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CHA RMAN Ladies and gentlemen, this morning is the easy bit, you talk and I listen. Just a couple of things before we begin. First of all, it seems to me that anyone who has shorter submissions to make, like, for instance, I don't mean uninterested or minor parties, but, it would economise in terms of cost to the taxpayer if they might wish to make their submissions and just go. So, I would invite people to do that if they wish. Secondly, as I understand it, there has been a request on behalf of Sergeant McCabe that his legal team should speak last, and I think that's fine, subject to a right of reply by An Garda Síochána. If that turns into a tennis match, well then hopefully I am just going to sit here and listen to it. And then the last thing is this: That we have audio of all the hearings but I was proposing to put up today and tomorrow's audio because the whole idea of public access to courts has to move into the modern age, but I won't do so in the event that people say outlandish or ludicrous things. So there it is. So who would like to commence.
MR. MRPHY: Chairman, just before we move into the individual submissions, on behalf of An Garda Siochana I wonder if I might just ask what the rationale for the request is on behalf of Sergeant McCabe to reverse the usual order. I will be, of course, entirely happy to
abide by your direction, Chairman, but it's not clear to me why this is being changed.

CHA RMAN We11, I didn't think about it very deeply and I would have to say, Mr. Murphy, and I will tell you the reason I didn't think about it very deeply was, 10:06 I felt that since this is all about what allegedly happened to Sergeant McCabe it would seem rational that he would speak. Now, equally, it seems to me also rational that since this is about what allegedly senior members of An Garda Síochána did to Sergeant McCabe, it 10:06 would be unfair for him to speak last without you having a right of reply, and that's the basis upon which I thought it was right to proceed. And honestly, I am listening to everything and I don't see a big deal about it, and if, as I said, it turns into something being said on behalf of Sergeant McCabe and you having to reply further, I will try and be as tolerant as I possibly can be, given my track record so far, and let's see how we get on.
MR. MRRAY: May it please you, Chairman.
CHA RMAK Would you like to go first, Mr. O'Higgins? MR. MCHEL O H GG NS: I am quite happy to do that. CHA RMAN Unless there is some minor party who would wish to go first. Please don't be shy. Mr. Lehane? MR. LEHANE: Chairman, yes, I have to make two very short submissions on behalf of Deputy John McGuinness in the first instance and then secondly on behalf of Ms. Anne Harris. My solicitors have copies of my speaking note, they are both relatively short, one is
ten pages and the other is 17 pages, unfortunately they are not here. So I am happy to go ahead now and have it handed up when it arrives.
CHA RMAN I am very happy for you to do that,

Mr. Lehane.

## SUBM SSI ON BY MR. LEHANE ON BEHALF OF DEPUTY JOHN MEGU NNESS:

MR. LEHANE: If I can deal first with Deputy John
McGuinness. In respect of Mr. McGuinness I am
instructed by Lawlor Partners Solicitors, Chairman. As you know paragraph [1] of the terms of reference requires the Tribunal to investigate whether a meeting took place between former Commissioner Martin Callinan and Deputy McGuinness on 24th January 2014 in the car park of Bewley's Hotel, Newlands Cross, County Dublin, and to examine and consider the circumstances which 1ed to any such meeting, the purpose of such meeting and the matters discussed at such meeting.

Now, Chairman, you will be aware that former Commissioner Callinan and Deputy McGuinness both agree that a meeting took place at the time and in the place specified in term of reference [1], they also agree that Sergeant McCabe was discussed at the meeting. However, they differ fundamentally in their accounts of how Sergeant McCabe was discussed at the meeting.

Deputy McGuinness gave evidence to you, Chairman, that Mr. Callinan told him that Sergeant McCabe had sexually
abused his family and an individual and that he was not to be trusted. Deputy McGuinness stated that Mr. Callinan suggested that he, Mr. McGuinness, had made a grave error in relation to the Public Accounts Committee and the hearings because of Sergeant McCabe, and that he would find himself in serious trouble. You will be aware, Chairman, that Deputy McGuinness kept a handwritten note of the meeting, a copy of which, I think the original of which is in the Tribunal's possession and the relevant extract read:
"Callinan, McCabe, sexual abuse! I ndi vi dual + family. Don't trust him Story not credi ble. I nvestigations ongoi ng. He's not credi ble."

Now, Commissioner Callinan denied Deputy McGuinness's account. He agreed that the meeting was his 1ast chance to stop the Public Accounts Committee from calling Sergeant McCabe. He testified that it was Mr. McGuinness who raised the allegation of child sex abuse and that he did so by asking whether Sergeant McCabe was raising these issues because of the file that went to the DPP. He stated that this query was not raised in response to, nor was it prompted by anything that Mr. Callinan had said. Mr. Callinan he knew about the file that went to the DPP, he knew what the DPP had decided. He agreed that the data protection correspondence which he said he discussed at
the meeting was never sent.

Now, Chairman, you will be aware that there were no other individuals present at this meeting. Garda Paul Hynes, who drove Mr. Callinan to the car park, witnessed the two individuals meeting but he remained in the car and his evidence was that former Commissioner Callinan did not discuss with him what he and Deputy McGuinness had spoken about in the car.

Former Commissioner Callinan accepted in evidence that Deputy McGuinness's statement to him, on his account, was a significant intervention by the Chairperson of the Public Accounts Committee at a significant time. This was in a context in which Mr. Callinan had requested the meeting in order to discuss data protection concerns and to dissuade the Public Accounts Committee from calling Sergeant McCabe to give evidence. Notwithstanding this Mr. Callinan told you, Chairman, he did not take a note or record of the alleged intervention by Mr. McGuinness, nor did he relate it to anyone else, including, and significantly, Mr. Brian Purce11, the then Secretary General of the Department of Justice, whom he spoke to shortly after the meeting in the car park.

Former Commissioner Callinan and Deputy McGuinness also differ fundamentally in their accounts of the circumstances leading up to the meeting. Deputy

McGuinness told you, Chairman, that at the conclusion of the Public Accounts Committee meeting on the 23rd January 2014, the day before the meeting in the car park, he approached Mr. Callinan to thank him for attending the Committee at the end of the hearing. He stated that as he approached Mr. Callinan, Mr. Callinan started telling a colourful story to the group he was in about former Garda John Wilson and a horse, at the conclusion of which Mr. Callinan stated "And the ot her fella fiddl es with kids, they're the kind of fucking headbangers l am dealing with, it's outrageous". He stated that there was a general hubbub at the conclusion of the hearing so he couldn't say whether anyone had overheard what Mr. Callinan had said.

Former Commissioner Callinan denied Deputy McGuinness's account. He agreed that at the conclusion of the Public Accounts Committee meeting on the 23rd January 2014 he spoke to Mr. McGuinness. He stated that he asked Mr. McGuinness whether the PAC intended to call
former Garda John wilson to which Mr. McGuinness replied "You must be joking, sure he' s a fucking header". He denied any knowledge of the colourful story relating to Mr . Wilson and suggested that he always thought that the nickname given to Mr . Wilson as a result of this incident in fact related to the fact that Mr. wilson shared a name with a famous darts player whom Mr. Callinan accepted looked nothing like Mr. Wilson. Mr. Callinan also stated that he had never
heard the term "kiddie fiddler" prior to the events which led to the establishment of this Tribunal.

Mr. Chairman, a number of individuals witnessed the exchange between former Commissioner Callinan and Deputy McGuinness at the end of the meeting. Former Commissioner O'Sullivan told the Tribunal that she saw the interaction, however she stated that she did not hear what was said due to the general hubbub. Assistant Commissioner John O'Mahony stated that he did not hear what passed between Mr. Callinan and Mr. McGuinness. And Mr. Andrew McLindon, the Garda Communications Director, told the Tribunal that he also witnessed the interaction but he did not hear what was discussed as he was focusing on the media. Superintendent Taylor stated that he was in the process of getting Mr. Callinan's hat and satchel but that he heard former Commissioner Callinan refer to Sergeant McCabe as a kiddie fiddler.

Chairman, you will have heard the evidence of Deputy Micheá 1 Martin, the leader of Fianna Fáil, Mr. McGuinness's party leader, who told the Tribunal that in late February 2014 Deputy McGuinness dropped into his office to thank Mr. Martin for raising the Mr. McGuinness was leaving the office he mentioned to Deputy Martin that he had met the then Garda Commissioner Martin Callinan in a car park and that he
had said to him that Maurice McCabe was not to be trusted and that he was a child abuser. Deputy Martin told the Tribunal that shortly after this conversation he told his chef de cabinet, Ms. Deirdre Gillane, and his press officer, Mr. Pat McPartland, of Mr. McGuinness's comments.

Chairman, in assessing the credibility of Deputy McGuinness and former Commissioner Callinan the Tribunal will obviously have to have regard to the evidence given by those two witnesses as well as the evidence of Mr. Martin and Mr. Purcell. And I don't proceed to set out in detail, Chairman, what that evidence is because the Tribunal is perfectly capable and has looked at it already. But I say in submission that the Tribunal is also entitled to consider the evidence of other witnesses in relation to their activities on the 23rd and 24th January 2014.

The Comptroller \& Auditor General, Mr. Seamus McCarthy, 10:14 told the Tribunal that on his way into the Public Accounts Committee hearing on 23rd January former Commissioner Callinan approached and engaged him in conversation. Mr. McCarthy stated:
"We -- my recollection is that we were apart fromboth groups, so my colleagues were not party to the conversation and the colleagues with Cormissioner Callinan were not party to the conversation. We began
just with sort of normal greetings and -- but very qui ckly the Commi ssi oner rai sed Ser geant MLCabe's name in the conversation, al ong the lines that Ser geant McCabe is not to be trusted, that he had questions to answer and that there were sexual of fence allegations agai nst him"

Mr. McCarthy stated that Mr. Callinan said sexual offences plural. Counsel for former Commissioner

Callinan, as you know, challenged Mr. McCarthy on his
"The onl y part that l do remember is hi msaying that Maurice McCabe was not to be bel ieved or trusted with anything and the reason 1 think I remember that is because it surprised me, I have to say."

Mr. Callinan accepted that the accounts given by Deputy McGuinness, Deputy Deasy and the Comptroller \& Auditor General were independent and related to different
conversations that he had with these people and that they were independent of one another. It is submitted that the evidence of mr. McCarthy in relation to his interaction with Mr. Callinan on the 23rd January 2014 is quite similar to Deputy McGuinness's evidence of what transpired in the car park the following day. In both accounts Mr. Callinan states that Sergeant McCabe was not to be trusted, that he had questions to answer and that there were allegations plural of sexual offences against him. It is noteworthy, Chairman, that 10:16 in responding to these allegations Mr. Callinan deployed the same tactic; namely, he suggested that it was the person with whom he was speaking and not him who raised the issue of sexual allegations in relation to Sergeant McCabe.

It is submitted that Deputy Deasy's evidence as to what transpired on the 23rd January, while it does not allege that Mr. Callinan raised an allegation of sexual abuse, is also corroborative of the accounts given by Deputy McGuinness and the Comptroller \& Auditor General, insofar as it shows that Mr. Callinan was briefing people negatively against Sergeant McCabe on the basis that he was not to be believed or trusted.

On a more general level, it is submitted that the evidence of Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Deasy that former Commissioner Callinan was briefing them negatively in such a public manner is also corroborative of the
account given by Deputy McGuinness as to the public and casual nature in which Mr. Callinan described Sergeant McCabe. It is submitted that it is not probable that a police officer of Mr. Callinan's stature and experience working and living in this country over the past two decades would not have heard the term kiddie fiddler before.

In addition to the evidence of Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Deasy it is submitted that the evidence of Mr. Philip Boucher-Hayes is also relevant insofar as it shows yet another witness giving direct evidence that Mr. Callinan was briefing them negatively against Sergeant McCabe. In Mr. Philip Boucher-Hayes' case the briefing took place on 17th December 2013 and consisted of Mr. Callinan stating that there were "psychol ogi cal, psychi atric issues with this man and there's more that I could tell you but l won't. There's an awf ul lot worse that l could tell, the worst possible kind of thi ngs, we will just leave it there".

The undisputed evidence relating to Mr. Callinan's interactions with Mr. Gerald Keane is also important. This shows Mr. Callinan interfering in a highly inappropriate manner, which Mr. Callinan accepted wasn't his finest hour, in a private dispute between Mr. Kean and Sergeant McCabe and is further evidence of Mr. Callinan's desire to influence people negatively against Sergeant McCabe.

Chairman, the law relating to the standard of proof that a tribunal of inquiry is required to adopt is we11-estab1ished and was authoritatively set out by the Supreme Court in Law or v. Pl anni ng Tri bunal [2010]1IR, 10:19 170, where former Chief Justice Murray held:
"In princi ple evi dential requi rements must vary depending upon the gravity of the particul ar allegation. This is not to adopt the "sliding scal e" of proof advocated by counsel for the applicant, but rather to si mply recogni se, as an integral part of fair procedures, that a finding in respect of a serious matter whi ch may invol ve reputational damage must be proportionate to the evi dence upon whi ch it is based. For example, a finding that a particular meeting occurred on one day rather than another may be of such little si gnificance that a tribunal could make a finding in that respect on the bare bal ance of probabilities. A finding of criminal behaviour on the ot her hand would requi re a greater degree of authority and wei ght derived fromthe evi dence itself."

Having regard to that test it is submitted the following are established by the evidence as a matter of probability:
A. That Mr. Callinan was deeply unhappy with the actions of Sergeant McCabe.
B. At the meeting in the car park on 24th January 2014 Mr. Callinan was intent on stopping the Public Accounts Committee from hearing evidence from Sergeant McCabe and he realised his meeting with Mr. McGuinness was his 1ast chance to prevent Sergeant McCabe giving evidence to the PAC.
C. During the course of the meeting Mr. Callinan deployed the same tactic that he had used with the Comptroller \& Auditor General the previous day and told Mr. McGuinness that Sergeant McCabe could not be trusted, that he had questions to answer and that he was a child sex abuser. He also threatened Mr. McGuinness with consequences both for him and the PAC should Sergeant McCabe give evidence.
D. Mr. McGuinness's evidence, which is supported by a near contemporaneous note and the account he gave shortly after the meeting to his party leader, is to be preferred over the account of Mr. Callinan which is supported by no documentary or hearsay evidence.
E. Rumours concerning sexual allegations involving Sergeant McCabe and minors were widespread in political and media circles.
F. Mr. Callinan repeated these rumours or implied their subject-matter in a very casual way over the
period December 2013 to February 2014 to a number of independent individuals; namely, Mr. Boucher-Hayes, Deputy Deasy, Mr. McCarthy and Deputy McGuinness.
G. It is not credible that two independent witnesses, Mr. McGuinness and Mr. McCarthy, would have raises the issue of the child sex abuse allegations concerning Sergeant McCabe in a near identical fashion in the manner that Mr. Callinan alleges, and that Mr. Callinan would have responded in a near identical way while telling no other person or recording the fact that two such important personages, one of whom occupies one of the most important constitutional offices in this State, made such a significant intervention at such a sensitive time both for An Garda Síochána and Mr. Callinan personally.
H. At the end of the meeting of the Public Accounts Committee on the 23rd January 2014, Mr. Callinan stated in Mr. McGuinness's earshot that "the other fella fiddl es with ki ds" in reference to Sergeant McCabe. Mr. McGuinness's evidence in this respect is corroborated by the direct evidence of Superintendent Taylor. Mr. Callinan's account is corroborated by none of the additional people who were present in the general vicinity; namely, former Commissioner o'sullivan, Assistant Commissioner o'Mahony or Mr. Andrew McLindon.
I. It is not credible that Mr. Callinan did not know what a kiddie fiddler was prior to the events that led to the establishment of the Tribunal.
J. Mr. Callinan was aware of the colourful story involving Mr. Wilson and the horse, as well as the true origin of Mr. Wilson's nickname. His denial of this was part of a further effort to remove himself from the account given by Mr. McGuinness of their interaction on 23rd January 2013.

That is my submission in relation to Mr. McGuinness, Chairman.

And my solicitor will hand in a copy of it.
CHA RMAK Yes. Was there a submission you wanted to make in relation to another particular point?
MR. LEHANE: Yes, Chairman. If it would suit you to take it now in relation to Ms. Anne Harris.
CHA RMAN Yes. Just let me get the submission, thank you. I am just encouraging you for your submission just to take a breath between each sentence, just to slow things down a wee bit. I am following you, thank you, but I find it just a little bit difficult and thank you for the speaking note, which I have.

SUBM SSI ON BY MR. LEHANE ON BEHALF OF MS. ANNE HARRI S:
MR. LEHANE: So I am now going to proceed to make a submission on behalf of Ms. Anne Harris and I am instructed by Mr. Alan O'Connor of Patrick F O'Reilly \& Company Solicitors. My solicitor tells me that that has been handed in to you and this is slightly longer.

Mr. Chairman, Ms. Harris is a freelance journalist who was the editor of the Sunday Independent for three years from 2012 to 2014 and Ms. Harris responded to the 10:23 call for help that you made in the opening statement delivered on the 27th February 2017 and she wrote to the Tribunal at a very early stage of its proceedings by letter dated 11th March 2017 to inform you that she had been warned off Sergeant McCabe by several journalists within her newspaper. She wrote to the Tribunal again by 1etter dated the 21st May 2017 providing greater detail of her information, met with the Tribunal investigators on the 17th and 24th October 2017 and consented to the audio recording of those interviews. She made a statement to the Tribunal by way of those interviews on the 24th October 2017 and gave evidence on Day 82.

Her evidence to the Tribunal may be summarised as follows. During the course of a regular editorial meeting at which Sergeant McCabe was discussed in May 2013 a freelance journalist mentioned the 2006 allegation. The freelance journalist repeated the
allegation in June 2013. Ms. Harris investigated this information and discovered that the matter had been investigated by the DPP and dismissed as groundless. Allegations concerning Sergeant McCabe circulated freely in Independent News \& Media and were discussed in very casual fashion. Mr. Ian Mallon, the then group news editor, on one occasion told her that there was more to Sergeant McCabe than met the eye and said "you know about McCabe and children". Mr. Fionnan Sheahan in September 2014, on Ms. Harris's account, described sergeant McCabe to her as a paedophile.

Ms. Harris's account is heavily contested by Mr. Mallon, Mr. Sheahan and Independent News \& Media. It was suggested that her evidence was false, tainted by improper motive, borne out of a grudge, that she was a bitter person and that she was abusing this tribunal of inquiry to ventilate her animus towards Mr. Mallon, Mr. Sheahan and Independent News \& Media. Notwithstanding the brutal nature of the assault on Ms. Harris by Mr. Mallon, Mr. Sheahan and Independent News \& Media, Mr. Mallon and Mr. Sheahan ultimately accepted in their sworn evidence that allegations concerning Sergeant McCabe and child abuse circulated freely in INM, that those allegations were discussed in 10:25 a very casual fashion and that it would have been perfectly proper to use the word paedophile in the context of such discussions. This journalistic clash cannot simply be ignored by the Tribunal; it must be
resolved and recorded in the report of the Tribunal.

The Tribunal is tasked by term of reference paragraphs [a] and [b] with investigating the allegation of Superintendent Taylor, wherein he alleges that he was instructed to contact the media to brief them negatively against Sergeant Maurice McCabe and that he was directed to draw journalists' attention to an allegation of criminal misconduct made against Sergeant McCabe and that this was the root cause of his agenda; namely, revenge against the Gardaí.

The Tribunal is tasked by term of reference [h] to investigate contacts between members of An Garda Síochána and media relevant to the matters set out in term of reference [a] and [b].

Resolving the journalistic clash between Ms. Harris and Mr. Mallon, Mr. Sheahan and Independent News \& Media is a necessary precursor to making a finding as to where, as a matter of probability, the source of these rumours was located. There is an additional reason why this journalistic clash must be resolved. Ms. Harris came to the Tribunal voluntarily as a citizen responding to a call for help by the Chairman of a tribunal of inquiry established at great public expense for the citizens of Ireland. As a consequence, she was subjected to a brutal attack on her credibility and motivation which has devastating consequences for her
reputation. She was also threatened with defamation proceedings for simply having provided a statement to the Tribunal, notwithstanding the fact that any such proceedings by virtue of the well-established principles of law would have been bound to fail. But these factors, combined with the privileges and immunities that attach to witnesses before tribunals of inquiry, and the qualified privilege that attaches to the reporting of the proceedings of a tribunal of inquiry, mean that while these proceedings may be sterile of legal effect they will certainly not be sterile of effect on her constitutionally protected rights to good name and reputation if these matters are left unresolved. It will also, I submit, have a chilling effect on other publicly minded citizens who might have to think twice before coming forward with information to assist a public inquiry in the future.

The background, Chairman, is well-known and I recite there in the submission the exchange of correspondence between Ms. Harris and the Tribunal, her statement, Mr. Mallon's statement, Mr. Sheahan's statement and the response from Mr. Sheahan's solicitor in which the threat of legal proceedings are made and a request is made for the identities to which everybody -- the names ${ }^{0: 28}$ of everyone to whom Ms. Harris's statements have been provided, and reference is also made to Mr. Sheahan's statement.

In section C, Mr. Chairman, I set out the relevant evidence, and in first case I go through Ms. Harris's evidence and at paragraph 18 you will see that Ms. Harris stated that after May 2013, she heard murmurings or echoes of that general story which she had heard from the freelance journalist throughout Independent News \& Media. And she says:
"You would hear it around the corridors. It was pervasive in the offices of INM I think it's fair to say. Peopl e tal ked about it without actually tal king about it, if that sounds strange. They would sort of tal k about, you know, the thing or there was sort of a I ot of innuendo. I never engaged in conversations with it and I generally shut it down, but it was quite clear 10:29 that it was tal ked about. And then you'd meet people fromthe political spectrumand it would be, you now you'd hear the same sort of rumour and innuendo. And all of this rumour and innuendo, as far as I could see, had one purpose, whi ch was to detract fromthe courage of a man who was doing something whi ch had the explicit purpose of bringing somet hing to the publ ic interest whi ch I argel y affected the publ ic."

Ms. Harris stated that the -- or described the casual
way in which these matters were being discussed as struck her as "casual cal umy". Ms. Harris described her interaction with Mr. Sheahan as follows:
"At the end of conf er ence towards the end of September everybody had left. He had gone out the door. He turned back, care to the office and said, because the I ast conversation had been about -- at the conference, had been about Sergeant Maurice MkCabe and he said "he's a paedophile, McCabe is a paedophile" and I was shocked because up to then I had been hearing talk all day, all in typical Irish euphemisms, all talk, you know, about, you know, interfering with children or i nappropriate or it was al ways said like that, an i nappropriate interest in children. It was never said like that bef ore and so it was the scale had suddenly up and accel er ated. " [As read]

And she described the interaction as being over in a occurred in the period September to early October, probably in the third week of September, and she said that she didn't think that Mr. Sheahan was gossiping.

Ms. Harris described her interaction with Mr. Mallon as follows, she says, this is paragraph 21:
"You are tal king about Mr. I an Mallon, who is the group news editor. He came in, very busy and came in and out 10:31 of meetings, usually to gi ve some message and then out agai n . And we were tal king about McCabe and it was, it wasn't a very big Tuesday conference, it was a
different one to the best of my recollection, and he
just said the same sort of thing, he sai d oh, you know, we have to bear in mind that he's -- that there's more to this than -- there's more to Sergeant McCabe than meets the eye, and that is all that was."

Ms. Harris was heavily criticised in cross-examination, as I have said. She was criticised her for misspelling of your name, for using the plural rather than singular of executive in her letter of 11th March 2017 and for saying that Mr . Mallon had referred to the allegation on more than one occasion. It was suggested that as a result of these matters her evidence as a whole could not be relied upon. It was suggested to her that when she wrote to the Tribunal she was critical of INM and was happy to make a statement critical of its senior executives. She was criticised for her inability to put a precise date on when Mr. Sheahan made the remark to her. It was put to her that a finding of fact by the Tribunal that Mr. Sheahan had used the word paedophile would have very serious consequences for his took no record of the interaction or discussed it with anyone else. She was also criticised for not naming the people in the corridors who were engaged in this casual calumniation. It was put to her by counsel for

[^0]you are a bitter person, you bear a grudge towards Mr. Sheahan and towards your former empl oyer, I ndependent Newspapers."

And an article was put to her wherein she referred to men with big swinging titles as testifying to her animus against Mr. Sheahan.

Paragraph 23, I refer to the evidence of Mr. Ian Mallon who gave evidence on day 90 . And you will see that Mr. Mallon was unable to remember precisely when he became aware of the allegation against Sergeant McCabe but that he thought it was in early 2014, however he could not exclude the possibility that he had heard it earlier in 2013. Mr. Mallon stated that he had no recollection of a freelance journalist raising the allegation at an editorial meeting. However, he suggested that the story was sure to have come up and he stated that he couldn't rule out the possibility. Mr. Mallon said that while Ms. Harris said she heard mutterings and rumours, "...I can't argue with that but she certai nl y di dn't hear themfromme". Mr. Mallon stated that he never discussed the paul williams articles with Ms. Harris and that he had no recollection of a conversation with her about Sergeant McCabe ever and he denied her account of the conversation.

However, Chairman, Mr. Mallon accepted that nearly
every journalist in Independent News \& Media was aware of the allegation against Sergeant McCabe and the decision of the DPP. He was unable to tell the Tribunal who or when he became aware of these matters. He accepted that these matters were being discussed in a very casual way, however he said that he had never heard the word paedophile being used or the expression kiddie fiddler. He accepted that the word paedophile is a commonly used term to refer to people who commit sexual offences against children, however notwithstanding that fact he said he would have been absolutely advised if it was used in relation to Sergeant McCabe by those casually discussing the allegation.

Mr. Rae gave evidence on day 92, Chairman, and the relevance of Mr. Rae's evidence is simply the fact that he testified, and he was the editor-in-chief of Independent News \& Media from 2013 to 2018 and the person to whom Ms. Harris would have reported after June 2013, and you will see the question there where you say to him:
"CHAI RMAN: She l eft in good standing and remai ned as a val uable contribut or, would that be fair to say?
A. Well, l certainly offered her a contract as a ment or for young journalists and for some of our young managers.
CHAI RMAN: Yes. So you had good time for her?
A. Yes."

Mr. Sheahan gave evidence on day 93. He was unable to tell the Tribunal when he first became aware of the allegations concerning Sergeant McCabe. He accepted that allegations concerning Sergeant McCabe were being discussed in media circles as well as political circles. You will recall, Chairperson, that in his statement he only referred to political circles and sought to expand on the definition of political circles 10:35 during his evidence. He said that he understood political circles to include media circles as well, notwithstanding the fact for those of us who are outside Leinster House that would not be apparent.

Mr. Sheahan stated that he had heard about an allegation of sexual assault and other allegations. And you will see there a reference to him saying that there was a series of allegations. Mr. Sheahan stated that he saw no evidence of a smear campaign, however he 10:36 accepted that he had not volunteered any information to the Tribunal even though he accepted he had important information to give to this Tribunal. Mr. Sheahan stated that he would have regularly attended editorial meetings with Ms. Harris and that the subject-matter of 10:36 what became the articles concerning Sergeant McCabe in the Sunday Independent would have been discussed. Mr. Sheahan accepted that he could not say that he had no contact with Ms. Harris during the whole of the
period beginning the start of September to the start of October during which Ms. Harris alleged their interaction took place. However, Mr. Sheahan denied describing Sergeant McCabe as a paedophile to Ms. Harris. He stated that newspaper coverage in his not dispute Mr. Mallon's evidence that these allegations were being discussed in a very casual way amongst journalists in Independent News \& Media. However, he said, interestingly, that he have never participated in or heard any of these conversations taking place. He concluded his evidence saying that Ms. Harris was a bitter person and that her evidence, as I said, was tainted by improper motive borne out of a grudge and he accused her of headline hunting and using this Tribunal to ventilate the grudge.

You will see at the conclusion, Judge, I repeat the earlier reference from Chief Justice murray's judgment in the Law or case in terms of the standard of proof, and I say at paragraph 39, having regard to that test it's submitted the following are established by the evidence as a matter of probability:
A. That journalists in Independent News \& Media were
aware of the 2006 allegation against Sergeant McCabe from 2013 onwards.
B. That these allegations were discussed openly in a
very casual fashion at all levels of the organisation.
C. That the allegations were of child sex abuse and that consequently it is likely that the word paedophile - which, Chairman, is a perfectly normal word to be used in the context of these discussions - would have been used. And similarly, it is likely that the term kiddie fiddler - which unfortunately is a colloquial term, which, because of various scandals in our society over the previous two or three decades, is also a word or a term that is in common use - would likely have been used.
D. The evidence of Ms. Harris that Mr. Mallon mentioned the allegation in a brief and colloquial manner is more likely than not.
E. The evidence of Ms. Harris that Mr. Sheahan described Sergeant McCabe as a paedophile is more likely than not, whatever that Mr. Sheahan meant to imply when he said it, whether he was saying that or implying that Mr. McCabe was a paedophile or was being described as a paedophile.
F. Ms. Harris's evidence was truthful and honest and
not tainted by any improper motive.

They, Chairman, are my submissions on behalf of Ms. Harris and you will see the relevant extracts either referred to in the footnotes of the speaking note or set out in text. So unless there is anything else.

CHAN RMAN Thank you very much, Mr. Lehane. That is very helpfu7. I just wanted to ask you two questions. First of all, if we can go back to John McGuinness, TD. 10:39 I have a concern in relation to the whole notion of corroboration or support, and the law in that regard is somewhat complicated and as we know it has been abolished in the neighbouring kingdom. To what extent do you say that people saying similar things to what Deputy McGuinness alleges was said by Commissioner Callinan in any way supports that? And then secondly, what do you say the legal test is? Accepting as I do of course I am not bound by the Rules of Evidence. Just if you can help me on that, I'd be grateful. If you can't, fine.
MR. LEHANE: Yes, Chairman, I can do it in two ways. Firstly, I resisted the urge in the course of the speaking note to put in large amounts of law or references to textbooks because the Tribunal will be fully aware of what the law is, but if I can very and shortly just describe what my position in relation to this is.

It is well-established that the rules of evidence that apply in a courtroom, be it a civil or criminal court, do not apply in the context of a tribunal of inquiry. There have been rulings of a number of tribunals of inquiry in relation to what the meaning of the term evidence, for example, is: Does it include hearsay evidence, and if it does include hearsay evidence to what extent it can be relied upon. And I'11 do a further short note on this just by reference to some decisions of the Moriarty -- or sorry, some findings of law of the Moriarty Tribunal in relation to that specific issue, and the Smithwick Tribunal, Judge, as well and I will circulate them.

CHA RMAN You don't need to do that, Mr. Lehane, because I am very well-advised. But just, what you say 10:41 about it is what I am interested.

MR. LEHANE: You are at large, Chairman, when considering evidence in its broadest possible term to have regard to a huge range of material. I say that included in that range of material is hearsay evidence -- the hearsay evidence of people as to what they heard, but also evidence given by other individuals in relation to similar types of activity to see whether it establishes a pattern. And I say that the test of evidence, as I said, is very broad, in relation to its practical application and possible relevance to this Tribunal, what the Tribunal has to ask itself is: Do these other accounts, which Mr. Callinan accepted in cross-examination were
independent of each other, from, for example, Mr. McCarthy, Deputy Deasy and Mr. Boucher-Hayes, do they show a pattern of activity, and if they show a pattern of activity, what was the nature of that activity, to see whether or not it can then support the 10:42 Independent accounts.

So, in a normal situation, they would be largely irrelevant to each other, but in the context of an inquisitorial inquiry where these matters were ventilated and circulated to the affected parties giving them an opportunity to comment on it and to make submissions and cross-examine witnesses, in relation to the issue of whether it would establish a pattern or if it be more likely than not, I say that it's relevant. And in particular, Chairman, as I said in the speaking note, I think the evidence of the Comptroller \& Auditor General has relevance when you look at both the content of what Mr. McCarthy said was said to him and what mr. Callinan's response to that was in the nature of what Mr. Callinan said Mr. McCarthy said to him, because there is a striking similarity, Chairman, between that and Mr. McGuinness's evidence. And you will recall from my cross-examination and I think it was Mr. Marrinan's cross-examination of Mr. Callinan, that Mr. Callinan was probed on that, was there any link, was he suggesting there was any link between these individuals, that they might have contaminated each other's evidence in any way, and Mr. Callinan,
although he suggested or he implied the possibility when he said that these people are meeting each other on a regular basis, when pressed did not suggest that they were contaminated. So I say it's a very broad definition of evidence and that it goes to establishing 10:43 a pattern, so I don't know if that --
CHA RMAN Al1 right. I understand your position on that. Thank you. The second thing was this: In relation to Anne Harris and Mr. Mallon, Mr. Sheahan, if the evidence goes so far as to establish casual talk in relation to Sergeant McCabe and the possibility of him having been a paedophile and doesn't also include what one would expect from responsible journalists, the need to look into that and see whether it might be founded on any verifiable fact, does that help me in any way in 10:44 relation to the terms of reference? You don't need to answer at length, Mr. Lehane, but what I am wondering is: Does the resolution of this matter actually put me in a position where $I$ know more in terms of making a report?
MR. LEHANE: I suppose it's superficially attractive to the Tribunal to say that unlike Mr. McGuinness this dispute, this journalistic clash between Mr. Sheahan, Mr. Mallon and Ms. Harris is not referred to in the terms of reference, therefore it is not required for you to make a finding on. However, you are required to inquire into links between certain gardaí and journalists. As part of that inquiry you looked into this allegation, because if you are satisfied that, for
example, Mr. Sheahan used the word paedophile to describe Mr. McCabe, the following question arises: We11, if that was how he was describing it, where did he hear this from, who told him and from whence did the source emanate? There was a lot of talk in the Tribunal, Judge, about rumours both in political and garda circles, but in relation to Mr. Sheahan, a very senior journalist, occupying a very important position in our society, who is denying using a very ordinary word in this context, I say that if you make a finding in relation to that it has a consequence for your terms of reference because if you find that he said it and he wasn't able to account for where he said it, contrast it with Ms. Harris's account where she says that when the freelance journalist raised the issue she took her own steps to ascertain the truth or otherwise of the statement. She was asked properly by your counsel, well, when you were inquiring into this statement by the freelance journalist, did you talk to Commissioner Callinan, former Commissioner o'Sullivan or Commissioner Taylor and she said she didn't. And that's perfectly relevant to your terms of reference. The same line of questioning would have followed had Mr . Sheahan admitted, for example, that he had used the term paedophile; we11, what was the basis for that?
Did you hear it from a guard? And that is the relevance of it, I say, to your terms of reference. But I do say, and I repeat my reference to the chilling effect and the fact that the evidence was volunteered
and inquired into. So I don't know if that is helpful to you.
CHA RMAN Thank you. I do understand where you are coming from, yes. So, we go on to? who would like to go next? Would you like to go -- I was going to take you towards the end, Mr. O'Higgins, if that is convenient to you?

MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: You were going to take me towards the end?

CHAL RMAN Well, isn't that more logical, in the sense 10:47 you have more to say?

MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: It's a matter entirely for you, Chairman. We have what I would regard as a short submission.
CHA RMAN A11 right. Has anybody got any problem with 10:47 that? No, they don't. Al1 right. Mr. O'Higgins, please.

## SUBM SSI ON BY MR. O H GG NS:

MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman,
I am going to make some submissions to you on behalf of Superintendent Taylor and if I could just indicate the manner in which I am approaching it. I am making a short submission at the outset to place Superintendent Taylor in context, and then I am going to go through the questions which you yourself posed and asked the parties to address their minds to, so I was going to go through those questions, and then $I$ am going to do an overview on the other side of those questions. It is,
as I say, a short submission, I hope it won't suffer for its brevity in that regard. It's very clear that you, Chairman, have an exceptionally good grasp of the facts as alleged by witnesses in their testimony, and in my respectful submission I will not be using my time 10:48 efficiently to go through any detailed analysis of that. Mr. Lehane is in a slightly different position because he is with regard to very defined exchanges. But I am not going to approach it in that way.

If I could say, Chairman, in terms of the overview, Superintendent Taylor has made a protected disclosure. The essence and core of the disclosure is that he negatively briefed the media with regard to Sergeant McCabe, that he specifically did so by placing emphasis on the fact that Sergeant McCabe had been the subject of a previous investigation of sexual abuse on a minor, that he had been exonerated as a result of that investigation, but that he was angered as a member of the force to have been investigated in that manner and, hence, had baggage when it came to this issue and he was motivated by spite and i11-wi11 and so forth.

In terms of assessing that allegation, Chairman, that allegation would be assessed in the way that any
allegation is assessed: You would look at what facts can be proved independently of it. In this instance, Superintendent Taylor nominated up to a dozen journalists whom he said would be in a position to
confirm that which he was alleging was true. I think it's the case that ten of those journalists have confirmed in stark terms that they did not receive any such briefing, and two of the journalists weren't
willing to comment.

There are, it seems to me, three particular criticisms levelled at Superintendent Taylor when it comes to assessing his credibility. One of those is that the briefing itself lacks any real specificity, it's vague in the extreme. Secondly, the timing as to when he spoke to these individuals and the context of the discussion is lacking in any detail. And thirdly, it is suggested that he does not come neutral to the position, that he is a person who had very serious and significant employment issues and other issues of a more grave nature, and that he himself has improper motive, because whatever information he has at his disposal he is manipulating it to put other people with whom he has grievances in a bad light.

Can I say on his behalf, in my respectful submission, all of those are very valid complaints, and they are, in my respectful submission, conceded by me as matters to which the Tribunal would properly take into account.

Because his evidence is as bare as it is, I am limited in terms of any submission $I$ can make in attempting to build it from the ground up, but if I had to point to
one thing, it would be this: If Superintendent Taylor decided in September 2017 to make these allegations in the terms that he did and with the level of knowledge that he had at that point, it is, in my respectful submission, remarkable that allegations which, on their $00: 52$ own, would seem to be -- on their own, I mean in isolation, preposterous, it is, in my respectful submission, either an incredible coincidence or there is something to it; that the very person which he claims was directing him to do this, on the evidence before the Tribunal, on five different occasions, in three different locations, within a very short time period, was, if the Tribunal accepts the evidence as given, and I'm only for the sake of this submission positing that it can do that, but if it does accept that, Superintendent Taylor has decided to come up with a version of events which on the face of it is preposterous, and yet, there are those instances where something very, very similar is going on. And if you conclude, by reference to the three PAC witnesses,
Philip Boucher-Hayes and the episode with Mr. Kean, that Commissioner Callinan was engaging in a pattern of discrediting Sergeant McCabe, either that is something that fits with Superintendent Taylor's general allegations of being instructed to do things in a
particular way, or Superintendent Taylor has got extremely lucky in that he fished out of virtually nowhere a scheme of things that actually matched quite closely some of the behaviour complained about with
respect to Commissioner Callinan. Now, I would just ask, as on overview position, that you would bear that in mind.

If I could turn, Chairman, to the questions as posed by 10:55 you, and some of them we are only in a position or deemed it appropriate to give very brief answers to; others we have sought to develop because, particularly the instance about confirmation and corroboration and that aspect of it. But if I could run through the questions in the order that they appear.

The first question is: what kind of talk, communication are or innuendo can fairly be said to come within the terms of reference, and what is the full extent of any calumny or detraction against Maurice McCabe that should be regarded as proven?

Now, in my respectful submission, Chairman, there is a distinction to be drawn -- and perhaps Ms. Harris might 10:55 be a good example of it, there is a distinction to be drawn between, for the Tribunal's purposes, between gossip that is circulated and material that can be connected in some way or other to Superintendent Taylor. And in that regard, some journalists have given evidence that they were in general terms aware of the story as far back as 2011. But mindful that the first term of reference of the Tribunal is very heavily anchored in the protected disclosure and the manner of
media briefing and similarly with [b], the emphasis falls on the direction to journalists and to perhaps a slightly lesser extent [c], it seems to me that if you are of the view that a large number of people out here were aware of this allegation, mindful of the fact that you are not being asked to investigate or make findings that people were speaking ill of him but rather you are being asked in a very funneled and focused way to see whether that came from Superintendent Taylor, if no connection is made, it seems to me you are left in a position of saying, well, there is no connection made and the only remaining matter you have to look at is if the volume of material is just so high that it poses a question for you, well, because this was so out there and because it had a particular prominence at a particular time, could that point to maybe supporting that, as a matter of probability, it would have to go back to Superintendent Taylor. And in posing that question I want to make clear I'm not by any means suggesting the answer is in the affirmative, but that is its only relevance, in my respectful submission.

If I could turn to the second question: To what extent are political, journalists and Garda rumours or talk necessarily to be considered? And in my respectful submission, it's the same answer.

Turning then to question 3: Is there any truth in the protected disclosure of Superintendent Taylor? Is he a
witness whose evidence in any respect can be accepted? should it as a matter of prudence be subject to a corroboration/caution warning?

If I could answer those questions in reverse, Chairman, it might be a more efficient way for me to deal with it. As you have pointed out, the Tribunal is not bound by the Rules of Evidence but they are always useful beacons and, in my respectful submission, there is no getting away from this; my client is handicapped by virtue of the criticisms that can be levelled at his evidence. Now, some of the authorities refer to more neutral language than the criminal corroboration warning, they talk about the need to exercise caution before relying on a person's evidence, but it of course 10:59 should be pointed out that notwithstanding the gravity of the Baskerville warning there is appended in the very last line of it that notwithstanding the danger of acting on the uncorroborated evidence of an accomplice, and I concede incidentally for the purpose of this submission by client fits the description of being an accomplice, notwithstanding that, the trier of fact can still rely on the evidence if satisfied to the appropriate standard of proof that it's true.

So I would not demur from any suggestion that the Tribunal should approach his evidence with caution and that as a matter of practicality caution would involve looking, where possible, for evidence that either
confirms, which is consistent, or corroborates, not strictly in the criminal sense, which is something independent of the testimony that connects the accused to the offence, but independent in the sense that in this instance I would perhaps make the submission that something would be independent if you were satisfied that the different accounts which you are looking at were made independently of each other; in other words, if you were to look at Mr. McGuinness, if you were to look at Mr. McCarthy, look at Mr. Deasy, if you were to 11:01 look at Mr. Boucher-Hayes, if you were to be satisfied that there was no collusion in those accounts, that they were all rendered independently of each other, that is something, in my respectful submission, which would exceed mere confirmation and might rise to corroboration.

