" -- crossed out"beef ed" -- "up the allegations. If there was anything in this - would he be supporting M cheál Martin for Taoi seach?"

I wonder if you could help me there, the reference to that.
A. You might have me there now, into politics. I'm trying to think who was -- yeah, who was supporting Micheál Martin for Taoiseach at the time.

449 Q. A17 right.
A. It's probably something, again, that I jotted down, you know -- it's probably a reference to some politician, but I'm trying to think.
Q. Yes. It isn't from the report, in any event?
A. No, no, no, no, I don't think it is. No, it isn't. And "waving at the Taoi seach" isn't. I think that is a reference to a Dáil hearing, where the papers were waved at the Taoiseach or perhaps Micheá 1 Martin had the dossier and he waived it at the Taoiseach in the Dái 1.

451 Q. You think?
A. That is what it seems to be to me.

452 Q. You see there "end - justification", does that make any sense to you?
A. It may mean that it was justified in the end, his complaints were justified at the end.
453 Q. A11 right.
A. You know, at the end, justification for what -- the complaints, etcetera.
454 Q. A11 right. And there seems to be a line drawn under that. Do we go to a new section then?
A. Yeah, yeah, it's just -- it's all a stream of consciousness.
Q. Then we go to the word "unaccept able". I don't know if you can think now --
A. It could, again, relate to the word from the o'Higgins Commission report in relation to the lie or the untruth.
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Q. And we go to page 5908, here we have:
"Pattern - badl y i nvestig (i nvesti gated).
I nexperi enced Gardaí. Poor supervision. Fal sel y cl ai med they had. "
A. Mm-hmm.

457 Q. I wonder could you help us with regard to --
A. Yeah, well, I would believe it would relate to the fact that these investigations were all badly investigated, that there was inexperienced Gardaí and that management 14:33 was very poor because the inexperienced Gardaí weren't being supervised.
458 Q. All right. And then if we could turn to 5909, it's page 12 of your notes.
A. Yeah.

459 Q. It refers to -- now, I just want to ask you about the way these notes are laid out. Are they a rolling record of what -- your work at the time? Do they follow each other chronologically?
A. No, that is what I am saying to you. I had -- I submitted various copies of notes to the Tribunal.

460 Q. Yes.
A. And they are written -- I mean, as I said, the real notes are the ones that were done on the computer. obviously the --

461 Q. The emails to yourself?
A. Well, the emails to myself and the drafts and the writing up and all that sort of stuff, yeah. These are jotting down, you know, things coming in, things coming
out. I think it is very clear what that is.
462 Q. Yes.
A. That is the call to Maurice McCabe.

463 Q. A11 right.
A. And that is the time of the call, that is the date of the call, that is no reply, left a message, told him I'm doing a report, it's going out tomorrow. If he'd like to call me back, good.
464 Q. A11 right. And these notes are in no particular order at all, am I correct?
A. No. But that is clearly --

465 Q. It refers to that?
A. That is very clear.
Q. Yes. Al1 right.
A. I mean, the other stuff wasn't as important, but this was.

467 Q. A11 right. Okay. Then you see underneath that there is a list:
"No evi dence of corruption or criminality, MC. "

## That is Martin Callinan?

A. Yeah. Derek Byrne.

468 Q. "DB, Chi ef Superintendent Rooney, Chi ef Superintendent Cl ancy, Noel Cunni ngham "

And then you refer to the "Statement in chapter 3, no evi dence. 3.3 exaggeration. GC - Justice (not sure of 2 ot her words)."

That is I think -- couldn't be -- your handwriting --
A. I couldn't even read my own handwriting.

469 Q. A11 right. If we go to the next page, 5910, there's a reference to the meeting in Hillgrove.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
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Q. And that's in relation to the boxes of Pulse records?
A. Yes. You can see they're not in any particular order because the Maurice McCabe phone call, which is the culmination of the work --

471 Q. Yes.
A. -- in relation to this, so this is obviously other stuff.

472 Q. Yes. Then we see here:
"You're partly responsi ble - sergeant in charge. He got the extra boxes. Derek woul dn't let himtake the boxes, conceal ed evi dence, ' gross der el iction of duty' agai nst Mck Cl ancy."

Is the source of that the report itself?
A. I don't think so, no. That is a conversation. Again, it's just --

473 Q. okay. And then we go down and there's a reference here to:
"I nitial compl ai nt, 2 [guards] working --"

We won't report the rank. Just two people of equal rank "working in the same station. Boss down the
corridor asked to investigate it." I wonder could you tell me --
A. That obviously relates to where I talked about the investigation earlier.
474 Q. okay.
A. So it appears there that I would have -- I must have known that there was conflict over that. There was two guards, not one, involved.
Q. And presumably -- you say it's "initial compl ai nt" there. Did you think that was Sergeant McCabe's initial complaint?
A. Sorry, can you go back to it?
Q. Yes. If you scrol1 up, please, Mr. Kavanagh. "Initial compl ai nt".
A. Possibly, yeah, possibly, could be.

477 Q. Could it be anything else?
A. Well, I don't -- no, I don't think so.

478 Q. Yes.
A. I mean --

479 Q. A11 right.
A. Yeah.

480 Q. What I want to ask you about there is, what had that got to do with anything and where did it come from?
A. Yeah, I don't know where it came from. It could have come from a conversation. But I couldn't put a time on 14:37 it.
Q. All right. And --
A. It goes back to --

482 Q. -- what relevance did it have to the o'Higgins

Commission report? It's nowhere referred to in it?
A. No, no, it's not.

483 Q. And at that stage --
A. And it wasn't used in the reports, either.

484 Q. Yes. So what relevance does it have to your work in relation to the O'Higgins Commission report?
A. It has no relevance.
Q. Yes. So I suppose what I am saying to you, Mr. Reynolds, is, did somebody else think it was relevant and was somebody else pointing you in that direction for it to appear in your notes which you were putting together in advance of preparing a broadcast on the 9th May?
A. No, I don't think so. I think it goes back to the point I was making in relation to general conversations 14:38 about the situation, the wider situation in Bailieboro and policing. You know, if I had been talking to people, you would talk about a wide range of subjects. You don't ring up and I specifically want you to tell me about this or that or the other. You have a conversation with people, other issues come in and out, you jot down as you're listening.

486 Q. I suppose that's the point really, that somebody else is pointing you in that direction?
A. No, I mean, I could be asking.

487 Q. Well, were you asking them?
A. In relation to?

488 Q. The D investigation.
A. No. This is more -- not the D investigation. This is
the fact that the investigation -- the investigation was carried out locally.
489 Q. Yes.
A. And it seems to me to relate back to the fact that whoever I was talking to didn't seem to think that it should have been carried out locally because there were two [garda colleagues] working in the same station.
490 Q. Mm-hmm.
A. The boss was down the corridor, he asked who investigated it.

491 Q. We11, just, I'm not sure if I picked you up correctly, but you said it wasn't the D investigation, but I think that does refer to the D investigation, the investigation?
A. Yeah, okay, yeah.

492 Q. Yes, it does. We're agreed on that?
A. Yes, okay.

493 Q. Yes. So what I am suggesting to you is, somebody is pointing you in that direction there as --
A. Somebody is talking about the D investigation.

494 Q. Yes.
A. That it shouldn't have been conducted locally, it should have been conducted nationally.

495 Q. Yes.
A. Because of this.

496 Q. And they are doing it in the context of saying that it was the initial complaint. So words must have meaning. So what I am asking you is, what does that mean "initial complaint"?
A. I presume it is chronological.

497 Q. Yes.
A. That there was an initial complaint.

498 Q. A11 right.
A. There were two [garda colleagues] working in the same station.

499 Q. Yes.
A. The boss was down the corridor.

500 Q. And this is what started the whole thing off in relation to Sergeant McCabe's complaints? Because we're looking at it --
A. No, I don't think I would go that far.

501 Q. We11, how far? what are you saying?
A. What I say is that this was part of the whole Bailieboro policing thing.
502 Q. A11 right. We11, maybe if we go to term of reference (b), I will try and make it clear to you. What we are looking at is, we are investigating the allegation of Superintendent David Taylor in his protected disclosure that he was directed to draw journalists' attention to an allegation of criminal misconduct made against Sergeant McCabe, which would seem to be what we are talking about here in that page of your notes, and that that was this -- and that this was the root cause of his agenda, namely revenge against the Gardaí. So it's 14:41 in front of you, if it helps you.
A. No, no, I see it.

503 Q. Yes. So what I am saying there is, that's essentially, and I'm asking you to comment on it, on that note there
what it says is, "initial complaint", okay, so that's how the whole thing started off, am I correct in saying that?
A. But I don't think that illustrates any revenge.

504 Q. All right.
A. Or I don't think it illustrates the terms of reference.

505 Q. All right. That's your answer to that question?
A. Yeah.
Q. And it in no way relates to why Sergeant McCabe is making all of these other complaints, some of them which, in the o'Higgins report, have been described as exaggerated or not stood up?
A. No. I mean, I never felt that was the reason why he was making the complaint.
507 Q. All right.
A. You're getting information about it, people are telling you about it. But I never felt that I was being told that for this particular reason, that this was connected.
508 Q. okay. Why did you think you were being told about it?
A. I didn't think about that.

509 Q. You're a journalist; surely, Mr. Reynolds, you would put -- ask a question, why am I being told about this?
A. No, well, you see, I already knew at that stage that there was no prosecution.
510 Q. Well, that is exactly the point.
A. Yeah.

511 Q. So why are you being told about it? Did you ever ask yourself that?
A. No.

512 Q. Okay. And especially in the context --
A. I never was suspicious of the fact that --

513 Q. A11 right. If we go to the next page, at 5911 we see:
"He was sergeant in charge at Bailieboro - reporting to the superintendent."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

514 Q. Now, is that a reference to Sergeant McCabe again there?
A. Yeah, I think it is, actually, and I think he was reporting to the superintendent, and again we're back to this issue of the complaint being investigated locally.
515 Q. Yes. So it again refers to the D --
A. I think it does, yeah.

516 Q. So what had that got to do with anything you were preparing a broadcast on, on the 9th May?
A. Nothing.

517 Q. okay.
A. I didn't use it.

518 Q. Yes. We know you didn't use it.
A. Okay.

519 Q. But what I'm asking you is, did you at that stage wonder why you were being told this?
A. No.

520 Q. In the context of the O'Higgins Commission reports?
A. No. As I said, there were conversations that went all round policing in Bailieboro.

521 Q. All right. We11, you said the first time you heard that was in 2013, it was sometime around the penalty points?
A. Yeah.

522 Q. And you paid no heed to it, so why if, in 2013 you heard the reference to the investigation, that nothing had come of it, and you dismissed it totally, and then we see a second reference to it, something you have dismissed totally in your evidence three years earlier, in your notes which you have given to us, the notes that you have put together in putting together the broadcast of the 9th May 2016, do you see what I mean?
A. I do. But you have to understand, journalists -journalists gather information. I'm speaking to somebody, most likely on the phone, $I$ have the phone in 14:44 one hand and I have a pen in the other, and I'm chatting away and jotting this down and that down and whatever. You gather all the stuff in, and then at a later date you go back and look at it and you say, oh, this is relevant, this is not relevant, and you use or not use. I used the analogy this morning of a court case; you sit and listen to all the information that is given in court, and then you go outside and you'11 assess it, take it away. But when you're being told things, you just scribble it all down and then you assess its relevance.
523 Q. Al1 right. If we just go to 5911, there is a reference to, just underneath that, "no corruption", and then "concl usi ons: role of sergeant in charge, access to
psychi atric report". I think that could have referred to the taxi driver -- the proceedings in court and what was and wasn't given in relation to the Jerry McGrath case --
A. Yes.
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524 Q. -- is that correct? Yes. And then there's a list there:
"Confidential reporter, Chi ef Superintendent Rooney, sergeant in charge - role."

And then we go to the next page. You've high1ighted paragraph 3.19:
"It would be quite wrong and unfair to suggest that Ser geant McCabe's compl ai nts were not taken seriously or were brushed asi de."

And then there's a reference to the interviews in Byrne/McGinn. If we go to the next page, 5913, there's a reference to Chief Superintendent McGinn's dealings with Sergeant McCabe, and then you've picked out a paragraph, 3.16 at chapter 3 in the report:
"'Sergeant McCabe has made many compl ai nts agai nst Commi ssi on' ."

Then we go to page 5914, we go to the Martin Callinan
matters, and the complaint of corruption, and you've highlighted paragraph 3.6 in relation to the people living under the stress of the allegations. Then at 5915 there's reference to particular pages in the report and quotes pulled out from it, isn't that right? 19:47
A. Mm-hmm.

525 Q. 5916, again references to particular paragraphs in the report. If we go to 5917, you have particular paragraphs noted. And we just see there paragraph 10.86 , the reference to the lie there, which it's the untruth, where it appears in Mr. Justice o'Higgins' report. Just at 5918, a reference to --
A. You went by the one that said "dedi cated".

526 Q. I'm sorry, highlight --
A. I know, but, I mean, to be fair --

527 Q. Yes. No, that's fine.
A. You know what I mean? I did note that as well, so --

528 Q. Yes. Sp that's at paragraph 3.1 --
A. Yeah.

529 Q. -- "dedi cated". I don't know if there is anything else 14:48 you want to --
A. All I'm saying is that these are a selection of handwritten notes. There are also email notes. You have to look at the whole notes together and you also have to look at the final broadcasts. I mean, I don't 14:48 think it is necessarily fair or representative to select particular words or two jot-down words and say, oh, this must illustrate something.
530 Q. Yes.
A. I don't think that is a fair reflection of my work. CHA RMAN No, but, Mr. Reynolds, I mean, the point is, I'm not coming in here with a wax tablet that is unwritten on. I actually know all of this stuff.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Looked at all of this stuff, you're being asked publicly and particular things are being high1ighted.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN I may take a different view. For instance, 14:48 that I always thought if you put urine in a bottle that's intended to be used as vinegar, that is a noxious substance, that is poison.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN But, I mean, you may take a different view, 14:49 that is fine.
A. No, I didn't take -- I just took Justice O'Higgins' view, you know.

CHA RMAN Well...
A. I can't have an opinion on this in public, I can't give 14:49 a view.

CHA RMAN No, no. No, I think we're going off the point.
A. Okay.

CHA RMAN But what I am saying is, Ms. Leader is not 14:49 being unfair. I know about all of this stuff.
A. Okay.

CHA RMAN There's this and that and the other. You're simply being -- if a thorough job isn't done, if you're
not asked the questions, well, then, if I reach a conclusion, whether it is positive or negative, it's al1 too easy for some commentator to write a big pompous column saying you got the following wrong. So that is why this is being done.
A. They will probably write them anyway.

CHA RMAN We11, I don't mind. That's fine. M5. LEADER: Right. If we go to page 5918, there's reference to particular paragraphs there. And if we just go to 5919, I think there's notes relating to Mr. Clifford's interview on the radio.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

532 Q. I think that is what that refers to, which we saw yesterday.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

533 Q. That is in the Séan O'Rourke show, which was in the middle of the day. Why do you think you made notes in relation to that?
A. Just because there was another -- I beg your pardon -another perspective.
534 Q. All right.
A. So, I mean, we had done our Morning Ireland broadcast, this was then broadcast. Somebody else had a completely different perspective on it. I felt I should be aware of it.

535 Q. A11 right.
CHA RMAN And there's another reference to "chi ps", I see, and what one might have with them.

ME. LEADER: I think we heard what Mr. Clifford was saying at the time on the 9th May in relation to that. And we just go 5920, there's -- do you know what these notes refer to?
"Chai rman rej ected garda gave - evi dence - computer accepts his bona fides."

There's a line under that:
"Criticism- didn't heed voice of McCabe. Commission. 1st responded promptly, reasonably and appropriate. $\mathrm{O}^{\prime} \mathrm{Hi}$ ggi ns adding? Confi dential reci pi ent transcript and recording - paragraph - accepted - never made any such threat and comments."
A. Does it not relate to the o'Higgins Commission report?
Q. In relation to --
A. Let me have a look at it again. I'm not sure who didn't heed the voice of McCabe. I'm trying to think that one through. I think it's --
537 Q. It relates to the report?
A. I think it relates to the report, doesn't it?

538 Q. Yes. And then --
A. I think it's criticism of the Garda as well.

539 Q. Yeah, it could possib7y also --
A. Yes. I think that is a reference to --

540 Q. Mr. Lorcan Roche Kelly's interview on RTÉ, it could possibly refer to that as well?
A. "1st responded promptly, reasonably and appropriate." I think that might refer to Sergeant McCabe.
Q. Yes.
A. Now --

542 Q. You're not clear yourself?
A. I'm not clear myself, no.

543 Q. Al1 right. Page 5921:
"My evi dence voi ceover in 6."

Is that right?
A. Yeah.

