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## WTNESS <br> PAGE <br> GARDA N CHOLAS KEOGH

QUESTIONED BY MR. MCGUINNESS .................................. 6

THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVS, ON VEDNESDAY, 16TH OCTOBER 2019:

CHA RMAN Morning. Now, Mr. McGuinness.
MR. MEGU NESS: Good morning, Chairman. Garda Keogh, 10:32 please.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much.

# GARDA N CHOLAS KEOGH CONTI NUED TO BE QUESTI ONED BY <br> MR. MCGU NNESS, AS FOLOVS: 

CHA RMAK Morning.
1 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Good morning, Garda Keogh?
A. Good morning.

2 Q. Yesterday, when the Tribunal rose, you had made
reference to a document in the Tribunal papers that you have noted?
A. Yes.

3 Q. I think you immediately found your note and you immediately brought it to our attention?
A. Yes.

4 Q. It related to --
CHA RMAN Just a bit closer to the microphone I think, Mr. McGuinness.
MR. MEGU NESS: Me, is it? Sorry.
CHA RMAN No, it's all right. I am just checking that people can hear what you say.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Sorry, Chairman.
5 Q. Yes, you immediately brought that to our attention and
that related to page 2185 of our papers, which was in volume 8. In your evidence yesterday, at page 145 of the transcript, you said:
"I see that Superintendent Mrray is in contact with Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an fromthe Laois-Offaly di vision in rel ation to my car tax, not through my own chi ef. He veers off to the chi ef of the Laoi s-Offaly di vision in rel ation to my car tax. And then of course as it transpires, I have explai ned the targeting."

You may recall I had just asked you about what you were saying about that contact. And you say:
"He's in contact with Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an in rel ation to car tax."

This is back in 2015. And you go on to say:
"Well, l don't know what was said, but it's only in the notes it caught my eye. But, you know, agai n, why would a superintendent fromone di vision contact a chi ef superintendent fromanother di vision about where a guard, not that they had no tax, but just had it in a different tax bracket category. That is a really kind of minor thing."

I ask:
"Q. What document are you refering to particularly? A. I think it's written down, if l can look for it, if you want."

You said you had a note of it somewhere and then provided us with that reference.
A. Yes.

6 Q. Just to inform you, that's at page 2185, which is on the screen there. I think that's the note you are referring to, in particular the middle entry?
A. Yes.

7 Q. We provided that note to your solicitor and counsel just now. I have no objection if they want to hand that?
MR. KELLY: Chairman, I thought before we raised this issue that I would have a chance to look at it.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: And an opportunity to speak to Garda Keogh about it.
CHAI RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: I would like to avail of that opportunity. CHA RMAN That seems perfectly reasonable, Mr. McGuinness, does it?
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. I don't want to take anyone short. Perhaps we will take five minutes, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Would you like five minutes at this point?
Is it convenient to have it at this point? You seem to be indicating you would prefer to do it at this point, Mr. Kelly, is that correct?

MR. KELLY: I would.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: Since the matter has now been raised, I want to deal with it now.

CHA RMAN This is on this particular issues, so that it will give us an opportunity then of closing off this particular issue by reference to this. That's really the only remaining matter, is that right?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN Okay, that seems very convenient. what wil1 I say? 10:50? Let's say not before $10: 50$, so 15 minutes, let me know if you need further. Mr. McGuinness, keep in touch, let me know, let Mr. Barnes know if you need longer.
MR. MEGI NNESS: Yes, Chairman. That's probably my
fault, I should have --
CHA RMAN No, no, sorry, there is no question of fault, we will sort it out, that's not a problem for anyone. Thanks very much.

## THE HEARI NG THEN AD ORNED BRI EFLY AND RESUMED, AS

## FOLLOVG:

8 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you, Garda Keogh. I think you have seen the original of that document we were looking at unredacted?
A. Yes, I did.

9 Q. I am not going to mention the name, because it seems to be --
A. I understand. I suppose, I accept that point two is not related to me. The reason it jumped off the page, point 1 is in relation to me, point 3 is related to me and point 2 is a conversation with a former superintendent of mine, but $I$ accept point two is not relating to me.

10 Q. Yes. No, I can accept obviously that in the setting it looked as if it might relate to you and it's appropriate to enquire whether it did or not?
A. Yes.

11 Q. So, I think we will leave that issue. The Chairman yesterday obviously mentioned that this issue of the car tax was related, interrelated with the payment or the delay in payment of your subsistence, travelling expenses, which is Issue 14. That's one of the issues that you complain about. So I was going to move on to that, to finish off that, if that is convenient. I have told my Friend I was going to do that.

I think this related to a complaint that you made in relation to the delay of travel expenses related to four particular dates; 18th June 2014, which was the occasion I think of one of your appointments with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy; 14th July of 2014, I think that was a visit to Judge McMahon; 30th July 2014, which was I think an appointment with Deputy Daly and wallace, $I$ think you noted that in your diary as a Section 62 issue?
A. Yes.

12 Q. The fourth one was I think an appointment I think with Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin on 13th August 2014. Al1 of those claims are contained in volume 4, at pages 728 to 742. I don't need to look at them. You submitted those in an original form. I think you weren't able to recall who you had submitted them to at the time?
A. I would have submitted them through the normal channels, as I would have always done. Yes.
A. And as I said, it was never an issue ever before.

14 Q. Yes.
A. These appeared to go missing.

15 Q. Yes.
A. Then I had to, I think roughly a year later or some 10:54 months later, $I$ have to resubmit them and I write "resubmissi ons" on the second batch.
16 Q. Yes, that is obviously correct in that regard. In terms of the procedure for processing them, Inspector Minnock, I think Superintendent Minnock now, describes the procedures at page 680 to 682 of this statement. I don't intend to open it, but you have probably seen it. He describes it, certainly up to a certain stage, as an entirely manual process. Normally a guard seeks approval if they are using a private car in advance.
The expenses incurred are then claimed for on a prescribed claim form. It's submitted, verified, checked and goes on up the system in a particular way, arriving into the finance office. Then it's sent, if
it's found to be correct, put on the oracle system and is scheduled for payment then in Killarney, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, yes. Now in relation to the seeking for approval.

17 Q. Yes.
A. That's something that in general has become, let's say, tighter in years. I would never normally over the years, nor did anyone, it's just you would hand in, send forward the sub claims and that was it. It would usually be something like travelling to court or something like that.
18 Q. Yes. But obviously reference has been made to a Directive of 2009, to ensure that only trave1 that's absolutely necessary be undertaken and that claims for travelling expenses be closely monitored as well?
A. Yeah. As I said, it was more liberal, that's probably correct.
19 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

20 Q. Superintendent McBrien, you will recall or heard of a discussion yesterday, she refers to having discussed the matter in September with Cathriona Quirke and she requested the finance officer to produce a sample list of members who claim travel and subsistence expenses for the purpose of an audit, did you see that?
A. Yeah, I have read something there.

21 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah, I read it somewhere, yeah.

22 Q. Yes. She describes this at page 842 and 843 of her
statement and she said:
"During these checks it was identified there was an issue with Garda Keogh's travel expenses. I advi sed that Garda Keogh's outstanding clai ms be withheld until I investigated thi s matter."

You accept her assertion that she was responsible for that?
A. The difficulty just with this particular thing, because 10:57 I'm already aware that it was Detective Superintendent Mulcahy instigated this, let's say, at the very start, but unfortunately he would have been on the investigation team, so investigating into my complaints. I mean, look, I would also say that is targeting from the very start. But having said that, in time myself and Detective Superintendent Mulcahy at the start don't -- there's mistrust there, but as things move on we build up trust. But that is how I understand it, the car tax emanates from that. I
think, and I could be corrected, that in order to veer into my car tax, he used the sub claims as a smokescreen, kind of as an excuse to go in to look at the car tax. identified in her statement that she did direct this audit, there was a list prepared. It's exhibited as M MCB 7, at pages 1112 to 1128 , which was the printouts of all the checks done in relation to, not just yours
but other members?
A. There is a difference. My car was checked first. It was checked by Garda Gerry white in the district office. And in the explanation it had clearly "called to super's office". He was the district clerk in the superintendent's office. When Superintendent McBrien made checks, my car again, with the other cars, it's to do with audit in Athlone. So it's slightly different to everyone else's.
24 Q. It would appear that whatever happened those original claim forms, they were processed. You brought this to I think Sergeant Minnock's attention at one particular stage, but in the interim you have resubmitted the claims, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

25 Q. What Sergeant Minnock says was that in early 2015 you received a minute from Garda Keogh querying a delay in paying his claims. That's at page 722 of the papers. You have seen this?
A. I am aware of that.

26 Q. Yes. He says, at page 681 and 682 of the Tribuna1 papers, that:
"Having conducted enqui ries into Garda Keogh's cl ai ms, the finance officer reported to me that cl ai m were not 11:00 with her for processing on the oracle system of making payment. The finance officer prepared a minute for hi $m$ a copy of whi ch is appended at ANS3. The finance of ficer advised that Garda Keogh submitted cl ai ms on
the 11th December 2014 and they were returned by Inspector Farrell for further attention."

Is that correct?
A. I'm not sure, because I have submitted to the Tribunal a handwritten document from Ms. Quirke, who, as I said, deceased now and she in her note to me said she never received -- handed in to the Tribunal, she never received those subsistence claims.
But did you not become aware that they had to be reprocessed by you to include the cost of public transport? Is that not a requirement to see whether that was an alternative?
A. That part is true, but that's a general thing.

28 Q. Yes.
A. To compare which is the cheapest option.. private or public.
Q. Yes.
A. Whichever is the cheapest. Generally that's the one that will be paid. My point is, Ms. Quirke informed me herself and has a written note that she didn't receive any of this. So I think this is just a smokescreen in relation to a reason to go in. I really never got to the bottom as to who the person was who called the superintendent's office on the day my car was checked by Garda Gerry white.
30 Q. Yes. But the finance officer, Ms. Quirke, she was able to tell you that the claims hadn't been submitted to her?
A. Oh yeah.

31 Q. And had not been processed on the oracle payment system?
A. From my recollection, she knew nothing about that.
A. The fact that she was the finance officer, when I was asking and writing to her about, you know, is there a problem with these claims, is there a problem. She said she knows something about them. As I said, I never had an issue with issuing claims before, and my car was taxed the same way and a previous car was exactly the same. So that we're talking about a number of years with a similar issue, and it was never an issue like before with anything like this.

But did you not learn that also Sergeant Haran had to re-sign the claim forms as well?
A. Some sergeant would have to sign the claim forms.
A. So my claim forms, I would imagine, would have to be signed twice, because the original ones I submitted ones went missing and then there's the resubmitted ones. So they would have both have to have been countersigned.
Q. Superintendent MCBrien returned them for signature and certification by Sergeant Haran and also required certification by you of the cost of public transport expense?
A. Okay. I presume we're talking about -- are we talking
about this second set of sub forms?
36 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

37 Q. The first set were never sent back to you with any query, isn't that correct?
A. As I said, they just go missing.

38 Q. Yeah.
A. It's years later, when I am reading the Tribunal documents, they just reappear.
Yes. Superintendent McBrien says that she met Superintendent murray on the 4th March. She has her notes of that at page 1731. That she informed him of the situation regarding the car tax and she arranged with him that she would forward the resubmitted claims to Inspector minnock and that Inspector minnock would discuss the claims with Superintendent Murray. Are you aware that he did that?
A. I would accept that. But again, could someone, at this point, if I'm driving around now for a year, where they know there's an issue with the car tax, which I clearly have said I didn't even contemplate the thing with the commercial -- as I said, I knew the car would be the first thing they'd look at, because I distinctly remember having the tyres and everything correct on the car. But -- sorry I have lost my --
40 Q. Yes. We11, perhaps we will just look at what Superintendent Minnock, Inspector Minnock as he was at the time, stated on page 682 of the papers. He says there on the second paragraph:
"On 4th March 2015 I recei ved a file from
Superintendent McBrien regarding clains submitted by Garda Keogh. Superintendent MEBrien file stated that she had addressed the matter with the new incoming chi ef Superintendent Murray, that he would di scuss the matter with me following his arrival. I attach the minute as AMS4."

That shows that the file claims re-signed by Sergeant 11:06 Haran and the certification by you of the public expense, would you agree with that?
A. I would. But again, common sense here: They knew there is a problem with the car tax, I didn't about it, but I am writing in to Ms. Quirke, you know, is there a 11:07 problem?
41 Q. Yes.
A. Wouldn't the handiest thing -- and they let me drive around with the car in the incorrect tax bracket for about a year. wouldn't the handiest thing for someone 11:07 to just say to me at the start, Nick, there's a problem with your car tax, will you just go and get it sorted?
42 Q. Yes.
A. That would have saved all this.

43 Q. Just going down that page, scrolling down a little bit. 11:07 This is what Superintendent Minnock says he did:

[^0]Chi ef Superintendent Murray appeared anxi ous to deal appropriately, swiftly and fairly with the matter. The following week I was going on a course, so I asked ME. MEKenny to CC Superintendent Murray on the reply e-mail. Superintendent Murray I ater advi sed me that 11:08 the Garda Keogh was asked to regul arise the tax cl assification of his vehicle. I amanare his clainm were paid and he recei ved a Regul ation 10 of Garda Sí ochána from di sci plinary regul ation 2007, for using a vehicle which was incorrectly taxed. This was consistent with matters of this nature coming to the attention of district management teamand to my attention. "

We have already looked at Superintendent Murray note of 11:08 his discussion with you on the 26th February, where he made it clear that he would deal with the claims once the tax was dealt with and he did that, isn't that correct?
A. He did that. But he did that after he had been on to the motor tax office looking for declarations, and if they got declarations there they would have done me for fraud.
44 Q. Well --
A. On something that they could have very easily cleared up a long time ago.
45 Q. We11, he directed Inspector Minnock to contact the county council to get the details of the registration and taxation position with regard to --
A. And get declarations. I am pretty sure, I think there was something about declarations.
46 Q. We11, it came back from the county council with no declaration made by you, isn't that correct?
A. That's just from what I remember, yeah.

47 Q. Yes.
A. That's my point, that they could have got -- this is probably why they were holding on. You know, it was a very simple thing, that they could have just said, listen, sort it out, end of story. But, you know, they 11:09 go looking, digging for declarations here on this. of course, as I said, I am not the only person that had a problem with, let's say, the car, my car in the station. And mine was a very minute thing. It's not that it wasn't taxed, it was just in a different bracket.
48 Q. Yes. Well, perhaps we will look then at the notes of Chief Murray at 2042 and 2043. This is the statement here, where, towards the bottom of the page -- well, perhaps we should start maybe in the middle of the top: 11:10
"The primary obj ectivity of the meeting insof ar as I was concerned was to di scuss with Garda Keogh a file I eft for me by my predecessor Superintendent Noreen MEBrien rel ating to financial clains Garda Keogh made in 2014 for travelling expenses invol ving the use of hi s personal jeep for travel to and from Gal way. My predecessor had expl ai ned to me that on 4th March 2015 she had been inf ormed by Detective Superintendent

Mul cahy that Garda Keogh's private vehi cle was not correctly taxed. She felt his clai m for travelling expenses were in breach of financial code regul ations and could not therefore be paid in those circumstances. She made me aware that Garda Keogh had been quer yi ng the nonpayment of his clains in writing, but that no one had spoken to himabout the matter."