Moving to the middle question: Can his evidence be accepted in any respect? This, Chairman, is a matter which the answer can only somewhat tritely, admittedly, 11:01 be in the affirmative. But the reason as to why that is so is laid out in the authorities. It is enshrined in the Gilligan judgment where there were many complaints about the quality of the witnesses, and indeed, an argument that was advanced to the effect that the manner in which the evidence had been gathered and the quality of the speaker was such that the evidence simply should not be received. And all of the way up to the Supreme Court there was the unanimous
view that that evidence should always be received subject to the usual admissibility rules, and it was under the heading of receiving every man's evidence, which in turn is a case which was decided in the court of Appeal, I understand you were the counsel in it many 11:02 years previously, in a case where the court deemed, notwithstanding certain prohibitions on a wife giving evidence against a man that certain evidence should be received, and any legislative prohibition on that would not be constitutional. The net effect of that is that all evidence can be received, all evidence is capable of being believed, and the test as to whether it should be believed, in my submission, is twofold: One, as in a witness with Superintendent Taylor, the necessary caution is required, the necessary -- the desirable confirmatory or corroborative elements have to be assessed, but at the end of the day, Chairman, you put all those things together, it's not a mathematical sum, you have to decide is it believable as a matter of probability. And as one of your own questions
highlights later, something can point east but in certain circumstances that might entitle you nonetheless to conclude west. So is his evidence capable of being believed? In my submission, the answer is yes. Should it be believed? That is a function for you, factoring all the relevant considerations together.

Next question: Is it possible to tell from a false
denial, for instance, but not limited to Superintendent Taylor to any journalists, that the opposite to an assertion is in fact the truth? And as I think I have given an indication, that can occur, but in my respectful submission, the number of occasions when it can occur are very minute, because if a witness says something, even something that is deemed to be false, it could not follow, in my respectful submission, that the reason why someone has asserted something that is false or incorrect even, is because the opposite is true. And one need look no further than the Lucas warning that is given in criminal cases to say that people tell untruths for a mixture of reasons, and to decide the significance of the truth you have to decide how material the lie is and examine the motives for telling it, and it's only when you exclude other possibilities that you are left with the position that they are telling it to advance some particular position.

Next question: Is what Superintendent Taylor claims to have been done on behalf of Commissioner Callinan an understatement of the reality of what he in fact did? Did he do whatever he did at the behest of commissioner Callinan or did he do it with the acquiescence or any knowledge of Deputy Commissioner o'Sullivan? If I could take the second question first, it might be more efficient.

The trite answer is, that is a matter for you, Chairman, looking at the evidence, to decide whether he did these things at the behest of Commissioner Callinan. Without running the risk of being repetitive, if Commissioner Callinan was uninvolved in this case, which is to say there was no suggestion that he had done anything improper, my client would be pushing a stone uphil1, in my respectful submission, in persuading this Tribunal that he was acting in a scheme that was concerted or a joint enterprise. But the answer to that question, in my respectful submission, again lies in the Tribunal's own analysis of the PAC members and Mr. Boucher-Hayes and the Kean incident. And having analysed that, in my respectful submission, if it comes to a conclusion that Commissioner callinan was pushing a line in a very concerted way, the question then arises: If Superintendent Taylor was pushing a similar line, is that mere coincidence or is it because there was a scheme in place? In my respectful submission, the Tribunal would more likely come down that the explanation is there was -- they were working in tandem rather than completely separately and in ignorance of each other.

With regard to Deputy Commissioner O'Sullivan, the considerably thinner, because, unlike Commissioner Callinan, there are no actions that can be pointed to independent of my client which seem to be capable of
interconnecting or interacting with my own client's account, and you are simply left with assertions by my client that she was aware at all times with respect to what was going on and that he had told her. So it's a much thinner case and it's a question whether looking at the evidence in the round, whether you are prepared to accept it as being broadly truthful.

With regard to the question of whether or not what my client said is, in fact, the tip of the iceberg or understated, I would make the following submission. It would be a counter -- what I would describe as a counter-intuitive finding, but truth, as I say, is not a geometric exercise, but why do I say it's counter-intuitive? Well, a person makes an allegation and the manner in which the allegation is outlined permits certain matters to be checked. A checking exercise is carried out, and the allegation at the end of that checking exercise is unsupported. The first base inference that might be capable from drawing from that is in briefing the journalists in the manner described, it's a fabrication. If you wanted to take a kinder view of it, you might say it was exaggerated or grossly exaggerated. But if you are to draw an inference which, in my respectful submission, would be at the other end of the spectrum, which would be well, actually, in some way or another this state of affairs seems to indicate that not on7y did he say what he said, but he said things that went beyond that, if you
are to get to that point, in my respectful submission, you would only be able to reach it by rejecting the sworn testimony of the ten journalists and, while one cannot say weight of numbers is of itself persuasive, the fact when there is a consistency of response, that, 11:10 in my respectful submission, would point away from that. And equally, when you pose the point of someone says A, could it actually mean the direct opposite of A, if you reach that point, it is, in my respectful submission, ultimately because, logically, you are pointed towards A but inexorably in assessing the truth you reach at point $B$ and it's not always an entirely logical exercise. But even though it may not ultimately be a logical exercise it is, in my respectful submission, guided in the first instances by 11:10 principles of logic, particularly when inferences are being drawn and particularly when there is no primary evidence. So, in my respectful submission, it would be extremely difficult and I might perhaps go as far as to say as a matter of law, in the absence of primary evidence, un7ess very, very clear sets of facts or a set of facts can be identified which would justify the inference, which would be actually what the journalists say is wrong and it went further.

Turning to the next question: To what extent, if at a11, is the account of Sergeant McCabe as to what he was told by superintendent reliable and accurate despite contradiction by Mrs. Taylor and Superintendent

Taylor? Could I make clear, Chairman, that in my submissions here, nothing I am saying implicitly even casts any doubt on the integrity of Sergeant McCabe. The question is --
CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. O'Higgins, I don't mean to interrupt but I really don't see how you can possibly say that. I mean --
MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: I am not.
CHA RMAN That is fine. But I mean, if two people say absolutely diametrically opposed things, what am I supposed to think? That one is a fantasist? That one is a liar? That somehow they got things totally wrong? It's not a challenge but I am just finding it very hard to see, that is all.
MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: I would say, Chairman, there is a middle ground which is that someone is an unreliable historian but they are recounting to the best of their recollection. And for Sergeant McCabe to have, first of all, been brought to his attention that Superintendent Taylor wanted to talk to him and to have had the information imparted to him which was imparted to him, was obviously a very, very significant event and may well be that in the course of recollecting it later, some things were misunderstood and I am speaking specifically here incidentally about the suggestion that Superintendent Taylor said that he was mere, a conduit of prepared scripts that were forwarded to the media. And I would just make a couple of observations, Chairman, for what they are worth.

Experience dictates when you take histories from people, whether it be in the capacity of a solicitor or counsel or journalist, or any other instances where histories are frequently taken, there can be things that get misunderstood, and sometimes an account has gone through two or three times before a fact which you had in the narrative is actually proven or established to be incorrect. And there is nothing sinister about it. But the second thing, Chairman, is this: In my respectful submission, Superintendent Taylor must have been conscious that when he said these things, that it wasn't going to stay within the four walls, and he must have been conscious, in my respectful submission, that questions would be asked. Now, it's always, I concede, 11:14 a very weak position for a person to say, well, if I was going to tell a lie, do you think $I$ would have told a lie as silly as that? Because regrettably, analysis of situation where untruths are told, often do unearth lies which are stupid. But this is a garda
superintendent who knows the way investigation works and it seems, in my respectful submission, inevitable that it must -- he must have realised very -- he must have realised even before he said that, if he was going to say it, that it would be proved to be a nonsense. And it's not something, on his accounts, that is to say, accounts rendered by him and not through third parties, that he has ever asserted. And in my respectful submission, it is a misunderstanding.

Next question: To what extent do Sergeant McCabe's reports of Superintendent Taylor -- that is the same question in relation to phone devices. Should a preference be made or what might be the effect of making a preference for Sergeant McCabe's protected disclosure?

If you decide, Chairman, that Superintendent Taylor told a lie about that - in other words, there is no confusion - does that damage Superintendent Taylor's credibility? Yes, it does. It would suggest that he was -- wanted to get Sergeant McCabe even more resentful and more angry than he otherwise would be, although, again, in my respectful submission, given the 11:16 nature of what my client was saying and given that he was saying Commissioner Callinan was directing it de facto, it's difficult, in my respectful submission, to see how the fact that he was authoring the texts themselves would achieve that aim.

Of what relevance are the allegations of Superintendent Taylor as to his phones and the seizures thereof?

Now, can I just say with regard to that, Chairman, this 11:16 is a matter which we have given some thought to, because it does not make a lot of sense that a guard who is familiar with phone evidence would seek to find comfort or succour in it if he was aware, in fact, that
the trail was gone cold. And the only thing that we can point to is this: when my client was arrested as part of the clerkin investigation, phone records were put to him with regard to the Roma events, which were in October 2013, and it now appears that those questions which were directed to Roma in 2013, were put on the basis of billing records and not call data records, the distinction being that a billing record simply shows calls and when they were made and received; call data records have significantly more information with regard to the communications and with regard to texts, I believe, as to what was said. And that would appear to be the only submission I can make as to why he entertained a confidence that the phones would support him, when, in fact, there was nothing there either way.
of what relevance are the allegations of Superintendent Taylor as to Commissioner o'sullivan, Detective Superintendent McGowan, Chief Superintendent Clerkin and his false High Court application?

They are relevant in the context of Commissioner o'Sullivan to this extent: My client clearly bears an animus to Commissioner o'sullivan and was of the view, incorrectly as it now turns out, that, somehow or other, she was a driving force behind his arrest and/or was using the arrest improperly to sideline him or to discredit him and in some way or other to protect
himself. That is not in the case. But if the -- if, Chairman, you say this is a man with an animus, this is a man with an agenda and his judicial review -- his state of mind in bringing that judicial review was informed by that, that counts against him, in my respectful submission, and that is a factor which would be included in the list which would indicate that his evidence was to be assessed with caution.

With regard to Chief Superintendent McGowan, or Detective Superintendent McGowan, in my respectful submission, that is something of a much less significant factor in the case. It's a human element in the case that Detective Superintendent McGowan happened to be involved in the investigation. on a human level, it's not surprising, in my respectful submission, that my client would resent it, I'm not saying with justification, but would resent it, and it's, in my respectful submission, it's not a significant factor.

With regard to Chief Superintendent Clerkin, my client -- and his judicial review application, my client was examined and cross-examined extensively on this, and two facts -- two matters emerge, in my respectful
submission: Detective Superintendent Taylor has unequivocally conceded that the investigation was a proper one, that there was an entitlement to arrest and detain him, that the custody regulations were
implemented and that he was interviewed in accordance with the terms of all of those custody regulations, and that is an unequivocal response by him and that speaks for itself, in my respectful submission. As far as the High Court application is concerned, I would urge, Chairman, that the Commission would approach that with a degree of caution. There was never anything determined in the High court. He has made it clear, rightly or wrongly, because, in my respectful submission, we are talking about a state of mind here, that he greatly resents the manner in which he was arrested, and by that I mean Mr. Clifford had it in the Examiner the night before, Mr. Browne was promo-ing it on TV3, there was a TV3 satellite van outside Balbriggan Garda Station, there was very informed articles in the newspaper, that he resents all that, and he is of the view, rightly or wrongly: I should have been brought down and had a voluntary statement. And I know, Chairman, you made an observation, and I understand it perfectly, that he had some warped view he should be brought down, you didn't quite say for tea and buns but wasn't a million miles away from that, and I could see a Garda commissioner saying, look, there is to be no voluntary statement here, we are not leaving ourselves open to an allegation of favourable treatment, he will be treated the same as every other suspect. But Detective Superintendent David Taylor's mindset was, I am a superintendent, no person of that rank has ever been arrested before, and, in fact, I
went down for a follow-up interview which was voluntary, in Ringsend or Sandymount Garda Station, and everything was in order.

The next question then is: why were disciplinary proceedings withdrawn?

I can answer that very easily, Chairman; we don't know, but we did forward the correspondence we received to the Tribunal in respect of that.

Is there any inference to be drawn from changes of phones, loss of computers or phones or failure to remember PIN numbers?

In our respectful submission, there is no inference to be drawn from Superintendent Taylor's use of mobile phones, the frequency with which he changed handsets or his inability to remember PIN numbers. We cannot see anything either side of the line on that.

To what extent, if any, can the allegations of John McGuinness, Mr. Boucher-Hayes, Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Deasy be relied on? And even though merely guided by the Rules of Evidence and not bound by them, is this 11:23 Tribunal in a position say that they corroborate or support each other?

Well, you will, I think, anticipate our position on
that, Chairman, from what $I$ have said already. They are all, in my respectful submission, very respectable parties. They are all people who have achieved very well in their walks of life. Conversely, they are not people who appear to have any axe to grind. And they are people who were subjected to a detailed examination by the Tribunal team and cross-examination by al1 relevant parties. So are they someone who are capable of being relied on? Most definitely, in my submission.

And do they -- are they confirmatory? They are.

Are they corroborative? Well, I'm respectfully submitting that an important element here as to what might push something from being merely confirmatory to corroborative is, if you ask yourself the question, are these four or five accounts, are they independently existing in respect of each other? Are they uninfluenced by each other? And if you come down that some or all of them are, that, in my respectful
submission, when you are looking for coincidence versus pattern from which inferences can be drawn, the more uninfluenced, the more independent they are of each other, the more likely they are to be true, in my respectful submission.

Next question: If they are believed to be accepted as probable, what is the full extent of the allegation of calumny against Maurice McCabe? Is Superintendent

Taylor reducing his role, and, if so, does this factor lessen or completely dissolve his credibility?

We11, the full extent of the calumny is that important persons who are to determine the seriousness and gravity of Sergeant McCabe's complaint, there was an attempt surreptitiously, and in a way that people were not accountable, to influence the decision-makers that he was not a person to be relied upon, and furthermore, in approaching it in that way, it was done not just simply that his honesty was being put in issue, but for the most part, and I am excluding Mr. Deasy from this, who was simply told he wasn't to be trusted, but in the other instances the parties were left in no doubt that he'd performed, allegedly, or had been scrutinised for doing something, either outright sexual abuse or something unspeakable, so the leve1 of calumny is high, in my respectful submission.

With regard to if Superintendent Taylor was reducing his role, does this dissolve his credibility? well, you have heard my submissions, Judge, on -- or, Chairman, on that earlier, but, oddly enough, it doesn't, and it gives me no comfort to say it, but I am making the submission because the Tribunal has asked for it, does it dissolve his credibility, simply on the basis if you were to use an analogy of a criminal prosecution where the prosecution have relied upon an informer or someone who was part of a gang and that
person minimised their involvement, which frequently, perhaps invariably has happened in those types of cases, fact-finders have been -- it has been deemed that fact-finders should be allowed to determine, notwithstanding that they have been demonstrated to tell lies on important and material issues, can they be relied upon as witnesses to the truth of something beyond doubt? And the answer is, yes, they are so capable. And the answer, when put to the actual test, whether it be judge or jury, is to be -- find that they 11:27 were, in fact, so capable.

I am in the rather unusual position, Chairman, when I make my out remarks at the end of these questions, I am in this very unusual position that, to put my client's 11:27 case, I actually have to persuade you that he behaved in a grossly improper way. It is an odd position to be in. But notwithstanding that he has behaved in a grossly improper way, I will be making a submission to you that there is a line that the Tribunal can consider 11:28 drawing in assessing that level of culpability.

Moving on to number 14:

What led to the visits of Ms. McCann, Eavan Murray and Paul williams to the home of Ms. D?

We11, the Court has heard evidence of that. My client's position is that with regard to Mr. williams,
it was a fait accompli when it came to his attention. with regard to Ms. McCann and Ms. Murray, I think he indicated in his statement he was aware that they were going up there, but he had not prompted it, he did not discourage it and he did not have the information to hand as to direct them to any particular place, and we would say, therefore, was not involved in that.

Has privilege been properly and honestly relied on and is there any evidence proffered by these parties that is reliable? what, in truth, happened? Did the visits have any Garda inspiration?

The only one, in my respectful submission, which conclusively demonstrates any Garda input is, Superintendent Reilly was a contact point for Mr. Williams.
CHAl RMAN Yes, o'reilly, Mr. o'Higgins.
MR. MCHAEL OHGGN: Or o'reilly, I beg your pardon. with regard to the journalistic privilege and has it been properly and honestly relied on, the difficulty, in my respectful submission, in assessing that is that you are effectively looking at something behind the curtain and you don't really know what is behind the curtain so you are left in an awkward position of having to surmise in circumstances where there are perhaps primary facts it would be very useful to have at your disposal before you drew inferences.

On the question of whether privilege is honestly asserted, in my submission that depends upon your view on the evidence tendered in support of the claim. Superintendent Taylor's position has been clear, he has given an unequivocal waiver in respect of that.

There are conflicts in the evidence as to what happened with regard to the visits, and particularly with Mr. Williams and Superintendent Taylor. That is just a matter for the Tribunal to determine in ordinary course.

To what extent, if any, does the evidence of the D family remain relevant?

The evidence is still relevant, in our submission, so far as it does support evidence of local Garda involvement in promulgating allegations against Sergeant McCabe. It's also relevant to conflicts of evidence between Ms. McCann and Alison O'Reilly and may influence the Tribunal when it comes to assessing either the reliability and/or credibility of those witnesses. But as that is not a matter directly connected with us, I don't propose to make a submission on it.

To what extent is any incorrect invocation of journalistic privilege such as to give rise to any inference, and, if so, what inference does any
incorrect invocation of journalistic privilege give rise to?

And we would say, Chairman, that, in our submission, the emphasis falls on the raising of privilege, not whether it's properly or improperly raised, because we would say the real question is whether the claim of privilege gives rise to a concern that the journalist relying upon it was negatively briefed in the manner alleged by Superintendent Taylor, and we would say that concern arises irrespective of whether the privilege is properly or improperly asserted, and we would also make the submission that if you can't exclude that possibility, and that possibility being that behind the claim there may have been a discussion with Superintendent Taylor along the lines he says, if that can't be excluded, it would seem the Tribunal should draw an inference that it's possible that Superintendent Taylor was telling the truth in that regard. And it's submitted that other inferences that ${ }_{11: 32}$ could be drawn, in effect that no briefing took place at all or a briefing that went further than alleged, that they are less inferences and matter of speculation.

The next question is answered in the previous one. And we are up to 18 :

To what extent do journalistic clashes, apart from that
between Alison O'Reilly and Debbie McCann, require to be resolved or even recorded in a report to the Houses of the Oireachtas, and, if so, why?

And I don't think I can profitably take up your time on 11:32 that, Chairman. It's not a matter really directed to Superintendent Taylor.

To what extent does the Tribunal have to report or comment on political involvement or the actions of any individual public representative?

We would submit there is no obligation on the Tribunal to report on the actions of any political representative or political involvement of any witness. 11:32 The Tribunal may be required to do so where it's relevant to an issue in evidence. The Tribunal has a discretion to make observations about how political representatives dealt with the issue of sergeant McCabe, in the event that it finds such actions were unhelpful and led up to the setting of a tribunal of inquiry and/or prolonged hearings into the matter. It's further submitted that the Tribunal should exercise that comment -- that discretion to comment sparingly.

So that deals with the questions that were posed, Chairman.

And if I could just say, by reference to an overview as an out, the Garda Síochána -- An Garda Síochána is a large organisation, and Commissioner Callinan - and I am using the titles they had at the relevant time made a number of references in the course of his evidence to the Garda family, and that can have a very benign meaning. we all know the benefits of a nurturing environment that a family provides, but not all families and not all family situations are healthy, and sometimes within that family environment people can feel very inhibited. And it does strike one, in my respectful submission, that there are an awful lot of people out there still who know a lot more about what has gone on in this -- in these matters that the Tribunal of Inquiry has been inquiring into, and Mr. Ferry has drawn my attention to a remark by you about the number of people who know things about it, and very, very, very few of them have come forward, and my client has come forward, and he is what I would describe in, I suppose, slightly colloquial or vernacular terms, a whistleblower. And whistleblowers, I am talking fairly generically here, but generically in the sense that it's an observation that can be perhaps universally or frequently applied, whistleblowers are very often damaged people. For instance, they may well have operated within a particular milieu which they must have known or should have known, had they given the matter appropriate consideration, was not an appropriate way to do their
business. But while part of that milieu were nonetheless satisfied not only to keep their head down but to be a cog or a -- even part of the engine driving that behaviour. And there may be a conversion, something of a Pauline conversion, when circumstances change and they find themselves on the outside looking in and seeing things through a different perspective, a different prism, and that person now comes forward with information. Now, again, Chairman, if I could use the analogy, because there are, in my respectful
submission, some useful comparisons within it; in circumstances where the State in criminal prosecutions used people who, for want of a better description, were gangland members, those witnesses' testimony was attacked and their characters, which in general were -- 11:36 they were people of poor character and they were people in respect of enough was known about their actions to be able to demonstrate very effectively the badness of that particular character and the fact that they were willing to tell a lie to advance a position and so forth, but nonetheless, the position in those cases always was that if you were drawing from a particular source, the persons in respect of whom you could draw from had, by definition, to be very flawed persons; they weren't choir boys, was the phrase that was used in some of the cases, and nor could you expect them to be. Now, this isn't murder and it isn't gangland crime, and that part of the analogy has no interface, but where there is a crossover, in my respectful
submission, is that if Superintendent Taylor was involved in this activity, which was completely indefensible activity, he is a flawed character. There is no getting away from that. But equally, in my respectful submission, and I don't make any apology for 11:37 this, he did a brave thing. It could not have been easy to have invited Sergeant McCabe to his home and said, 'here is what I have done'. It could not have been easy to have made a protected disclosure and to have stepped outside the fold of the family to make those allegations. I want to make it very clear: I am not looking for any favouritism or favoured status because he has done that, $I$ am not for a moment suggesting that, somehow or other, his evidence starts prim facie slightly more favourable than other persons' evidence, I am putting it into the mix in the same way I am realistically acknowledging the shortcomings in his evidence. But I would point out it would have been very easy for -- it would have been easier, $I$ think it's fair to say, far easier for Superintendent Taylor, who, as he described in his evidence, was in a bad place when he made these statements, it would have been -- it would have been easier for him to just simply keep his head down. He didn't do that. Now, the question arises as to whether 11:39 he actually has something to contribute in terms of the determinations which this Tribunal has to reach. And no doubt and quite correctly and -- there is, as I have conceded, objective premises upon which there are
doubts in terms of his testimony, and people who represent other parties here will correctly hone in on that, and all that's there. I mean, I am not running away from it; it would be foolish to attempt do so. But at the same time, you do have to ask yourself, why did he come out? And if you are saying he is a bitter man who simply wanted to use this as a staging post and a platform to attack people with respect to whom he bore grievances, but on the run of the evidence, in my respectful submission, he liked Commissioner Callinan, the two men had a good rapport, they trusted each other, that trust may have been abused in the sense that they had a rapport to do things which the Tribunal is investigating and may ultimately conclude they had no entitlement to do, but he doesn't appear to be a man 11:40 who actually has a grievance with Commissioner Callinan. And insofar as he says that Deputy Commissioner, and later Commissioner, O'Sullivan stood four square with Commissioner Callinan, it's to be noted, in my respectful submission, he put his evidence 11:40 where he put it. He didn't, in my respectful submission, push the boat out on it. He simply said they had conversations. When he was cross-examined on that, there was a lack of specificity, and that is where it lies. And I would ask you to bear in mind 11:41 that he did come forward and came forward in circumstances where it must have been very difficult to do.

And I would finish, Chairman, by simply making the point that I made at the outset:

Is Superintendent Taylor a fantasist? Is
Superintendent Taylor a person who had a certain amount 11:41 of information and saw an opportunity to damage other people by making this statement? Or is he somebody who was, admittedly very belatedly, troubled by what he had done and wanted to let, in the first instance, because in the first instance, let's be clear, I don't think anybody anticipated a tribunal of inquiry, even one as efficient as this, running for 100 days to investigate it, he told Sergeant McCabe, he followed it up with a protected disclosure. He could not, in my respectful submission, have been looking so many hurdles down to us being present here today, and, in my respectful submission, his motive in that regard, admittedly very late, was a benign one. And I ask the Tribunal to give that full consideration, and I know the Tribunal will give that full consideration. But I come back again: 11:42 If he was a fantasist, if he was somebody who simply wanted to throw a spanner in the works, he was a very lucky fantasist and he was a very fortunate spanner-thrower because further investigation has revealed that the man whom he said was directing him in 11:42 this was extremely active and, moreover, in the case of Mr. Philip Boucher-Hayes, was nominating my client as the go-to person for further information. And if you accept Mr. Boucher-Hayes' evidence on that point, in my
respectful submission it goes a significant way to taking this out of conspiracy and fantasy and firmly planting a seed which grows into an oak tree as far as that aspect is concerned.
CHAl RMAN Thank you, Mr. O'Higgins. Mr. Gillane, would you like to make a submission for RTÉ prior to lunch?

MR. G LLANE: Yes. I will be 15 minutes, I think, at the most.

## SUBM SSI ON BY MR. G LLANE:

MR. G LLANE: Thank you, Chairman, and I do have a speaking note that I can hand in to you if that is of any use to you, Chairman. What I propose to do is to address you briefly, I hope, in relation to [k] in the first instance, to deal with the February 2014 story and its alleged relationship to [k], and then, lastly, to deal with [a], [b] and [h] together, Chairman.

And in dealing with [k] at the outset, I do so on the basis that this is a discrete term of reference directly referring to RTÉ, and I say that the actual terms in which [k] is expressed are vital to the exercise the Tribunal must undertake and that the true import and meaning of the terms of [k] must not be lost.

It's submitted on behalf of RTÉ that this term of reference does not mandate some sort of broad inquiry
into journalism or journalistic standards, nor does it involve asking what might or might not have been included in some notional reasonable report on the o'Higgins Commission report. It cannot be over-emphasised, in my submission, that this term of reference is a targeted inquiry in relation to a very specific allegation, the elements of which involve the suggestion that Commissioner o'Sullivan herself, using briefing material prepared in Garda HQ , influenced or attempted to influence RTÉ broadcasts on the 9th May.

Now, in the first instance on behalf of RTÉ, it's submitted that, unlike any of the other terms of reference with which you are dealing, there was never any primary or direct evidence whatsoever to support the proposition as expressed in [k]. The wording in [k] appears to borrow largely, if not entirely, from the protected disclosure of Sergeant McCabe dated the 26th September 2016, wherein he states that he was on work-related stress leave, due, amongst other things, to a disgraceful series of broadcasts on RTÉ on the 9th May.

In the same document, Sergeant McCabe goes on to state that he's now satisfied on impeccable authority that those broadcasts were "pl anned and orchestrated by Commíssi oner Nói rín Ơ Sul Ii van personally using bri efing material prepared at Garda HQ. "

And the rest of the protected disclosure is then silent on that topic.

In interview with your investigators, Chairman, on the 6th December 2017, he stated that the impeccable authority that he was referring to was John Barrett of Human Resources.

Now, in fairness to Sergeant McCabe, he has always been clear that the sole basis for his belief in this regard is what he asserts John Barrett said to him and that he has absolutely no other information in relation to this. And manifestly, there is now a significant conflict on this question as Mr. Barrett denies that this was said, and that is a matter for resolution ultimately by you.

However, it's submitted on behalf of RTÉ that even apart from that conflict, which is obviously very, very important, it's respectfully submitted that the proposition housed in [k] never, in fact, gets out of the starting blocks. In the first instance, we say that grave findings would have to be made against former Commissioner o'sullivan before one could even consider drawing the conclusions that are being contended for against RTÉ and Paul Reynolds. Former Commissioner o'Sullivan explicitly denies discussing the O'Higgins Commission report with Mr. Reynolds or indeed giving it to him. She has also explicitly
denied ever trying to influence RTÉ or any of our broadcasts in general or specifically in relation to the O'Higgins Commission report. There is no document, no text, no communication, supportive of such a proposition during what the Tribunal has referred to as 11:47 the target time, and, in truth, in terms of her evidence here, there appears to be no challenge to her evidence in that regard.

Further, not only does former Commissioner O'Sullivan make plain that she did not influence the 9th May reporting, she has said that she would have wanted an entirely different focus on the o'Higgins Report and that the RTÉ reports, in fact, did not strike the tone she would have wanted. It appears that the broadcasts on the 9th May managed to simultaneously upset both Sergeant McCabe and former Commissioner O'Sullivan at a time when the sting of the allegation against her was that she, in essence, authored or moulded the broadcasts for her purposes. Further, we say that the unchallenged evidence of Ray Burke, the senior news editor, is that he, in fact, directed Paul Reynolds to try and get his hands on the report, which was diametrically opposed to a claim that Mr. Reynolds had been fed a Garda story that he then brought to RTÉ.

Mr. Reynolds has also explicitly denied receiving briefing material from former Commissioner o'Sullivan or being influenced by her in any way in relation to
the report. Indeed, he clearly stated that Garda HQ had "no idea" what he was doing. And it's of some relevance, we say, that these broadcasts take place some two years after the so-called Taylor campaign, or alleged campaign, is supposed to have ended.

Sergeant McCabe himself agreed, when questioned by the Chairman, that he did not believe that RTÉ was so "spi nel ess" that they would accede to a request to spin a report in favour of the gardaí. while he felt that the report was one-sided, again he said his sole basis for including it in his protected disclosure in the terms that he did was because of what he says Mr. Barrett told him. Importantly, during these exchanges between you, Chairman, and the witness, counsel for Sergeant McCabe intervened to suggest that the broadcast and the leaked report was "an excl usi ve", and, after further questioning, Sergeant McCabe then indicated that he wished to agree with his counsel. This was repeated after you indicated that now was an opportunity to give evidence on the topic rather than to simply agree with counsel, and Sergeant McCabe indicated that he had on three occasions explicitly no evidence in this regard.

There was then a second intervention which is of some importance in the context of what we now know, Chairman. Counse1 for Sergeant McCabe then made a second intervention on the basis of a submission that
there was "accompanyi ng document ation" with the leaked report directing Mr. Reynolds to take a particular line and this could be divined from what appeared to be a question-and-answer script in the broadcast. The basis for both of these interventions on which you are being invited to draw inferences against RTÉ and Mr. Reynolds are plainly wrong.

Firstly, this was not an exclusive, and it's beyond doubt now that a number of journalists and media organisations had access to the O'Higgins Commission report prior to the 9th May, and these include John Mooney, Mick Clifford, Philip Boucher-Hayes, and stories had run in print media and on the radio, and the Tribunal has heard in particular in relation to some of the radio material, that on the 26th April Mr. Mooney engaged in a discussion where it was put to him by an interviewer that Sergeant McCabe's claims had been "rubbi shed". This isn't in the terms of reference, but plain7y was a matter of upset to Sergeant McCabe.

Secondly, there is no evidence at all of any accompanying documentation as suggested, and the use of a script, far from being sinister, was openly acknowledged by Mr. Reynolds as a necessary part of live broadcasting and was written by him, and, significantly, this evidence was corroborated by Mr. Burke, and the Tribunal has seen evidence of the
genesis of the script originating from within RTÉ rather than externally.

We respectfully submit that the task of the Tribunal again in this area is not to engage in some sort of quality analysis of individual pieces of journalism, I think that has already been acknowledged, and we explicitly say that everyone is entitled to a view on any issue of public concern and any individual piece of journalism covering such an issue. we have already explicitly accepted that Sergeant McCabe was absolutely entitled to his own views on these matters and no attempt was made to budge him from those views. It may perhaps be of relevance in your determination, however, in this regard, to have regard to the following:

It does seem that Sergeant McCabe did not, in fact, hear or see most of the broadcasts after 8:20 a.m. on the 9th May, and, on his evidence, he may have been unaware of many of the references to him in those programmes as being never less than truthful, where his courage was applauded and that he had done the State some considerable service. It's not proposed to repeat here the details of the programmes - the Tribunal has the programmes - but it is submitted that a close reading of the actual words used during the broadcasts show any number of references to Sergeant McCabe's dedication, commitment, courage and public service, and all of those are undoubted facets of Sergeant McCabe's
career to date.

There is nothing in the broadcasts that could give rise to an inference that the proposition in [k] is established. Suffice it to say that the words 'liar' 11:52 and 'irresponsible' were never uttered in any broadcast, stil1 1ess could reasonably be said that Sergeant McCabe was branded as such by RTÉ.
CHA RMAN Well, the word 'liar' was used.
MR. G LLANE: No, I am going to come to that. The word $11: 52$ 'lie' was used, but not 'liar', which has an obvious broader connotation, and I meant to say that directly, and we will deal with that directly.
CHA RMAN A11 right. I didn't mean to challenge what you were saying. I do -- I do understand that
'irresponsible' certainly doesn't come into it. The word 'lie' comes in in its generic forms.

MR. G LLANE: Yes. We also say that notwithstanding our position in relation to the task of the Tribunal in relation to the analysis of the broadcasts, that it is apparent on the evidence that great care was taken in relation to the broadcasts themselves. It cannot be ignored, $I$ submit, that all of the broadcasts were the subject of a rigorous and structured editorial process. The Tribunal heard evidence from now-retired Ray Burke, 11:53 but is also aware of the involvement of other senior editors. The report was being worked on over the weekend prior to broadcast, and discussion as to when, what format and on what programmes the report would
feature were all the subject of internal discussion with no outside interference whatsoever.

Further factors are of relevance in relation to your assessment in this regard and I would ask the Tribunal to weigh these in the balance also.

Mr. Reynolds honestly raised a narrow issue of privilege and had not sought to invoke privilege in a vacuum and simply say 'I am not answering any questions'. He engaged with the privilege issue in relation to the O'Higgins Commission report and confirmed that he had more than one source and cross-referenced the contents of each report to ensure it was the same final report. He has said on oath that 11:54 the broadcasts were based on the O'Higgins Commission report and nothing else. There is a denial of the existence of any briefing material howsoever described and he has described his own approach to the construction of the reports and the editorial process
which can be examined. He has himself disclosed to the Tribunal various notes in relation to the script-writing process and has been subjected to cross-examination on those notes. where he has volunteered those notes, which are unstructured scraps of thought and contemporaneously-gathered information, it's submitted that the Tribunal should be slow to follow any invitation to draw critical conclusions from them. The use of the word 'lie' was explained in great
detail, and undoubtedly, Chairman, as you pointed out, the word 'lie' was included in some of the reports. This word was discussed between Mr. Reynolds and mr. Burke and the decision to use the word was not lightly made, still less made on the basis of any outside influence. I don't propose to argue whether any difference exists between a knowing untruth and a lie, but the word is used in a context where Mr. Reynolds made clear that Sergeant McCabe was right to be suspicious of the withdrawal of a statement of complaint in the context in which this happened and in interview Mr. Reynolds did point out that Judge o'higgins used the word 'untruth'.

It's important, we submit also, that the document itself, the o'Higgins Commission Report, is available to the Tribunal, and the Tribunal, in that sense, is not in any sense deprived of it, and, by having that document, every word of the 9th May broadcasts can be analysed.

We submit that it's the essence of the journalists' task to gather material, talk to sources, record relevant information as necessary to substantiate a story and thereafter to rely on accumulated material to 11:56 make judgment calls as to what can be put out into the public domain. Almost every word in the broadcasts can be sourced in the o'Higgins Commission Report, Chairman. During cross-examination by counse1 for the
former Commissioner, it was correctly observed that no one other than counsel for the Tribunal, properly performing her role in terms of putting available propositions, had suggested, in fact, to Paul Reynolds that he was influenced or shaped by anything that former Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan did or by any briefing documents. Mr. Reynolds was asked whether or not the broadcasts were the subject of complaint to the Broadcasting Complaints Commission, and he confirmed they were not. And it was also confirmed in evidence that, despite threats of legal action made on the day of the broadcast, no proceedings were ever issued in respect of those broadcasts, whereas other publications were subject to litigation.

We respectfully submit that the 24th February story is a matter which the Tribunal is also considering, and how that story has emerged as an issue in the course of your work is worth exploring. This story, as you know, was not the subject of litigation or complaint and was not itself contained in the terms of reference of the Tribunal. That is not a complaint that the Tribunal is not entitled to have regard to it. However, the weight that is attempted to be placed on it by counsel for Sergeant McCabe in particular does illustrate some of the problems with the approach to [k]. Indeed, the text of the story was itself originally and wrongly billed as some class of press release. It's now accepted that this is no such thing. Sergeant McCabe,
just to fill in the context in which this arose, was asked very briefly about this by counsel for the Tribunal, and we've included relevant extracts from that evidence in our speaking note and I won't go into it now, and it appeared that the point of referring to that was to introduce the evidence of Sergeant McCabe's own statement on the issue of cooperation with the o'mahony inquiry. We submit that Mr. Reynolds' story appeared so peripheral to the Tribunal's work prior to the commencement of hearings that it didn't feature in Sergeant McCabe's interviews or indeed Mr. Reynolds' interviews. Sergeant McCabe, further, was never asked about it by his own counsel, and, in fact, I asked a small number of questions about it as it had been brought up.

Matters of significance are listed at page 10 in the speaking note in respect of that story, and I would ask the Tribunal to bear these in mind.

The issue of the Commissioner's direction was being pursued in 2014 by other media organisations and this was accepted by Sergeant McCabe. It was also accepted that The Irish Times was going to run a story along those lines the following day, which was what, in fact, 11:58 inspired Sergeant McCabe to issue his own press release. And what is clear about that 2014 story now is the following:

The question of non-cooperation with the O'Mahony inquiry emanated from Dái 1 Éireann in 2013. In February 2014, Mr. Reynolds had sight of the direction issued by the Commissioner. Whatever view one takes of what is contemplated by the full passage under the heading "di rection", Mr. Reynolds was informed on the record by the Garda Press Office that this was a direction to cooperate. The story was then written in those terms, was originally an on-1ine story and went through the on-1ine editorial process. The story never, in fact, made it to television. Mr. Reynolds did try and contact Sergeant McCabe for his views on the matter and to give him a right to reply. Sergeant McCabe declined to give him his version of events, which was his absolute right, and indicated a preference to give it to another journalist who would broadcast it much later that night. Before Mr. Reynolds had any detail of what Sergeant McCabe would say but now being conscious of the broad fact that Sergeant McCabe did not accept the characterisation of events from the Garda Press Office, Mr. Reynolds immediately amended the on-line story to reflect his understanding that Sergeant McCabe disputed this and gave that prominence as a headline introduction. Once Sergeant McCabe's statement was reflect this and Sergeant McCabe's statement was given prominence and quoted from in full and this continued in further reports the following day.

It's submitted that this story from 2014 is being inappropriately pulled into your work as if it were evidence against Mr. Reynolds in connection with the terms of reference, and he was accused actually of "deep prej udi ce" against Sergeant McCabe in this context. I respectfully submit that this is, in fact, a textbook example of journalism at work, where a story is sourced with a public interest at a time when other media organisations were doing the same, and, thereafter, seeking on-the-record contributions from participants and publishing those contributions when made. It's submitted that now, some years later, perhaps on the basis of the initial misunderstanding as to the nature of the document itself, which was Mr. Reynolds' copy, that a weight is now being placed on it which it simply does not and cannot bear.

In relation to terms [a], [b] and [h] and Superintendent Taylor, I would propose to say the following, and I have some speaking notes, they are commencing at page 11 in respect of that:

The extent to which the Tribunal can rely on the evidence of Superintendent Taylor at all on the question of negative briefing, is a live issue, obvious 7 y , and dependent on a number of matters. whether it can be said, and the Tribunal has raised a number of questions on it, whether there is any truth
in relation to what he told Sergeant McCabe and then included in his protected disclosure, is obviously a matter for you, Chairman. Before one considers the individual allegations, and they are allegations, against John Burke and Paul Reynolds, the Tribunal will be concerned with questions of credit and transactions to which RTÉ and its employees are strangers. For example, whether Commissioner Callinan did direct a course of action to be taken, whether Superintendent Taylor agreed to it, whether former Commissioner o'Sullivan connived in it, questions in relation to texts, phones and missing phones and questions in relation to Mr. Taylor's motivation. Other parties before you, Chairman, will have perhaps longer and more relevant submissions to make in relation to those questions. However, for my purposes, I think it can be said, and to use a phrase that I think Mr. O'Higgins used earlier in relation to whistleblowers, I say I think it can be said that Superintendent Taylor is a damaged witness, who made his disclosure in a context of what he was then describing as a trumped-up investigation into him, and it's submitted that, in consequence of that, combined with, combined with the allegations he is making, which are so serious, that great care does, in fact, have to be taken with his evidence in terms of seeing whether it's supported outside him. He presented a picture to the Tribunal, from taking up his post, of meeting journalists, as they made it their business to introduce themselves to
him, or he would encounter them at crime scenes, where he was an assiduous attender. In September 2016 he made his protected disclosure, where he makes no reference at all to Mr. Burke, but does refer to Mr . Reynolds in a context other than the negative briefing that he is then outlining in detail in that disclosure, and it's submitted that that is not a solecism on his part where he does specifically name another journalist in the Ms. D context. It's not until the 13th April 2017 that Mr. Burke and Mr. Reynolds are named and named in a fashion utterly devoid of detail or context, and this is replicated in his evidence, and Mr. O'Higgins has indicated earlier that criticisms in that regard, which I am not going to repeat in terms of vagueness, are valid criticisms. But the validity, I respectfully submit, of those criticisms is that the person on the other end of the allegation is at the sharp end of why those criticisms can be made, because the potential for unfairness is real and tangible where someone is left in a situation where bare assertion meets denial and it becomes impossible to forensically stress-test what is being said. It's impossible to know or determine from Superintendent Taylor, out of the scores of contacts with the Garda Press office with members of the media, why Mr. Burke and Mr. Reynolds ended up his on list. It may be because it's easy and has the appearance of credibility to place someone on the list who has a profile or reputation. Specifically in relation to

Mr. Reynolds, Superintendent Taylor described the briefing as opportunist and arising at crime scenes and press conferences rather than by telephone. There was, what I respectfully characterise, a targeted intervention and questioning by you, Chairman, in relation to that, and, in response, Superintendent Taylor was unable to give a single scrap of detail to a single instance of this. Despite claiming he linked the briefing explicitly to the sexual assault allegation, he could not even recount in any way Mr. Reynolds' supposed reaction to it. And when you, Chairman, asked him to relive the reaction of any journalist, he said he could not do so. It's a signal fact, I respectfully submit, in addition, that Superintendent Taylor never mentioned in his disclosure, in his interview or in his initial evidence, that he'd never, in fact, even met John Burke before or during the time period of the negative briefing. In fact, in relation to Mr. Burke, there was an impressionistic account of briefing him by phone. And I respectfully submit that it beggars belief that, when asked questions on this topic by counsel for the Tribunal directly in relation to Mr. Burke, that Superintendent Taylor did not say that Mr. Burke was someone he'd never even met at that stage, rather than vaguely asserting that he was someone who wasn't given to going to crime scenes.

