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# THE HEARI NG COMMENCED ON FRI DAY, 1ST DAY OF <br> NOVEMBER, 2019 AS FOLLOVB: 

J USTI CE CHARLETON So Ms. Leader.

## SUBM SSI ON BY ME. LEADER:

MS. LEADER: Yes, sir. I just will outline my understanding of the law in relation to costs when it comes to tribunals, sir, and you will be aware that Section 3 of the Tribunals of Inquiry (Evidence) (Amendment) Act 1997 is the relevant statutory jurisdiction for costs and what it says is:
"Section 6 of the Tri bunal s of I nqui ry (Evi dence) (Amendment) Act, 1979, is hereby amended by the substitution for subsection (1) of the following subsection:
(1) Where a tribunal or, if the tribunal consists of more than one member, the chairperson of the tribunal, is of opi ni on that, having regard to the findings of the tribunal and all ot her rel evant matters (incl uding the terms of the resol ution passed by each House of the Oi reachtas rel ating to the establishment of the tribunal or failing to cooperate with or provide assi stance to, or knowingly gi ving fal se or misleading inf ormati on to, the tribunal), there are sufficient reasons rendering it equitable to do so, the tribunal,
or the chai rperson, as the case may be, may, ei ther of the tribunal's or the chai rperson's own motion, as the case may be, or on application by any person appearing bef ore the tribunal, order that the whole or part of the costs;
(a) of any person appearing bef ore the tribunal by counsel or sol icitor, as taxed by a Taxing Master of the Hi gh Court, shall be paid to the person by any ot her person named in the order."

Now that section has been considered by the Supreme Court, in particular in the decision of Mrphy -vFl ood which is [2010] 3IR at 136. What the Supreme Court said in relation to that section of the Act is that:
"It gi ves to the Chai rperson a stat ory power in rel ation to costs. This incl udes a specific reference enabling regard to be had to cooper ate with the tri bunal."

At paragraph 37 of that judgment it sets out:
"The power and authority of the tribunal is limited to that gi ven to it by the term of reference and the law, and so the tribunal may make findings of a lack of cooperation. There may be degrees of lack of cooper ation fromminor to maj or. I would not attempt a

Iist of activities or omission whi ch may be deemed to be a lack of cooperation."

Later on in that judgment, Ms. Justice Denham endorsed the following paragraph from Mr. Justice Geoghegan's prior judgment in Haughey -v- Justice Mbriarty \& Others which is in the Irish Reports 1999 at page 14. What he said there is:
"As the question of costs does not really arise yet, I amrel uct ant to make any comments on it, but as it has feat ured so promi nently in the arguments l thi nk l should say this; in my opi ni on power to award costs under the Act of 1997 is confined to instances of non- cooper ation with or obstruction of the tribunal, but that of course incl ude the adducing of del i berately fal se evi dence and that is why the statutory provi si ons specifically requi res regard to be had to the findings of the tribunal as well as other rel evant matters."

So just to conclude the reference to the Murphy judgment at paragraph 63 of the judgment Ms. Justice Denham said she was of the opinion that:
"The issue for a Chai rman is whether a party has cooperated with a tribunal when it comes to the matter of costs. Ordi narily any party permitted to be represented at a tribunal should have their costs paid out of public funds. However, this may be lost if the
party fails to cooperate with the tribunal, pl us the Chai rman has to consi der the conduct of or on behal f of a party bef ore the tribunal. The power to award costs is affected by lack of cooperation, by non- cooperation with a tribunal. Non- cooperation could include failing to provi de assi stance or knowi ngly gi ving fal se or misl eading inf ormation. Fundament ally the issue is whet her a party has cooperated with a tribunal as to be entitled to his or her costs."

So therefore the position would appear to be, sir, you have a discretion with regard to the award of costs and the relevant matter to be considered in exercising that discretion is whether or not parties cooperated with the Tribunal.

Now on a prior occasion, sir, in dealing with issues of costs relating to the Tribunal you asked the parties to address four particular matters with regard to today's hearing, sir. It may be appropriate for me to run through those four particular matters at this stage.

The first thing you asked the parties about is whether they had any different view to the law to the view which I have just expressed, sir, in other words whether cooperation is the matter which has to be addressed at this hearing and whether the truth with regard to telling the truth to the Tribunal is a matter which has to be addressed at this stage.

The second thing, sir, is whether they have any issues with regard to fair procedures in relation to the costs hearing. In that regard, sir, a number of letters have been sent to the parties which appear here today, first of all a letter asking them in relation to their application for costs, asking for submissions dealing with their application for costs which the Tribunal has received and which are included in the papers before you, sir. A further letter has been sent with regard to whether they have any application in relation to any other party, et cetera. Also, a letter has been sent to both of the parties before the Tribunal dated 22nd October I think, sir, yes 2019 setting out what I just set out before you today, sir, and also the particular matters which have to be addressed or which we're suggesting should be addressed by them in furthering their application for costs.

The third thing, sir, that you asked the parties to address in relation to any reward of costs which you might make is what percentage below which would be disproportionate or unreasonable in relation to an award of costs. So you expressed it in these terms:
"The third question is what percentage bel ow whi ch you woul $d$ be acting unreasonably, ther ef ore flying in the face of fundamental reason and common sense and di sproportionately in the sense of Meadous as flying in the face of fundament al reason and common sense in
goi ng" --

MR. HARTY: Sorry, I'm loath to interrupt. I wonder could I have the date of that letter because I appear to be missing...
M. LEADER: I think it's 22nd October.

MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON yes, it is. I don't know, Ms. Mullen, do you have it?
MG. LEADER: of this year. I beg you pardon, 2019.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON Ms. Mullen, I don't know if you have another copy of it. Can you find it, Mr. Harty? MR. HARTY: No, the last letter I have from the Tribunal is 19th October and then 7th November. I appear not to have received a letter on --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON 7 th November is next week. MR. HARTY: Sorry, 7th November of last year. Excuse me, sorry.
MR. J USTI CE CHARLETOK 7th November, has that been furnished?
M. LEADER: It starts "thank you for" --

MR. HARTY: Sorry, 22nd October, excuse me. I have it. ME. LEADER: Thank you. Yes, so I was dealing with the third question in relation to the percentage below which, and I think I have set that out.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Sure.
ME. LEADER: And then the final question, sir, that you asked the parties to address is whether in view of the fact that it is a matter of public money, in other words taxpayers' money, is there any sense in which
compassion or mercy comes into consideration in any order that the Tribunal may make?
MR. HARTY: Sorry, sir, that is not the letter I have dated 22nd October.

MS. LEADER: No, no, it wasn't.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON what Ms. Leader is doing is filling you in on -- we had a costs hearing in relation to the other module.

MR. HARTY: Yes. But the important thing is none of these questions were actually asked of me --
MS. LEADER: No.
MR. HARTY: -- before now.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I'm going to ask you --
MR. HARTY: I'm sorry, but my understanding is they
were sent a letter but if they're not --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON There seems to be some misunderstanding.

MS. LEADER: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON But what Ms. Leader was saying and it was explained to me on the last occasion there was a costs hearing which was in relation, if you like, to the Maurice McCabe aspect of things, I came out and asked those questions of parties.

MS. LEADER: Yes.
MR. HARTY: Sorry, I'm taking the letter.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON It's not in the letter, but it's actually on the transcript that's on the website. MS. LEADER: On the website, yes. It's just to save you asking the questions now, sir.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: We11, thanks.
ME. LEADER: It may be appropriate for the parties to address those matters.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I think it is and thank you for reminding me. So, Mr. Hartnett.

## SUBM SSI ON BY MR. HARTNETT:

MR. HARTNETT: very good. Firstly, sir, if I could bring you to the letter which invited us to the Tribunal, if you like, which is dated August 2017 and it states that:
"The Tribunal has identified you as a person whose reputation and/ or good name will be at issue in the forthcoming hearings and who al so, possibly, may be the subject of critical comment. Accordingly, the Tribunal is hereby formally notifying you of same. "

Then it goes on to say that we were provided with a copy of materials which reflects on your good name so as you are afforded the means to defend same. Now, clearly an issue arose at that stage in relation to a right to a good name, et cetera. And I submit that in the general constitutional atmosphere that we must, as a matter of right, be entitled to legal representation where these issues are clearly demarcated at the very beginning. As a result of that letter my client, Marisa Simms, instructed Mr. Mullaney, a sligo
solicitor, who instructed counsel. Mr. Mullaney spent four weeks here representing Ms. Simms, as he was obliged to do having been instructed by her, away from his practice in sligo and indeed counsel attended as wel1.

I submit that the question of good name being at stake is very significant and if one was to draw an analogy with legal aid, certainly the courts have decided where one's right to liberty and good name is at stake, one has a right to representation. I submit, by analogy, the same applies here and I also submit that in the public interest those who may find themselves in a similar position should be in a position where they can obtain legal advice and legal aid from a solicitor and counsel. If one was to, if you like, lose the possibility of costs based on the finding of the Tribunal, it might be very difficult for people to obtain representation and that would not be, in my submission, in the interests of justice.

It might be noted that the section which is opened by My Friend, Ms. Leader, does refer to other matters in general that the Tribunal can take into account and I submit that that is one of them.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Help me on that, where is the piece you're referring to?
MR. HARTNETT: I shall find it now.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON This is Section 3, it's
possibly in the letter to you I think.
MR. HARTNETT: It's in the actual section where it says on the third line "all other rel evant matters", on the third line of Section 3 or Section 6 as it is but amended by section 3.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Okay, just give me a second.
"Where a Tribunal consists of more than one person, the chai rperson of the Tribunal, is of opi ni on that, having regard to the findings of the Tribunal and all ot her rel evant matters (incl udi ng the ternฐ of the resol ution..." et cetera. "...there are sufficient reasons rendering it equitable to do so."

Is that --
MR. HARTNETT: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON So you're saying there is a general kind of discretion?
MR. HARTNETT: yes, and I submit the matter I have just mentioned must be something you can take into consideration and I say should take into consideration. The question arises within that as whether this Court should take account of compassion and mercy and I submit again a court certainly would be obliged, it just strikes me, I think the preamble refers to concepts of charity, I think that any court will always be driven or be conscious of the concepts of compassion and mercy in making any decision and I submit that, again by analogy, the same should apply to a tribunal
which is carrying out a quasi judicial function. I suppose a judicial function.

So the question again, although I don't wish to repeat myself, should a person be required to attend without legal representation? And I submit that the answer to that must be no.

Now, there can be different forms of non-cooperation clearly and that was referred to by Ms. Justice Denham. There have been tribunals in the past where people have destroyed documents; where people have failed to disclose cheque books payment stubs, et cetera, et cetera, very clear, if you like, obstruction or non-cooperation and I submit that they qualitatively must be distinguished from a situation where, for instance, evidence of a witness is rejected by the Tribunal, that there is a significant difference. If somebody has set out to destroy documentation, if somebody has set out to, for instance, suppress the existence of a bank account, then clearly that would be, in my submission, a much more serious matter which a tribunal could take into account. Again, just to repeat myself, I submit that there is a difference between that and the acceptance or rejection of evidence that is given before a tribunal.