I think that is correct?
A. Yes.
"Frommy perspective, Garda Keogh and I had an amicable conversation and he told me about his career and time in Bray. He reminded that we met before in court when he was a garda in Bray and I and inspector in W ckl ow but I unf ortunatel $y$ had no recollection of the meeting.

I di scussed his si ckness record with hi mand his ad hoc appearances at work. He expl ai ned in a vague way the investigation that he was part of and the fact that he di $d_{n ' t}$ like to be at work when certain people were there. It's a cause of stress to him resulting in his si ckness."

He goes on about that. Then he say:
"I spoke to himabout his car tax, he got slightly annoyed and he felt people were getting at him l showed hi mthe results of enqui ries I had Inspector

M nnock made at a tax office and tol d himthey were in rel ation to jeep, it showed it was taxed in wrong category, commercial instead of private, resulting in a I oss of revenue to the State. I spoke about the effect on his cl ai nゅ for travel expenses.

I offered a sol ution to deal with the matter, which was that he would correct his tax, pay arrears to cover the period of the travelling cl aim and when he showed me proof of same, l would approve hi s travel cl ai ms....l expl ai ned that woul d concl ude the matter and it would never be mentioned agai $n$. He agreed to that course of action."

We discussed what you did then yesterday on foot of that. He approved the claims on the same day or thereabouts, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

50 Q. Once you produced the documents. And you were paid those monies then; isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

He then reported the matter to the chief superintendent. If we look at page 2194 and 2195. It's described there. He signed off on it. We have seen the letter at 2195 of the 7th April. He describes how he had approved the claims for payment on page 2 there, 2196. A11 of the documentation relating to the claims then are in the papers up to page 2217. I don't know whether you have looked at them there, but 2205,
which is the note left by Superintendent McBrien. It's endorsed by Superintendent MCBrien there. To the finance officer:
"Attached forms are approved for payment. Do you mind noting a copy of this file for me please."

Is that right? Page 2206 is the form that was sent back to you, through Sergeant Baker and Sergeant Haran and you submitted:
"Amended as requested. "

In January, is that right?
A. Yes.

52 Q. 2207 is the direction earlier given by Superintendent McBrien that that should be done and provide the cost of public transport.

Insofar as Superintendent Murray's position is concerned, wouldn't it be fair to say that he did deal with the matter swiftly and fairly and ensured that this issue was put to bed and you were paid the claims that you were entitled?
A. The word swiftly is -- look, perhaps, a bit too meet him, there's an issue with your car tax, get it sorted. And I did, the very next day. He never mentioned anything about discipline. I, of course, had
never been disciplined before. It was the next day, or the next day $I$ meet him that he disciplines me. That's on, if I am correct, the 3rd April 2015 he disciplines me for the first time on the car tax. And interesting7y, that's the same date there's a series of text messages between him to Chief Superintendent Scanlan to Nóirín O'Sullivan and back from Nóirín o'Sullivan to Chief Superintendent Scanlan to Pat Murray. I have seen the contacts, it doesn't say what was in the text messages of course, but on that particular day.

53 Q. You don't know what being texted about?
A. Look, it could have been whether -- the fact that I know Nóirín O'Sullivan (Inaudible), this is my first discipline tax matter. There is a lot of stuff going politically at the time to do with whistleblowers. Forgive me for thinking that it was quite possible they could have been texting in relation to me.
54 Q. That's obviously speculation on your part?
A. Unfortunately, I can't get to read text messages.

55 Q. Yes.
A. And just again for clarification, when the text messages were handed in to the Tribunal, the gardaí didn't twig that, they didn't spot it. It was spotted, of course, ultimately in the end. But they're here, they're somewhere in the Tribunal safe, I understand.

56 Q. Text messages?
A. No, not the text messages. As I said, the text messages are -- it just shows that there was text
messages sent, received on two three -- between Superintendent Murray, Chief Superintendent Scanlan and then Chief Superintendent Scan7an to Commissioner o'Sullivan and the very same back with Commissioner o'Sullivan to Chief Superintendent Scanlan to Murray on that day. What's interesting as well, in those, the billing records that I got you, there's no other series or pattern of text messages anywhere else between them in the records that I viewed. It just happens to be on that day, 3rd April 2015, the day I have to be disciplined over this tax matter.
57 Q. Have you any evidence to suggest that anyone else was consulted about your discipline?
A. Well, I don't know. In relation to that, as I said, those records are here.

58 Q In any event, the origin of it, in a sense, related to your own car and the taxation regime that it was in. I mean, you can't suggest that that was in any way created by any of the officers concerned or that they weren't entitled to have regard to it in considering whether expenses payment should be claimed or certified or actually be paid. These are all legitimate issues within the scope of the expenses regime?
A. Like, if I had known I was going to be disciplined in relation to that, I probably would have challenged it. well, that's as may be. I was going to pass on from that and go back to the sequence of events then of your other complaints. It does relate to another disciplinary investigation. This is Issue number 7,
the disciplinary investigation in relation to Garda Keogh in July 2015. You recall what that relates to?
A. Yes.

60 Q. At pages 135 to 136 of your statement, your original statement to the Tribunal, you say:
"There was an issue of a mix-up about my signing of $f$ sick and then not reporting for duty."

You say:
"I had apparently rung in off sick. I was on the contrary sick. It was at most a mistake. The medical certificate materialised retrospectively to certify my sickness during the period. In any case, this medi cally certified absence was irrationally turned by Superintendent Murray into a charge of bei ng absent without I eave. "

I think this commenced with a message or a call to your 11:21 unit sergeant at the time, a report made to Sergeant Moylan, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

61 Q. If we perhaps look at that, at page 607. He was your unit sergeant at the time. If we just scroll down the 11:22 page. He says:
"I was Garda Keogh's unit sergeant at the time of his sick report on 9th July 2015 and subsequent call to
report off sick on 10th July 2015. However, I was on annual leave on the 10th and 11th July and rested the 12th July. I returned to work on Mbnday, the 13th July, when I became aware that Garda Keogh had not shown up for duty on the previ ous two days. I tried to 11:22 call himto no avail. I subsequently reported his absence to the district officer, Athl one, and Superintendent Murray by e-mail.

The e-mail was sent to the district of fice inbox at
3: 15 on 14th July 2015 and was as follows:
"Superintendent, l'm not sure if you are aware that Ni ck Keogh has not been in work all weekend. He went si ck last Thursday and Friday, reported fit for duty on Friday ni ght but has not attended yet. I was on leave on Sat urday and it appears he did not appear into work on that ni ght. He was not on I eave on Sunday or Mbnday ni ght ei ther and did not turn up for work. I have tried calling himbut he is not answering or returning my calls.

Just said l'd let you know. I meant to say it earlier as wasn't sure if you knew. It appears from others that he has "broken out" and is drinking in Tullamore."

Then he details a Facebook message that he got from you at 00:29:
"Sorry about this week, Cormac, I missed your call and
di dn't have credit to call you back.

I did not acknow edge this message. "

Just in terms of procedure, when you are off and sick, is it normal procedure to ring in and say, I'm now better, that is off sick and, $I$ will be back in for duty?
A. Yes.

62 Q. So it would appear then that you obviously knew you were meant to be in duty then on the 9 th -
A. Yes.

63 Q. - 10th, 11th, 12th. The four days or so that we're talking about?
A. Yes.

64 Q. I think you noted that in your diary yourself, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

65 Q. Perhaps we will just look at Volume 47, page 13319. 13319, I beg your pardon. Just while we are waiting
for that to come up, to get to the consequence of it for you. You were, indeed, disciplined and you were find $€ 300$ I think?
A. Yes. They tried to discipline me on two breaches and on one of them I pleaded not guilty and on the other one I pleading guilty and I was find $€ 300$.
66 Q. Yes. You sought to review that by way of an appea1?
A. Correct.

67 Q. And it went --
A. Sorry, just for clarification, I was given a notice from Chief Superintendent wheatley that I was entitled to appeal it if I so wished.
68 Q. Yes.
A. There was discrepancies in relation to certainly the date of the phone call with Superintendent Murray and in relation to that text message or the message that $I$ had sent to Cormac Moylan, there was an issue to do with that date, which was wrong. It would have implied I wasn't -- or wasn't, let's say, was deliberately not answering my sergeant's phone calls or anything like that. I would have good time for any of those sergeants at work but wasn't like that. The date that Superintendent Murray had on that was incorrect. He has, in his own version of events, that then he brings in I wouldn't answer the sergeants and that, which was not the case. The date that he stated on what I am to be disciplined for, was incorrect. It was actually the next date. The next date, which $I$ had it in my note, which is the correct date that phone call was made. It 11:28 also then would have covered that I did actually text the sergeant to say I am sorry about this week.
69 Q. We will tease that out in a minute. But in any event, the entry there, just under the line on the left-hand side, it actually seems to be for the 7th July, it says:

[^1]Then it says:
"Tuesday rest day."

Is RD rest day?
A. RD rest day.
Q. RD rest day?
A. Yeah.

71
Q. And then:
" Wednesday RD dri nk. "

And then:
"Thur sday drink si ck. "

And then:
"Friday: Si ck. Rang of fick while drinking."

Is that right?
A. That's correct. I rang off sick while I was drinking. Obviously at the time it was a great idea and I thought, oh I'11 be fine in the morning. I didn't remember the next morning. Like, I did put my hands up 11:29 to that. I just notice in these diary entries as well, there's names of guards that are talking to me and that, and a lot of them should be blacked out under the circumstances of the Tribunal, I think.

72 Q. Well, we redacted those that we thought were obviously appropriate, but we will hear representations. The days we're concerned with, Saturday the 11th then, you have put in:
"AWDL dri nk."
A. Yeah.

73
Q. Then Sunday 12th:
"AWOL dri nk."

Then down the next page, some trial starts over there. And then:
"AVOL. St op dri nking."
A. Yeah.

74 Q. And then Tuesday 14th:
" AWOL. "

Then there's reference to D/Superintendent Mulcahy. Then the 15th it says:
"RD. "

And then in the side it says:
"Rang of f sick 11: 45."

Is that right?
A. Yeah.

75 Q. And then 12:08, and there's phone numbers:
"Superintendent Pat Murray rang me re above, above AWOL. "
A. That's absent without leave.
Q. Yes.
"I tol d himl had been drinking. Di dn't real ise I rang of $f$ si ck. He said sending me to CMD and hol ding a case conference to do with me."
A. The CMO is the chief medical officer.

77 Q. Yes. Then there is reference on the 16th:
"Got cert from doctor to cover re re AhOL but they
still will come after me."

Is that right?
A. Yes.

78 Q. The entries you made about you being AWOL, obviously they're in your own handwriting?
A. Oh yeah.

79 Q. I mean, the first part of the complaint you made is that Superintendent Murray turned your absence
irrationally into a charge of being AWOL, but that's the way you seemed to have characterised it yourself in your own diary at the time?
A. Yes. Well, obviously those notes would have been written -- I wouldn't have wrote them while I was drinking. They would have been -- I would have written them after the sequence of events, yeah.
Q. Okay. You did produce a doctor's certificate on the 16th, from Dr. Bartlett, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

81 Q. Superintendent Murray sought an explanation from you, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

82 Q. Perhaps we will just look at page 243. That's signed by him and sent down to the sergeant in charge.
"Garda Keogh reported fit for duty on Friday, the 10th July. However, he failed to report on either Sat urday 11th, Sunday 12th, Mbnday 13th, Tuesday 14th. "

That would seem to reflect you having phoned in sick on that friday night, is that right?
A. Yes.

83 Q. Superintendent Murray had notes of the phone call at PM, his exhibit PM35, which is volume 8, page 2220.
Perhaps we will just look at those. He has this headed:
"Tuesday, the 14th."

Now, I know your diary refers to a phone call, 12:08. Could that have been 12:08 on the 14th?
A. No. No. My diary was correct here. Just, if you want to look at Superintendent Murray's statement to the Tribunal, he has that the phone call was made on the 15th in his statement to the Tribunal.

84 Q. Just a curiosity is that you made the hadn't invoked claim for the phone call on the basis that it did take place on the 14th; isn't that correct?
A. Probably that was a heat of the moment thing, I would imagine. I don't know did I read that, you see. If you just give me a second.
85 Q. Yeah.
A. Sorry, the month again?

86 Q. CHA RMAN Ju7y 2015.
A. Yes, because I have the note made on the 14 th, where I had a conversation with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy about obviously the main investigation, what's going on with the main investigation. So my note was on the 15 th of July, 12:08, Superintendent Murray rang me. I have recorded the number that he rang me from as we11. So I was in no doubt that my version is correct. I accept there's certain parts, notes and all the rest.
87 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
A. But you see, it was also the side note as well, where I rang off sick, because $I$ rang off sick on the date that he did -- he rang me at 12:08, about roughly, what, an hour and a half or something after $I$ had rang off sick.

So his note here of Tuesday 14th is not accurate. and --

88 Q. Sorry if, you wanted to finish.
A. I'm okay.

89 Q. I think you told us in relation to the entries "AWOL" that you would have put them in later. I think you've told us some of the other entries we discussed earlier in the week, you put them on days after they had occurred, relating back to those days?
A. Yeah. I would have gone on a binge, Judge, so I
wouldn't -- straight out, I wouldn't have been concentrating on my diary and AWOL at the time.
Q. But would you agree with me that you're using the diary as record of things that have happened?
A. Yes.

91 Q. And you're putting events into days that you think they happen on?
A. On this one I'm a hundred percent certain, there is no think in this.
Well, that's my point?
A. I am then prosecuted internally for something on the 14th and I made an issue about this. Because the reason it's important on the date is, if that 14th was correct, it means then I deliberately made no effort to contact any sergeant or anything like that, which wasn't the case. I didn't have phone credit and I did manage to be able to send a text to the sergeant. That's the issue.

93 Q. We11, I am not sure whether it is, that's what I am
trying to explore.
A. Sorry, yes.
Q.

I am not quite clear, myself.
CHAN RMAN Sorry, do you mind, would you just explain that again?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Sorry, would you mind explaining that again? You say the date is important?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Because?
A. Because Superintendent Murray is trying to say that I did not respond to any sergeant's calls or anything like that. I would not have done that deliberately. I would have got on well with those sergeants. The reality is, I was probably asleep or whatever when the phone calls happened.

97 Q. CHA RMAN So you say you didn't deliberately refuse to answer calls from sergeants?
A. Yes.

98 Q. CHA RMAN That's the basic point you're making. Is that the point?
A. Yeah. But there's more to it because then, someone from my unit contacts me and says, better get in contact some way with Cormac, you know, there's going to be an issue out of this. So I then got onto Facebook, where I texted Sergeant Moylan and explained. I never even thought of doing that prior to it, but I texted him to say that, as I stated, I am sorry about this week and that was it. But Superintendent Murray
tries to pursue this on the 14th and he includes in part of the charge.
99 Q. CHA RMAN Just go slowly. Go on?
A. As part of the accusation that $I$ am not answering the phones to sergeants deliberately. Ironically, I do answer superintendent --
CHA RMAN No, don't get lost for a second?
A. Yes.
A. Yes.

102 Q. CHA RMAN Now, you're saying the date is important because?
A. The date is important in relation to $I$ do contact the sergeant and I do apologise. If his date was correct, it would mean I didn't do that or I did it after, after 11:39 his phone call. He's saying he phoned me on the 15th.

103 Q. CHA RMAN Right. And if he is correct?
A. If he's correct, then I didn't make any effort to contact the sergeant in that period of time.
104 Q. CHAN RMAN okay. Whereas if he's not correct and if your date is correct?
A. Then I did make an effort to contact the sergeant.