It's of further note that of the very small number of
phone contacts with Mr. Burke, some of them pre- and post-date the actual campaign that Superintendent Taylor described, which took place over a relatively narrow time frame. obviously, it must be accepted that
just because he never met Mr. Burke, doesn't make it impossible that he negatively briefed him. However, it might be expected, we submit, that some class of relationship of trust would be developed before such a thing could be contemplated or attempted, and while such a relationship could, in principle, develop over the phone, it seems the evidence for it here in relation to Mr. Burke is simply non-existent. Further, and understandably, when Superintendent Taylor was pushed on these matters generally and his apprehensiveness about bringing the matter of sexual abuse into conversations, Superintendent Taylor said he was "caref ul" about the journalists he approached. And we respectfully ask the question, how can this sit with the proposition that he's briefing someone he had never even met? And further, we say that this is somewhat even more bizarre, that he would be sharing this allegation and agenda with Mr. Burke, whom he had never met, while keeping it a secret, on his account, from all those he worked with, with the exception of Andrew McLindon.

It's submitted further that the inherent implausibility in this account is vividly illustrated in relation to the evidence in respect of Ms. McCann and Ms. Murray.

Leaving aside the weight of phone contact and the timing of the visit to Ms. D, it's clear that Mr . Taylor had communications with them specifically in relation to Ms. D in the spring of 2014 when Sergeant McCabe-related issues were reaching a crescendo or peak. And further, on the evidence that you have heard, this was not just generic run-of-the-mil1 contact with those journalists, but now there was the very real prospect of national newspapers running a story based on this allegation, which was, I respectfully submit, if there is any truth to his allegation, to be the entire thrust of the campaign.

No coherent, credible or rational explanation has been advanced by Superintendent Taylor as to why these people were not on his 1ist. Indeed, when pressed on it, he attempted to say that he brought their names forward to the Tribunal, but it's crystal clear that, in fact, they were put to him by Tribunal investigators halfway through his clarifying interview. They are the 12:08 only journalists, in fact, in respect of whom some detail was available to Superintendent Taylor in terms of dates and locations, yet those events are absolutely and singularly absent from his protected disclosure, from his correspondence with the Tribunal and indeed absent from his interview with the investigators until they bring it up.

We draw the analogy with a person who is fishing or a
man fishing for days, weeks and months without success, until one day ultimately that person lands not just a fish but a very large fish, and, on return from his trip, when asked to recount the details of the trip, the one thing he forgets to mention is the day he caught the fish.

Mr. Burke and Mr. Reynolds have denied the allegations of Superintendent Taylor. There is little more they can do in the context of the baldness of the allegation. They have both provided their phone numbers to the Tribunal, they have both explained the context of their phone contacts. And in Mr. Burke's case, he has also explained the context and meaning of later texts after Superintendent Taylor had retired, as 12:09 an attempt to see if something might come of staying in contact with him, but nothing ever did. we respectfully submit that Superintendent Taylor's account is unworthy of credit and must be jealously examined in the light of the consequences for the people of whom he speaks.

Chairman, you have referred in the number of questions you asked last week in respect of which you required some assistance, to journalistic clashes, and I attempt 12:09 to deal with that at just page 14 of the speaking note. And you have heard in the specific context of evidence from Professor Kenny and a suggested conversation with Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Brady at a PAC meeting, which has
been denied by Mr. Reynolds. It's submitted that this is not a matter that necessarily requires resolution in the context of the terms of reference that you are analysing and dealing with. Professor Kenny mentioned the names for the first time after giving evidence to the Tribunal, in respect of a particular event said to have taken place in February 2014. He subsequently provided some detail to support that claim, and Mr. Reynolds was in a position to check the detail and establish that Mr. Kenny was in error in that regard. while it may be suggested that this might have happened on some other occasion, this places Mr. Reynolds in an invidious position, having dealt with the material advanced to support the first proposition. Mr. Brady has also denied the conversation took place, although, importantly, he says he did speak to Professor Kenny on another occasion about Sergeant McCabe when Mr. Reynolds was not present, and I respectfully submit, in the context of the terms of reference, resolution of that matter is not necessary, but you have the evidence of Mr. Reynolds on oath in that connection.

In relation to Mr. Boucher-Hayes, the Tribunal has heard evidence from him in relation to what transpired in the vicinity of the RTÉ studio immediately prior to the broadcast of the Crimecall programme, and I am not going to rehearse that evidence, but it does appear that -- or does not appear that any rational basis has
been advanced as to why he would make that up or be mistaken in his recollection of it. He, in fact, came forward to the Tribunal with details of it, having heard the Tribunal's call for relevant information. while not corroborated in any strict sense, any allegation of recent fabrication is refuted by the evidence of his colleagues, who gave evidence that he reported the conversation to them shortly afterwards in broadly similar terms to the way in which he reported it to you, Chairman.

While RTÉ, Paul Reynolds and John Burke are not central characters in terms of the wide range of issues with which the Tribunal is concerned, the Tribunal itself is very central to them in terms of allegations that have hung over them for a very long time. To put it in simple terms, in relation to John Burke, no one has ever pointed to a single syllable of his journalism to bear out any claim that he was ever involved, wittingly or unwittingly, in a campaign against sergeant McCabe.

In relation to Mr. Reynolds, an allegation of deep prejudice was made which it was suggested governed the overall conduct of Mr. Reynolds. Over four years of journalism and hundreds of broadcasts, this allegation appears to rest on a single sourced -- on-the-record, sourced on-line story that never even made it to television and an attempt to tie it to the 9th may broadcasts two years later, and we respectfully say
that that allegation ought never to have been made. We say that hard-earned reputations of these individuals have been built up over decades and hang in the balance in terms of the allegations made against them and it's respectfully submitted that there is simply no evidence 12:13 to support adverse findings against them.

And those are my submissions on behalf of RTÉ, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Thank you, Mr. Gillane. I have no questions 12:13 for you. Can I just see where do we go from here. It's a quarter past. Just one other thing that was on my mind, if $I$ might mention it: $I$ am just going through who is represented, and there is a lot of people, and they are clearly not here, but unless I am wrong, Mr. McGuinness, I think the situation is that Haughey rights involve giving people an opportunity, they don't involve obviously requiring them to be here and make submissions. If they don't want to be here, what can I do. Am I wrong?
MR. MEGU NESS: No, Chairman. I think everyone represented is well aware that this day and tomorrow have been set aside, and perhaps beyond, for those who wish to attend and make a case such as it may be on behalf of their clients, and if they choose not to partake, that is their business.
CHA RMAN Yes. Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh, would you like to make a submission now? I am uncomfortable about calling on people because $I$ think, really, I am happy
to adopt any order the room wants, save for what we discussed at the very beginning.
MR. Ó MU RCHEARTAI GH Chairman, I would like to make a submission, but if I could possibly make it after 1unch?

CHA RMAN Yes, definitely. Is there anyone who wants to make a submission before lunch? A11 right. We11, then, I am going to adjourn for an hour.

## THE HEARI NG RESUNED, AS FOLLOVB, AFTER LUNCH

## SUBM SSI ON BY MR. Ó MU RCHEARTAI GH

MR. Ó MUIRCHEARTAIGH: Thank you very much, Chairman.
Fionán Ó Muircheartaigh for Alison O'Reilly, instructed 13:21 by Augustus Cullen Law.

These submissions have three sections: The evidence of Alison O'Reilly in response to the Tribunal request and related matters; evidence as to credit and credibility; and some short answers on some of the 20 questions you listed, Chairman, the other day.

Taking the first part, first. Alison o'Reilly's involvement stems from her awareness of a whispering campaign against Sergeant Maurice McCabe in 2013 and her discussions with the Irish Mail on Sunday crime correspondent Debbie McCann in 2013 and 2014. Both Debbie McCann and Alison O'Reilly were both working for the Irish Mail on Sunday at the time. Alison O'Reilly
is now employed in the Irish Mail on Sunday's sister paper, the Irish Daily Mail. Debbie McCann's discussions regarding Sergeant McCabe became increasingly animated in the early months of 2014. Alison o'reilly's evidence is that, insofar as she had discussions with Debbie McCann on this matter, she is attesting to the fact of those conversations. She is not saying that everything she was told by Debbie McCann was true, but she is saying that what she
ascribes to Debbie McCann is a true account of what Debbie McCann said to her regarding Maurice McCabe, Superintendent David Taylor and the former Garda Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan.

It is common call between Alison O'Reilly and Debbie McCann that the topic was discussed between them on a number of occasions. Alison o'Reilly had concerns in relation to the veracity of the story regarding Sergeant McCabe, as detailed to her by Debbie McCann in those conversations. Alison O'Reilly decided to investigate that matter for herself. She went to Cavan and met John wilson, the retired garda, and subsequently sergeant McCabe on the 28th February 2014. Through her statement, her direct evidence and through her phone records and the records of text messages that still exist, Alison O'Reilly has been able to confirm the timing of her visit precisely. Alison O'Reilly has provided those text messages, phone records to the Tribunal to show that she attended John wilson and Maurice McCabe in Cavan on the 28th February 2014, and, I might add, she met Maurice McCabe after 3:15 -3:11pm on that day. Whereas Debbie McCann has not been in a position to provide evidence of her exact travel date, Debbie McCann has advised the Tribunal that she travelled to Cavan sometime in or around the end of February and she also mentioned the 14th or 21st -- or the 14th and the 21st February have also been mentioned in relation to that visit. Robert Cox, the deputy
editor of the Irish Daily Mail, gave evidence in his statement of the 15th June 2018 that both Alison o'reilly and Debbie McCann visited Cavan at the same time, on the same day and that this stuck in his memory as a result of a phone call he received on that same day from Alison O'Reilly. Alison O'Reilly provided phone records to the Tribunal, and Mr. Cox accepts, under cross-examination at the Tribunal, that this phone call did not happen. Mr. Cox withdrew many of the assertions he had made in that written statement of the 15th June 2018, when faced with the phone records, texts and the questions raised about his statement. There is, therefore, a clear inconsistency between the evidence of Robert Cox and Debbie McCann in terms of the timing of Debbie McCann's date of trave1 to Cavan and the related events. As detailed in her evidence to the Tribunal, Alison o'reilly was satisfied, after speaking to Sergeant McCabe on the 28th February, that there was no basis for the suggestions that he was a paedophile. Alison o'reilly informed Debbie McCann about her meeting with Sergeant McCabe and Debbie McCann responded that Alison O'Reilly was being manipulated. Debbie McCann claims Sergeant McCabe was a paedophile and that this had been confirmed to her by Superintendent David Taylor and a senior Garda source. Alison O'Reilly asked Debbie McCann whether the Garda source was her pal Nóirín and Debbie McCann confirmed that it was.

Debbie McCann denies that this conversation took place. Alison O'Reilly is clear on the fact and content of that conversation. As noted previously, Alison o'reilly does not attest to the truth of what she was told in that conversation. In her evidence, Debbie McCann misrepresented a sequence of texts between her and Alison o'reilly on the 9th may, subsequent to the publication of the Guerin Report. Debbie McCann advised the Tribunal that a text in the sequence of messages furnished by Alison o'Reilly was deleted and that it was held back to show her in a bad light. The actual sequence, as has been included above, shows that this is not so. Alison o'Reilly did not delete any texts. Debbie McCann's perception of Sergeant McCabe on the 9th may 2014 should be considered in the light of the following: Approximately two-and-a-half months after Debbie McCann was refused a meeting with Ms. D and after both she and the Irish Mail on Sunday had apparently dropped the story, she responded to a text from Alison O'Reilly as follows, on the 9th May 2014 Alison O'Reilly texted to Debbie McCann:
"A hi ghl y respected officer hel din hi gh regard is how judge Guerin descri bes McCabe. "

On the 9th July, Debbie McCann responded as follows:
"I amfully aware and to be honest l thi nk it is gross. There is a very messed-up girl at the heart of $t h i s$ and
no one gives an eff."

On the 9th may 2013 [sic], Alison O'Reilly replied:
"'Paul Willians and the Indo have an agenda agai nst MECabe', says M cheál Martin to pals."

On the 9th May 2014, Debbie McCann replied:
"It's a farce. Everybody knows, frompoliticians to cops to journalists. It's an effing pantomime."

This exchange occurred after the Mail had apparently decided not to run with the story concerning Ms. D. This is referred to in the evidence of Debbie McCann to ${ }_{13: 28}$ the Tribunal on the 8th June. This suggests that even after the decision to drop the story by the Mail, Debbie McCann still had a very negative perception of Sergeant McCabe. The Tribunal heard in evidence on the 8th June that, despite being on maternity leave, Debbie ${ }_{13: 28}$ McCann continued to work on stories for her employer. But the following points are pertinent in that regard: Debbie McCann was the crime correspondent with the Irish Mail on Sunday; she was in regular contact with David Taylor, the head of the Garda Press office. Superintendent David Taylor says he negatively briefed journalists as the opportunity arose in relation to Sergeant Maurice McCabe's agendas and his motivation for revenge against the gardaí. Superintendent David

Taylor says he was in touch with and discussed Debbie McCann's visit to Ms. D's house with her in or about the time of her visit. The Mail legal team did not challenge this evidence by cross-examination. Debbie McCann was the first journalist to visit Ms. D's house seeking an interview with Ms. D. It is unlikely that Debbie McCann did not discuss Sergeant McCabe with David Taylor. Debbie McCann was refused to divulge the content of any discussion she had with Superintendent David Taylor about Maurice McCabe or Ms. D. Debbie McCann's father, Superintendent John McCann, was aware of the historic allegations against Sergeant McCabe. He told the Tribunal that he did not discuss it with his daughter, and Debbie McCann concurs with that account.

It is submitted that these facts suggest that the origin of Debbie McCann's concerns regarding Sergeant McCabe and Ms. D were as a result of Superintendent David Taylor and other senior gardaí. This contact was 13:30 indicated in Debbie McCann's conversations with Alison O'Reilly. The contact is an identifiable factor in the escalation of her interest and her express views of Sergeant McCabe and her excursion to Ms. D's house.

Debbie McCann's refusal to answer any questions regarding her contacts with David Taylor, notwithstanding his waiver of privilege, suggests the inference that Superintendent Taylor did brief her
negatively. If he did not, there could be no reason for not divulging the content of those conversations. It also suggests that, whatever contacts took place, they were not confined to the formula suggested by Superintendent David Taylor in his evidence.

If Debbie McCann had not been persuaded that Sergeant McCabe was guilty of sexual misconduct with a minor, it is difficult to rationalise how she could have expressed the views she did about Sergeant McCabe. The ${ }_{13: 31}$ texts suggest that she continued to hold those views for some time after her visit to the D household.

It seems inescapable also that Debbie McCann learned the detail of the allegations from a Garda source. In her direct evidence to the Tribunal she stated she knew before her visit to Ms. D's house of the issue of tickling. The reference to tickling only appeared in the confidential Garda investigation of the complaint, and, as far as we are aware, this was never divulged to ${ }_{13: 31}$ third parties or never mentioned prior to Debbie McCann's evidence to this Tribunal.

In his direct evidence, editor of the Irish mail on Sunday, Conor o'Donnell, told the Tribunal:

[^1]I now go on to the second part, Chairman.

Evidence as to credibility and credit:

A number of considerations arise in assessing the evidence of Alison o'reilly and Debbie McCann, where it conflicts. And I will try and address the circumstances surrounding the submission of the evidence and the manner in which the witnesses were treated.

As to the submission of the evidence, the process by which DMG Ireland responded to the Tribunal appears to be that Mr. Kealey, solicitor for the Mail, met with Alison o'Reilly and three other reporters in the mail group who were written to by the Tribuna1. A response was then forwarded that the Mail had no information that could help the Tribunal. There were, in effect, two parts to this response: that there were no communications and the other communications would
attract journalist privilege. This response was despite the fact that there were events, such as Debbie McCann's visit to Ms. D's house and Alison O'Reilly's visit to Sergeant McCabe's house, and that these were matters of fact that had nothing to do with journalistic privilege and the Tribunal is entitled to be told about them.

Alison O'Reilly's approach:

Alison O'Reilly indicated in her evidence that she was cautioned against becoming involved in the Tribunal. In this regard, we refer to the emails from Mr. Kealey to Alison O'Reilly on the 29th May 2017 and the memo of the 14th June 2017, which the Tribunal have. Counsel for the Irish Mail advised that Mr. Kealey had a different account in relation to this matter. In this regard, a document was provided to the Tribunal by Mr. Mohan SC, without any notice to Ms. O'Reilly, but Mr . Kealey did not come forward or give evidence to the Tribunal to rebut Alison O'Reilly's note, email and personal evidence. It is for the Tribunal to draw whatever inferences it may from these facts - in particular, the email, I think, on the 29th May at 15:44pm, to which Alison O'Reilly received no response, it is clear in that email Alison O'Reilly offered to provide her employer with any information required.

Lega1 advice:

Alison O'Reilly consulted her solicitor and counsel as to her duty with regard to the Tribunal. She was advised, notwithstanding the difficulty it might place her with her employer and taking account of the approach indicated to her by Mr. Kealey, that she had a legal, civic and moral duty to assist the Tribunal. She was further advised she should furnish the Tribunal with any information that might be relevant to their
inquiries, and I might add there, without delay. This was the context in which she furnished the Tribunal with her statement dated the 7th June 2017.

The response to Alison O'Reilly's statement:

There was no substantive response from the Irish Mail and Debbie McCann until the Tribunal wrote and indicated that it knew of the visit of Debbie McCann to Ms. D's house. when a subsequent statement of Debbie McCann was discussed with investigators, notwithstanding Debbie McCann having Alison O'Reilly's statement, no specific inaccuracy was identified. It simply stated that some statements were inaccurate, with no indication of what they were. Indeed, no indication of what might be inaccurate was given to Alison O'Reilly until she was actually giving evidence, approximately a year after she had submitted her statement. This was done orally, when Alison O'Reilly was giving evidence on the second day of the Tribunal, and it was then done on7y on the prompting of the Tribunal.

A subsequent written statement from Debbie McCann denied several of the statements made in Alison statement was eventually submitted a few days before Debbie McCann gave her evidence. This approach to her evidence was contrary to the process and procedure laid
down by the Tribunal.

It is submitted that Debbie McCann's involvement with this Ms. D is central to the sequence of events where Sergeant McCabe's character was being increasingly called into question. Key events that had a resonance with this were the meetings of the PAC in January 2014 with Commissioner Callinan and Sergeant McCabe, and the alleged contacts with the Comptroller \& Auditor General, the Chair of the PAC, John Deasy, and Philip Boucher-Hayes, of the then Garda Commissioner. These events were in one sense a high tide of allegations of negative briefing. This led shortly thereafter to the eventual emergence of the historic allegations about Sergeant McCabe through a series of newspaper articles by another journalist with whom both Debbie McCann and David Taylor had contact. Counsel for the Irish Mail put it to Alison O'Reilly that the reason why she made the statement to the Tribunal was because she had legal issues with the Mail. Alison O'Reilly refutes this and 13:37 points out the legal advice she had and the fact that there was no nexus whatever between the issues before the Tribunal and the matters in her dispute with the newspaper. It was also suggested by Mr. Mohan, for the Irish Mail, and in evidence of Sebastian Hamilton and Debbie McCann, that Clare Daly TD was approached to raise these matters relating to Sergeant McCabe in the Dáil at Alison O'Reilly's request.

As the evidence by Deputy Daly to the Tribunal on the 21st June showed, Alison O'Reilly was in no way involved communicating with Deputy Daly or having contact with Deputy Daly at any stage. Deputy Daly's concerns regarding Sergeant McCabe extended over a much 13:37 longer period.

Attack on character:

The Irish Mail Group media wrote in correspondence dated the 18th April to the Tribunal alleging the statement made by Alison O'Reilly on the 7th June was motivated by a dispute she was having with the newspaper. An attack was made on the motivation, but no effort was made to engage in a timely manner with the factual matters which were the issue before the Tribunal and the substance of her submission.

It is submitted that the position of the paper in that regard is entirely unsustainable for the following reasons: she acted on legal advice of a solicitor and counse1; she made a statement only after careful deliberation; as a result, she believed she had a legal, civic and moral duty to assist the Tribunal; it turned out she had we11-founded concerns regarding the initial approach and was advised upon by solicitors -as advised upon by the solicitors for DMG Media; there was a failure to show any nexus between the legal dispute of Alison O'Reilly and the dispute she had with

DMG Media; there was a failure to show any justification for the attack on Alison O'Reilly's credibility; the manner of Alison O'Reilly's cross-examination exceeded the bounds of what was warranted by the nature and purpose of the Tribunal; intrusive personal questions were asked of her that had no conceivable relevance to the matters being investigated, and it is of note that the only journalist to be asked her age was Alison O'Reilly, she was also asked about her personal relationships.

A11 in a11, there was an attempt not just to discredit but to intimidate the witness outside the parameters which were relevant to this inquiry.

Alison O'Reilly formed the view that Mr. Kealey, her newspaper's solicitor, was not desirous of entering into any substantial dialogue with the Tribunal on the matters raised. He tabled an account of events which was incomplete. Alison O'Reilly tabled her own note of the encounter which counsel for the Irish Mail stated Mr. Kealey would challenge. It is a matter of fact that Mr. Kealey did not offer any oral evidence or offer any opportunity to be examined on this note.

Conclusion on evidence tendered:

It is submitted that this contrast in conduct and circumstance should be given weight in the Tribunal's
consideration of any material conflict of evidence. It is suggested where there are conflicts in evidence, these should be resolved in favour of Ms. O'Reilly. Ms. O'Reilly is not attesting, as I said before, to the truth or otherwise of what she was told by Debbie McCann; she is giving an account of what she was told by Debbie McCann. It is entirely possible that Debbie McCann exaggerated her knowledge of the matter, conflated information she had obtained or adopted in her conversation, but the conversation reported by Alison O'Reilly did take place and in the terms which are contained in her statement. Alison O'Reilly acted at all times as requested by the Tribunal, responding in a timely and complete manner to those requests. This is to be contrasted with the approach adopted by DMG Media Ireland. Notwithstanding a different version of events put to Alison O'Reilly by Mr. Mohan SC on behalf of Mr. Kealey, he did not seek to give evidence on the matter of his handling of the paper at Tribunal interface. The attempts by DMG Media Ireland to conflate the Tribunal matters with other disagreements which predated the Tribunal request by more than a year, were, both in fact and in manner of the challenges made, an abuse of process.

And the final part, Chairman, you will be relieved to hear I'm not going to address the 20 questions, but I'm going to just touch on three or four of them, and these are the ones we think we can say something usefully.

On question 1, we think this is an absolutely fundamental question to the Tribunal's inquiry, and what we would say, having listened to a lot of the evidence here, is that it is suggested that a very wide 13:41 definition is warranted. Obviously, such a definition would include allegations that Maurice McCabe was a paedophile or a kiddie fiddler or he had interfered with nephews and nieces, but it should also, in our view, include confirmation of allegations by State agencies that Sergeant McCabe was the subject of sexual allegations and that there was a damaged person at the centre of these allegations. while professionalism and care has been shown by many, many journalists, it is possible to be negatively briefed without even knowing
it. The Tribunal may wish to consider whether leaks were used to influence the perception of Sergeant McCabe and his attempts to have disfunction in Cavan-Monaghan addressed. Whether this was a deliberate attempt -- whether reports based on leaks were a deliberate attempt to belittle Sergeant McCabe on behalf of those who leaked the report, or not, it could certainly be said that these leaks promoted a dialogue that Sergeant McCabe was not all he was cracked up to be by his advocates.

Now, on questions 12 and 13 , if I might take them together, relating to John McGuinness, Philip Boucher-Hayes and John Deasy, I say the following:

As regards the evidence of the chairman of the PAC, the Comptroller \& Auditor General, Philip Boucher-Hayes, John Deasy, this evidence, if it is to be believed, would constitute direct evidence of negative characterisation of Sergeant McCabe. The evidence of Alison O'Reilly, on the other hand, is direct evidence of conversations. It is submitted that it is evidence of what may be accepted or suggested as a fact of those conversations, but not to the truth of those, of what was said. It is for the Tribunal to assess the likely truth of what was said to Alison O'Reilly, taking account of the evidence of Debbie McCann and all the surrounding circumstances, including the explanation given for refusing to disclose a conversation with Superintendent David Taylor. If the Tribunal accepts that Alison O'Reilly was told that Superintendent David Taylor confirmed to Debbie McCann that Sergeant McCabe was connected to Ms. D, being in a bad way, we submit that the refusal to confirm or deny what the superintendent may have told Debbie McCann should be taken as indicative of what she told Alison O'Reilly in that regard was true.

Question 14: what led to the visit of Debbie McCann, Eavan Murray and Paul Williams?

Two things are clear from Alison O'Reilly's evidence: Sergeant McCabe was subject to an ever-increasing
interest throughout 2013 and 2014. Alison O'Reilly's evidence is that Debbie McCann was increasingly exercised not by penalty points but with the sexual allegations concerning Sergeant McCabe. This is demonstrated by McCann's articles submitted to the Tribunal. Debbie McCann gave evidence to the Tribunal that she knew at the time she was going to Cavan that the allegations included tickling, and, as I said before, that phrase appears in the confidential report of Inspector Cunningham, which was not known to anyone except the gardaí until it was circulated to the Tribunal subsequent to her evidence on the point. This was after she made reference to tickling. Mrs. D in her evidence says she was horrified by the visit of Debbie McCann.

It follows inescapably that the most likely source of the information was a revelation to her before the time of her visit and it is submitted, therefore, that her visit must have had Garda inspiration.

Question 15, which is: Does evidence of the D family remain relevant?

This might need to be modified. I gather there are fresh papers in today from the $D$ family, but I will read out what $I$ had in good time.

The evidence of Ms. D's family remains relevant. They
say Debbie McCann was the first journalist to call. They say Paul williams was the only journalist to interview Ms. D. They say Eavan Murray also visited before Paul williams -- visited them before Paul williams. There is an important conflict of evidence here, as Ms. Eavan [sic] says that when she visited them, it was a few days or very shortly after paul williams, she expressly explains that in terms of a video that was made and a discussion about that video. This is important, because if there was a discussion about the video, it would suggest the family's recollection in regard to these events might be mistaken.

And finally, on the question of political involvement, I don't intend to depress on this, except to mention the case of Deputy Wallace and Deputy Clare Daly. The evidence suggests that Deputy Wallace and Daly had been expressing concerns about Garda management and were familiar with the concerns of sergeant McCabe and they were in regular contact with Sergeant McCabe since in or about 2011. I've already covered the fact that there is no substance to the suggestion made by counsel that Deputy Clare Daly was contacted or asked by someone else at the request of Alison O'Reilly to raise 13:47 the smearing of Sergeant McCabe in the Dáil. Deputy Daly does not know Alison o'reilly, never met her and never asked anybody -- and was -- never asked anybody to do or -- something for her by Alison o'Reilly.

Thank you very much, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much, Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh. Refreshingly forthright, if I might say so. There's just two things, however, that are on my mind in consequence of listening to you. The first is this: You're correct in saying that where two people have a disagreement as to what one said to the other, that this doesn't necessarily mean if one person is to be believed in preference to the other, that what that person was told was true, and I think we all accept that. But there is an issue here. First of all, I'm not bound by the hearsay rule; and secondly, even if I was bound by the hearsay rule, an admission against interest by a party to proceedings is an exception to the hearsay rule. Now, unless you have a difficulty with that. I mean, the classic example of it is R v. Christie, isn't it, 1916 Appeal Cases, what is said in the presence of the accused can be admitted. It can also be the case that where something calls for a denial and a denial is not made, that that can be taken as an admission, but it is, in fact, the prime driving force of the law in relation to confessions, that when someone makes an admission against their interest, that that is admissible in evidence. So I just tend to wonder whether you're right in the submission you make on -- just prior to question 14 , where you say the evidence of Alison O'Reilly and the others' direct evidence of conversations - that is correct. It is submitted that it is evidence which may be accepted or
rejected of the fact of those conversations - that is correct. As to whether they took place - correct. But you say not to the truth of what Alison O'Reilly was told. I am not sure that is correct. Do you get the point I'm making, Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh?
MR. Ó MURCFEARTA GH Yes, Chairman. Let me explain why that particular submission --

CHA RMAN Don't worry about the submission. It is just I want to move on from that.
MR. Ó MI RCHEARTA GH I didn't mean to say, and, in fact, I tried to explain in a following paragraph that the truth of what was reported in those conversations could and should be considered in the broader context of the other things that happened, including the refusal to expand on conversations with Superintendent Taylor. The reason I put that there was, Ms. O'Reilly was again and again, and I'm sorry to use the word 'badgered', but she was badgered really about the fact that certain things in the conversation she reported couldn't be true. Now, if there are things in the conversation that couldn't be true, like about her having had an interview with Ms. D, we -- the purpose of that submission is to cover off that point. In the statement Ms. O'Reilly gave the Tribunal, she only gave a statement to cover what she knew and she knew she was 13:50 told. But there are other pieces of evidence that have come before this Tribunal which corroborate and underline many of the things that are in that conversation. And I apologise for the careless
drafting, but I was really trying to distinguish between the things she stands over as absolute fact and the things that had to be -- the truth has to be deduced from surrounding other evidence.
CHA RMAK Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh, I do understand, and it's just taking the sentence in a particular place it is, perhaps led me to think something that it doesn't, in fact, mean. And the second point that I wanted to ask you about in consequence of your submission was this: Again, under question 14 , you say that Ms. McCann was increasingly exercised not by the whole issue of cancelling fixed charge penalty notices but the alleged sexual allegation or allegations concerning Sergeant McCabe, and then you say this is demonstrated by Debbie McCann's articles submitted to the Tribunal. Now, I can't actually for the life of me think of how there is any possible connection whatsoever. I mean, any responsible journalist is entitled to, for instance, take the view that much is being made of little, that a mountain is being made out of a molehil1, but there are no articles written by anybody saying that Sergeant McCabe had done anything discreditable, and the closest anyone gets to that are the Paul williams articles from the 14th April 2014. I'm just not sure, it may be that that came out wrong in the word processor.
MR. Ó MU RCHEARTA Gt I'm afraid that seems to have come in from somewhere, and it relates to a completely different matter and is not really within the terms of
the Tribunal.
CHA RMAN I understand that.
MR. Ó MI RCHEARTAI GH So I would like you to disregard that.

CHA RMAN Yes. No, you have clarified this, Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh, and that isn't a problem. And as indeed I have said on a number of occasions, we live in a free country, and whether people like Sergeant McCabe or take a different view to him or not, they're absolutely entitled to do that, just as they are entitled to take a different view in relation to, for instance, a judgment of the High Court, or whatever. Thank you very much. So could I ask Mr. Freeman? MR. TOM MRPPH: Tom Murphy, Chairman, instructed by Michael Kealey for Associated Newspapers. I wonder would it be prudent if I would go next? CHA RMAK Yes, it certainly would, and I meant to do that. Just let me find you, please, if you wouldn't mind, Mr. Murphy. Yes, please go ahead.

## SUBM SSI ON BY MR. TOM MURPHY:

MR. TOM MRPHY: Thank you, Chairman. I have a speaking note, which has been handed in. I don't propose to be too long.

As I said, these submissions are made on behalf of Associated Newspapers Limited, trading as DMG Media Ireland, and its journalists, and they are Debbie McCann, Sebastian Hamilton, Conor O'Donnell and Robert

Cox.

Respectfully, as we see it, Chairman, the remaining terms of reference of the Tribunal of relevance to my clients are [a], [b] and [h], and adopting the numbering employed by you in your remarks on the 22nd June, Chairman, the questions relevant to my clients appear to be the following:
4. Is it possible to tell from a false denial, for instance, but not limited to Superintendent Taylor or to any journalist, that the opposite of an assertion is in fact a truth?
14. What led to the visits of Debbie McCann, Eavan Murray and Paul williams to the home of Ms. D? In that regard, has journalistic privilege been properly and honestly relied on and is there any evidence proffered by these parties that is reliable? what, in truth, happened? Did the visits have any Garda inspiration?
15. To what extent, if any, does the evidence of the D family members remain relevant?
16. To what extent is any incorrect invocation of journalistic privilege such as to give rise to any inference and, if so, what inference does any incorrect invocation of journalistic privilege give rise to?

Question 17 was: what is the relevance of question 5 as to any incorrect or dishonest invocation of journalistic privilege? And question 5 read: Is what Superintendent Taylor claims to have done on behalf of Commissioner Callinan an understatement of the reality of what, in fact, he did? Did he do whatever he did at the behest of Commissioner Callinan and did he do it with the acquiescence or any knowledge of Deputy Commissioner o'Sullivan?

And finally, number 18: To what extent do journalistic clashes - seven of them now today - apart from that between Alison O'Reilly and Debbie McCann, require to be resolved or even recorded in a report to the Houses of the Oireachtas, and, if so, why?

While this submission will cover each of those matters, it is necessary, for reasons that will become apparent, to do so in a slightly different order to that adopted by you, Chairman. Thus, it is appropriate that the question of whether the Chairman is required to resolve the conflict of evidence between Debbie McCann and Alison O'Reilly should be considered first.

Conflict of evidence:

From her first written statement to the Tribunal onwards, Ms. Alison O'Reilly has made it clear that she has no "direct information" of the matters into which
the Chairman is investigating, of alleged attempts by senior gardaí to besmirch the reputation of Sergeant McCabe. She is relying wholly on things that Debbie McCann allegedly told her and which Debbie McCann
strenuously denies. Thus, in her written statement to the Tribunal on the 9th June 2017, she summarised her interaction with Deputy Howlin as:
"I said it's not really direct information. I only know what Debbie told me."

The Tribunal has heard ample evidence from several witnesses that a number of things that Ms. McCann is alleged to have told Ms. O'Reilly did not happen. A stark example of the descriptions that she is meant to have given of an interview between her and Ms. D, Ms. O'Reilly claimed that Ms. McCann "described in detail the state the womn was in", and to have given details of the nature of the alleged assault and where it took place. She is also alleged to have said that she remained in contact with Ms. D in the period after this interview. The fact that no meeting and no interview ever took place, however, has been confirmed, not only by Ms. McCann and her colleagues in the Mail on Sunday, Conor o'Donne11, Robert Cox, but by members

It can therefore be stated with some confidence that the Chairman is largely faced with a conflict of
evidence in which either Alison O'Reilly is telling of statements that were not made relating to things that could not have happened, or Debbie McCann was falsely telling her of things that did not happen. Neither of these outcomes can in any practical way assist the Chairman in determining the matters he is obliged to investigate under the terms of reference set out at paragraph 2 above. Notwithstanding the preceding paragraph, it may be argued that you, Chairman, could determine that Mr. McCann was speaking the truth when, as Ms. O'Reilly alleges, she told Ms. O'Reilly "Bet ween 2013 and 2014 that Superintendent Dave Tayl or and then Acting Commissi oner O Sullivan tol d her Maurice McCabe abused a girl when she was a child and that the abuse was covered up because Mr. McCabe was a garda and the case was never given a Pul se number."

Leaving aside Ms. McCann's denials and, for example, that she only became aware of any issue with regard to Pulse when paul williams wrote about it in the Irish Independent, these allegations are hearsay upon hearsay. While tribunals of inquiry can consider hearsay evidence, it is well-established that it must be treated with caution.

Further and more importantly, it is not necessary for you, Chairman, to make a decision on this aspect of the evidence before you to come to a conclusion on the matters that you are obliged to investigate. The

Tribunal has had the advantage of hearing from all of the parties central to these issues. They are Ms. McCann, former Commissioner O'Sullivan and Superintendent David Taylor. Each has been cross-examined by several parties. Witnesses who were in a position to corroborate the allegations, or otherwise, have been called. These range from Superintendent Taylor's colleagues in the Garda Press Office, to those who worked with former Commissioner o'Sullivan, to the Teachta Dála who raised Ms. O'Reilly's allegations in the Dáil. Without relying upon hearsay evidence of little probative value and it is submitted that to place any relevance -- or reliance on evidence of such a nature would be inherent and unsafe [sic], it is submitted that you, Chairman, are actually in a position to evaluate the credibility of all the aforementioned witnesses and you do not need to rely upon matters which do not on any characterisation come close to direct evidence to fulfil the obligation the Oireachtas has entrusted in you.

In these circumstances, it would not be in the interests of those either involved or implicated in these allegations or, in my respectful submission, in the interests of the Tribunal, to record them in a report to the Houses of the Oireachtas.

Should you, Chairman, nonetheless decide that the
conflict of evidence must be resolved and included in your report, the following matters, some of which have already been touched upon, should be considered:

The primary or initial allegations against Ms. McCann are contained in a letter from Brendan Howlin TD to the Tribunal on the 15th March 2017. Ms. McCann was unaware, until she had sight of this letter, that she was alleged to have been one of the journalists to whom Deputy Howlin made reference in his statement to the Dái 1 on the 8th February 2017. while there are several divergences between what Deputy Howlin told the Dáil and what is contained in his letter to the Tribunal, the central allegations bear repeating. They are:
"Mb. O' Reilly informed me that the Mail on Sunday crime correspondent, Debbi e McCann, had an ongoi ng communi cati on with Garda Commi ssi oner Nói rín O Sul I i van during 2013 and 2014. Ms. O Reilly said that Ms. MECann tol d her that the Commi ssi oner had gi ven inf ormation to her contai ni ng serious sexual mi sconduct on behal f of Mr. McCabe. It invol ved a girl in Cavan whomit was alleged had been abused by Ser geant MtCabe. "

Notwithstanding the constraints placed upon her by her obligations to uphold journalistic privilege, Ms. McCann has been clear about these allegations. As she stated in her first interview with the Tribunal
investigators:
"Commi ssi oner O Sullivan has never mentioned or spoken to me about Sergeant McCabe, ever."

She reiterated this when giving evidence in public. Ms. McCann's position is that, in this regard, it was wholly supported by former Commissioner o'sullivan in her evidence. Further, former Commissioner
o'Sullivan's records show no mobile telephone contact with Ms. McCann, contrary to what was alleged in the Dáil. Lastly, even Superintendent Taylor has not made the case that former Commissioner o'Sullivan was involved in a campaign to denigrate sergeant McCabe in such a direct fashion.

In short, there is no evidence before this Tribunal that former Commissioner o'sullivan ever spoke to Ms. McCann about Sergeant McCabe in any way adverse or otherwise.

Subsequent to Deputy Howlin's letter, Ms. O'Reilly wrote to the Tribunal alleging that Ms. McCann had told her that in 2013/'14 Superintendent Taylor had provided her with similar information about Sergeant McCabe.
For reasons outlined in correspondence to the Tribunal from her solicitor and confirmed in evidence by Ms. McCann, she is unable, for reasons of journalistic privilege, to confirm or deny that Superintendent

Taylor was a confidential source or to discuss any confidential communications she may have had with him. In light of this, it is incumbent on the Tribunal to consider the other evidence before it rather than seek to draw adverse inferences from Ms. McCann's reliance upon her Article 10 rights and those provided to her under the Constitution of Ireland.

Central to this is the visit of Ms. McCann to the home of Ms. D in early 2014. It is important to stress that 14:02 the relevant terms of reference require the Tribunal not to investigate the fact of this visit or those of Ms. Murray or Mr. Williams, but whether it was prompted by an attempt by Superintendent Taylor to encourage the media to write negatively about Sergeant McCabe, as per 14:03 term of reference [a], or as a result of having been "di rected to draw journal ists' attention to an al legation of criminal misconduct made agai nst Sergeant McCabe", term of reference [b].

In this third statement to the Tribunal on the 22 nd Tribunal 2017, which he reiterated in evidence, Superintendent Taylor said the following about the visits to Ms. D's home by Ms. McCann and Ms. Murray:
"I was made aware they were going up there, I did not di scourage it. I don't knowif l knew Mb. D's name. I knew that Mb. D's family lived up in Cavan. I don't know if l knew thei r address. I don't thi nk so. I do
remenber Debbi e MtCann and Eavan Murray contacting me separately and telling me that they were going to do a story, bef ore each of them went up to Cavan. I don't thi nk I gave these journalists any information about the address of M. D. I recall they had a fai $r$ anount of inf ormation thensel ves. I was aware they were going to the house, yes. I did not di scourage themfrom attending Cavan. I would have encour aged it."
"Further, I did not provi de any inf or mation in rel ation 14:04 to ME. D, I did not know her first name, I di d not know the detail. I knew it was an allegation agai nst Sergeant McCabe by Mr. D's daughter. They both had this level of detail, frommy recollection. I have been asked if I confirmthe information that it was Mr. D's daughter that had made the allegations agai nst Sergeant McCabe and I believe that I did confirmthat to them both separatel $y$. They would have been aware of our attitude to Sergeant McCabe. They woul d have known this frommy previ ous bri efings. They would, ther ef ore, have been telling me what they were going to do. I do not -- l would not di scourage it as it suited the agenda. "

Finally, he says:
"I remenber Debbi e McCann contacting me bef ore she went to Cavan to Ms. D's home, but I cannot remenber her contacting me afterwards."

In summary, Superintendent Taylor says that while he had, at unspecified times, dates and places and in a wholly unspecified manner, negatively briefed Ms. McCann, he did not speak with her until she was on her way to visit the Ds' property, had provided no information to facilitate the visit, was aware that she had "a fair amount of information" prior to it and has no recollection of any contact or discussion with Ms. McCann subsequently.

Ms. McCann has strenuous7y denied that she was negatively briefed by any member of An Garda Síochána in relation to Sergeant McCabe. She has confirmed that she had multiple sources in respect of the allegations against Maurice McCabe made by Ms. D and that they were both Garda and non-Garda sources. She did not contact the Garda Press Office about the allegation. She obtained the address of the D family through her own efforts rather than from sources. Her description of the important elements of her interactions with Mrs. D, namely that they met at the home of the $D$ family, that they had a conversation in which Mrs. D declined an interview with Ms. McCann, that Ms. McCann never met Ms. D, and that, following the meeting at the D household, Ms. McCann took the matter no further, all have been confirmed by Mrs. D. It is accepted by all parties and by the Tribunal that Ms. McCann did not write negatively about Sergeant McCabe on the Ms. D
allegation or on any other matter.