So there is a public interest, in my submission, in anybody who is called as a witness whose good name is
at stake, as it was here, in having, if you like, legal representation and having an appropriate system whereby that can be obtained. And in those circumstances I submit, I ask for costs on behalf of marisa simms. MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Mr. Hartnett, again can you help me on just a couple of matters?
MR. HARTNETT: yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Firstly, is there any shaft of light, if I could put it that way, in terms of the evidence of your client whereby it could be said this at least elucidated an important matter, as opposed to the Tribunal's findings which really speak for themselves.
MR. HARTNETT: Just going to the actual findings one will remember in fact under examination by counsel for the Tribunal, Ms. Leader, questions were asked about the interaction between a social worker and my client and she indicated that in fact it was a feeling she had and did not say that it was a statement.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: You're talking about when a social worker visited the house?

MR. HARTNETT: yes.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON Had a chat with the children. was introduced as this is a cousin of mine who has come to say hello type thing, but she didn't in fact say that she was sent by the Gardaí.
MR. HARTNETT: yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON And that she was here effectively to destroy their lives et cetera, et
cetera. It was just something that was internal to her. In other words she didn't repeat that but it was in the letter.

MR. HARTNETT: Yes, that was clearly, that was a finding by the Tribunal based on that evidence and that clearly is a matter that aided the Tribunal and I'd ask you to take that into account. I can't think of any other bits and pieces, but again I go back to -MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON One might think, perhaps, of the Inter Certificate papers, the bag.
MR. HARTNETT: Yes, I have to say I didn't apply my mind entirely to the factual aspect.
MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON I'm just trying to think it through. There's the Inter Certificate papers.
MR. HARTNETT: Yes.
MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON And what happened to them or what was threatened to happen to them.
MR. HARTNETT: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON The evidence on that came from Ms. Simms, but also came from her mother.
MR. HARTNETT: Yes. I'm afraid I have to admit -MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETOK It didn't -- no, I'm sure you remember. Look, all these details come to us, Mr. Hartnett --

MR. HARTNETT: yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON -- and like legal cases we're better off if, like the river outside, they pass through and don't stay on top of us.
MR. HARTNETT: One wouldn't want to collect it all.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Yes, I know exactly what you mean.

MR. HARTNETT: My megabytes are limited.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I'm just trying to think it through.

MR. HARTNETT: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON That is one and then there was a contradiction in the evidence.

MR. HARTNETT: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON So that's --
MR. HARTNETT: We11 --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Then there's the general domestic situation.

MR. HARTNETT: Yes.
MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON And what about then the text messages? Would you say anything about the text messages?

MR. HARTNETT: We11, they're there.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Yes.
MR. HARTNETT: Made available.
MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON Mm.
MR. HARTNETT: So again I draw a very specific difference between tribunals in the past where people may have set out to destroy the trail.
MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON: Yes.
MR. HARTNETT: And where material, as in this case, it was made readily available, voluntarily in cooperation with the Tribunal.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON So in other words what you're
saying is, if a person says: Look, this is what I think about it, this is how $I$ feel about it, this is how I see it, but here is the documentary evidence and if that contradicts what they say that is substantial cooperation. Is that the point you're making?

MR. HARTNETT: That is my submission.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Yeah. Can you help me then on -- you've given me a submission then on number four, compassion or mercy. Would you like, because everybody else did on the last occasion, to say what percentage below which the Tribunal would fall and fly in the face of fundamental reason and common sense, in other words become unreasonable and subject to a judicial review? MR. HARTNETT: Yes. Without, if you like, throwing away any argument I might have in relation to whether we're entitled to the whole of our costs.

## MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Mm.

MR. HARTNETT: If the Tribunal was to decide that there should be a proportion, I would submit that $25 \%$ would be the maximum that should be applied to that.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON A11 right.
MR. HARTNETT: In view of the circumstances.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON A11 right. It's good to have your submission on that in any event.
MR. HARTNETT: But that's as a fallback position.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON No, I appreciate it's a
fallback position and I appreciate that you don't want to do it, but everybody else did and I have asked and thank you for answering.

MR. HARTNETT: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON And then, have you any issue with the fair procedures that were involved?
MR. HARTNETT: In relation to these costs matters?
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: Yes.
MR. HARTNETT: No, none whatsoever.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I think we followed the Ryan judgment.
MR. HARTNETT: I have no dispute on that.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Then the first thing is, have you any difference with Ms. Leader in terms of the law that was outlined by her? I don't think you have from what you've said save for --
MR. HARTNETT: The law is there. There are
interpretations of it.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Yes.
MR. HARTNETT: And clearly there is a big issue on the whole question of what is a substantive finding. And I think that that is always out there and I suspect, I think there was an opportunity for clarification before the Supreme Court on that, but the case was settled prior to hearing I think the case of Fox.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON That is right, C11r. Fox.
MR. HARTNETT: Yes, so I think that there was to be an argument in relation to the judgment. Interesting that two judgments by Judge Baker, Chawke and Fox, and the Fox case was in some way compromised prior to hearing. MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Yes. Well it wasn't my fault, but there you go. A11 right. Thank you Mr. Hartnett.

So Mr. Harty.

## SUBM SSI ON BY MR. HARTY:

MR. HARTY: Firstly, Judge, as a matter of courtesy, the Court will be aware of the matters that were before the High Court, in both matters a notice of appeal has been prepared and is about to be lodged.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON It's nothing to do with this.
MR. HARTY: We11, it is, in fact, in that one of the reliefs sought in those is a declaration in relation to our client's entitlement. It obviously doesn't bind the Court in relation to that but it is relevant -- or it doesn't bind the Tribunal but it is relevant and is a matter of courtesy.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON But is it relevant?
MR. HARTY: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON As I understand the Orange case, if a public official - and in that instance it was to do with communications regulation - is to be stopped from doing what their statutory duty requires, there has to be an actual order of the Court, but is there an order of the Court --
MR. HARTY: No, there's no order.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON -- to stop me dealing with costs?

MR. HARTY: None at a11. It's simply as a matter of courtesy and indicating to the Tribunal that this is not a waiver of my position in respect of those
proceedings.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON oh no, I appreciate that fully.
MR. HARTY: Absolutely not. No, there is no restriction on the Tribunal delay.

Tribunals of inquiry, as the Tribunal itself so eloquently set out on a number of occasions, are established by the Oireachtas to inquire into matters of public concern. They are an instrument, a special instrument which has been constitutionally permitted to allow the Oireachtas to engage in these investigations. At its heart citizens and individual citizens are not to bear the brunt or the expense of the desire of the body politic to investigate. And that is the principle upon which the provision for costs has been laid out for two reasons; firstly because the individual reputation is to be protected; secondly, so as to ensure that if an individual, in order to protect their reputation, requires legal representation, that that representation is met at the expense of the body politic which wished to carry out the inquiry. That is the manner in which it has been established and it is under the Tribunals of Inquiry Act which predate even I think the Constitution it is therefore a common law precept which is only bolstered by the Constitution system under which we now live.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Sorry, would just help me on that if you wouldn't mind?
MR. HARTY: We11, the Tribunals of Inquiry Act predates
the Constitution, I understand. It's a --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I see. Now I get you, yes.
MR. HARTY: The reality is, is that the Oireachtas is not permitted to carry out this exceptional power at the cost of the behest -- at the cost or to the detriment of individuals. Tribunals are legally neutral. They cannot affect the rights between individuals or individuals and the State. Tribunals -that legal neutrality must, as a matter of first principles, go so far as to the issue of costs, because it certainly could not be acceptable for the State to require an individual to come before a tribunal willy-nilly at that individual's expense because that would then be the State both intervening and affecting greatly the constitutional entitlements of that individual, and it would be utterly disproportionate to the purpose of tribunals of inquiry in the first place, which are to carry out legally neutral fact-finding exercises.

Now, it is a fact-finding exercise and in the way of the world generally the finding of facts involves the preferring of one person's version of events to another's. That, in and of itself, does not give rise to a risk in respect of costs because $50 \%$ of the people before a tribunal would therefore be at risk in relation to their costs.

The finding in relation to the case law, which has been
relied upon and it is, I would agree for the most part, an accurate summation of the law, it is not simply that evidence was not accepted, it is not simply that evidence was untrue; it is that that evidence being not accepted and untrue amounted to non-cooperation. It's not an either or. It's accumulative. It is only when the evidence which is not accepted amounts to non-cooperation, or misdirects the work of the Tribunal, therefore, adding to the load that the question of a costs order against any individual arises.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON It's not a costs order against
-- no one has asked for a costs order against you.
MR. HARTY: Sorry, a refusal of a person's costs.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON It is your right in the Tribunals of Inquiry Acts that one party can look for costs as against, but nobody did and we wrote to absolutely everybody. So the Garda Commissioner didn't look for costs against you, for instance.
MR. HARTY: No, and I didn't look for costs against the Garda Commissioner either. Circumstances were the Garda Commissioner made false allegations against my client and initial statements submitted, which allegations were not accepted by the Tribunal and didn't form part of the report.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Sorry, help me about that. MR. HARTY: Oh, there was a suggestion that my client took a garda car, a patrol car, wrongly, without permission, to travel to Marisa Simms' house to
intervene in the incident with Marisa Simms'
ex-husband. That was set out in the initial statement submitted by the Garda Commissioner in respect of this. It was not substantiated by the sergeant at the station at the time who said that in fact my client requested permission to use the patrol car and was given permission to use the patrol car. It didn't form part of the report, then it didn't form part of the terms of reference either. But it was evidence given.

Similarly, the Garda Commissioner in its initial statement suggested that my client, in moving to Donegal, had breached the provisions of the Garda Code. That, similarly, was not correct and was a false allegation.

Perhaps most significantly, the initial statement suggested by the Garda Commissioner said that the matter never left Donegal and never went up the ranks and was only --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Mr. Harty, if you were going to attack the Garda Commissioner it may be that the Garda Commissioner ought to be here.
MR. HARTY: No, you said to me the Garda Commissioner didn't ask for their costs against me. I'm simply saying I didn't ask for my costs against them.
MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON Mr. Harty, you're being argumentive and it doesn't really help. I mean, look, there's fundamental principles I'm bound by.

MR. HARTY: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON And we all know what they are. You said you weren't asking for costs against the Garda Commissioner. I said I was puzzled by that statement. And then you entered into, effectively, an attack on the character of the Garda Commissioner and his conduct at the Tribuna1. So I'd just ask you to be aware of the fact that the Garda Commissioner isn't here. If you want to persist in it, if you feel it's going to in any way impact on my assessment as to costs well then I'11 adjourn and we can get the Garda Commissioner in here. That's all I'm saying, Mr. Harty.
MR. HARTY: I hadn't intended to name names. I had intended to raise the fact that certain parties had been given costs in circumstances where they set out in statements matters which were factually untrue against my client.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON who has been given costs?
MR. HARTY: Yet again the Tribunal asked me not to name names. I've already indicated that the first statement submitted on behalf of the Garda Commissioner sets out false matters.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I didn't give the Garda Commissioner any costs.
MR. HARTY: No . The person who set that out in that statement, which was submitted by the Garda Commissioner at that time, was given their costs. MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Are you talking about the Association of Garda Sergeants?