105 Q. CHA RMAN That is the Facebook contact?
A. Yes.

106 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Are we clear on that?
MR. MEGU NESS: I'm not quite sure, Chairman.
107 Q. CHA RMAN I think I am understanding. You say the fact that you contacted your sergeant on Facebook on the 14th --
A. It was actually very early, just after midnight on the 15th.
Q. CHA RMAN okay, early hours, very early hours on the 15th, before Superintendent Murray, as you say, describes -- if his date is correct, you only did that after your conversation with Superintendent Murray?
A. Yes.
A. Yes.

110 Q. CHA RMAN If his date is correct?
A. If his date is correct, yes.

111 Q. CHA RMAN Whereas you say you are sure that your date is correct and that shows that you did so before your conversation on the phone with him?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAK Thank you very much. That's the point you want to make. okay, thank you. Now, I am sorry, Mr. McGuinness.

112 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: we were looking at the note and the evidence is the evidence. We will see. So, he says there on the second line:
"Phoned member at 12 noon. Spoke to hi muntil 12: 15. Admitted being AWOL. Said reported of fick 10/7 in a fit of drinking after a few days, said he forgot he had 11:41 reported off sick, di dn't go to work. Admitted had a drink probl em and had stopped going to AA.

Sai d he gets it hard to sleep bef ore earlies. Drinks
beer and wi ne, nostly cans of beer. Brought up his whi stlebl ower case and says is worried about Garda A and ( bl ank), that they will get him...one and half years ago, done nothing since Garda A was informed and questioned on all the allegations. Chal lenged himwhy he di dn't answer sergeant trying to contact hi mover AhOL weekend. Said he had no credit. Agreed credit not required to answer the call."

Do you remember saying that?
A. I wouldn't have said that. I mean, of course I would have answered the sergeant. As I said, I would have only seen -- when I stopped drinking, I would have seen the missed call. I mean there would have been a lot of missed calls from different people, but I did see -from recollection, I think there was only one missed and that was from Sergeant Cormac Moylan. But there was a missed call, I accept that. The phone could have been on the table and I could be panned out on the couch. It's not that I deliberately wouldn't answer the sergeant. That's being honest about it.
113 Q. At a later stage, when Mr. de Bruir was considering as part of the appeal, it seems to have been submitted that your phone simply wasn't charged at the time and had run out of charge?
A. Oh, that's quite possible also. But I know I certainly didn't have credit on that thing. But that would be a common thing too, you know.

114 Q. Okay.
A. Again, Mr. de Bruir's report, it's based on Mick Finn's investigation, so...
Q. This is apparently based on your solicitor's submission that the phone wasn't charged and that's the reason you didn't answer it?
A. Right. Well look, my recollection is that $I$ just didn't have credit, you know.

116 Q. okay.
A. It's quite possible the phone -- I just don't even remember that part.

117 Q. Yes.
A. But I didn't have credit anyway.

118 Q. I am just exploring this issue of the date because you made an issue of it in the appeal to chief superintendent wheatley?
A. Yes.

119 Q. She tried to enquire about what the relevance of it was. You were seen to try and persuade her that she should get the superintendent's records and you didn't produce any records of your own about a call or any of that. But you had said that the call was on the 14th in your application for the Haddington Road allowance?
A. Yes.

120 Q. If you look at page --
A. I accept that. They based on that on what obviously Superintendent Murray had written. I do know my notes are accurate on this.

121 Q. Okay. Well perhaps we will just look at those two documents. 2247:
" 3 hours Haddi ngt on Road 14/7/15. "

This was an application to get some payment, as it were, for taking the phone call.
A. I was sort of annoyed with -- I would have been annoyed with what Superintendent Murray was up to and that, and I'd say I wrote that in the station. So I wouldn't even have had my diary with me. I went off the -- used his version of it, so that is incorrect.

122 Q. Okay. Then that's supported by a document on 2248, again you specify the date and the time there, and it says:
"Recei ved phone call from Superintendent Murray."

There's a query of what was the duration of it. The Haddington Road allowed members to receive payment for being contacted when they're off duty, isn't that right?
A. Yeah. I see here the time on that is incorrect. Obviously I saw something down from Superintendent Murray and I am fuming and I get a little bit bold, I suppose, and say right. I am using his date and time. I don't have access to my own diary. So the time is at 12:08 on the 15th.

123 Q. Yes.
A. As I said, Superintendent Murray himself has changed
his version from what he has gone by, by way of, where he is trying to get the disciplinary thing. The statement that he has made to the Tribunal, he now puts in that it was the 15th.

124 Q. Yes.
A. That he was in Dublin or something on the 14th and couldn't have done it.
Q. Yes.
A. That's from recollection really.
Q. Yes. Then you switched yourself to the 15 th, if we look at page 2252, isn't that right?
A. Yes. I have obviously gone back, looked at -- I see what's going on there in that period of time. I go back to my notes.
"I believe Superintendent Pat Murray has made a mistake regarding the date of said phone call. I believe this call was made on the 15 th July, not the 14 th July 2015. "

127 Q. You had previously requested the call log, on the next page, on the 3rd October, for the call log for the 14th, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

128 Q. In order to ascertain the length of time?
A. I don't if I connect it. oh yeah, I did. No, you are correct.
Q. Yes. If the application for Haddington Road related to the 14th, you would be obviously seeking to claim an
allowance for duty performed on a day that you were in fact AWOL, as it were. Now, I don't know whether that could be done or not. But in any event, the claim, you modified it to the 15th, isn't that right, because you think the phone call happened on the 15 th?
A. Well, I'm a hundred percent certain the phone call happened on the 15th.
Q. You'd rung in off duty on the 15 th then as well, is that right? The side note on the page we were looking at.
A. Oh yeah. I rang in off duty at 10:45. Like I shouldn't have wrote that Haddington Road stuff. As I said, I was annoyed over stuff that had gone down, the way Superintendent Murray was approaching it with the reporting and the thing, the other stuff obviously with 11:49 the sergeants and all the rest. I shouldn't have put in that Haddington Road stuff. when I wrote that, I obviously wrote it in the heat of the moment because I am using his version, which is incorrect, of the date. As I said, I hadn't my diaries in work with me?
131 Q. Yes. Originally we had been looking at the request for Superintendent Murray to you to provide an explanation. I think you provide an explanation, which is in your papers at page 245, isn't that correct? If we just look at that. Perhaps if we go to page 245 of the Tribunal's documents.
A. Yeah. Oh yeah, that's correct. And it has:

[^2]phone. He agreed he was absent without leave and indi cated he reported of $f$ sick on the $10 / 7$ while he was drunk but had forgotten he had done so. He no excuse for not ret urning Sergeant Mbylan's calls."

132 Q. That's the report that Superintendent Murray wrote, that we will come to in a minute.
A. Again, the issue with that date, you know, it implies that I was being -- that I just was ignoring my sergeants, essentially. And that's not what happened.

133 Q. Yes.
A. No deliberate thing there.

134 Q. He includes tab D there. Perhaps we will just look at that. Bear with me. If we look at page 2227. That's the explanation you sent him at the time.
"With reference to overleaf, made mistake regarding reporting unfit for duty. I was still on sick these days. I apol ogi se for same. Si ck cert attached. Forwarded for your information."

On the 10th August then, the chief superintendent decided to appoint Superintendent Alan Murray, is that correct?
A. Yes.

135 Q. Superintendent Murray conducted an investigation and you met him?
A. Yeah.
Q. You pleaded guilty to the first charge and you were
acquitted of the second charge?
A. I pleaded not guilty to the second charge.

137 Q. Yes. I am sorry, did I misstate that, I beg your pardon. You pleaded guilty to the first charge, you not guilty to the second charge?
A. Yes.
Q. You were acquitted of that, as it were?
A. Yes.
Q. You didn't make an issue, $I$ think, of the importance of the phone call at the time?
A. Yeah, I didn't --

140 Q. Am I right or wrong?
A. I had so much going on at the time, all that's going on with the investigation and everything else, I didn't. But then, of course, when it becomes apparent to me what Superintendent Murray is up to there with this, you know, sticking the boot in to do with the thing with the sergeants, that I'm not -- that annoys me. So chief superintendent wheatley then affords me the entitlement of appea1, I then on, 1et's say, legal grounds, request to appeal that. Firstly I looked for a copy of my statement. They wouldn't give it to me. And the second thing was the date of the phone call and again, I was completely ignored with that.
141 Q. Well, you acknowledged receipt of the report from Superintendent Alan Murray. You included a copy of your statement in it, did you not?
A. No, I never got a copy of my -- I didn't get a copy of that statement. I didn't actually read -- get a copy
of that statement until I seen it, I think it's in the Tribunal documents there. I was writing to them looking for a copy of that statement.
142 Q. Could we look at page 254. This is the report of the appointing officer to the member concerned. If you just scroll down there. Continue down the page.
"I acknow edge recei pt of this notice."

If we continue down.
A. That pretty much just backs up what I just said, what I am looking at on the screen.
143 Q. Yes, but in Superintendent Murray's report, which was given to you, was your own statement not part of that report?
A. No, I had never got a copy of the statement I made to Superintendent Alan Murray. If I may read this out, as to what I wrote to Chief Superintendent wheatley. CHA RMAN I can see it there, yeah.
A.
"The decision is not justified having regard to the i nf ormation given by me.

Part of the sanction rel ates to a phone call whi ch l recei ved from Superintendent Pat Murray, whi ch he made at 12:08 on the $15 / 7$."

We're talking about 2015.
"And it is rel evant to my defence.

I would be obliged if a call log can be obtai ned regarding this and I request a copy of the statement I 11:57 made to Superintendent Al an Murray for the purpose of I egal advice."

Because I mean, I knew somewhere -- this is interesting, I knew somewhere I had in that statement
it was work related stress or I was under a lot of stress, or something like that. And of course, at that period of time, they're marking me out with the flu. I did not get a copy of that statement.
144 Q. Chief superintendent wheatley says in her statement at page 6112:
"Garda Keogh was provi ded with a copy of the statement when the report of intervi ew was served on him in rel ation to the phone records, nothing turned on them in rel ation to the core issues under consideration."

But a copy of your statement is included in volume 31, at page 8846 .
A. okay. I'm not agreeing with you, I'm just saying okay. ${ }^{11: 58}$

145 Q. CHA RMAN You are understanding what he's saying, yes.
A. Yes.

146 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Just to be clear about what we are referring to as your statement. This is the statement
of explanation and/or defence that you gave in interview with Superintendent Murray?
A. With Superintendent Alan Murray.

147 Q. Alan Murray, yes.
A. That's the statement I am saying I never got a copy and 11:58 I was looking for a copy of that statement in order to appeal it, and I never got a copy of that statement.
Q. Did I say 8846 ? This is the typewritten version of it.
A. My recollection is he had a hand -- he wrote it in longhand.

149 Q. Yes.
A. As I said, I read this, I read this in the Tribunal documents.

150 Q. Yes.
A. But I never got a copy of either longhand or a typed version.

151 Q. We11, my understanding is that you signed an acknowledgment of the receipt of the report of Superintendent Murray's inquiry, which included this?
A. I got the report with the other documents, but not the statement.
Q. Most likely the handwritten version, which, if we just scroll down two pages?
A. I am under oath.

153 Q. Yes.
A. There was other documents there.

154 Q. Yes.
A. But not the statement, either longhand or typed.

155
Q. If we go to the top of that, of that page, scroll back
up to the top, and the top of the next page. This is the handwritten record of Superintendent Murray's interview with you. The typed version of which we have seen in two pages previously. Is it your evidence that you didn't get that or you have no recollection of ever getting that?
A. I never got a copy, either typed or the longhand version. Sorry, not version, the original. No, I never. That's why I was writing looking for it, in order to appeal the thing. The appeal then, of course, just is upheld without me getting a copy of that. And the other thing, the other thing, those are the two issues, the statement and the phone call. When you have a guard and a superintendent, let's say, have a different version of events in this, the chief should have been impartial and just checked the phone records, very simple, sort out the date of the phone call.

That's one issue. I never got a copy of that statement and I looked for it.

MR. MEGI NESS: Chairman, I see it's just 12 o'clock.
I wonder would it be appropriate to take a very short break.

CHA RMAN Yes. Have you much more on this topic? I was wondering if we could conveniently -- we will adopt Mr. Kelly's suggestion that we will take a break mid morning and mid afternoon. I think that's a good idea, Mr. Kelly. Is this a convenient time or have you some significant --
MR. MEGUNESS: I have some little time more, but I
think perhaps --
CHA RMAN You are right, if we don't take a break now, we will be too close to lunchtime. So we will take a little break now and we will come back in 15 minutes, okay. Very good, thanks very much.

## THE HEARI NG AD OURNED BRI EFLY AND RESUMED AS FOLONB

MR. MEGU NESS: Garda Keogh, can I direct your attention to a document, just it may clear up confusion on my part. It's at 2258, which is in volume 31, volume 8. This appears to be the report of the appointing officer to the member concerned. So you are meant to get it, as it were. Just on the line underneath your name, it says:
"Pl ease find attached a copy of the report of intervi ew pursuant to regul ation 19(1)."

Now, if we just go down to the bottom. You appear to
have signed that, acknowledging receipt of that. If the report of interview included your interview, I may be wrong about that, it would appear that you were perhaps meant to have got it, get it at that time. You don't recollect getting it anyway?
A. I don't recollect reading that statement. I know I looked for it and I don't recollect reading it until in the Tribunal documents.

157 Q. okay.
A. I can only go off memory on this, but I am sure I would have spotted it in a document like this.
158 Q. Yes. In Superintendent Murray's statement --
CHA RMAN Sorry, can we go down a bit further? Can we scroll down further?
MR. MEGU NESS: That's a different, new --
CHA RMAN Yes, I'm sorry, you refer to that. Thanks very much.
159 Q.
MR. MEGU NESS: In any event, could we look at page 2045? This is from Superintendent Murray's statement. At the end of the first paragraph, four lines from the end of that paragraph, he says:
"On the 4 th August 1 reported the matter to chi ef superintendent West meath, recommending the matter be dealt with as a less serious breach of discipline. I attach a copy of my notes rel ating to the matter and a copy of my report to the chi ef superintendent marked PM 35. "

He says then, further down that page, with reference to the 30th, he said he met you on the 30th to serve on behalf of superintendent Mullingar, that's Superintendent Alan Murray:
"... who had been appoi nted by the chi ef superintendent to i nqui ry into Garda Keogh's absence wi thout I eave under Regul ation 14 of the di sci pline regul ations."

You acknowledge receipt of that.
"It was clear he was annoyed with re. I indi cated to hi ml had expl ai ned this might happen. At his request I expl ai ned to himhow Regul ation 14 worked and that it $12: 17$ was a way of dealing with less serious breaches of di sci pline. "

Then he goes on to a discussion in relation to that.
Is that accurate in your recollection?
A. On the 30th August. I am looking at point 14, apologies?
Q. I think you do have a note in your diary of him calling at 9pm.
A. Okay. Yeah, I have a note, 9pm, that's on a Sunday:
" 9 pm superintendent arrives into the station and serves Regul ation 15 papers on me."

161 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

162 Q. Do you recall what he recounts there in that paragraph?
A. I have a vague -- I don't particularly. I remember it was a Sunday night and it was unusual for a superintendent to arrive in on a Sunday night. I vaguely remember. I don't particularly remember -just if you can clarify what exactly, what part?