Evidence before the Tribunal has shown that knowledge, sometimes detailed, of the sexual allegations against Sergeant McCabe were we11-estab1ished among gardaí in the Cavan-Monaghan region, at Garda Headquarters and among politicians, especially in Leinster House, and journalists. It is set out and supported by evidence given to the Tribunal that journalistic interest in Sergeant McCabe and the allegations he was making against, increased considerably in the period after former Commissioner Callinan described his actions as 'disgusting' when appearing before the PAC on 23 January 2014. It is not, therefore, at all surprising that a number of media outlets would seek to explore various aspects of Sergeant McCabe's past at this time. The fact that four national newspapers sought to make contact with the D family - the Irish Mail on Sunday, the Irish Sun, the Irish Daily Star and, successfully, the Irish Independent - is hardly a surprise. This is how independent journalists operate, especially when the persons being sought are part of a bigger story of the day. This cannot be taken, on any reasonable view, as a sign that the journalist in question has been directed or encouraged to follow this path either by gardaí or by others. It is submitted that there is certainly no evidence before the Tribunal that could lead to any such deduction with regard to Ms. McCann. On the remaining allegations by Ms. O'Reilly, the
following factors should be borne in mind:
A. Several of the matters she alleges were told to her simply could not have happened.
B. If, as now appears to be alleged, Ms. McCann was inventing matters as a form of braggadocio, which she strenuously denies, her lies would have quickly unravelled, especially the crucial ones that she had an hour-long interview with Ms. D and that her story had not appeared in the paper only because her editor-in-chief, Sebastian Hamilton, didn't want the story in the paper because he was too cautious about the scandal, and that she was annoyed about this. All of this is wholly inconsistent with what Ms. McCann has 14:08 told several of her colleagues in the Irish mail on Sunday. As she pivotally described her interactions with Mrs. D, there was no story.

Ms. McCann has no earthly reason to make up what she is alleged to have said, and no credible explanation as to why she had done so has been produced to this Tribunal. On the other hand, for reasons detailed in Mr. Kealey's letters of the 13th April 2018 to the Tribunal solicitor, Ms. O'Reilly had a strong motivation, to make the allegations that she did, not just to the Tribunal but to Deputy Howlin and earlier to Alan Crohan, who subsequently passed them to Deputy Clare

Da7y.

That three different versions of text conversation between Ms. McCann and Ms. O'Reilly have sought to be relied upon by Ms. O'Reilly in support of her evidence is of concern to my clients and it is respectfully submitted that the Tribunal should be similarly greatly concerned by this. Ms. O'Reilly sought to implicate Ms. McCann's father, retired Superintendent John McCann, in the allegations she made concerning Debbie McCann. Ms. O'Reilly led this Tribunal to believe, both in her written statements to the Tribunal and also in the evidence that she gave, that superintendent McCann was "a source" of the information for Ms. McCann in her journalistic work.

Superintendent McCann was the head of the Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Investigations Unit within the National Bureau of Criminal Investigation. The Tribunal heard strong denials from both Ms. McCann and from Superintendent McCann, this allegation was utterly false.

In short, the factual evidence before this Tribunal all points in the direction of Ms. McCann's evidence is credible while Ms. O'Reilly's is not.

Evidence of the D family:

For the reasons outlined above, especially in paragraph 5 of the speaking note, the evidence of the $D$ family is not just relevant but important in corroborating the nature of the interaction between Mrs. D and Ms. McCann and the extent of Ms. McCann's pursuit of the matter following their meeting.

Invocation of journalistic privilege, questions 16 and 17. Questions posed by you, Chairman, refer to two possible inappropriate invocations of journalistic privilege: incorrect and dishonest. It is necessary to deal with these separately.
CHA RMAN There is one other as we11, Mr. Murphy, which is correct invocation of journalistic privilege. And I don't mean to stop you, but it may be misunderstood, because what I said on Friday 1ast was pretty long and pretty complicated.
MR. TOM MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAR But it could be the case that someone has correctly invoked journalistic privilege where, let us say, the source has come out publicly and said that, I did such and such, but in fact it's only the tip of the iceberg, and the journalist, using that person as a source prior to them coming out, has been told the other nine-tenths of the iceberg and feels, therefore, under a duty of confidence. So there are three, I think, possibilities.
MR. TOM MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN And you can address that one as you go along
if you wish, but I just thought, just for fear I was unclear, I just thought you should perhaps be reminded of that.

MR. TOM MRPPY: Thank you, Chairman. Yes. And I think I've actually -- if you just refer to my reading note, I'm speaking about the two possible inappropriate invocations. It is necessary to deal with these separately. The possibility that the privilege has not been honestly invoked is also touched upon in question 14 , which is dealt with further on.

On June 22nd, 2018, you, Chairman, heard submissions on privilege, including those on behalf of my clients, and there is no need to repeat these now, save to say that they primarily address the question of whether privilege is correctly invoked by my clients and especially by Ms. McCann. It is important to record at the outset that no party to the Tribunal has suggested or alleged that Ms. McCann's reliance on Article 10 rights is anything other than honest. Furthermore, there is no evidence that her invocation of journalistic privilege was anything other than principled. on several occasions during her evidence Ms. McCann made clear how difficult a position she had been placed in because of her stance, thus she told the 14:12 Tribunal:

[^2]further on this, but l have a career as a journalist that l'mvery keen to protect in all of this, as well as assist your work, obvi ously. And agai n, I can't answer that question. He" -- meaning
Superintendent Taylor -- "has wai ved privilege. I am the journalist and I believe that that decision lies with me. I have a career to think about goi ng forward. I can't go there. I would love to go there, but I honestly cannot do that."

The impact on Ms. McCann's career and livelihood of revealing confidential sources was stressed by her on several occasions. For example, she said:
"I amin a position where l amtrying my best to defend not onl y my own career as a journalist but al so assist the Tribunal. It is a very difficult position to be in. By reveal ing the contents of my communi cation and conversations with a source, it is leaving me very much open as a journalist not to be trusted when l continue my career as l intend to do."

This is an archetypal Catch-22: answer the question and your career will be damaged, perhaps irrevocably; don't answer the question and your failure to do so could lead to adverse inferences, including, most seriously, a potential finding of dishonesty. Further, and despite some suggestions to the contrary, the stance adopted by Ms. McCann in relation to her
journalistic privilege is mirrored by other journalists, including some who, like her, sought to contact Ms. D. Thus, Conor Lally and The Irish Times, who, albeit somewhat later, published an interview with Ms. D, relied upon his Article 10 rights, and his position was not altered by the fact that Superintendent Taylor, Commissioner o'Sullivan and former Commissioner Callinan are not claiming privilege. Like Ms. McCann, Mr. Lally also told the Tribunal that no Garda member, past or present, had ever briefed him negatively about Sergeant McCabe.

Similarly, Michael o'Toole of the Irish Daily Star told the Tribunal, in response to his having been identified by Superintendent Taylor as one of the reporters to whom he passed negative information about sergeant McCabe, he said:
"I am goi ng to claimjournalistic privilege. The principle of j ournalistic privilege is very important to me. However, I do wi sh to state that nobody in any position of authority in An Garda Sí ochána smeared Maurice MECabe to me or negatively briefed me about Ser geant McCabe. "

Mr. O'Toole had contacted Mr. D by Facebook in early 2014, according to the latter's evidence.

Finally, John Mooney of the Sunday Times, who
repeatedly approached Ms. D via Facebook, declined to answer certain questions of him by the Tribunal, relying on his privilege as a journalist. All these journalists had regular ongoing contact with Superintendent Taylor at the relevant time, yet none have had their honesty impugned, and neither should Ms. McCann.

Question 17 appears to proceed on the basis that journalists may have improperly or dishonestly invoked privilege to assist Superintendent Taylor because what he was allegedly saying to reporters was worse than he was outlining to this Tribunal. Such a finding, certainly in relation to Ms. McCann, would require a very substantial leap on the part of this Tribunal, on the evidence before it. while Superintendent Taylor has told the Tribunal that Ms. McCann was one of the several journalists he would negatively brief, which Ms. McCann denies, there is no evidence that Ms. McCann is seeking to down-play any wrongdoing by him by exercising Article 10 rights. Further, there is no conceivable reason why she would do this. The Tribunal must ask itself, it is submitted, how does it benefit Ms. McCann to lie to this Tribunal, to cover up anything Superintendent Taylor was telling her and other journalists about Sergeant McCabe was worse than that he had alleged he said? It is submitted that if Ms. McCann was willing to lie for Superintendent Taylor, surely the easiest avenue for her would be to
simply lie to the Tribunal in evidence and deny that Superintendent Taylor was a source. The fact that Ms. McCann went through the obviously difficult experience of claiming privilege and under cross-examination from a number of parties and in the face of important observations from the Chairman as to the effects of claiming such privilege, refused to waiver on the point, convincingly suggests that her reliance on Article 10 and her rights contained therein was both honest and appropriate. Further, it is also undermining of a suggestion of a contrivance on her part in the interests of protecting Superintendent Taylor. Further, even if this Tribunal was to determine that Ms. McCann's reliance on journalistic privilege was incorrect as opposed to dishonest, this also could not justify any inference that she had done so to assist Superintendent Taylor or to cover up any additional wrongdoing on his part. Such a finding would be, in the absence of any other evidence, and it is submitted that there is no such evidence, a breach of her Article 10 rights, suggesting, as it necessarily would, impropriety on her part and thereby damage her professional standing and good name.

Insofar as it is alleged that Ms. McCann's visit to the 14:17 home of Ms. D was the result of a campaign of briefings by gardaí, that has already been dealt with in my submissions.

False denials:

For the reasons outlined previously, Chairman, particularly in paragraphs 4 and 22 of the speaking note, the Tribunal could not conclude that any of my clients who gave evidence to it could be taken to have made false statements or to have given false denials. That said, in the event that you were to so conclude, Chairman, the mere fact that a false denial has been given cannot, in the absence of other corroborative evidence, lead to a conclusion that the opposite assertion must be true. A denial may be wholly or partly false, as may be the assertion to which the response has been given, neither party may be telling the truth, wholly or in part. It is, of course, open to the Tribunal to determine the credibility, or otherwise, of any witness before it, but that cannot involve a decision that an adverse finding of itself must corroborate the alternative.

Visit to Ms. D's home:

The circumstances surrounding and the evidence regarding Ms. McCann's visit to the home of Ms. D are outlined in previous paragraphs of the speaking note,
Chairman. It is not necessary to repeat them. However, the central question and indeed the only question which falls within the terms of reference is: Did the visits have any Garda inspiration? while

Ms. McCann has accepted that her sources of information regarding the allegations about Sergeant McCabe were Garda and non-Garda, she has consistently made clear that in seeking to firm up the information which she had received, she was not directed or therefore inspired to do so by anyone. As she told the Tribunal's investigators:
"Sources don't direct me to do my job."

Further, even counsel for Superintendent Taylor stated that he could not advance the theory that his client had directed Ms. McCann to go to Ms. D's home. There is no evidence that any member of An Garda Síochána pushed, directed or inspired Ms. McCann to follow up this line of inquiry.

In summary, the evidence before the Tribunal is that Ms. McCann, acting in a wholly professional manner, sought to ascertain the accuracy of information she had 14:19 received. She did so in a sensitive and appropriate way by approaching those persons best able to confirm or deny the allegations. When they declined to do so, she took the matter no further. This is what professional journalists do, and any finding to the contrary would, it is respectfully submitted, be perverse.

It is important to stress that, in seeking to assist
the Tribunal, journalists are faced with professional obligations which require serious consideration. My clients have, it is submitted, at all times sought to assist the Tribunal with its investigation, both through statements to the Tribunal investigators and through direct evidence and under cross-examination. At no time have they either dishonestly or improperly sought to hinder its work. Any finding or inference drawn to the contrary would be devastating both personally and professionally for those involved. while it is submitted that any such finding would be unwarranted given the evidence before the Tribunal, it is important to again emphasise that the reliance on the rights afforded to journalists either through Bunreacht na héireann or by virtue of article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights, has only been done so for professional and legitimate reasons and with a view to the protection of sources in the wider context of this democratic society. The Tribunal is urged to be mindful of these core principles when assessing the evidence.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much, Mr. Murphy. There's just a couple of things that arise in relation to that. you make a number of references to Article 10. As you are aware, Article 10 has two parts. The first gives rise to what is the right to communicate.
MR. TOM MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN which, in the case of journalists, as I have said already in my ruling, involves confidential
communication, the non-revelation of sources, but it is, of course, under the second part of Article 10 , subject to the good of society.
MR. TOM MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN I don't, therefore, know how journalists can possibly claim that the privilege is theirs and not a privilege that is granted by society for specific reasons, which, if it steps outside that, can require an answer? That is a question.

MR. TOMMRPH: Sorry, Chairman, yes. I mean, these submissions were made previously on the point, I think. whoever claims to have owned the privilege, I think the test remains the same, the test that I previously outlined, I think, in the submissions to you last week, and they were whether there is this pressing need for the information that has been sought. Journalists, I suppose, in many ways, they see it as their own, and I can see why they might do that, given the nature of the profession that they engage in, but it is certainly my client's position that it is not for Superintendent
Taylor to waive that privilege.
CHA RMAN Right. The second point is the point that I asked Mr. ó Muircheartaigh about. You'11 appreciate it's all very well to say hearsay, hearsay, but hearsay has exceptions.
MR. TOM MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN The biggest and most obvious exception is that admission against interest is never taken as hearsay. I don't have to cite any case law in that
respect. It goes back hundreds of years.
MR. TOM MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN So if there was an admission, and I say if, and please don't take any question as being an assertion, it's not, if there was an admission against interest by Debbie McCann, then that's surely something I am entitled to rely on, even if I was sitting as a judge in the High Court. I don't know if you quarre1 with that proposition?
MR. TOM MRPHY: Sorry, Chairman, I mean, it has been our position that the conversations which Mr. Ó Muircheartaigh asserts did take place, it has been Ms. McCann's position from the very outset that they did not take place, so $I$ am not sure that there is an admission against interest there, but it is firm7y our position that they did not take place.

CHA RMAN I get that. But, I mean, whatever about the very colourful comment made by a public representative here last week, and obviously I have no quarrel with that public representative, he is obviously a decent person, as to the amount of lies told to the Tribunal, the plain reality is that, with this, if I think, Mr. Murphy, that I have to resolve this issue as to who said what, vis-à-vis the conversations between Ms. O'Reilly and Ms. McCann, the plain reality is that if $I$ resolve them in a particular way, then it may be that $I$ am dealing with an admission against interest by a party. In the context of a court case, I would be entitled to rely on that. In the context of a criminal
case, that would amount to an admission. In this context, where I'm not bound by the hearsay rule, it seems to me that those considerations merely help to illuminate this but don't stop me from reaching a conclusion in the event that $I$ were to come to that conclusion.

MR. TOM MRPHY: Thank you, Chairman, yes. I can't quarrel with that too much, I would have to say. But I would say that there really isn't any further corroborating evidence of the matters that have been put forward.

CHA RMAK You're relying principally, Mr. Murphy, on the lack of substance --

MR. TOM MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN -- between what was behind what was
allegedly said --
MR. TOM MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN -- to say that they weren't said or I should find they probably weren't said.
MR. TOM MURPH: Yes. And in my speaking note, I have urged caution in respect of that.

CHA RMAN The next matter was, I am somewhat puzzled, given that Ms. McCann said that she was never negatively briefed by Commissioner o'Sullivan, Superintendent Taylor or Commissioner Callinan, as to
why no question was ever put to those witnesses on behalf of her or on behalf of the Daily mail or the Mail on Sunday -- sorry, no question was put to, I obviously mean Nóirín O'Sullivan, Commissioner Callinan
or David Taylor on behalf of the Mail on Sunday or the Irish Daily Mail or the represented journalists and editor.

MR. TOM MRPHY: Yes, Chairman. Well, I think it is obviously an incredibly difficult position to be in if you are claiming privilege over certain conversations or sources or information, depending on which way you would look at it, that you would then go in and stress-test the particular evidence to which you are refusing to give any information, but I think that was made clear to the Tribunal previously, but I can't put it any further than that.
CHA RMAN Well, it may be we're back to Browne v. Dunn yet again. Just another thing: The address of the $D$ family, Ms. McCann says, was obtained through her own efforts rather than from sources. I presumed that meant looking at the phone book, but to do that one has to have a first name and a second name.

MG. TOM MURPH: I think in evidence she accepted that she had the name, but it was her own endeavours, presumably through the phone book, I think she may well have said that in her evidence. She resourced that herself.

CHA RMAN And then I think the last substantial matter is that the Irish Daily Mail and the Mail on Sunday are 14:27 saying that Alison O'Reilly gave evidence out of bitterness, but the Irish Daily Mail and the Mail on Sunday are also telling me that $I$ can't make a finding that there may have been improper or dishonestly
invoked privilege.
MR. TOM MRPH: Yes.
CHAN RMN Just merely stating it perhaps shows the disharmony between those two positions, and given that your clients have had every possible opportunity perhaps not to rely on their previous correspondence, accusing one of their own staff members of dishonest conduct and deliberately supporting a different staff member, I just tend to wonder where that stands?
MR. TOMMRPH: Chairman, I think correspondence came from my clients saying that they couldn't challenge the credibility of Ms. O'Reilly without doing so under cross-examination, I think, is that right?
CHAI RMAN We11, I think we're way past the whole notion of correspondence. I mean, the reality is, the position that was taken was adopted in evidence.

MR TOM MRPHY: Yes.
CHAN RMN Was actually supported by evidence, but it was evidence of opinion, and indeed I think I put it to Mr. Hamilton that there is a vast difference between, for instance, disliking somebody and then doing something bad to them. That seems to me to be a leap. I don't know whether you feel you want to make a submission on that. And I'm not saying you've left anything out, Mr. Murphy, your submissions have been very comprehensive and to the point, if I may say so. MR. TOM MRPH: Sir, I don't think I can put the matter much further than that.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much, and I'm very
appreciative of your help. So can I just go through things, if I may, from the start, ladies and gentlemen. So I have heard -- the Tribunal, Mr. McGuinness would come back at me in the event that there is any serious error of law made by anybody which he feels I ought to be corrected on, and obviously he is here with Mr. Marrinan and Ms. Leader and Ms. Mullan. Mr. McDowe11 is going at the end, so is the commissioner and the various represented gardaí. I have heard from Superintendent Taylor, I have heard from Alison o'reilly, I have heard from RTÉ. I just want to make sure. And then there's Independent News \& Media, is the next one, so would I take a submission from Independent News \& Media now?
MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman --
CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. McGuinness, I beg your pardon. MR. MEGI NESS: -- might I just say that Mr. Fanning, Senior Counsel, has been in direct contact and he expected to be here tomorrow morning --
CHA RMAN That is fine.
MR. MEGU NNESS: -- to do that.
CHAI RMAN That is absolutely fine.
MR. QU N: We11, Chair, I could go on behalf of the Examiner, if that was convenient. I have a relatively short submission.

CHAL RMAN Yes. We11, certainly, you can do that.
Thank you, Mr. Quinn. And I don't mind if someone is here tomorrow, not today, that's grand.
MR. BUCKLEY: Chairman, if it is convenient, on behalf
of the D family - Mr. Buckley - we might follow Mr. Quinn, if that is convenient to the Tribunal. I will be very brief, less than five minutes or so.

CHA RMAN We11, I am happy to take you whenever you want. Do you want to go now?

MR. BUCKLEY: I think Mr. Quinn was keen to proceed first, so I'm very happy with that.

CHAI RMAN Yes, Mr. Quinn, I am all ears.

## SUBM SSI ON BY MR. QU NN

MR. QUN: Thank you, Chairman. We have a speaking note prepared and Ms. English will just pass a copy of that in. This closing submission will be brief, Chair. It's on behalf of the Irish Examiner, its former editor Tim Vaughan, and then its journalists Mick Clifford, Cormac O'Keeffe, Juno McEnroe and Danie1 McConne11.

And, Chair, you already have the benefit of the submission that was made on Friday by Mr. English in relation to journalistic privilege and the speaking note that we circulated on Friday.

We have carefully considered, Chair, the 20 detailed questions which you set out on Friday, on page 146 of the transcript of that day, and, having considered those, from our perspective it seems to us that they are perhaps more appropriately addressed by the principal protagonists or at least others who have been involved in this module. As it happened, neither the

Examiner nor its journalists have been involved in any journalistic clashes, either one way or the other. And obviously the Tribunal will be conscious that the hearings are not an inter partes nature, and none of our parties nor the legal advisers have been present for the entirety of the module, so we don't propose to address the central issues which the Tribunal has to consider as part of its terms of reference in this module. From our perspective, however, there are some key points we would just like to briefly outline. They 14:32 are set out in bullet-point format on page 2 of the speaking note.

Firstly, to reiterate that, in our view, journalistic privilege properly arises in relation to Mr. McEnroe, O'Keeffe and O'Conne11 in their capacity as journalists, and that the privilege has been appropriately invoked by them in that context.

Secondly, the privilege is not that of the source and
it's not designed or intended to benefit the source. The fact that an alleged source has apparently waived privilege is not determinative.

Thirdly, there is vital public interest behind protecting journalistic privilege, which should only be pierced in limited cases in the public interest and where absolutely necessary, and, to use that we11-rehearsed quote, unless it is justified by an
overriding requirement in the public interest. And then as Mr. Vaughan, a former editor of the Examiner with 15 years' experience explained during his evidence, if you are a journalist who would decide to reveal the source, whether the source chooses to or not, then it has the potential to cause problems down the line in relation to future contacts who might decide not to approach you with stories in the public interest.

Next we say that to draw negative or indeed any inferences from the evidence of witnesses who have invoked privilege, runs the risk of undermining the privilege itself and its purpose and could do so in an unstructured way. We say there should be no attempt, without coherently meeting the necessary and carefully calibrated legal tests, to circumvent the privilege by drawing inferences.

Next we say that the privilege has been honestly
invoked by these journalists and in a considered manner and in the specific context of the factual issues that arise herein. We say it is entirely misguided and contrary to the privilege itself to expect those invoking it to set out in detail precisely how the
privilege will be damaged if they address the questions. As was painstakingly explained in Becker, even to do so runs the risk of undermining the privilege. Each of the journalists has independently
adopted a bona fide position about an issue critical to their profession.

Next we say that each of the parties has cooperated with the Tribunal and has engaged honestly with the Tribuna1. And then over on to page 3 we say there is a huge public interest in maintaining journalistic privilege and confidentiality, which should not be undermined without comprehensively and in a reasoned fashion addressing the requirements of the jurisprudence.

And then 8, we say: Aside from the foregoing, it is submitted that no necessity has been established or successfully contended for by any party to establish why it is essential for these journalists to answer those questions to enable the Tribunal to reach a decision on the matters pertinent to the terms of reference in this module.

At 9 we say: It should also be noted on behalf of these journalists that they firmly submit that no inferences should be drawn one way or another based on their answers. The arguments of other parties that inferences should be drawn one way or the other are self-serving and unjustified.

And then finally we say, and perhaps this is not central from the Tribunal's perspective, there was an
unjustified collateral attack on the Irish Examiner by and on behalf of the Garda Commissioner and the former commissioners, and this is utterly rejected and was entirely unjustified for the reasons which we set out below. You will recal1, Chairman, this occurred at the 14:35 end of Mr. Clifford's evidence, and at the end of Mr. Vaughan's evidence we say it was a gratuitous, deliberate and was a considered attack.

The initial news coverage of the Examiner in October 2016, the coverage commenced on the 4th October, of the protected disclosures, was entirely justified, irrespective of the conclusions that may or may not be drawn by this Tribunal.

In short, the effort on behalf of the Commissioner in particular to attack and criticise the Irish Examiner in this regard is a classic example of trying to shoot the messenger. The fact that two senior serving members of An Garda Síochána had made hugely significant protected disclosures to the Department of Justice back in September 2016 was unprecedented and entirely newsworthy. Mr. Clifford gave detailed evidence of that on Day 85.

In addition, we point out that neither former commissioner contacted the Irish Examiner at the time to make a complaint or seek a right of reply, nor have they ever since made any complaint to the Irish

Examiner, either directly or via the Press Ombudsman. Former Commissioner O'Sullivan did make a public statement on the 5th October and this was quoted extensively by the Irish Examiner on the 6th October on page 1 and on page 6 stories under the headline "O' Sul Ii van deni es all know edge of pl ots". Former Commissioner O'Sullivan did not resign until September 10th, 2017, almost a year later. The true position is that this story was hugely newsworthy and the Irish Examiner reported the fact that these protected disclosures had been made, the nature of the complaints and the allegations and that they raised serious and significant issues.

We say it's wholly unrealistic to expect that this news should not have been published until, somehow or other, the actual full validity of all of the claims are fully investigated. We say that clearly those issues are part of the central matters being explored by the Tribunal and they have taken significant and careful probing, much of which has on1y unfolded gradually and during the course of this module itself.

And then, Chair, just only by way of example, we point to two events that happened as recently as last week. One was during the cross-examination of the editor of the Irish Daily Mirror by counsel for the former commissioners, where it emerged that he was saying that he had become aware over the following two or three
weeks that the story, namely the Ms. D allegation about Sergeant McCabe, had been peddled around town by Superintendent Taylor to a number of other news outlets. That evidence only emerged last week. Mr. Kierans confirmed under further questioning by counsel on behalf of the gardaí that the story about Sergeant McCabe that we were offered was certainly sent to at least two or three other newsrooms, and I discovered that in the two or three weeks after we had the story that Cathal McCann [sic] had. And just another example we gave of how this complicated, difficult issue has evolved is the statement from Tom Donnelly, again I think just of last week, the 18th June, where he confirms what he says Philip Boucher-Hayes said to him; that, namely, after Commissioner callinan had -- or former Commissioner Callinan had spoken to Philip Boucher-Hayes and indicated that he could get more information by contacting Superintendent Taylor, that Philip Boucher-Hayes had said that very thing to Mr. Donnelly.

So these things are only emerging, and the argument somehow that the claims in the protected disclosures were clearly a ball of smoke meriting no reporting, we say is clearly unsustainable and that there were real, significant and serious issues involved.

So we entirely reject that attack that was made on the paper by that party.

In addition, these parties would like to reiterate the point made in the submission and in the speaking note last week, that, as a newspaper, former editor and journalists, they entirely reject the argument that they should sit in judgment on sources. By their nature, sources come with many different motives, some may be high-minded and some may be malicious; in other words, of the nature of sources, is usually of complex and varied motivations. Also, a source's motives or interests can evolve or change with time. Ultimately, the important exercise is that of news-gathering, and the importance of the European Court of European Rights decision in Goodwin is that the rights protected by Article 10 apply to all sources, whether high-minded or malicious. And we say it's not the function of the journalist to abandon the confidentiality of their relationship based on passing judgment of the worthiness of the source.

The criticisms that have been put forward on behalf of the former commissioners in particular, they are utterly rejected.

And then in conclusion we say it is respectfully properly invoked the legal entitlements to journalistic privilege in the matter. These parties have cooperated with the Tribunal at all times and their evidence has
been consistent throughout. The privilege is clearly engaged despite the alleged source waiving the privilege. The parties submit that no inferences should be drawn from the invocation of the privilege, and finally, that the collateral attacks during the course of this module on the Irish Examiner's coverage of the protected disclosure by An Garda Síochána were wholly unjustified and represent a misguided attempt to shoot the messenger, rather than address the real issues. Thank you, Chairman.
CHAN RMAN Thank you very much. Mr. Quinn, thank you very much for that. There is just one matter again. You have invoked Article 10. I take it you agree with all the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights in doing so?
MR. QU N: Yes, chair.
CHAD RMAN Every single one of them on journalistic privilege?
MR. Qul NE yes.
CHA RMAN what about the one which says that the journalist wasn't entitled to hold back the source of information that there was to be a terrorist attack and that the public interest overrode any privilege? You are aware of that one?
MR. QU N: Yes, Chair, and I think that is one of the classic example where the public interest clearly does override.

CHA RMAN We11, then, how can the privilege be personal to the journalist, his or hers to waive or not
waive at will?
MR. QUN: And, Chair, I think in terms of trying to carefully frame our speaking note and submission, we didn't exactly make that point. I think the point made on page 2 , you will see it's slightly more nuanced and in line with the jurisprudence that while it's not the source's privilege, we then talk about the public interest and the fact that it can be pierced where absolutely necessary. And I think that is the point we have made there in the third -- second and third bullet-point on page 2. I suppose, therefore, the challenge from the Tribunal's point of view is to determine or to have it submitted to you by somebody that, without the evidence of, and if I can confine myself to Messrs. McEnroe, McConne11 and O'Keeffe, that 14:41 without their evidence, that the Tribunal cannot determine the issues in the terms of reference.

CHA RMAN And how is a tribunal or a court to decide under Article 10, paragraph 2, of the European Convention on Human Rights, that there is an overriding 14:41 requirement in the public interest, if the journalist refuses to simply answer any questions of any kind whatsoever and simply blanks a judge attempting to get to the truth of matters?
MR. QU N: We11, I suppose, Chair, if one looks at the 14:41 example of what happened in Becker, they were able to simply get on with it and complete the prosecution of Mr. X, notwithstanding the absence of the journalist's evidence. And I suppose in this case the Tribunal has,
perhaps to use one of the road traffic analogies that may have been envisaged, you have the drivers of both cars giving evidence than you have of the twelve so-called bystanders, eight of them.
CHA RMAN That is what -- I thought it was ten.
MR. QU N: We11, nine, I think, and the names have been added as we have gone along.
CHA RMAN yes.
MR. QU N: I don't want to be perhaps -- yes. But to make the point, I think there is no doubt, I can see from the Tribunal's point of view, it would be desirable and he1pful to have the evidence of all of the bystanders.
CHA RMAN Tell me who the two drivers of the cars are.
MR. QU N: Superintendent Taylor and Commissioner
Callinan.
CHA RMAN okay, but one is saying and the other denying.
MR. Qu N: Yes.
CHA RMAN I get your point. I understand. Thank you 14:42 for your submission, Mr. Quinn.
MR. QU N: Thank you, Chairman.

## SUBM SSI ON BY MR. BUCKLEY:

MR. BUCKLEY: Chairman, it might be convenient. Niall
Buckley, instructed by Fanning \& Kelly on behalf of the D family, and hopefully our submissions will be quite short. Mr. Kelly is just handing in a brief speaking note, to which I will just speak to briefly, Chairman.

The Tribunal formulated a number of questions in which it anticipated represented parties might wish to address it, and I think only a very limited number of those pertain to Ms. D and the members of her family, namely questions 14 and 15 , principally. And to address those briefly in reverse first in outline and then to develop that a little, Chairman.

I think the D family's position is that the relevance of their evidence has receded in terms of significance during the course of the Tribunal's inquiries. whilst Ms. D is obviously at the centre of the early part of a key narrative of events that involve Sergeant McCabe, in reality their evidence really provides context, the true focus of the inquiry is what happened subsequently. And it's respectfully submitted that the balance of evidence indicates that their evidence is rather peripheral to the core inquiry the subject of the terms of reference.

In terms of the issue of the media visits to the D family home, Chairman, I think it's important to point out that, of the three visits by journalists in respect of which the Tribunal had raised specific query, Ms. McCann, Ms. Murray and Mr. Williams, two of those, the evidence has been, were entirely unsolicited. The visits of Debbie McCann and Ms. Murray in the spring of 2014 were unsolicited, and neither of them, on the
evidence of both the journalists and the D family members, met with Ms. D. And the D family really have no information as to how these visits came to be initiated.

Ms. McCann confirmed she visited of her own initiative without invitation, on Day 88, and Ms. McCann also said there was never any meeting or discussion with Ms. D. To the extent, I suppose, that Ms. O'Reilly's counse1 has suggested a greater significance to this, I was slightly troubled by the submission which was made that Ms. McCann's involvement with this Ms. D is central to the sequence of events where Sergeant McCabe's character was being increasingly called into question. With respect, $I$ think the internal logic in respect of that statement is perhaps a little open to question, certainly insofar as it suggests or implies that there may have been or would need to have been direct communication occurring between Ms. D and Ms. McCann. And as I say, the evidence of both the protagonists in interview occurred between them. I say the logic of that is a little questionable because the published articles don't bear that out. And secondly, on the logic of Ms. O'Reilly's counsel, the key revelation Ms. McCann prior to the time of her visit, ergo she had sources independent of Ms. D in relation to the allegations. So the theory advanced by Ms. O'Reilly's
counsel really isn't predicated on any direct contact between them at a11, and I don't think the court needs to or that it would be warned in disregarding the direct evidence of both individuals whom it is alleged met, when both of their evidence to this Tribunal has been that they did not. And insofar as there was an emphasis placed by Ms. O'Reilly's counse1 on a continuing key relevancy of the D family's testimony, I would query to what extent that was substantiated. There was a focus placed on a discrepancy of the recollection of dates as to the occurrence of a meeting between Ms. Murray and the D family, but really, the materiality of that discrepancy wasn't thrashed out in the submission and it is still not entirely apparent to the D family.

Returning, though, Chairman, to the second visit, that that of Ms. Murray, again Ms. Murray confirmed in her evidence that her initial contact with the $D$ family was made by way of an unsolicited phone call. Her evidence 14:47 was that she understood Mr. D was not opposed to them visiting -- to her visiting them, and she also never met with Ms. D, and the evidence of Mrs. D was consistent with this also insofar as there was a generic discussion about having been through a difficult period in recent times, and the resurgence of attention on Sergeant McCabe had not helped their daughter's circumstances.

So whilst Mr. and Mrs. D's evidence was that they recall the meeting with Ms. Murray predating the interview with Mr. Williams, they're not aware of what, if anything, turns on that. Certainly, Ms. Murray had no evidence of telephone records, mileage claims or notes to verify her alternative recollection of dates which was advanced four years later and after they had given their evidence, and by which stage she was familiar with and had read that evidence. But it's also noted that her recollection of the genesis of the story lead and her timeline was at odds with the evidence of her deputy head of news, Mr. O'Shea, when he gave evidence, but the D family really don't have any information to share on those matters.

With respect to Mr. Williams, Chairman, the engagement was somewhat different. Ms. D gave evidence in late 2013/early 2014 she had articulated to her father that she wanted to get across her side of the story and she had become frustrated at the public lauding of sergeant 14:48 McCabe in certain quarters. The evidence was that her father had cautioned her against reporters, but Ms. D had persisted with a desire to speak to someone, and Mr. D gave evidence that his primary concern was for his daughter and she remained distraught at this time, and it was for this reason he raised the issue of responding to media approaches with a long-time family friend, Superintendent O'Reilly. So I'd respectfully ask that the Tribunal might consider that communication
and that initiation of communication through the prism of a parent approaching a family friend on behalf of a child, rather than qua any office held by any of the parties.

Mr. D gave evidence that it was he that initially contacted Paul williams to facilitate his daughter's wishes, and Mr. Williams confirmed in his evidence that Mr. D contacted him and explained that his daughter wished to speak with Mr. Williams. Again, Ms. D gave unchallenged evidence that she'd met with mr. williams on one occasion, on the 8th March, and that nobody prompted her or encouraged her to speak with any reporter.

This ultimately prompted an article in April 2014 in the Irish Independent, which reported Ms. D articulating a desire to see an investigation into the manner in which her original 2006 complaint had been handled. It's important to stress that it had nothing to do with the false Rian referral, of which contents Ms. D was then unaware. And whilst I suppose the Tribunal has properly inquired into those matters, it's respectfully submitted that the facts show that ultimately these matters fall outside the terms of reference as properly understood.

Ms. D also gave evidence of discussions regarding pursuing a GSOC complaint as a possible avenue of
redress and pursuing contact with political figures around a dossier of cases, intended to be pursued further. And again, it is respectfully submitted that those matters and those discussions fall outside the terms of reference, given the underlying focus of Ms. D 14:50 at that time being concerned with an investigation of an earlier complaint and not the later Tusla file and the contents as reflected by it.

And returning then to reflect on what, in light of that, is the continuing relevance of the D family's evidence. I think the D family do not contend their evidence is of key relevance to the primary focus of the Tribunal's inquiries as prescribed by the terms of reference. It obviously has an importance in terms of grounding the context to what subsequently happened, but they would respectfully request that, insofar as is possible, their affairs be treated with as much sensitivity as possible in the context of an inquiry which has made clear what is properly and what is not its focus of inquiry.

And I suppose, finally, I just add that Ms. D's interview with Mr. williams, a voluntary interview took place against a context of widespread media reporting on deficiencies in Garda investigations and shortcomings had been highlighted in the press, and there were certain issues which might have created traction from Ms. D's perspective, as a source of
discontent about the way her complaint was handled, it being undertaken by a colleague in the same district. It is not suggested that the Tribunal would determine or arrive at any view in respect of that, and that's being pursued before a separate forum, but I suppose I advance those remarks and submissions only to demonstrate that there are independent and understandable impetuses derived from Ms. D's personal experiences for her pursuing the interview with mr. Williams and that they are not necessarily tied up in the matters the subject of the Tribunal's inquiry.

Those are the principal submissions on behalf of the D family, unless $I$ can assist any further, Chairman?
CHA RMAN Yes. In the course of your submissions, I note, Mr. Buckley, that you make reference to the letter from Sergeant McCabe to Superintendent Clancy, and, as you will be aware, the vast majority of that was blacked out because it was irrelevant to anything that we are doing, and it apparently concerned events at a barbecue or some other kind of gathering where perhaps there was refreshments taken. And therefore, I appreciate you reminding me of that, but that is the position the Tribunal has --
MR. BUCKLEY: I'm obliged, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Yes. Well, let's go through this from the back. Are there going to be any submissions by Cathal McMahon? Have you heard anything, Mr. McGuinness?

MR. MGGU NESS: No, Chairman.

CHA RMAN we11, like, that somebody may be here tomorrow or tomorrow afternoon?
MR. MEGU NESS: No, no, I have heard nothing, Chairman. Thank you.
CHA RMAN All right. okay. And then John Barrett? MR. MGGI NESS: Mr. Barrett's legal representatives don't intend to make any submissions.
CHA RMAN A11 right. That is grand. Thank you. And then Eavan Murray?
MR. MGGU MESS: Mr. MCAleese, I think, has indicated by correspondence he doesn't intend to make any submission.
CHA RMAN All right. And then John Mooney? I think Mr. Bradley was here briefly for John Mooney. I mean, he really just flits into the picture and flits out again.
MR. MEGU NESS: I don't believe we have heard anything from Mr. Mooney in that regard.
CHA RMAN Okay. And then Mr. Lally? And again, it's no criticism to say that no one wants to make
submissions - they're entitled to, if they wish, and it quite often happens at the ends of cases that people don't want to make a submission, so that is fine, and they are very minor players.
MR. MEGU NESS: The Irish Times, through their
solicitors, have indicated they didn't intend to make any submissions.

CHA RMAN For Mr. Lally?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.

CHA RMAN Yes. And again, I think very peripheral. okay. And then we have heard from counsel for Anne Harris. And for John kierans? I am going back to the page previously then.
MR. MtGU NESS: I don't believe he intends to make any 14:55 submissions.

CHA RMAN okay, that is fine. And again, that is fairly normal at the end of a case. And then the Department of Justice and Brian Purcell, we have had extensive submissions from them in the issue relating to the o'Higgins Tribunal, but they were hardly ever involved in this at all.
MR. MEGU NESS: No. Mr. McCann had been here, but -CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: And Mr. Meehan. But there's no
evidence of any intention to make any submission in the matter.

CHA RMAN Yes. And then for Mr. Shatter, was there any indication that -- I mean, I can take the evidence as given, obviously, but...
MR. MEGI NESS: Mr. Gallagher on his behalf, and indeed Mr. Shatter, have been following matters closely, but there's no intention, as I understand it, to make -- or necessity to make any submission.
CHA RNAN Yes. And again, I have no difficulty with ${ }_{14: 55}$ that. And then for Gemma O'Doherty, have you heard anything, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGU NESS: We haven't had any correspondence, I think, from Ms. O'Doherty's solicitors or from

Mr. Harty.
CHA RMAN Yes. And then we have heard from Mr. Lehane on behalf of John McGuinness. For Michelle Taylor was there any desire to make any submissions? Has anything been indicated? I know she was separately represented to you, Mr. O'Higgins, isn't that right?
MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: we don't believe there is any intention to make a submission, chairman.

CHAN RMAN Yes. Just let me check.
MR. MCHAEL O H GG NS: we will confirm that overnight, $14: 56$ but that is the position.

CHA RMAN Yes, it's a separate firm of solicitors, in any event, but if she wants to make submissions, certainly I'm here to listen, but if she doesn't, again it is fairly normal. And The Irish Times is here twice, because they're also for The Irish Times Trust, and I presume they don't want to make any submissions, as we have heard, in relation to Mr. Mallon. Okay. The Irish Examiner have made submissions. The Times newspaper and News Group Limited, I think that was Mr. Mooney. But have we heard anything as to whether they wish to?
MR. MEGU NESS: There's no indication of any intention to do so.
CHA RMAN Yes. And again, that can happen. And for Michael O'Toole, Mr. Thuillier is here, is he?
MR. KELLY: Mr. Thuillier appeared in that, Chairman. We are not making any submissions, thank you.
CHA RMAN You're not making any submissions. Thank
you, Mr. Kelly. Independent News \& Media and Paul williams then?
MR. FREEMAN Mr. Fanning appears with me in that.
CHA RMAN And that's tomorrow, that is fine.
MR. FREEMAN Tomorrow.
CHA RMAN That is absolutely fine. There is no
difficulty whatever about that. So what I seem to have left then is for, it's the Commissioner, and it is Independent News \& Media, and it is Sergeant McCabe. And I have covered everybody e1se, haven't I? Can I just ask for an indication, Mr. McDowe11, how long do you think you will be? If we have to go to tomorrow, then we have to go to tomorrow, that is fine.
MR. MEDOWELL: I'd imagine we will have to go -- unless we're going to sit very late this evening, because I don't know how long the Commissioners' counsel are going to be.
CHAN RMN We11, I don't know, do you want to start making submissions now?
MR. MRPFH: Certainly, Chairman.
CHA RMAN yes, you do. And again, I am not trying to rush anybody.
MR. MRPHY: No, I appreciate that, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Well, I mean, that may be taken as somewhat hypocritical, given my attitude before, but just wipe out those sins, Mr. Murphy, and just carry on as best you can.
MR MRPHY: Thank you, Chairman.

## SUBM SSI ON BY MR. MRPPY:

MR. MRPHY: Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to make final submissions on behalf of the former Garda Commissioners, the current Garda Commissioner and senior officers in An Garda Síochána.

In making our submissions, we would submit that there is a value in considering the matters that the Tribunal was asked to investigate and the evidence heard in those matters by reference, firstly, to the starting point of the Tribunal. And as I will outline in the course of these submissions, this Tribunal was set up against a background of huge public controversy, arising from the publication of allegations contained in two protected disclosures.
CHA RMAN Mr. Murphy, I don't mean to interrupt your flow, even as are you getting off the ground. Did you want me to look at something?
MR. MRPHY: I have a note, Judge, if it would assist you, yes.