544 Q. And then there's a reference to "Cases Crime - 8 failings, MkGrath murder and investigation, MECabe's allegation, nos(?) up(?) 5 peopl e."
A. Mm-hmm. I think that's just a baseline structure of how we were going to put the television stuff together, 14:52 I think. V/o is voiceover, "in 6", for the six o'clock. That we would look at the eight cases, looking at -- the McGrath one we particularly highlight. I think that is reflected in the television bulletins, yeah.
545 Q. Right. Then we have page 5922 , some notes you had scribbled together referring to --
A. Yeah.

546 Q. -- certain paragraph numbers, and again it continues in that. Is there anything you want to bring to my particular attention?
A. I mean, all I'm saying to you is that it again reflects the chaotic nature of my note-taking in the initial stages, that I grab any bit of paper and just scribble
it down quick, and just pointers.
547 Q. Yes. Then at the last page of your notes, it's page 5923 of the materials, it refers to the conclusions chapter.
A. Yes.

548 Q. "Conditions at Bailieboro depl orable. Not the cause of deficiencies of personnel."

Then particular paragraph 13.176 in relation the desire to have the complaints examined by the minister.
"There was an allegation of corruption.

No evi dence to support this hurtful allegation.
13. 178 'The Mnisters request for a Report fromthe Commissioner arising out of the complaint in January ' 12 - was entirely reasonable and appropriate. In seeking that report the M ni ster was not asking the Cormissioner to investigate himself'."

And that refers to the previous Minister, Minister Shatter.
A. Yeah. I think you can see again, not everything in all of those notes appeared in the final broadcast. But I think it illustrates that I did go, I read 11 of the chapters, I jotted down bits where I could.
549 Q. Yes. Now, in relation to the chapters, you didn't -if you could just assist me in why you picked out
certain chapters and your thinking along those lines?
A. Well, I think the only one that I left out was the Pulse chapter.
550 Q. Yes.
A. And I thought -- it just seemed to me that it would be very complicated. I'm sure there were a lot of findings in it, but within the timescale, within what I had to report, it looked to me like it could be a standalone chapter in relation to the pulse and the technology. And I suppose looking at it afterwards, I was sorry I didn't do it on the Tuesday because I think on the Wednesday morning The Irish Times spotted it and The Irish Times did a story and got good headlines out of it for their edition on the wednesday. And then the report was published on that day. So it wasn't for any 14:55 particular reason. I felt the eight criminal investigations and the failings of the Gardaí had to be done. I felt that the corruption allegations were crucial, they had to be covered, and I tried to put in as much as I could. So if I was to leave anything out, 14:55 I think, for neatness' sake, I just said the Pulse chapter.
551 Q. All right. Now, if I could go back to the term of reference again and we will just put it up again:
"To i nvesti gate whet her Cormi ssi oner O Sul I ivan, using briefing material prepared in Garda Headquarters, influenced, or attempted to influence, broadcasts purporting to be a leaked account of the unpublished

O' Hi ggi ns Commi ssi on report in whi ch Ser geant McCabe was branded a liar and irresponsible."

Now, we have seen in your notes that material did creep into them about the D investigation and it being the matter which started all of this, which seems to be what the negative briefing Superintendent Taylor was trying to convey to -- what he says he was trying to convey to journalists was all about. okay. And if we look at Sergeant McCabe's protected disclosure, it's at 14:56 page 244 of the materials. 244, yes. This is back in September 2016. Sergeant McCabe explains that he is out on work-related stress leave, and:
"One of the reasons for this is to a di sgracef ul series 14:57 of broadcasts on RTÉ on 9th May 2016 purporting to leak an account of the unpubl i shed O' Hi ggi ns Commi ssi on report in which l was branded a liar and irresponsi ble. I am now satisfied on impeccable authority that those RTÉ broadcasts were pl anned and orchestrated by the Commi ssi oner Nói rín Ơ Sullivan personally using briefing material prepared at Garda Headquarters."

Now, if I can just go through that. It would appear from evidence given that Sergeant McCabe thinks his authority is Mr. Barrett of the Garda Human Resource Section, where he is said to have made a comment to Sergeant McCabe that that would have been Block 1, the broadcasts on the 9th May, which we understand to be a
reference to the Commissioner's block in Garda Headquarters, something which is disputed by Mr. Barrett, that he never said. But what I am asking you now, Mr. Reynolds, is: First of all, we all agree that there is no reference to the $D$ allegations in the O'Higgins report, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

552 Q. They, for some reason, come into your notes where you are preparing your broadcasts on the 9th may, for the 9th May 2016, that's right?
A. But there's no reference to them in the broadcasts.

553 Q. Not in your broadcasts. They come into your notes.
A. So they're not in the report and they're not in the broadcasts.
554 Q. Yes. They're in your notes.
A. There's a reference to the facts.

555 Q. Yes.
A. To some of the facts surrounding that allegation, yes. They are facts.
556 Q. Yes.
A. So I don't necessarily see facts as negative briefing in fact, I don't. I don't see how the facts can be construed as negative briefing. People are telling me what the facts were surrounding the issue at the time.
557 Q. So they are there. Somebody has brought them to your 14:59 attention?
A. Sure. Somebody had brought facts to my attention.

558 Q. Yes. In the context of, and correct if I am wrong, you preparing to do a report or a story, if I can -- a
report/story on the O'Higgins Commission report?
A. I don't think anybody deliberately brought -- nobody, in fact -- I'm sure nobody deliberately brought them to my attention. They came to me in the course of a conversation in relation to the issues and the problems 14:59 surrounding policing in Bailieboro.

559 Q. okay. And you, for whatever reason, didn't ask the person who brought them to your attention why they were doing that, is that my understanding of your evidence?
A. Yeah. This was a conversation, I listened to what I was being told, I took a note of it and excluded it, but these were facts in relation -- surrounding the allegation.
560 Q. A11 right.
A. But they had no bearing on the broadcasts. And the only thing I was interested in in relation to the broadcasts was the report and, as you can see, I have comprehensive notes in relation to the broadcasts, and many things that I wrote in those notes did not appear in the final broadcasts and did not influence me in any 15:00 way in the final broadcasts.

561 Q. Okay. And just for completeness' sake, was Commissioner o'sullivan the source of that information?
A. No.

562 Q. Okay. Now, you know Commissioner O'Sullivan, and have 15:00 known her for a period of time, you came up through the ranks together; I think that is the phrase that is being used at the moment?
A. Yeah.

563 Q. Yes. And her phone shows that she was in text contact with you and phoning you at least in September 2016, October 2016 and February 2017, they are redacted --
A. This is all after the publication of these reports?

564 Q. Yes. We11, you appreciate we only have certain phones from the former Commissioner, and one of them covers a time period starting, I think, in April, later on in April 2016, yes. And those texts have been redacted from the material that is distributed by the Tribunal. But those texts show that you were on friendly, personable terms, and I don't think you -- yourself or Commissioner o'sullivan have never said anything but that, isn't that right?
A. We had, as I said, with all people, I tend to have a professional but personable relationship.
565 Q. Okay. But you knew Commissioner o'Sullivan?
A. Well, of course $I$ knew her. I interviewed her plenty of times.
Q. Yes. So I am asking you, in view of all of that, did that relationship in any way, did she use that relationship in any way to --
A. No.

567 Q. -- influence you in your broadcast --
A. No.

568 Q. -- of the 9th May?
A. No.

569 Q. Al1 right.
A. I think that is clear from, you know, the material.

570 Q. And just in relation to the reports themselves, insofar
as they show that, they high1ight, and I hope I am not being unfair to you there, but high1ight that Sergeant McCabe's complaints in relation to corruption, if we take the one on the -- the second one on the radio in relation to the senior officers, highlight that nothing came of those complaints, and you point out in the morning broadcast, that on many occasions he was not correct in what he said?
A. And I also point out where he was correct.

571 Q. Yes. And you stand by that. But I am saying in so doing, it might, in some people's eyes, support the proposition that you were being sympathetic to a Garda point of view that, as Superintendent Taylor has put it forward, that Sergeant McCabe was somehow embittered because of the D investigation back in 2007 and that he had an agenda with the guards and this is why he was complaining?
A. We11, all sorts of people have all sorts of opinions about my work and they have all sorts of opinions about me. I can only present the facts, I can only stand over the facts and I only report the facts.

MG. LEADER: If you would answer any questions anybody else might have for you.

THE WTNESS WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. MEDOVELL:
the Tribunal here today. At what point did you first become aware that Sergeant McCabe was the subject of an allegation, an historical allegation, of sexual abuse against a minor?
A. I believe it was 2013, as I gave in my evidence. I believe it was 2013. I believe I heard it, that there was an allegation made, that it was investigated, file was sent to the DPP and there was no prosecution.
Q. I see. And at what point did you become aware that it was alleged that the minor in question was the child of $15: 05$ a colleague in An Garda Síochána?
A. I'm not sure of that, to be honest with you. But it seems that I must have been aware when it shows up in my notes in 2016, and it could have been even at that point when I learnt it.
574 Q. So do you think in 2013 you were acquainted with the fact or -- that the allegation suggested that Sergeant McCabe had sexually assaulted the child of a colleague?
A. Honestly, I don't know. I don't think so. But I didn't really -- I didn't focus on this allegation at all.
Q. I see.
A. Once I heard the DPP, that was it.
Q. I see. And I take it then from that, that you had put the matter largely out of your mind once you heard that 15:06 the Director of Public Prosecutions had directed no prosecution, is that right?
A. Yeah.

577 Q. So in all of your dealings with members of An Garda

Síochána in relation to Sergeant McCabe and the penalty points story which you were covering, are you saying that nobody ever mentioned to you the earlier allegations of sexual misconduct against Sergeant McCabe?
A. I don't think so. I only covered, as I've said, the penalty points story in relation to official reports or publications. Yes. But, I mean, I presume that at the time of the penalty points issue you would have had dealings with Superintendent Taylor, for instance, as the official spokesman for An Garda Síochána?
A. Sure, yeah.

579 Q. And I'm just wondering, are you saying that at no point in any of your dealings with people, including Superintendent Taylor, did the subject of the sexual allegation ever arise or re-emerge?
A. I have no recollection of it re-emerging at any time. I mean, it may -- I was aware that it was known, I was aware that journalists, that gardaí, that politicians knew it, but --
Q. Well, can we stop there. You were aware that journalists, gardaí and politicians knew about this allegation. when did you become aware of that?
A. I couldn't put a timescale on it, but I knew, I knew it 15:08 was known. And you see --
Q. Well, I will help you, if I can.
A. Okay.

582 Q. You become aware of the allegation itself in 2013?
Q. And are you saying that you -- if you were so aware, you must have been discussing it with quite a number of people? assault on the part of Sergeant McCabe?
A. Yeah, I think I was, yeah.

No, because anybody that I knew that was aware of it also knew that the DPP had said there was no prosecution.
591 Q. Yes. But the point is that if you knew that gardaí,
journalists and politicians were aware of this matter, you must have -- that knowledge can only have arisen from discussions with people?
A. No, I mean, it didn't -- well, it wasn't even a discussion. I mean, I knew my colleagues, for example my political -- my colleagues in the political unit in Leinster House were hearing this, I knew other journalists were aware of it because there were -- some of them were my colleagues, but it wasn't being discussed. Like, I mean, they knew as well.
592 Q. We11, what about the third category, gardaí, that you mentioned earlier?
A. Sure gardá knew about it.

593 Q. I see. And how did you know that gardaí knew about it?
A. Because it was investigated by the gardaí.

594 Q. How did you know that gardaí you were dealing with were aware of this allegation?
A. The gardaí what?
Q. That gardaí that you were dealing with were aware of this allegation?
A. It's a bit like, if I can put it this way, Chairman, it's a bit like, there's a phrase in education called the hidden curriculum, where children are in a school and they might not necessarily be told where the principal's office is but they know, that they know will know things, they will hear things, just by virtue of being there. Journalists, the same. I knew this was around in the ether. I couldn't tell you how I
knew, where I knew, but it wasn't being openly discussed, it wasn't being spoken about negatively, but people knew about it.
I see. But, you see, spoken about negatively; to discuss it at all was negative from Sergeant McCabe's point of view, was it not?
A. I don't see anything negative in the fact that the man was exonerated.

597 Q. We11, I'm not going to waste my time on this, but I am suggesting that the fact that you have been exonerated of a very serious accusation, if made public or semi-public, is negative, and most people would not like it to happen to them?
A. I don't know what to say to that.

598 Q. We11, put it this way: Supposing, just imagine yourself in a similar situation?
A. But I am in a similar situation.

599 Q. If an untrue allegation had been made against you ten years ago, and people, ten years later, are discussing it at the level of senior gardaí, politicians and journalists, would you be happy about that?
A. I'm before this Tribunal today because three people have made false allegations against me. They will probably be discussing them for the next ten years. No matter what the Chairman says, these allegations are out in social media and people will see them and believe them. I can't be responsible for that. That is the way it is. I have the greatest sympathy for Sergeant McCabe. That if people on7y choose to

Well, we will come back to that in a while. Can I ask you to deal with the circumstances in which you came to make a broadcast on the 24th February 2014. First of all, did $I$ understand from your evidence that, prior to your making that broadcast, a source gave you a copy of the Commissioner's direction which had been read out to Sergeant McCabe?
A. No, I said I had sight of the Commissioner's direction.

601 Q. You'd had sight of it?
A. Yes.
Q. I see. That is what I was going to ask. So somebody showed you --
A. I think it's illegal, isn't it, under Section 62 of the Garda Síochána Act, to have --
603 Q. I don't know.
A. I don't know.

604 Q. I'm not venturing any view on that. I'm just asking you -- I'm just asking you, very simply, somebody showed you this direction either on the 24th February or on the previous day, is that a reasonable inference?
A. I saw it.
Q. Yeah. Either on the previous day or that day?
A. I saw it.
Q. Yes. Can you confirm the date?
A. No.

607 Q. Well, was there any reason why you would hold back on this material until the 24 th for any extend period of time?
A. I don't -- I can't think of any reason at the moment.

608 Q. And may I ask you as we11, given that we have seen the very elaborate steps that were taken to deal with your broadcasts in May of 2016, did you seek editorial guidance as to whether you would go ahead with your story on the 24th February 2014?
A. I didn't see it as a big a story. I mean, when we published the first one at twenty past two, it went up online for about an hour, an hour-and-a-half, before it was updated. Indeed the whole story never went on television. I never saw this as a big deal. asked you did you seek any editorial guidance as to whether you should publish this on that day?
A. No, I'm not sure if I sought any editorial guidance, but whoever the news editor was on the day, probably would have known it was coming in, wasn't that interested. I would have spoken to a programme editor. CHA RMAN Well, I think, you would hardly have access to the actual website itself and put up anything --
A. No, no.

CHA RMAN -- you wanted at a11. You wouldn't have the relevant logs to key in. So you clearly had to give it to someone? I think that is all Mr. McDowe11 is asking you.
A. Yes, the way it works in RTÉ is that there is a news desk, and, if reporters want to file stories, they file it into the copy system and other editors read it and certain programme editors are interested in it and certain programme editors are not interested in it, and 15:16 this story didn't cause -- nobody was particularly interested in this, and they stuck it up online and it stayed there and then I updated it, but it wasn't a particularly big deal.
610 Q.
MR. MEDONELL: You have just told the Chairman that you didn't think it was a story, is that right?
A. No, no, I didn't say that. I didn't think it was a big story.
611 Q. A big story?
A. Yeah.

612 Q. Can we look at page 7256, please. Sorry, I have the wrong page then. That is Sergeant McCabe's statement. Your statement is what I am concerned with. Sorry, it's page 7255 -- no, it's not, that is not it. Maybe My Friends can help me. Where is the --
CHA RMAN what are you looking for, Mr. McDowe11? MR. MEDOVELL: The text that you put up on --
A. Yeah, that wasn't a statement.

ME. LEADER: 7381.
MR. MEDOWELL: 7381.
613 Q. Yes. This is your text?
A. That's my report.

614 Q. Yeah. And you wrote that out on the 24th February 2014?
A. That's correct.

615 Q. And just to clarify what the Chairman has just asked you, do you have direct access to the website or do you have to --
A. No, I don't.
Q. So you had to submit it to somebody who does have control of the website?
A. I submit it into the RTÉ internal system, an editor will look at it and then it is decided -- if other editors want to take it, they will -- for example, if a 15:18 story goes in about Beyoncé, 2 FM will be interested in that, it won't appear on Radio 1, etcetera, etcetera. So the copy system is whereby all the information goes into the copy system, all the stories go in and people select at will. But there is an editor on the news desk who reads through the copy system to make sure that nothing goes in there and nothing goes out or is broadcast that shouldn't.
617 Q. I see. So can we take it that you wrote that story on or about that day?
A. Oh, yeah.