163 Q. Well, it's just that he's describing it in a statement and his account of the meeting, recommending a less
serious breach of discipline being put against you there?
A. Right. I don't think it was -- I think that was -- I don't think it was a section -- that wasn't dealt with by way of a Section 10, that was a more serious breach. 12:20 Regulation 14 , I see here.
164 Q. Yes. But in any event, what he recommended to the chief superintendent, according to one report of the 4th August 2015, at page 2222. I think it starts:
"In this case l would consider the menber's hi story of absence and his bl atant di sregard to responsibilities to the organi sation, whi ch appears to stemfromhis over indul gence of al cohol. I respectfully recommend that the nenber be dealt with by Rel ation 14 of di sci pline regul ations for his absence without I eave amounting to four days."

That's the charge you pleaded guilty to?
A. Yeah.

165 Q. Do you follow what happened then? Chief superintendent wheatley appointed Superintendent Alan Murray to enquiry into that?
A. Oh yeah, I have no issue with Alan Murray's part at all.

166 Q. That chief superintendent formulated two charges, do you follow that?
A. Yes.

167 Q. And what I want to suggest to you is that your concern
about the date of the phone cal1 and your concern about when it happened was only really relevant to the second charge and it had nothing to do with the first charge of being AWOL. You were AWOL, you agreed you were AWOL. You've noted your AWOL yourself?
A. Yeah.
Q. ca11, chief superintendent wheatley teased that out in correspondence with you, she enquired why you wanted them and she made her decision that they were in large part irrelevant to the appeal against the charge that you pleaded guilty to?
A. You see, they tried to charge me with two different things.
CHA RMAN They did charge you with two different thing.
A. They did, yeah.
Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. Sorry.

MR. MEGU NESS: Superintendent Alan Murray acquitted you, Alan Murray acquitted you of the second one and your appeal was on7y, therefore, against the first one, isn't that right? And in relation to the penalty.
A. Just for clarification, can you just give me the two charges again? Because one was neglect of duty, but I 12:23 can't remember which was one and which is -CHA RMAN One was AWOL.
A. Yeah, but that wasn't the actual charge, it had some other wording on it.

173 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. The other concerned the medical certificate.
A. Discreditable.

174 Q. CHA RMAN The other concerned the medical certificate that retrospectively declared you to have been ill, to have been sick, do you understand?
A. Yeah. The first one then is the --

175 Q. CHA RMAN Hold on, just so we know where we are going.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Mr. McGuinness is inviting you to comment, he's inviting you to comment on this point: That the question you raise about the 14th/15th is relevant only to the second charge, of which you are found not guilty. Do you understand? Do you know what I mean?
A. I understand.

177 Q. CHA RMAN It's a bit complicated, I understand, but we have two charges. You were not guilty of number 2, you were found guilty of number 1 because you pleaded guilty to number 1 . And he says this material about the date, it relates on1y to question number 2 . what do you say to that? What's your position? He says it appears that that's the case, and what do you say to that?
A. As I said, I was given the opportunity to appeal it and I went to appeal on just the two grounds. One was in relation to the phone call, as I said, neglect of duty I think is the first one, which I pleaded guilty to, I think that that's right, and not guilty to the discreditable.

178 Q. CHAN RMAN Correct. The second one concerned the medical certificate, if you know what I mean?
A. Yeah.

179 Q. CHA RMAN It was somewhat complicated 1anguage and it's not entirely easy to understand exactly what it's saying, but it concerned it. Now what do you say? Don't mind about that, he says the point about the dates only referred to the second charge that you were found not guilty of?
A. I have a difficulty, a slight difficulty, in that in neglect of duty, like part of Superintendent Pat Murray's thing brings in the thing about the sergeants and, it would appear, deliberately not answering the sergeants and that. The fact that I was entitled to the appeal, if they had done it fairly in the appeal, they could have dealt with all that fairly, given me a copy of the statement, checked out the phone records and they could have then dealt with it.
180 Q. CHAN RMAN okay.
A. They didn't deal with the appeal, the mechanism they didn't deal with.
Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. Is my argument.

CHA RMAN You say, rightly or wrongly, relevantly or irrelevantly, you raised it on the appeal and you didn't get a satisfactory outcome. That's really what it comes down to?
A. What I'm saying is, I didn't actually get -- I was afforded the opportunity to appea1. Having said yes,
for my defence in the appeal I need these two things, just the clarification on the phone call, a copy of my statement, and I didn't get either of those.
CHA RMAN Very good. Okay. Now, Mr. McGuinness.
MR. MEGI NNESS: Just in the context of later events,
Mr. de Bruir's observations seem to accord with what Chief Superintendent wheatley had -- her state of mind, that the date of the call didn't change the fact that you were AWOL, nor the fact that you had pleaded to the charge. So he didn't see the date of the call to be that relevant. Do you want to say anything else about the relevance of it to the appeal?
A. Again, in relation to Mr. de Bruir's thing, it's based on Assistant Commissioner Mick Finn's investigation. I have huge problems with everything in that, a lot of that investigation.

184 Q. CHA RMAN Mr. McGuinness is just putting the same point to you essentially.
A. Yeah. seems to have focused on the point about relevance or relevancy, do you understand?
A. Yeah.

186 Q. CHA RMAN I think you have said what you said about that?
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Okay, I think we will move on from, Mr. McGuinness, because Garda Keogh says look, here is my case on that.

187 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: It's just that part of the bundle of allegations in relation to Superintendent Murray was that you say in your statement to the Tribunal, the original statement:
"Pat Murray then vi ndi ctivel y requested an acknow edgment of this finding to him in circunstances where it was a contest bet ween my version and that of Pat Murray, he had acted as formul at or of the charge, judge, witness, gi ving untrue testimony and now enforcer of a cap in hand acknow edgment."

You repeat that assertion a number of times in relation to Superintendent Murray.
A. That's in the statement, isn't it, that I made prior -- 12:29 the statement $I$ made to get it in before the deadline, in to the Tribuna7. I accept that statement was very a rushed statement, in that $I$ hadn't received all from Tribunal, like everybody else, statements. I am not sure, $I$ know there's mistakes in that statement. I
think I have Superintendent Alan Murray and Pat Murray mixed up in that. I do remember reading that and seeing there's a mix-up in things there with the two Superintendent Murrays. Just on the statement, that particular statement that $I$ made, the one that had to be in for the deadline, which I think I just got in on the deadline of the Tribunal, was an extremely rushed statement. That statement, I think it was clarified in the statement $I$ made to the Tribunal, just that
statement, there were -- I didn't have the same -- I am not even sure how much time I had, I don't think I even got to read over that particular statement because it had to be in by the deadline for the Tribunal.

But the statement to the Tribunal is in large part a repetition of -- it's not quite verbatim, there are additions in your statement to the Tribunal, but it's almost a verbatim repetition of your statement of complaint to Assistant Commissioner Finn?
A. Yeah, it's similar, but there are -- I think there are mistakes, some slight mistakes in the statement I put in for the deadline, which I say -- and there was a reason that was rushed, because that's to do with a Tribunal order that wasn't served on me on -It's just that it seemed to remain in the appeal, even up until the time that chief superintendent Finn had dealt with it and when came to it Mr. de Bruir, because even he pointed out that there was two different Murrays and that Superintendent Murray wasn't the assignor of the charge to you, it was Chief Superintendent wheatley?
A. Yes. Yeah, I accept there's a mix-up in that statement there that I sent and I am aware, I know what you are trying to say, yeah. I am just wondering. Obviously you served under Superintendent Murray and you have obviously complained him in the way that we have heard about so far. But you knew and you came face-to-face with Superintendent Alan Murray?
A. Correct.
who conducted the discipline?
A. Yes.

192 Q. I am just wondering, how do you think you got it mixed up between the two of them and that you accused Superintendent Murray of being prosecutor, witness, judge, jury, executioner?
A. Yeah.
Q. And that persisting over a number of years in the documents, until it was corrected in the investigation interview with our investigators in 2018?
A. Yes. As is stated, I didn't get the Tribunal order, I didn't get the Tribunal order actually from recollection until after the deadline. But luckily I had heard that a statement needed to be in for the Tribunal.

194 Q. Yes.
A. And I had to --
Q. CHA RMAN Garda Keogh, do you mind if I ask you, we're going around in circles here.
A. Sorry.

196 Q. CHA RMAN This has nothing to do -- you have another complaint, which we will get to in due course, about not getting the Tribunal order?
A. Right, okay.

197 Q. CHA RMAK Look, Mr. McGuinness is saying, at some point it became obvious that it was Superintendent Alan Murray and not Superintendent Pat Murray who was the relevant person for these charges?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN A11 right.
A. Yeah.

199 Q. CHA RMAN And he is saying, why didn't you drop the allegations against Superintendent Pat Murray? why
didn't you go to your solicitor and say, please write to the Tribunal and say I was mistaken about those, I was wrong, he wasn't the prosecutor, executioner, everything else, $I$ was wrong about that.
A. I think I clarified that, just from recollection. Don't mind about clarifying anything, why didn't do you that?
A. I think I did.

201 Q. CHA RMAN You think you did it?
A. In the statement to the Tribunal, when $I$ sat down to make my statement to the Tribuna1. That's just from recollection, Judge.
202 Q. CHA RMAN When you went to your solicitor to make your statement to the Tribunal, is that correct?
A. No, this was here in Dublin Castle, when I met the Tribunal.

CHAI RMAN You were interviewed. That's the very point that Mr. McGuinness is asking you. When you were interviewed -- I mean, I don't want to be difficult
about this, I just want to save us wasting time, running around in circles about who clarified what on the 25th. I just want to get it simple. Do you understand me?
A. Yeah.
Q. CHAN RMAN I mean, there is nothing sort of hostile about this, $I$ just want to get it clear?
A. I am a bit confused myself.

CHAN RMAN Okay. Let's go back to basics?
Q. CHAI RMAN

Do you agree, I am not concerned whether you say yes or no, do you agree that you seem to have got it wrong and blamed Superintendent Pat Murray in this particular instance, do you think you made a mistake about that?
A. I'm sorry.

207 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. In which particular?

208 Q. CHA RMAN Saying that he was the prosecutor, executioner, charge hand, general investigator and he was to have blame for all the things that happened?
A. No, he initiated, he wasn't the investigator.

209 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. I accept he wasn't the investigator.

210 Q. CHA RMAN Now, now that we know what we are talking about?
A. Yeah.

211 Q. CHA RMAN I'm sorry I started this?
MR. KELLY: Chairman, if I can help, I think at volume 12:35
1 , page 73 you will find clarification.
CHA RMAN Thank you. Volume 1, page 63.
MR. KELLY: 73.
CHA RMAN 73. Thank you very much. What's in volume

1, page 73.

## MR. KELLY:

"I wi sh to clarify that Superintendent Pat Murray was not the prosecutor and enforcer in this matter and that ${ }_{\text {12:35 }}$ this is an error in my statement."

CHAI RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. KELLY:
"Superintendent Al an Murray was the deciding officer."

CHAN RMAN okay, that's in the interview. Now what Mr. McGuinness says to you is: why didn't do you that earlier? why did it wait until -- that's the question he's asking you. I am not saying it's a good question or a bad question or am important question, but that's a simple question, why didn't do you it earlier?
A. I just don't know, is the answer.

CHA RMAN Okay. All right. Now I think that was your 12:35 question.

MR. MEGU NNESS: We11, that is part of it, Chairman. CHA RMAN oh, I'm sorry.
212 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: The other half of it was, I am just concerned to know how could you have made a mistake and 12:36 how could the mistake persist for so long? That's really what I'm interested in.
A. When I had handed in the -- it was a lot of volumes and it got it on the night of the deadline. As I said, I
don't think I got to read over it. But I was aware, there's more than just one mistake in that particular large statement that I had made. I was aware I was going to be coming up to the Tribunal investigators at some point and I kind of just said, right, we'll deal with all that when -- the mistakes, we'11 address them as we go along.

213 Q. okay.
A. I think I did as best I could.

214 Q. Can I ask you, was that the first time the mistake was drawn to your attention, by the Tribunal investigators, when they were interviewing you last summer in 2018?
A. I can't just recall.

215 Q. Okay, can you recollect anyone having brought it to your attention prior to that?
A. I can't.

216 Q. Al1 right.
A. I can't recall, because there was a lot of investigations.
217 Q. of course, I understand, yes.
MR. MGGI NESS: Chairman, I think I am going to leave that issue.

218 Q. CHAN RMAN Very good. Anything else you want to say about that?
A. No, Judge, no.

CHA RMAN Thanks.
MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, the next issue is issue
number 8.
MR. MRPHY: Chairman, before we move on to that issue,

I wonder if I could renew the submission I made the other day, which you very kindly indicated you would adopt today.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: Let me respond. I have made an arrangement 12:37 with the Tribunal, the documents are being looked at now.

CHA RMAN Right.
MR. KELLY: I want to see the outcome of that.
CHA RMAN should we pass over from this for the moment 12:37 and we will move to the next item, leaving this one so your team can do whatever they want to do.
MR. KELLY: I would suggest, if it doesn't
inconvenience my Friend too much, that we leave it over
until tomorrow.

CHAN RMAN Happy with that, Mr. Murphy?
MR. MRPHY: Yes, Chair. I just have a slight concern that the issue is a very specific one, which is whether former Commissioner o'Sullivan intervened by telephone to Superintendent Patrick Murray in April --
CHA RMAN I understand.
MR. MRPHY: It's a very specific allegation. It's not clear exactly to me what exactly has taken place at this stage, because, as I have indicated in my submission, the complainant himself has indicated he

CHA RMAN Okay. Mr. McGuinness.
MR. MEGI NESS: I was only going to suggest, Chairman, that via media, might be to take Garda Keogh on the
facts.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGI NNESS: In the sense that that might be relevant to a substratum of evidence upon which people might be basing their submissions rather than hypothetically hypothesise.

CHA RMAN What do you say to that, Mr. Murphy?
MR. MRPHY: Judge, I respectfully object to that because that would undermine the entire basis of my
submission.

CHA RMAN That's all right, I just wanted to clarify. MR. MRPHY: Can I just say, insofar as my concerns are high1ighted in the submission, just what has happened in the last few minutes has indicated the wisdom of conducting a witness with a need to withdraw
allegations on which there is no evidence.
CHA RMAN Hold on, Mr. Murphy, hold on, I would prefer to deal with it when we are dealing with it.

MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN Okay. Mr. Murphy, it doesn't seem unreasonable where Mr. Kelly's team wishes to look or look again, whatever it is, I am sympathetic to the idea that they should have that opportunity and then reflect on the matter and come back. whatever it is that's going to happen, we can discuss that at a convenient time tomorrow.

MR. MRPH: May it please you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Obvious7y there is no question of anybody having to make decisions or do anything until such
time. So, we will do that, Mr. Kelly and
Mr. McGuinness, we will leave that over until tomorrow.
MR. MEGU NESS: Very good, Chairman.
MR. KELLY: Yes, Chairman.
CHA RMAN In light of that, we will see where we are going.

MR. MRPHY: Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Garda Keogh, I am going to skip that issue and look at issue number 9, which relates to four different investigation files that you were involved in that were the subject of scrutiny and query and so forth and about which you have made complaints. It's issue number 9. I am going to go through them in sequence obviously. The first one relates to a theft at a Custom Place, Ath1one, on 4th July 2015. You deal with this in your statement, in Volume 1, at pages 129, 30 and 31 and the papers relating to it are in appendix 8 , at page 189 onwards. But just looking at the first one there, I'm afraid we will have to look at these in some detail?