CHA RMAN I am happy to look at it, Mr. Murphy, if you feel that it would help in your -- the bench has just collapsed under the weight of it, Mr. Murphy, but thank you.
MR. MRPHY: As you appreciate, Chairman, from the top of the document, that $I$ have to deal with references [a], [b], [c], [f], [g], [i], [j], [l], [k], [m], so I would ask the Chairman's indulgence in relation to that. I will go as speedily as I can. Chairman, at
the outset --
CHA RMAR Well, not so speedily as the stenographer can't follow it, but thank you, even though we have the best in the world.

MR. MRPHY: We11, my first point, Chairman, is that the controversy which is the subject of considerable media and political commentary, much of that was highly critical of An Garda Síochána as an organisation, and of former Commissioners Callinan and O'Sullivan in particular, and on behalf of those parties, it is our central submission that when commentary was for the first time subjected to any degree of scrutiny, many of the allegations, including some of the most serious, were either withdrawn or were shown to be misinformed and groundless. And while in such circumstances so many questioned the value of conducting these hearings, we submit that the true value of this process lies not in upholding the allegations, but in the process itself. And what this process, conducted by you, Chairman, has demonstrated, is the ease with which allegations of misconduct can gain public and political traction, with little or no concern for whether they are true or not. For when those allegations are subjected to a form of judicial scrutiny or Tribunal scrutiny of looking for and testing the evidence in support of them, a very different picture can emerge.

And we say that before sifting the evidence from the commentary and the conjecture in respect of these
allegations, briefly I would like to address the background to the allegations and some of what we say are the applicable legal principles, in very general terms. Then, having applied those principles to the individual matters covered by the terms of reference, I 15:01 will address the 20 questions that you invited the parties to assess.

The first point I wish to make in relation to the allegations, Chairman, is that the central reason why this Tribunal was established to deal with the matters which are before you today, was the allegation made by Superintendent David Taylor in his protected disclosure of the 30th September 2016 and in that disclosure he claimed that the most senior police officer in the State had instructed or directed him, and those two words are most important in the terms of reference, instructed or directed him, to brief negatively against Sergeant Maurice McCabe to the media and to politicians in a manner which included referring to an allegation that Sergeant McCabe had submitted a sexual assault. And the words that were used in the protected disclosure, if I can quote them briefly, are:
"I recall being instructed or di rected to contact the
media to brief themon a particular line the Commi ssi oner had instructed; namel y, to bri ef negativel y agai nst Sergeant MkCabe. In particular, I recall I was to brief the media that Sergeant McCabe
was motivated by maliciousness and revenge. I was al so to encourage media to write negatively about Sergeant McCabe, that his complaints had no substance, that the Garda who fully investigated his complaints had found no substance to his allegations. In essence, I was to brief that Sergeant McCabe was driven by agendas. I was al so directed to draw journalists' attention to the complaint of sexual assault made agai nst Sergeant MECabe and that $t$ his was the root cause of the agenda: revenge agai nst the gardaí."

Those very specific terms contained in the protected disclosure have been subject to analysis by this Tribunal and to challenge in the course of the evidence, and I will come back to specific details of it later on. What we will be saying, Chairman, is that what has emerged from the evidence is a very different picture to what was contained in the protected disclosure of Superintendent Taylor. And although sergeant McCabe has clearly expressed a great interest in these complaints, on an analysis of the terms of reference it's our submission actually the central person is Superintendent Taylor and his credibility is absolutely central to any assessment of the merits of the matters which were put before you for this assessment.

Now, on the opening day of this process on the 27th February 2017, you, Chairman, interpreted this aspect
of the terms of reference as inquiring into whether the reaction of senior officers of An Garda Síochána to concerns about poor performance was in your words "not onl $y$ one of distaste but of active and thought-through malice whereby media briefings take place agai nst indi vi dual s who rock the boat".

And in determining whether there was any evidence of media briefings being motivated by active and thought-through malice, you set the following standard in your approach to all the allegations when you said this:
"One usef ul aspect of the legal mind is it's conditioned to look for evi dence, to seek supporting evi dence, to look for patterns indi cative of truth, not to leap to concl usi ons and not to decl are that someone has done somet hing di screditable without sufficient proof. That is our standard and we will abi de by it."

Now, the primary submission, Chairman, on behalf of An Garda Síochána, is that the evidence that's been put before you allegedly of briefings motivated by malice, is wholly inadequate, and that what little evidence there is is inherently flawed and contradictory and the on7y direct evidence of these briefings is the account of Superintendent Taylor, which we will submit is utterly lacking in credibility. To the extent that there is any supposed supporting evidence of the
briefings, Sergeant McCabe's protected disclosure contained what, in broad terms, was the same allegations made by Superintendent Taylor, albeit with more details than were provided by Mr. Taylor, but it's important to note that insofar as it relates to this allegation, Sergeant McCabe's protected disclosure was based solely on his account of his conversations with Superintendent Taylor, on the 20th September and the 21st September 2014, and what he says he was told by, what he referred to as an impeccable authority, Mr. John Barrett. In each case, of course, the evidence of Sergeant McCabe is hearsay, as he himself candidly acknowledged on Day 60 of this Tribunal, at page 35 , when he said to you, Chairman:
"All l'm doing, I am not saying I have evi dence agai nst ei ther of the Commi ssi oners, all l'msaying is, this is what he, Mr. Tayl or, tol d me."

So front and centre, Chairman, you will recall that when Sergeant McCabe gave his evidence during the 1ast section of the Tribunal's inquiries, he made it very, very clear what the position was. You adopted that position. And in relation to the need to cross-examine him about these issues, that was all passed over because he very frankly indicated that he was merely a herald of the information that was going to be given and led in evidence by Superintendent Taylor. So we say that that emphasises the central role of

Superintendent Taylor, and it would appear an acknowledgment by Sergeant McCabe of his role is a minor role in relation to this matter, other than as the person who brought this to the attention through his protected disclosure, having spoken to Superintendent Taylor.

So we say, that you have mentioned several times, Chairman, that hearsay is admissible in a tribunal such as this, and your opening statement makes it clear that the hearsay aspect of evidence will go to the weight to be attached, given the absence of any opportunity to -the absence of any opportunity to test the hearsay evidence. But significantly, however, this is not a situation where the person who purportedly made the hearsay statement is unavailable, but where in fact they are available and have contradicted the hearsay statement in a number of important respects. And it is submitted, therefore, that the weight to be attached to the accounts of both Superintendent Taylor and Sergeant 15:07 McCabe is affected by the fact that a significant divergence emerged between them about what was said in their conversations in September 2014, which we will deal with later on.

You, Chairman, on day 60 referred to this split, as it were, in terms of the evidence, between Sergeant McCabe and Superintendent Taylor as a chasm in the evidence and so it has proved to be in the time that has flowed
since March 2018.

So in effect, and in summary, we say the position of An Garda Síochána is that neither of the protected disclosures of Sergeant McCabe or Superintendent Taylor are correct in relation to the allegations of series of negative media briefings because Sergeant McCabe relies exclusively on what he has been told by Superintendent Taylor and Superintendent Taylor's credibility has been effectively shattered, we say, by a series of parts of examination in the part of this process. So the position is that the evidence rests on two accounts, one of which is entirely hearsay and both of which contradict each other in several important respects.

Briefly, Chairman, if I might address a word in relation to the background prior to the institution of this Tribuna1. The history, which you have examined, demonstrates that the protected disclosures were addressed to the Minister for Justice at the time, Ms. Frances Fitzgerald, they were delivered to her through the disclosure manager at An Garda Síochána, they were sent to the Minister on 3rd October 2016. In making these disclosures, both Sergeant McCabe and Superintendent Taylor sought to avail of the protections under the Protected Disclosures Act 2014, including that of having their identities protected. It's emerged from the evidence that the Tribunal has examined that at the same time both Sergeant McCabe and

Superintendent Taylor were in a manner inconsistent with such protected briefings, seemed to be briefing and/or confirming the contents of the protected disclosure to at least one member of the media and to members of the Oireachtas. Before the Minister had any 15:09 substantial opportunity to consider the protected disclosures, long before the persons against whom the allegations were made became aware of the actual content of the disclosures, substantial details of the disclosures were carried in a newspaper on the 4th October 2014, raised on radio by a TD and raised in the Dáil. Mr. Callinan, then acting Commissioner, and acting Commissioner O'Sullivan and An Garda Síochána immediately became the focus of a political and media storm, and that required Ms. O'Sullivan, who was then acting Commissioner of An Garda Síochána, to take unusual step of issuing a press release in which she made it clear that she was "not privy and di d not approve any action desi gned to target any Garda empl oyee who may have made a protected disclosure" and that she would condemn such an action.

On the 7th October 2014, in circumstances where controversy about the allegations in the protected disclosures had raged over the previous days, the retired, would conduct an initial review into the protected disclosures and that he would advise what, if any, further investigation would be required. And

Sergeant McCabe and Superintendent Taylor had by then been named in the media as the authors of the protected disclosures. On the 17th December 2016, Mr. Justice O'Neill reported back to the Minister and in circumstances where there was a clear conflict between Superintendent Taylor's allegations and the unequivocal denials by Mr. Callinan and Ms. O'Sullivan he recommended the establishment of a commission of investigation on the basis that matters of significant public concern flowed from it.

Then parliamentary steps were taken to establish such a commission of investigation and put in place in the first week of the 7th February of 2017. But a series of events that week led instead to the establishment of this tribunal of inquiry.

The factors which contributed to the momentum behind the decision to establish this Tribunal included the following:
A. On the 8th February 2017 Mr. Brendan Howlin TD, leader of the Labour Party, published an allegation in the Dáil that Ms. O'Sullivan, who was then the Garda Commissioner, had personally made phone calls "to journal ists during 2014 in the course of whi ch the Commi ssi oner made very serious allegations of sexual crimes having been committed by Ser geant Maurice MLCabe". Deputy Howlin incorrectly said in the Dáil
that he had that morning spoken to journalists who he said had direct knowledge of such phone calls and not surprisingly the allegation then published by Deputy Howlin in the Dáil had profound and immediate political and media impact. Commissioner O'Sullivan issued a statement that evening in which she said she had no knowledge of the claims referred to by Mr. Howlin and refused them in the strongest possible terms. Evidence at this Tribunal has established that Ms. Alison O'Reilly, a journalist for the Irish Daily Mail, was the source of this allegations published by Deputy Howlin. It emerged during this Tribunal that she had told Deputy Howlin the conversations she had had with a colleague, Ms. Debbie McCann, journalist with the Irish Daily Mail, which, according to Ms. O'Reilly, Ms. McCann said that Commissioner Callinan and Superintendent Taylor had told her about an allegation of sexual assault against Sergeant McCabe. There is obviously a dispute between Ms. McCann and Ms. O'Reilly in respect of what Ms. McCann may have said, but however we say that Ms. O'Sullivan's evidence has been that no such allegation about Sergeant McCabe was ever made by Commissioner O'Sullivan to Ms. McCann and that they never discussed Sergeant McCabe at any stage. The Tribunal in its own inquiries has established that there is no record of any such calls between Ms. O'Sullivan and Ms. McCann during the relevant period. Also there has been no evidence of any suggestion of contact by Ms. O'sullivan with any other
journalist of the kind contained in the allegation published by Deputy Howlin.
B. Secondly, on the evening of the 9th February 2017, in a report in the examiner.ie website, later on the RTÉ Prime Time programme, the fact that a more serious allegation about Sergeant McCabe had apparently been made and processed by Tusla was revealed and the circumstances in which this Tusla allegation came about were of course the subject of a previous module. This Tribunal will ultimately determine what occurred, but we submit that all the evidence suggests that it was not in any way caused or contributed to by any member of An Garda Síochána.
C. Then third7y, on Monday, 13th February 2017, Sergeant McCabe, together with Mrs. McCabe, through their solicitors, issued a statement calling for the establishment of this Tribunal, a tribunal rather than a commission of investigation, and the statement was headed "Truth Today - Justice to Follow', and in it the reason given for the need for a public inquiry in the form of a tribunal was what Sergeant McCabe claimed to have been his treatment by lawyers for An Garda Síochána and Commissioner Callinan at the o'Higgins Commission. And the statement included a number of quotations. The first was:
"Our experience of the O Hi ggins Cormission is too
fresh in our minds to allow for repetition."

It goes on to deal with the fact that:
"... Maurice at the hands of the legal teamrepresenting the current Commi ssi oner, was cast in the role of cul prit and/ or defendant and as a person making those compl ai nts in bad faith and without cause.

When chal lenged in that respect that legal teamsought and obtai ned confirmation fromthe present Commissioner that they did so on her personal instructions.

Because the 2004 Act prohi bits under pai $n$ of criminal I aw the publ ication of the actual evi dence tendered to such commi ssi ons, the public has little or no appreci ation of what was done and attempted to be done to Maurice in the course of its hearings."

And then:
"For example, agai nst the background of the current Tusl a controversy, the entirely fal se allegation made of sexual abuse in 2006 agai nst Maurice was repeatedly the subject of attempts at introduction in the proceedi ngs for the purpose of di screditing his motives and testimny...
...for these reasons we have consi stently submitted
that any further inquiry into these matters must be a public inquiry."

This was a point, Chairman, that we touched on just at the very end of the last section of your inquiries, but 15:14 we say it is an important point and it is a point that demonstrates the background of the process; because in essence that particular suggestion of a false allegation being made in the source of the o'Higgins Commission never took place.

The statement then went on to say:
"Now that the truth has emerged of the fal se and shocking campai gn to vilify us and di scredit us there is no reason to have any secret or private i nqui ry under the Commi ssi on of I nqui ry Act 2004."

So as we submitted at the end of the previous module the facts which emerged in the course of that module about what actually happened in the o'Higgins Commission were markedly different to the allegations which led Sergeant McCabe to call for the establishment of the establish and we say no reason has been given by him for that particular disparity, which we say is somewhat striking.

Chairman, if $I$ can move then please to the section 4 which deals with the focus of the Tribunal. Again your
words, Chairman, were, you had to examine whether there was any evidence of briefings, motivated by "active and thought through malice". And we say, taking that focus and that approach, that the focus of this Tribunal is not to any wider knowledge or discussion by anybody of the allegations of sexual assault against Sergeant McCabe, but rather on the use to which it is claimed that allegation was put by Superintendent Taylor on the instructions or directions of Commissioner callinan and with the knowledge of Ms. O'Sullivan. And applying that focus to the evidence we say the task of the Tribunal is somewhat complicated by the fact that the Tribunal has heard extensive evidence of stories indicating the wider circulation of rumours about Sergeant McCabe in media, political and Garda circles in 2014 and 2013. Knowledge of the fact that Sergeant McCabe had been the subject of a complaint of sexual assault was known to some journalists, specifically involved in covering policing and crime issues, from as early as 2011. And this has emerged also in the course 15:16 of the evidence in this Tribunal.

Chairman, you will remember the evidence of crime reporter Michael o'Toole of The Star newspaper, where he said he heard it some time around then and that he heard it from a non-Garda source. Similar evidence was given by John Mooney, crime correspondent the Sunday times. Mr. Conor Lally also gave evidence that he heard about this around 2010/2011. This of course was
long before the period being considered by this Tribunal and indeed before the beginning of the alleged campaign which Superintendent Taylor alleged he was instructed and directed to begin, in the middle of 2013. It's noteworthy that at that stage Mr. O'Toole, having become aware from sources which were non-Garda sources, was moved to explore the allegation and he has told you that he promptly established from local Garda sources not only that no charges had been directed against Sergeant McCabe but that there was no substance 15:17 to the allegations. And Mr. O'Toole when he spoke to you about that uttered the phrase, very memorable phrase, he said "the matter was dead to me fromthen on".

The evidence before you, Chairman, has also established that there was an intensification of knowledge about the historical allegation against Sergeant McCabe amongst political journalists, amongst politicians and in Leinster House circles in late 2013 and early 2014. A point I wish to make at this stage is that that of itself does not establish the existence of a campaign on part of Superintendent Taylor of the types which he has alleged he was directed and instructed to conduct.

The further increased knowledge about historic allegations of sexual assault concerning Sergeant McCabe is likely of course to have been a consequence of the greater prominence which he had attained in the
public domain and the issues which he was attracting in political and media circles during the period leading up to and after his appearance at the Public Accounts Committee in January 2014.

And it's interesting in the submission filed a few moments ago by Mr. Buckley on behalf of the D family, what was submitted to you today was that Ms. D saw that Sergeant McCabe:
"... was being glorified in certain sections of the media for exposing deficient investigative practices, she --"

Ms. D
"-- consi dered thi s ironi c gi ven she harboured concerns about the investigation of her own compl ai nt about Ser geant McCabe and she felt that the prevailing redia focus represented an opportunity to ask questions about her own compl ai nt now that she had reached a maj ority."

So there is evidence of a non-Garda person responding to that ever increasing controversy.

Many of the witnesses who have spoken to you, Chairman, have given this Tribunal a flavour of the extent to which rumours of all types are prevalent under the surface in Irish politics and in the journalistic
community. The pattern of progress of this rumour concerning Sergeant McCabe was as sporadic and as unstructured as rumours on the scale usually are. Some witnesses spoke of never having heard the rumour although they dwelled in political or media circles at the time. Many witnesses have spoke of having become aware of suggestions about Sergeant McCabe and sexual assault, but most often from another journalist or from political circles and without being able to pin down precisely where they heard it from. Such is the nature 15:19 of the pattern of rumour it would be beyond the capacity even of a tribunal of inquiry to identify its original process or to plot its pattern of process.

I make the case very briefly that rumours can travel in 15:19 unexpected directions, their dissemination can be incoherent, but insofar as the process of rumour mongering is concerned different people hear different versions. Another feature of rumours which can become widespread, particularly within the narrow confines of journalistic and political circles, is they travel back on themselves and mutate and alter in character. You have the evidence of journalists, such as Mr. Fionnan Sheehan, about the process of this type of exchange of rumour within political and media circles.

We say that the existence of this rumour, even in the intense and widespread manner achieved by early 2014, does not of itself ground an inference that it must
have been deliberately spread in a systematic way by Superintendent Taylor. In addition, we say the mere existence of a rumour certainly cannot be relied upon to confer credibility on Superintendent Taylor's account and his account which is otherwise unsupported that he was instructed and directed by the Commissioners to harm Sergeant McCabe in any way.

Finally on this point, Chairman, we say that the existence of widespread awareness of the story or even widespread discussion or chatter in relation to political or journalistic and Garda sources doesn't come within the terms of reference, does not in itself need to be considered. We accept that the Tribunal is entitled to, perhaps even obliged to, consider the same, as to whether there is evidence of this type of talk, communication or innuendo falling within the terms of reference.

Briefly, Chairman, we deal in the next three sections with the burden of proof. I don't propose to address you at any length, Chairman, as I think you have already been addressed on that front. To simply shorten the point --
CHA RMAN I'm just wondering, do you have any -- maybe 15:21 it would just shorten it if I ask you the question. You have no quarre1 with the proposition that the standard of proof is probability --

MR. MRPHY: Yes.

CHA RMAN -- but that every judge should be careful before coming to a conclusion that something particularly discreditable was done by somebody -MR. MRPPH: yes.
CHA RMAN -- in expressing that opinion, that the proof is actually there --

MR. MRPHY: yes.
CHA RMAN -- in other words, that the ground is firm; in other words, the heavier the allegation the more solid the ground possibly would need to be --
MR. MRPHY: Precisely, yes.
CHA RMAN -- but it is still balance of probabilities.
MR. MRPH: And perhaps the clearest quotation one can see is Mr. Justice O`Flaherty's quotation at paragraph 26:
"The degree of probability required should al ways be proportionate to the nature and gravity of the issue to be investi gated. "

And that comes from the case of $\underline{\mathbf{O}}$ Laoi re v. Medi cal Counci I.

The other authorities which are contained there exactly replicate what you've said a moment ago, Chairman, indicating the need in this process to carefully weigh the evidence and to look at the implications of findings for those who might be the subject of findings from that evidence.
we say at paragraph 28, Chairman, having moved through the case law, that we invite you to apply a suitably exacting standard of evidence when considering whether allegations of serious wrongdoing and moral turpitude by, for example, two former Commissioners or Mr. McLindon, have been proved on the balance of probabilities. There has to be, we say, a proportionality between the gravity of the matters alleged by Superintendent Taylor as to an alleged orchestrated and sustained smear campaign, and the evidence relied upon to justify that profoundly serious allegation. There must also, we say, be a proportionality between the gravity of the allegations made as to the remarks attributed to Commissioner Callinan in December 2013 and January 2014, and the evidence relied upon to justify those two separate allegations.

In support of that proposition, Chairman, we briefly address a point which I think you have raised on a number of occasions, both in this section of the Tribunal's work and its previous sections, relating to all persons, from whatever perspective or side they may come from, who may be affected by attacks on their good 15:23 name. But what we say is that the allegations of a coordinated effort or campaign conducted on the directions or instructions of, and with the knowledge and acquiescence of senior Garda management, that
allegation itself, we say - and there is evidence before you to that effect - has caused significant damage to the reputation and standing of An Garda Síochána. For example, for Mr. Callinan, for Ms. O'Sullivan, for Mr. McLindon, Superintendent

Taylor's allegations have the greatest seriousness and one that is deeply damaging. It has had the effect of being put in the public of undermining their professional standing, impugning their personal integrity, it is one which they and their families have 15:24 had to endure for more than a year and a half, often in the context of intense media and political commentary which is detrimental to them.

Ms. O'Sullivan has also given evidence that these allegations assert to undermine her position as Commissioner and contribute significantly to the circumstances which occasioned her decision to retire from that post in September 2017.

We also submit that the reportage and commentary on the matter was particularly difficult for those who were the subject of allegations in circumstances where the media felt free, because the allegation was contained in a protected disclosure, to report on the allegation without having to establish whether the allegations made had any basis in fact or in some cases even having to put them to the person who was the subject of the allegation. And because the provisions of the
operation of the 2014 Protected Disclosure Act was such that those against whom the accusations were made were initially not even aware of the content of the allegations, they were constrained in how they would respond.

Moving from that, Chair, to one issue which we say will be of importance to our submission, and to your assessment of all of the evidence in this case, and that's the question of the impact of delay and flawed memory.

The first point we wish to make, Chairman, is that many of the matters being inquired into by your, Chairman, have been the subject of intense political, media and public commentary for a considerable period of time. Many of these matters have been discussed in detail, in public, and have been presented in some cases as accepted as being true. One such example is the content of Superintendent Taylor's protected disclosure. Many of the points that he made out in that protected disclosure in the course of his evidence he now accepted were not accurate, yet at the time and over many months up to this process of your hearings in this Tribunal, they were presented in political circles 15:26 and in the media print and broadcast as being true, even to the extent that some people thought that this inquiry wasn't necessary at all because they appear to be so self-evidently true.

We say as a consequence of these matters being discussed so intensely in public is that what people learn through that public discussion can often inform or taint their own memory. One feature which has arisen in this Tribunal is that individuals have given information or evidence for the first time about events that occurred long before they first gave that information and after aspects of that information had been in public circulation for a considerable period of time, and we say it's entirely possible that their memory of those is mistaken through the passage of time and we say it's particularly important that regard be had to these delays and it's also possible that their memories are based on what they have since heard.

We will deal with a number of those instances below but at the outset it's our submission that the Tribunal should exercise great care in looking at the reliability of information against the fact of this
background. So we will see a number of examples where witnesses have spoken of instances which occurred effectively in private, in a one-to-one discussion, say in 2014, and then for the first time they mention this three years later, after there has been a tsunami of public discussion about the very same events, to what effect that may affect people, not even a question of $i 11$ wil1 but a question simply affecting the process and understanding the arrangements themselves.

Moving if I can now, Chairman, to the terms of reference and I will begin if I could with sections [a] and [b]. [a] and [b] I have referred to a few moments ago and the Tribunal has these issues, very clearly.

This relates to the specific statement by Superintendent Taylor that he was instructed or directed by former Commissioner Martin Callinan and/or Deputy Commissioner Nóirín O'Sullivan to contact the media, to brief them negatively and to brief them Sergeant McCabe was motivated by malice and revenge, and then also to draw attention to the allegation of criminal conduct made against Sergeant McCabe.

So we say that the allegation in [a] and [b], which you have to assess, is that the two most senior officers in An Garda Síochána were involved in directing and instructing a systematic campaign to malign the reputation of a sergeant of An Garda Síochána, including by advancing the suggestion of his
involvement in a sexual offence, and we say that from a point of view of interpretation that both of those paragraphs should be read together; because the reference to Sergeant McCabe being driven by agendas in paragraph [a] can only be understood by the reference in paragraph [b] to the route cause of his agenda being "the allegation of criminal misconduct" against him. That is to say, the 2006 allegation. So we submit that the reference to the 2006 allegation are part of
paragraphs [a] and [b], notwithstanding that there is no express reference to same in paragraph [a].

In his statement to you and in his evidence to you, Chairman, Superintendent Taylor has sought to extend this allegation to encompass Mr. Andrew McLindon, the civilian director of communications of An Garda Síochána. Superintendent Taylor belatedly accused Andrew McLindon of an involvement in the alleged conspiracy we say long after he had made his own protected disclosure. Now the words of these paragraphs in the terms of reference are in fact, in [a] and [b], taken from Superintendent Taylor's protected disclosure. This may explain the looseness of the language employed. But given that Sergeant McCabe was completely exonerated by the DPP, the ingredients of the alleged briefing which Superintendent Taylor alleges he was instructed to carry out, we say, are nonsensical and this raises questions as to the credibility of his account. This
is touched upon in question 5 which you have raised, Chairman: what is the full extent of the allegation of calumny against Sergeant McCabe? A point to which I wil1 return to later on.

At the outset the submission that we wish to make, Chair, is that having looked at all of the evidence that you have heard and looking at a11 of the testimony of Superintendent Taylor we respectfully submit that
the allegation made by Superintendent Taylor is untrue. we say it's not supported by any evidence whatsoever that is capable of being relied upon from Superintendent Taylor or any other party and we say that in fact when one looks at the evidence all of the available evidence contradicts rather than supports his allegation of negatively briefing the media. And more fundamentally, we say there's no credible evidence that if he did anything of the sort he claimed to have done that he did it on the direction or instruction of Commissioner Callinan, Deputy Commissioner o'Sullivan or with the acquiescence or permission of either.

On a preliminary point, Chairman, we say that one might have thought that if such a campaign actually existed, that there would be evidence of it in the media. On the contrary, all the evidence before you demonstrates there is no actual output from which such an effort or campaign in the form of negative stories about sergeant McCabe, there's no sign of a chilling effect operating in the media coverage of Sergeant McCabe. In the years since 2010, seven and a half years, when Sergeant McCabe had raised issues, when these first became reported in the media, there have been hundreds and hundreds of print media reports and broadcast items, positive, if there were any such campaign or coordinated effort to malign Sergeant McCabe to the media on Superintendent Taylor's own part it was
extremely unsuccessful to the extent that it is hard to believe that it ever happened at all.

The Tribunal's own inquiries have identified only one set of stories which can be said to malign Sergeant McCabe and reference the Ms. D allegation. They are the Paul williams stories in March and April of 2014, in which Sergeant McCabe wasn't named but was identifiable as the subject of the story to anyone who was otherwise aware of the matter, but we say that neither Superintendent Taylor, nor anyone in senior Garda management at Garda Headquarters was involved in directing Paul williams towards the D family. The initiative, the approach to Paul williams came, as established by the evidence, from the D family themselves. Chairman, you have received that evidence.

We say the only direct evidence such as it was, that could possibly suggest the existence of a campaign or effort was the evidence of Superintendent Taylor
himself. And we invite you, Chairman, to consider that for the very reasons I'm going to outline now his evidence is not to be believed.

First, we say that Superintendent Taylor is not a
person in his testimony one can identify credibility and credit.

1. We say that he misled the Clerkin inquiry in his
first statement.
2. He swore an affidavit in the High Court proceedings verifying a series of very serious allegations --
CHAD RMAN I'm sorry, Mr. Murphy, to interrupt, maybe just tell me why you say he misled Clerkin if you wouldn't mind, it might help.
MR. MRPHY: Ultimately by effectively denying any involvement in the process, in contrary to the evidence which you received here. So there is a stark contrast between what he has said to you, Chairman, and what was said at that time. And insofar as the notifications in relation to the Roma children, there was also a specific point of evidence there where there's a denial which ultimately was present. If you see, Chairman, down at the end of page 16, footnote 17 in the Tribunal materials, first of all, Mr. Taylor says:
"I did not di scl ose any of the inf ormation or rel ease any ot her information to any persons within the media or to any medi a outlets."

But in evidence to you on day 77 , page 113 , he says:
"CHAI RMAN: I mean this thing with the press woul d have ${ }_{\text {15:33 }}$ gone on. I mean, you mi ght thank themfor it, perhaps, until now, i nvesti gations could have been compromised, cases could not have been brought. I mean, are you not grat ef ul for Superintendent Cl erkin stopping your
tracks?
A. I regret i mmensel y."

The following exchange, Mr. McGuinness asked him:
"Do you accept that on many occasi ons you engaged in systematic and continuous seeking out of information from officers, documents and you circul ated the i nf ormation and documents to many journalists --
A. Yeah. I accept that.
Q. -- at a time when you're not entitled to do it?
A. Yeah, I accept that, yeah.
Q. Now it seems to be, looking at the totality of it, therefore, acting as a press officer in an unauthorised way, would you agree with that, at the very least?
A. Yes, I regret, I regret that matter."

So we say that there is a complete difference in his approach towards the Clerkin investigation at that time and to his evidence here to you.

Second point: Chairman, he swore an affidavit in the High Court verifying a series of very serious allegation about the Clerkin which he has now accepted were not true. And we say that all the evidence before 15:34 the Tribunal has established that contrary to the various assertions made on behalf of Superintendent Taylor in that affidavit, the Clerkin investigation was we11-founded and extremely well conducted. And again,

Chairman, applying this Tribunal's assessment and experience in the criminal law to the process of that investigation file submitted by the DPP to the Tribunal for its investigation, we say it is clear that that examination and investigation by Superintendent Clerkin 15:35 was meticulous, incredibly thorough and fair.

We say it is clear from the evidence that Commissioner o'sullivan had no involvement in the organisation or management of the clerkin investigation. We know that she had no involvement in the appointment of Chief Superintendent Clerkin to conduct the investigation. we know that Superintendent Clerkin alone made the decision to appoint Superintendent James McGowan as the superintendent to the investigation. we say that the criticisms of the conduct of the investigation made by Superintendent Taylor in his application for leave for judicial review and similar criticisms made by Mrs. Taylor were unfounded. Needless to say they had an effect not just on the people referred to, Martin callinan and Nóirín o'sullivan, but on public confidence in An Garda Síochána as an institution.

In response to your ninth question, the relevance of the allegations of Superintendant Taylor as to
Commissioner O'Sullivan, Detective Superintendent McGowan, Chief Superintendent Clerkin and the false High Court applications, is that they show that he was prepared to lie about serious and significant matters
which are relevant to this Tribunal and that he had an animus towards former Commissioner o'sullivan. We say furthermore that his belated and apparent reluctance to withdraw the allegation during the course of the Tribunal goes to the credibility of his account.

Third, we say that Superintendent Taylor, as acknowledged by him for the first time in evidence, was in fact engaged in a pattern of inappropriately providing confidential information about Garda activities and investigations to selected journalists. нe has now belatedly and after vigorously challenging the bona fides of the investigations into these matters admitted doing this after he had left his role with the Garda Press office. The evidence demonstrates that his activities in that regard were extensive. They were ongoing for many months. They didn't even cease after he came under suspicion for leaking police information concerning a Roma child. This leaking included the provision of confidential information to journalists about the most sensitive of live Garda investigations, including into a rape investigation and a murder investigation, he thereby risked significant harm being caused to these investigations. Not only that, by effectively providing to certain members of the media a ${ }^{15: 37}$ paralle1 and unapproved press information service he was undermining the Garda Press Office.

Fourth, we say and acknowledge it's a matter for this

Tribunal to decide on the conflict of facts which have now arisen about what Superintendent Taylor told Sergeant McCabe during their conversation on the 20th and 21st September 2016 and the conflict between Superintendent Taylor and Deputy Wallace, Deputy Daly, Deputy McGuinness and the journalist Mr. Michae1 Clifford over what he told them about the use of texts in the alleged campaign to malign Sergeant McCabe. If the Tribunal on the weight of the evidence before it finds Superintendent Taylor's testimony to this

Tribunal on that aspect to be untrue, then it goes to his general lack of credibility and further undermines the credibility of his protected disclosure.

We draw attention to those specific clashes between the different version of events which different witnesses have told you he provided to them.

The next point, Chairman, I would like to make briefly, but it's a point which has on addressed in the course
of earlier comments and submissions to the Tribunal: Superintendent Taylor's protected disclosure was bereft of any specific detail that one might have expected to enable some party to contradict or disprove his account. He hasn't at any stage provided specifics of any incident or occasion at or on which he engaged in such negative briefings with journalists. His subsequent statements to the Tribunal are similarly 1acking into detail. This is notwithstanding the fact
that Mr. Callinan and Ms. O'Sullivan repeatedly expressing their concern about the absolute lack of any detail and impossibility of defending themselves against such vague and nebulous allegations. we submit, Chairman, it would be unfair, fundamentally unfair, to make any findings against any individual on the basis of any allegation of such vagueness, not least because that vagueness effectively denies the parties any opportunity to meaningfully cross-examine the person making the allegation. Superintendent Taylor hasn't identified any occasion when he says he spoke to Commissioner Callinan during which he was instructed to conduct the campaign or on which he subsequently updated Commissioner Callinan on the progress or effect of any such campaign with the
exception of the purported communications about the williams visits, which we will discuss later on. He hasn't identified any specific occasion when he discussed such a campaign of negative briefing with Andrew McLindon. we say it is simply unsafe to rely upon vague evidence lacking detail. We also submit, Chairman, that it lacks credibility that Superintendent Taylor would not have some detail if these incidents had actually happened in point of fact. And we submit that one is forced to conclude that they did not happen.

In evidence Superintendent Taylor merely repeated that he availed of opportunities to drop negative references
about Sergeant McCabe or suggestions about a backstory into the conversations with journalists but he was unable to identify any such particular occasion.

We say that the importance of focusing on the words of the terms of reference is emphasised because the words at paragraphs [a] and [b] are taken from Superintendent Taylor's protected disclosure. During his evidence he repeatedly said that his alleged briefing was "opportuni stic when opportunity arose". However, according to him the direction he had been given was "to contact the media to brief themnegatively agai nst Sergeant MECabe". That is, in other words, to proactively take steps to brief the media. So the account of what he did is at odds with his direction to proactively brief the media.

Another point, Chairman, is that in his protected disclosure Superintendent Taylor did not name any journalists who he had negatively briefed. He didn't do so during the review conducted by Mr. Justice o'veill. He didn't do so in his initial statement to the Tribunal. He did not provide the names of any such journalists until 2017. And that's in a letter of the 13th April of 2017 from his solicitor.

In response to a specific query correspondence from the Tribunal he named for the first time nine journalists as being those to whom he claims he maligned Sergeant

McCabe. Later he produced two further names, those of journalists Debbie McCann and Eavan Murray. But this, however, was only after the Tribunal had become aware of the degree of telephone contact between Superintendent Taylor and these two journalists, and after the Tribunal had become aware that they had each travelled to seek to interview Ms. D. But remarkably, having allowed the Tribunal hearings to proceed almost to conclusion, on day 94 of this Tribunal's hearings Superintendent Taylor named a twelfth journalist who in 15:41 common with seven other journalists on his list promptly denied his allegation.

Chairman, now turning please to page 20 , we point out that Superintendent Taylor acknowledged that he, in his 15:42 words, "ceased" activities in relation to the alleged campaign after Mr. Callinan had retired as Commissioner. This was notwithstanding the fact that he also claimed that the new Commissioner, Nóirín O'Sullivan, and Mr. McLindon had been complicit in conducting such a campaign and he had kept them both fully informed. In Superintendent Taylor's case, if it were true, there is no good reason for him to have ceased the alleged activity. Indeed, it could be said that he would have continued or possibly even accelerated his campaign in order to impress the new management, but that didn't happen because again the fundamental underlying allegation was false.

Five, we would say that one would have thought logically any purported smear campaign that had at its core a reference to an allegation of child sexual abuse would be directed at discrediting the victim by causing the listener to believe the historical allegation to have been true. In other words, that by dropping mention of the sexual assault allegation into conversations, the listener's mind would be prompted into thinking that the allegation was true or that there was something to it in.

In relation to core issue, Superintendent Taylor gave entirely contradictory evidence. On day 76, page 7, he was asked was it is his position that he was to impart the message to parties that were being negatively briefed that "there's no smoke without fire" in relation to the sexual abuse allegation. He confirmed twice that that was not part of the methodology of the smear campaign, day 76 , page 7 . But this evidence flatly contradicts the statement he had given to the Tribunal investigators in May 2017, which appears at page 128 of the materials. There he said:
"I was to say that Maurice McCabe was driven by agendas, he was motivated by revenge, that revenge is dri ven by the allegation, sexual allegation made agai nst hi mby another menber's daughter a number of years ago. I would say, I did al ways clarify to a journalist that a file had gone to the DPP and that
there was no prosecution. However, this was the narrative... it was put in such a way that there was no smoke without fire. I would drop that in when tal king to journalists."

In this Tribunal when Superintendent Taylor was asked to account for the contradict, the question put to him was:
"I suggest to you that no smoke without fire means
there is something in the allegation, the allegation is likely to be true, isn't that what the expression means. "

Superintendent Taylor said:
"I don't accept that."

He was questioned, the question said:
"I see. And are you in a position to reconcile what you told us a few mintes ago with what l suggest to you was a different account in the statement to the Tri bunal investi gators."

Superintendent Taylor replied:
"No. As I said, my position as directed by the Cormissioner was al ways to bring the journalists'
attention to the fact that Sergeant McCabe was motivated by revenge in bringing these matters to the publ ic arena."

That is day 76 , page 10.

We submit, Chairman, the fact that Superintendent Taylor isn't even able to say whether the smear campaign he claims to have existed involved inducing the persons being briefed to believe that Sergeant McCabe was guilty of child sexual abuse is a strong indicator that no such smear campaign ever existed. Apart from discrediting a core plank of the alleged smear campaign, the superintendent's directly contradictory accounts of the campaign calls into question the very essence of his story and further underscores the necessity to treat his entire account with skepticism.

Again, in the course of interaction with the Chairman, you asked him, in the course of the process, questions 5 and 13, the question of:
"Is what Superintendent Tayl or clains to have been done an understatement of the reality of what he did?"
"If these are to be bel ieved or accepted as probable
what is the full extent of allegation of cal umy agai nst Ser geant McCabe? Is Superintendent Tayl or reducing hi s role, and if so, does thi s factor lessen o compl etel y di ssol ve his credi bility?"

And we say that it must be emphasised that Commissioner Callinan did not ask Superintendent Taylor to negatively brief the media, whether in the form suggested in the questions or at all. The significance of the ambiguity in Superintendent Taylor's account is he clearly cannot decide which lie to settle on. If he briefed the media negatively he would know what the message was. The fact that he doesn't means that he did neither. For this reason, this factor we say lessens his credibility to the extent of completely dissolving it. It's very difficult to see why Superintendent Taylor would, when making his protected disclosure, or more particularly in giving evidence, reduce his role from what he was actually doing.

A further point we wish to make, Chairman, is that based on the evidence you have heard there is no other evidence of any kind to substantiate Superintendent Taylor's allegations. As we have submitted in our submissions last week in relation to the issue of journalistic privilege, none of the journalists who Superintendent Taylor claims to have briefed supported his claim. On the contrary, eight of the journalists have expressly denied that they received any such
briefing from him or from any member of An Garda Síochána and the balance invoked journalistic privilege. of those four, as previously submitted, two can be discounted by reference to the timeframe in which they became aware of the rumours against Sergeant 15:46 McCabe and one of the remainder, Cormac O'Keeffe, expressly denied having been negatively briefed by either Mr. Callinan or Ms. O'Sullivan. So, in those circumstances we submit it would be wrongful to draw any inference from their claim of privilege against a third party such as Mr. Callinan, Ms. O'Sullivan or Mr. McLindon, where the Tribunal itself hasn't challenged the claim of privilege and sought to compel the witnesses to answer the question using the mechanisms under the Tribunal of Inquiry Act.

If there is a consequence for that claim of journalistic privilege, it's a consequence for the journalist and not for any third party.

Chairman, we also go on to say that looking at the Clerkin investigation, from the standpoint of An Garda Síochána, as an institution, one of the more damaging allegations put forward by Superintendent Taylor was his suggestion that the absence of documentary or electronic evidence to support his claims was due to, as his counsel put it, in the judicial review application report, "skullduggery". Part of Superintendent Taylor's case in this regard is that the

Clerkin investigation was "trumped up" and that Deputy Commissioner o'Sullivan caused his phone to be seized for the purpose of securing the evidence on that phone about Superintendent Taylor's negative briefing of journalists with her acquiescence.
of course the evidence has established that the phone he used during that time period was the one that would have contained such evidence, if it existed, was never seized and always remained in the position of Superintendent Taylor. And he must have known that to be the case.

His allegations in this regard, which he repeated to politicians and journalists and to the High court, were 15:48 false. They created a public narrative that was false and caused tremendous to An Garda Síochána, to Commissioner o'sullivan and to her husband. This issue has to go to the credibility of the rest of his protected disclosure and to his credit.

It's difficult to imagine an allegation more undermining to An Garda Síochána, its law enforcement role, than one which alleges that having confiscated material which demonstrated misconduct by its senior But that is an allegation that was recklessly made and it was as recklessly made as it was casually withdrawn.

We say also that Superintendent Taylor's allegation are not substantiated by the content of various computers, laptops or email addresses used by Superintendent Taylor to which this Tribunal has had access and which have been forensically examined by the Tribunal, nor are they substantiated by the contents of or metadata relating to other parties' devices. And a very thorough examination has been conducted under your direction, Chairman: Nothing by way of evidence to support Superintendent Taylor's claim has emerged from that forensic independent assessment.

A further question arises, Chairman, as to if you take the view that the evidence is as I have set it out to be in the last few minutes, given by Superintendent Taylor, is there a motive for this deception. We would respectfully submit that there is. We say in determining the credibility of Superintendent Taylor's allegation, clearly a highly relevant consideration is whether he may have had a motive to lie and if so, what 15:50 the motive might have been. We11, Chairman, you have heard evidence that Superintendent Taylor was upset, he was angry, at having been moved from the Press officer role. That he was bitter with Commissioner o'Sullivan as a result. It upset him to the extent, through the evidence, transcript day 76, that he had difficu7ty sleeping, that he openly voiced his upset to colleagues and to journalists.