618 Q. And that was shortly afterwards, after your being shown a copy of the direction that had been given to Sergeant McCabe, is that right?
A. Well, I will grant you that, yeah, it's fine.

619 Q. And I know you're not going to cavil with this: Can we take it, bearing in mind what you said about Section 62 of the Garda Síochána Act, that it was somebody with access to Garda records who showed it to you?
A. I'm not -- I'm not going to discuss the provenance of it at all.

CHA RMAN We11, it had to be somebody who had access to somebody who had access to somebody who had access to Garda records at the least, I would suppose, Mr. McDowe11.

MR. MEDONELL: Yes. We11, the text itself recites that -- and this is at a time when Sergeant McCabe had given evidence to the PAC and this is a time later than the Commissioner's controversial remarks at the PAC, and it was to do with penalty points, isn't that right, the O'Mahony investigation?
A. It was, that's correct, yeah. Ticket-fixing, I think he said it was, was it?
621 Q. Can we save ourselves a little bit of time by saying that this cast Sergeant McCabe in an unfavourable 1ight --
A. No.

622 Q. -- in that it suggested to a reader that he had been directed to cooperate with the O'Mahony inquiry and had not done so?
A. No, that story is based on a direction, it reported the fact that it had happened.
623 Q. Yes. And it also points out that gardaí are obliged to comply with directions?
A. That's correct.

624 Q. How would that be relevant if he had complied with the direction?
A. The Garda Commissioner was saying he hadn't complied
with it.
625 Q. Yes. You see, that is the point I am coming to. So the Garda Commissioner was, one way or another, putting out the story that Sergeant McCabe had not complied with the direction?
A. No, I saw the direction.

626 Q. Yes.
A. The direction was very clear, as far as I was concerned.

627 Q. Yes.
A. I reported on the direction. That story is a report on the direction.
628 Q. And what did the Garda Commissioner -- you've just said the Garda Commissioner said something?
A. Yeah, an hour-and-a-half later the Garda Commissioner
said: Yeah, that's my position on it.
CHAD RNAN There just seems to be a wee bit of subtlety, Mr. Reynolds, attaching to this. On the one hand, there was a very definite direction, you're not to access Pulse any more. There was also an
indication, look, if you have anything else to say in relation to Pulse or fixed charge penalty notices, then you should bring that to the attention of Assistant Commissioner o'Mahony, and that's 14th December 2012.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN You seem to be reporting on it a good while later, about 18 months later.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN So that is it. It may help other people.

I'm not reading it as a direction to Sergeant McCabe --
A. okay.

CHA RMAN -- you have to go to o'mahony. It's a direction, don't access pulse and go giving a whole load of Pulse stuff to people, but if you have got something further that you need to bring to anybody's attention, there's an investigation, there's assistant commissioner. That is my reading of it.
A. My reading of it was in the context of dealing with Garda and security issues. I deal with disciplined organisations - An Garda Síochána, the defence forces, and, to a certain extent, there is a rank structure in the prison service as well. So I'm aware that when the Commissioner tells a sergeant something, he doesn't give invites. The Garda Commissioner doesn't invite a
sergeant to do something, just as much as the director-general of RTÉ, even though I am not in a rank -- I don't work in a ranked organisation. CHA RMAN No, I understand that. No, I get all that. And that is certainly the ideal. But what I have understood so far is that you read it, you understood it perhaps the same way as I did, but that you checked it at some stage with David Taylor, and the official line was, that's not just an invitation, like if you would like to turn up for work in the morning we'd be delighted to see you; it is, in fact, a direction, turn up for work in the morning or we will be very undelighted not to see you.
A. But I read it that way the first time. CHA RMAN okay. All right. Then that is fine.
A. I read it as a direction the first time and I reported it as a direction the first time. And I looked for comments from both Sergeant McCabe and from Garda Headquarters and Superintendent Taylor came back to me and he said, yes, the Garda Commissioner says he told him to cooperate.
MR. MEDOVELL: We11, we will deal with your contact with Sergeant McCabe in a moment, but what your report doesn't say is that he was -- is that the people to whom this direction was given were told to desist from accessing Pulse, it doesn't say that?
A. Yeah.

630 Q. Why not? That was the gravamen of the direction.
A. That issue, as far as I was concerned that issue had already been wel1 ventilated.
631 Q. I see.
A. But the controversy was over -- there was a question-mark, the Minister for Justice told the Dáil
that Sergeant McCabe had refused to cooperate, I thought, $I$ wonder what this is -- what is the real situation here?

632 Q. I see.
A. What exactly was he told? I saw the direction and then 15:24 I went to Garda Headquarters to say well, is this your view on it? Yes. I went to Sergeant McCabe and he declined to talk to me.

633 Q. We11, let's remember what in fact it stated. It
stated, the direction stated that he was not to access pulse records and that he was not to communicate with other people and that if he had any further concerns he could contact Assistant Commissioner o'mahony, isn't that right?
A. Yeah. But he clearly had further concerns.

634 Q. In any event, you published that on the afternoon of the 24th February. And it was after that, that you contacted Superintendent Taylor, isn't that right?
A. I'm not sure, it could have been before that and it could have been before that when I tried to contact Sergeant McCabe. I'm not a hundred percent sure of the timeline.
Q. Well, I think the text traffic or the communications traffic logs show that you communicated afterwards, not 15:25 before?
A. I think there was communication with myself and Superintendent Taylor before that.
Q. I see. And I have got to suggest to you that you only contacted sergeant McCabe after you had put it up on the screen, so to speak?
A. I don't know, I don't think so.

637 Q. I suggest to you that you did, because he told you that he was already in contact with the Prime Time programme in relation to it?
A. No. when I finally spoke to him that evening, when he took -- he took my call at around nine o'clock I think it was, he told me he wasn't going to -- he told me there was going to be a statement, he wasn't going to
give it to me, he was giving it to Prime Time. I was unable to contact him throughout the day. But there are a number of -- that's the first report you're looking at there. There was an updated report at 16:45, which included the Gardaí, the Garda Commissioner's statement. I was still looking for details from Sergeant McCabe. By his own evidence he said he was aware of this story by four o'clock. The story was updated again at six o'clock. And then, when I finally got to speak to him even though he wouldn't te11 me anything, I garnered from that conversation that he disputed this, and that he would be issuing a statement through his legal representative later that evening and I incorporated that immediately over an hour before the Prime Time broadcast was -- before the Prime Time programme was broadcast. And then, as soon as I actually saw the contents of his statement I then at quarter to midnight incorporated that into the story. So I made best efforts to get information from him and even though he wouldn't give me the statement I 15:27 had some indication that he was issuing one and I had some indication that he was in dispute and even though he didn't give me the statement $I$ still put that in, because clearly there was a dispute with it.
638 Q. I see.
ME. LEADER: I don't want to interrupt anything, but Mr. McDowell has just been handed the chronology that the witness has just given evidence about, in relation to the updates of his report.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEDONELL: That's correct, Chairman. And I'm not making complaint about the lateness of it but I haven't, I can't speed read.
CHA RMAN No, I appreciate that. But you could move on to another subject if you wish, Mr. McDowe11.

MR. MEDONELL: Yes. I wil1 come back to it if I can. CHA RMAN Yes.

MR. MEDONELL: But before I depart from it, I am suggesting to you that you put it up on the website through the editor before you made any contact with Sergeant McCabe?
A. Well, I can't give you a timeline on that. I tried my best to contact Sergeant McCabe and when I did get him, he wouldn't talk to me.

When you say when you did get him he wouldn't talk to you, he told you that he was dealing with Prime Time on the matter, isn't that right??
A. Yeah. We11, I found that strange. I was puzzled by that. I mean, the report, I mean, by his own admission 15:28 it was there since four o'clock and he was clearly very upset about the report and I was trying to get his side of the story and he was prepared to wait six and a half, seven hours and allow a report to remain like that. I couldn't understand that.

641 Q. Well, he was angry about your report, wasn't he?
A. But there was -- it's very simple to sort that out.

642 Q. I see. Now going back to your notes, which Ms. Leader was asking you about earlier. As I understand it these
notes are taken from two notebooks you had, one for Apri1 2016 and one for May 2016, is that right?
A. That's correct.

643 Q. And can I bring you to page 5898; can I ask you, do those notes predate or postdate your obtaining a copy or copies of the O'Higgins report?
A. Which? Just this page here or --

644 Q. Yes. Those notes there.
A. These four here, one, two, three, four, I can only see -- there's only seven.

645 Q. No, sorry. Page 5898 we're looking at.
A. Just this page?

646 Q. Yes.
A. "Accel er ated recrui tment" --

647 Q. And the next page.
A. I would say they do, yeah.

648 Q. You say they predate or postdate?
A. I would say they predate.

649 Q. I see. So can we take it from that, that these are notes of a conversation between yourself and a source at a time when you had no access to the o'Higgins report?
A. At the time I was seeking access to the O'Higgins report.

650 Q. I see. But you hadn't had any access to it at the time 15:31 of this --
A. I don't think I had it in my hand when I was having these conversations and jotting down these notes.

651 Q. I see. We11, I suggest to you that it either predates
or postdates you being given one or more copies of the o'higgins Commission report?
A. Yeah, no, I --
Q. which is it?
A. I said to you I believe they predate.
well, could I bring you to the second or third last line on page 5899:
"Hi ggi ns Tri bunal same concl usions as internal."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

657 Q. Now this can't just have been bits and bobs of a conversation, you're being told that the o'Higgins Tribunal as it's called, has come to the same
A. I'm not being told anything definitive there.
Q. No.
A. You don't see the full sentence. We're having conversations, you know, O'Higgins Tribunal, and somebody could have been saying like you know, by and large, Paul, I mean these, the O'Higgins Tribunal, what is in the O'Higgins Tribunal by and large and, you know, give or take it's the same conclusions as internal, I have only written down a couple of words here and a couple of words there. This is not the basis for anything.
659 Q. The next line is:
"J uni or $M$ ni ster's I ack of supervision and in bad condi tions. "
A. Yes.

660 Q. Are you asking the Tribunal to believe that this does not refer to somebody giving you an impression of what is in the report?
A. No, no. It is an impression, okay. Well, those two sentences clearly are.

661 Q. Yes.
A. But it's not definitive.

662 Q. Yes, whoever you were talking to seemed to be in a position to be telling you what was in the O'Higgins Commission report?
A. No, they were telling me some aspects of it.

663 Q. Yes?
A. Or as I said bits and bobs.

664 Q. Yes?
A. Some of it was in it and some of it wasn't.

665 Q. I see.
A. But --

15:33
666 Q. If you go back to the previous page then, whoever that person was -- do you recall who that person was? I'm not going to ask you who it was for obvious reasons, but do you recal1 who it was?
A. I'm not going to say.

667 Q. Well, you're not breaching privilege by saying --
A. It was clear I was talking to somebody but I mean that is as far as it goes.
668 Q. I'm not going to ask you to identify your source.
A. Well, fine.

669 Q. I am going to ask you do you remember who you were talking about at al1, or to?
A. I'm not getting into any conversation in relation to the person I was talking to or the people I was talking to.

670 Q. I'm not going to push you to identify your source.
A. Yeah. No, no, I'm not getting into any conversation in relation to the people I was speaking to. As I have said to you, the source for the broadcasts is the O'Higgins Commission report.

671 Q. I see. So you're going to leave us in the dark as to whether you know to whom you were speaking when you made those notes?
A. I'm afraid I will have to take it to my grave,

672 Q
Q. I'm not asking you to divulge anything except to inquire whether you now know who that conversation was with.
A. I can't help you, Mr. McDowell.
Q. We11, you go back to page 5898 you have, halfway down the note:
"Ser geant in charge compl ai nt agai nst hi minvesti gated I ocally (mi stake) (wrong) Superintendent Cl ancy."

So somebody, you weren't putting those propositions to somebody else, isn't that right? Or, is that right?
A. I'm having a conversation, I'm jotting these things down.

677 Q. This isn't you putting that proposition to somebody
else?
A. I don't think so, but I wouldn't rule it out.
Q. So you might have actually been putting to somebody
else the fact that Sergeant McCabe had been --
A. I mean, as I said --

We11, something does hang on it. And that is, and I will just make it very clear to you if you can't see, that if somebody who claimed to have knowledge of the contents of the O'Higgins Commission report was also mentioning to you the complaint of sexual abuse against Sergeant McCabe and the inadequacies of the original investigation that suggests somebody was negatively briefing?
A. No, it doesn't. These are facts. That's a list of facts there. And facts are not negative briefing.
681 Q. So telling you something which is factual is not negative briefing, is that right?
A. I don't believe so.

682 Q. I see. The truth is the truth. The facts are the facts. They may be unpalatable but --
CHA RMAN I mean, we have had this discussion before.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN And you may have missed it. You made reference to the catechism earlier on and the difference between truth and lies. well, the difference between calumny, which is something that is
wrong, and it is untrue, and detraction, something that happened a long time ago, let's say when a person lived in another country, it's nothing to do with the person's job, nothing anybody needs to know, but it is spread around again, and I don't know if I am going to have to wrestle with this whole notion of detraction, because it seems to me the terms of reference are pretty clear, but I think the point being made to you by Mr. McDowell is this: Look, if nobody needs to know about 2006 and the allegation made December by Ms. D, the investigation which reached a particular conclusion, state solicitor who reached a particular conclusion, the background which was important in terms of reaching a conclusion, the legal analysis by the DPP all were to the same effect --
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN - 'nothing to see here, guys', well then, why does anyone need to bring it up 12 years later, 14 years later, whatever? what are they at if they are bringing it up, if it is not, and I'm going to use the word, detraction here in the technical sense? That is really the question Mr. McDowell is asking.
A. Yeah, look, I can't answer that. It looks to me that obviously this case had a traumatic impact on Sergeant McCabe and rightly so, and his family, etcetera, but it 15:39 obviously had an impact on policing locally, whereby somebody was talking to me and said this should have been handled differently from a policing point of view, it shouldn't have been --

CHA RMAN I know, but I mean, this is yet another thing that is jumping around in this room, and frankly I am going to get a hammer and squash it now. whether it was fair to Superintendent Cunningham that he got the job, the reality is that he did a very, very good job.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

CHA RMAN So, there it is.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN whether it was fair to him or not. I'm not investigating whether, you know, the Garda Síochána should be very scrupulous about this thing that so many people talk about, which is conflicts of interest. I must say it doesn't really interest me terribly much.
I'm not sure it's as big a legal principle as people think it is.
A. When I talk to people they give me opinions and I'm having conversations.

CHA RMAN No, no, that is certainly a different matter, you see, Mr. Reynolds, because if you are talking to people, and if you are saying, as indeed you told Ms. Leader this morning, a newspaper man goes down and he talks to people and they talk to him --
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN -- and you basically take it in like a sponge and then you see what is important.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN But I think what Mr. McDowe11 is asking about you is this: If people are telling you a bit of
ancient history that is completely irrelevant to anything that is going on today is that not detraction? Do you not see it as detraction? So, I am not going to --
A. Well, I mean, I personally don't see it as that. And I 15:41 never got the sense from these people that I was talking about that they were, that they were pouring poison in my ear against Sergeant McCabe. I never got that impression. I mean, yes, this obviously was something that happened in Bailieboro, they were all aware of it, it was an incident that happened, but I never got the impression that they were, as I said, pouring poison in my ear, to use the horrible phrase as the Chairman says, negatively briefing. There was no persistent, consistent, deliberate hammering away, giving you this negative stuff against Sergeant McCabe. It just wasn't there. There was a conversation in this case about policing in Bailieboro and this came up. And moved on. And I am jotting down notes, I'm taking everything that's been said so that later when I need to filter it and when I need to use it, if it is relevant I will use it, and it wasn't relevant.
683 Q. MR. MEDONELL: Yes.
A. These are the initial notes, thoughts, stream of consciousness, whatever you want to call it. Nothing hangs on it.

684 Q. I see. Could I ask you then to go page 5910 of the typed notes? It's clear that these notes were made at a time when you had access to the o'Higgins report,
because you've annotated paragraphs for various propositions?
A. Well, not this page here. There's no --

685 Q. No.
A. There's no annotations there.

686 Q. No, but earlier on in your notebook you have annotated paragraphs. This is your main notebook, right?
A. Yeah, but that's what I'm saying. If I was talking -what I'm saying to you is, I'11 grab a notebook, there's not necessarily a chronology or a logical sense 15:43 to these. As I explained to Ms. Leader this morning, I wrote on the back of envelopes as well.
687 Q. Yes. We11, I am going to suggest to you that it is more probable than not that page 13 of this notebook was written at a time when you already had access to the report because you have detailed paragraph references in earlier pages in the same notebook?
A. Sorry, am I looking at page 13 now or am I look the at something --
Q. Sorry?
A. This one here that starts "meeting in the Hill grove", is it?