MR. HARTY: No, I'm talking about the Donegal division, matters which were submitted by the Donegal division, which was the first statement received from the Garda Commissioner.

MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON Sorry, I'm mystified. But anyway let's carry on, Mr. Harty.
MR. HARTY: we11, what I can say is that in terms of this exercise whereby we're apparently assessing each person's evidence line-by-line and picking out both bits that we say are true and untrue, that exercise has to be a universal exercise then and must be applied universally, to all witnesses before a tribunal if that is the manner on which we are simply, this is to be done.

In relation to that test -- and I say that is not the test. It is manifestly not the test. The first thing is that the untruth must be related to the actual terms of reference, not simply the evidence called before the Tribunal. It is not open to the Tribunal to call evidence, dislike evidence in relation to peripheral matters which are not central to the function of the Tribunal, and then to fix the person who has given that evidence with the costs of that appearance.

So the Tribunal must firstly be satisfied that the evidence which it is unhappy about is evidence which is central to the terms of reference, core to the terms of reference. we cannot have a situation where a tribunal
can call evidence and dislike the evidence of the manner in which a witness dealt with something entirely peripheral to the terms of reference and relying on that, therefore, effectively penalise that person in respect of costs.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON would you he1p me, what do you mean by that?

MR. HARTY: We11, very simply, there is a suggestion in your letter to my solicitor that the Tribunal didn't like the evidence of my client in respect of PULSE checks which occurred a number of years before any matters which the Oireachtas asked the investigation, the Tribunal to investigate into. Similarly, the hostile reception in Donegal Town is utterly irrelevant to interaction between members of An Garda Síochána and Tus7a, or the HSE in respect of Garda Keith Harrison in that Sergeant Durkin at no stage had any interaction with Tusla, or the HSE in relation to my client.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Mr. Harty, it was your client saying these things, you know.
MR. HARTY: In fact my client didn't say these things in evidence. It was contained in a statement.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON How did they sudden7y appear before the Tribunal?
MR. HARTY: They appeared, sir, because when the Tribunal was engaging in its editing of the statements at the start it removed some matters from my client's statement and left other matters in. It removed the matters which predated his move to Donegal and it
removed matters which post-dated his suspension in Donegal.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON What's your problem with that?
MR. HARTY: Well, the Tribunal didn't remove other matters, but it was entirely open to the Tribunal to say these are not relevant to the terms of reference -MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Mr. Harty, before you start shouting at me - and you already are raising your voice - I was asked to inquire into what happened vis-á-vis your client and Tusla. That happened in Donegal.
MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR J USTI CE CHARLETON what therefore happened or didn't happen for instance in Athlone, or what happened or didn't happen in Galway University, or what happened or didn't happen in relation to his first marriage was neither here nor there. Now what you're saying is the Tribunal was canvassing irrelevant material --
MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: -- including checks in relation to PULSE --

MR. HARTY: Mm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON which the Tribunal felt fed into the whole issue of the domestic circumstances under which complaints were made about your client. You're also saying that his relationship with other members of the Garda Síochána in Donegal is irrelevant in the context where your client was making an allegation that Garda Headquarters had engineered a situation where all of his colleagues or many of his
clients were turned against him, specifically Sergeant Durkin who was bullying him and engineered a situation where social workers called to his house. That's what your client was saying.
MR. HARTY: And the Tribunal will be we11 aware that I objected at all stages to any line of questioning in relation to that on the basis of the fact that it was a matter for High Court proceedings which were then extant. I didn't accept it was relevant, my client didn't accept it was relevant, and the matter was left there. And it rested there until such time as the Tribunal report came out and then was added to by this to be contained in this letter. But it has little or nothing to do with the job of the Tribunal --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Mr. Harty, your memory is defective.

MR. HARTY: My memory is exact and I can look at the transcript and show where I objected to the questioning being put to my client, where I objected to being asked to apologise, or my client to apologise to
Sergeant Durkin. My memory is very clear in relation to it.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You're saying --
MR. HARTY: It's not saying --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON No, you're saying allegations of bullying by your client against colleagues was irrelevant to the claim you were making. You're saying the extent to which your client was checking up on his ex-girlfriend, who was then becoming his domestic
partner or was in the course of re-communicating with the person who would become his domestic partner, is not relevant to the domestic circumstances which led to his relations making complaints to the Gardaí about his conduct towards her when in fact they started living together.
MR. HARTY: I am saying --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You've made that submission. I understand it.

MR. HARTY: And I am saying --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I'm not saying I accept it, but I do understand it.
MR. HARTY: I'm saying that the Tribunal, when it makes a ruling on this matter, must relate it clearly to how these individual matters relate to a percentage costs penalty against my client. That involves an analysis of the centrality of the evidence, the time taken to get the evidence and the difficulty or otherwise that arose as a result of the evidence being given by my client. Those matters must be undertaken in terms of an analysis and a ruling in respect of costs and that is what the Ryan judgment says. It doesn't require a precise analysis, but it does require an analysis.

In relation to the other matters which are sent out in the letter, and I will say this, it is manifest from the letter sent to us that both the issue in respect of sergeant Durkin and the issues in respect of Donna McTeague are expressed in manners which would
suggest that the Tribunal wishes to express its disapproval of my client's evidence.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON Just hang on a minute, what are you actually saying?
MR. HARTY: I'm saying that it suggests, and if I read the letters.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON You're talking about the letter now of 22nd October 2019?

MR. HARTY: Exactly. "Garda Harrison mai ntai ned to the Tribunal that Tusla" --
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON Just give me which page are you on there.
MR. HARTY: Page 3.
"Garda Harrison mai ntai ned to the Tribunal that Tusla intervened in his family life as Gardaí mani pul at ed social services to that end. Furthermore,
Garda Harrison accused Tusla of goi ng al ong with this garda mani pul ation. These allegations were compl et el y rejected by the Tribunal as false. The following is the rel evant extract fromthe report, in particular" --

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Sorry, just hang on. Do you want to say something?
MR. HARTY: I want to say something about the entire paragraph. I'11 read the entire paragraph.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I've actually read the paragraph before going out.
MR. HARTY: well, no, I'd prefer to read it. I think
it's probably --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You're telling me stuff I already know.

MR. HARTY: I know, and it's perhaps of assistance if I read it.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You're actually now quoting the Tribunal Report, but if you feel you should please carry on.
MR. HARTY: Thank you.
"In particular, it is alleged that Donna McTeague had apol ogi sed over a tel ephone to do a home visit. It was cl ai med that in the aftermath of the meeting,
Donna METeague apol ogi sed to Marisa Si mms clai ming she di dn't have any choi ce in the matter, that her team I eader had been in contact with the Gardaí and as a result had to do the visit. It is further clai med that after the visit, before leaving, Donna McTeague was agai $n$ apol ogi sing but guar anteeing that $t$ his was the end of it.

There is no mistake in any of these matters. The fact is that at the hearing that they were reduced by Marisa Si mms to give some kind of a feel ing which she had in consequence of the meeting when the allegations as made were specific, and the fact that Garda Keith Harrison notwithst anding this reduction cl ai med he had been told the i mmedi ate conversation surrounding the alleged events by Marisa Sims, that social services
... action described the determination to pursue damagi ng and hurtful allegations, not withstanding the fact they knew that they were untrue."

Now, in relation to that the characterisation of the allegations as damaging and hurtful is utterly irrelevant to what this Tribunal is to be assessing in terms of cooperation or non-cooperation.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Well, Mr. Harty, just let me give you an example. That's the witness stand over there in this court and this court will have seen a lot. Let's suppose a woman comes into this court and makes an allegation against another person to the effect that that person told malicious lies about her, in consequence of which she had a terrible row with her husband and her marriage broke up.
MR HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON Let's suppose that in fact what she said was true --
MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON -- that the other person did in fact tell lies about her and it did in fact have an affect on her life.
MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON I suppose the difference
between where I'm sitting between where you're sitting or your solicitor is sitting is that I can see everybody's face in the court. I can see what's going on.

MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I can see the upset, for instance, of the people against whom allegations are made.

MR. HARTY: Mm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Certainly, looking back to the Tribunal, $I$ can recall people being in tears in consequence of what your client was saying about them. Those are facts.

MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON But these are human things, you know. When people say wrong things - by wrong I just mean incorrect or untrue, whether maliciously or mistakenly, people get upset.
MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Now you seem to be turning that into something else. I don't know what it is and maybe you'd help me, if you really want to turn it into something else maybe you'd tell me. You've given me a big long passage --
MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON -- and you seem to be drawing some kind of an inference or saying the Tribunal should draw some kind of an inference from that. I actually don't know what you're saying.
MR. HARTY: well there are a number of things to be said. Firstly, the Tribunal did not find that it wasn't said by Marisa Simms to Keith Harrison. And it didn't find that.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: she said it in evidence.
MR. HARTY: she said it in evidence but when he reported that that was what he had said to her she had said to him - and that's all he ever reported. That is a11 he ever reported. He never said it was said to him by Donna McTeague. He said it was said to him by Marisa Simms. She did not say she didn't say it to him and Keith Harrison did not say she didn't say it to him.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON So your point is what? MR. HARTY: My point is that there is no finding of an untruth on the part of Keith Harrison there, firstly. MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON Okay.
MR. HARTY: Secondly, in relation to that, the manner in which it was expressed would suggest costs as a means of retributive justice.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Now, maybe you'd help me on that particular point.
MR. HARTY: Because the emphasis on damaging and hurtful allegations in that instance, and similarly in relation to the bullying in Donegal, the question of whether or not that was hurtful to Sergeant Durkin, despite being irrelevant, was what exercised the mind of the Tribunal when the matter was being raised. And yet again it is not relevant to the issue of costs. MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON So what are you saying? MR. HARTY: I'm saying the issue of costs has to do with whether or not non-cooperation occurred, which would be a remarkable suggestion against my client. My
client, who was obliged to go through thousands of pages of documents, faced a situation whereby An Garda Síochána had six counsel; the Tribunal had three counse1; Tusla had three counse1; individual members of the Donegal division had counsel, each of them cross-examining, calling witnesses that he was obliged to cross-examine. A vast panoply of State-funded lawyers ranged against him and he cooperated fully. You didn't like some of his answers but that is not the same thing as saying that he didn't cooperate.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Mr. Harty, you really have to be careful of how you use language here. That's what law is about; how you use language. I didn't like things. I don't like or dislike anybody. And even if I liked or disliked anybody, I've taken an oath to judge cases in accordance with the evidence. That's my oath. That's what I do. No question of liking or disliking anybody, or liking or disliking anybody's evidence. What courts have done, except in the most exceptional circumstances, has always been to spare people's feelings and to say the evidence of mrs. O'Toole is preferred to the evidence of Mrs. O'Neill. And the reason that they do that is in order to maintain an objective balance between people. But if you're saying to me that I made findings of fact because I either liked somebody or didn't like somebody, well that has nothing to do with anything on earth.
MR. HARTY: With all due respect, sir, firstly the
suggestion that is made in the opening of your sentence that I don't know what law is, is inappropriate. Secondly, sir, I never said you liked or disliked any particular person. I said you liked or disliked their evidence.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You don't make assessments of evidence upon the basis of you like that evidence. MR. HARTY: One prefers one set of evidence over another.
MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON Nobody does.
MR. HARTY: That is liking or disliking. And if the Court wishes me to --

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Al1 right, if that's --
MR. HARTY: -- produce a copy of the oxford English Dictionary to show that that's what the word "like" means.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETOK Mr. Harty, if that's what you meant I understand.
MR. HARTY: And, sir, I fully understand how words impact on law. And insofar as the Court wished to suggest something otherwise to me, I will say to you I don't accept that.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON well we're getting a bit -MR. HARTY: we are getting a bit, sir.
MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON we are a bit out of the boat.
MR. HARTY: we are entirely out of the boat. If the Tribunal wishes to leave it hang there, that apparently I don't understand what law is about we'11 leave it hang there.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I never said you didn't understand what law is about. It's clear you're an extremely good lawyer, Mr. Harty. But to use language to a judge to say that a finding was made because the evidence wasn't likeable. Evidence may be highly unlikable but nonetheless it may be a fact.