220 Q. CHA RMAN These are, you say, unreasonable criticisms of your police work?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN That's the heading under this. Okay. MR. MEGI NESS: This related to a report by you. If we look at page 190 of the documents. I don't know if you want to take the paper copy or not. If you want to look at it on screen there. There are various
different matters entered there. But you signed it, your supervisor is Sergeant Moylan. There are remarks of the supervisor in relation to:
"CCTV vi ewed but no evi dential val ue as camera panning, 12:42 qui ckly passed premises."

Then there's:
"The identity of somebody collated at Custom Place at 12:42 the time of offence, possible suspect, statenent of injured party encl osed."

There's a second page on that about additional enquiries conducted. Presumably they are subsequent to 12:42 the original report, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. There's comments then under the heading " 13 ":
"Blank in area around time of crime. No other evi dence. "

Did you submit that file along with -- I think there's a second file, this relates to two files, isn't that correct?
A. Yeah. Sorry, just clarify, two files. If I can just be of assistance here?
Q. Yes.
A. Two persons arriving at the same time to report an
incident of theft. The difficulty is, one, it was obviously, I presume, the same suspect that took the two items. One item was a phone I think belonging to one person, the other was a wallet or a purse and belonged to the other. which meant they had two different incidents recorded on Pulse. It wasn't just dealing with one, there it was two, just the way it happened.
224 Q. CHAD RMAN Two injured parties?
A. Two injured parties, sorry, yes.

CHAN RMAN Who were the victims of thefts?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN It seems that the same suspect was applicable to both, is that right?
A. Yes. I understand the wallet and the phone were beside 12:44 each other and the same, let's say, incident but the -CHA RMAN Oh, I see what you mean?
A. For recording the incident.

CHA RMAR Yes.
A. Because there were two different parties.

229 Q. CHA RMAN So somebody left his or her wallet down and somebody else left his or her phone down and the two went missing?
A. Correct.

CHA RMAN Okay. Right, thank you very much.
MR. MEGU NESS: In relation to this, superintendent Murray raised a query, I don't think we need to look at the second initial report, but if you go on to page 197, Superintendent Murray raised the query:

"The attached two crime files are returned for further attention as follows.

The suspect has been identified in both cases. What 12:45 efforts have been made to deal with them?"

And the second one is that:
"Why is it that both inj ured parties who are witnesses appear to have written out their own statements on form C8 rather than i nvestigating member taking down the st at ement?

Each and every reported crime must be brought to i nvesti gati ve concl usi on so the injured parties and the publ ic in general can have confidence in the police service we provide.

For report by 10/8/15. "

Now, in this case you were the investigating member?
A. Yes.

231 Q. You didn't, as it were, and we will come to the whether or why of it, but you didn't take the statements of the 12:46 witness in the form of an interview that might normally be done when you're taking a statement of complaint?
A. Not in the usual way, correct, yeah.
with the relevant forms that we see the statements in and they wrote them out themselves?
A. Yes, they wrote them out themselves, which $I$ then read over to them, read over to them and I wrote on the bottom part, the relevant part, where "this statement has been read over to me and is correct" and they signed their statements and I witnessed their signature.
Q. Yes.
A. Just for clarification, as I said, both of these
injured parties arrived in to me at the same time and I was at the public office and I was busy. Just procedurally, it's a thing I wouldn't normally do, but I have often done it in the past. They are perfectly balanced statements, legally, would be my argument, 1egally balanced. would be regarded as having been made and signed in your presence?
A. Yeah, it was done in accordance with law. by question and answer and maybe trying to develop detail?
A. Oh, well I would have --
Q. Possible detail?
A. When we were doing that, I would have told them, listen, you need the date, the time and the relevant parts in, what was taken. I think I have the two statement forms. I was present while they made their
statements in front of me, if you know what I mean, while I was answering the phones. The relevant parts to put into the statement.
Are there desks in the public office that they can sit at?
A. No, it's a hatch. But there is -- they could write, they were able to write. There's two hatches, one, let's say, would've where I was or just in front of me at the desk, and the other one was just beside me, to the left.
238 Q. Yes. Anyway, the documents I think sought a report for the 10th August. I think Sergeant Monaghan sent that down to you, it would appear. I don't think you made a report by 10th August, but Sergeant Monaghan wrote to you on the 11th August then, asking for a reply to that, isn't that right?
A. A reply to Superintendent Murray's.

239 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

240 Q. At page 201, you wrote a rep7y there, which seems to have been received or sent to the public office on the 28th. "This was the day of triathlon, hundreds of people in the area. That's the suspect.
"There is no evidence to link (blank) to the crime. In 12:49 rel ation to why both statements were taken the way they were, is because l was on my own in the public office during the triathl on. It was very busy when the two injured parties arrived in, so l did the best l could
under the circunstances. Forwarded for your inf or mation. "

That made it clear that although $X$ was seen there, there was, in your view, perhaps no reason to -- or evidence to connect them to the crime
A. It was myself that nominated $X$. Because I actually brought one of the injured parties in to view the CCTV with me. I was going through the CCTV with the injured party and $X$ was in the area all right, but $X$ didn't actually go into the building on the cameras. That was as far as I could go, he was in the area. He did not go in or out on the camera into the building. Therefore, I had no evidence then to put to X .
241 Q. Was that one of the additional enquiries you made? 12:50
A. Well, that would have been done when you watch the CCTV. That's as far as I could go, let's say, $X$ was in the area, the problem was $x$ didn't go in or out of the building. It was an open house to do with the triathlon, Judge, it would be like a St. Patrick's Day event in Dublin, I'd say, it'd be a big event in Athlone. There was an open house on this particular occasion for something and I think these ladies were working and that in the open house. There was a door, there was loads of people going in and out of this house, and on the camera X was around the area all right, but he didn't go in or out of that house. That was really as far as it progressed.
242 Q. Am I right in thinking that the viewing of the CCTV
didn't take place on that night?
A. I'm not sure. I just can't remember.
Q. It seems to be entered on the file as an additional inquiry conducted?
A. As I say, I know I was busy that particular night.
Q. Yes. In any event, Superintendent Murray, on page 302, sent down a further memo, he said:
"The expl anation given in this case for what l see is a I ai ssez faire attitude towards an investigation of these two crimes is far fromsatisfactory. Garda Keogh appears to need advice in rel ation to the purpose and the scope of intervi ewi ng witnesses and in that regard should be advised in rel ation..."

CHA RMAN Sorry we have 302.
MR. MEGU NESS: I'm sorry, did I say --
CHA RMAN You said 302.
MR. MEGU NESS: Sorry, I beg your pardon, 202.
CHAl RMAN We11, that explains that. Thank you. 202.
Yes. Have you got that on the screen?
A. Yeah.

CHAI RMAN Okay. Now, Mr. McGuinness.
246 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: You saw this at the time, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

247 Q.
"The expl anation given in this case for what l see as a I ai ssez faire attitude towards the investigation of this these two crimes is far fromsatisfactory. Garda Keogh appears to need advice in rel ation to the purpose and the scope of intervi ewing witnesses and in that regard should be advi sed in rel ation to exi sting instructions of chapter 3 of the crime instructions manual. The manner in which these statements form of an investigation is contrary to the training and ethos of menbers of An Garda Sí ochána and does not al low for this organi sation to assure the victins in this case that the best possible effort was put into investigating the crimes reported."

Now, just on that point, that is the chapter that gives ${ }_{12: 53}$ sort of instructions and objectives about how it is best for a guard to interview and what they should be seeking to achieve when taking a statement?
A. Yes.

248 Q. As a matter of best practice, I suppose?
A. Yes. And now it calls for clarification. when I received this document, from recollection, that chapter, whatever, 3 of the crime investigations manual is attached to the report. So obviously I read that chapter 3 and at the very bottom part of it, it has:
on occasion a witness may wish to make -- something like, a witness can make a statement themselves and the guard then have to read it over to them, sign it and that's it. So I was even covered under their own
investigation manual in relation to that. 249 Q. Yes. It says in the second paragraph:
"The basis of any investigation is the injured parties statement and in these cases the injured parties nomi nate a suspect. The issue must be explored in a proper fashi on with them Garda Keogh has al so nominated the same suspect on the crime tacking file. It is incumbent on us to ensure we expl ore the various available options to assist in gathering evi dence. The 12:55 case of DPP v. Ready indi cates the low threshol din rel ation to reasonable suspi ci on that exi sts in order to assist investi gations. The tools available to Garda Keogh to assist himin his work are not used in this case. In order to bring the matters to a acceptable 12:55 concl usi on for the vi ctims, please address the foll owing:

Garda Keogh shoul d be gi ven formal advi ce regarding the i nvesti gation of crime and the importance of i nt ervi ewing witnesses.....

What efforts have been made to incl ude or excl ude the suspect identified? As two mont hs have passed, this matter needs urgent attention.

Ser geant Mbnaghan shoul d ensure that Garda Keogh is supervised in bringing this matter to a concl usion so that the victins office can advi sed injured parties of
the efforts An Garda Sí ochána put into sol ving thei r crimes."

That would appear to be consistent perhaps with the injured parties not having viewed the CCTV at that point in time?
A. Oh, oh no, I would have had the injured parties in earlier to view it, because the camera system I think doesn't retain -- I am not sure how long it retains footage, $I$ am not sure if it's a month period or what it is. But, no, I would have had them in fairly -there was one lady that came in view, from recollection, the CCTV. She was under no doubt that it was being followed up because she was sitting beside me, viewing the CCTV with me.
250 Q. Yes.
A. So there was no issue there either.

251 Q. It's just that it doesn't appear in their original statements, so it would have seemed logical that it must have been on some subsequent date. Have you any 12:57 note of the date on which they came in? Did you take a statement from them on that date?
A. It could have been either that evening or the next day, I'm not sure, but it would have been fairly lively. I know I was busy when they came in to report the thing, 12:57 but it would have been -- it would have been -- it would have been -- again, I'm working off memory, it would have been very -- either that evening, I presume, or the next day. But I do recall one of the witnesses
came in and we went through the whole thing. For clarification as well, it was me that nominated the suspect, because I don't think in the statements that they wrote themselves, I don't think they actually nominated a suspect themselves.

252 Q. Yes. Well, it's perhaps not clear who nominated them in the original report. But this memo of the 3rd September, I think that was sent down to you through Sergeant Monaghan. Sergeant Monaghan seems to have sent it to you on the 7th September, and then you, I think, send the reply back up on the 22 nd September and that's to be seen at page 208. That says:
"Ser geant Mbnaghan. With reference to the above, I have al ready written on this and expl ai ned verbally to Superintendent Pat Murray regarding the statements whi ch are legally bi nding and val id made by the injured parties on C8 forms, whi ch were read over, both witnesses have si gned the same. When I got a chance, I brought (somebody) into the CCTV room and vi ewed the footage with her but it did not show the suspect enter or I eave the buil ding. I al so wi sh to poi nt out that nei ther of the witnesses named a suspect in the st at ement."

So you clear that up. You nominated:
"...the suspect who was in the area at the time, al ong with hundreds of ot her people for the triathl on. There
is no evi dence to link hi mto this crime. Forwarded for your information."

Then Sergeant Monaghan then sends that up to the superintendent on the 5 th, if we look at page 207. It 12:59 says:
"Wth reference to the above, please find attached report from Garda Keogh. Chapter 3 of the crime i nvestigati on manual has been brought to the attention of Gar da Keogh. Gar da Keogh nomi nat ed (bl ank) for these thefts but si nce then has been unable tolink him with the crimes. All CCTV was vi ewed and this gives no leads in the investigation. This case cannot be progressed at this time and any devel opments will be reported to your office as they arise."

That seems to be endorsed by Superintendent Murray's handwriting, do you recognise is as that?
A. Yeah.

253 Q. It says:
"I note your views. The crime file has been sent to the victinm office, who will informthe injured parties of the efforts made and the result. I do not expect to 13:00 see a repeat of the situation by the member invol ved. "

Can we take it that that relates to you?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

254 Q. Okay. Would you expect then to be required to take the statements yourself in accordance with the superintendent's wishes in that regard? Is that what you took from that?
A. Is that the end? Is there not more in relation to this?
Q. No, that's it, as I understand it?

256 Q. CHA RMAN Do you think there is more?
A. I am just not sure, you see.

257 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. There's a couple of these investigations.

CHA RMAN That can be checked.
MR. MEGU NESS: In relation to this one.
CHAN RMAN That can be checked out.
MR. KELLY: I see that it's page 208.
CHA RMAN Just go to 208, Philip, thanks very much.
MR. MEGI NESS: I think we've read page 208.
CHA RMAN They don't appear in chronological sequence. We have had 208.
MR. MEGU NESS: we have had 208.
CHA RMAN And then you went on to 202. We11, we will take a break here and we will return. Basically, obviously Superintendent Murray was making criticism very clear and presumably you will be asking Garda Keogh for his response to those, is that right? So we

## THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED FOR LUNCH

## THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLONG:

258 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Garda keogh, we saw there just before the break the report that went back up to Superintendent Murray and his handwritten note. He said, you know, when the file came back to him on the 6th October, he closed it off, realising there was nothing more that could be done with it?
A. Right.

259 Q. In a sense, you were able to provide that information to him, about what was done, that allowed him to close it off?
A. Yes.

260 Q. I am not adopting this as a criticism in any way of your investigation, he seems to have been approaching matters quite differently from when he came in as chief superintendent, or superintendent, in terms of organising matters. I referred to it yesterday, but maybe it's appropriate just to look at it. Page 2039.
CHA RMAN Do you mean when he came in as superintendent?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHAN RMAN Yes. So he was the new superintendent, replacing Superintendent McBrien?
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN Yes. Thanks.
261 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Here, on this page, going into the next page, there's an $A$ to $V$ of initiatives. We will just start maybe at the top of 2039. He says he set
about evaluating things and introducing initiatives for the purpose stated. He sets them out there. I am not going to debate any of them with you. But down at I was this instruction relating to the reporting of critical serious incidents, on the 18th August. That is his Exhibit PM 10. If we look at that on the screen. Just down the screen to I. That's it there. Just to continue on over the page, it shows all of the other things he produced or was in charge of at the time. L to V . Now I am not asking you to comment on any of those. But he says in his statement to the Tribunal, in relation to this: He didn't feel that there was anything overly critical:
"... but I intended to allow people to see the standard I was setting. It was not a personal criticismof Garda Keogh in any way. I took the file as an example of the new framework and how it could assist in upping the game with that time of vol ume crime."

Now, you didn't see it that way?
A. No. I'm sorry, can we just look at the previous report that he wrote in relation to that theft at Custom Place.

262 Q. Yes.
A. It was on the screen earlier, I just wanted to just have a quick glance at it.

263 Q. Yes, of course. It is at 202 to 203. He doesn't, in fact, refer to the instruction in it, which is a
curiosity, maybe an omission on his part. This file started on the 4th July, and he introduces the instruction in the middle of August. It's there obviously prior to him writing this memo to you of the 3rd September. But it seems to perhaps illustrate his thinking, that he was trying to up the standard in relation to what should be in a file. That this wasn't directed at anyone personally, this is what he was asking all people to strive towards.
A. You see, I'm not so sure about that. I think he has -- 14:06 is it okay if we can just go back to the report he wrote in relation to the Custom Place.
Q. Yes. Let's go back to that, it's at page 202 to 203 ?
A. Yeah.