689 Q. No, I will show you if you like if you have any doubt about the matter. If you go to say page 5902.
A. This is page 5 at the top?

690 Q. Page 5, yes.
A. Okay. "He descri be this as poi soni ng and attempted mur der."

691 Q. Attempted murder, yes.
A. Yeah.

692 Q. Stop at that point.
A. Hmm.

693 Q. Did he ever describe the vinegar incident as attempted murder?
A. No, I don't think so. No.

694 Q. Yes. So somebody was putting that -- you didn't think that when you had access to the report, did you?
A. No, I don't think so.

695 Q. So somebody was putting, was putting that little bit of 15:44 poison in your ear; that his exaggeration was such that he was attempting to ramp up the vinegar incident into an attempted murder, isn't that correct?
A. I think you're building your castle on sand, Mr. McDowell.

696 Q. No. Just answer the question now.
A. Well, I am answering the question. I don't think so.

697 Q. Somebody was putting this --
A. I'm scribbling stuff down, maybe somebody made a mistake, you know maybe they misinterpreted it,
whatever, you know. I don't know. As I said, I was taking everything in.

698 Q. Yes.
A. I don't -- you know.

699 Q. You were taking it in from somebody --
A. Somebody --

700 Q. -- and you wrote down "he described this as poi soni ng and attempted mur der"?
A. Somebody obviously made a mistake.

CHA RMAN I think the point Mr. McDowe11 is making, and it may well be a good point --
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN -- is, you know, it's very unpleasant to put urine on your chips and then eat them --
A. Yes, it is.

CHA RMAN -- fine, but that is not a method of murder that you or $I$ would have come across in the criminal courts over 20 or 30 or 40 years.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAK And if somebody said to you that Sergeant McCabe thought that putting urine in a vinegar bottle was a method of murder, well, that indicates that he's off his head basically. Yes.
A. Mmm, it's wrong.

CHA RMAN So that is the point that is being made.
A. No, but the point is it's wrong.

CHA RMAN We11, it's not just wrong, it's very, very, very wrong.
A. But I don't think somebody told me that, said right,
now -- and the person I was talking to said, right, I'm going to give him this line and he will go off and he will put attempted murder on the television. I genuinely don't think the person said that.
701 Q. MR. MEDONELL: We11, did you think it was a joke?
A. No, I didn't think it was a joke either. I just wrote. I mean, I have come to the Tribunal with palms up. I'm giving you all this sort of stuff.
702 Q. Yes. And I'm asking you what all this means.
A. That's what I'm telling you. It's all bits and bobs, these are initial conversations with people, strings of this, that and the other.
Q. You see, the point --
A. I won't stand over the accuracy of any of this sort of stuff.
Q. Yes.
A. I won't stand over the provenance of any of this sort of stuff. I will -- as I said to you, this was not supposed to be poured over by a team of highly intelligent and well trained lawyers. This is just the initial stuff.
Q. Yes. This is a contemporary account of what somebody was telling you about the O'Higgins report?
A. It's, I'm gathering information from wherever I can get 15:46 it.
Q. Yes. Is it a contemporaneous --
A. And obviously this particular individual --

707 Q. Yes?
A. -- knows very little, if not nothing, about the report and that became clear very quickly when I got the report.

708 Q. Yes, but --
A. This thing, it records delay and error there, these notes are full of error.

709 Q. If you read down the page it says:
"He descri bed this as poi soni ng and attempted murder."

And then you quote paragraph 5.51:
"No evi dence of crime."
A. Mmm.

710 Q. And then you have:

"Allegation of criminality withdrawn by Sergeant
MECabe. "
A. Mmm .

711 Q. Then you have:
"Garda Naught on i nvesti gated assault. I nvestigation del ay and error. Garda Naught on made mistakes.
I nappropri ate. "

And then there is a statement, this is a quotation from the report:
"Correctly identified di screpancies in the case."
A. Mmm .

712 Q. Now somebody was telling you or giving you an account of what was in the O'Higgins report?
A. Look, bits of it were right and bits of it were wrong.

713 Q. Yes, but somebody --
A. Yeah. But I don't believe the person who was giving me 15:47 that information was deliberately saying I'11 sneak in this attempted murder or I'11 sneak in this mistake and hope he doesn't spot it.
714 Q. And can we go not next page, it's headed, page 6:
"J uni or gardaí, no i nvesti gation, he's the sergeant in charge, file sent for discipline, DPP and GSOC. "

Then there is a reference:

## "Page 167 and paragraph 8.51 MkCabe compl ai nt."

A. Mmm.
Q. "Look at page 152, it was not this."

Is that somebody --
A. No, that could be me to me.

716 Q. I see. So those could be your own personal notes?
A. The whole thing is a compendium.

717 Q. Yes.
A. I mean, if I brought this stuff to Ray Burke he would 1augh me out of the place.

718 Q. Fair enough. I'm not suggesting you could use it as a source. But I'm suggesting to you that this was a contemporaneous set of notes made by you, both of your own deliberations and of things people were telling you?
A. It's a compendium of everything. I'm not standing over it.
719 Q. I see. We11, if I come to page 5904 , which is page 7 of your notes, you have:
"Taping confidential reci pient. Al an screwed. Lost hi s job. "
A. Yeah.
720 Q. Then on the right-hand side:
"Look at all people lost thei r jobs."
A. Mmm .

721 Q. "Ball of smoke?"
A. "Ball of smoke" as well, again, yeah.

722 Q. You did say, did you not, on one of your television or radio interviews that a number of people had lost their jobs over Sergeant McCabe's allegations?
A. We11, a number of people had lost their jobs.

723 Q. Yes. And among them --
A. The confidential recipient lost his job because extracts of a recorded conversation, selected extracts were leaked and I think the Commission dealt with that.

724 Q. Yes?
A. We know that the Minister for Justice lost his job.

725 Q. Yes. What about the Commissioner? Did you not say that he had lost his job arising out of this?
A. I don't think he lost his job arising out of this now. But I think -- I mean, if you think back to the time, I mean there was the GSOC bugging that never was, there was the phone recordings which he actually was trying to do something about, there was the penalty points, there was all these Garda scandals, they all came to a head.

726 Q. You see the point is that I'm suggesting to you that by
no stretch of the imagination, even the most vivid imagination, could you say that the allegations being considered by the o'Higgins Commission had lost Commissioner Callinan his job?
A. Well, it didn't say that in the Commission report and I 15:50 didn't report it in that way. But I mean, I think if you stand back, you know the allegations and how he did or didn't deal with them were certainly a contributory factor, I mean, not just to Commissioner Callinan but also Minister for Justice, Alan Shatter.

727 Q. But the penalty points --
A. I mean, you saw in the television piece today that even after the report came out and found -- you know, to a certain extent vindicated the way the minister for Justice at the time dealt with the issues, Fianna Fáil still came out and said no, they weren't happy.

728 Q. I'm talking about Commissioner Callinan now.
A. Or are you? okay.

729 Q. And I'm suggesting to you that it is simply false and completely false to suggest that the matters considered at the o'Higgins Commission contributed to his loss of his job.
A. I don't know about that.

730 Q. We11, do you want to argue that they did?
A. I wouldn't argue with you, Mr. McDowell. It's a matter 15:51 of opinion, you know.
731 Q. Put it this way: The penalty points matter, you're not suggesting that Mr. Justice O'Higgins was investigating that?
A. No.
Q. Fair enough.
A. But ultimately allegations of poor policing, malpractice, victims not being served, probationer gardaí carrying out investigations, that would land at 15:52 the door of the serving Commissioner.

Now can I bring you back to page 5910 and if we could have the latter part of the page:
"I nitial compl ai nt two members of An Garda Sí ochána in
the same rank working in the same station, boss down the corridor asked to investigate."

You wrote that down in your notebook, does that reflect your own thinking or the thinking of somebody else?
A. No, they were the facts as outlined to me.

734 Q. As outlined to you by whom? Sorry, I'm not going to ask you to identify --
A. Exactly.
Q. But by somebody who you were dealing with, is that
A. Yeah.

736 Q. So these weren't your own thoughts?
A. No, I don't think so. No, no, they weren't mine.

737 Q. And they definitely refer back again, now we're in May, 15:53 they refer to the allegation of sexual assault against Sergeant McCabe and the manner in which it was investigated?
A. The manner in which it was handled, yeah.


738
Q. Pardon?
A. Yeah, the manner in which it was handled.
Q. Yes. Can I just, at this stage you are aware of the ranks of the people involved and the fact, the proximity of their workplace, is that right?
A. I'm not even sure if that is correct, to be honest with you. And if it is, that is fine.
Q. Well, the same station --
A. Yeah.
-- can only mean one thing?
A. But I'm not even sure if they are two [rank redacted].

742 Q. I'm not using the rank.
CHA RMAN We have been trying to not use the rank all the way through, Mr. Reynolds.
A. Okay. Well, I'm sorry.

MR. MEDONELL: I'm suggesting to you that somebody is having a conversation with you, pointing out the closeness and proximity of the two people, members of An Garda Síochána, who were involved in this allegation being made?
A. That is a criticism not of Sergeant McCabe, that is a criticism of the way the investigation was handled.

744 Q. But I'm suggesting to you that whoever was talking to you was making that criticism at the time, isn't that right?
A. They were making a criticism of the way the investigation was handled.
Q. Yeah?
A. They were not criticising Sergeant McCabe and they were
not referring to the allegation, they were referring to the investigation.
Q. I just want to bring you then to the next line:
"Boss down the corridor asked to investigate."

Well, first of all, that's not something that you could have thought up, because the man who investigated was not down any corridor from the two [garda colleagues].
A. No, the boss who was down the corridor from the two individuals asked was asked to investigate it and appointed somebody else to investigate it.
Q. well, that is not right?
A. Well, sorry, it's not right that the Superintendent Taylor wasn't down the corridor?
Q. Yeah.
A. okay.
Q. He was stationed in Monaghan.
A. Yeah, but I mean, I wouldn't necessarily take it literally either. You know, down the corridor is a phrase, like, you know what I mean.
Q. I see.
A. He was the supervising officer.

754 Q. I see. And you're suggesting or somebody is suggesting to you that that was an error or an improper aspect of the investigation?
A. No, not the investigation. The fact that the investigation was carried out locally.
Q. Yes.
A. There was no criticism of the investigation, there was no -- nothing negative about Sergeant McCabe or nothing about the incident, it was about the fact that the investigation should not have been handled locally. That was the opinion of the person.

756 Q. We11, whoever is having this conversation that you're recording is a month -- in the month after the first time this has been raised with you, raising again the D 15:56 sexual assault allegation.
A. No, is making the point that the investigation should not have been carried out within that division. It should have been handled from somewhere like Dublin. How is that in any way relevant to the o'Higgins Commission?
A. It's relevant to policing in Bailieboro.

758 Q. Well, was it relevant to the O'Higgins Commission?
A. We11, I didn't put it into any of my reports on the

O'Higgins Commission.
CHA RMAN I think what Mr. McDowell may be driving at, is this: If it is someone you know and if it is someone from up the corridor who actually investigates you, that may make the whole thing, if you like, worse and make you more bitter in consequence of it. I think that is the point. And I think that he is saying well look, was that the whole idea that was being conveyed to you? Do you see the distinction I'm making?
A. I'm --

CHA RMAN If someone you don't know from Adam comes in and says I'm sorry, Maurice, or whatever it may be, I've been asked to investigate this and I'm from, I don't know, Central Detective Unit, Tralee --
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN -- that is one thing, if it is somebody who you know and who is metaphorically or 1iterally up the corridor, it may make it worse. I think that is the point being put across. So, if that is the point being put across and if that is the point being put across to you, it would seem that some people may think that that is being put across in the context of well, that is why he is so bitter. That is the point I think you're making, Mr. McDowe11.
MR. MEDONELL: That is the point.
A. Well, okay. That is a big jump. I never got that impression.

759 Q. And can I ask you this, again without any sense trying to intrude on your private journalistic privilege,
could that note have recorded a second conversation with the same person or is it likely to have been a different person from your April note?
A. Oh, it could have been a variety of different people, yeah. I spoke to a number of people.
Q. I see. So it's possible --
A. I can't say if it was or wasn't.

```
It's possible then that the Chairman should conclude
``` that more than one person mentioned the D investigation to you in the context of your inquiries into the o'higgins Commission report?
A. The Chairman should not conclude anything on the basis of these notes. Do you know what I mean?
762 Q. That is a very inviting thought, but I mean I have got to suggest to you that these notes are contemporaneous? \({ }^{15: 59}\)
A. They are.

763 Q. And they record conversations you're having with people?
A. They do.

764 Q. And sometimes your own thoughts?
A. Yes.

765 Q. And these aren't your own thoughts, these are conversations with strangers?
A. Other people. Their opinions. Their views.

766 Q. Yes. And I am just putting the point to you again, 15:59 that the Chairman is entitled to conclude that it wasn't just one person who raised these matters with you, this matter with you, it was more than one person? CHA RMAN In other words, there were a number of
people making the same point, is that what you -MR. MEDONELL: Yes. CHA RMAN okay.
A. I don't think there's any evidence of that. Well no, you can speculate, Mr. McDowe11, but that's pure speculation. And you have to go back to the point that I do not -- I do not know now and I did not then see any of these conversations as casting any aspersions on Sergeant McCabe.

MR. MEDONELL: I understand that. Chairman, we're just 16:00 coming up to four o'clock and I would like to look at the documents that I was given earlier.
CHA RMAN A11 right. Can we just have a rain check for a start? I think there are some witnesses, including public representatives, who we didn't reach today, and I'm sorry about that. Secondly, I'm unfortunately back with other duties which includes Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, so there's tomorrow, there's Thursday, there's Friday, and Mr. McGuinness, in that context, and noting the apology that I've made, these things inevitably happen from time to time, can you perhaps give me an update and those in the room an update on where we're going?

MR. MEGI NNESS: Yes, Chairman. We11, we have a number of other witnesses obviously scheduled for tomorrow. We have Ms. Claire Grady, Mr. Ray Burke from RTÉ, Mr. John Barrett who is being recalled and Mr. Fíonán Sheehan and then Mr. Conor O'Callaghan to deal with three technical issues. Then it's intended to list a
number of witnesses next Thursday with the possibility of perhaps going into Friday. Deputy Daly and Deputy wallace are being rescheduled for then. And there's a number of additional witnesses who will be put up on the website. I can confirm who those are now.
CHA RMAN And that's convenient to those involved? MR. MEGI NESS: It is. We're awaiting confirmation from a number of them and we're waiting for statements. CHA RMAN In addition to that I think there may be three people who we asked for statements from and it will be wel1 appreciated how, I suppose, I want everything done yesterday.
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN But I'm sure people are attending to that.
MR. MEGI NESS: Chairman, I'm reluctant to say --
CHA RMAN No, and I don't want you to.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN Because the best thing to do is to do the stuff as opposed to make a fuss about it.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NNESS: In fact, I may have got that wrong. I think we're scheduling Deputy Daly and Deputy wallace for next Friday week, rather than the Thursday week.
CHAN RMAN You mean, tomorrow week?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Tomorrow week.
CHA RMAN Yeah.
MR. MEGI NNESS: we're trying to make as much progress as we can, but things are in preparation.

CHA RMAN Yes. Then there may be legal submissions in relation to a particular issue.
MR. MEGU NESS: Indeed.
CHA RMAN I don't anticipate that necessarily needs to be long, but that does need to be fitted in to see where we actually are going.

MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN And people would need to adopt what I would call a position so that I actually know where I stand on that. And the position is not only a position as to 16:02 now but as to the future and as to any report.

MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN And I have indicate what the elements of that are and I don't think I am wrong. But if there was anything to be added --
MR. MEGU NESS: That is likely to be on the
following -- not the following week because we don't have the hall here for the week commencing the 25 th. CHA RMAN I wonder could we see if there's any place else we could sit, but let's perhaps explore that. And again, as you know, I have a schedule now which has now begun in relation to other duties. So we can get as far, in any event, as tomorrow, Thursday, friday, and then we can discuss other matters.
MR. MEGUINESS: Yes. We will see where we are then, 16:03 Chairman.
CHA RMAN A11 right. And vis-à-vis -- could I just ask vis-à-vis Mr. Reynolds, I suppose it's taken a long time for the penny to drop that it's not always
beneficial for me to sit on, but Mr. McDowe11 can I just ask you and other persons who wish to ask Mr. Reynolds questions.
MR. MEDOWELL: I hope to be finished in another quarter of an hour, but that is subject to reading the material.