MR. HARTY: It would be better not to paraphrase me, sir, where $I$ said the evidence wasn't liked, not likeable.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON We'11 have a transcript in due course --

MR. HARTY: Yes, we will.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON And you can read it all and admire the way you put things. Now, let's get on with things.

MR. HARTY: Right. So in respect of both of those categories, it is obviously an attempt at retributive justice by way of costs. And that's the manner in which they're expressed.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON what do you mean by that? what is retributive --

MR. HARTY: what I mean is that he is to be punished for the evidence he against --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Mr. Harty, stop shouting at me. What do you mean? By the way, I have an entitlement to put this entire transcript out on air on the Tribunal website. You're being recorded. Everybody is being recorded. what do you mean by "retributive justice"? MR. HARTY: what I mean, sir, is that two of the
categories that you rely upon are premised on the hurt feelings of the witnesses. That the costs that you are seeking to reduce are on the basis of people's feelings being hurt. So that is costs, punishment, not for the cooperation, not for the involvement of the evidence in the findings of the report, but for the impact that it had on certain witnesses.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON So what you're saying is that were the Tribunal, as a matter of law, to approach the award or non-award of costs on the basis that witnesses were hurt --

MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: -- that would be to turn the exercise on costs into a question of just desserts in consequence of causing shame or embarrassment to somebody.

MR. HARTY: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON But whereas the true exercise is the degree of cooperation by a person whether they caused hurt or not.

MR. HARTY: Exactly. Exactly.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON And you're saying that the Tribunal's letter indicates a tone of retribution -MR. HARTY: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON -- against your client which is inappropriate?
MR. HARTY: Exactly.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON we11, retribution for what?
MR. HARTY: I've just read it out, sir.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON No, but retribution for what? MR. HARTY: For apparently hurting the feelings of Donna McTeague and not withdrawing an allegation when Marisa simms withdrew it the day before.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON So you accept that Marisa Simms withdrew that allegation?
MR. HARTY: That's what the letter says. That's what the report says.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You seem to accept that.
MR. HARTY: I don't have to accept or reject it. The findings are there.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Okay, you accept the finding. MR. HARTY: The findings are there. I don't have to accept or reject it.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON A11 right. So did you want to mention the next matter?

MR. HARTY: Yes. The checking on PULSE. That was a matter which took approximately ten minutes to be dealt with, both in cross-examination of my client and in the examination I think it was of Chief Superintendent Sheridan. Ten minutes.

MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON Mm.
MR. HARTY: So ten minutes out of 19 days' hearing, as a matter of mathematical analysis we're certain7y talking about less than a percentage point. At most. MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON Mm-hmm. okay.
MR. HARTY: And, in any event, I say it wasn't central to what the Oireachtas asked the Tribunal to inquire into.

And in relation to the fourth category, because I've dealt with the third, the rejection of Garda Harrison's evidence in relation to the texts on the phone as ridiculous and nonsense. The Tribunal didn't accept his evidence. So be it. The Tribunal, the Chairman of the Tribunal is a fan of the films of Kurosawa and the Chairman of the Tribunal will be well aware, therefore, of Mr. Kurosawa's greatest work, a film by the name of Rashomon. And the whole point --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Rashonon, yes.
MR. HARTY: Yes. Rashomon --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON This is the one where -MR. HARTY: Everything is about --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON --someone is killed under the tree and then four different witnesses give their own view about things.

MR. HARTY: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Yeah. Sorry.
MR. HARTY: And central to Mr. Kurosawa's view of the world is the importance of perspective.
MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON okay.
MR. HARTY: And how people can have different versions of events without necessarily seeking to mislead or to lie. Central to Rashomon is the idea that you, the viewer, and to a certain extent, in this instance, the Chairman of the Tribunal was Mr. Kurosawa's camera lens - best able to view each person's version of events and to assess what probably happened. But simply because the camera determines that something could not have
happened in that way, or did not happen in that way does not mean that a witness is not cooperating, not doing their best to give their version of events. Witnesses are mistaken. Witnesses do mis-recollect how things happen. Witnesses do, in attempting to deal with matters or recall them later, do construct a version of events in a manner which is entirely innocent, a version of events which they can live with, or which they can accept happened, without seeking to mislead anybody. There is no absolute need to lie deliberately. There can be the accidental lie. The unintentional lie.

In assessing the question of costs the accidental or unintended lie cannot be a basis for a reduction in costs. The incorrect recollection of what took place cannot be a basis for reduction in costs. The imperfect recollection of what occurred cannot be the basis. And if it is to be the basis then each and every witness will have to have their evidence assessed in its entirety so that when the Tribunal, for example, was unable to resolve who called who in the January of 2014 between the guards and Tus7a. And that was central, but neither witness could satisfy you as to who made the call.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON At the end of the day was it so important in the sense that if there is an allegation of a child witnessing a row, a serious row, aren't the Gardaí obliged to actually call the social workers then
under the guidelines?
MR. HARTY: This is the call three months later. This is the call in January as opposed to October.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Mm.
MR. HARTY: So no, they're not.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON There was a lot of stuff going on though, Mr. Harty, that went over several months.

MR. HARTY: what I'm --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON It wasn't exactly the happiest of relationships. I know things are better now.
MR. HARTY: It wasn't the happiest of relationships but it also was a situation where this Tribunal was tasked with investigating the interactions between the Garda Síochána and Tusla in relation to Garda Keith Harrison.
A central interaction was the one which took place in January of 2014, and from the evidence given by both Tusla and An Garda Síochána this Tribunal could not resolve who called who.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON So what's your point on that?
MR. HARTY: My point is that that should be visited in costs if we are simply to deal with imperfect recollection.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETOR Visited in costs? How do you mean?

MR. HARTY: Against the witnesses who gave that evidence, if we are simply dealing with imperfect recollection.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON So what are you saying? Are you saying I shouldn't have awarded Tusla costs? They
didn't look for costs.
MR. HARTY: I'm picking it as an example, sir.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: Mm.
MR. HARTY: It's not an unreasonable example to select.
And it's not --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Look, Mr. Harty, my difficulty, and it's my fault, was simply in understanding the submission and therefore $I$ asked a question on it. MR. HARTY: The situation is, sir, that there's a variety of evidence such as, for example, the allegation made by the Chief Superintendent in Donegal that my client had driven a garda car without permission from Buncrana Garda Station to Donegal Town when in fact he had been given that permission. But that allegation was made full square on a statement submitted by Chief Superintendent McGinn. I do know that Chief Superintendent McGinn applied for her costs. MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON was it all the way from Buncrana to Donegal?
MR. HARTY: I can't remember, whichever station it was.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I thought it was Letterkenny out to where they lived which is -- I mean Buncrana to Donegal Town --

MR. HARTY: I can read it.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You're talking about an hour and a bit. Don't worry about it, Mr. Harty, I have the submission. I understand.

MR. HARTY: I don't want to be wrong. To Churchill. 61 km away. So Buncrana to Churchil1.

MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON Yeah.
MR. HARTY: 61km.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: Yeah.
MR. HARTY: And that was an allegation made that he did so illegally, wrongfully, unlawfully.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON A11 right.
MR. HARTY: That wasn't visited in costs. Now, I wouldn't have said it should be visited in costs, but if we're engaging in an exercise whereby any individual on truth is something which must be visited in costs and must be assessed in that light, then that exercise has to take place in respect of every witness.

There are other, just from that statement alone, there is the suggestion that my client had broke the Garda Code, which was unfounded. And there was also nothing in that statement indicating the interaction which took place between the Donegal division and the district after this, which interaction was on7y uncovered as a result of the evidence given.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I'm just not following that point, I'm sorry.
MR. HARTY: It was dealt with between Chief Superintendent McGinn and Assistant Commissioner Kenny. The Tribunal will recall that that was only revealed in the evidence of chief Superintendent McGinn as a result of cross-examination.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON what are you -- I'm sorry, I don't know --

MR. HARTY: Her statement makes no reference to this matter.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON To which?
MR. HARTY: To dealing with the matter of Assistant Commissioner Kenny.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON what matter of Assistant
Commissioner Kenny?
MR. HARTY: My client.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I know, but what are you
talking about? $I$ 'm sorry, it's my fault. I'm lost. I don't know what you're talking. Sorry, Chief Superintendent McGinn --
MR. HARTY: Chief Superintendent McGinn --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETOR -- and Assistant Commissioner Kenny would be the superior officer --
MR. HARTY: Exactly.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON -- did what?
MR. HARTY: They discussed and raised the issues of Keith Harrison at regional path meetings $I$ think were the ones afterwards --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Mm.
MR. HARTY: In the statement delivered first by Chief Superintendent McGinn to the Tribunal no mention is made of this and it was only during the course of the evidence of chief Superintendent McGinn that this came to light, by which stage Assistant Commissioner Kenny was out of the country, if I recall, on an extended vacation.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON He might have been, but your
point is?
MR. HARTY: My point is that it wasn't revealed in the statement. That was a matter which, if we are to look at every single bit of evidence and say: You are entitled to costs or you are not entitled to your costs, then we need to look at why those -- I picked the first statement against my client contained in the booklet and went through that one. I'm sure if I'd gone through all this I would have found other matters that weren't supported by the evidence called before the Tribunal.

MR JUSTICE CHARLETON What? How do you mean?
MR. HARTY: what I'm saying is that the Tribunal has picked out four isolated bits of evidence as a manner in which to say that my client is not entitled to his costs.

MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON Well, I mean you -- it says "in the light of the above" and I think it also refers to the entire of the report. Well, the letter does. MR. HARTY: Yes, it does. Well, in light of the above my client is entitled to his costs in their entirety. The Tribunal is not entitled to select him as a person not to get his costs in circumstances where the Tribunal has not assessed the evidence of other witnesses, and assessed whether or not they should have a reduction in their costs.
MR JUSTICE CHARLETON: well, I actually have.
MR HARTY: In respect of this module.
MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON well, I actually have in
relation to, I think there was maybe eight different individuals and there was eight different individual assessments.