265 Q. This is the one you're talking about? This is the one of the 3rd of --
A. Yeah. I mean, without even going into the contents of the report, I mean it's a really long report on a very, very -- on a non-issue essentially, in relation to the taking of statements. It's a very lengthy report. It took quite some time to do that report.

266 Q. Yes. We11, Inspector Minnock expressed a view in his statement at page 691, asking parties, injured parties or witness to write their own statement would not be normal practice and in his view not best practice?
A. As I previously said, I have on numerous occasions over my career not -- not, sorry, numerous, on occasions over whatever, the last 20 years, in circumstances like that, where it's just a difficulty and it's awkward, I
would have, the odd time, got persons to do the statement, make their own statements in that fashion. It was never questioned before. As I said, they are perfectly legal and valid statements.
267 Q. Yes.
A. Was never ever questioned before by any previous superintendent, ever.
Q. That is what I
A. oh yeah, sorry.

Had any superintendent sent a file back to you in the past?
A. Oh never, never. As I said, it would have been -we're talking perhaps once a year an incident would crop up, where one would be busy or there's an awkward situation or something or if you have to take a lot of statements, a number of statements together and you're on your own, in circumstances that where it's just awkward, the norm that I always would have done would be take the statement, sit down with someone, write out the statement, but in exceptional circumstances, and this is one of them. But they were never ever questioned before any anyone else. They were always just accepted, fair enough, there's a statement there, it's valid, legally valid and that's it.
270 Q. May I say, I have made my own statements in my own words to the guards on occasions, so it can be done obvious7y?
A. Yes.

271 Q. But in circumstances where it is acknowledged not to be
best practice, is there anything wrong in the superintendent calling your attention to the fact that it isn't best practice?
A. I completely -- I have to disagree with that.

272 Q. Okay.
A. I mean, how many -- over the years, in different court cases there's always where people would say, I didn't put that into my statement, the guard put that into my statement and I didn't. It actually probably is best practice, if one was to look at it. As I say, it's not 14:09 the norm in the Guards, but no one can accuse me of saying, oh, this particular thing, oh, you got so and so to -- or you put something in that wasn't -- they've written their own statement, it's their statement, I read it over to them, they signed it.
I am not going to ask you any more about that. Can I ask you to look at the instructions that had issued in the sort of interim period, at page 198 of the documents. It's dated 18th August, it's addressed to each sergeant, each member in the Athlone district. It 14:09 relates to the document referred to earlier, obviously it is the document.
"All incidents of a critical or serious nature must be subject of a short, concise report in addition to any entry made on Pulse. A report in addition to the Pulse entry is necessary in order that local and di vi si onal management are aware of the background surroundi ng all critical or serious incidents either reported or
di scovered by members. There have been some excell ent detections recorded in the di strict which di spl ays outstanding police work by all members invol ved. it is i mportant that the outstanding pol i ce work di spl ayed is hi ghl ighted at a di visional and regi onal level to show the commitment and dedi cation of the district force to the communities we serve and the organi sation's goals and val ues."

Then he continues:
"To ensure the reporting system works swiftly, the sergeant on duty at the time the inci dent is heard by ei ther being reported or di scovered, or inthe sergeant's absence, the station orderly or Member in Charge will prepare a short concise report, e-mail it to the district office e-mail, CC it to myself, I nspector Farrell, D/ Sergeant Curley and Sergeant Baker.

Reports are requi red for all...serious and likel y to gener ate the community....In addition, this reporting systemshould be used to hi ghl ight excellent police work carried out."

Then it continues on the next page

[^3]outlining the occurrence, details of all victims, incl udi ng....details of any arrests made or planned to incl ude power of assist used, detention used, name, age and gender of person, detail of investigative steps taken and those pl anned or suggested. Any ot her information deemed necessary to provi de a comple ete pi cture.

Please bring to the attention of each menber for i mmedi ate i mpl ementation and for strict compliance. "

Now, I suppose you wouldn't quarrel with that, as it seems to be focusing everyone's mind on getting and recording, the details being available for all to see in an audit or in the report if they pick up the investigation file or whatever?
A. Yeah. I mean, I'm not disputing anything in that.

274 Q. okay. Were you not really characterising it as a sort of retrospective attempt to, as it were, call you to account?
A. In relation to the taking of statements.
Q. okay.
A. Like, he put a lot of time into that report over statements that were perfectly legal. Now, correct me if I'm wrong, I am not a legal expert.
Q. Yes.
A. But I don't think it would be an issue in any court if
there were to be a prosecution in relation to those statements. report to you, but he seems to be envisaging under this and perhaps implicitly in his report, that the initial investigation file should, as it were, contain as much as possible in relation to the offence that's being investigated. You couldn't disagree with that in principle?
A. No, no. But just for clarification like, I would have put those two incidents on Pulse as well. So I had two separate incidents on Pulse.
Q. Yes.
A. Because there are two separate thefts, which I previously explained. All that information in there would have been recorded on Pulse. So I would have complied with all those.
Q. No, I understand that. Perhaps the thing could have been avoided if all the details in your final report had been included in the initial investigation file, would that be a fair comment or not?
A. Sorry, I am just not -- I am a little bit unclear on that.
Q. You see, the matter closed off when you sent your final reply to the superintendent?
A. Yeah.

282 Q. In September, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

283 Q. We've already looked at that. I mean you were
furnishing the details then of how it was that the person had become nominated as the suspect if possible and then how they had been then ruled out?
A. Yes.

284 Q. That there was, in fact, nothing to connect the suspect 14:14 to the crime?
A. Yes.
Q. I mean, he seemed to think, it would seem, that there could have been more detail in your investigation file report at the beginning, that those might have been included?
A. Like what?
Q. Well, the fact that you had nominated the suspect and outlining any steps to try and connect him via the injured parties?
A. We1l, I think that's addressed in the crime file. I think I say I looked at the CCTV, nominated this fella. I think. I am just going from that, this is what, 2015. But I think I did address those on the crime file. So there's two incidents on Pulse; there's a crime file as well gone in also.

287 Q. Do you see this as Superintendent Murray getting at you?
A. Oh absolutely. Like, that's a big long report on something that really is a non-issue. That is my take 14:15 on it. I could be -- I'm in your hands there, but that's the way I took at it.

288 Q. It's just, I am anxious obviously to give you every opportunity to voice your criticisms?
A. Yes.

289 Q. Mr. Marrinan is going to be dealing with Superintendent Murray, he will be making obviously the same sort of enquiries of Superintendent Murray about what he did. We want to be sure we have it chapter and verse from you?
A. Yeah.
A. Yeah.
Q. Is that "no ID for suspect"? Then, there was an additional inquiry recorded on the next page at item 12, I think that's your handwriting?
A. Yeah, it is.

293 Q. So was that done later?
A. I just have to read it first, sorry.

294 Q. Yes. It says:
"Garda CCTV vi ewed, crime occurred 4: 31-4: 34 8/8. Poor qual ity footage of car moving with stol en trailer
hi t ched.

Comments: Unable to make out registration number, col our or type of car."

This is one of the crime files that Superintendent Murray raised a query about. If we look at page 215, on the 14th August:
"In rel ation to the stol en trailer, who supplied CCTV? No statement fromthat person on file. Has any effort been made to enhance the CCTV? Should it be circulated anyway? Where is the CCTV now?"

So, it would seem obvious but I want to give you an opportunity to comment on this --
A. Just for clarification, the first line there:
"Who wrote the statements on attached C8s?"

295 Q. That relates to one of the other ones? I wasn't trying to be smart.
Q. Yes.
A. Just from recollection, I thought -- you see, when the
paper starts coming down to me, it seems to go -- a couple of these -- we will see in this one also, connected with another one, where he is questioning me on a couple of different investigations. Then he rolls them all into -- like this. That first line is related 14:19 to the previous one.
Q. Yes, that's right.
A. Yeah, sorry.
Q. These are files that are all currently ongoing and live.
A. Yes.

299 Q. And being dealt with at different levels at different times, in different ways obviously. So, it would appear that the additional enquiry hadn't occurred before wrote this?
A. Sorry, just looking at this. Actually he's writing down to me now, $I$ think, on three separate incidents.

300 Q. Yes.
A. These are three separate incidents. The first one is what we've already dealt with. The second one,
Mulligan's, $I$ think it's some way in this, but he writes down with this and the theft of the trailer, the two of them in kind of the one correspondence. The third one, yes, is the theft of the trailer, yes.
301 Q. Yes. So he has obviously got the file without the additional enquiries recorded on it, they were done later by you?
A. That incident occurred at 4 to 4:30am in the morning, which we have just seen.
Q. Yes.
A. When that incident occurred, I went to Kilmartin's petrol station. Sorry, I know I named the location, but it's actually not relevant, Judge, for anything here anyway. I went to a 24 -hour petrol station that night, and I asked to view the CCTV at the petrol station.

303 Q. Yes.
A. The young lad at 4 am, $4: 30$, 5, whatever, that night, the early hours of the morning I called down to him, he 14:21 couldn't work -- he wasn't able to operate the CCTV. So he had to wait for someone to -- basically about a week later I get the CCTV footage in relation to that incident. But $I$ had requested it that night, but I don't get it. So I can't really advance anything until I get the CCTV from that petrol station.

304 Q. Yes.
A. So that's sort of out of my hands there.
Q. Yes. But the entry then wasn't put in on that night, "CCTV vi ewed to no avail."

## Is that right?

A. You see, I got a number of CCTV, I did a petrol station, a pub. Oh yeah, I viewed -- I am able to see
a car from CCTV from some pub in relation to -- but I can't make out the details. It's not until we get the footage from the petrol station that I make out the identification on the car, which is later.

306 Q. Yes.
CHA RMAN Take your time.
A. Sorry.

307 Q. CHA RMAN Don't get confused. No, no, no. There's a number of different incidents and there's a number of different CCTVs. Now, you were just talking, as I understand, about Mulligan's filling station.
A. No, we haven't got to that one yet, Judge.

308 Q. CHA RMAN okay, very good.
A. That's separate.

309 Q. CHA RMAN No, that's all right. This was the trailer question?
A. Yes.

310 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. The trailer question was on 17th August '15, is that correct?
A. I just --

311 Q. CHA RMAN I don't expect you to remember the date. Whenever it was, the trailer issue. The trailer question, you obviously wanted to view the CCTV?
A. Yes.

312 Q. CHA RMAN In regard to the trailer question. And as I understand, it wasn't sufficiently clear to --
A. On.

313 Q. CHA RMAN Go on, on?
A. The first CCTV I viewed we can make out, we can make out, let's say, something passing by.
314 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. The trailer. But can't --

315 Q. CHA RMAN Nice and slowly.
A. It's not clear.

CHA RMAN Does that mean there's two CCTVs?
A. Yes.

317 Q. CHAN RMAN No more than two?
A. There could have been even -- I'm not sure if there was 14:23 a third.

CHA RMAN A number. More than one, there was more than one?
A. From recollection, I don't think there was anything on one. There was a blurry --
319 Q. CHA RMAN Don't worry, you're going too far ahead of me.
A. Sorry.
Q. CHA RMAN I just want to make sure, this is the trailer theft that's reported to you?
A. Yes.

321 Q. CHAN RMAN You go to the scene, is that right?
A. Yes.

322 Q. CHA RMAN You visit the scene?
A. I can't remember, the injured party, yes, he comes in,

I think he comes in and reports it, just from recollection.

323 Q. CHA RMAN That's all right, as best you can. If it turns out that that's wrong, that's okay, but you for the moment you think he came in and he reported it?
A. Yes.

324 Q. CHAN RMAN Does that mean that you went out?
A. I would have gone out, yes. The pub, from recollection, I think was closed that night. I called
then to the 24 -hour station, a different petrol station from --
Q. CHAL RMAN Because they had CCTV?
A. Yes, they had excellent CCTV but the guy couldn't work the CCTV.

326 Q. CHA RMAN Okay.
A. I asked for whenever they could.

327 Q. CHA RMAN So it took some time?
A. It took about a week.

328 Q. CHA RMAN To get at least one of the CCTVs, is that right?
A. To get the good CCTV, yes.

329 Q. CHAI RMAN Okay. But you had seen the no so good CCTVs?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN Possibly two of them, possibly two, one certainly?
A. I don't think there was anything on it.

331 Q. CHAI RMAN And it took you some time to get the good one?
A. About a week.

CHA RMAN okay, all right. Sorry, I am just trying to get this clear in my head.
332 Q. MR. MGGI NNESS: Yes. The questions that he raised in relation to the trailer there, on page 215:
"Who supplied the CCTV? No statement taken fromthat person? Has any effort been made to enhance the CCTV? Should it be circulated in any way? Where is the CCTV
now?"

That query must have arisen because it's the only reference to CCTV. There is a tick at number 7 , where it says there is CCTV. The supervisor puts in on the page later, is it later? Is that your writing?
A. Is this page 215.

333 Q. That's page 215. If we go back to page 213. Your name is there, Nick Keogh?
A. Yes.

334 Q. And then the supervisor. Then whose writing is that?
A. That's sergeant -- I can't make out the signature. It's one of the sergeants anyway.
335 Q. Yes.
CHA RMAN Sergeant Moylan?
A. I presume it's Sergeant Moylan.
Q. CHA RMAN That's to be clarified in due course, okay. Anyway, yes.
337 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: That entry was only put in obviously after the CCTV had been viewed?
A. Yeah, this would be the first, this would be the poor quality CCTV, CCTV given to no avail. I couldn't progress the matter with the particular CCTV that I got from that bar.
Q. I suppose two separate issues, just to be clear. You didn't write this, this wasn't a CCTV that you viewed, because I thought you told us you couldn't view it on the night?
A. Correct. Yeah, I don't think I get the good quality

CCTV until someone can download, someone can work the thing, download it. I think that's left in the station. I just vaguely remember I arrived in to work and it was left in an envelope for me and then I get, I am able to -- what I do then is, I contact the
injured -- from recollection, contact the injured party, he comes down and views the CCTV with me in the station. Sorry, I am getting mixed up. That's the poor quality one, is where I view it with the injured party. We see a car with the trailer but we just can't 14:28 make out the car. We get then the same car later on at the petrol station. But I don't know that at this point.
339 Q. No, you don't. The point I am making here is that this entry is unlikely to have been made on this file that night. It was only made after the poor quality CCTV DVD was viewed by you later?
A. I presume. I think, I am not sure if I am understanding the question, that's all. But I think the date that I wrote that should be on it, on the report, I presume.
340 Q. There's a signature of --
CHAI RMAN The sergeant.
341 Q. MR. MLGU NESS: -- the sergeant there, on $11 / 8$, which is sort of four days later. I am trying to ask a question which -- if you look at the next page, this says?
"Additional i nqui ries conducted. Garda CCTV vi ewed.

Crime occurred at 4:31."

That is the CCTV referred to on the first page as being of poor quality.
A. Correct, yes.

342 Q. So that was not on the form originally. All the indication of the CCTV on the form originally was the tick that you put in box number 7 on the next page, further up that page, I beg your pardon.
A. Can we just go back to that?

343 Q. Do you want to take a paper copy in case it's easier?
A. Please, could I?

CHAN RMN Yes, that might be a good idea.
MR. MEGU NNESS: volume 1, page 213. You may be able to flick backward and forward. As I understand your narrative --

CHA RMAN Just give him a chance to have a look, Mr. McGuinness.
344 Q. MR. MGGI NESS: Yes, of course.
A. Yeah, okay.