Third, we say that Superintendent Taylor on the evidence was further embittered against Commissioner o'Sullivan after he became the subject of the criminal investigation into the leak of detail about the Roma child and when the Clerkin investigation broadened into an investigation into many other leaks of confidential information made by Superintendent Taylor. Now, we know from the evidence that Superintendent Taylor and Mrs. Taylor believed, and still believe, that Ms. O'sullivan was determined to somehow "get a charge" 15:50 in, that phrase that was used. Superintendent Taylor seems to have developed a particular fixation about the fact that Ms. O'Sullivan's husband was involved in the Clerkin investigation and seemed to see that this was some way reflecting Commissioner O'Sullivan's intention 15:51 to have him prosecuted.

Fourth, the evidence suggests that Superintendent Taylor was particularly embittered about his arrest and detention and that he visited his angst in this regard also upon Commissioner O'Sullivan. This was a theme of his discussion with the journalist Mick Clifford in the summer of 2016 and in his discussions with Deputies wallace and Daly on the 3rd October 2016, all of which we say is reffected in the notes that each of them took 15:51 at the time and which has been reflected in the evidence they gave to the Tribunal.

Furthermore, it's also evident, we say, as a theme in
his meeting with Deputy McGuinness in January 2017. In addition, Superintendent Taylor expressed his unhappiness about his arrest and the intensification of his angst against Ms. O'Sullivan in particularly trenchant terms during his second visit to Commissioner 15:52 Callinan's home when the evidence indicates that he said "bring her down".

And If I could also indicate that this evidence, I think, in addition the Tribunal materials at --

Tribunal transcripts, Day 76 and page 184 . We say that this is evidence which you could safely rely upon, Chairman, if you consider it appropriate to do so, to consider that it is evidence of motive, that Superintendent Taylor was very motivated to falsely implicate Ms. O'Sullivan as being involved in or aware of an alleged campaign of negative briefing against Sergeant McCabe because he was bitter towards her. And the extent to which he was motivated to undermine Commissioner o'sullivan was reflected in his involvement within a few days of makings his protected disclosure, in circumstances of his anonymity initially being protected, in meeting the journalist Mr. Clifford to disclose or confirm details of his protected disclosure, and then in his actions in briefing Deputy Wallace and Daly on Monday the 3rd October 2017, thereby ensuring that his allegations against Commissioner o'sullivan received publicity.

As referred to above, these actions, we say, are the antithesis of a statutorily-protected disclosure process. They led to significant political and media controversy and repeated calls for Commissioner
o'Sullivan to resign from then on.

Superintendent Taylor also alleges that Commissioner Callinan was involved in directing him to conduct a campaign of briefing against Sergeant McCabe. We suggest that his reason for doing so was to give credence to the suggestion that such a campaign was being conducted by senior management and that Ms. O'Sullivan was aware of it and would be implicated in it. In order for his allegation of an unauthorised campaign against Sergeant McCabe to have any credence, it had to include a suggestion that Commissioner Callinan was involved in directing it. Any suggestion that Superintendent Taylor would have been involved in such activity with the knowledge of only Deputy Commissioner o'sullivan and not of Commissioner Callinan, wouldn't have been credible, having regard to the fact that he worked directly with the Commissioner and was perceived as being closer to Superintendent Taylor and would, of course, have had recourse to the Commissioner.

And in an effort to give his allegation of an unauthorised campaign further credence, belatedly, Superintendent Taylor suggested that Mr. McLindon, the
newly-appointed civilian director of communication, also had knowledge of or involvement in it. And we say it appears that he did so apparently out of personal and professional animosity towards Mr. McLindon, who he appears to have resented as his newly-appointed external line manager. This can be seen in the footnote, Chairman, at the end of page 26 , footnote 31 , extract from the transcript Day 70 , page 48 , line 20 , and also in the Tribunal materials at page 2407 where a text message has been reviewed by the Tribunal from Superintendent Taylor to another person, and it says:
"Glad to be away fromthe impending car crash by her, and especially the rodent Andy. But really miss the team Keep in touch. Dave."

And it would appear from a reading of that text and the context it was written, the "car crash by her" refers to Ms. o'sullivan and "the rodent Andy" refers to mr. Andrew McLindon. But this is not the only evidence. There is other evidence from the circumstances and from his actions at the time and evidence from persons who were in the Press office.

We say it is also entirely possible for you, Chairman,
allegations against Commissioner Callinan and Deputy Commissioner o'Sullivan to Sergeant McCabe which eventually found their way in some form into his
protected disclosure, in order to create a smokescreen or fog bank which could be used by him in the defence of possible criminal and disciplinary proceedings, in respect of the various wrongdoing which he had vigorous7y denied and which he apparently now appears to accept.

So, in summary, what we say, Chairman, is that there is no substantiating evidence that Mr. Callinan or Ms. O'Sullivan instructed or directed any such effort on Superintendent Taylor's part to malign Sergeant McCabe or that either were aware of any such effort. The evidence before the Tribunal has established, we submit, that Superintendent Taylor's protected disclosure, and indeed much of his verifying statement of grounds and the verifying affidavit, is essentially a work of fiction. We invite you, Chairman, to find that the allegations framed in Terms of Reference (a) and (b) are untrue. We say that such a finding, if made, would serve the public interest in establishing how a mere allegation can become the received truth at enormous personal cost to the individuals involved and at enormous cost to our society. It would also serve public interest at least partially redressing the substantial harm to the reputation of An Garda Síochána 15:56 generally and the reputation and professional standing of former Commissioner Callinan, former Commissioner O'Sullivan and Mr. McLindon. So in those -CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Murphy, you wanted to say
something?
MR. MRPHY: Just to summarise in one sentence, Chairman: Ultimately we say that there is no evidence that is subtended to support the allegations made which form the subject matter of Superintendent Taylor's accusations in terms [a] and [b].

I wonder, Chairman, whether this would be an appropriate moment?
CHA RMAN Yes, I think it is. I'm afraid there is bad 15:57 news for coffee lovers in the sense that I have just got a message that the meeting at 10:00 has been put back to 9:30, which means $I$ should be in a position to start here at 10:15, but that will mean we will get things done that bit quicker.
MR. MRPH: Yes.
CHAN RMAN Thank you.
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 157:24 } \\ & \text { articulated }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { assiduous [1] - } \\ & 86 \cdot ? \end{aligned}$ | 24:8, 52:19, 62:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:19, 124:26, } \\ & \text { 125:6, 125:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $73: 14,75: 14$ | $32: 1,94: 2,182: 2$ |
| 159:18 | assist [12] - | 158:27, 170:7, | 126:7, 138:25, | Barrett's [1] - | $7: 13,7: 26,7: 28$ |
| articulating [1] - | 25:17, 103:27, | 173:4, 191:12, | 150:29, 153:24, | 163:6 | 8:16, 8:26, 8:27, |
| 160:18 | 106:24, 120:5, | 199:15, 205:1 | 159:3, 162:18, | BARRINGTON | 22:3, 34:3, 39:21, |
| AS [2]-7:1, 95 : ascertain [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 132: 3,132: 16, \\ & 134: 11.135: 1 \end{aligned}$ | attest [1] - 98:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 175:8, 182:6, } \\ & \text { 184:7, 189:3, } \end{aligned}$ | [1] - 4:20 | 41:22, 48:22, |
| 38:16, 137:20 | 137:29, 138:4, | 95:27, 108:4 | 194:10, 202:3, | based | 73:18, 93:8, |
| ascribes [1] - | 162:14, 167:19 | attitude [2] - | 202:6, 207:5, | 18:15, 79:16, | 93:25, 108:18, |
| 96:1 | assistance [1] - | 125:19, 166:25 | 211:16, 212:13, | 89:10, 109:20, | 109:22, 116:26, |
| aside [4]-89:1, | 90:25 | attract [1] - | 214:12 | 148:23, 152:18, | 118:4, 122:22, |
| 93:23, 120:18, | Assistant [2] - | 102:21 | awareness [2] - | 172:7, 190:15, | 131:13, 141:27, |
| $148: 13$ <br> aspect [7] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:10, 20:27 } \\ & \text { Associated }[2] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { attracting }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \\ & \text { 183:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 15,185: 10 \\ & \text { awful [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 206:22 } \\ & \text { basis [19] - 8:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:1, 144:23, } \\ & \text { 144:29, 145:14, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 43:10, 71:4, | 116:15, 116:27 | attractive [1] - | 17:18, 66:12 | 16:24, 37:3, | 148:21, 149:2, |
| 120:27, 170:29, | ASSOCIATED | 37:21 | awkward [1] - | 38:25, 55:7, | 149:16, 151:6, |
| 171:14, 173:11, | [1] - 3:16 | trib | 62:25 | 60:27, 71:21, | 152:21, 155:26, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 199:11 } \\ & \text { aspects [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | AT [1] - 215:20 attach [1]-25:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 187:15 } \\ & \text { audio [3] - 7:18, } \end{aligned}$ | axe [1]-59:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 10,75: 11, \\ & 75: 29,76: 4,80: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:2, 162:13, } \\ & \text { 164:21, 165:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $127: 16,190: 9$ | attached [2] 173:12, 173:19 | $7: 20,22: 20$ | B | 84:14, 91:29, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:3, 168:10, } \\ & \text { 171:21, 183:7, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 23:20, 31:17, | attaches [1] - | 14:20, 15:28 |  | 176:9, 188:27, | 196:27 |
| 87:9, 119:19, | 25:8 | 16:21, 19:11, | 124:19, 191:4, | 200:7 | BEHALF [4] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:21, 170:8, } \\ & \text { 177:18, 181:6, } \end{aligned}$ | attack [10] - | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 17,105: 9 \\ & 110: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 215:6 | Baskerville [1] - $45: 17$ | 6:4, 6:5, 9:7, 22:1 <br> behaved [2] - |
| 181:18, 182:27, | $106: 8,106: 14$ | Augustus [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { background [7] } \\ -25: 19,167: 13, \end{gathered}$ | beacons [1] | $61: 16,61: 18$ |
| $184: 8,203: 7$ <br> Assault [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 107: 2,149: 1 \\ & 149: 8,149: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 95:6 | 169:2, 174:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45:9 } \\ & \text { bear [9]-28: } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { behaviour [3] - } \\ \text { 18:20, 42:29, } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:18 } \\ & \text { assert [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 151:28, 153:22 attacked [1] - | $74: 19$ <br> authoring [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:22, 180:7, } \\ & \text { 190:21 } \\ & \text { backstory [1] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:1, 43:2, 69:25, } \\ & \text { 82:19, 84:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $67: 4$ behest [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 188:16 } \\ & \text { asserted [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:15 } \\ & \text { attacks [2] } \end{aligned}$ | ```54:19 authoritatively``` | 201:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 19,122: 14 \\ & 157: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 24,49: 3, \\ & 118: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| 48:9, 53:28, 63:2, | $153: 5,187: 25$ | [1] - 18:4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { bad [7]-41:20, } \\ 68: 22,98: 11, \end{gathered}$ | bears [1] - 55:24 | behind [7] - |
| $64: 12$ <br> asserting [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { attained [1] - } \\ & \text { 182:29 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { authorities }[3] \text { - } \\ & 45: 12,46: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:22, 98:11, } \\ & \text { 110:19, 143:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { became [11] - } \\ 29: 12,30: 4,31: 4, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 27,62: 23, \\ & 62: 24,64: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| 87:26 <br> assertion [6] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { attempt [12] - } \\ 60: 7,69: 4,77: 13, \end{gathered}$ | 186:24 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 179:8, } 215: 10 \\ \text { badgered }[1]- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 26,95: 23 \\ & 120: 19,175: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:15, 146:25, } \\ & 176: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 48:3, 86:21, | 90:16, 90:25, | 18:21, 72:25, | 114:18 | 175:14, 193:23, | belated [1] - |
| 117:12, 136:12, | 92:28, 107:12, | 73:6, 133:22, | $67: 18$ | $207: 5,210: 3$ | $198: 3$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:13, 140:5 } \\ & \text { assertions [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:20, 109:21, } \\ & \text { 124:14, 147:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 172:10 | baggage [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { Becker [2] - } \\ \text { 147:27, 154:26 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { belatedly [4] - } \\ & 70: 8,192: 8, \end{aligned}$ |
| 50:2, 97:10, | 153:8 | 176:2 | 40:21 | become [9] - | 198:12, 212:28 |
| 196:27 <br> asserts [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { attempted [5] - } \\ & 72: 10,81: 24, \end{aligned}$ | avail [1]-174:25 | $\begin{gathered} \text { balance [7] - } \\ \text { 18:19, } 79: 6,93: 3, \end{gathered}$ | 118:18, 150:29, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BELFAST [1] - } \\ & 4: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 73:11, 140:12 | 88:9, 89:17 | $\text { 80:16, } 81 \text { : }$ | 156:18, 186:12, | 184:6, 184:19, | belief [2] - |
| assess [3] - | 179:17 | 89:22, 173:17, | 187:7, 207:2 | 202:3, 202:6, | 73:10, 87:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 110: 11,169: 7 \\ & 191: 16 \end{aligned}$ | attempting [2] 41:28, 154:23 | 193:6 | $57: 15$ | $214: 21$ <br> becomes [1] - | believable [1] - $47: 19$ |
| assessed [4] - | attempts [4]- | $200: 29$ | baldness [1] - | 86:21 | belittle [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 40: 25,40: 26 \\ & 47: 17,56: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:20, 109:18, } \\ & \text { 119:1, 179:25 } \end{aligned}$ | avenue [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 90:10 } \\ & \text { ball [1] - 151:24 } \end{aligned}$ | becoming [1] $103 \cdot 3$ | 109:21 |





| [1] - 179:16 | 150:11, 170:3, | 112:20, 171:3, | $210: 6$ |  | $167: 8,187: 4$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { commit [1] } \\ & 30: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 170: 4,170: 21 \\ & 179: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $183$ | confidentiality <br> [2] - 148:8, 152:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 84: 4,91: 22, \\ & 115: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { considers [1] - } \\ & \text { 85:3 } \end{aligned}$ |
| commitment [1] | complete [3] - | $49: 10,49: 16$ | confine [1] - | connects [1] - | consisted [1] - |
| - 77:28 | 108:14, 154:27, | conclude [7] - | $154: 14$ | $46: 3$ | 17:15 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { commi } \\ \text { 176:28 } \end{gathered}$ | completely [7] - | 69:14, 136:5, | 101:4 | $85: 11$ | $-51: 5$ |
| Committee [12] - | 49:22, 60:2, 68:2, | 136:8, 200:25 | confines | connotation [1] | consistent [3] - |
| 10:5, 10:18, | 115:28, 192:16, | 213:26 | 184:20 | - 78:12 | 46:1, 153:1, |
| 11:14, 11:18, | 206:4, 206:15 | concluded [1] - | confirm [9] - | CONOR [3] - | 158:24 |
| 12:2, 12:5, 12:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { complex [1] } \\ & 152: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 32:16 | 41:1, 96:17, | $3: 17,4: 3,5: 5$ | consistently [2] |
| 19:4, 20:19, | complicated [4] | $-12: 1,12: 9$ | $125: 15,125: 17$ | 101:25, 116:29, | conspiracy [2] - |
| 183:4 | $\begin{aligned} & -34: 13,130: 17 \\ & 151: 11,181: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 13,12: 17 \\ & 32: 22,49: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 137: 22,165: 10 \\ & 211: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $119: 25,133: 3$ $181: 28$ | $71: 2,192: 10$ |
| 33:15, 96:6, | complicit [1] - | $107: 26,120: 28$ | confirmation [4] | conscious [4] - | 110:5 |
| $202: 11$ | 202:20 | 136:11, 141:5, | $-43: 9,46: 15$ | $53: 12,53: 14$ | Constitution [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { commonly [1] - } \\ & 30: 9 \end{aligned}$ | comprehensiv | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:6, 152:25, } \\ & \text { 186:2, 202:9 } \end{aligned}$ | 109:10, 179:11 | $83: 19,146: 3$ | - 124:7 |
| communicate | comprehensiv | conclusions [4] | - 47:16, 59:11, | 22:20 | $\text { [2] }-20: 13,47: 10$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-138: 26} \\ & \text { communicatin } \end{aligned}$ | ely [1]-148:9 compromised | $\begin{aligned} & -73: 25,79: 28 \\ & 149: 13,171: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 59:15 } \\ & \text { confirmed }[1 \end{aligned}$ | consequence | constitutionall |
| g [1] - 106:3 | [1] - 195:27 | conclusively ${ }^{11}$ | $41: 3,79: 13,81: 9$ | 85:23, 113:5, | constrained [1] |
| communicatio | Comptroller [7] | - 62:15 | 81:10, 97:24, | 115:9, 182:28, | -189:4 |
| $\mathbf{n}$ [10]-43:14, | - 14:20, 15:28, | concurs [1] | 97:27, 110:18, | 190:2, 207:17, | constraints [1] - |
| 74:4, 122:18, | 16:21, 19:11, | $100: 14$ | 119:23, 123:27, | 207:18 | 122:26 |
| 132:18, 139:1 | 36:17, 105:9 | condemn [ | 126:14, 126:27 | consequences | construction [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 157:19, 159:29, } \\ & \text { 160:1. 185:17. } \end{aligned}$ | 110:3 | 175:21 conditi | $\begin{aligned} & 151: 5,157: 6 \\ & 158: 18,160: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[4]-19: 15,24: 29} \\ & 28: 20,90: 20 \end{aligned}$ | - 79:20 |
| $213: 1$ <br> communicatio | 58:13, 209:2 concede [2] | $-171: 15$ <br> conduct [10] | 203:17 <br> confirming [1] | consequently $[1]-33: 8$ | 103:22 <br> contact [29] - |
| ns [8] - 13:13, | 45:20, 53:15 | 92:24, 107:28, | 175:3 | consider [14] - | 24:6, 31:29, |
| 55:11, 89:3, | conceded [3] - | 143:8, 175:27 | confirms [2] | 9:17, 14:16, | 62:16, 83:12, |
| 102:20, 124:2, | $41: 24,56: 27,$ | 182:24, 191:13, | $46: 1,151: 14$ | 61:20, 73:25, | 89:1, 89:8, 90:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 192:7, 200:16 } \\ & \text { community }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:29 } \\ & \text { conceivable }[2] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 197:12, 197:16 } \\ & \text { 200:13, 212:8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { confiscated [1] - } \\ & \text { 208:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:16, 120:22, } \\ & \text { 124:4, 146:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 24,100: 20 \\ & \text { 100:22, 105:17, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 184:1 | - 107:7, 134:22 | conducted [6] | conflate [1] - | 159:29, 175:6, | 106:4, 112:21 |
| COMPANY [1] - | concern [9] - | 168:19, 187:27, | 108:21 | 185:15, 194:21, | 119:21, 123:10, |
| 4:3 | 34:11, 64:8, | 196:29, 201:21 | conflated [1] - | 211:13, 211:14 | 126:9, 126:17, |
| Company [1] - | $64: 11,77: 9$ | $209: 8,212: 12$ | $108: 9$ | considerable [4] | 127:18, 133:3, |
| 22:5 <br> comparisons | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:6, 159:24, } \\ & \text { 168:22, 176:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { conducting [2] - } \\ & 168: 16,202: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { conflict [11] - } \\ 73: 14,73: 19, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -77: 23,168: 6 \\ \text { 189:16, 190:10 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 134:4, 144:18, } \\ & \text { 158:1, 158:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $-67: 11$ | $200: 2$ <br> con | $\begin{aligned} & \text { conduit [1] - } \\ & 52: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:1, 112:5, } \\ & \text { 118:22, 118:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { considerably [2] } \\ -49: 27,127: 11 \end{gathered}$ | 161:1, 169:25, <br> 177:29, 191:9, |
| $207: 13$ | 57:5, 71:4, 85:6, 22.14, 129:8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { confer [1] } \\ \text { 185.1 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:29, 122:1, } \\ & \text { 176:5, 199:1, } \end{aligned}$ | consideration <br> [6]-66.29, 70.19 | $201: 12,202: 4$ |
| $42: 29$ | 161:6, 162:20, | conference [3] - | 199:4 | 70:20, 108:1, |  |
| complaint [16] - | 184:18 | $27: 1,27: 4,27: 28$ conferences [1] | $\begin{gathered} \text { conflicts [4] - } \\ 63: 7,63: 19, \end{gathered}$ | $138: 2,209: 19$ | 149:27, 160:7, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 60: 6,80: 11,81: 8, \\ & \text { 81:20, 81:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { concerning [14] } \\ & -19: 24,20: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { conferences [1] } \\ & -87: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63: 7,63: 19 \\ & 102: 7,108: 2 \end{aligned}$ | [3] - 47:27, 102:5, | 160:9 contacting |
| 101:19, 149:28, | 23:4, 23:24, 31:5, | confessions [1] | confusion [1] - | 141:3 | 125:1, 125:27 |
| 149:29, 160:19, | $31: 6,31: 26,$ | - 113:22 | $54: 11$ | considered [12] | $125: 29,151: 19$ |
| 162:1, 170:8, | 115:13, 129:10, | $55: 14,119: 28$ | 168:29 | 114:13, 118:23, | 24:14, 86:24, |
| 181:17, 183:18, | 182:27, 184:2, | 130:26, 197:22 | CONLETH [1] - | 122:3, 145:23, | 88:1, 90:13, |
| 183:21 <br> Complaints [1] - | $198: 19$ <br> concerns [9] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { confidential [9] - } \\ & \text { 101:19, 111:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 15 \\ & \text { connected }[3]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:25, 147:21, } \\ & \text { 149:8, 182:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100:27, 101:3, } \\ & \text { 105:9, 147:7 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 81:9 | 11:17, 96:8, $100: 18,106:$ | $\begin{aligned} & 124: 1,124: 2 \\ & \text { 132:12, 138:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 24,63: 24 \\ & 110: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 183:17, 185:14 } \\ \text { considering }[4] \end{gathered}$ | contained [13] - <br> 81.21, 108:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { complaints [7] - } \\ & \text { 41:23, 46:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 106:25, 112:19, | 198:10, 198:20, | connection [5] - | $-35: 18,81: 17$ | 122:6, 122:13, |


| 135:9, 167:14, | $158: 8,161: 11$ | conversations | 122:17, 181:27 | 26:20, 77:22, | 212:28 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 170:12, 170:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { continuous [1] - } \\ & 196.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[24]-16: 1,26: 14} \\ & 32: 15.69: 23 \end{aligned}$ | corridors [2] - <br> 26.9, 28.24 | 77:28 | credibility [29] - |
| 186:24, 188:24, | contract [1] | 88:16, 95:27, | corroborate [4] - | 7:29, 19:9, 22:26, | 54:12, 60:2, |
| 208:9 | 30:26 | 96:11, 100:21, | $58: 26,114: 27$ | $34: 19,34: 23$ | $60: 21,60: 26$ |
| containing [1] - | contradict [3] | 101:2, 110:8, | 121:6, 136:19 | $45: 15,52: 23$ | 63:22, 86:28, |
| 122:21 <br> contaminated | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 174:14, 199:24, } \\ & 204: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:10, 113:28, } \\ & \text { 114:1, 114:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { corroborated [4] } \\ & -20: 23,20: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:11, 66:5, } \\ & 81: 18,85: 9 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 10,102: 3 \\ & 107: 3.121: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| [2] - 36:28, 37:4 | contradicted [1] | 114:15, 132:19, | $76: 28,92: 5$ | $136: 15,139: 2$ | 136:16, 143:12, |
| contemplated <br> [2] - 83:5, 88:9 |  | 140:11, 140:24, 142:6, 172:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { corroborates [1] } \\ & -46: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 150:22, 153:6, 156:12, 162:15, | 170:23, 171:28, <br> 174:9, 185:4, |
| [2]-83:5, 88:9 contemporane | [1] - 51:29 | 173:23, 177:13, | corroborating | 167:12, 170:14, | 192:20, 194:26, |
| ous [1] - 19:19 contemporane | $\begin{aligned} & \text { contradictory } \\ & \text { [3]-171:25, } \end{aligned}$ | 201:2, 203:8 conversely [1] - | [2] - 130:3, 141:10 corroboration | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 172:11, 176:26, } \\ & \text { 178:10, 179:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 198:5, 199:12, } \\ & \text { 199:13, 200:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| ously [1] - 79:26 <br> contemporane | 203:13, 205:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 59:4 } \\ & \text { conver } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[4]-34: 12,43: 9} \\ & 45: 13,46: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 180:20, 181:20, } \\ & \text { 181:29, 182:28, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 206: 4,206: 15 \\ & 208: 19,209: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| ously-gathered | $193: 6,203: 20$ | 67:4, 67:5 | corroboration/ | 189:22, 198:4, 199:20. 205:20. | credible [9] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-79: 26} \\ & \text { contend }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { contrary [10] - } \\ \text { 104:29, 123:11, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { convincingly }{ }^{[1]} \\ & -135: 8 \end{aligned}$ | caution [1] - 45:3 corroborative | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 199:20, 205:20, } \\ & \text { 205:21, 208:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:13, 10:14 } \\ & \text { 20:5, 21:1, 89:14 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $161: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:28, 137:26, } \\ & \text { 138:9, 147:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cooperate [1] - } \\ & 83 \cdot 8 \end{aligned}$ | [6] - 16:20, 16:29, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 212:24 } \\ & \text { court [4] - 35:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:21, 129:26, } \\ & \text { 193:8, 212:21 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { contended } \\ 73: 26,148: 15 \end{gathered}$ | 193:17, 195:9, | cooperated [2] - | $59: 16,136: 10$ | 47:6, 140:28, | credit [6] - 85:6, |
| content [9] - | 196:26, 206:28 | $148: 4,152: 28$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { cost }[3]-7: 9 \\ 214 \cdot 22214 \cdot 23 \end{gathered}$ | $154: 18$ <br> Court [16] - 18:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 19,95: 10 \\ & 102: 3,194: 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| 32:10, 36:18, | contrast [3] - | cooperation [2] | 214:22, 214:23 | $46: 29,47: 4$ | 208:20 |
| 98:2, 100:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 13,107: 28 \\ & 195: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -82: 7,83: 1 \\ & \quad \text { coordinated }[2] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Council [1] - } \\ & 186: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 29,47: 4, \\ & 55: 21,57: 5,57: 8 \end{aligned}$ | crescendo [1] |
| 189:3, 189:20, | contrasted [1] - | $-187: 27,193: 28$ <br> copies [1] - 8.28 | Counsel [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 28,116: 12, \\ & \text { 140:8, 152:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:5 } \\ & \text { crime [10] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 209:2 contents [7] - | 108:15 <br> contribute [2] | copies [1] - 8:28 <br> cops [1] - 99:11 | 144:18 <br> counsel [32] - | 153:14, 158:2, <br> 195:3, 196:23 | 67:28, 86:1, 87:2, <br> 87.27, 95:17 |
| 13:26, 79:14, | 68:26, 188:17 | $\text { copy }[4]-10: 8 \text {, }$ | 15:9, 18:11, $28: 25 \cdot 38: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & 195: 3,196: 23 \\ & 197: 28,208: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87:27, 95:17, } \\ & \text { 99:23, 122:16, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:18, 160:21, } \\ & \text { 161:8, 175:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { contributed [2] - } \\ & \text { 176:18, 178:13 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:15, 84:16, } \\ & 145: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 28:25, 38:17, | courtroom [1] - | 181:19, 181:23, |
| 209:6 <br> contested [1] - | contributions <br> [2] - 84:11, 84:12 | core [6] - 40:13, 138:20, 156:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 19,75: 22, \\ & 75: 28,80: 29, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 35:2 } \\ & \text { courts }[1]-7: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:27 } \\ & \text { Crimecall [1] - } \\ & 91: 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:13 } \\ & \text { context }[38] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { contributor [1] - } \\ & 30: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 203:3, 203:12, } \\ & \text { 205:13 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81: 2,81: 24,82: 2, \\ & \text { 82:13, 87:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { cover [5] - } \\ \text { 114:23, 114:25, } \end{gathered}$ | 91:27 <br> crimes [1] - |
| 11:15, 23:28, | contrivance [1] - | CORMAC [1] - | 103:6, 103:22, | 118:17, 134:24, | 176:28 |
| 33:10, 35:3, 36:9, | 135:11 | 3:27 | 105:17, 106:22, | $135: 17$ | Criminal [1] - |
| 38:10, 39:25, | controversy [6] | Cormac [2] - | 107:21, 112:23, | $\begin{gathered} \text { coverage [5] - } \\ 32: 5,149: 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:19 } \\ & \text { criminal }{ }_{[16]}- \end{aligned}$ |
| $41: 12,55: 23$, $75: 27,80: 8$ | $-167: 13,168: 6$ 175:24. 179:23. | $145: 16,207: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:11, 150:27, } \\ & \text { 151:6, 157:9, } \end{aligned}$ | 149:11, 153:6, | $18: 20,24: 9,35: 2$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 75: 27,80: 8, \\ & 80: 11,82: 1,84: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 175: 24,179: 23 \\ & 183: 24,212: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { correct [7] - } \\ 113: 6,113: 28 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 151: 6,157: 9, \\ & \text { 157:25, 158:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 193:21 | $45: 13,46: 2$ |
| 85:20, 86:5, 86:9, | convenient [5] - | 114:2, 114:4, | 158:7, 164:2, | covered [4] - | $48: 12,60: 27$ |
| 86:12, 90:10, | 39:7, 144:24, | 130:14, 174:6 | 166:16, 207:27 | 112:22, 120:15, | 67:12, 124:18, |
| $90: 13,90: 14$ $90 \cdot 27.91: 3$ | $144: 29,145: 2$ | corrected [1] - | counter [3] - <br> 50:12, 50:13 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 166:10, 169:5 } \\ \text { covering [2] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:29, 179:14, } \\ & \text { 191:13, 191:27, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 90: 27,91: 3, \\ & 91: 19,104: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 155:25 <br> Convention [2] - | 144:6 correctly [6] | $50: 15$ | $77: 10,181: 19$ | 197:2, 210:3, |
| 114:13, 138:18, | $138: 16,154: 20$ | $68: 28,69: 2,81: 1$ | counter- | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cox [6] - 96:29, } \\ \text { 97:7. 97:9, 97:14 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 214:3 } \\ & \text { critical [5] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 140:28, 140:29, 141:2, 146:18, | conversation | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 130:20, 131:16, } \\ & 152: 26 \end{aligned}$ | intuitive [2] - $50: 13,50: 15$ | $117: 1,119: 25$ | 28:14, 28:15, |
| 147:22, 156:15, <br> 161:16, 161:19 | 14:28, 14:29, | correspondenc | country [2] - <br> 17:5, 116:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cracked [1] - } \\ & \text { 109:25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 79:28, 148:1, } \\ & 168: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 161:25, 188:12, | 29:25, 29:27, | $25: 20,58: 9$ | counts [1] - 56:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { crash [2] - } \\ & 213.13 \quad 13 \cdot 18 \end{aligned}$ | criticise [1] 149:17 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 213: 18 \\ \text { continue }[1] \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 28,91: 15, \\ & 92: 8,98: 1,98: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89: 25,106: 10, \\ & \text { 123:26, 143:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { County [1] - } \\ & 9: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 213: 13,213: 18 \\ & \text { create [1] - } \\ & 214: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 149:17 <br> criticised [5] - <br> 28:6, 28:7, 28:16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:20 } \\ & \text { continued }[4] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 5,108: 10 \\ & 110: 15,114: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 143:10, 143:15, } \\ & \text { 163:11, 164:28, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COUNTY [1] - } \\ & 4: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 214:1 } \\ & \text { created [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 6,28: 7,28: 16 \\ & 28: 21,28: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 83: 28,99: 21, \\ & 101: 11,202: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 114:21, 114:29, | 201:27 | couple [3] - 7:5, 52:28, 138:23 | 161:28, 208:16 credence [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { criticism [1] - } \\ & 163: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| continuing [2] - |  |  |  | 212:11, 212:15, | criticisms [9] - |





|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 160:13 | 51:12, 72:17, $74: 13,106: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & -18: 4,18: 25, \\ & 24: 26,25: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 17:22, 17:27, <br> 18:15, 18:22, | 99:19, 100:4, | 159:5, 159:8, |
| - 21:21 | 108:7, 147:23, | 32:26, 35:1, 53:8, | 18:25, 19:4, 19:6, | 101:22, 101:24, | 159:13, 159:17, |
| end [22] - 12:5, | 149:4, 149:12, | 78:5, 120:23, | 19:16, 19:18, | 102:3, 102:6, | 159:21, 159:24, |
| 13:6, 20:18, 27:1, | 149:23, 151:28, | 127:5, 148:14 | 19:22, 20:22, | 102:9, 102:12 | 160:6, 160:8, |
| 39:6, 39:9, 47:17, | 152:5, 156:27, | 169:11, 177:9 | 20:23, 22:23, | 103:2, 103:11, | 160:11, 160:28, |
| 50:18, 50:26, | 158:14, 174:13, | 177:25, 182:8, | 22:25, 23:15, | 103:13, 104:17, | 161:12, 161:13, |
| 61:14, 86:17, | 179:23, 190:11, | 182:16, 194:15, | 23:23, 26:2, 26:3, | 104:20, 104:28, | 164:16, 164:19, |
| 86:18, 96:26, | 203:13, 213:25 | 196:26, 208:7, | 28:12, 28:28, | 104:29, 105:25, | 167:9, 168:25, |
| 144:8, 149:6, | entirety [1] - | 214:13 | 29:9, 29:10, | 106:1, 107:23, | 168:28, 170:15, |
| 164:8, 180:5, | 146:6 | establishes [1] - | 30:16, 30:17, | 107:26, 108:1, | 170:17, 171:8, |
| 180:19, 195:16, | entitle [1] | 35:24 | 31:3, 31:11, | 108:2, 108:18, | 171:15, 171:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 213:7 } \\ & \text { endeavours [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 22 \\ & \text { entitled }[14]- \end{aligned}$ | establishing [2] | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 20,32: 7, \\ & 32 \cdot 11 \\ & 30 \cdot 16 \end{aligned}$ | 109:5, 110:2, | 171:22, 171:24, |
|  |  | - 37:5, 214:20 | 32:11, 32:16, | 110:4, 110:5, | 171:26, 171:29, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:20 } \\ & \text { ended }[2]-75: 5 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { entitled [14] - } \\ & \text { 14:16, } 77: 8 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | establishment | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 17,32: 27 \\ & 33: 18,33: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:6, 110:7, } \\ & \text { 110:8, 110:13 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 172:12, 172:16, } \\ & \text { 172:21, 172:28, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 86:2 | 102:26, 115:18,116:10, 116:11 | 176:8, 176:15, | 33:29, 35:1, 35:6, | 110:28, 111:2, | 173:11, 173:14, |
|  |  | 178:19, 180:23 | 35:7, 35:18, | 111:6, 111:12, | 173:27, 173:28, |
| 163 | 140:7, 140:29, | euphemisms [1] | 35:21, 35:22, | 111:14, 111:22, | 174:12, 174:28, |
|  | 153:21, 163:21, | - 27:8 | 35:25, 36:17, | 111:29, 112:5, | 177:8, 177:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 188:11 } \\ & \text { enforcement }[1] \\ & -208: 23 \end{aligned}$ | entitlement [2] - | European [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 23,36: 29 \\ & 37: 5,37: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:18, 113:24, } \\ & \text { 113:27, 113:28, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 177:28, 178:12, } \\ & \text { 179:15, 181:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 56:28, 69:15 } \\ & \text { entitlements }[1] \end{aligned}$ | 153:14, 154:19 | 38:29, 41:27, | 113:29, 114:26, | 181:11, 181:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & -208: 23 \\ & \text { engage }[3]- \end{aligned}$ |  | evaluate [1] - | 42:10, 42:13, | 115:4, 117:18, | 181:21, 181:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 77: 5,106: 15, \\ & 139: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -152: 27 \\ & \text { entrusted }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | $121: 16$ | $43: 26,45: 1$ | 117:22, 118:22, | 181:26, 181:28, |
|  |  | evening [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 12,45: 15 \\ & 45: 19,45: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 118:25, 119:12, 120:1, 120:23, | 182:16, 183:23, <br> 184:23, 185:16, |
| engaged [11] - | 121:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 166: 15,177: 6, \\ & 178 \cdot 4 \end{aligned}$ | $45: 27,45: 29$ | 120:28, 121:12, | 186:27, 186:29, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14: 23,15: 20, \\ & 26 \cdot 14 \\ & 28 \cdot 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -66: 8,66: 10 \\ & \text { envisaged }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | event [8]-7:22, | 46:18, 46:26, | 121:14, 121:19, | 187:4, 187:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 26: 14,28: 24 \\ & 76: 17,79: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  | 52:22, 65:20 | 46:28, 47:1, 47:3, | 122:1, 123:6, | 187:17, 188:1, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 76: 17,79: 11, \\ & \text { 148:5, 153:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $155: 2$ | 91:6, 136:8, | 47:8, 47:11, | 123:9, 123:17, | 188:15, 189:9, |
| 196:6, 198:9, | EOIN [1] - 5:20 | 141:5, 144:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 23,49: 2, \\ & 49 \cdot 2650 \cdot 6 \end{aligned}$ | 123:27, 124:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 189:22, 190:7, } \\ & 192 \cdot 4 \quad 192 \cdot 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 199:26 } \\ & \text { engagement }[1] \end{aligned}$- 159:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:21 } \\ & \text { equally }[3]-8: 8 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $165: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 26,50: 6 \\ & 51: 18,51: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:22, 127:3, } \\ & \text { 127:8, 127:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 192:4, 192:27, } \\ & \text { 193:2, 193:5, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | events [23]- | $54: 28,56: 8,$ | 129:5, 129:13, | 193:6, 193:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & -159: 16 \\ & \quad \text { engaging }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | $51: 7,68: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 1,21: 2,42: 17 \\ & 55: 4,83: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 61:28, 62:10, | 129:24, 129:25, | 193:16, 193:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:22 } \\ & \text { engine [1] - } 67: 3 \\ & \text { ENGLISH }_{[1]}- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ergo [1]-157:27 } \\ & \text { error }[3]-10: 4 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | 83:21, 89:23 | 63:3, 63:7, 63:13, | 129:28, 130:2, | 194:15, 194:16, |
|  |  | 97:16, 102:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 63: 16,63: 17 \\ & 63: 20.65: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 131: 21,131: 23, \\ & 133 \cdot 27134 \cdot 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 194:18, 194:20, } \\ & \text { 194:23. 195:9. } \end{aligned}$ |
| ENGLISH [1] - | $91: 10,144: 5$ | 105:4, 105:6, | $66: 6,68: 14$ | 133:27, 134:16, 134:19, 135:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 194:23, 195:9, } \\ & \text { 195:14, 195:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 3:29 | escalation [1] - | 105:12, 107:19, | $68: 16,68: 18$ | 135:19, 135:20, | 196:20, 196:25, |
| $145: 12,145: 19$ enormous [2] - | especially [6] - | $108: 17,112: 12$, $150 \cdot 25,156: 14$, | 68:22, 69:9, | 136:6, 136:11, | 197:8, 198:8, |
|  |  | $150: 25,156: 14$, $157: 13,162: 20$, | 69:20, 70:29, | 136:23, 137:14, | 198:15, 199:9, |
|  | 127:7, 127:21, | 157:13, 162:20, $176: 15,190: 7,$ | $72: 15,74: 7,74: 8$ | 137:18, 138:6, | 200:21, 200:28, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 214:22, 214:23 } \\ \text { enshrined [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | 128:9, 130:1, | $\begin{aligned} & 176: 15,190: 7 \\ & 190: 26,199: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 74:21, 75:21, | $138: 12,138: 21$ | 201:8, 203:13, |
| $46: 22$ | essence [6] | eventual [1] | 75:24, 76:23, | 141:10, 142:9, | 203:19, 206:18, |
| ensure [1] - | 40:13, 74:19, | $105: 14$ | 76:28, 76:29, | 142:19, 142:22, | 206:22, 206:23, <br> 207.26, 208:3, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 79:14 } \\ & \text { ensuring [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 80:22, 170:5, | eventually [2] - <br> 104.27 213.29 | 78:25, 81:10, | 143:18, 143:19, | 208:7, 208:9, |
| 211:27 | 180:8, 205:16 | ever- | 82:4, 82:6, 84:4, | 147:4, 147:12, | 208:26, 209:9, |
|  | 148:16 | increasing [1] | 84:25, 85:26, | 149:6, 149:7, | 209:14, 209:22, |
| 107:17 | essentially [1] - | 110:29 | 86:13, 87:17, | 149:24, 151:4, | 209:26, 210:2, |
| enterprise [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 214:16 } \\ & \text { establish [9] - } \end{aligned}$ | evidence [392] - | 89:6, 90:27, 91:5, | 154:16, 154:29, | 210:27, 211:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:10 } \\ & \text { entertained }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |  | 9:28, 11:7, 11:11, | 91:21, 91:25, | 155:3, 155:12, | 211:9, 211:12, |
|  | 36:14, 37:10, | 11:19, 13:21, | 91:28, 92:7, 93:5, | 156:11, 156:15, | 211:14, 213:21, |
| 55:14 | 91:10, 148:15, | 14:11, 14:12, | 95:8, 95:10, | 156:18, 156:27, | 213:23, 214:9, |
| 89:12, 205:17 | $180: 24,182: 22,$ | 14:14, 14:17, | 95:25, 96:15, | 157:1, 157:20, | 214:13, 215:3 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:3, 16:5, 16:17, } \\ & \text { 16:27, 17:9, } \end{aligned}$ | 96:24, 97:1, | 158:4, 158:5, | Evidence [3] - |
| entirely [20] - | 188:26 | 16.27, 17.9, | 97:14, 97:16, | 158:19, 158:20, | 34:19, 45:8, |