MR. HARTY: I know for a fact that chief superintendent

MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON It's the same tribunal.
MR. HARTY: I know for a fact that in relation to this module, this evidence of chief Superintendent Terry McGinn was certainly not assessed to see whether or not she should suffer a reduction in her costs.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Right. You didn't look for costs against her in any event.
MR. HARTY: I didn't look for costs against her and I didn't believe that my client had not cooperated with the Tribunal; nor do I find that if my client had -- if there is non-cooperation on the part of my client there is therefore non-cooperation on the part of chief Superintendent Terry McGinn.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Al1 right.
MR. HARTY: And a number of other witnesses who gave evidence which evidence was not accepted by the Tribuna1. My client did cooperate fully. He is entitled to his costs in its entirety.

There is -- the question of mercy, or otherwise, is I would submit not a relevant test.

MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON Mm.
MR. HARTY: The question is justice. Sorry, as set out in the section, perhaps if I could take it. Equity,
not mercy, is the test. It is equitable to do so. And only equity is the test.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Do you disagree with Mr. Hartnett's submission in that regard?
MR. HARTY: I do.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON We11, where do you say he got it from?

MR. HARTY: We11, I'd say very simply that the section says "equity", therefore that the test is equity, not mercy. I'm careful in my words. I think they're different things.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Right.
MR. HARTY: And in terms of equity, the Tribunal will have to look at all of the evidence that was put before it; all of the evidence which was accepted or not accepted, and then engage in the equitable exercises if that is the what the Tribunal says is the test by way of non-cooperation evidence which is not accepted.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON So what do you think I ought to do?

MR. HARTY: Well, everybody is entitled -MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON No, just -- so I should produce another tribunal report?
MR. HARTY: We11, in fact I would go with my first proposition which is that it's only if the evidence in and of itself was noncooperative to the point that it impeded the work of the Tribunal.

MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON Mm.
MR. HARTY: And it is only if it impeded the work of
the tribunal that you then engage in this exercise. MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETOK so let me give you a proposition then. Let's suppose somebody goes on the television tonight and says that three TDs have been accepting bribes and obviously that's -- maybe you want to talk to your solicitor, I don't know?
MR HARTY: No.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON All right. well let me give a proposition then. I'11 start again. Let's suppose a person goes on the television tonight and says that three TDs are accepting bribes to, let's say, vote in relation to legislation in a particular way.
MR. HARTY: Mm.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON And let's suppose, as would be the case, it's covered by Prime Time, or whatever. And let's suppose that there's public disquiet, editorials in various newspapers and a tribunal of inquiry is established and the terms of reference, et cetera, as to whether this is true or not. The Tribunal is there and the witness comes up, who is making the allegations, and the witness is asked: well, on what basis do you make these allegations? And you say: None whatsoever, I was just going to make -- I wanted to make a fuss. In other words I was suffering from the her Herostratus syndrome - to use a term from Amion psychology. In those circumstances, according to Ms. Justice Denham, that witness - even though they've made serious allegations - would be entitled to their costs because they have fully cooperated in the sense
that they had said: There's no need to go any further, you don't have to be here for the next two years, you don't have to gather vast amounts of materials and distribute them to everybody electronically or otherwise; instead this whole thing is at an end and I was in the wrong.

MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON And that would be cooperation, wouldn't it?

MR. HARTY: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON But on the other hand, if the person persisted in the allegation, and claimed there was evidence here, there, and everywhere, the Tribunal looked at it and had to hear all the evidence and in the event that, for instance, the TDs - two of whom were women, let us say - were deeply upset and the one who was a man was in tears listening to this and their political careers were ruined; would you say that was cooperation even though the Tribunal, at the end of the day, found that none of this happened, that they had not accepted bribes? would you say that was cooperation by the person making the allegation? MR. HARTY: It depends on whether or not the person gave their truthful evidence. And whether or not people are crying, anywhere, is irrelevant to the assessment of the equity of a person's entitlement to their costs. The situation is absolutely -- it is no role for the Chairman of the Tribunal to decide to punish people for giving a version of events which is
not accepted. No role. And it is certainly not the role for the Chairman of the Tribunal to decide to punish people for giving the version of events which hurts other people. It is absolutely outside the role. MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: No, you're absolutely right about that. It can't anything to do with the court case, the fact that evidence hurts other people. It's everything to do with whether or not something is truly. But lies do hurt other people.
MR. HARTY: It's not a court case, firstly, it is a tribunal of inquiry. It is a unique creature, entirely of statute.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON No, look, Mr. Harty, I know al1 about tribunals of inquiry, you don't need to tell me about that.
MR. HARTY: we11, we appear --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON It's not a court case, but it has every single indicia of a court case and it has every single right attached to a murder trial. In fact it has even more rights than are attached to a murder trial.

MR HARTY: with a couple of differences in terms of a civil court case.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON All right. Fine. Okay. Well, there's an article in the Dublin Uni versity Law Journal by me and --
MR. HARTY: I've read it.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON -- Paul Carey and Ciara Herlihy.

MR. HARTY: I've read it.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON We11, it's surprising that you have since it's not out.

MR. HARTY: I listened to the paper --
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON Yes, it's coming out. It's different. Anyway, look, let's go on. It's not out yet, Mr. Harty.

MR. HARTY: We11, I 1istened to the paper certainly. MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You may well have a version of it.

MR. HARTY: We11, I understood that that was the same paper.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Well, it's nice to know --
MR. HARTY: It was the one --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON It's nice to know you're
following my academic pursuits. But in any event --
MR. HARTY: And in relation to that, sir, what 1 will
say --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON what I'm saying to you, Mr. Harty, is this, it's very simple: Evidence may be hurtful. That's tough.

MR. HARTY: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON As my mother used to say: The truth hurts. Of course it's something that many mothers in this country used to say to many children and I'm sure it helped me along the way. On the other hand, if evidence is untrue and it's hurtful, it's the untruth that matters.
MR. HARTY: And that is not one which is empowered --
the Tribunal is empowered to award costs in relation to.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON No, I agree. I'm not entitled to award costs simply because evidence is hurtful. But I think I am in relation to evidence which is untrue. MR. HARTY: well, it is untrue and hurtful to somebody

MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON Do you accept that?
MR. HARTY: But --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON But do you accept that?
MR. HARTY: No.
MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON As a legal proposition?
MR. HARTY: No.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON so people can come in to a tribunal of inquiry and tell the most egregious lies in the instance given in relation to the three TDs and they should be awarded their costs?
MR. HARTY: You --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: It doesn't matter that it's hurtful, it doesn't matter that it's untrue, it doesn't matter that it causes public chaos, it doesn't matter that it causes a diminution in respect for democracy in our country, they should be awarded their costs? But why? First tell me why?
MR. HARTY: Firstly, sir, you've actually put two entirely different questions to me. The first question is whether or not simply because evidence is untrue are you entitled to award costs against someone? The answer to that is, no. It is a different thing --

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON In the ordinary way, the cases that have been heard in this order 99 Rule 1, if people come in and make untrue allegations and lose their case, costs follow the event. Now, why is a tribunal of inquiry different?
MR. HARTY: Because it is a tribunal of inquiry and not a court of law.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Al1 right.
MR. HARTY: Because they are established --
MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON Just --
MR. HARTY: No, sorry, I'd be grateful, sir, if you'd let me answer each question that you pose to me.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I'm just trying to get to the heart of it, Mr. Harty, and the heart of it seems to be: why should a person who tells nothing but lie and I'm taking the case up of three TDs, why should they be awarded costs? Just please tell me why that should be the case?
MR. HARTY: The hypothetical question that you are asking now I don't propose to answer because it is entirely a hypothetical. You did ask me an actual question which is: whether or not simply because somebody tells an untruth --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You don't feel hypotheses are useful in discussing legal matters?
MR. HARTY: I'm answering the questions in the order in which I was asked them.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON All right. You carry on.
MR. HARTY: The first question you said: where a
person gives untrue evidence they should be disentitled to their costs. The answer to that is absolutely not. That is an absolutely incorrect proposition.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON We11, a party I meant.
MR. HARTY: A party. well, firstly, there are no parties, there are only witnesses before a tribunal.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: Mm.
MR. HARTY: There are no parties. There are witnesses, and where a witness gives untrue evidence, or argues a case which is found to be untrue, that does not disentitle that witness to their costs. That was the first proposition that was put to me and the answer to that is, absolutely there is no law to say that that is the case.

The second proposition was where a person has told egregious lies and has persisted with egregious lies, giving rise to the entire tribunal having to take place, then the Tribunal has to look at those lies. were they knowingly untrue? It has to find that the person knew that they were egregious lies. The Tribunal has to find that they were done for the purpose, I'm told for the purpose of undermining the work of the Tribunal.
MR J USTI CE CHARLETON Mm-hmm.
MR. HARTY: And in those circumstances the Court then should look at the questions of costs. But they have to be knowing non-cooperation, or increasing the workload of the Tribunal knowingly. And that involves
findings made on, substantive findings of knowing non-cooperation. In those circumstances, yes.

In relation to the hypothetical situation of the three people who tell the -- lies told by the three people, that is the test which has to take place. They have know whether they are lies. They have to assess the truth or accuracy of those lies. They do have to be central lies to the questions that are being asked, and then the Tribunal should look at the equity. And in doing that they need to look at the lies told by other witnesses and how those lies impacted on the work of the Tribunal because equity involves between the witnesses, not just between the Tribunal and the individual witness. And the equitable assessment must take place at that stage.

There was no finding of non-cooperation on the part of my client. There was no suggestion, in the second report, that my client had told lies. No finding to that effect. And in the absence of those findings my client is entitled to his costs.

The one other matter which I should raise, and my solicitor does remind me, that these matters all arose as a result of a protected disclosure. Protected disclosure which was made to members of the Oireachtas who, as a result, included my client in the terms of reference. And this Court should be mindful of the
basic principles in respect of protected disclosure which is that the person who makes a protected disclosure ought not to be penalised as a result of making that protected disclosure. And in assessing whether or not my client is entitled to his costs, this tribunal needs to be aware and alert to the purpose of the Tribunal and the overall public good that arises from people being, firstly, able to make protected disclosures and, secondly, giving evidence such as their recollection or their views before a tribunal of inquiry, without fear of being penalised, save in exceptional circumstances.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: what would you say the exceptional circumstances are?
MR. HARTY: Your egregious lies, where they knew they were telling lies from the start; where they made it a11 up; where they continued to add it altogether; where such findings have been made.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON And you would say in those circumstances I would be entitled to award no costs? MR. HARTY: You would be entitled to award no costs in those circumstances.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON A11 right.
MR. HARTY: But you would need to have made those findings in your report.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Mr. Harty, can I ask you the same four questions that -- in fact there's five, that other people have been asked?

MR. HARTY: Yes.

MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON Okay. You differ on the law in relation to cooperation and truth from Ms. Leader's outline?
MR. HARTY: I say that -- I don't think we differ because I think we're both saying the same thing; the one difference is that I'm saying that simply an untruth isn't what the law says.
MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON okay. Untruth is not enough.
MR. HARTY: Yes.
MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON And it has to be egregious non-cooperation.

MR HARTY: No.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON Maybe you'd just help me. Just say it again, if you wouldn't mind.
MR. HARTY: Non-cooperation, deliberately misleading the Tribunal in its function is probably the primary purpose of non-cooperation. So, for example, shredding documents. For example, failing to reveal meetings which took place at a senior level at an appropriate time.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETOK we11, your client wasn't at a senior --

MR HARTY: Well, I'm giving examples.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON okay.
MR. HARTY: My client didn't destroy any documents.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Sorry, shredding documents, yes, okay. Concealing meetings.
MR HARTY: Concealing meetings.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Yeah.

MR. HARTY: That would be serious non-cooperation -MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Yeah.
MR. HARTY: -- which would have impeded the work of the Tribunal.
MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON Okay.
MR. HARTY: So giving evidence which is not accepted is not sufficient.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Okay. A11 right. So have you any issues with the fair procedures, the submissions sought, et cetera, et cetera initially, the submissions made, the letter of 22nd October; have you any issue with the fact that we're attempting to follow fair procedures but do you think we have fallen at any of the hurdles?
MR. HARTY: what I would say is that there is one matter which you haven't done, which is to indicate a basis for a calculation of a proposal, but that is not necessarily breaching fair procedures now.
MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON okay.
MR. HARTY: But if there is a proposal to reduce, a mechanism by which that proposal is breached is a matter which should be revealed and which I would be entitled to argue on.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You better tell me now. Here's your chance.
MR. HARTY: We11, I don't know what mechanism you propose to use to I can't argue on it.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON We11, what about Veolia Whter? You've read that case.

MR. HARTY: Not for a very long time. what are you suggesting you're going to do?
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Mr. Harty, it's not for you to interrogate me. We're here in order to --
MR. HARTY: well, what I'm saying is -MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Sorry, Mr. Harty, just hang on a wee moment now please. You're saying if a court, for instance, says that witnesses -- if a court says a party is entitled, because of various factors, to no costs --
MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR JUSTI CE CHARLETOR -- is entitled $30 \%$ of their costs.
MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Is it entitled to $50 \%$ of their costs.

MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON That there's some logarithm out there, of which I'm unaware, that ought to be deployed and you ought to have a chance to make submissions on it. The letter actually says:
> "The Tribunal in the circumstances is considering whether to award your client's costs or whether in the circunstances it is going to award your client's reduced costs and asks for submissions on that."

> Now, what more than that am I supposed to do?
> MR. HARTY: What you're supposed to do, if you propose
to use a mechanism for calculating how my client's costs should be reduced, I should be told that.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON what are you talking about?
MR. HARTY: I'm not the one making the decision. It
would never have occurred to me --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON But you say --
MR. HARTY: -- that my client should suffer a reduction in his costs.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON It never would have occurred to you, no?
MR. HARTY: No. Not at all.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You're saying, therefore, if there is to be a reduction there has to be what?

MR HARTY: A mechanism.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON what is the mechanism?
MR HARTY: well, I don't know. I don't propose to do
it. Perhaps if the Tribunal were to tell me what it proposes to do. It put four items out there, is it operating on the basis of $25 \%$ per item?
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON These are the kind of decisions that are made every day by courts.

MR. HARTY: It's not a court.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You know you snapped at me
"this is not a court", and frankly you've done it several times during the course of the Tribunal.
MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm. I'd ask --
MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON Just hang on a minute, Mr. Harty. Just please hang on a minute.
MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You're saying that for some reason that I unfortunately can't understand but I'm trying to get to the bottom of, that this Tribunal is in breach of fair procedures.
MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Now, you'11 be aware that the original Act says that the Tribunal has the powers of the High Court. It exercises the same jurisdiction in relation to the matter over it. You're aware there's further jurisdiction given. So what I'm saying to you is, of course it's not a court, but I am a judge and the reason I'm the Chairman of the Tribunal is because I'm a judge.
MR. HARTY: Mm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON And judges, every day, and the Supreme Court indeed not every day but certainly every week, has to make decisions as to whether an award of costs ought to be reduced.
MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON So what --
MR. HARTY: In the case of Lowry --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Sorry, I'm a bit lost for words. What exactly are you saying about -- what exactly are you saying that -- what? That you're not getting fair procedures because you don't know of some logarithm of some kind? I don't understand. MR. HARTY: Firstly, I didn't mention the word "I ogarithm".
MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON No, I --

MR. HARTY: We --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON No, no, you're absolutely right. I mentioned "I ogarithm" but if you're saying is there a mechanism?

MR. HARTY: In fact a better word; methodology. I'11 quote directly from Lowry -v- Mbriarty:
"Nei ther was he gi ven an indi cation of the methodol ogy of cal cul ation of reduction or matters to which the Tribunal would have regard set out in the General Ruling so that he could address these in response with a vi ew to averting that outcome. "

The methodology, not just the matters that you intend to avert to, but also the methodology. There is no mention in your letter of a methodology.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON We11, now, you have a chance to make submissions. What --

MR. HARTY: No, I don't --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Just hang on --
MR. HARTY: -- propose to make submissions --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON -- a minute, Mr. Harty --
MR. HARTY: I intend to rely on Lowry - v- Mbriarty.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Mr. Harty, what methodology do
you suggest I apply?
MR. HARTY: We11, I think you need --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON One you've suggested is that there are four issues in the Tribunal and if I find against your client on all four it would be a complete
reduction of $100 \%$; if $I$ find in relation to three it would be $75 \%$; two $50 \%$; one $25 \%$. Is that your submission?

MR. HARTY: I didn't make any such suggestion and you're fully alert to the fact that what I said is I have no idea what methodology you propose to use, whether it is simply --

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON No, but you said --
MR. HARTY: No, sir, for the transcript and so there's no confusion, I never suggested --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You see the transcript is going to be a wee bit confused if you don't let me speak. You've said there are four issues there. Is it to be the case that if you find in relation to one you'11 reduce by $25 \%$ ?

MR. HARTY: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: Yes.
MR. HARTY: That wasn't me suggesting that as a methodology. That was me asking was that the methodology.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Oh, I see. what do you suggest now? Because this is --

MR. HARTY: I don't suggest a methodology.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON This is a question of fair procedures. You're saying you're entitled to $100 \%$ of your costs.
MR. HARTY: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON You're saying there should be no reduction.

MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON So if you're saying that, for instance, I find that your client was, as you say, deliberately misleading, was impeding the work of the Tribunal --

MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON -- that I can award 100\% reduction of costs?

MR. HARTY: No, I don't say that. I don't say that. I never said that.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: We11 --
MR. HARTY: I never said that.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I'm inviting a submission.
MR. HARTY: No, I don't propose to make a submission.
I've already said plenty in relation to that.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Let's suppose a judge is
sitting here, Mr. Harty, and he says, he or she says to
a party: So if I'm to reduce costs, what do you
suggest I ought to do?
MR. HARTY: I suggest you shouldn't and, if you intend to reduce costs you first have to tell me the methodology you intend to use.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON A11 right. We11, I'm asking you what methodology do you suggest?
MR. HARTY: I don't know what methodology to use.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON This is fair procedures. I'm hearing you, Mr. Harty, you see.

MR. HARTY: No.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON So maybe you would te11 me what
methodologies I ought to apply.
MR. HARTY: Perhaps if the Tribunal were 1istening to me, the Tribunal would be aware of the fact that what I am saying is that I don't know the methodology and I cannot comment on it.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON what do you suggest should be the methodology?

MR. HARTY: We11, I have suggested that I am entitled to $100 \%$. I'm not obliged to move off that position. But if the Tribunal is moving off that position, it must set out its methodology and its reasoning in relation to it.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Have you read any of the determinations which the Tribunal made in relation to the witnesses in the Maurice McCabe matter?
MR. HARTY: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON And is there anything wrong with the methodology there?
MR. HARTY: There is no methodology set out there.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON You're saying that all of those are wrong?
MR. HARTY: Yes.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: And you're saying they're wrong because?
MR. HARTY: Because they don't actually set out a methodology for the reduction.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON We11, what do you suggest as a methodology?
MR. HARTY: We11, there must be an assessment of how
the costs must be referred to in the -- how the costs order relates to the evidence given and whether or not that evidence impeded the work of the Tribunal.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON: So to the extent to which it impeded the work of the Tribunal, there should be a percentage reduction?

MR. HARTY: In the instant case, where four items have been --

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON No, it refers to the entire of the Tribunal Report.
MR. HARTY: Yeah.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON And it instances four matters which we would specifically like you to address.

MR. HARTY: Yes.
MR. J USTI CE CHARLETON Now --
MR. HARTY: well, if the situation --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON what is wrong with the methodology used, for instance, in relation to the other persons?
MR. HARTY: If anything other than a complete refusal of costs is contemplated, the Tribunal must set out its methodology as to why, how that calculation was arrived at.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON A11 right. And if it's 100\% I don't.

MR. HARTY: If it's 100\% you don't.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Thank you. Right, the next question --

MR. HARTY: Sorry.

MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON what percentage below which the Tribunal would fall so that the Tribunal would fall into acting unreasonably in the sense of flying in the face of fundamental reasoning and common sense?
MR. HARTY: In circumstances where the Tribunal hasn't assessed the evidence given by each and every witness who has applied to it and, rather, has selected a number of witnesses for this issue, I suggest that there is no reasonable position in which the Tribunal can make a reduction.
MR. JUSTICE CHARLETON Okay. You've addressed me on the issue of compassion or mercy. You say it's a matter of equity.
MR. HARTY: Mm-hmm.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Then the next matter and the last matter I want to ask you about and this is a new question, I asked Mr. Hartnett this this morning: Is there any shaft of light in terms of your client's evidence that I can actually identify whereby I can say that evidence was helpful to the Tribunal, that evidence was true, that evidence was accepted, that evidence assisted in resolving a matter of public disquiet? I mentioned a couple of things to Mr. Hartnett, he mentioned a couple of things to me; is there anything you would like to mention to me?
MR. HARTY: I'm saying my client assisted greatly to the Tribunal at all times.

MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Do you want to address that issue?