345 Q. As I understand it, you knew there was CCTV on the night, isn't that right, of the incident, but you weren't able to view it, that's what you told us?
A. No, sorry. I am sorry, I am working from recollection from a number of years ago as well. So bear with me. I mightn't explain it great.
346 Q. Take your time.
A. I may not explain it great, but I'11 try and get it. when the injured party reported this to me, with him I
view the poor quality CCTV. On the night of the theft I had gone to Kilmartin's petrol station, where I had asked -- where I have already said, I've asked, the young lad couldn't work it. So I don't get the good -we don't know there is CCTV on the Kilmartin's thing at 14:31 al1.

347 Q. Yes.
A. I had left the details with the operator, with the young lad to pass it on to whoever could monitor the CCTV, look at the CCTV and he actually found a car with 14:31 a trailer pulling up to fill petrol in it. So we didn't actually know there was anything, it was just I had looked for CCTV, but we didn't know until -luckily it turned out there was that car. The car, after they swiped the trailer, pulled in for petrol down the road into that petrol station. I get the CCTV a week later, let's say, after $I$ write this document.
348 Q. We11, you see, that doesn't help me, because I am trying to find out what bits of the document you wrote when. I think you have told us that the entry on the first page wasn't written by you on the night, "CCTV viewed", isn't that correct?
A. That's the sergeant.

349 Q. Yes.
A. The sergeant has dated this the $11 / 8 / 15$. So I presume ${ }^{14: 32}$ that's -- I can on7y presume that's the date I sent it to the sergeant. I am just presuming, obviously I don't know.

350 Q. The entry that is yours on the next page, could I
suggest, if we stop there at 7, slightly up, did you tick that box, marking CCTV on the night, because you knew there was CCTV which you hadn't either seen or downloaded on the night in question?
A. That's correct. But that CCTV, we didn't know if there ${ }_{14: 33}$ was anything on it.
351 Q. Indeed.
A. It was only poor chance -

352 Q. Indeed.
A. - that I had enquired.

353 Q. Indeed.
A. I wasn't even expecting that these criminals would steal a trailer and then pull in to a petrol station down the road with the trailer.
354 Q. Yes.
A. I just asked, is there a chance I could view the CCTV, the car pulls in at such and such a time, and I get that CCTV roughly a week later.
355 Q. Yes. But can we just then look at the next entry, which I think is your handwriting, is it? Number 12?
A. Yeah.
Q. This says:
" Garda CCTV vi ewed, crime occurred at 4:31-4:34, 8/8, poor quality footage of car noving with stol en trailer hi tched. "

That is not the Kilmartin's one
A. Correct, actually, yeah. Garda CCTV, I knew there was
another CCTV. Yeah, on the Garda CCTV was the one actually that $I$ had the injured party in that we viewed and again we couldn't, just couldn't -- he was able to spot where he lived and that the car had pulled out. We seen the car pulling out with the trailer but that was -- and the direction of travel it went. That was all we could ascertain at that point in time.

357 Q. The remarks then underneath, that's your remark:
"Unable to make out regi stration number, col our of car."
A. Correct.

358 Q. You were on7y able to make those entries and put them on here, as you say, perhaps a week later, after you
A. Yes. Like I would have -- this is after I viewed the CCTV, of course.

359 Q. Yes.
A. I would have had to have viewed the CCTV to write what I wrote there.

360 Q. Yes. Superintendent Murray gets the investigation file with whatever is recorded on it by the date he writes his query of the 14 th August, at page 215 ?
A. Yes.

361 Q. He is raising these questions:

[^4]been made to enhance the CCTV? Shoul d it be circulated in any way? Where is it now?"

So he is raising those issues. You reply to him, if we look at 216, which appears to be the 28th August, to Sergeant Monaghan. It's the third entry that we are concerned with:
"It is Garda CCTV whi ch is stored on computer. The inci dent happened at ni ght and the qual ity is poor."

So, perhaps the additional remarks didn't relate to the trailer actually being towed away, is that possible?
A. I'm sorry, I'm lost.

Well, here is a question, and $I$ hope it's as clear as I intend it to be: was it the Garda CCTV that showed the trailer being towed away or was it Kilmartin's?
A. No, no, it was the Garda CCTV that showed the trailer being towed away. Kilmartin's is approximately a week later. I have already requested the CCTV from Kilmartin's, but $I$ don't get it till a week later. But that's good quality.

363 Q. CHA RMAN That shows a vehicle, a car and trailer?
A. A car and trailer and the injured party --

364 Q. CHA RMAN Somewhat carelessly robbing a trailer and 14:37 then having to pull in for petrol?
A. Yes.

365 Q. CHA RMAN But there it is. well, who knows.
A. Exactly.

366 Q. CHA RMAK What's to explain what people do. But it does seem curious and somewhat inefficient. But that's what it looks like.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAK okay.
367 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Sergeant Monaghan sends that up, saying that:
"The onl y CCTV foot age avail able to cover the I ocation of the theft is Garda CCTV and on vi ewing it the qual ity is poor, as it was ni ghttime. This CCTV is stored on the hard drive in the station."

So he is able to tell the superintendent where that CCTV is. Then it's recorded here for the first time that:
"Garda Keogh has si nce obt ai ned CCTV footage from Kilmartin's N6 Centre, this shows two possi ble suspect vehi cl es whi ch has updated the inci dent with. Is that on Pul se? Enquiries are ongoing in this case and any progress will be reported."

Superintendent Murray then, on the 3rd September, sends a memo back down to the sergeant in charge, it's at page 219. He says as follows on the 3rd September:

[^5]It appears the crime file was submitted premat urely, i ndi cating no evi dence was available and now evi dence has come to light following a request for further i nf or mation.

The following issues have not been dealt with:

1. My question in rel ation to CCTV in correspondence dated 14/8 has not been answered;
2. The car identified was invol ved in a burglary in Ballinasl oe on the 9th May. What Ii ai son has occurred with the investigating menber of that inci dent?
3. How is it proposed to allow the CCTV harvested to assi st the investi gation?
4. Where is the CCTV now froman evi dential point of vi ew?

Ser geant Mbnaghan shoul d supervi se the proper i nvestigation of this crime so that we can show to the victim we were thor ough and professional in our approach to sol ving the crime."

That had been then followed up by Sergeant Monaghan to you on the 8th September, where you clarified, in answer to the four points there:
"Sergeant Mbnaghan. Garda CCTV of poor quality saved, Kil martin CCTV downl oaded. St at ement regardi ng same attached to file. Garda Keogh has spoken with Garda X and supplied garda with as copy of the Kilmartin CCTV of car and suspect. Both incidents connected on Pul se. 14:40 Warning attached to the car regi stration, which is regi stered to a false address."

Under 3:
"CCTV forwarded with a request to be put on G Tube on 10/ 9.

Garda Keogh has original CCTV. Copies of same forwarded to garda (blank) at Ballinasl oe Garda station and G Tube. "

That's signed by you then on that date. That would appear to answer the questions obviously
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

368 Q. Now, that is sent up with a statement from Kilmartin's, page 221. Then on page 222, Sergeant Monaghan sends your report to the superintendent and says in the text of it there, in the middle:
"All the CCTV saved. Original sin the possession of Garda Keogh. A copy of CCTV has been forwarded to Garda in Ballinasloe. Garda Keogh has been in contact with this menber in relation to possible suspects for
both case. Another copy has been forwar ded to the collat or in Mullingar to be upl oaded on G Tube. Garda Keogh has put a warning on Pulse in rel ation to the suspected offending vehicle, has made contact with Gar daí in Kildare where the car is regi stered to. Thi s 14:41 address is false. This crime is still under i nvesti gation and any further progress will be reported as it arises."

Superintendent Murray seemed to have noted there:
"Noted. I appreci ate the additional enqui ries carried out, whi ch ensure the organi sation is achi eving its goals in rel ation to the investigation of crime. Report on the efforts at identification by the 1st Novenber."

So he appears to be expressing appreciation of what you had done there. Were you aware of that at the time?
A. I think there's more.

369 Q. It appears that you probably were, because there is a document at page 223?
A. There's nothing really -- like again, there's nothing for him to criticise really at this point. I thought this was the one where at some point he implies that
it's only where he gets involved in the thing that there's progress made. We skipped page 221, which is the statement at Kilmartin's, which kind of is what I said, where I go down the night of the crime and I look
for the CCTV.
370 Q. Well?
A. Sorry.

371 Q. You're contacted on the 8th. But he views it on the 10th and he downloaded and handed it over then, it would appear, isn't that right? But if we look at 223, Sergeant Monaghan appears to send on the minute from Superintendent Murray to you and then asking you to report any developments as required by the 1st November. Now you've included this as an aspect of targeting, is that because of the initial request from Superintendent Murray?
A. No. Again, I think, like the previous thing, I think this is then rolled into -- is this not rolled into more (Inaudible), like what we saw in that previous page, where $I$ am questioned about three different investigations on one sheet. I think that this doesn't just -- I could be wrong, but I think there is an end there. I am not sure. We11, I mean, what Superintendent Murray says in his statement, page 2049, is that:
"Queri es generated in this case were not in any way di rected to Garda Keogh personally but were intended to ensure the investigations were carried out to a high standard to fulfil his obl igations as district of fi cer."

Inspector Minnock, in a sense, goes further and says at

690 :
"These further investi gations undertaken by Garda Keogh resulted in good work and the successful identification of the suspect vehi cle on CCTV footage. The good work was hi ghl ighted to me as part of the ongoing oversi ght of inci dents on Pul se."

He also expresses the view that:
"It is clear to me that the queries kept the i nvesti gati on open and there was a successful outcome to the investigation. It appears Chi ef Superintendent Murray was al so compl imentary in rel ation to the further work conducted by Garda Keogh in stating that he appreci ated the additional inqui ries."

They in fact identified suspects who were arrested for this, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

373 Q. I think you made an application for overtime to attend I think for the purpose of the court proceedings in relation to that?
A. Yes.

374 Q. That was granted by Superintendent Murray?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you reported in on the basis of a relapse a couple of days before that?
A. Yes. I couldn't attend. I wasn't -- yeah.
Q. Okay. I think you certainly phoned at some stage on the day of the arrest to say that you wouldn't be there and told people were the file was?
A. Yeah, I did. I knew, I just couldn't -- but I did leave it in a position that others were able to -- the State wasn't at any disadvantage, another guard was able to deal with it.
Q. I think there was a conviction actually secured in the case then as well?
A. Yes.
Q. You became aware of that also. Do you regard yourself as having been sort of prodded to make the enquiries which led to the breakthrough, or is that something you were doing yourself in relation to the investigation?
A. The breakthrough was made essentially by taking a chance of going around to Kilmartin's petrol station that night and asking them, can you just check your CCTV to see did a car arrive in between such and such a time and such a such a time with a trailer. Like because the car had gone in that direction, pure chance.
Q. Yes.
A. And as it happened, the car did pull in. And that's how we got the footage.
Q. Yes.
A. In relation to the injured party in any doubt, the injured party I was working with and, as I said, was in the station, viewing the original Garda CCTV. I am sure I would have had to have shown the other CCTV
obviously to say, is this your trailer and take a statement or whatever way it went from there, I just can't recall. But I was in regular touch with the injured party myself in relation to that. So the injured party knew that we were doing our bit.
381 Q. Yes. But in terms of the requirement made of you by Superintendent murray in his memo of the 14th August that we have seen at page 215 , do they not appear to be sort of reasonable requests in relation to the information that would have been available to him on the investigation file?
A. This is page 219. 215, the third paragraph.
A. Sorry, what's your question in relation to that?

383 Q. The question was: Are those sort of enquiries or queries not reasonable perhaps in the light of the limited enough information that would have been available to him on the investigation file as submitted to him at that time?
A. That's fair enough, but again, on this document, you see, he's rolling three separate investigations into one on this document.
384 Q. Is that -- sorry go ahead?
A. Like, you know. There's the c8s, then there's the Mulligan's, sorry then there's the -- yeah, Mulligan's and then there is what we are dealing with now, the stolen trailer. So these are all rolled in to one. I am not sure, but I think that crops up again, where there's more queries down the line, where they are
rolled in again together. So I'm not sure if this just ends here or not.
Q. We11, I think I have opened a11 the documents. But do you think there are other documents?
A. I'm not sure. But as I said previous7y, when I was giving evidence before we broke, that, was that it? I had a feeling that what he starts to do then is, he rolls all these investigations, where -- on this single sheet of paper, he is now writing down effectively on three separate investigations, three totally different investigations with different things. he seemed to have viewed it as not an inappropriate use of his authority to ensure that all reasonable enquiries were pursued and that you had in fact been praised for following it through?
A. Yeah. No, this part, as it is now, it's fair enough. But I mean, do we not -- perhaps, you see this might crop up again in further sheets in relation to other stuff. I'm not sure.
Q. All right. I know you have told us previously that no other superintendent had sent down queries on sort of investigation files, that you took as criticism?
A. Not on this level. Not on this level.

The second thing, Mulligan's thing, are we getting on to that, because that's criticism there.
389 Q. We are dealing with all of them but we are dealing with them one at a time.
A. Sorry.
Q. I am not trying to stop you making a general comment, please do.
A. Yeah. I mean, in relation to that, I mean, there's no issue there. The only issue I have is, somewhere, from recollection, $I$ think he writes something down which implies that $I$ only going to get the CCTV, the relevant CCTV because he had written down to me. I recollect reading something and it might be further on down in another paper, which I am not sure of.
We11, 1 mean, $I$ am not criticising you at all, 1 am just trying to establish what the facts are. There doesn't appear to have been any mention or distinction between the two types of CCTV that you were aware of on the night and no information such that he raised queries about what CCTV you were talking about. That's
what all those questions are relating to. But on its own, I don't want to misinterpret it, but just looking at that query, the third query on that page, do you see that as targeting?
A. Just on those two lines, he's entitled to ask those questions, on those.

392 Q. We will pass on to the next one and then we will come back to the sort of combined effect, as it were, if you want to on that. The next one is criminal damage,

Mulligan's filling station on the 7th and the 8th August. This was one that was reported on by you also, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

393 Q. I will just get the page. This arose out of a report put in by you. If we look at page 215 , he has raised a query in relation to your report, which had named a particular family, isn't that correct? We don't need to name them now here?
A. Well I won't be naming them but I know the family, yeah.
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah. Sorry what page are you on now?

395 Q. Yes, just bear with me.
CHA RMAK Is that a convenient time to take a little break?

MR. MEGI NESS: Yes, Chairman. I have just lost my place on this document. CHA RMAN Anyway, we usually break mid afternoon. So that's as convenient a time. I am sure you'd probably appreciate a break. So we will do that and then we clarify. So, if I said ten minutes, is that fair?

MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you.
CHA RMAN Very good. Thank you very much.

THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED BRI EFLY AND RESUMED AS

## FOLLOW:

MR. MEGI NNESS: Thank you, Chairman. The document was
not where I expected it to be.
CHA RMAN That's al1 right.
396 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: In any event, the original file investigation that we are concerned here with, Mulligan's filling station, it doesn't appear to be in your papers, but we have located that at page 8942, which is in volume 31. For whatever reason it's a poor copy, it says:
"Criminal damage Mulligan's filling station, Roscommon Road, Sunday, 3rd August. Ni ck Keogh, supervi sor Der mot Mbnaghan. No suspects to date."

Is that your handwriting there?
A. Not the "no suspects to date", the rest of it is mine.

397 Q. Okay, there is an entry on the next page:
"Additional inqui ries, area searched for cul prits."

It would appear that that file went up to
Superintendent Murray and he considered it on the 14th. If we go back to page 215 in Volume 1, that we were looking at there, he says there in the middle sentence:
"In rel ation to Muli gan's, it appears (blank) may be suspect. Was this put to themin any way?"