CHA RMAN That is perfectly reasonable. I'm not trying to rush you.
MR. FERRY: Probably about 20-25 minutes.
CHAI RMAN Yes. It's the same basically as the others. 16:03 And then, you would have perhaps some questions.

MR. G LLANE: Two minutes, tops.
CHA RMAN Are there any from --
MR. WFELAN We11, this might be an opportune moment just to clarify one aspect, Chairman, and it's this. I 16:04 mean, it will have an impact on the nature and extent of any cross-examination we would have. Obviously one of the reasons this witness is in the witness box is terms of reference [k] which you opened with this morning, which is a specific personalised allegation from Sergeant McCabe against Nóirín O'Sullivan that she did influence or seek to influence, is the way it is put in the terms of reference.
CHA RMAN Well now, it certainly is from Sergeant McCabe.

MR. WFELAN Yes.
CHA RMAN But it is on the basis of authority and we have noted what the authority is. And we're going to look into that tomorrow.

MR. WFELAN No, but my question at this stage is, because this will affect the nature of the cross-examination, is whether that allegation -- I respect the Tribunal has to inquire into the terms of reference, but after five or six hours now of evidence from Mr. Reynolds, together with two and a half folders of documents, \(I\) think we're entitled to inquire whether Sergeant McCabe is maintaining that allegation at this stage. And if he is not, that may change cross-examination. And that is the personal one against Nóirín O'Sullivan that she influenced or sought to influence.

CHA RMAN Mr. Whelan in any event you have to deal with the allegation that is Mr. Reynolds is one of the people on the list of nine in the letter from the solicitor sent.

MR. WFELAN Exactly.
CHA RMAN I appreciate that. And that's something you have to do. But the other thing is this: we all know the update in relation to the statements, and Mr. McDowe11 you know it as we11, I don't know how you feel about that, but I'm certainly not saying to you withdraw or not or what do you say about it, because the duty really is on me to inquire, but is there any way you can help Mr. Whelan as to where you stand on

MR. MEDONELL: I wil1 take instructions overnight from Sergeant McCabe on this issue. As you know, he was depending upon Mr. Barrett in this respect.

CHA RMAN Yes. And you know what the up-to-date statement from Mr. Barrett says.
MR. MEDONELL: Yes. He can only go on what he is told in respect of that. It may be, just to satisfy Mr. Whelan, that I will be instructed to say that the particular charge cannot be sustained unless Mr. Barrett sustains it.

MR. WELAN If that terms of reference falls away that will shorten my cross-examination.