MR. HARTY: That is the issue: My client assisted greatly at all times. There is -- the suggestion that somehow my client acted entirely as a force of penumbration during the course of the Tribunal is entirely unfair. My client --
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I was asking you is there any -- is there any bright spot you can refer me to? MR. HARTY: well, what I'm saying is that the suggestion that there is no -- the suggesting that I'm to identify bright spots, I say my client examined every, dealt with every piece of evidence.
MR JUSTI CE CHARLETON You know what I went through with Mr. Hartnett. I mean, you know what I went through with Mr. Hartnett. I mean I asked him about the encounter in the kitchen between you and Marisa simms. I asked him about what was said by the social workers as opposed to what was in the statement. I asked him about the Leaving Certificate papers. I mean, these things -- he mentioned the first matter. Is there anything you can mention is what I'm asking you?
MR. HARTY: My client gave evidence in relation to how he was treated when he arrived first. How he was moved because of who his girlfriend was related to. That was a matter which was of some importance to the State to know that this does happen or can happen, or be an issue that needs to be determined. Whether he was right to be aggrieved about it or not is an entirely different matter. My client then gave evidence about
what occurred in relation to his difficulties with his wife, with his partner, the rows he had with her, and he dealt with those. He gave evidence which was not found to be untruthful. It was found to be wrong, but not untruthful. My client gave his evidence, I say, in a truthful manner, albeit that it wasn't accepted as being the correct version of events. And to quote the third report: "It happens". They were the precise words that the Tribunal used to sum up the case made by my client in the third report. I can read the exact phrase:
"The allegations were untrue. That happens."

It happens. It doesn't give rise to an order for costs. It just happens. Evidence is accepted or not accepted.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON Thank you kindly for your submissions, Mr. Harty.
MR. HARTNETT: One point of clarification. Mr. Barnes, ever astute, feels that I may have suggested, when the figure of $25 \%$ was mentioned, that I was suggesting that was the figure to be awarded when in fact I was referring to it as a potential deduction.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON That's exactly what you said. MR. HARTNETT: I'm very glad to hear that. Mr. Barnes was concerned.
MR. JUSTI CE CHARLETON I'm sure I have taken many things up wrong and will require many clarifications
over the course of the last hour-and-a-half. But there you are. Thank you for your help. Just in case there's any misunderstanding, my side of the Tribunal, in other words I'm inviting them to a cup of Japanese tea, nobody else.
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|  | 58:8 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 3,35: 20 \\ & 50: 21,50: 22 \end{aligned}$ | applies [1] | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} -25: 29 \\ \text { astute }[1] ~-~ \end{array}$ |
| 2 |  | action [1]-33:1 <br> activities [1] - |  |  |  |
|  | 57:21 absolute [1] - | 6:1 | 50:28, 55:3, <br> 71:13 | 12:1 | 71:21 |
| $20[1]-3: 6$ |  | Acts [1] - 23:16 |  | apply [4] | Athlone [1] - |
| 2010 [1]-5:14 | 42:10 <br> absolutely [9] - | actual [5] - 13:2, | alleged [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:29, 16:11 } \\ & \text { 64:25, } 67: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 28: 13 \\ \text { atmosphere }{ }^{[1]} \end{array}$ |
| 2014 [2]-42:23, | $21: 3,23: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 14,20: 22, \\ & 26: 18,55: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 32:11, 32:29 ${ }^{\text {allow [1]-21:11 }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:25, 67:1 } \\ & \text { appreciate }[3]- \end{aligned}$ | $-11: 25$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 43: 16 \\ & 2017[1]-11: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 27,52: 4,52: 5, \\ & 56: 2,56: 3,56: 13 \end{aligned}$ | add [1] - 58:17 | alone [1] - 45:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { appreciate [3] - } \\ & \text { 18:26, 18:27, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | added [1] - | altogether [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:2 } \\ & \text { approach [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 52: 19,52: 20 \\ \text { attack [2] - } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2019[4]-4:2, | $64: 2$ | 29:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 58:17 } \\ & \text { amended [2] - } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 8:13, 9:9, 31:8 | academic [1] - | adding [1] - 23:9 |  | 39:9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 24:22, 25:5 } \\ \text { attempt [2] - } \end{gathered}$ |
| 22nd [6] - 8:12, | 53:1 | address [7] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4:16, 13:5 } \\ & \text { Amendment [2] } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 9:6, 9:21, 10:4, |  | 7:19, 8:20, 9:27, |  | appropriate [4] - | $5: 29,38: 17$ |
| 31:8, 60:11 | 30:11, 37:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:3, 64:11, } \\ & \text { 68:13, 69:28 } \\ & \text { addressed }[5] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | - 4:12, 4:16 <br> Amion [1] 50:25 | $59$ |  |
| 25\% [5] - 18:19, |  |  |  | argue [2] - | $42: 5,60: 12$ |
| 62:19, 65:2, |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65:15, 71:22 | 40:12, 40:14, | 7:27, 7:29, 8:15, | amounted [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60:23, 60:27 } \\ & \text { argues [1] - } 56: 9 \end{aligned}$ | attend [1] - 14:5 attended [1] - |
|  | 41:4, 42:9, 54:8, | 8:16, 69:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:5 } \\ & \text { amounts [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { argument [2] - } \\ & \text { 18:15, 19:25 } \end{aligned}$ | $12: 4$ <br> August [1] - |
| 3 | 54:10 | adducing [1] |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 3[5]-4: 11, \\ 12: 29.13: 4.13: 5 . \end{gathered}$ | acceptable [1] -22:11 | $6: 16$ | 23:7, 51:3 | argumentive [1] | $11: 11$ <br> authority [1] - |
|  |  | adjourn [1] - | analogy [3] | - 24:28 |  |
|  |  | 25:1 | 12:8, 12:11 | arguments [1] - | 5:25 |
| 31:13 | 14:25 | admire [1] | 13:29 |  | available [2] - |
| 30\% [1] - 61:12 | accepted [15] | 38:14 | analysis [5] | arise [1] - 6:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:20, 17:27 } \\ & \text { avert [1] - } 64: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| $37 \text { [1] - 5:23 }$ | 23:3, 23:5, 23:7, | admit [1] - 16:21 | 30:16, 30:21 |  |  |
| 3IR [1] - 5:14 | 23:24, 48:21, | advice [1] | another's [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:22, 23:11, } \\ & 58: 7 \end{aligned}$ | averting [1] - |
|  | 49:18, 51:21, <br> 52:1, 60:6, 69:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:15 } \\ & \text { affect [2]-22:7, } \\ & 33: 23 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $64: 12$award [15] - |
| 4 |  |  | $22: 24$ <br> answer [6] - | arose [3] - |  |
|  |  |  | 14:6, 54:29, | 11:23, 30:19, | 6:13, 7:3, 7:12, |
| 4[1] - $3: 4$ | ```71:6, 71:16, 71:17 accepting [2] -``` | affected [1] - 7:4 |  | $57: 25$ | 8:23, 39:10, 54:1, |
|  |  | affecting [1] - | 55:12, 55:20 | arrived [2] | $54: 4,54: 28$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:14 } \\ & \text { afforded [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | answering [2] - | 68:22, $70: 23$article [1] - | $58: 20,58: 21,$ |
| 5 | 50:5, 50:11 |  |  |  | 61:24, 61:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 50\% [3] - 22:25, } \\ & 61: 15,65: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 12:11, 42:14 | afraid [1] - 16:21 | 18:29, 55:26 answers [1] - | $52: 25$AS [1] - 4: | 63:17, 66:7 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:11, 42:14 } \\ & \text { accordance [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | awarded [5] - |
|  |  | aftermath [1] - | 36:9 | aspect [2] | 43:29, 54:17, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 36:16 } \\ & \text { according }{ }_{[1]}- \end{aligned}$ | 32:13 <br> afterwards [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { anyway [2] } \\ & \text { 26:6, 53:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $10: 22,16: 12$ | 54:23, 55:17, |
| 6 |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { assess }[2]- \\ 41: 28,57: 7 \end{gathered}$ | aware [9] - 4:10, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 50:26 } \\ & \text { accordingly }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:20 } \\ & \text { aggrieved }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { apologise [2] - } \\ & \text { 29:20 } \end{aligned}$ | assessed | 20:6, 25:7, 29:5, |
| 6 [2] - 4:15, 13:4 | $11: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 70:28 } \\ & \text { agree [2] - 23:1, } \end{aligned}$ | apologised [2] - | 42:20, 45:11, | 41:7, 58:6, 63:6, |
| 61km [2] - 44:29, |  |  | 32:12, 32:14 | 47:24, 47:25, | 63:9, 67:3 |