| 58:25 | 151:11, 153:26, | 184:27, 185:3, | expression [2] - | facets [1] - | 176:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| evident | $15$ | $18$ | $30:$ | $77$ | acts [11] - 40:4, |
| 210:29 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 187:6, 188:4, } \\ & 189: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { existent }[1] \text { - } \\ & 88: 12 \end{aligned}$ | expressly [3] - <br> 112•8, 206.29, | facie [1] - 68:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 26,51: 21, \\ & 51: 22.56: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| 18:8 | examples [1] - | existing [1] | 207:7 | 126:7, 160:7 | 62:27, 100:17, |
| evidently [1] - | 190:21 | 59:18 | extend [1] | fact [91]-12:26, | 103:14, 160:24, |
| 189:29 | exceed [1] - | exists [1] - 80:7 | 192:5 | 20:11, 25:3, | 180:20, 199:1 |
| evolve[1] - | 46:15 | exonerated [2] - | extended [1] - | 28:18, 28:21, | factual [3] - |
| $152: 11$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { exceeded [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $40: 18,192: 16$ | 106:5 | 30:11, 30:17, $31: 13,37: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:16, 129:24, } \\ & 147: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| $151: 12$ | except ${ }^{2]}$ | expand [2] | ext | 31:13, 37:15, | fail [1] - 25:5 |
| exact [1] - 96:24 | 111:11, 112:16 | expect [4] - | 198:16 | $44: 5,45: 22,48: 3$ | failure [4] - |
| exacting [1] - | exception [4] - | 37:13, 67:26, | extensively [2] - | 48:23, 50:10, | 58:13, 106:28, |
| 187:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 24,113: 14 \\ & 139: 27,200: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $147: 24,150: 15$ expected [3] - | $\begin{array}{r} 56: 24,150: 4 \\ \text { extent }[31]- \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 5,53: 7,54: 19, \\ & 54: 29,55: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 107: 1,132: 25 \\ \text { fair }[8]-18: 12 \end{gathered}$ |
| $154: 4,186: 24$ | exceptionally | 88:7, 144:19, | $34: 14,35: 8 \text {, }$ | 57:29, 61:3, 61:4, | $26: 10,30: 25,$ |
| exaggerated [3] | [1] - 40:3 | 199:23 | 43:16, 44:3, | 61:11, 67:19, | 68:20, 101:27, |
| - 50:23, 50:24, | exceptions [1] - | expense [1] | 44:23, 51:26, | 73:21, 74:14, | 125:5, 126:8, |
| 108:8 | 139:25 | 24:26 | 54:2, 55:24, | 74:22, 77:17, | 197:6 |
| examination | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EXCHANGE [1] } \\ & -3: 30 \end{aligned}$ | experience [6] - <br> $17: 4,53: 2,135 \cdot 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 22,59: 28, \\ & 60: 4,63: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81: 4,82: 13 \\ & 82: 25,83: 11, \end{aligned}$ | 66:22, 164:8, |
| 36:24, 36:25, | exchange [5] - | 147:3, 178:29, | 63:27, 64:29, | 83:19, 84:7, | $165: 15$ |
| 59:6, 59:7, 79:24, | 13:5, 25:20, | 197:2 | 65:9, 84:24, | 85:25, 87:14, | fairness [1] - |
| 80:29, 97:8, | 99:13, 184:24, | experiences [1] | 117:22, 117:25, | 87:17, 87:19, | 73:9 |
| 100:4, 107:4, | 196:4 | - 162:9 | 118:11, 130:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:19, 89:21, } \\ & \text { 92:2, 95:27, 98:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { fait }[1]-62: 1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:5, 138:6, } \\ & 143: 13.150: 26 \end{aligned}$ | exchanges [2]- <br> $40 \cdot 8,75 \cdot 15$ | explain [3] - 114:6. 114:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 157:9, 158:9, } \\ & \text { 171:28, 183:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 2,95: 27,98: 2, \\ & \text { 102:22, 102:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { faith [1] - 179:8 } \\ & \text { fall }[2]-160: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 143:13, 150:26, } \\ & \text { 174:11, 197:5, } \end{aligned}$ | 40:8, 75:15 exclude [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:6, 114:11, } \\ & \text { 192:14 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 171:28, 183:27, } \\ & \text { 189:27, 192:22, } \end{aligned}$ | 105:21, 107:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fall [2]-160:25, } \\ & \text { 161:4 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 209:8 <br> examine [6] | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 14,48: 16 \\ & 64: 13 \end{aligned}$ | explained [6] <br> 79:29, 90:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 194:1, 206:1, } \\ & \text { 206:15, 209:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:23, 110:9, } \\ & \text { 112:22, 113:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { falling [1] - } \\ & \text { 185:17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { examine [6] - } \\ & 9: 17,36: 13, \end{aligned}$ | 64:13 excluded [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 29,90: 12, \\ & 90: 14,147: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $211: 19$ | 114:1, 114:11, | falls [3] - 44:2, |
| 48:15, 172:24, | 64:17 | $147: 27,160: 9$ | external [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:18, 115:2, } \\ & 115: 8,117: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $64: 5,136: 28$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:1, 200:9 } \\ & \text { examined [10] - } \end{aligned}$ | excluding [1] - 60:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { explains [1] - } \\ & \text { 112:8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 213:6 } \\ & \text { externally }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:8, 117:13, } \\ & \text { 118:6, 119:22, } \end{aligned}$ | false [20] - |
| 56:24, 69:23, | exclusive [2] - | explanation [4] - | 77:2 | 124:12, 127:17, | $48: 7,48: 10$ |
| 79:21, 90:20, | $75: 17,76: 9$ | $49: 21,89: 14$ | extract [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 130:22, 133:6, } \\ & \text { 135:2, 136:9, } \end{aligned}$ | 55:21, 117:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:24, 121:5, } \\ & \text { 174:18, 174:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { exclusively [1] - } \\ & \text { 174:8 } \end{aligned}$ | $110: 14,128: 21$ explicit [1] - | $\begin{array}{r} 10: 10,213: 8 \\ \text { extracts }[2] \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:2, 136:9, } \\ & \text { 146:22, 149:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:22, 136:1, } \\ & \text { 136:7, 136:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 209:5 <br> Examin | $\begin{aligned} & \text { excursion [1] - } \\ & \text { 100:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:21 } \\ & \text { exnlicitlv }{ }^{[7]} \text {. } \end{aligned}$ | $34: 4,82: 3$ <br> extreme | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:10, 154:8, } \\ & \text { 173:16, 173:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:13, 160:21, } \\ & \text { 179:23, 180:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $57: 13,144: 24$ | 100:24 <br> executive [1] | 73:27, 73:29, | 41:11 | 178:6, 179:3, | 180:14, 197:27, |
| 145:14, 146:1, | $28: 9$ | $74: 27,75: 23$ | extremely [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:12, 181:16, } \\ & \text { 188:27, 190:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $202: 28,208: 16$ |
| $149: 10,149: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { executives [1] - } \\ & \text { 28:16 } \end{aligned}$ | 77:8, 77:11, 87:9 | 42:27, 51:19, | 192:12, 193:5, | $\begin{gathered} \text { falsely [2] - } \\ \text { 120:3, 211:15 } \end{gathered}$ |
| 149:27, 150:1, | exercise [10] - | $127: 15,182: 7$ | 196:29 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 198:9, 199:29, } \\ & 200 \cdot 24 \quad 202 \cdot 18 \end{aligned}$ | familiar [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 150: 4,150: 10 \\ & 165: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $45: 14,50: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { explored [1] - } \\ & 150 \cdot 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { eye [2]-23:8, } \\ & \text { 28:4 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 200:24, 202:18, } \\ & \text { 205:1, 205:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $54: 28,112: 20$ |
| EXAMINER ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 18,50: 19, \\ & 51: 13,51: 14, \end{aligned}$ | 150:19 exploring [1] - |  | 206:13, 210:13, | families [2] - |
| 3:26 <br> Examiner's [1] | 65:24, 71:24, 152:12, 190:1 | 81:19 | F | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 212:22 } \\ & \text { fact-finders [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 66:9, 188:10 } \\ \text { family [37] - } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:6 } \\ & \text { examiner.ie }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { exercised [2] - } \\ \text { 111:3, 115:11 } \end{gathered}$ | 183:12 <br> expres | fabrication [2] - | facto [1] - 54:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:1, 10:12, } \\ & 63: 14,66: 6,66: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 178:5 } \\ & \text { example [21] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { exercising [1] - } \\ & 134: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100:23, 192:2 } \\ & \text { expressed [5] } \end{aligned}$ | face [2] - 42:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { factor }[7]-56: 6 \\ & 56: 13,56: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 9,66: 10 \\ & 68: 10,111: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| 18:16, 35:6, 36:1, | exist [1] - 96:17 | 71:23, 72:16, | 135:6 | $60: 1,100: 22$ | 111:26, 111:29, |
| $38: 1,38: 24,$ | existed [4] - | 101:10, 170:20, | $\begin{gathered} \text { Facebook [2] - } \\ \text { 133:26, 134:1 } \end{gathered}$ | 206:3, 206:14 | 117:23, 119:26, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:21, 84:8, 85:8, } \\ & \text { 113:16, 119:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 193:15, 205:9, | 211:2 | 133:26, 134:1 <br> faced [3] - | factoring [1] - 47:26 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:28, 126:19, } \\ & \text { 126:22, 127:18, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $120: 18,132: 13$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 205:12, 208:9 } \\ \text { existence }[6] \text { - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { expressing [3] - } \\ \text { 112:19, 186:5, } \end{gathered}$ | 97:11, 119:29, | factors [4] - | 129:28, 130:2, |
| 149:18, 150:24, | 79:18, 182:22, |  | 138:1 | 25:6, 79:4, 128:1, | 142:15, 145:1, |


| 155:27, 156:5, | 178:16 | fire [3]-203:16, | flits [2]-163:15 | 5:15, 5:20, 5:25, | $25: 16,58: 9$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 156:23, 157:1, | fed [1] - 74:25 | 204:3, 204:10 | FLOOR [1] - | 5:29, 94:10 | 66:18, 66:19, |
| 157:2, 158:12, | FELIX [1] - 4:7 | firm [3]-137:4, | 4:17 | force [3]-40:20, | 67:8, 69:26, |
| 158:15, 158:19, | fella [2] - 12:10, | 165:12, 186:8 | flow [1] - 167:17 | 55:27, 113:22 | 89:18, 92:3, |
| 159:13, 159:27, | 20:20 | firmly [3] - 71:2, | flowed [2] - | forced [1] - | 103:11, 132:7, |
| 160:2, 161:12, | felt [4] - 8:6, | 140:15, 148:22 | 173:29, 176:10 | 200:25 | 141:11, 152:21, |
| 162:14, 183:7, | 75:10, 183:19, | first [50]-7:6, | focus [12]- | foregoing [1] - | 207:24 |
| 194:13, 194:15 | 188:24 | 8:21, 8:24, 8:27, | 74:13, 156:16, | $148: 13$ | forwarded [2] - |
| family's [4] - | FENNELLY [1] - | 9:9, 26:2, 31:4, | 158:10, 161:5, | forensic [1] - | 52:27, 102:17 |
| 112:11, 156:10, | $5: 29$ | 34:10, 43:13, | 161:13, 161:21, | 209:11 | founded [3] - |
| 158:8, 161:11 famous [1] - | ferry [1] - 66:16 <br> few [8]-66:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 28,48: 27 \\ & 50: 19,51: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 175:14, 180:29, } \\ & \text { 181:3. 181:4. } \end{aligned}$ | forensically [2] - 86:22, 209:5 | 37:14, 106:25, 196:29 |
| 12:27 | 104:27, 112:7, | 52:18, 70:9, | 181:11, 183:20 | forgets [1] - 90:5 | four [8]-53:13, <br> 59:17, 69:19 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { fanning [2] - } \\ \text { 144:17, 166:3 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 183:6, 191:4, } \\ & \text { 204:22, 209:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 72:12, 73:22, | focused [1] - $44: 8$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { form }[7]-128: 7 \text {, } \\ \text { 168:24, 178:23, } \end{gathered}$ | 92:24, 108:28, |
| Fanning [1] - | 211:21 | 91:5, 91:14, | focusing [2] | 193:19, 206:8, | 127:17, 159:7, |
| 155:26 | Fianna [1] - | 95:14, 100:5, | 13:15, 201:5 | 213:29, 215:5 | 207:3 |
| FANNING [4] - | 13:22 | 112:1, 113:5, | fog [1] - 214:2 | format [2] - | fourth [2] - |
| 3:5, 3:7, 3:12, | fiction [1] | 113:11, 118:23, | fold [1] - 68:10 | 78:29, 146:11 | 198:29, 210:18 |
| $5: 11$ | $214: 17$ | 118:27, 122:29, | follow [8] - 48:8, | formed [1] - | frame [2]-88:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { fantasist }[4] \\ & 52: 11,70: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { fiddler [7]-13:1, } \\ 13: 19,17: 6,21: 2, \end{array}$ | 142:18, 145:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 58:1, 79:28, } \\ & \text { 127:25, 137:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 107:16 forme | framed [1] - |
| $\begin{gathered} 70: 21,70: 23 \\ \text { fantasy }[1]- \end{gathered}$ | $30: 8,33: 12$ 109:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 156:7, 168:5, } \\ & \text { 168:12, 169:9, } \end{aligned}$ | 145:1, 168:3, | $9: 14,9: 21,11: 7,$ | $214: 18$ <br> Frances [1] |
| 71:2 | fiddles [2] | 176:14, 178:27, $189: 13,190: 7$ | follow-up [1] - | $12: 8,12: 16$ | 174:21 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { far [11] - 8:18, } \\ \text { 26:19. } 37: 10 . \end{gathered}$ | $12: 10,20: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & 189: 13,190: 7, \\ & 190.8 \text { 190.24, } \end{aligned}$ | $58: 1$ | $12: 21,13: 5,13: 6$ | FRANCIS [4] - |
| $43: 27,51: 19$ | fide [1] - 148:1 fides [1] - | 193:23, 194:25, | followed [2] - $38: 23,70: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:18, 14:9, } \\ & \text { 14:22, 15:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $5: 32$ |
| 57:4, 63:17, | 198:13 | 195:1, 195:17, | following [27] - | 15:19, 16:27, | FRANKFORT ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ |
| 68:20, 71:3, | figures [1] - | 198:8, 201:28 | 16:6, 18:25, | 18:6, 20:26, 29:2, | -5:26 |
| $76: 25,101: 20$ | 161:1 | firstly [4] - | 21:23, 32:26, | $38: 20,73: 24$ | frankly [1] - |
| farce [1] - 99:10 fashion [7] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { file [5]-10:22, } \\ \text { 10:27, 161:7, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 23,76: 9, \\ & 146: 14,167: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 2,50: 11 \\ & 77: 15,82: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 26,74: 10, \\ & 74: 17,74: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 172:26 } \\ & \text { free [2]-116:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 20:8, 23:6, 23:26, | 197:3, 203:29 | fish [3]-90:3, | 82:28, 83:29, | 81:1, 81:6, 85:10, | 188:24 |
| 33:5, 86:11, | filed [1] - 183:6 | 90:6 | 84:21, 98:16, | 96:3, 121:3, | freelance [7] - |
| $123: 15,148: 10$ | $\text { fill }_{[1]}-82: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fished [1] - } \\ & \text { 42:27 } \end{aligned}$ | 99:22, 106:20, 109:29, 114:11. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:9, 123:8, } \\ & \text { 123:9. 123:13. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 8,22: 28, \\ & 22: 29: 26: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { father }[4] \text { - } \\ \text { 100:11, 129:9, } \end{gathered}$ | final [3] - 79:15, | fishing [2] - | 109:29, 114:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 123: 9,123: 13, \\ & 123: 18,127: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 29,26: 6, \\ & 29: 16,38: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| 159:18, 159:22 favour [2] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { finally [8]- } \\ \text { 112:15, 118:11, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89: 29,90: 1 \\ & \text { fits [2]-42:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:23, 126:25, } \\ & \text { 128:1, 130:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:8, 145:14, } \\ & \text { 147:2, 149:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 19 \\ & \text { freely }[2]-23: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 75:10, 108:3 } \\ & \text { favourable }[2] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 125:25, 133:29, } \\ & \text { 148:28, 153:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $45: 21$ <br> Fitzgerald [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:29, 164:22, } \\ & \text { 171:10, 176:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 149: 26,150: 2 \\ & 150: 6,150: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $23: 25$ <br> Freeman [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 57:25, 68:15 } \\ & \text { favoured }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 161:23, 185:9 finders [2] - | $174: 21$ <br> FITZGERALD | 196:4 <br> follows [6] | $\begin{aligned} & 151: 16,152: 4, \\ & 152: 22,167: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 116:13 <br> FREEMAN [3] - |
| $68: 12$ <br> favouritism [1] - | 61:3, 61:4 <br> findings [7] | $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-4: 31} \\ & \text { five }[4]-42: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:26, 26:28, } \\ & \text { 27:22, 98:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 168:9, 187:6, } \\ & \text { 191:8, 198:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $3: 6,166: 3,166: 5$ frequency [1] - |
| $68: 12$ | 35:10, 44:6, | 59:17, 145:3, | $98: 26,111: 17$ | $214: 27$ | 58:18 |
| fear [1] - 131:1 | $73: 23,93: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 203:1 } \\ & \text { fixation [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | FOLLOWS [2] - <br> $7: 1.95 \cdot 1$ | forms [1] - 78:17 <br> formula [1] - | frequently [3] - |
| feature [4] - | $186: 28,200: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fixation [1] - } \\ & \text { 210:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $7: 1,95: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { formula [1] - } \\ & \text { 101:4 } \end{aligned}$ | $53: 5,61: 1,66: 24$ |
| $184: 19,190: 5$ | $34: 21,52: 9$ | fixed [1] - | footnote [3] - | formulated [1] - | $111: 26,179: 1$ |
| February [18] - | 144:20, 144:22, | $115: 12$ | $195: 16,213: 7$ | $156: 2$ | FRIDAY ${ }_{\text {[1] - }}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:24, 20:1, } \\ & \text { 22:12, 71:16 } \end{aligned}$ | 163:23, 164:7, | flash [1] - 27:16 <br> flatly [1] - | footnotes [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { forth [2] - 40:22, } \\ & 67.21 \end{aligned}$ | 215:19 |
| 81:16, 83:3, 91:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 166:4, 166:6, } \\ & 166: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 203:20 | FOR [21] - 3:1, | forthright [1] | 130:16, 145:19, |
| $96: 14,96: 21$ | finest [1] - 17:26 | flavour [1] - | $3: 4,3: 11,3: 16,$ | 113:3 | $145: 21,145: 24$ |
| $96: 27,96: 28$ | finish [1] - 70:1 | 183:27 | $3: 20,3: 26,4: 2,$ | fortunate [1] - | friend [2] - |
| 97:18, 122:11, | Fionnan [2] - | flawed [4] - | $4: 7,4: 11,4: 15$ | 70:23 | 159:28, 160:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 170:29, 176:14, } \\ & \text { 176:22, 178:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $23: 9,184: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:24, 68:3, } \\ & \text { 171:25, 189:10 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 20,4: 24,4: 31 \\ & 5: 2,5: 5,5: 10 \end{aligned}$ | forum [1] - 162:5 <br> forward [14] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { front [2] - } \\ & \text { 172:20. 185:23 } \end{aligned}$ |





| 165:8, 165:23, | 20:14, 75:26, | 197:3, 197:4, | 106:3, 121:24, | 132:24 | 16:18, 19:2, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 210:15 | 75:29, 87:5 | 197:5, 197:10, | 122:22, 123:14, | isolation [1] - | 20:19, 21:10, |
| inter [1] - 146:4 | interventions | 197:12, 197:15, | 138:10, 145:29, $146: 1.151: 26 .$ | $42: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:7, 127:14, } \\ & \text { 183:4. 187:16 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 50:1 | interview [22] - | 198:23, 207:22, | 164:12, 181:19, | $16: 14,20: 7$ | $211: 1$ |
| interaction [13] - | 58:1, 73:4, 80:12, | 208:1, 210:4, | 191:17, 194:12, | 35:12, 36:14, | jealously [1] - |
| 13:8, 13:14, 16:4, | 87:16, 89:20, | 210:5, 210:6 | 205:9, 210:13, | 38:15, 40:21, | 90:19 |
| 21:9, 26:28, | 89:26, 100:6, | 210:14 | 211:16, 212:8, | 60:11, 65:17, | JERMYN [1] - |
| 27:15, 27:16, | 112:3, 114:22, | Investigation [1] | 212:17, 212:18, | 65:19, 77:9, | 3:30 |
| 27:21, 28:22, | 119:16, 119:22, | - 129:19 | 214:22 | 77:10, 79:8, | job [1] - 137:9 |
| 32:3, 119:7, | 119:23, 122:29, | investigations | involvement ${ }^{16]}$ | 79:11, 81:18, | JOHN [9] - 3:6, |
| 130:4, 205:20 | 126:24, 128:10, | [7]-10:13, | -61:1, 63:18, | 82:7, 82:21, | $4: 11,4: 15,4: 31,$ |
| interactions [3] | 133:4, 157:22, | 161:26, 195:27, | $65: 10,65: 15,$ | 82:26, 84:26, | $4: 32,5: 15,5: 25$ |
| - 17:23, 126:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:3, 161:24, } \\ & \text { 162:9. 202:7 } \end{aligned}$ | 198:11, 198:13, 198:21. 198:24 | $78: 26,95: 15$ | 101:17, 106:16, | $5: 25,9: 7$ |
| 128:17 <br> interconnectin | interviewed [1] - | Investigations | $\begin{aligned} & 105: 3,112: 15, \\ & \text { 157:12, 191:21, } \end{aligned}$ | 120:19, 140:23, | $\begin{gathered} \text { John [31] - 8:26, } \\ \text { 9:9, 12:8, 12:21, } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\mathbf{g}[1]-50: 1$ | 57:1 | [1] - 129:18 <br> investiga | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 192:9, 195:9, } \\ & \text { 197:9, 197:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 148: 1,151: 12 \\ & 156: 22,159: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:10, 15:17, } \\ & 34: 10,58: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| 26:22, 27:11, | 76:18 | $-183: 12$ | $211: 21,213: 2$ | 164:10, 186:18, | $73: 6,73: 11$ |
| 84:9, 100:23, | interviews [4] - | investigators | involves[1] - | 189:7, 203:12, | $76: 12,85: 5$ |
| 111:1, 113:14, | 22:21, 22:22, | [10] - 22:19, 73:4, | 138:29 | $206: 25,208: 18$ | 87:17, 92:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:23, 127:9, } \\ & \text { 139:28, 140:6. } \end{aligned}$ | 82:11, 82:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 89: 19,89: 26 \\ & 104: 11,123: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $19: 24,21: 6$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { issued [4] - } \\ 81: 12,83: 4, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 17,96: 13 \\ & 96: 20,100: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| 140:15, 140:27, | 107:13 | 137:7, 138:5 | Ireland [6] - | $177: 5,178: 18$ | 105:10, 109:28, |
| 146:25, 146:27, | introduce [2]- | 203:21, 204:24 | 24:27, 102:13, | issues [23] - | 109:29, 110:4, |
| 147:1, 147:9, | 82:6, 85:29 | invidious [1] | 108:16, 108:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:22, 17:17, } \\ & \text { 41:16, 61:6, 89:5, } \end{aligned}$ | 129:9, 133:29, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 148:7, 153:23, } \\ & \text { 153:26, 154:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { introduction [2] } \\ & -83: 25,179: 25 \end{aligned}$ | invitation [2] | IRELAND | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:16, 61:6, 89:! } \\ & 92: 13,105: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 163: 5,163: 13, \\ & 163: 14,164: 3, \end{aligned}$ |
| 154:21, 170:20, | intrusive [1] - | 79:28, 157:7 | 3:18 | 105:22, 121:2, | 165:3, 172:11, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 214:20, 214:24 } \\ \text { interested [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | 107:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { invite [4]-7:11, } \\ & \text { 187:3, 194:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Irish [44]-27:8, } \\ & \text { 82:24, 95:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:7, 147:22, } \\ & \text { 150:13, 150:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:27 } \\ & \text { joint [1] - } 4 \end{aligned}$ |
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| peak [1] - 89:6 | 158:26, 177:28, | 49:9 | 101:3, 103:24, | 168:5, 169:9, | 43:2, 43:6, 44:11, |
| peddled [1] - | 182:1, 183:2, | persuasive [1] - | 108:11, 114:2, | 180:4, 180:6, | 48:17, 48:19, |
| $151: 2$ | 189:16, 190:10, | $51: 4$ | 115:6, 119:20, | 182:21, 185:9, | 53:16, 58:26, |
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| 185:21 | S [1] - | 189:18, 190:3 | 29:5, 34:2 | 43:11, $45:$ | rais |
| oposed [1] - | 174:2 | 190:4, 190:10 | 37:18, 41:19 | 47:20, 53:15 | 105:27, 112: |
| 77:23 | proved | 190:26, 197:21, | 47:17, 55:4, 55:6, | 55:6, 61:14 | raised [21] |
| ropos | 40:27, 53 | 205:3, 208:16 | 60:11, 61:9 | 65:27, 82:1 | 10:20, |
| $7: 19$ <br> proposition [9] - | 173:29, 187:7 proven [2] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { 214:20, 214:24 } \\ \text { publication [3] - } \end{gathered}$ | 61:15, 69:20 | 84:29, 85:6 | 15:2, 15:12, |
|  |  |  | 69:21, 76:17 | 85:11, 85:1 | 16:14, 16:19 |
| 72:16, 73:21, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 43:17, } 53: 8 \\ \text { provide }[4]- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 8,167: 14, \\ & 179: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 80:26, 89:19 | 85:16, 87:2 | 38:15, 64:6, 79:8 |
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| $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-67: 12} \\ & \text { prospect }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | $66: 8,156: 15$ | 178:2 publishing [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { putting [2] - } \\ 68: 16,81: 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 206:9 } \\ & \text { questions' } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { range }[4] \text { - } \\ 35: 19,35: 20 \end{gathered}$ |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 174:26 } \\ & \text { protected [55] - } \end{aligned}$ | 188:29 <br> prudence [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { Purcell [3] - } \\ \text { 11:23, 14:12, } \end{gathered}$ | qualified [1] - | 144:27, 145:2 | 18:12, 18:17, |
|  |  | 164:9 <br> purported [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:8 } \\ & \text { quality }[3]- \end{aligned}$ | $\text { 153:11, } 155: 2$ | $61: 13,75: 21$ |
| 43:29, 44:29, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45:2 } \\ & \text { prudent [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | QUINN [16] - | 77:2, 87:3, 87:25, |
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| 201:18, 206:17, |  |  | questioned [3] - | 83:28, 150:3 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 208:20, 211:21, } \\ & \text { 211:23, 211:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $147: 1,147: 8$, $148: 7,150 \cdot 2$ | pushed [2] - | $204: 19$ <br> questioning [4] |  | 87:11, 87:12, |
|  | 148:7, 150:2, |  |  |  | 171:2 |
| $214: 14$ protecting [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 154:7, 154:21, } \\ & \text { 159:20, 167:13 } \end{aligned}$ | pushing [3] | $-38: 23,75: 18$ | radio [3]-76:14, | 27:13, 111:27, |
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| 119:9, 131:28, | 112:12, 125:14, | 101:18, 111:13, | refusing [2] - | Reilly [1] - 62:16 | 169:9, 172:24, |
| 141:9, 156:15, | 126:9, 158:11, | 117:4, 120:7, | $110: 15,142: 10$ | reiterate [2] - | 173:3, 174:6, <br> 174:17, 185:11 |
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| 117:7, 117:23, | 15:22, 15:24, | 188:2 | 18:3, 37:25, | 214: | 36:20, 51:5, 57:3, |
| 124:11, 130:3, | 29:11, 58:14 | eported [10] - | 37:26, 47:15 | respectable [1] - | 87:6, 95:9, |
| 134:5, 177:27, | 58:19, 125:1 | 30:20, 92:8, 92:9, | 65:16, 90:24 | 59:2 | 102:16, 102:19, |
| 198:1, 209:19 | 125:27, 125:28, | 108:10, 114:12, | 103:18, 118:21, | respected [1] - 98.23 | 102:21, 103:16, |
| reliability [2] - | 181:23 | 114:19, 150:10, | 175:15, 175:29, | 98:23 | 104:5, 104:7, |
| $\begin{gathered} 63: 22,190: 20 \\ \text { reliable [3] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reminded }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 131:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:17, 176:4, } \\ & \text { 193:24 } \end{aligned}$ | 186:17 <br> requirement ${ }_{[2]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { respectful [54] - } \\ & 40: 5,41: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 133: 14,136: 14 \\ & 197: 24,201: 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| 51:28, 62:11, | reminding [1] - | reporter [2] | - 147:1, 154:21 | 41:24, 42:4, 42:7, | responsible [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:19 } \\ & \text { reliance }[6] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:23 } \\ & \text { remove }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 160:14, 181:24 reporters [4] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { requirements } \\ {[2]-18: 8,148: 10} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:19, 44:21, } \\ & 44: 25,45: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 37: 13,115: 18 \\ \text { rest }[3]-73: 1, \end{gathered}$ |
| 121:14, 124:5, | 21:8 | 102:15, 133:15, | requires [2] - | 46:14, 48:5, 48:8, | 92:26, 208:19 |
| 131:19, 135:9, | rendered [2] | 134:12, 159:22 | $9: 13,91: 2$ | 49:8, 49:11, | rests [1] - |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 135:14, 138:13 } \\ \text { relied }[16] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 46:13, 53:27 } \\ \text { repeat [6] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reporting [4] - } \\ & \text { 25:9, 74:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { requiring }[1] \text { - } \\ & 93: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 14,49: 20 \\ & 49: 26,50: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $174: 12$ <br> result |
| 28:13, 35:8, | 32:22, 38:28 | 151:24, 161:25 | resent [2] - | 51:1, 51:6, 51:9, | 12:26, 28:12, |
| 58:24, 59:9, 60:9, | 77:23, 86:15, | reports [7] - | 56:17, 56:18 | 51:15, 51:18, | 40:18, 97:5, |
| 60:28, 61:7, 62:9, | 131:14, 136:26 | 54:3, 74:14, | resented [1] - | 53:11, 53:14, | 100:19, 106:23, |
| 62:21, 117:18, | repeated [6] - | 79:20, 80:2, | 213:5 | 53:22, 53:29, | 124:16, 128:26, |
| 129:5, 133:5, | 19:28, 22:29, | 83:29, 109:20, | resentful [1] - | 54:15, 54:18, | 135:26, 209:25 |
| 185:3, 187:12, | 75:20, 200:28, | 193:25 | $54: 14$ | $56: 6,56: 11$ | RESUMED [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 187:17, 193:3 } \\ & \text { relies [1] - 174:7 } \end{aligned}$ | 208:14, $212: 4$ repeatedly $[4]$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { represent [2] - } \\ & 69: 2,153: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { resents }[2]- \\ 57: 11,57: 16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 16,56: 19 \\ & 56: 25,57: 4,57: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $7: 1,95: 1$ |
| relieved [1] - | 134:1, 179:24, | representative | resign [2] - | 58:16, 59:2, | 158:26 |
| 108:26 | $200: 1,201: 9$ | [4] - 65:11, 65:15, | $150: 7,212: 5$ | 59:20, 59:25, | retire [1] - |
| relive [1] - 87:12 <br> reluctance [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { repeating [1] - } \\ & \text { 122:14 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:18, 140:20 } \\ & \text { representative } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { resisted [1] - } \\ & 34: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60: 18,62: 14, \\ & 62: 22,66: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 188:18 retired |
| 198:3 | repetition [1] - | s [2] - 65:19, | resolution [4] - | 67:10, 67:29, | 78:25, 90:15, |
| rely [9]-45:23, | 179:1 | 163:6 | $37: 18,73: 15$ | 68:5, 69:10, $69 \cdot 20 \quad 69 \cdot 21$ | 96:13, 129:9, |
| $80: 25,84: 24$ | repetitive [1] - | represented ${ }_{[7]}$ | $91: 2,91: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:20, 69:21, } \\ & 70: 14,70: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $175: 27,202: 17$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:18, 140:7, } \\ & \text { 140:29, 143:6 } \end{aligned}$ | 49:5 | $\begin{aligned} & -93: 14,93: 22, \\ & \text { 142:2, 144:9, } \end{aligned}$ | resolve [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 14,70: 16, \\ & 71: 1,121: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { return [2]-90:3, } \\ & \text { 192:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 140: 29,143: 6 \\ & \text { 200:20, 211:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { replicate [1] } \\ & \text { 186:25 } \end{aligned}$ | 142:2, 144:9, $156: 3,165: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:21, 140:23, } \\ & 140: 26 \end{aligned}$ | respectfully [26] | 192:24 returning [2] |
| relying [6] - | replicated [1] - | 183:20 | resolved [6] - | - 59:13, 73:20, | 158:17, 161:10 |
| $45: 15,64: 9$ | 86:12 | representing [1] | 24:1, 24:23, 65:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 4,81: 16,84: 7, \\ & 86: 16,87: 4, \end{aligned}$ | reveal [1] - |
| 119:3, 121:12, <br> 134:3, 141:12 | replied [5] - | - 179:5 | 108:3, 118:14, | 87:14, 87:21, | 147:5 |
| remain [3] - | $99: 3,99: 8$ | $25: 1,25: 13$ | resolving [1] - | 88:18, 89:11, | $70: 25,178: 8$ |
| $63: 14,111: 23$ | 204:26 | 28:21, 86:29, | $24: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 18,91: 18, \\ & 92: 29.93: 5 . \end{aligned}$ | revealing [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:23 } \\ & \text { remainder [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { reply }[5]-7: 15, \\ 8: 12,8: 17,83: 13, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:2, 188:3, } \\ & \text { 191:19, 214:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { resonance [1] - } \\ & \text { 105:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 29,93: 5, \\ & \text { 117:3, 129:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 132: 12,132: 18 \\ \text { revelation }[3] \text { - } \end{array}$ |
| 207:6 | 149:28 | $214: 26$ | resourced [1] - | 137:26, 152:25, | 111:18, 139:1, |
| remained [5] - | Report [4] | reputational ${ }_{[1]}$ | 142:22 | 156:17, 159:28, | 157:25 |
| 11:6, 30:24, | 74:13, 80:16, | $-18: 14$ | Resources [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:24, 161:3, } \\ & \text { 161:17, 192:29, } \end{aligned}$ | revenge [8] - |
| 119:21, 159:25, | $80: 28,98: 8$ | reputations [1] - | $73: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 161:17, 192:29, } \\ & \text { 209:17 } \end{aligned}$ | 24:11, 99:29, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 208:10 } \\ & \text { remaining }[3] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { report [30] - } \\ & \text { 24:1, 37:20, 65:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 93:2 } \\ & \text { requ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { respect }[33] \text { - } \\ 9: 10,18: 13 \end{gathered}$ | respects [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 170:1, 170:10, } \\ & \text { 191:11, 203:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 44:12, 117:3, | 65:9, 65:14, 72:3, | 7:13, 7:28, 25:24, | 18:19, 20:22, | 173:18, 174:14 | 205:2 |
| 127:29 | $72: 4,73: 28,74: 3$ | 75:9, 95:9, | 43:1, 45:1, 46:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { respond [1] - } \\ & \text { 189:5 } \end{aligned}$ | reverse [3] - |
| remains [2]- $111 \cdot 29,139: 13$ | 74:23, 75:1, | 105:28, 108:22, | $50: 3,58: 10$ | responded [7] | $7: 28,45: 5,156: 7$ |
| 111:29, 139:13 remark [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 10,75: 11, \\ & 75: 17,76: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 112:25, 161:17 requested [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 59:18, 63:5, } \\ & 67: 17,67: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 10:26, 20:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { review [7] - 56:3, } \\ & \text { 56:4, 56:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 28:17, 66:16 | 76:12, 78:27, | 11:16, 108:13 | 69:8, 81:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 10,97: 22, \\ & \text { 98:19 98.26, } \end{aligned}$ | 175:27, 197:18, |
| remarkable [1] - | 78:29, 79:12, | requests [1] - | 82:18, 84:22, | 98:19, 98:26, | $201: 21,207: 27$ |
| $42: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 14,79: 15, \\ & 79: 17.109: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 108:14 | 88:29, 89:21, | 102:13 responding [5] - | reviewed [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { remarkably [1] - } \\ & 00>\cdot 7 \end{aligned}$ |  | require [7] | 90:24, 91:6, <br> $126 \cdot 15,140 \cdot 1$ | 16:11, 24:24, | 213:10 |
| remarks | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:9, 118:14, } \\ & \text { 121:27, 122:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:21, 65:1, } \\ & \text { 118:13, 124:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:15, 140:1, } \\ & \text { 141:21, 156:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 108:13, 159:27, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Reynolds [36] - } \\ & 73 \cdot 26-73 \cdot 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 61:14, 117:6, | 178:5, 188:25, | 134:14, 138:2, | 157:15, 159:16, |  | 74:22, 74:24, |



| 105:5, 105:8, | 174:10, 176:14, | 111:3, 115:13, | 8:29, 35:9, 39:13, | 151:26, 173:21, | 166:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 105:15, 105:27, | 195:4, 196:23 | 122:21, 127:4, | 39:24, 40:1 | 176:9, 188:2, | sitting [1] - |
| 106:5, 109:11, | serious [18] - | 169:21, 170:8, | 42:12, 95:11 | 197:29, 198:23, | 140:7 |
| 109:17, 109:21, | 10:6, 18:13 | 176:27, 177:18, | 123:17, 129:24, | 212:3 | situation [5] - |
| 109:24, 110:6, | 28:20, 41:15 | 179:24, 181:6, | 144:25, 149:16, | significantly [5] | 36:8, 53:19, |
| 110:18, 110:29, | 85:24, 122:21 | 181:17, 182:27, | 155:28 | - 11:22, 55:10, | 86:20, 93:16, |
| 111:4, 112:20, | 138:2, 144:4, | 184:7, 191:21, | shortcomings | 76:28, 173:14, | 173:15 |
| 112:21, 112:26, | 150:12, 151:26, | 203:3, 203:7, | [2] - 68:18, 161:27 | 188:17 | situations [1] - |
| 115:14, 115:22, | 168:13, 176:27, | 203:17, 203:26, | shorten [2] - | silent [1] - 73:1 | 66:9 |
| 116:8, 119:2, | 178:6, 187:5, | 205:11 | 185:24, 185:26 | silly [1] - 53:18 | skepticism [1] - |
| 122:23, 123:4, | 187:12, 195:4, | sexually ${ }_{[1]}$ | shorter [1]-7:7 | similar [9] - | 205:18 |
| 123:14, 123:19, | 196:23, 197:29 | 9:29 | shortly [7] - | 16:5, 34:15, | skullduggery" |
| 123:25, 124:15, | seriously [1] - | SHANE [1] - | 11:24, 14:3, | 35:23, 42:19 | [1] - 207:28 |
| 124:18, 125:13, | 132:27 | 3:29 | 19:20, 34:27, | 49:18, 92:9, | sleeping [1] - |
| 125:17, 125:19, | seriousness [2] | shaped [1] | $92: 8,105: 13$ | $123: 25,181: 26$ | 209:27 |
| 126:14, 126:29, | - 60:5, 188:6 | 81:5 | 112:7 | 197:18 | sliding [1] - |
| 127:5, 127:10, | serve [2] - | share [1] | show [10]-36:3, | similarity [1] - | 18:10 |
| 127:16, 133:11, | 214:20, 214:23 | 159:14 | 77:27, 96:20, | 36:22 | slightly [8] - |
| 133:16, 133:24, | service [3] - | shared [1] - | 98:11, 106:28, | similarly [5] - | $22: 6,40: 7,44: 3$ |
| 134:26, 137:2, | 77:23, 77:28 | 12:27 | 107:1, 123:10, | $33: 11,44: 1 \text {, }$ | 66:20, 68:15, |
| 151:2, 151:7, | $198: 26$ | sharing [1] - | $160: 24,197: 28$ | 129:7, 133:13, | 118:19, 154:5, |
| 156:14, 157:13, | serving ${ }_{[2]}$ - | $88: 21$ | showed [2] - | 199:28 | $157: 11$ |
| 158:27, 159:20, | $148: 26,149: 19$ | sharp [1] - 86:18 | $32: 6,106: 2$ | SIMON [4] - | slow [2] - 21:23, |
| 169:19, 169:21, | set [17] - 14:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shatter [1] - } \\ & 164: 18 \end{aligned}$ | shown [3] - | 3:21, 3:22, 5:20, | 79:27 |
| 169:28, 169:29, | 34:6, 51:22, | SHATTER [2] - | 168:14 | simple [1] - | 87:29 |
| 170:2, 170:6, | 93:23, 120:7 | 4:20, 4:22 | shows [6] - | 92:17 | smear [7] - |
| 170:8, 170:20, | 127:8, 145:24, | Shatter [1] - | 16:22, 17:12 | simply [29] - | 31:20, 187:11, |
| 172:1, 172:6, 172:12 172:21, | 146:11, 147:25, | 164:22 | 17:24, 55:9, | $18: 12,23: 2$ | 203:2, 203:19, |
| 172:12, 172:21, | 149:4, 167:12, | shattered [1] | $98: 12,143: 3$ | 25:2, 30:17, | $205: 8,205: 12$ |
| 173:2, 173:20, | 171:10, 194:5, | $174: 10$ | shut [1]-26:15 | $46: 28,50: 2,55: 9$ | $205: 14$ |
| 173:27, 174:5, | $209: 14$ | Sheahan [27] | shy [1]-8:24 | 60:11, 60:13, | smeared [1] - |
| 174:7, 174:24 | sets [1] - 51:21 | 23:9, 23:14, | sic [4]-99:3, | 60:26, 68:24, | 133:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 174:29, 176:1, } \\ & \text { 176:28, 177:18, } \end{aligned}$ | setting [1] | 23:19, 23:21, | 112:6, 121:15, | $69: 7,69: 22,70: 1$ | smearing [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 176:28, 177:18, } \\ & \text { 177:22, 177:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 65:21 | 23:22, 24:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 151: 10 \\ & \text { side }[4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 21,75: 22, \\ & 79: 10,84: 17, \end{aligned}$ | 112:26 |
| 178:7, 178:17, | $206: 1$ | $28: 17,28: 19$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { side }[4]-39: 2 \\ 58: 20,159: 19, \end{gathered}$ | $88: 12,93: 5,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Smithwick [1] - } \\ & 35: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 178:23, 180:23, | seven [3] | $28: 28,29: 2,29: 7$ | 187:24 | 104:14, 128:4 | smoke [4] - |
| 181:6, 181:15, | 118:12, 193:22, | $31: 3,31: 16,$ | sided [1] - 75:11 | 135:1, 154:22, | 151:24, 203:16, |
| 181:16, 182:10, | $202: 11$ | 31:19, 31:23, | sideline [1] - | 154:23, 154:27, | 204:3, 204:10 |
| 182:18, 182:27 | several [12] | 31:28, 32:3, | 55:28 | 185:23, 190:28, | smokescreen |
| 183:9, 183:19, 184:2, 184:7, | $22: 15,104: 25$ | 32:10, 33:22, | sifting [1] - | $200: 20$ | [1] - 214:1 |
| 185:7, 191:11, | 119:12, 121:5, | $33: 24,37: 9$ | $168: 28$ | simultaneously | so-called [2] - |
| 191:13, 191:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:11, 128:3, } \\ & \text { 128:16, 131:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 23,38: 1,38: 7, \\ & 38: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sight }[2]-83: 3, \\ & 120 \cdot 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-74: 16} \\ & \text { single [5] - 87:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $75: 4,155: 4$ |
| 192:15, 192:23, | 132:13, 134:18, | Sheahan's [3] - | sign | 87:8, 92:18, | 33:13, 38:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 193:19, 193:21, } \\ & \text { 193:22. 193:28 } \end{aligned}$ | $173: 8,174: 14$ | 25:22, 25:23, | $127: 24,193: 20$ | 92:26, 153:17 | 138:19, 139:3, |
| 193:22, 193:2 | $\boldsymbol{s e x}[4]-10: 20$, | 25:27 | signal [1] - | singular [1] - | 139:7, 214:23 |
| 194:5, 194:8, 199:3, 199:8, | 19:14, 20:7, 33:7 | Sheehan [1] - | 87:13 | 28:8 | sole [2] - 73:10, |
|  | Sexual [1] - | 184:24 | significance [6] | singularly [1] - | 75:11 |
| 201:29, 205:1, | 129:18 | SHEEHAN ${ }_{[2]}$ - | - 18:18, 48:14, | 89:24 | solecism [1] - |
|  | sexual [36]- | 5:16, 5:31 | 82:17, 156:11, | sinister [2] - | 86:8 |
| 207:5, 211:18 | $10: 12,15: 5,15: 8$ | SHIP [1] - 4:28 | 157:10, 206:9 | $53: 9,76: 25$ | solely [1] - 172:7 |
| 212:9, 212:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:12, 15:14, } \\ & \text { 16:9, 16:14, } \end{aligned}$ | shocked [1] - | significant [19] - | sins [1] - 166:26 | solicitor [11] - |
| 213:28, 214:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:9, 16:14, } \\ & \text { 16:19, 19:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:7 } \\ & \text { shod } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:13, 11:14 } \\ & 20: 14,41: 16 \end{aligned}$ | Siochana ${ }^{[1]}$ - $7: 26$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 15,22: 5, \\ & 25: 23,53: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| sergeant [1] - | 30:10, 31:17, | $180: 15$ | $52: 22,56: 1$ | SIR [1] - 4:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:23, 53:3, } \\ & 102: 14,103: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| 191:19 | 40:17, 60:16, | shoot [2] | $56: 20,71: 1,$ | sister [1] - 95:21 | 106:21, 107:17, |
| series [8] - | 87:9, 88:15, | $149: 18,153: 9$ | 73:13, 149:21, | $\text { sit }[4]-7: 17,$ | 123:27, 128:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 31: 19,72: 21 \\ & \text { 105:15, 174:6, } \end{aligned}$ |  | short [13]-8:26, | 150:13, 150:20, | 88:18, 152:6, | 201:25 |