CHA RMAN Well, it may do, but we're talking about perhaps another hour between the jigs and the reels, isn't that right?
MR. WFELAN I would be 20-25 minutes if that terms of reference falls away.
CHA RMAN I know, but adding everybody else together. 16:06 A11 right. We11 then, it's ten o'clock in the morning. Thank you very much.
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\hline Costello [1] - & 62:2, 153:2, & examined [1] & DARREN \({ }^{2]}\) - & 162:24, 174:10 & 29:13 \\
\hline \[
50: 8
\] & 154:2, 154:4, & 117:29 & \[
4: 10,5: 2
\] & decide [2] - & Denieffe [4] - \\
\hline Council [1] - 7:7 & 154:6, 154:10, &  & DARRYL [1] - & 17:6, 95:27 & 107:8, 108:16, \\
\hline counsel [2] - & 154:13, 154:15 & referenced [1] & 3:2 & decided [3] - & \[
112: 1,116: 25
\] \\
\hline 101:27, 124:9 & covers [1] - & 9:22 & date [8]-10:11, & 45:20, 95:1, & depart [1] - \\
\hline counter [1] - & 150:6 & 1] - & 10:27, 19:9, & 160:9 & 167:9 \\
\hline 87:2 & cracking [1] - & \[
46: 9
\] & 89:12, 130:5, & decision [14] & DEPARTMENT \\
\hline counter- & 123:3 & Crossans [1] - & 138:19, 157:29, & 13:19, 27:11, & [1] - 4:24 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 193:20 & factor [2]-78:5, & 3:5, 3:7, 3:12, & 105:7, 105:12, & 59:13, 59:20, & footage [1] - \\
\hline expressly [1] - & 184:9 & 5:10, 6:10, & 105:16, 152:7, & 67:18, 71:12, & 68:22 \\
\hline 103:18 & factors [4] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 112:20, 118:20, } \\
& 112 \cdot 24 \\
& 118 \cdot 2,
\end{aligned}
\] & 159:2, 182:3 & 73:5, 73:29, 75:4, & football [1] - \\
\hline \[
158: 3
\] & \[
15: 6,45: 8
\] & 123:25, 124:5, & filter [1] - 176:21 & 77:3, 78:29, 81:4,
90:5, 91:2, & \[
55
\] \\
\hline extensively \({ }^{[1]}\) - & facts [23] - & 125:7, 125:21 & filtered [1] - & 104:19, 106:21, & 3:4, 3:11, 3:16, \\
\hline 97:4 & 38:22, 60:3, 88:1, & fanning [2] - & 99:19 & 106:28, 109:1, & 3:20, 3:26, 4:1, \\
\hline extent [3] & 93:10, 148:16, & 112:25, 113:9 & final [17] - 9:19, & 113:13, 115:26, & 4:7, 4:10, 4:14, \\
\hline 163:12, 184:14, & 148:18, 148:19, & far [12]-13:1, & 9:23, 10:7, 10:21, & 119:3, 122:1, & 4:20, 4:24, 4:30, \\
\hline 194:16 & 148:21, 148:22, & 18:3, 27:16, & 10:26, 10:28, & 138:1, 148:4, & 5:2, 5:5, 5:9, \\
\hline extra [1] - & 148:24, 148:27, & 76:23, 123:23, & 11:22, 12:24, & 152:1, 157:8, & 5:14, 5:19, 88:20 \\
\hline 131:16 & 149:12, 151:20, & 135:12, 135:13, & 12:29, 17:23, & 158:12, 164:1, & force [8]-14:23, \\
\hline extracts [2] - & 151:21, 173:7, & 162:8, 163:21, & 17:25, 39:21, & 164:3, 164:4, & 97:23, 102:21, \\
\hline 183:16 & 173:17, 173:18, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 164:16, 171:13, } \\
& 193: 23
\end{aligned}
\] & 94:14, 140:25, \(145 \cdot 25,149 \cdot 20\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 166:3, 187:19, } \\
& \text { 188:19 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
102:28, 104:10, \\
104:12, 104:16
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 124:2 & 185:16 & father's [1] - & 149:21 & firstly [2] - & 107:16 \\
\hline eyes [3]-61:19, & factual [1] - & \[
48: 23
\] & finalising [1] - & \[
50: 29,124: 16
\] & forces [2] - \\
\hline 95:21, 151:11 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 173:19 } \\
& \text { factually }[1] \text { - }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { favour [2]-7:12, } \\
& 53: 27
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 17:19 } \\
& \text { finally [8] - 30:1, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { fit [1]-117:24 } \\
& \text { fits [1] - 124:7 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 104:2, 163:11 } \\
& \text { forget }[1]-23: 1
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline F & 29:20 & favouring [2] - & 41:28, 49:18, & fitted [1] - 193:5 & forgot [1] - \\
\hline & failings [4] - & 22:26, 23:20 & 100:5, 100:27, & FITZGERALD & \[
72: 15
\] \\
\hline faces [1]-7:14 & 144:12, 146:17 & 102:19, 115:4, & 166:10 & Fitzgerald [1] - & formed [1] - \\
\hline Fachtna [2] - & failures [5] - & 115:5, 115:6 & findings [11] - & 24:23 & 108:5 \\
\hline 38:29, 39:9 & 36:3, 54:9, 55:1, & feature-driven & 16:14, 28:7, & Fitzpatrick [1] & former [24] - \\
\hline facilitate [2] - & 55:3, 55:7 & [1] - 102:19 & \[
29: 14,29: 21
\] & \[
17: 7
\] & 14:27, 25:4, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 65: 14 \\
& \text { fact [54] - 15:23, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { fair }[18]-12: 14, \\
23 \cdot 1330.17
\end{gathered}
\] & features [2] 114:13, 114:26 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 33: 25,36: 3 \\
& 51: 26,53: 13
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { five }[5]-7: 10, \\
42 \cdot 18 \quad 119: 10
\end{array}
\] & \[
32: 22,39: 1,60: 8,
\] \\
\hline 19:22, 33:19, & \[
33: 16,34: 17
\] & February & 59:15, 59:16 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 42:18, 119:10, } \\
& 119: 19,195: 5
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 61: 24,63: 15, \\
& 63: 25,63: 28,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 33:23, 33:25, & 42:1, 56:3, 64:1, & 58:5, 63:16, & 146:7 & fixed [7] - 53:23, & 64:9, 67:10, \\
\hline 38:25, 41:13, & 66:18, 118:11, & 150:3, 157:8, & fine [12]-24:11, & 109:8, 112:9, & 67:17, 67:19, \\
\hline 51:17, 53:6, 62:9, & 125:2, 140:15, & 157:24, 158:10, & \[
24: 15,46: 20
\] & 112:12, 113:1, & \[
68: 8,68: 18,69: 4,
\] \\
\hline 62:19, 66:3, & 140:26, 141:1, & \[
159: 28,165: 8
\] & \[
62: 28,140: 16
\] & \[
113: 3,162: 22
\] & 69:27, 69:29, \\
\hline 66:14, 66:19, & 175:4, 175:10, & fed [3]-82:2, & 141:16, 142:7, & fixing [1] - & 70:12, 72:1, \\
\hline 67:17, 78:7, 93:6, & \[
182: 18,185: 2
\] & \[
98: 1,98: 10
\] & \[
160: 25,164: 2
\] & \[
161: 13
\] & 79:23, 118:3, \\
\hline 94:5, 94:12, & fairly [4] - 16:18, & feedback [4] - & 171:15, 179:7, & flavour [2] - & 118:28, 150:6 \\
\hline 94:17, 95:11, & \[
25: 28,29: 20
\] & 18:9, 20:22, & 186:7 & \[
56: 2,57: 20
\] & forth [3]-93:9, \\
\hline 95:22, 95:26, & 41:9 & \[
28: 26,76: 2
\] & finished [4] - & flaws [3] - 14:3, & \[
104: 4,110: 29
\] \\
\hline 96:15, 97:22, & fairness [1] - & \[
\text { FELIX }_{[1]}-4: 7
\] & 8:8, 23:28, 42:17, & \[
14: 15,54: 9
\] & forthcoming [1] \\
\hline 99:7, 99:11,
99:17 105:1, & 23:10 & felt [12]-14:14, & 194:4 & FLOOR [1] - & - 41:24 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
99:17, 105:1, \\
106:19, 110:10
\end{tabular} & faithfully [1] - & 14:25, 22:17, & Fionnuala [1] - & \[
4: 16
\] & Forum [1] - \\
\hline 106:19, 110:10, & \[
52: 18
\] & \[
45: 29,46: 27
\] & \[
94: 22
\] & floor [1] - 103:10 & 89:26 \\
\hline \[
112: 11,112: 28 \text {, }
\] & Fake [1] - 89:29 & 49:8, 49:25, & firm [1] - 107:28 & focus [4]-91:2, & forward [1] - \\
\hline 124:12, 129:8, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { falls [2] - 196:8, } \\
& \text { 196:14 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 136:13, 136:17, } \\
& \text { 142:24. 146:16 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { first [66] - 7:4, } \\
8: 19.9: 3.9: 5 .
\end{gathered}
\] & 119:17, 152:20, & \[
151: 14
\] \\
\hline 134:1, 134:4 & false [10] - 44:6, & 146:18 & 10:10, 10:11, & folders [1] - & 14:21, 45:8, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 137: 3,148: 22, \\
& 149: 3,152: 17
\end{aligned}
\] & 44:18, 47:6, & FERRY [2] - & 10:18, 10:28, & 195:6 & 100:11, 121:25, \\
\hline 156:7, 156:10, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 87: 20,87: 21, \\
& \text { 126:19, 126:20, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 101:22, 194:9 } \\
& \text { few }[4]-70: 10
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 14:4, 15:17 } \\
& \text { 15:18, 17:29 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { follow [3] - 13:1, } \\
& 57: 22,129: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 121:28, 122:21, } \\
& \text { 166:8, 167:21, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
161: 23,163: 26
\] & \[
156: 23,184: 19
\] & 92:23, 101:28, & 18:3, 18:11, & followed [3] & 168:9, 187:3, \\
\hline 164:29, 173:4, & 184:20 & 118:20 & \[
18: 26,19: 2,19: 3
\] & 19:5, 19:15, & \[
191: 11
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 186:4, 188:10, } \\
& 100 \cdot 15
\end{aligned}
\] & falsely [1] - & Fianna [3] - & 19:13, 20:8, & 49:14 & fourth [1] - \\
\hline fact-check [1] - & 129:4 & 14:29, 24:20, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 20: 22,21: 7 \\
& 23: 27,24: 11
\end{aligned}
\] & following [11] - & \[
10: 18
\] \\
\hline 95:11 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { familiar [2] } \\
47: 3,64: 11
\end{gathered}
\] & fides [1] - 143:6 & \[
24: 15,26: 1
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 17:8, 42:20, } \\
& 57: 29,58: 1,62: 1
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
Fr [1] - 105:6 \\
Frances [1] -
\end{tabular} \\
\hline fact-checked [1] & family [7]-78:6, & figure [1] - 14:10 & \[
26: 16,27: 1
\] & 106:29, 108:2, & 24:23 \\
\hline - 95:26 & \[
92: 6,98: 14,99: 5
\] & figures [1] - & 31:12, 35:15, & 117:16, 142:4, & FRANCIS \({ }_{[3]}\) \\
\hline fact-checking & 99:11, 99:13, & 31:22 & 44:23, 45:13, & \[
193: 17
\] & 3:23, 5:17, 5:21 \\
\hline [5] - 93:6, 94:12,
\[
95: 22,96: 15
\] & \[
174: 25
\] & file [11] - 72:20, & \[
45: 14,52: 23
\] & FOLLOWS [3] - & frankly [2] - \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 9: 22, \\
& 97: 22
\end{aligned}
\] & FANNING [13] - & 79:6, 97:24, & 54:17, 55:14, & 7:1, 8:6, 89:1 & 66:28, 175:2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 191:21 & 185:10 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{instructed [4] -} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{intrude [1] -} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Investigation [1] } \\
& -51: 27
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 99: 13,176: 1 \\
& \text { irrespective }[1] \text { - } \\
& 120: 2
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline inexperienced & ated [1] - & & & & \\
\hline [3] - 129:4, & 99:14 & 50:24, 101:27, & 189:2 & investigations & \[
120: 2
\] \\
\hline 129:10, 129:11 & inkling [2] & 118:4, 196:5 & investig [1] - & [13] - 14:2, 14:8, & irresponsibl \\
\hline inference [4] & 91:23, 92:13 & INSTRUCTED & 129:3 & 14:13, 14:16, & [11] - 8:28, 56:23, \\
\hline 58:16, 59:9, 70:9, & INM [11] - 89:10, & [12]-3:2, 3:6 & investigate [12] - & 36:4, 43:2, 43:10 & 56:25, 56:26, \\
\hline 157:25 & 91:6, 99: & 3:18, 4:7, 4:1 & 8:23, 14:24 & 4:9, 55:2, 74:24 & 56:29, 57:1, 57 \\
\hline inference & 99:19, 99:21 & 4:15, 4:21, 4:25, & 56:15, 81:7 & 19:9, 146:17, & 57:10, 57:13, \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 67:15 } \\
& \text { influence [15] - }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 100:7, 101:5, } \\
& \text { 101:8, 108:17 }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 5:2, 5:5, 5:10, } \\
& 5: 15 \\
& \text { instructions }[1]
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 132:1, 145:20, } \\
& \text { 146:26, 185:12, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Investigations} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{issue [32] -} \\
\hline & & & & & \\
\hline 7:26, 8:25, 11:22, & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 117:15, 117:18 } \\
\text { inner [1] - 99:21 } \\
\text { innocent [1] - }
\end{gathered}
\]} & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 187:17, 187:23, } \\
& \text { 187:24, 189:13 }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
[1] - 51:5 \\
investigative [1]
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 14:17, 15:15, } \\
& \text { 17:3, 26:5, 35:2, }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline 13:13, 15:24, & & - 195:27 & & & \\
\hline 34:4, 34:5, 41:11, & & instructs [1] & investigated [28] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& -115: 6 \\
& \text { investigators }[1]
\end{aligned}
\]} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 17.J, <o.0, נు } \\
& \text { 39:29, 57:28, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 56:17, 146:28, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 45: 15 \\
& \text { input }[3]-27: 7, \\
& \text { 28:22, } 94: 23
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\[
117: 15
\] \\
intelligent [2] -
\end{tabular}} & - 15:2, 72:20 & & 58:5, 59:24, \\
\hline 149:20, 150:23, & & & 74:23, 77:15 & - 90:2 & 59:26, 63:24, \\
\hline 194:22, 195:12 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { 28:22, 94:23 } \\
\text { inquest }[3] \text { - }
\end{array}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 59:1, 180:11 } \\
& \text { intended }[3] \text { - }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 77: 17,78: 16, \\
& 79: 6,80: 14,81: 9
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
163: 24
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 64: 15,65: 23, \\
& 70: 25,71: 25,
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline influenced [10] & & & & & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 7: 26,8: 25,12 \\
& \text { 15:12, 41:17, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 105:18 & 191:29 & & 163:15 & \[
74: 15,77: 4,97: 3
\] \\
\hline 56:16, 59:10, & inquire [4] & intention [2] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 84:9, 84:17, } \\
& 92: 18,93: 28
\end{aligned}
\] & invited [1] - 7:9 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 109:14, 112:7 } \\
& \text { 137:13, 148:24, }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline 124:14, 146:28, & \(172: 3,195: 4\),
\(195: 7,195: 24\) & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{interest [8] -} & \[
94: 6,97: 24
\] & invites [1] - & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 195:11 } \\
& \text { information }
\end{aligned}
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{inquired [1] -} & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 127: 16,129: 9 \\
& 134: 10,137: 13
\end{aligned}
\] & 163:15 & \[
153: 10,154: 2
\] \\
\hline information
\(-9: 7,9: 8,9: 14\) & & \[
15: 7,21: 23
\] & 152:7, 155:15, & \[
190: 14
\] & 195:28 \\
\hline 9:18, 11:6, 11:8, & 64.28
inquiries [2] & 65:24, 103:19, & 172:22, 173:6, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 190:14 } \\
& \text { involved }[15] \text { - }
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline 11:10, 11:12, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
74: 16,190: 10 \\
\text { inquiry [5] - }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 175:13, } 175: 14 \\
\text { interested }[9]-
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 181:12, 185:28, } \\
& \text { 187:20 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 66:7, 84:7, 92:27, } \\
& 94: 21,95: 29,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 15: 7,22: 17 \\
& 62: 14,63: 12,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 11:16, 11:17, } \\
& 11: 20,12: 5 \text {, }
\end{aligned}
\] & & 51:22, 52:21, & Investigated [2] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 94: 21,95: 29, \\
& 97: 17,103: 1,
\end{aligned}
\] & 76:1, 104:3, \\
\hline 12:10, 12:15, & 58:4, 58:10, & 53:8, 149:16, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& -77: 10,127: 9 \\
& \text { investigated) }
\end{aligned}
\] & 106:23, 108:15, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 104:20, 117:19, } \\
& \text { 133:21, 149:5, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 13:10, 13:12, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 161:20 } \\
& \text { insight [1] - }
\end{aligned}
\]} & 159:5, 159:7, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
-129: 3
\]} & 112:17, 114:2, & 163:10, 184:15, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 13:25, 18:18, } \\
& \text { 18:22. 47:6. }
\end{aligned}
\] & & 159:5, 159:7, & & 132:8, 186:4, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 163:10, 184:15, } \\
& 191: 29
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 18:22, 47:6, } \\
& 66: 19,79: 14,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 29:26 } \\
& \text { insofar [20] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 160:11 } \\
& \text { internal [6] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { investigates [1] } \\
& -189: 4
\end{aligned}
\] & 186:19, 192:6 involving [1] & issuing [2] - \\
\hline 79:21, 79:22, & 9:6, 11:4, 12:26, & 80:21, 80:24,
160:8, 169:25 & investigating [4] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{114:22
\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Ireland [20] - } \\
15: 29,17: 2,17: 5,
\end{gathered}
\]} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 166:12, 166:21 } \\
\text { it'd [1] - 105:19 }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 83: 8,85: 6,92: 2, \\
& 92: 24.93: 5 .
\end{aligned}
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{37:11, 53:16,} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
170: 1,170: 10
\]} & 175:11, 184:28 & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { it'd [1] - 105:19 } \\
& \text { it) [1]-86:5 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 93:12, 99:7, & & & 175:11, 184:28 & \[
15: 29,17: 2,17: 5
\] & it) [1] - 86:5 iterations [1] - \\
\hline 107:22, 136:16, & 54:11, 57:4 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{124:20} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& {[48]-71: 7,71: 10,} \\
& 71: 27,78: 8,
\end{aligned}
\]} & \[
27: 1,27: 28,
\] & \[
94: 13
\] \\
\hline 138:14, 138:22, & 60:26, 62:2, 70:9, & & & 29:27, 34:27, & itself [9]-36:21,
\(68: 28,101 \cdot 13\) \\
\hline 149:23, 160:13, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 72:9, 106:1, } \\
& \text { 106:2, 124:18, }
\end{aligned}
\] & interpose [1] -
88:9 & 71:27, 78:8,
80:21, 81:21, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
43: 5,43: 15
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 120:21, 131:20, } \\
& \text { 153:29, 158:24, } \\
& 161: 7,187: 13
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline 166:19, 180:15,
181:26 & 106:2, 124:18, & interrupt [3] - & 82:13, 91:10, & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
181:26 \\
informationgathering [1] -
\end{tabular}} & 124:25, 150:29 inspector [8] - & & 97:17, 99:29, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 43: 16,50: 22, \\
& 53: 19,95: 24,
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline & 20:10, 54:13 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 166:26 } \\
& \text { intervene [1] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
100: 1,104: 14
\] & 100:12, 103:21, & \\
\hline 13:12 & 54:15, 54:16, & \[
105: 13
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 132: 4,133: 2 \\
& 133 \cdot 9 \quad 134
\end{aligned}
\] & 142:22 & \\
\hline 36:6, 37:13, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 87:25, 126:24 } \\
\text { Inspector [2] }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 32: 14 \\
& \text { interview [9] - }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 134:12, 134:13, } \\
& 134: 14,134: 20,
\end{aligned}
\] & 3:18 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{jailed [1] - 71:2} \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 46:17, 104:9, } \\
& \text { 107:27. 119:12 }
\end{aligned}
\] & & & 134:14, 134:20,
\[
138: 6,144: 12 .
\] & Irish [19] - 89:17, & \\
\hline \[
169: 14
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
26:24, 78:16 \\
inspectorate's
\end{tabular} & 68:3, 68:7, 68:11, & 138:6, 144:12, & 89:18, 89:2 & 60:16, 96:27, \\
\hline inherent [1] - & [1]-63:8 & 70:7, \(90: 4,93: 17\)
96:23, 142:11, & 161:12, 163:7, & \[
105: 3,105: 2
\] & \[
145: 17
\] \\