| B | bolstered [1] - | case [25]-5:1, | chance [3] - | 38:1, 38:10, | 65:17, 65:21, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:25 } \\ & \text { bookl } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 3,17: 26,19: 21, \\ & 19: 22,19: 27, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60: 25,61: 20, \\ & 64: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 13,38: 20, \\ & 38: 24,39: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:24, 65:28, } \\ & \text { 66:2, 66:7, 66:11 } \end{aligned}$ |
| bag [1] - 16:10 | 47:8 | 20:19, 22:29 | chaos [1] - | 39:13, 39:18, | 66:13, 66:16, |
| Baker [1] - 19:26 | books [1] - | 50:15, 52:7, | 54:21 | 39:22, 39:25, | 66:23, 66:26, |
| balance [1] - | 14:13 | 52:10, 52:17, | character [1] - | 39:28, 40:1, 40:5, | 66:29, 67:6, |
| 36:24 | bottom [1]-63:3 | 52:18, 52:23, | 25:6 | 40:9, 40:12, | 67:13, 67:17, |
| bank [1] - 14:21 | bound [1] - | 55:4, 55:16, | characterisatio | 40:15, 40:22, | 67:20, 67:23, |
| Barnes [2] - | 24:29 | 55:18, 56:10, | n [1] - 33:5 | $40: 26,41: 10$ | 67:27, 68:4, 68:9, |
| 71:20, 71:26 | breach [1] - 63:4 | 56:14, 60:29, | charity [1] - | 41:12, 41:14, | 68:12, 68:15, |
| based [2] - | breached [2] - | 63:21, 65:14, | 13:26 | 41:18, 41:21, | 68:17, 68:24, |
| $12: 17,16: 5$ basic [1]-5 | $24: 13,60: 21$ | 68:7, 71:9, 72:2 cases [3] - | CHARLETON | $42: 26,43: 4,43: 6$, $43: 9,43: 19$, | $\begin{aligned} & 68: 27,69: 1 \\ & \text { 69:11, 69:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| basic [1]-58:1 <br> basis [11]-29:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { breaching [1] - } \\ & \text { 60:18 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { cases }[3]- \\ 16: 26,36: 16, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[280]-4: 4,9: 7,} \\ & 9: 10,9: 15,9: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:9, 43:19, } \\ & 43: 23,43: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:11, 69:15, } \\ & \text { 69:28, 70:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 37:7, 39:3, 39:10, | bribes [3] - 50:5, | 55:1 | 9:25, 10:6, 10:13, | 44:3, 44:6, 44:18, | 70:12, 71:18, |
| 42:15, 42:17, | 50:11, 51:21 | categories [2] - | 10:16, 10:19, | 44:21, 44:25, | 71:25, 71:28 |
| 42:19, 50:22, | bright [2] - 70:7, | 38:17, 39:1 | 10:26, 11:1, 11:4, | 45:1, 45:3, 45:6, | chat [1]-15:23 |
| $60: 17,62: 19$ | $70: 10$ | category [1] - | 12:26, 12:29, | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 21,45: 28 \\ & 46: 3,46: 6,46: 9 \end{aligned}$ | Chawke [1] - $19 \cdot 26$ |
| bear [1]-21:13 become [2] - | bring [1] - 11:10 broke [2] - | 41:1 caused [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 6,13: 17,15: 5, \\ & 15: 8,15: 20, \end{aligned}$ | 46:14, 46:17, | 19:26 <br> checking [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:13, 30:2 } \\ & \text { becoming [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 16,45: 15 \\ & \text { brunt }[1]-21: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 39:20 } \\ & \text { causes [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:23, 15:28, } \\ & \text { 16:9, 16:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:21, 46:29, } \\ & 47: 12,47: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 29: 28,40: 17 \\ \text { checks }[2]- \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 29:29 } \\ \text { beg }_{[1]}-9: 9 \\ \text { beginning }[1]- \end{array}$ | bullying [3] - | 54:21, $54: 22$ causing [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:16, 16:19, } \\ & \text { 16:22, 16:26, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 47:27, 47:29, } \\ & \text { 48:6, 48:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 27: 11,28: 19 \\ \text { cheque }[1]- \end{array}$ |
|  | 35:21 | 39:15 | 17:1, 17:4, 17:7, | 48:19, 48:27, | 14:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:28 } \\ & \text { behalf }[3]-7: 2, \\ & 15: 4,25: 21 \end{aligned}$ | Buncrana [4] - | central [8] - | 17:10, 17:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:3, 49:6, 49:12, } \\ & \text { 49:19, 49:22, } \end{aligned}$ | Chief [13] - |
|  | 44:13, 44:19, | 26:22, 26:28, | 17:15, 17:19, | $49: 28,50: 2,50: 8$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:4, } 25: 21 \\ & \text { behest }[1]-22: 5 \\ & \text { below }[5]-8: 21 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $44: 22,44: 29$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40:27, 41:19, } \\ & 41: 24,42: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:21, 17:25, } \\ & \text { 17:29, 18:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $50: 14,51: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 16,44: 17, \\ & 45: 23,45: 26, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $3: 6,4: 6,11: 7,$ | 43:15, 57:9 | 18:17, 18:21, | 51:11, 52:5, | 46:11, 46:13, |
| $8: 25,9: 23,18: 11,$ |  | centrality [1] - | 18:23, 18:26, | $\begin{aligned} & 52: 13,52: 17, \\ & 52: 24,52: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $46: 22,46: 25$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:1 } \\ & \text { best [2] - 41:27, } \end{aligned}$ | C | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30:17 } \\ & \text { certain }[3] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:2, 19:5, 19:7, } \\ & \text { 19:10, 19:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $53: 2,53: 5,53: 9,$ | $\begin{array}{r} 48: 4,48: 8,48: 17 \\ \text { child }[1]-42: 28 \end{array}$ |
| 42:3 |  | 25:14, 39:7, | 19:23, 19:28, | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 13,53: 15, \\ & 53 \cdot 1953 \cdot 23 \end{aligned}$ | children [2] - |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { better [5] - } \\ \text { 16:27, 38:7, } \end{array}$ | calculating [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:25 } \\ & \text { certainly }[9]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 9,20: 16, \\ & 20: 18,20: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $54: 3,54: 8,54: 10$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15: 23,53: 25 \\ \text { choice }[1] \text { - } \end{array}$ |
| $43: 10,60: 24$ | $62: 1$ <br> calculation [3] - | 12:9, 13:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:2, 21:27, 22:2, } \\ & 23: 12.23: 15 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 12,54: 14 \\ & 54: 19,55: 1,55: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 32:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:5 } \\ & \text { between [15] - } \end{aligned}$ | 60:17, 64:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:11, 34:6, } \\ & \text { 40:24, 48:9, 52:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:12, 23:15, } \\ & \text { 23:26, 24:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $55: 10,55: 13$ | $44: 28,44: 29$ |
| 14:25, 15:17, | 68:22 | $53: 8,63: 16$ | $24: 27,25: 2,$ | 55:24, 55:28, <br> $56 \cdot 4$ 56.7, 56.25 | Ciara [1] - 52:28 |
| 17:23, 22:7, | $\begin{gathered} \text { camera [2] - } \\ 41: 26, ~ 41: 29 \end{gathered}$ | Certificate [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:18, 25:23, } \\ & 25: 28,26: 5,27: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 56:4, 56:7, 56:25, 58:13, 58:19, | circumstances |
| $27: 15,33: 26$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 41:26, 41:29 } \\ \text { cannot [6] - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:10, 16:14, } \\ & 70: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 28,26: 5,27: 6, \\ & 27: 19,27: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 13,58: 19, \\ & 58: 23,58: 26, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[18]-15: 3,18: 22} \\ & 23: 21,25: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| 43:13, 45:18, | 22:7, 26:29, | cetera [10] - | 28:3, 28:7, 28:12, | $59: 1,59: 8,59: 10$ | $28: 23,30: 3,$ |
| 45:23, 57:13, | $42: 15,42: 17$ | $8: 11,11: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 19,28: 22, \\ & 29: 15.29: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 59:13, 59:21, } \\ & 59: 24,59: 26, \end{aligned}$ | $36: 20,47: 23$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 57:14, 70:15 } \\ \text { big }_{[2]}-19: 17, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:18, 67:5 } \\ & \text { canvassing }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:12, 14:13, } \\ & \text { 14:14, 15:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 15,29: 23 \\ & 29: 25,30: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $59: 29,60: 2,60: 5,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 26,56: 26, \\ & 57: 2,58: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| 34:20 | 28:17 | $16: 1,50: 18$ | $30: 11,31: 3,31: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60: 8,60: 19 \\ & 60: 24,60: 28, \end{aligned}$ | 58:14, 58:20, |
| bind [2]-20:12, | $\begin{gathered} \text { car [5] - 23:28, } \\ 24: 6.24: 7.44: 12 \end{gathered}$ | $60: 10$ | 31:11, 31:23, 31:27, 32:2, 32:6, | 61:3, 61:6, 61:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 22,61: 23, \\ & 61: 25,69: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| bit [7]-37:23, | careers [1] - | $6: 25,7: 2,41: 5 \text {, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 9,33: 18 \\ & 33: 21,33: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:15, 61:18, } \\ & \text { 62:3, 62:6, 62:9, } \end{aligned}$ | citizens [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 37: 24,37: 25, \\ & 44: 26,47: 4, \end{aligned}$ | careful [2] | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 7,41: 26, \\ & 51: 28,52: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $34: 2,34: 6,34: 11,$ | 62:12, 62:15, | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 12 \\ & \text { civil }[1]-52: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| 63:22, 65:12 | $36: 12,49: 10$ | $63: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 16,34: 22, \\ & 35: 1,35: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 62:20, 62:23, } \\ & 62: 27,63: 1,63: 6 \end{aligned}$ | claim [1] - 29:27 |
| bits [3]-16:8, | Carey [1] - 52:28 | Chairperson [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 1,35: 10 \\ & 35: 13,35: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 63:15, 63:20, | claimed [4] - |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 26:10, } 47: 14 \\ \text { boat [2] - } 37: 25, \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { carry [6]-21:21, } \\ \text { 22:4, 22:18, 26:6, } \end{gathered}$ | $-5: 18$ <br> chairperson [3] | 35:26, 36:11, | 63:22, 63:29, | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 13,32: 17 \\ & 32: 27,51: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 37:26 | 32:8, 55:28 | -4:21, 5:1, 13:9 | $37: 6,37: 10,$ | 64:2, 64:17, $64: 20,64: 22,$ | claiming [1] - |
| body [2]-21:14, | carrying [1] - | chairperson's | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 13,37: 17, \\ & 37: 23,37: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 64:24, 64:27, | 32:14 |
| 21:20 | 14:1 | [1] - 5:2 |  | $65: 8,65: 11,$ | clarification [2] - |





| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:29, 69:5, } \\ & \text { 69:14, 69:26, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 10,34: 15, \\ & 34: 21,39: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 39:6 } \\ & \text { impacted }[1] \end{aligned}$ | $34: 23,34: 24$ | interrogate [1] - | J |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 70:1, 70:8, 70:22 | 40:26, 51:7 | 57:12 |  |  |  |
| harty [1] - 44:26 | 56:25, 61:11, | mpeded [5] - | initial [4] | 9:3 | January [3] - |
| Harty [29]-9:11, | 61:14, 61:17, | 49:27, 49:29 | 23:23, 24:2 | intervene [1] - | 42:22, 43:3, |
| 20:1, 24:21, | 62:26, 62:29, | 60:3, 68:3, 68:5 | 24:11, 24:1 | 24:1 | 43:16 |
| 24:27, 25:12, | 63:5, 63:19, 66:1, | impeding [1] - | nnocent [1] | intervened [1] - | Japanese [1] - |
| 26:6, 27:19, 28:7, | 66:6, 69:14 | 66:4 | 42:8 | 31:16 | 72:4 |
| 29:15, 33:9, | home [1] - 32:12 | perfect [3] | nquire | intervening [1] - | job [1] - 29:14 |
| 36:11, 37:17 | hostile [1] - | 42:18, 43:21 | 21:8, 28:9, 40:28 | 22:14 | Journal [1] - |
| 38:3, 38:24, 43:7, | $27: 14$ | 43:26 | inquiry [10] - | introduced [1] - | 52:25 |
| 44:6, 52:13, 53:7, | hour [2] - 44:25, | importance | $21: 6,21: 2$ | $15: 24$ | Judge [2] - |
| 53:20, 55:14, | 72:1 | 41:20, 70:25 | 22:17, 50:17 | investigate [2] - | 19:26, 20:5 |
| 58:26, 61:3, 61:6, | hour-and-a- | ant [3] - | 52:11, 52:14, | 21:14, 27:13 | judge [5] - |
| 62:28, 64:22, | half [1]-72:1 | 10:9, 15:1 | 54:15, 55:5, 55:6, | investigating [1] | 36:16, 38:4, |
| 64:24, 66:17 | house [3] - | 42:27 | 58:11 | - 43:13 | 63:11, 63:13, |
| 66:27, 71:19 | 15:21, 23:29, | inappropriate | Inquiry [5] - | investigation [1] | $66: 16$ |
| Haughey [1] - | 29:3 | [2] - 37:2, 39:26 | 4:11, 4:15, 21:23, | - 27:12 | judges [1] - |
| ```6:6 Headquarters [1]-28:28 hear [2]-51:14,``` | House [1] - 4:24 | incident [1] - | 21:29, 23:16 | investigations | 63:15 |
|  | HSE [2] - 27:16, | 24:1 | insofar [1] - | [1] - 21:11 | judgment [8] - |
|  | 27:18 | inclu | 37:20 | invited | 5:23, 6:4, 6:6, |
|  | human [1] - | 6:16, 7: | instance [13] | 11:10 | 6:22, 19:8, 19:25, |
| ```71:26 heard [1] - 55:2 hearing[10]-``` | $34: 11$ | included [2] - | 14:17, 14:20 | inviting [2]- | $30: 22$ |
|  | hurdles [1] | $8: 8,57: 28$ | $20: 19,23: 19$ | $66: 13,72: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { judgments [1] - } \\ & \text { 19:26 } \end{aligned}$ |
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