| SOLICITOR'S | 24:21, 38:5, | 156:25, 170:12, | 30:24, 135:23, | 120:2, 129:12, | 82:27, 83:8, 83:9, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [1] - 4:26 | 67:23, 79:13, | 170:15, 191:6, | 188:3, 188:9 | 136:7, 138:5, | 83:10, 83:22, |
| solicitors [8] - | 97:25, 97:27 | 195:14, 199:15, | 214:2 | 199:28 | 83:26, 84:2, 84:8, |
| 8:28, 9:11, | 101:15, 101:27, | 199:23, 200:18, | standpoint [1] - | states [2]-16:7, | 89:10, 92:27, |
| 106:26, 106:27, | 111:17, 124:1, | 201:27 | 207:22 | 72:19 | 96:9, 98:19, |
| 163:26, 164:29, | 129:14, 130:21, | specifically [7] - | stands [2] | stating [2] - | 99:14, 99:17 |
| 165:12, 178:18 | 130:24, 132:19, | 40:15, 52:25, | 115:2, 143:9 | 17:16, 143:3 | 125:3, 127:22, |
| SOLICITORS | 135:2, 146:20, | 74:2, 86:8, 86:29, | star [1] - 181:24 | Station [2] - | 128:10, 128:13, |
| [11]-3:7, 3:12, | 146:21, 146:22, | 89:3, 181:18 | Star [2]-127:19, | 57:15, 58:2 | $128: 18,150: 9$ |
| 3:22, 3:30, 4:4, | 147:5, 152:19, | specificity [2] - | 133:1 | stature [1] - 17:4 | 151:1, 151:6, |
| 4:11, 4:22, 5:6, | 153:2, 153:21, | 41:10, 69:24 | tark [3] - 41:3 | status [1] - | 151:10, 159:11, |
| $5: 11,5: 21,5: 26$ | $161: 29, ~ 177: 11$, $180: 9,181: 26$ | specifics [1] | $119: 15,195: 10$ | $68: 12$ | 159:19, 185:10, <br> 194:9, 205:16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Solicitors [1] - } \\ & \text { 22:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 180:9, 181:26 } \\ \text { source's [2] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 199:25 } \\ & \text { specified [1] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { start [5] - 32:1, } \\ \text { 144:2, 166:18, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { statutorily [1] - } \\ & 212: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 194:9, 205:16 } \\ \text { strange [1] - } \end{gathered}$ |
| solid [1] - | $152: 10,154: 7$ | 9:24 | $215: 14$ | statutorily- | $26: 12$ |
| 186:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sourced [4] - } \\ & 80: 28,84: 9 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { spectrum }[2] \\ 26: 17,50: 26 \end{gathered}$ | started [1] - 12:7 <br> starting [2] - | protected [1] - | strangers [1] - 85:7 |
| $48: 9,51: 7,52: 16$ | 92:26, 92:27 | speculation [1] - | $73: 22,167: 10$ | stay [1] - 53:1 | STREET [10] - <br> 3.8 3.13 3.23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 59: 8,60: 29 \\ & \text { 86:20, 86:28, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { sources [20] - } \\ 80: 23,126: 15, \end{gathered}$ | 64:24 | starts [1] - 68:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { staying [1] - } \\ & 90: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 8,3: 13,3: 23, \\ & 4: 17,4: 28,5: 3, \end{aligned}$ |
| 87:25, 87:26, | 126:17, 126:20, | 167:29, 168:2 | $67: 12,77: 22$ | stems [1] | $5: 12,5: 17,5: 22$ |
| 88:19, 112:25, | 132:12, 137:1, | spin [1]-75:9 | 109:10, 169:16 | 95:15 | 5:32 |
| 113:23, 130:19, | 137:9, 138:18, | spineless [1] - | STATE [1] - 4:26 | stenographe | strenuously [3] |
| 144:27, 159:23, | 139:1, 142:7 | 75:9 | state [6]-50:27, | [1] - 168:2 | -119:5, 126:12, |
| $171: 17$ sometime [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:16, 152:6, } \\ & \text { 152:7, 152:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { spite [1] - 40:22 } \\ & \text { split [1] - 173:26 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 4,57: 10 \\ & 72: 24,119: 18 \end{aligned}$ | ```step [1] - 175:17 stepped [1] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & 128: 8 \\ & \text { stress [6] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 96:26 } \\ & \text { sometimes }[3] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 152:15, 157:28, } \\ & \text { 182:6, 182:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { spoken [7]- } \\ & 11: 9,123: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $133: 21$ <br> stateme | 68:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 72:20, 86:22, } \\ & \text { 124:10, 137:29, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 53:6, 66:10, | 182:9, 185:12 | 151:17, 173:5, | 11:12, 22:11, | $38: 16,139: 8$ | 142:9, 160:20 |
| 127:4 <br> somewhat | SOUTH [1] - 5:3 spanner [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 177:1, 183:26, } \\ & 190: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 21,25: 2, \\ & 25: 21,25: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $176: 12,201: 1$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { stress-test [2] } \\ 86: 22,142: 9 \end{gathered}$ |
| 34:13, 46:20, | 70:22, 70:24 | sporadic [1] | $25: 28,28: 15$ | $25: 11,25: 12$ | stressed [1] - |
| 88:20, 133:4 | spanne | 184:2 | 31:9, 38:17, | still [10] - 45:23, | 132:12 |
| 141:22, 159:17, | thrower [1] | spread [1] | 38:18, 57:18, | 63:16, 66:13, | strict [1] - 92:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 166:24, 180:26, } \\ & \text { 181:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 70:24 } \\ & \text { sparingly }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 185:1 | $57: 24,62: 3,70: 7$ | 78:7, 80:5, 96:17, | strictly [1] - 46:2 strike [2] - |
| 181:12 somewhere [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sparingly [1] - } \\ & 65: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { spring [2]-89:4, } \\ & \text { 156:28 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 10,82: 7 \\ & \text { 83:25, 83:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 18,158: 14 \\ & 186: 12,210: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { strike [2] - } \\ 66: 11,74: 14 \end{gathered}$ |
| 115:28 | speaker [1] - | SQUARE [1] | 96:15, 97:2, | sting [1] - 74:18 | striking [2] - |
| sorry [9] - 35:10, | 46:27 |  | 97:10, 97:12, | stone [1] - 49:8 | 36:22, 180:26 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 52: 5,114: 17 \\ & \text { 139:10, 140: } \end{aligned}$ | speaking [27] - 8:29, 16:13, | square [1] - 69.19 | $\begin{aligned} & 104: 3,104: 5 \\ & 104: 10,104: 1 \end{aligned}$ | stood [1] - 69:18 | $\begin{gathered} \text { strong [3] - } \\ 128: 25,129: 20 \end{gathered}$ |
| 141:28, 144:16, | $21: 25,34: 5,$ | $69$ | 104:19, 104:24, | stop [3] - 10:18, | 205:11 |
| $195: 5,214: 29$ sort [8] - 15:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 24,36: 16, \\ & 44: 7,52: 24, \end{aligned}$ | 143:8 | 104:26, 104:27, 105:19. 106:12. | stopping [2] | strongest [1] - |
| sort [8]-15 26:12, $26: 13$ | $13$ | stage [8]- | $\begin{aligned} & 105: 19,106: 12, \\ & 106: 22 . \\ & 108: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 19:3, 195:29 | 177:8 |
| $26: 18,28: 1$ | 82:18, 84:21, | 22:13, 87:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:22, 108:12, } \\ & 114: 24,114: 25, \end{aligned}$ | stories [8] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { struck [1] - } \\ & \text { 26:27 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 71:29, 77:5, | 90:26, 97:18, | 177:24, 182:5 | 118:27, 119:5, | 147:8, 150:5, | structured [1] |
| $193: 9$ | 116:23, 120:10, | 182:21, 199:25 | 122:10, 124:21, | 181:13, 193:19, | 78:24 |
| sought [16]- $31: 10,43: 8,79: 9$, | 136:4, 136:25, | staging [1] - |  | 194:5, 194:7 | stuck [1]-97 |
| 127:17, 127:22, | 141:20, 145:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:7 } \\ & \text { star } \end{aligned}$ | 173:16, 173:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { storm [1] - } \\ & 175: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 91:26 |
| 129:4, 129:8, | 145:20, 146:12, | $131: 25,132: 2$ | 177:6, 178:18, | story [45] | stupid [1] |
| 133:2, 137:20, | 152:3, 154:3, | standard ${ }^{77}$ | 178:20, 178:26, | $10: 13,12: 7$ | 53:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 138:3, 138:8, } \\ & \text { 139:16. 174:25 } \end{aligned}$ | 155:28 speaks | 18:2, 32:24, | 180:12, 191:6, | $12: 24,21: 5,26: 5$ | subject [28] - |
| 179:10, 192:5, | $57: 3,90: 21$ | 45:24, 171:10 | $201: 22,20$ | 29:18, 43:27, | $: 15,19: 29$ |
| 207:13 | specific [15] - |  | 204:23, 214:15 | $5$ |  |
| sounds [1] - | 35:12, 72:7, | standards [1] - | statements [9] - | $1: 18,81: 19$ | 79:1, 81:8, 81:14, |
| $26: 12$ | 90:27, 104:13, | $72: 1$ | 25:26, 68:23, | 81:27, 82:8, | 81:20, 109:11, |
| source [27] - | 139:7, 147:22, | standing [5] - | 104:14, 104:25, | 82:18, 82:24, | 110:29, 139:3, |



| 129:17, 195:29, | suspicion [1] - | Taylor [182] - | 185:2, 187:10, | 83:11, 92:28 | 214:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 197:5, 197:14, | 198:18 | 13:16, 20:24 | 191:7, 192:5 | ten [4]-9:1, | RRACE [2] - |
| 197:15 <br> superintendent | suspicious [1] - $80: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 5,38: 21, \\ & 39: 22,39: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 192:8, 192:18, } \\ & \text { 192:29, 193:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $41: 2,51: 3,155: 5$ | $4: 5,5: 7$ |
| 's [1] - 205:14 | sustained [1] | 40:12, 40:28, | 193:4, 194:11, | 113:24, 143:9 | 153:22 |
| supplementary | 187:11 | 41:8, 42:1, 42:16, | 194:20, 194:25, | tendered [3] - | test [11]-18:24, |
| [1]-104:26 | winging [1] - | 42:26, 43:25 | 195:17, 196:28, | 63:3, 107:26, | 32:25, 34:18 |
| support [16] | 29:6 | 44:9, 44:18, | 197:17, 197:19, | 179:15 | 35:25, 47:12 |
| 34:12, 36:5, | swore [2] - | 44:29, 47:14 | 197:25, 198:7, | tennis [1]-7:16 | 61:9, 86:22 |
| 55:15, 58:27 | 195:3, 196:22 | 48:2, 48:21, | 199:2, 199:5, | tenths [1]- | 139:13, 142:9, |
| 63:3, 63:17, | worn [2] - | 49:17, 51:29 | 200:11, 200:23, | 130:25 | 173:13 |
| 72:15, 91:8, | 23:23, 51:3 | 52:1, 52:20, | 200:28, 201:19, | term [19]-9:24, | testified [2] - |
| 91:14, 93:6, | yllable [1] | 52:26, 53:11, | 202:5, 202:10, | 13:1, 17:6, 24:3, | 10:19, 30:18 |
| 129:5, 168:26, | 92:18 | 54:3, 54:9, 54:23, | 202:15, 203:12, | 24:13, 24:16, | testifying [1] - |
| 187:20, 207:26, | ystematic [3] - | 55:19, 56:26, | 204:6, 204:15, | 30:9, 33:11, | 29:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 209:10, } 215: 4 \\ & \text { supported }[8] \end{aligned}$ | $185: 1,191: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60:1, 60:20, 63:9, } \\ & \text { 64:10, 64:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 204: 26,205: 8, \\ & 205: 24,206: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $33: 13,33: 15$ | testimony [9] |
| 19:18, 19:22, | ochána [31] - | 64:19, 65:7, 68:1, | 206:7, 206:17, | 38:25, 43:28, | $67: 14,69: 1,$ |
| 85:26, 123:8, | 7:16, 8:10, 20:15, | 68:21, 70:4, 70:5, | 206:27, 207:24, | 71:21, 71:28, | 158:8, 192:28, |
| 127:8, 143:18, | 24:15, 66:2, | 75:4, 84:20, | 208:11, 209:4, | 72:5, 124:16, | 194:26, 199:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 193:2, 206:27 } \\ & \text { supporting }[4] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 126:13, 133:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 84: 25,85: 10, \\ & 85: 19,86: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 209:16, 209:22, } \\ & \text { 210:1, 210:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 124:19 | testimony.. [1] - |
|  | 137:14, 149:20, | 87:1, 87:7, 87:15, | 210:8, 210:9, | terms [76]-7:9, | 179:27 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 171:15, 171:29 } \\ \text { supportive }[1]- \end{gathered}$ | 168:8, 171:2, | 87:24, 88:3, | 210:11, 210:19, | $37: 16,37: 10$ | 168:25 |
|  | 171:22, 174:4, | 88:13, 88:16 | 211:2, 211:15, | 37:25, 38:11, | tests [1] - |
| $74: 4$ <br> supports [2] - | 174:22, 175:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:3, 89:15, } \\ & 89 \cdot 22 \text { 90.9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 212:7, 212:18, } \\ & \text { 212:24. 212:29. } \end{aligned}$ | $38: 22,38: 27,$ | 147:17 |
|  | 175:16, 178:14, | $90: 15,96: 3,$ | $213: 11,213: 26$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 11,40: 24, \\ & 41: 3.41: 28,42: 3 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { text }[10]-34: 6 \\ 74 \cdot 481 \cdot 27 \end{gathered}$ |
| $34: 17,193: 6$ <br> suppose [10] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 178:25, 188:4, } \\ & \text { 191:17, 191:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $97: 25,99: 25,$ | TAYLOR [1] - | 41:3, 41:28, 42:3, 43:15, 43:26, | $\begin{aligned} & 74: 4,81: 27, \\ & 96: 16,96: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| $37: 21,66: 20$,139:17, 154:11, | 192:8, 197:22, | 99:26, 100:1 | 4:7 | 57:2, 66:21, | 98:9, 98:19, |
|  | 207:2, 207:23, | 100:8, 100:10, | Taylor's [29] | 68:26, 69:1, | 129:3, 213:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:17, 154:11, } \\ & \text { 154:25, 154:29, } \end{aligned}$ | 208:17, 208:23, | 100:20, 100:27, | 42:24, 54:11 | 71:23, 71:25 | 213:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 157:9, 160:22, } \\ & \text { 161:23, 162:5 } \end{aligned}$ | 214:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100:29, 101:5, } \\ & \text { 105:17, 110:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 27,58: 17 \\ & \text { 63:4, 85:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $72: 13,74: 6$ | textbook [1] - |
| supposed [4] - | T | 110:18, 114:16, | $90: 18,121: 8$ | 81:3, 81:21, 83:9, | 84:8 <br> textbooks [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 52: 11,75: 5, \\ & 87: 11,171: 29 \end{aligned}$ |  | 120:12, 121:4, | 185:4, 188:6 | 85:26, 86:15 | tex |
| Supreme [2] | tabled [2] - | 123:12, 123:24, | 189:20, 192:13, | 89:22, 91:3, | $98: 21$ |
| $18: 5,46: 29$ <br> surely [2] - | 107:19, 107:20 tactic [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:1, 124:14, } \\ & \text { 124:23, 126:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 193:29, 199:10, } \\ & \text { 199:22, 201:8, } \end{aligned}$ | 91:19, 92:9, | texts [9]-54:19, |
| surely [2] - | $16: 12,19: 10$ | 132:5, 133:7, | 202:22, 206:10, | 92:17, 93:4 | 55:12, 85:12, |
| $134: 29,140: 6$ surface [1] - | $\text { taint }[1]-190: 5$ | 133:15, 134:5, | 206:24, 207:29, | 97:14, 108:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 15,97: 12, \\ & 98: 6,98: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 183:29 } \\ & \text { surmise [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | tainted [4] - | 134:11, 134:16, | 208:4, 209:1, | 112:8, 115:29 | 101:11, 199:7 |
|  | 23:15, 28:29, | 134:25, 134:29, | 209:10, 209:18, | 117:4, 120:7, | THE [8]-3:26, |
| 62:26 <br> surprise [1] - | $32: 18,34: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:2, } 135: 13, \\ & 135 \cdot 17 \quad 137 \cdot 11 \end{aligned}$ | 214:11, 214:14 | 124:11, 136:28, | 3:30, 4:2, 4:3, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tandem } \\ & \text { 49:22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:17, 137:11, } \\ & \text { 139:21, 141:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 215:5 } \\ & \text { TD [5] - 34: } \end{aligned}$ | 146:8, 148:18, | $7: 1,94: 10,95: 1$ |
| $127: 20$ <br> surprised [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tangible [1] - } \\ & 86: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 142: 1,144: 10 \\ & 151: 3,151: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 105:26, 122:6, 175:11, 176:22 | 156:11, 156:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 215:19 } \\ & \text { theirs [1] - 139:6 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:25 } \\ & \text { surprisina }[2] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | target [2] - 74:6, | $155: 15,165: 3,$ | tea [1] - 57:21 | 156:22, 160:25, 161:5, 161:14, | theme [2] - $210 \cdot 21 \quad 210 \cdot 29$ |
| $56: 16,127: 14$ | $175: 19$ | 169:13, 170:19, | Teachta [1] - | 161:15, 169:4, | thems |
| surprisingly [1] | targeted [2]- | 170:23, 171:27, | 121:10 | 169:5, 169:17, | $54: 20,67: 6,$ |
| $-177: 3$ <br> surreptitiously | 72:6, 87:4 | 172:3, 172:4, | team [6]-7:14, | 170:12, 170:21, | 78:22, 85:29, |
|  | task [4]-77:4, | 172:8, 172:18, | 59:7, 100:3, | 171:1, 172:2, | 125:6, 184:22, |
| [1] - 60:7 | 78:19, 80:23, | 173: | 179:5, 179:10, | 173:27, 177:8, | 190:29, 194:16, |
| surrounding [4] | 181:11 | 173:6, 173:20, | 213:1 | 185:13, 185:18, | $200: 3$ |
| - 102:8, 110:14, | tasked [2] | 173:28, 174:5, | telephone [4] - | 191:2, 192:12, | THEN [1] - |
| $115: 4,136: 23$suspect [1] - | 24:3, |  | 87:3, 123:10 | 201:6, 211:5, | 215:19 |
|  | taxpayer [1] - |  | 159:5, 202:4 | 215:6 | theory [2] - |
| 57:27 | 7:10 | 182:3, 182:23, | television [2] - | Terms [1] - | 137:12, 157:29 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { there" }[1] \text { - } \\ & 17 \cdot 00 \end{aligned}$ | $153: 1$ | tomorrow [9]- | $96: 24,97: 15$, $184: 15,184: 21$ | 92:14, 95:9, | 167:8, 167:11, |
| 17:20 <br> thereafter [3] | throw [1] - 70:22 thrower [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 93: 22,144: 19, \\ & \text { 144:28, 163:2, } \end{aligned}$ | 184:15, 184:21 travelled [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 20,96: 25, \\ & 97: 7,97: 8,97: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:12, 168:24, } \\ & \text { 169:11, 170:14, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 80:25, 84:11, | 70:24 | 166:4, 166:5 | 96:26, 202:7 | 98:9, 99:16, | 172:13, 174:18, |
| 105:13 | thrust [1] - 89:12 | 166:12, 166:13 | treat [1]-205:17 | 99:19, 100:13, | 174:28, 176:19, |
| thereby [3] - | THUILLIER [1] - | tomorrow's [1] - | treated [4] - | 101:16, 101:22, | 177:9, 177:12, |
| 135:22, 198:23, | 3:11 | 7:20 | 57:26, 102:10, | 101:25, 102:13, | 177:25, 178:11, |
| 211:27 | illi | tone [1] - 74:14 | 120:24, 161:18 | 102:16, 102:18, | 178:19, 180:29, |
| therefore [14] - | 165:26, 165:27 | TONY [1] - 5:25 | treatment [2] - | 102:26, 103:3, | 181:4, 181:12 |
| 37:25, 62:7, | THURSDAY ${ }_{[1]}-$ | took [19]-9:14, | 57:26, 178:24 | 103:6, 103:9, | 181:13, 181:21, |
| 97:13, 111:19, | 7:1 | 9:23, 17:15, | tree [1]-71:3 | 103:12, 103:13, | 182:2, 183:27, |
| 119:28, 125:21, | ticklin | 28:22, 32:3, | tremendous [1] | 103:23, 103:27, | 185:14, 189:25, |
| 127:14, 130:25, | 101:18, 111:8, | 38:15, 64:21, | - 208:17 | 103:28, 104:2, | 190:6, 190:18, |
| 137:5, 139:5, | 111:13 | 88:3, 91:15, 98:1, | trenchant [1] - | 104:8, 104:20, | 191:5, 195:16, |
| 154:11, 162:22, | de [1] - 105:12 | 101:3, 114:2, | 211:5 | 104:22, 105:1, | 196:26, 197:3, |
| 173:19, 196:14 | tie [1] - 92:28 | 119:20, 119:23, | Tribunal [276] - | 105:19, 105:23, | 198:1, 198:5, |
| therein [1] - | tied [1] - 162:10 | 126:26, 137:24, | 9:13, 13:2, 13:7, | 106:1, 106:11, | 199:1, 199:9, |
| 135:9 | Tim [1] - 145:15 | 161:24, 180:10, | 13:13, 13:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:17, 106:24, } \\ & \text { 107:5, 107:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 199:11, 199:21, } \\ & \text { 199:28. 201:23. } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { thereof [1] - } \\ & 54: 23 \end{aligned}$ | TIM [1] - 3:28 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 210:25 } \\ & \text { top [1]-167:25 } \end{aligned}$ | 14:3, 14:10, 14:14. 14:16. | 108:13, 108:19, | 201:28, 202:3, |
| thinking [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { timeframe [1] - } \\ & \text { 207:4 } \end{aligned}$ | top [1] - 167:25 topic [4]-73:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:14, 14:16, } \\ & \text { 14:21, 15:17, } \end{aligned}$ | 108:21, 108:22, | 202:6, 202:8, |
| 203:9 | timeline [1] - | 75:21, 87:22, | 18:5, 21:3, 22:13, | 109:16, 110:11, | $203: 21,204: 6$ |
| thinner [3] - | 159:11 | 96:7 | 22:17, 22:19, | 110:16, 111:6, | 204:24, 207:12, |
| $49: 26,49: 27$, 50.5 | timely [2] - | totality [1] - | $22: 21,22: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:12, 114:24, } \\ & \text { 114:27, 115:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 207: 15,209: 4 \\ & 209: 5,210: 27, \end{aligned}$ |
| 50:5 THIRD [1] - 4:17 | 106:15, 108:14 | 196:13 totally [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:29, 24:1, 24:3, } \\ & 24: 13,24: 24, \end{aligned}$ | 116:1, 117:4, | 211:10, 211:11, |
| THIRD [1] - 4:17 third [10] - | TIMES [3]-3:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { totally } \\ & 52: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 13,24: 24, \\ & 25: 3,25: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 118:27, 119:6, | 213:9, 213:10, |
| 27:18, 53:27 | timing [4] - | touch [3] | 28:14, 28:19, | 119:12, 121:1, | $214: 13$ |
| 101:21, 124:21, <br> $154: 10,198 \cdot 7$ | $41: 11,89: 2$ | 100:1, 108:28 | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 4,31: 4,31: 22, \\ & 31: 23.32: 20 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:26, 122:7, } \\ & \text { 122:13, 122:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { tribunal [14] - } \\ \text { 18:3, 18:18, } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 154:10, 198:7, } \\ & \text { 207:11, 207:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $96: 18,97: 15$ | 213:15 | 31:23, 32:20, $34: 25,35: 11$ | 123:17, 123:23, | 23:17, 24:25, |
| 210:1 |  | 122:3, 131:9 | 35:12, 35:27, | 123:26, 124:3, | 25:9, 35:3, 65:21, |
| thirdly [3]- | titles [2]-29:6, | 180:4, 192:2 | 37:22, 38:6, | 124:11, 124:21, | 70:11, 154:18, |
| 41:13, 146:25, | 66:4 | towards [12] - | $41: 25,42: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:22, 126:28, } \\ & \text { 127:3, 127:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 173:9, 176:16, } \\ & 178: 19.178: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| 178:16 | today [8] - 7:19, | 23:18, 27:1, 29:1, | 42:13, 43:28, | 127:27, 128:22, | 184:12 |
| THOMAS [1] - | 70:16, 111:26, | 29:2, 39:6, 39:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 7,45: 27,49: 9 \\ & 49: 20,58: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 128:24, 128:28, | Tribunal's [19] |
| thorough | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:12, 144:28, } \\ & \text { 169:12, 178:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 11,194: 13 \\ & 196: 19,198: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 58:26, 59:7, | 129:7, 129:11, | 10:9, 43:22, |
| 197:6, 209:8 | 183:8 | 211:18, 213:4 | 60:25, 61:20, | 129:12, 129:20, | 49:12, 82:9, 92:4, |
| thought- | together [6] | town [1] - 151:2 | 63:10, 63:21, | 129:24, 131:18, | 107:29, 109:3, |
| through [2] - | 47:18, 47:27 | track [1] - 8:18 | 64:17, 65:9, | 131:26, 132:17, | 137:7, 148:29, |
| 171:4, 171:10 | 71:18, 109:28, | tracks [1] - | 65:13, 65:16, | 133:10, 133:14, 134:2, 134:13, | 154:12, 155:11, <br> 156:12, 161:14 |
| thrashed [1] - | 178:17, 191:23 | 196:1 | 65:17, 65:23, $66: 15,68: 27,$ | 134:15, 134:17, | 162:11, 172:22, |
| 158:13 $\text { threat }{ }_{[1]}$ | tolerant [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { traction [2] - } \\ \text { 161:29, 168:2 } \end{gathered}$ | $69: 13,70: 18$ | 134:22, 134:24, | 187:23, 194:4, |
| threatened [2] | Tom [2] | trading [1] | $70: 19,71: 24$ | 135:1, 135:13, | $197: 1,202: 9$ |
| 19:14, 25:1 | 116:14, 151:12 | 116:27 | 74:5, 76:15, | 136:5, 136:16, | tribunals [3] - |
| threats [1] - | TOM [24] - 3:17, | traffic [1] - 155:1 | $76: 29,77: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:18, 138:1, } \\ & \text { 138:4, 138:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 7,35: 4 \\ & 120: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| 81:11 | 6:9, 116:14, | trail [1] - 55:1 | 77:24, 78:19, 78:25, 79:5, | 138:12, 138:19, | tried [1]-114:11 |
| $33 \cdot 14 \quad 41 \cdot 7$ | 116:21, 116:22, | $-85$ | $79: 22,79: 27,$ | 140:21, 142:11, | trier [1]-45:22 |
| 42:12, 42:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 130:18, 130:28, } \\ & \text { 131:4, 138:27, } \end{aligned}$ | trans | 80:17, 81:2, | 144:3, 145:2, | $\text { trip [2] - } 90: 4$ |
| 53:7, 75:23, 95:8, | 139:4, 139:10 | 145:25, 209:26, | 81:17, 81:22, | 146:3, 146:7, | trite [1] - 49:1 |
| 102:15, 108:28, | $139: 26,140: 2,$ | 213:8 | 82:3, 82:19, | 88: | tritely [1] - 46:20 |
| 129:3, 130:26, | 140:10, 141:7, | transcripts [1] - | 84:24, 84:28, | 148:17, 149:14, | trouble [1] - 10:6 |
| 150:29, 151:8, | 141:14, 141:17, | $211: 11$ | 85:5, 85:27, | 150:20, 152:29, | troubled [2] - |
| 151:9, 156:24, | 141:20, 142:4, | transpired [3] - | 87:23, 89:18, |  | 70:8, 157:11 |
| 185:20, 190:25 | 142:19, 143:2, | 16:6, 16:18, | 89:19, 89:25, | 158:5. | true [25]-21:6, |
| throughout [3] - | 143:10, 143:17, | 91:25 | 90:12, 91:6, | $160: 23,162: 3,$ | $41: 1,45: 24$ |
| 26:6, 111:1, | 143:27 | travel [4] - | 91 | 162:24, 164:11, | 48:11, 59:24, |



| varied [1] - | vigorously [2] - | waived [2] - | 25:19 | 161:24, 162:10, | $67: 14$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 152:10 | $198: 12,214: 5$ $\text { vilifv }_{[1]}-180$ | $132: 5,146: 22$ | well-rehearsed $[1]-146: 29$ | $\begin{aligned} & 166: 2,194: 7 \\ & 194: 13,194: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { wittingly [1] - } \\ 90 \cdot 10 \end{gathered}$ |
| 33:13, 79:22, | Violence [1] - | 100:28, 135:8 | west [1]-47:23 | $200: 17$ | woman [1] - |
| 127:16, 144:9, | 129:18 | waiving [1] - | whatsoever [5] - | willing [3] - | 119:18 |
| 196:27, 209:2, | virtually [1] - | 153:2 | 72:15, 79:2, | 41:5, 67:20, | wonder [5] - |
| 214:4 | 42:27 | walks [1] - 59:4 | 115:17, 154:23, | 134:28 | 7:27, 113:25, |
| vary [1] - 18:8 | virtue [3]-25:4, | WALLACE ${ }_{[1]}$ | 193:2 | Wilson [9] - | 116:15, 143:9, |
| vast [2]-143:20, | 45:11, 138:15 | 4:26 | whence [1] - | 12:8, 12:21, | 215:8 |
| 162:18 | vis-à-vis [1] - | Wallace [5] - | 38:4 | 12:24, 12:25, | wondering [2] - |
| VAUGHAN ${ }_{[1]}$ | 140:24 | 112:17, 112:18, | whereas [2] - | 12:27, 12:29, | 37:17, 185:25 |
| 3:28 | visit [25] - 89:2, | 199:5, 210:24, | 81:13, 96:23 | 21:6, 96:13, | word [23] - |
| Vaughan [2] - | 96:18, 96:29, | 211:26 | whereby [1] | 96:20 | 23:27, 28:19, |
| 145:15, 147:2 | 100:2, 100:3, | walls [1] - 53:13 | 171:5 | Wilson's [1] - | 30:7, 30:8, 33:8, |
| Vaughan's [1] - | 100:5, 101:12, | wants [4]-94:1, | wherein [3]- | 21:7 | 33:9, 33:14, 38:1, |
| 149:7 | 101:17, 102:23, | 94:6, 163:20, | $24: 5,29: 5,72: 19$ | wipe [1] - 166:25 | $38: 10,78: 9,$ |
|  |  | 165:13 |  | $7: 12.8: 24.93: 24$ | $79 \cdot 29 \quad 80 \cdot 2 \quad 80 \cdot 3$ |
| ventilated [1] | 111:19, 111:20, | $22: 15,158: 3$ | 160:22 | 109:16, 131:1, | 80:4, 80:8, 80:13, |
| 36:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:9, 124:12, } \\ & \text { 126:6, 126:7, } \end{aligned}$ | warning [4] - | whispering [1] $95 \cdot 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:28, 133:21, } \\ & \text { 156:3, 163:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80:19, 80:27, } \\ & \text { 114:17, 115:26 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 96:9 | 135:25, 136:21, <br> 136:24 157.27 | $45: 17,48: 12$ | whistleblower | $\begin{aligned} & 165: 22,169: 9 \\ & 182: 21,189: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $174: 16$ |
| $37: 15$ | $158: 17,211: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { warped [1] } \\ & 57: 20 \end{aligned}$ | [1] - 66:21 whistleblow | 192:26, 206:21 | $72: 16$ |
| verify [1] - 159:6 | visited [6] - | warranted [2] - | [3] - 66:21, 66:25, | wished [2] - | words [17] |
| verifying [4] - | 97:3, 112:3 | 107:5, 109:6 | 85:18 | 75:19, 160:10 | 46:8, 54:10, |
| 195:4, 196:23, | 112:4, 112:6, | ways [2]-34:22, | whole [6]-7:20, | wishes [1] - | 77:26, 78:5, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 214:15, 214:16 } \\ \text { vernacular }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | 157:6, 210:20 visiting [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:17 } \\ & \text { weak [1] - 53:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 12,31: 29 \\ & 34: 11,115: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 160:8 <br> withdraw [1] - <br> $198 \cdot 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 152:9, 169:17, } \\ & \text { 169:22, 171:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 66:21 } \\ & \text { version [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | 158:22 visits [12] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { website [1] - } \\ & \text { 178:5 } \end{aligned}$ | $143: 14$ <br> wholly [10] - | 198:4 withdrawal [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:1, 186:8, } \\ & \text { 186:9, 192:11, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 42:17, 83:14, 108:16, 199:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 25,62: 11, \\ & 63: 8,117: 15 \end{aligned}$ | wee [1] - 21:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:3, 123:8, } \\ & \text { 126:4, 128:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80:10 } \\ & \text { withdrawn [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 201:5, 201:6, } \\ & \text { 201:13, 202:16, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 108:16, 199:16 } \\ \text { versions [2] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:8, 117:15, } \\ & \text { 117:20, 124:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { week [11] - } \\ 27: 18,90: 24, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:4, 128:15, } \\ & \text { 136:12, 136:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $58: 6,168: 14$ | 203:6 |
| $129: 3,184: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 136: 29,156: 22, \\ & 156: 24,156: 28, \end{aligned}$ | 139:14, 140:19, | 137:19, 150:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 208:28 } \\ & \text { withdrew [1]- } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { work-related }[1] \\ & -72: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { versus [1] - } \\ & 59: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 157:3, | 150:25, 151:4, | 153:8, 171:24 | 97:9 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 59: 21 \\ & \text { via }[2]-134: 1, \end{aligned}$ | vital [2] - 71:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 151: 13,152: 4, \\ & \text { 176:14, 176:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wide [2]-92:13, } \\ & \text { 109:5 } \end{aligned}$ | WITNESS ${ }_{[1]}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { works [2] - } \\ \text { 53:21, } 70: 22 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:1 } \\ & \text { vicinity }[2] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 146: 25 \\ & \text { vividly }{ }_{[1]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 206:25 } \\ & \text { weekend [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wider [3] - } \\ & 138: 18,181: 5, \end{aligned}$ | 6:2 <br> witness [9] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { world [1] - 168:4 } \\ & \text { worry [1] - 114:8 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 20:26, 91:26 } \\ \text { victim [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88:28 } \\ & \text { voiced }[1] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 78:28 } \\ & \text { weeks [3] - 90:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:14 } \\ & \text { widespread [6] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:12, 45:1, } \\ & \text { 47:14, 48:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { worse [3] - } \\ \text { 17:19, 134:12, } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 203:4 } \\ & \text { video [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 209:27 } \\ & \text { volume [1] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:1, 151:9 } \\ & \text { weigh [2]-79:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:25, 161:25, } \\ & \text { 184:20, 184:28, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 15,75: 15 \\ & 85: 20,107: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 134:26 } \\ & \text { worst }[1]-17: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:9, 112:11 } \\ & \text { view }[23]-32: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $44: 13$ <br> voluntarily [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 186:26 } \\ & \text { weight [10] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 185:10, } 185: 11 \\ \text { wife [1] }-47: 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:17 } \\ & \text { witnessed }[3]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { worth [2] - } \\ 52: 29,81: 19 \end{gathered}$ |
| 44:4, 47:1, 50:23, | $24: 24$ | 18:22, 51:4, | WILLIAMS ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $11: 6,13: 4,13: 14$ | worthiness [1] - |
| 55:25, 57:17, | voluntary [4] <br> 57:18, 57:24 | 81:23, 84:16, | 3:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { witnesses [22] - } \\ & 14 \cdot 11 \quad 14 \cdot 17 \end{aligned}$ | 152:19 |
| 57:20, 63:2, 77:8, | $58: 2,161: 24$ | 89:1, 107:29, 167:23. 173:1 | Williams [29] - 29:23, 61:26 | $20: 5,25: 7,36: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { write [3] - } \\ & \text { 124:15, 126:29, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 109:10, 115:19, | volunteered [3] | $\begin{aligned} & 167: 23,173: 11 \\ & 173: 19,199: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 61:29, 62:17, | $40: 4,42: 20$ | 170:2 |
| 116:9, 116:11, | $-31: 21,38: 29$ | well-advised [1] | 63:9, 99:5, | 46:24, 61:7, | writing [1] - |
| 127:23, 138:18, | 79:25 | $-35: 15$ | 110:26, 112:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:23, 102:9, } \\ & \text { 119:13, 121:5 } \end{aligned}$ | 79:23 |
| 155:11, 162:4, | W | established | 112:8, 115:24, | 121:17, 141:26, | 76:27, 83:8, |
| 191:22, 209:14 views [6] - |  | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 4,25: 4,35: 1, \\ & 120: 23,127: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:16, 120:20, } \\ & \text { 124:13, 156:26, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 147:12, 183:26, } \\ & \text { 184:4, 184:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97:10, 102:16, } \\ & \text { 104:24, 104:26, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 77:12, 77:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { waive }[3]- \\ & \text { 139:21, 153:29, } \end{aligned}$ | well-founded [2] | 159:3, 159:16, | 190:22, 199:16, | 115:21, 118:27, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 83: 12,100: 23 \\ & 101: 10,101: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 154:1 | $-106: 25,196: 29$ well-known [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:7, 160:8, } \\ & \text { 160:10, 160:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 207:14 } \\ & \text { witnesses' [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:5, 129:12, } \\ & 213: 18 \end{aligned}$ |


| wrongdoing [4] <br> - 134:20, 135:18, <br> 187:5, 214:4 <br> wrongful [1] - <br> 207:9 <br> wrongly [3] - <br> 57:9, 57:17, <br> 81:27 <br> wrote [7] - <br> 22:12, 22:16, <br> 28:14, 104:8, <br> 106:10, 120:20, <br> 123:23 |
| :---: |
| Y |
| year [4] - <br> 104:18, 108:23, <br> 150:8, 188:11 <br> years [12]- <br> 22:10, 47:6, 75:4, <br> 84:13, 92:24, <br> 92:29, 140:1, <br> 159:7, 190:25, <br> 193:21, 193:22, <br> 203:28 <br> years' [1] - <br> 147:3 <br> young [2] - <br> 30:27 <br> yourself [3]- <br> 39:26, 59:16, <br> 69:5 |
| É |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Éireann [2] - } \\ & \text { 13:26, 83:2 } \end{aligned}$ |
| Ó |
| $\begin{aligned} & \quad \mathbf{O ́}_{\text {[16] }} \text { - 6:8, } \\ & \text { 93:27, 94:3, } 95: 3, \\ & \text { 95:4, } 95: 5,113: 2, \\ & \text { 114:5, 114:6, } \\ & \text { 114:10, 115:5, } \\ & \text { 115:27, 116:3, } \\ & \text { 116:6, 139:23, } \\ & 140: 12 \end{aligned}$ |


[^0]:    "Your evi dence about Mr. Sheahan calling Sergeant McCabe a paedophile is tai nted by improper motive, that

[^1]:    "I bel ieve that it was fair to say that a likel y source of Debbie McCann's inf ormation was the gardaí."

[^2]:    "I really wish l could hel p you further on this, it would probably make my life easier if l could help you