\hline 33:24 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Inspired [2]
27:19, 49:22} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
143:26 \\
interviewed [4] -
\end{tabular}} & 181:12, 182:2, & 105:28, 106:19, & JERMYN [1] - \\
\hline initial [15] - & & & 181:12, 182:2,
186:22. 186:27. & 107:14, 108:7, & Jerry [2]-87:7, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 35: 20,73: 8, \\
& 131: 26,132 .
\end{aligned}
\] & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 10: 24,27: 27, \\
& 63: 20,90: 6, \\
& 141: 10,153: 11 \\
& \text { instantly [1] - } \\
& \text { 18:11 } \\
& \text { Institute [1] - }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
91: 25,150: 17
\]} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 186:22, 186:27 } \\
& \text { 187:2, 187:6, }
\end{aligned}
\] &  & 139:3 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 131:26, 132:9, } \\
& \text { 132:11, 132:13, }
\end{aligned}
\] & & & 187:2, 187:6, & \[
122: 5,123: 23
\] & jigs [1] - 196:11 \\
\hline 134:27, 134:29, & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 141:10, } 153: 11 \\
& \text { instantly [1] - } \\
& \text { 18:11 } \\
& \text { Institute [1] - }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 22:16, 68:17, } \\
& \text { 68:20, 68:26, } \\
& \text { 139:19, 183:11 } \\
& \text { introduction [1] }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 188:10, 188:11, } \\
& \text { 188:13, 188:16, } \\
& 188: 22,190: 9
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 146:12, 146:13 } \\
& \text { IRISH [3]-3:26, } \\
& 4: 1,4: 2 \\
& \text { irrelevant [2] - }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{4}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 117:24 } \\
& \text { job [20]-55:13, } \\
& 66: 28,75: 26, \\
& 76: 8,86: 8,93: 2
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline \(135: 3,136: 1\),
\(144 \cdot 28,176 \cdot 24\) & & & & & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 144:28, 176:24, } \\
& \text { 180:2, 180:12, }
\end{aligned}
\] & & & & & \\
\hline & Institute [1] - & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline McCOURT \({ }^{11]}\) - & 39:29, 44:25, & 116:13, 116:17, & met [4]-61:8, & Minister [15] - & 21:11, 26:15, \\
\hline 4:7 & 49:2, 55:20, & 117:13, 124:11 & 90:2, 90:9 & 14:27, 24:22, & 29:5, 31:2 \\
\hline McCULLOUGH & 57:11, 58:10, & media [12] - & metaphorically & 25:1, 25:13, 51:1, & 191:18 \\
\hline [1] - 5:19 & 62:14, 63:12, & 21:17, 21:21, & [1] - 189:17 & 63:15, 75:19, & money [1] - 84:6 \\
\hline McDonald [1] - & 66:19, 67:28, & 65:1, 65:7, 65:15, & method [2] & 145:10, 145:19, & month [2] - \\
\hline 94:22 & 67:29, 68:10, & 70:14, 72:3, 97:4, & 179:7, 179:13 & 145:22, 164:20, & 188:19 \\
\hline McDowell [40] - & 68:16, 68:19, & 99:20, 100:25, & methodology & 183:19, 184:10, & monthly [4] - \\
\hline 101:21, 151:25, & 69:23, 70:29, & 108:8, 156:26 & [1] - 42:26 & 184:14 & 102:22, 102:23, \\
\hline 151:27, 158:28, & 71:24, 72:19, & MEDIA [2] - 3:5, & Michael [11] - & Minister's [1] - & 102:24, 103:15 \\
\hline 159:10, 159:21, & 74:14, 76:27, & 3:18 & 17:9, 26:23, & 170:15 & months [3] - \\
\hline 159:22, 159:25, & 79:4, 81:16, & media's [1] - & 107:8, 107:13 & Ministers [1] - & 91:3, 106:3, \\
\hline 161:6, 161:7, & 81:29, 82:3, & 72:4 & 107:24, 108:3, & 145:16 & 162:27 \\
\hline 164:9, 166:27, & 83:12, 83:15 & MEEHAN [1] - & 108:18, 111:25, & minor [6] - & MOONEY [1] - \\
\hline 167:2, 167:6, & 84:29, 86:15, & 4:25 & 112:1, 116:25, & 25:28, 34:21, & 5:14 \\
\hline 167:7, 167:9, & 86:27, 87:5, & meet [2]-111:6, & 151:27 & 53:23, 79:5, & Mooney [4] - \\
\hline 172:1, 172:5, & 87:27, 93:22, & 111:26 & MICHAEL [2] - & 152:4, 152:10 & 18:26, 19:4, 19:5, \\
\hline 172:13, 174:9, & 96:6, 96:21, 98:9, & meeting [4] - & 3:11, 3:18 & minute [4] - & 40:11 \\
\hline 174:22, 175:28, & 99:24, 101:5, & 62:23, 116:25 & MICHELLE [1] - & 40:8, 50:11, & Mooney's [1] - \\
\hline 176:23, 178:15, & 112:6, 125:13, & 131:4, 177:21 & 4:7 & 50:13, 55:25 & 19:10 \\
\hline 179:1, 179:25, & 128:16, 129:23, & meetings [2] - & Micheál [14] - & minutes [13] - & morale [1] - \\
\hline 184:25, 186:16, & 130:15, 132:19, & 94:24, 99:27 & 14:29, 19:5, & 22:17, 55:24, & 54:29 \\
\hline 189:2, 189:24, & 133:25, 134:28, & member [7] - & 19:14, 24:21, & 55:26, 55:27, & moreover [1] - \\
\hline 189:25, 191:2, & 136:13, 138:12, & 51:9, 54:3, 89:25, & 38:26, 39:9, & 88:12, 107:19, & 119:28 \\
\hline 191:5, 191:10, & 140:15, 140:17, & 89:28, 103:4, & 79:28, 80:9, & 119:5, 119:10, & morning [27] - \\
\hline 194:1, 194:4, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 140: 25,141: 2, \\
& 141: 15,142: 22
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
108: 16,116: 27
\] & \[
80: 23,86: 3,86: 5,
\] & 122:15, 123:1, & \[
15: 19,17: 2,17: 8
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 195:21, 195:27, } \\
& 196: 3
\end{aligned}
\] & 144:27, 153:9, & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { members [11] - } \\
\text { 80:25, 81:14. }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 127:23, 127:28, } \\
& 128: 9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 194:9, 194:12, } \\
& 196: 13
\end{aligned}
\] & 29:5, 32:4, 41:20, \\
\hline MCDOWELL [1] & 153:19, 155:4, & 102:21, 104:12, & Mick [3]-38:26, & misconduct [3] - & 50:22, 51:18, \\
\hline - 6:14 & 155:5, 155:10, & 104:22, 111:5, & 39:8, 131:18 & 61:1, 135:21, & 51:23, 64:22, \\
\hline McENROE [1] - & 158:11, 167:20, & 113:24, 125:10, & MICK [1] - 3:28 & 153:4 & 64:27, 65:20, \\
\hline \[
3: 26
\] & 170:7, 171:12, & 152:29, 185:10, & microphone [ & mishmash [1] - & 65:26, 67:6, \\
\hline McENROY \({ }_{\text {[1] - }}\) & \(172: 18,173: 5\),
\(173 \cdot 24,175 \cdot 1\) & 186:18 & - 7:20 & \[
85: 19
\] & 106:29, 108:2, \\
\hline 4:7 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 173:24, 175:1, } \\
& \text { 176:5, 176:9, }
\end{aligned}
\] & membership [2] & middle [1] - & misinterpreted & 138:21, 146:12, \\
\hline McGinn [2] -
26.23, 39.2 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 176:5, 176:9, } \\
& \text { 179:27. 182:16. }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
-102: 13,104: 7
\] & \[
142: 17
\] & [1] - 178:20 & \\
\hline 26:23, 39:2 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 179:27, 182:16, } \\
& \text { 183:23. 183:24 }
\end{aligned}
\] & memo [6] - 90:3, & midnight [1] - & missed [1] - & 163:27, 175:22, \\
\hline McGinn's [1] - & 183:23, 183:24 & 107:13, 108:2, & 166:18 & 173:26 & 177:11, 194:20, \\
\hline 139:21 & \begin{tabular}{l}
184:6, 184:9, \\
184:12, 186:10
\end{tabular} & 108:13, 110:7, & might [22] - & missing [1] - & 196:16 \\
\hline McGouran [4] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 184:12, 186:10, } \\
& \text { 188:2, 188:4, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 121:22 & 22:5, 27:18, & 52:10 & Morning [16] - \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 16: 24,28: 14, \\
& 30: 9,30: 27
\end{aligned}
\] & 190:13, 190:14, & memory [1] -
59.2 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 27: 29,30: 10, \\
& 30 \cdot 13 \\
& 34 \cdot 27,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Mistake [1] - } \\
& 77: 10
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 15:29, 17:1, 17:5, } \\
& \text { 26:16. 26:29. }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
McGrath [4] - \\
\(87 \cdot 7\) 139.3
\end{tabular} & 192:25, 194:16 meaning [2] - & memos [1] - & \[
48: 4,74: 10
\] & mistake [7] - & 27:28, 29:27, \\
\hline 87:7, 139:3,
144:12, 144:18 & \[
44: 20,134: 27
\] & 110:14 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 82: 10,91: 25 \\
& 101: 12,105: 2
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 77: 16,81: 6 \\
& 82: 17,172: 2
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 34: 27,34: 28, \\
& 41: 20,43: 5,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline McGuinness
[20] - 4:10, 60:27 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { means [3]-7:9, } \\
& \text { 120:8, 179:29 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 63:29 & \begin{tabular}{l}
117:17, 118:21, \\
127:27, 142:28
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 178:20, 178:29, } \\
& \text { 181:27 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 43: 15,43: 16, \\
& 50: 22,53: 19
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 64:12, 88:6, & meant [5] - & \[
20: 8,22: 11
\] & 143:29, 151:11, & mistakenly [1] - & 142:22 \\
\hline 125:27, 191:19, & 33:14, 34:13, & 71:18, 71:19, & 151:23, 155:24, & 82:14 & morning's [2] - \\
\hline 191:24, 192:7, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 64:29, 65:1, } \\
& 114: 21
\end{aligned}
\] & 153:3, 155:12, & \[
173: 3,194: 14
\] & mistakes [1] - & 51:14, 52:13 \\
\hline 192:13, 192:15, & 114:21 & 190:9 & mightn't [2] - & 181:13 & Moroney [2] - \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 192:17, 192:20, } \\
& \text { 192:22, 192:26, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 69:9 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { mentioning [1] - } \\
& 173: 13
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{|l|}
\hline 21: 29,41: 1 \\
\text { mild [1] - 124:24 }
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { mobile [1] - } \\
& 67: 10
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
17:13 \\
Morrissey [1] -
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 192:28, 193:3, & measured [1] \(120 \cdot 22\) & mentor [1] - & mind [9] - 16:15, & Molloy [2] - & \[
55: 22
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 193:7, 193:12, } \\
& \text { 193:16. 193:25 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
120:22 \\
meaty [1] -
\end{tabular} & 118:12 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 20: 2,20: 3,40: 2 \\
& 41: 5,122: 10
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
104: 27,105: 7
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { most }[9]-16: 26, \\
33: 25,43: 1,60: 2,
\end{array}
\] \\
\hline mean [95] - & 22:14 & \[
\text { [2] }-3: 23,5: 22
\] & 142:7, 152:25 &  & 121:3, 121:16, \\
\hline 11:27, 13:14, & Media [12] - & merits [1] & \[
160: 27
\] & \[
149: 28,158: 5
\] & 138:15, 156:12, \\
\hline 13:19, 23:11, & 89:9, 106:19, & 120:2 & mine [3] - 47:11, & 164:10, 194:14 & 184:1 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 24: 8,27: 21, \\
& 28: 29,34: 13
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 107:7, 111:5, } \\
& \text { 112:24, 113:15, }
\end{aligned}
\] & message [3] - & \[
48: 5,185: 24
\] & Monaghan [2] - & \[
\begin{gathered}
\operatorname{motivated}_{[3]} \text { - } \\
74 \cdot 21 \quad 118 \cdot 1
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
109:17, 163:18 organisations \\
[2] - 99:20, 163:11 organising [1] -
\end{tabular}} & P & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{```
138:5
    pair [1] - 95:20
    palms [1] -
```} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 174:12, 180:18, } \\
& \text { 193:2, 196:6 } \\
& \text { particularly }[9] \text { - }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 162:22, 183:26, } \\
\text { 184:11, 184:27 } \\
\text { penny }{ }_{[1]} \text { - }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { perfectly [1] - } \\
& \text { 194:7 } \\
& \text { performed [1] - }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & & & \\
\hline & PAC [4]-62:23, & 179:2 & 15:21, 43:4 & 193:29 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\[
54: 1
\] \\
perhaps [15] -
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline 7:6 & 67:27, 161:9, & panel [1] - 89:27 & 53:18, 68:18 & people [97] - & \\
\hline original [1] & 161:1 & paper [2] & 117:13, 119:26 & 7:11, 7:12, 7:29, & \[
36: 25,55: 10
\] \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\[
173: 14
\] \\
originally [3] -
\end{tabular}} & package [2] - & 85:14, 144:29 & 144:18, 159:6, & 11:15, 11:21, & \[
56: 12,59: 9
\] \\
\hline & 22:6, 63:6 & papers [2] - & 159:9 & 13:11, 14:7, 14:8, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 83: 11,94: 24 \\
& 101: 29,106: 3
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { originally [3] - } \\
& \text { 22:19, 96:6, }
\end{aligned}
\] & packages [1] & 113:8, 128:8 & ies [7] & 14:26, 15:8, 18:9, & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 102:26 } \\
& \text { originated [1] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 63:3 } \\
\text { pad }
\end{gathered}
\] & par [2]-24:11 & \[
32: 17,33: 16
\] & 21:18, 21:28, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 128:9, 163:22, } \\
& \text { 191:22, 192:2, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 99:1 } \\
& \text { OSMOND }
\end{aligned}
\]} & 26:10, 28:14, & \[
24:
\] & \[
52: 21,53: 8,
\] & \[
39: 12,39: 22
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 193:20, 194:11, } \\
& 196 \cdot 11
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & 30:25, 35:22, & 24:13, 24:16 & 121:9 & 43:21, 43:25, & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{4:} & 35:23, 36:23, & 24:17, 31:28 & partly [1] - & 45:16, 49:4, & period [7] - \\
\hline & 40:12, 40:14, & 32:7, 34:24, & 131:15 & 53:11, 55:13, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 32: 14,100: 25 \\
& 100: 27,104: 6
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline 29:14 & 47:17, 47:18, & 37:25, 44:14 & PARTNERS [2] - & 55:20, 55:21, & \\
\hline ourselves [1] - & \[
47
\] & 46:6, 46:14, 47:3, & 4:11, 5:16 & 56:2, 56:5, 58:23, & 149:26, 150:7, \\
\hline ```
161:15
    out"beefed [1] -
``` & 50:9, 52:10, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 84: 23,85: 11, \\
& 87: 17,126: 27
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { parts [1] - 26:16 } \\
& \text { party [2]-33:18, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 65: 8,66: 22 \\
& 66: 26,66: 27
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
158: 3
\] \\
permission [1] -
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\[
127: 21
\] \\
outgoing [1] -
\end{tabular}} & 55:29, 64:19, & 127:6, 139:13 & 157:3 & 68:25, 68:27 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 122:11 } \\
& \text { persistent }[1] \text { - }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & 67:8, 75:4, 75:5,
\(80: 11,81: 4,81 \cdot 8\) & 139:23, 140:2, & pass [1] - 121:6 & 75:29, 76:29, & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{89:10} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 80: 11,81: 4,81: 8, \\
& 83: 21,85: 10,
\end{aligned}
\] & 140:9, 140:18, & passing [1] - & 81:29, 83:10, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\[
176: 15
\] \\
person [27] -
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & 85:28, 86:1, & 143:13, 144:24 & 92:25 & 85:4, 86:8, 88 & \\
\hline 100:25
outlined [5] - & 86:28, 87:16, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 145:9, 177:16 } \\
& \text { 181:1, 182:7 }
\end{aligned}
\] & past [13] - 7:10 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 90: 23,90: 24, \\
& 105: 19,114:
\end{aligned}
\] & 16:26, 20:12, \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { outlined [5] - } \\
89: 13,113: 9,
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
90: 4,110: 25
\] & paragraphs [9] - & \[
26: 4,29: 3,30: 26
\] & 116:26, 120:9, & 59:16, 76:7, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 89:13, 113:9, } \\
& \text { 120:11, 185:16, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 111:2, 113:4 & 12:1, 22:28, & 42:16, 88:16, & 121:2, 131:28, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 77: 14,77: 20, \\
& 78: 15,82: 16,
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
120:11, 185:16, \\
185:17 \\
outlook [2] -
\end{tabular}} & 113:6, 113:17, & 54:22, 85:26 & 91:25, 119:5, & 133:18, 133:21, & \\
\hline & 119:3, 121:19, & 140:7, 140:9 & 119:10, 119:19, & 136:16, 140:2, & 113:17, 113:18 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
98: 6,106: 7 \\
\text { outset [1] - }
\end{gathered}
\]} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 122:15, 123:17, } \\
& \text { 124:28, 126:6, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \(142: 9,177: 1\),
177.7 & 158:12 & \(144: 13,148: 23\),
\(150: 14,151: 18\) & 149:8, 171:7, \\
\hline & 126:7, 129:1, & 177:7 & PATRICIA \({ }_{\text {[1] }}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 150:14, 151:18, } \\
& \text { 153:15, 154:25, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 171:19, 172:15 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 151:29 } \\
& \text { outside [8] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & 129:14, 131:3, & pardon [5]
24:25, 58:6, & \begin{tabular}{l}
3:2 \\
PATRICK
\end{tabular} & 155:3, 156:3, & \[
179: 24,181: 25
\] \\
\hline 41:10, 61:9, & 135:23, 137:4, & 91:16, 142:19 & 4:24, 5:2, 5: & 156:12, 156:19, & 188:17, 190:2 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 77: 19,78: 10, \\
& \text { 109:3, 120:3, }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 139:12, 139:20 } \\
& \text { 139:29. 142:8. }
\end{aligned}
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\end{aligned}
\] & reputation [3] & retired [3] - 61:8, & robust [1] & run-up [3] - & scoop [4] - \\
\hline & 25:8, 32:23, & 66:20, 70:4 & 33:12 & 10:13, 74:11, & 106:3, 106:4, \\
\hline \[
145: 16
\] & 51:25 & retirement [4] - & robustness [1] - & 82:29 & 113:6, 113:17 \\
\hline report" [1] - & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { request }[3] \\
\text { 51:29, } 99: 11,
\end{array}
\] & 64:6, 65:22, 69:5, & 93:7 & \begin{tabular}{l}
runs [1]-51:15 \\
rush [1]-194:8
\end{tabular} & screen [3] - \\
\hline 139:1 & \[
145: 16
\] & 70:13 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Roche [1] } \\
& \text { 143:26 }
\end{aligned}
\] & rushed [1] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 8: 21,65: 9 \\
& 165: 21
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline report's [1] - & require [2] - & returning [1] - & ROGERSON'S & 22:21 & screwed [2] - \\
\hline 16:14
report/story [1] -
149:1 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 66:23, 119:24 } \\
& \text { rescheduled }[1]
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
23:2 \\
revenge [2] -
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& {[1]-4: 32} \\
& \quad \text { role }[8]-14: 11,
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 86:8, 182:28 } \\
\text { scribble }[2]-
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
138: 25,144: 29
\] & 40:23, 41:29, & 83:9, 90:16, & sentence [2] - & 151:28, 152:2, & sexual [17] - \\
\hline scribbled [1] - & 43:17, 47:2, & \[
90: 24,120: 25,
\] & \[
49: 16,170: 4
\] & 152:17, 153:1, & 61:1, 71:11, 72:5, \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 144:22 } \\
\text { scribb }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 47:18, 52:20, } \\
& \text { 55:6, 56:13, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 124: 9,145: 19 \\
& 168: 23,169: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { sentences [1] - } \\
& 170: 22
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 153: 4,154: 4, \\
& 154: 21,156: 5
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 91: 11,92: 14, \\
& 92: 17,93: 23,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 178:19 & 56:25, 57:10, & seem [8]-26:6, & separate [2] & 156:29, 157:12, & 94:4, 96:7, 97:18, \\
\hline script [4] - & 58:10, 58:27, & 63:29, 69:28, & 71:25, 71:27 & 159:17, 160:23, & 152:3, 153:4, \\
\hline 12:24, 17:26, & 64:24, 65:9, & 73:11, 134:5, & September [2] - & 161:8, 161:16, & 153:16, 154:20, \\
\hline 35:10, 35:24 & 65:28, 66:5, & 135:22, 162:26, & 147:12, 150:2 & 162:4, 163:1, & 173:13, 185:26, \\
\hline scripts [3] - & 66:16, 66:29, & 189:21 & sequence [1] & 164:5, 164:10, & 188:21 \\
\hline 11:28, 18:1, & 69:16, 75:7, & sees [1]-21:18 & 108:1 & 164:21, 164:27, & sexually [1] - \\
\hline 33:10 & 75:13, 75:20, & select [2] & sergeant [16] & 165:12, 165:20, & 152:18 \\
\hline scroll [3] - & 76:14, 77:5, & 140:27, 160:15 & 32:24, 43:24, & 166:7, 167:12, & Seán [1] - 50:8 \\
\hline 35:25, 36:29, & 78:11, 81:17, & selected [3] - & 76:13, 76:23, & 167:14, 172:17, & shall [1] - 106:2 \\
\hline 132:13 & 83:1, 83:14, & 113:16, 113:18, & 77:8, 79:11, & 173:4, 173:14, & shape [2] - \\
\hline scrolling [1] - & 84:22, 85:7, & 183:16 & 79:12, 100:23, & 174:24, 176:8, & 87:14, 102:12 \\
\hline 122:14 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 85:24, 90:18, } \\
& \text { 92:23. 98:22 }
\end{aligned}
\] & selection [1] - & \[
131: 15,137: 6
\] & 176:16, 179:11, & share [1] - 98:25 \\
\hline Scrupulous [1] - & 92:23, 98:2 & 140:22 & 138:29, 139:10 & 181:7, 183: & Sharon [1] - \\
\hline 175:12 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 104:24, 107:21, } \\
& \text { 109:4, 111:16, }
\end{aligned}
\] & self [1] - 37:9 & \(163: 14,163: 16\),
\(172: 22,182: 2\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 185:27, 186:21, } \\
& \text { 186:29, 188:14, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 12:18 \\
\hline 16:12 & 112:25, 115:1, & semi [1] - & Sergeant [134] - & 191:9, 194:21, & \[
25: 1,25: 13
\] \\
\hline SEAN [1] - 3:1 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 126:8, 126:10, } \\
& 128 \cdot 1413 \cdot 17
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
156: 12
\] & \[
8: 28,12: 11,14: 9
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 194: 24,195: 8 \text {, } \\
& \text { 195:28 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 26:22, 27:23, \\
\hline SEBASTIAN \({ }_{[1]}\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 128:14, 130:17, } \\
& \text { 131:7. 131:13. }
\end{aligned}
\] & semi-public [1] - & 23:2, 23:21, 25:9, & \begin{tabular}{l}
195:28 \\
sergeant's
\end{tabular} & \[
39: 1,39: 10,
\] \\
\hline - 3:17 & 135:27, 136:24, & 156:12 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 25: 21,27: 15, \\
& 28: 7,28: 11
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { sergeant's [1] } \\
& \text { 124:4 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 63: 15,145: 23 \\
& 184: 10
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 10:10, 10:18, & 137:4, 138:8, & \[
108: 16
\] & 33:18, 33:20 & sergeants [1] - & SHATTER \({ }_{[2]}\) - \\
\hline 14:6, 23:13, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 138:12, 140:9, } \\
& \text { 142:28, 145:24, }
\end{aligned}
\] & sends [5] - & \[
33: 22,33: 28
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 75:24 } \\
& \text { series }[3]-7: 6 .
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
4: 20,4: 21
\] \\
\hline 24:17, 26:21, & 148:21, 148:22, & 30:24, 30:26, & 34:6, 38:3, 41:23, & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { series }[3]-7: 6, \\
118: 6,147: 15
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Sheehan [1] - } \\
& \text { 191:28 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 31: 16,31: 17, \\
& 32: 7,106: 21,
\end{aligned}
\] & 149:17, 152:9, & \[
43: 20,121: 28,
\] & 44:15, 44:28,
\[
45: 2,45: 3,45: 24,
\] & serious [6] - & 191:28 \\
\hline 138:8, 151:4, & 152:22, 152:24, & senior [18] & 46:16, 48:11, & 14:2, 14:3, 15:3, & 5:16 \\
\hline 169:22, 190:1 & 153:26, 155:14, & 14:21, 16:26, & 50:3, 50:21, 51:7, & 24:19, 33:25, & SHIP [1] - 4:27 \\
\hline secondhand [1] &  & 27:3, 27:14, & 51:25, 53:7, & 156:11 & shocking [2] - \\
\hline - 18:17 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 156:26, 157:16, } \\
& \text { 158:11, 160:19, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 27:18, 31:22, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 53: 19,55: 14, \\
& 56: 8,56: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { seriously [1] - } \\
& \text { 139:16 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
43: 27,44: 1
\] \\
\hline secondly [2] - & 162:2, 163:26, & \(47: 22,50: 15\),
\(53 \cdot 2,57 \cdot 8,93 \cdot 18\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
56:8, 56:19, \\
56.26, 56.28
\end{tabular} & \[
\text { serve [1] - } 89 \cdot 26
\] & shook [1] - \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
7: 10,191: 16 \\
\text { secret }[1]-
\end{gathered}
\] & 163:28, 164:18, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 53: 2,57: 8,93: 18, \\
& 107: 17,111: 4,
\end{aligned}
\] & 56:26, 56:28,
\[
57: 9,58: 9,60: 29,
\] & serve [1]-89:26 served [1] - & \begin{tabular}{l}
61:13 \\
shooting [2]
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 66:15 & 164:24, 165:19, & 119:25, 126:13, & 61:5, 62:10, & 185:4 & 79:20, 81:29 \\
\hline Secretary [1] - & 168:10. 168:19 & 151:5, 154:19, & 62:27, 63:17, & service [3] - & short [2] - \\
\hline 25:6 &  & 156:20 & 63:26, 64:4, 71:7, & 54:2, 57:17, & 118:20, 158:16 \\
\hline Section [3] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 168: 25,168: 2 \\
& \text { 169:6. 169:18 }
\end{aligned}
\] & sense [12] & \(71: 9,72: 3,72: 6\),
\(72 \cdot 11,72 \cdot 11\) & 163:13 & shortcut [1] - \\
\hline 147:27, 157:18, & 170:4, 171:4, & 71:22, 71:24, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 72: 11,72: 21, \\
& 72: 26,74: 1,
\end{aligned}
\] & serving [2] - & 84:2 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 160:27 } \\
& \text { section }[1] \text { - }
\end{aligned}
\] & 171:26, 172:14, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 74: 26,85: 25, \\
& 96: 26,100: 15,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 72: 26,74: 1, \\
& 74: 20,76: 4,76: 7,
\end{aligned}
\] & 51:9, 185:6 sessions [1] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { shorten [1] - } \\
& \text { 196:9 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 128:22 & 173:10, 173:22, & 121:26, 128:15, & \[
76: 10,76: 19
\] & 12:16 & shortly [4] - \\
\hline security [10] - & 175:26, 176:3, & 174:21, 176:6, & \begin{tabular}{l}
79:9, 79:12, 81:2, \\
81:11, 81.20
\end{tabular} & set [10]-14:24, & 43:23, 49:28, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 89: 20,103: 24 \\
& \text { 103:26, 103:27, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 176:5, 176:27, & 177:10, 189:28 sensitive [1] - & 82:8, 82:20, & \[
96: 14,102: 14
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 105:18, 160:22 } \\
& \text { show [6] - }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 103:28, 107:14, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 180:4, 182:13, } \\
& \text { 182:25, 183:29, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 9:18 & 82:24, 82:28, & 119:15, 119:23, & 123:4, 142:16, \\
\hline 111:15, 111:28, & 187:11, 188:5, & sent [24]-10:25, & 84:13, 93:26, \(96: 8,97 \cdot 9,97 \cdot 16\) & 126:15, 182:20 & 150:10, 151:1, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 115:27, 163:10 } \\
& \text { see }[134]-10: 13,
\end{aligned}
\] & 188:7, 189:9, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 20: 4,20: 6,20: 25, \\
& 20: 27,23: 16,
\end{aligned}
\] & 100:3, 100:13, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { sets [1] - 122:7 } \\
& \text { settled }[2]-
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
165: 15,177: 23
\] \\
\hline 10:21, 13:24, & \(190: 6,191: 7\),
\(193 \cdot 5,193 \cdot 19\) & \[
23: 28,29: 1
\] & 101:15, 116:1, & 116:13, 125:6 & 74:8, 157:17, \\
\hline 14:22, 15:4, 21:6, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 193:5, 193:19, } \\
& 193: 25
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
30: 19,31: 14
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 127:15, 132:10, } \\
& \text { 135:10, 135:22 }
\end{aligned}
\] & settlement [1] - & \[
157: 24,160: 29
\] \\
\hline 23:11, 23:26, & seeing [1] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 35: 11,36: 5, \\
& 49: 29,64: 9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 135:10, 135:22, } \\
& 136: 9,137: 9,
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
124: 16
\] \\
seven [3] -
\end{tabular} & shown [1] - \\
\hline 27:18, 31:4, 33:9,
35:17, 35:25, & 16:28 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 49: 29,64: 9, \\
& 67: 17,69: 2,
\end{aligned}
\] & 139:16, 139:22, & 104:6, 167:24, & \begin{tabular}{l}
160:22 \\
shows [2] -
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \[
36: 8,36: 15
\] & seek [4]-70:7, & 69:29, 79:6, & 143:29, 147:1, & 168:10 & \[
150: 1,152: 13
\] \\
\hline 36:29, 37:17, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 158: 8,158: 17, \\
& 194: 22
\end{aligned}
\] & 97:24, 110:7, & 147:10, 147:12, & several [3] - & sic [1] - 114:7 \\
\hline 37:26, 40:3, 40:4, & seeking [11] - & 152:8, 182:3, & \begin{tabular}{l}
147:25, 147:28, \\
151:2, 151:14
\end{tabular} & 73:11, 92:29, & \[
\text { side }[7]-23: 9,
\] \\
\hline 40:5, 40:14, & 83:5, 83:6, 83:8, & 195:16 & 151:2, 151:14, & 94:13 & 29:19, 76:28, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 92:20, 92:21, & smallish [1] - & 189:12, 191:16 & spin [1]-66:16 & 42:16, 74:16, & 51:1, 60:5, \\
\hline 167:22, 183:4 & 32:3 & sort [13]-61:25, & spoken [5] - & 74:24, 85:20, & 107:22, 107:28, \\
\hline sides [1] - & smoke [3] - & 76:2, 78:24, & 43:4, 50:1, 156:2, & 85:21, 135:9, & 111:12, 166:6, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 115:11 } \\
& \text { siaht }[4]-105: 6,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 86: 9,183: 8 \\
& 183: 9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 86: 14,97: 13, \\
& 98: 3,108: 23,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
156: 4,158: 22
\] & \[
136: 2,147: 6
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 166:23, 184:16 } \\
& \text { stood } 22 \text { - }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 105:7, 157:13, & sneak [2] - & 114:19, 129:28, & 153:12 & 26:25, 150:7 & 33:26, 136:12 \\
\hline 157:14 & 181:26, 181:27 & 167:27, 179:28, & sponge [1] - & starts [2]-32:4, & stop [4]-19:17, \\
\hline gns [1] - 30:6 & snippets [1] & 180:5, 180:8 & 175:26 & 177:21 & 32:13, 153:22, \\
\hline sillem [1] - 17:18 & 73:18 & sorts [3] & spot [1] - 181:28 & state [2] - 76:16, & 178:2 \\
\hline similar [3] - & Soap [1] - & 151:18, 151:19 & spotted [1] - & 174:12 & stories [6] - \\
\hline 74:5, 156:16, & 109:20 & sought [2] - & 146:12 & State [2]-14:19, & 82:2, 100:8, \\
\hline 156:17 & soap [1] & 158:19, 195:11 & spread [1] & 121:9 & 119:24, 120:6, \\
\hline similarly & 109:20 & sound [3] & 174:5 & STATE [1] - 4:26 & 159:2, 160:14 \\
\hline 68:1 & social [1] - & 29:13, 29:15, & SQUARE [1] - & Statement [1] - & story [79]-9:21, \\
\hline SIMON [4] - & 156:26 & 158:16 & 4:11 & 130:27 & 40:16, 62:1, 62:4, \\
\hline 3:21, 3:22, 5:20, & Society [2]-7:8, & source [19] - & squash [1] - & statement [17] - & 62:5, 83:4, 90:27, \\
\hline 5:20 & 122:5 & 9:20, 12:5, 66:19, & 175:3 & 44:6, 63:16, & 91:26, 92:6, \\
\hline simple [2] - & soft [1] - 68:25 & 91:19, 95:23, & SR [1] - 123:6 & 89:13, 98:16, & 92:11, 92:20, \\
\hline 64:3, 167:27 & solicitor [2] - & 95:24, 99:8, & staff [2]-19:15, & 99:6, 116:4, & 92:21, 93:7, \\
\hline simply [6] & 174:12, 195:16 & 108:8, 123:6, & 113:2 & 159:17, 159:18, & 93:19, 94:3, \\
\hline 51:19, 100:7, & SOLICITOR'S & 123:20, 131:20, & stage [33]-9:10, & 159:23, 165:29, & 94:28, 95:2, \\
\hline 109:28, 141:29, & [1] - 4:26 & 149:23, 157:10, & 13:6, 13:25, & 166:6, 166:13, & 95:11, 95:14, \\
\hline 157:23, 184:19 & SOLICITORS & 168:20, 171:14, & 19:27, 20:27, & 166:17, 166:20, & 95:27, 96:4, 96:9, \\
\hline Sincerely [1] - & [10]-3:7, 3:12, & 171:21, 171:24, & 22:9, 25:29, 30:6, & 166:23, 181:16, & 96:22, 97:16, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 120:17 } \\
& \text { single }[1]-
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 3: 22,3: 29,4: 3, \\
& 4: 11,4: 21,5: 6,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { 172:6, 182:19 } \\
\text { sources [2] - }
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 30: 8,31: 11 \\
& 42: 12,60: 25
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 196:2 } \\
& \text { statements }[4] \text { - }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 98:4, 98:20, 99:1, } \\
& 99: 2,99: 18,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 66:28 & 5:10, 5:20 & 30:14, 104:13 & 75:3, 75:14, & 105:16, 192:8, & 99:22, 99:29, \\
\hline SIR [1] - 4:32 & someone [6] - & SOUTH [1] - 5:3 & 80:28, 81:1, & 192:10, 195:20 & 100:15, 100:20, \\
\hline Sir/madam [1] - & 65:29, 91:24, & South [1] - & 83:25, 84:25, & Station [3] - & 101:12, 106:8, \\
\hline 50:20 & 158:28, 189:3, & 113:22 & 92:19, 92:27, & 54:14, 54:27, & 106:9, 106:10, \\
\hline sit [6]-66:24, & \[
189: 4,189: 11
\] & \[
\mathbf{s p}[1]-140: 18
\] & 94:9, 95:1, 97:7, & \[
76: 17
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 106:12, 106:13, } \\
& \text { 110:18, 110:22, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 82: 3,88: 17 \\
& 138: 22,193:
\end{aligned}
\] & sometime [1] - & \[
\begin{array}{|l}
\text { space }[1] \text { - } \\
22: 14
\end{array}
\] & 102:28, 106:6, & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { station }[6]- \\
76: 13,131: 29
\end{gathered}
\] & 110:23, 110:24, \\
\hline 194:1 & sometimes & speaking [8] & \[
137: 24,154: 18
\] & 134:7, 135:6, & 110:26, 111:1, \\
\hline site [1] - 100:11 & 190:20 & 11:21, 13:10,
60:18. 75:29 & 163:23, 186:3, & \[
185: 11,186: 8
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 111:9, 111:12, } \\
& \text { 112:6, 112:11, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline sitting [2]-7:10, & somewhat [2] - & \[
76: 7,138: 1
\] & 195:1, 195:9 stages [3] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { stationed [1] } \\
& \text { 188:1 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 112:15, 112:18, \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
64:26 \\
situation [12] -
\end{tabular} & somewhere [4] - & \[
171: 23,171: 27
\] & \[
95: 29,96: 4
\] & stations [2] - & 115:21, 120:2, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 33: 9,66: 7,83: 12 \\
& 105: 23,109: 28
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 68:3, 68:7, 80:6, } \\
& 188: 24
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { speaks [2] - } \\
68: 28,120: 20
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 144:29 } \\
& \text { stand [11] }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
64: 11,64: 13 \\
\text { stayed }[1] \text { - }
\end{gathered}
\] & 123:14, 123:16, \\
\hline 111:3, 116:6, & soon [3]-34:26, & special [1] - & 17:11, 35:29, & 159:8 & 146:13, 148:29, \\
\hline \(133: 16,156: 16\),
\(156: 17,164: 23\) & 44:9, 166:16 & 73:17 & 41:13, 88:16,
151:10, 151:20, & stemming [1] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 153:2, 153:7, } \\
& \text { 158:10, 158:11, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 156:17, 164:23 } \\
\text { six [12] - 16:6, }
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
sorry [37] - \\
18:29, 21:12
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { specialist [1] - } \\
& \text { 122:4 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 151:10, 151:20, } \\
& \text { 180:5, 180:8, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 71: 10 \\
& \text { step [2] - 10:9, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 158:10, 158:11, } \\
& \text { 158:14, 159:6, }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 17:12, 19:7, & \[
25: 11,30: 25,
\] & specific [6] & 184:7, 193:9, & \[
44: 27
\] & 159:11, 159:13, \\
\hline 94:24, 94:26, & \[
31: 8,35: 4,40: 22
\] & 10:12, 12:6, 43:2, & 195:25 & STEPHEN [2] - & 159:14, 160:11,
160:19. 161:22. \\
\hline 99:27, 119:5, & \[
47: 29,48: 20
\] & 45:5, 45:27,
\(194: 20\) & standalone [1] - & \[
6: 6,89: 5
\] & 160:19, 161:22,
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70: 22,71: 15
\] & 80:11, 83:21, & unbalanced [2] - & \[
174: 1
\] \\
\hline 191:19, 192:1, & 45:12, 62:29 & \[
74: 19,75: 2,75: 4
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 85: 22,85: 29, \\
& \text { 86:28, 125:15, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
28: 12,51: 16
\] & untruth [12] - \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 192:24, 193:23 } \\
\text { THURSDAY }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 82:16, 84:6, } \\
& \text { 102:12, 107:16, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 80: 24,81: 12, \\
& 90: 2,91: 28,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 86: 28,125: 15 \\
& 125: 17,129: 13
\end{aligned}
\] & undelighted [1] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 44: 5,45: 3,45: 4 \\
& 45: 12,45: 27
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 7:1 & 108:18, 114:7, &  & \[
163: 25,163: 26
\] & - 163:28 & \[
5: 12,45: 27
\] \\
\hline ticket [1] & 141:17, 149:11, & 112:21, 121:26, & turned [3] - 7:20, & & \[
37: 23,126: 21
\] \\
\hline 161:13 & 165:27 & 122:26, 124:10, & \[
17: 26,99: 10
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 123:19, 128:21, } \\
& 140: 3,143: 8 .
\end{aligned}
\] & 128:29, 140:11 \\
\hline ticket-fixing [1] - & top [7]-13:21, & 124:19, 124:27, & TV [5] - 21:7, & 140:3, 143:8,
157:18 & untruth" [3] - \\
\hline 161:13 & 13:23, 22:28, & 129:21, 150:9, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 22: 6,26: 25,30: 3, \\
& 73: 11
\end{aligned}
\] & undergone [1] - & \[
45: 8,49: 15
\] \\
\hline \[
\operatorname{TIM}_{[1]}-3: 28
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 34: 24,115: 18 \\
& \text { 122:14, 177:25 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 152:1, 156:22, } \\
& \text { 169:25, 169:29, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
73:11 \\
twelve [2] -
\end{tabular} & & 87:21 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { world }[1]-21: 26 \\
& \text { World }[3]- \\
& 89: 26,89: 27, \\
& \text { 100:18 } \\
& \text { worse }[2]- \\
& \text { 189:5, 189:18 } \\
& \text { worst }[1]-21: 26 \\
& \text { worth }[1]-29: 25 \\
& \text { wrap }[2]-35: 27,
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
118:13 \\
yourself \([15]\) - \\
9:27, 10:5, 10:6, \\
30:18, 35:11, \\
35:18, 36:25, \\
129:26, 136:29, \\
144:3, 150:11, \\
156:16, 168:20, \\
172:10
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 36:15 wrestle [1] - & 0 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { wrestled }[1] \text { - } \\
& \text { 46:4 } \\
& \text { write }[4]-37: 20, \\
& 82: 4,142: 3, \\
& \text { 142:6 } \\
& \text { writer }[2] \text { - } \\
& \text { 114:26, 115:13 } \\
& \text { writing }[4]- \\
& 90: 15,115: 4, \\
& \text { 115:5, 129:28 } \\
& \text { written }[7] \text { - } \\
& 41: 4,49: 3,94: 29, \\
& 121: 22,129: 23, \\
& \text { 170:10, 177:15 } \\
& \text { wrongly }[2]- \\
& 38: 3,38: 7 \\
& \text { wrote }[9]- \\
& 36: 13,113: 23, \\
& 149: 19,159: 28, \\
& 160: 19,177: 12, \\
& 178: 27,179: 26, \\
& \text { 185:14 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ó }_{[2]}-118: 17, \\
& 118: 18
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Y & \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { yarn }[1]-123: 3 \\
\text { year [3] - 89:16, } \\
90: 3,1] 6: 10 \\
\text { years }[16]-7: 7, \\
24: 23,58: 25, \\
59: 3,90: 29, \\
104: 6,105: 19, \\
113: 15,114: 11, \\
138: 9,156: 19, \\
156: 24,174: 18, \\
174: 19,179: 9 \\
\text { yesterday }[14]- \\
8: 8,49: 11,59: 18, \\
59: 27,60: 5, \\
67: 29,71: 15, \\
71: 21,72: 14, \\
72: 24,94: 23, \\
119: 13,142: 14, \\
192: 12 \\
\text { young }[6]- \\
89: 15,93: 17, \\
93: 24,96: 18,
\end{gathered}
\] & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}```