You describe the queries in general from Superintendent Murray as oppressive and irrational. You said that
this was oppressive in the sense of Superintendent Murray, you put it, colourfully, is:
"Pie out of the sky nominating these suspects"."

And criticising you for not having nominating them because they lived two miles away, you said, and had no transport. The query is sent to you and you answer it then on the 20th August, page 216. It's the second query that you reply to on that page. It says:
"In rel ation to (blank) being suspect, there is no evi dence to suggest this and when I spoke to (bl ank)..."

Who is, I think, the owner?
A. The injured party and the owner.

398 Q.
"...he did not feel it could be as they could not frequent this area."

Sergeant Monaghan reported that up later that day to the superintendent and in the second paragraph there, sergeant Monaghan sort of conveyed that:
"In rel ation to that, Garda Keogh indicates there is no evi dence to suspect the (blanks) of this damage. On speaking with the owner, he is happy it was not the (blanks) as they do not frequent this area. Any
devel opments will be reported."

It goes to Superintendent Murray and on the 3rd September, in the letter that we have already seen, but the final paragraph of that:

```
"The crime file in rel ation to Muligan's has been sent to the victim§ office so they can informthe injured party of our lack of progress due to the unavailability of avenues of inquiry to progress the case."

I think that was the extent of any query that was raised and your response that dealt with it. The investigation file that we have looked at, I am not sure there is any reference to speaking to the owner, the injured party on it, but you hadn't identified any suspects yourself?
A. No. Actually, just on that incident, we were actually very close to the scene when we got the call.
399 Q. Right.
A. So we immediately went down, just from recollection, I think it was a door they broke into, there was glass. Again, I think it was cigarettes or whatever, but we searched the scene immediately because we were so close to the area. I do recall searching just the area, looking to see if we could find anyone around. I think the owner came that night, just from recollection. I'm not certain, I think, perhaps, but I was talking to the owner at some stage. Yeah.

400 Q. Superintendent Murray, in his statement to the Tribunal, says at page \(304 / 5\) that his nomination of this family group, as it were, as potential suspects may have written at a PAF meeting. He sees no issue with given their profile and said that the fact that someone doesn't have access to transport wouldn't preclude them from committing a crime a couple of miles away.

So, he was happy, he says in his statement, with your reply on this and he was happy to have it sent to the victims office because it was clear that there didn't seem to be any other available avenue of investigation. Presumably you agreed with that; there was no other avenue to go down? But do you regard it as inappropriate that he should, as it were, sort of have an overview as to whether that step that you then reported to him had been taken and that he could then be sure, in fact, that the owner had no reason to suspect these people as well.
A. I mean, I said in my original statement, pie out in the sky. I was going to say I couldn't put it better myself. But like, the persons that are nominated by Superintendent Murray live the other side of the town, Athlone, the river Shannon goes through it. I mean, there's plenty of other suspects on the Connaught side of the town that could have been -- I don't see any rationale for nominating those people as suspects for this crime.
in a sense his requirement of you might have prompted you to conduct that inquiry then? It probably did, I suppose.
A. But I mean, it was a needless inquiry. I can't really 15:17 comment on it.

407 Q. A11 right.
408 Q. CHA RMAN You didn't think there was any basis for it, and on further investigation the owner also ruled it
out, to confirm that view?
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MEGI NESS: But did you regard that at the time you got that query as targeting or bullying or harassment?
A. Again, the previous page, is it 215, where he starts writing down a number of these issues together and some of them were rolled up in -- and again, with this, I'm not sure does this crop up somewhere else in further 15:17 correspondence again. I'm not sure until we will get to it.

410 Q. We11, he certain1y appears to be, you know, reviewing the files certainly and raising queries where he thinks it's necessary. You think it is going further, is that 15:18 right?
A. I mean, I had said there was no suspects.

411 Q. okay.
A. Superintendent Murray is then nominating suspects himself, like, suspects are not from that area, they are from a good bit away and there's plenty of, let's say, local criminals until that area that are well capable of carrying out that crime.

412 Q. Did you nominate any of those?
A. I didn't, I didn't, because, I'm not sure, I think -- I 15:18 am not sure even about the CCTV or whatever, but I think if -- I am actually not sure but I think -- just this is in my head and I could be totally wrong, I think there were two individuals and they were well
covered up. But even at that, I can't stand over that because I just think perhaps, but I'm not sure. Perhaps we will pass on to the last of the four files that you raised concerns about. This was a robbery on 13th September 2015. It has got a particular Pulse number. You wrote a report on it and it's at page 229 of our documents. It's a handwritten report.
"Wth reference to the above, robbery fromthe person was reported 4am 13/9, the injured party..."

The details are given.
". .. was intoxi cated and after pointing out the scene was brought home by gardaí. Garda Keogh is going onto rest days and has two days annual leave booked and is not due to work until 19/9/15. Thi s was a serious i nci dent and the injured party may have injuries. Could this be forwarded to D/ Branch for favour of i mmedi ate investi gation? Forwarded for your inf ormation pl ease."

Superintendent Murray, in his statement to the Tribuna1, at page 2049, says that this was discussed at the PAF meeting, it would appear the next day, and that 15:20 Sergeant Baker brought it to his attention that the report was far from satisfactory, that Inspector Minnock felt the same and that D/Sergeant Curley assigned a member to carry out enquiries. Following
enquiries, the matter was reviewed and that doubts existed as to whether the incident occurred at all. were you aware of any of that at that time?
A. I'm not sure at the time. I have read, obvious7y, the documents, so I am obviously aware of it now and I
would have been -- yeah, as Superintendent Murray was writing out with all these queries in relation to this, obviously I become aware of it because I have to respond in writing to what he's sending me down on paper, questions in relation to it.
414 Q. Yes. I mean, he did write a minute dated the 23rd September, which is at page 230, relating to this incident. That was endorsed over to you. But that said, in the middle paragraph:
"In this case the incident on its face was serious.
The scant report submitted does not gi ve any indication of what investigative steps were taken at the initial reporting stage regarding the scene, searches of it, CCTV, i nj ured parties, account of events, descriptions of assailants, what was taken, what vi ol ence was used, what injuries were recei ved, whet her photographs were taken etc. These issues are the basic steps requi red at a commencement of any investigation. The duties of the first member at the scene are al so set out clearly in the Cl T manual but are not recorded in this report.

I requi re an expl anation, please, as to why this matter was dealt with in the fashi on chosen."

Now, he is raising several different issues about components of what might have been done and what might be expected to be done. Your report is on a short page rather than being on a form. Is that a common way to report an offence?
A. If I can explain this.
Q. Yes.
A. When that incident occurred, I put the incident onto Pulse, where I detailed everything. I particularly remember even something about McKenzie clothing or something going into the report, into the Pulse report. At the very top line:
"Re robbery fromperson, Pulse inci dent number 12207121".

A11 those questions are answered in that Pulse detail.
The purpose of the report that arose there, the scant report, was simply, I am not going to be around, this
is serious, because I am going on leave this, this is a serious incident, can you get someone from D/Branch to deal with this? That was all. That was the purpose of that report. I am not going to be around to investigate this, I am gone for I think the next six days, it's a serious robbery from a person, can you get someone else please in the next few days to look at this?

416 Q. Yes.
A. The details of everything, virtually every question he asks on page 230 are in Pulse, on the Pulse incident report.

417 Q. Yes. So this wasn't intended to be the sort of detail that would otherwise go in a report, if you are making a report?
A. Oh no, this is just to say, look, I'm not going to be around here, this is a serious incident, can you pass it on to D/Branch, because it's a robbery from a person, where a young man was mugged. You know, all the details of the actual incident are in the Pulse report on the computer, which I've referred to at the very top line.
418 Q. We11, there's certain7y a Pulse entry referred to. Anyway, Superintendent Murray's request was sent to you and you are asked to report by \(15 / 10\), isn't that right? One can see at page 231, Sergeant Monaghan sends it down to you. You reply then in a handwritten report at page 232 , isn't that correct?
A. 232, yeah.

419 Q. 232. You say:
"With reference to the attached report, the inci dent was reported to the gardaí at 4am 13/9/15. The i nj ured party was brought to the scene where it was searched. The i nj ured party was driven around the area in an effort to identity the suspects. There is no CCTV in the area the inci dent occurred. The injured party was then brought home and placed in the care of
hi s mother. When I returned to work on 19/9, having al ready written a report on the inci dent and put it on Pulse, I rang the injured party, who informed me that he had made a statement to a detective to the effect that he did not want the matter pursued by gardaí. The 15:26 attached report from Superintendent Murray is not hing short of a formof harassment towards myself. Forwar ded for your inf ormation please."

I mean, if it is the case that Sergeant Baker and Inspector Minnock shared Superintendent Murray's view that the report was far from satisfactory, it would appear that they may not have checked the Pulse or if they checked the Pulse, they also expected to have a report with the same detail in it perhaps. would that be common, to do that when you're sort of a guard who is called to the scene, or bringing the facts of the offence back to the station; that you put it on Pulse but you also write a report
A. You see, I didn't have to write a report. The Pulse report is on the system. So when they type in, log into Pulse, whatever, every morning, to look at what has happened and crimes and things like that, they would see the purpose of the report is, this is serious, I'm not going to be around the next few days to deal with this. For clarification, is the actual Pulse reported in this, that we can see what I inputted into Pulse, which would've been available. If they didn't look at Pulse, that's negligence on their
behalf.
420 Q. We11, I am not suggesting that they didn't. But I am just wondering, is what is required under
Superintendent Murray's system of reporting, is it goes on Pulse and there's also a paper file, starting with a 15:27 report?
A. Sorry, I couldn't hear the last part. I am sorry, I beg your pardon. Is what's required under Superintendent Murray's regime, is it that it should be put on Pulse and that there should also be a paper report? Am I misunderstanding it?
A. Well, no, there would be a crime file I assume with this as well. The Pulse incident and a crime file were what was required. What I did here, as I have already said, I'm not going to be around, this is serious, can you get a detective branch to -- it's a robbery from a person, it is serious.
422 Q. I mean, all the Pulse entries seem to be there, from page 225, 226, 227, 228.
A. \(22 \ldots\) sorry?

423 Q. 225 is the first one.
A. If I may read this out and I won't read anything identifiable.

424 Q. Yes.
A. Like this is the Pulse report, I report what was taken, 15:29 I put the location on it, the investigating garda, supervisor, the assisting garda that's with me, the occurred date and time and all the rest.
"I nj ured party wal ki ng home through (a certain area) to ( another certain area) and under a bridge was mugged by t wo mal es, €20 stolen. Patrol of area. I nj ured party pointed out scene with negative results. Suspects were Irish, in their 20s. One wearing a white Air Max top and black tracksuit bottons. Two wearing Bl ue MKKenzie wing sheet top. Both fled towards waste ground behi nd the I ocation. No CCTV. "
of course, that ultimately then is updated on the 23rd of -- do you want me to go into that or do you want to get on to something there?
425 Q. No, you have read out, haven't you, the entirety of the narrative?
A. of the narrative, yes.
Q. Yes.
A. It's updated then and there's another part of this which we will have to get to. But that's -- so I have everything in that pulse report.
427 Q. Yes. Now, in your statement you sort of queried why, when he seemed to regard it as serious, it got reclassified?
A. That's correct.
Q. Have you seen the evidence as to -- the basis upon which was reclassified and who reclassified it. That it was done as a result of a conference?
A. And it's nonsense. I have seen it.
Q. Yes.
A. It's actually very wrong. That should never have been
reclassified.
430 Q. Okay. Superintendent Murray says that:
"They all felt recl assification was the best course of action. "
A. Sorry, just for clarification again here, this is the guards, one person will make the decision and everyone else will agree.
431 Q. We11, I mean we will hear evidence from anyone else involved, but the decision to reclassify was apparently made at a PAF meeting, it was included in the Pulse narrative and that the rationale for it was included too?
A. I am going to dispute everything in relation to this. Pardon?
A. I am going to dispute everything in relation to this. what was done here was wrong from start to finish. There's a couple of correspondence in it, whichever way you want to deal with it.
433 Q. We11, what do you want to say about the correspondence?
A. No, there's a lot of correspondence, I suppose, I was just wondering, if we read through that and then we can go --
434 Q. Inspector Minnock was present obviously at the first 15:32 PAF but he said that decision was made to recategorise it in line with the Crime Counting Rules. That's what he says at page 683.
CHA RMAN Can you see that? I am not sure I am seeing
it, Mr. McGuinness.
A. 683.

MR. MtGI NESS: It's towards the bottom. It's the last paragraph on that.

\section*{CHA RMAN}
"At a later state the inci dent was agai n di scussed."

MR. MtGI NESS: Yes. As I understand it, it was Sergeant Curley who wrote the letter recommending the recategorisation on the 16th September. Were you aware of that?
A. Just one moment, sorry. Okay.
Q. The history of the Pulse recategorisation is contained in Inspector Curran, as he is now, in his appendix, commencing at page 507. Because you will no doubt have understood that when the detective went back to the injured party, he wouldn't provide any more details, he wouldn't make a statement about the matter, as I understand it, and didn't want the matter to be pursued 15:35 in any way further by the Gardaí.
A. You're correct in the last part, but I don't think you're correct in the rest. I read the injured party's statement in this documents, and the injured party confirms, to my recollection, I could be wrong, that he 15:35 was mugged but he doesn't want to pursue it. He doesn't say that there was no...

436 Q. Be that as it may, it's is recorded that he didn't want to pursue it and this says that he refused to cooperate
with Gardaí?
A. Correct. He refused to cooperate. This person had made a statement confirming the incident happened. He just says he doesn't want to make a statement. Theirs is a big difference, I think.
What else do you want to say about that?
A. Well, I was going to say like --

438 Q. CHA RMAN You don't agree with the reclassification?
A. No.

439 Q. CHAN RMAN Your position as I understand it is, irrespective of whether the injured party wanted to proceed or didn't want to proceed, the facts were the facts, there was a crime?
A. There was, Judge. I won't go into the details, I will just make it very quick. I was on in patrol car on church Street in Ath1one, the main street, whatever time of the night, this injured party was walking home, 1et's say, that direction and the incident occurred approximately half a mile away in that direction. The injured party got into a taxi on his way to the Garda station to report this crime. The taxi driver let the injured party out when they saw the patrol car, took details of the crime and obviously we went to the scene with the injured party and that. If this crime never occurred, I mean, the injured party was very close to his house, why did he jump into a taxi to come back, all the way back into the town.

440 Q. CHA RMAN The difference, if I understand, on this issue, the difference is, you say the fact that he
didn't want to pursue it is not relevant to the level of seriousness of the crime?
A. Yes.

441 Q. CHA RMAN So you disagree with the reclassification, you say that should not have happened, that was wrong?
A. Yes.

442 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. I have that. That's what I understood you to be saying?
A. Judge, I have no problem if they all want to line up and say, oh, it should have been reclassified. I was standing my ground on this one.

CHA RMAK I understand, yes.
443 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Sergeant Curley's recommendation made to the superintendent, which was apparently all discussed and agreed upon, dated \(16 / 9\), is at page 495, 15:37 Volume 4. Volume 3, sorry. There's a report Garda Divilly attached:
"I nci dent cannot be i nvesti gated wi thout the cooperation of the victim The credi bility of the
vi ctimhas to be questioned as it is not normally a vi ctim woul d ref use to cooperate and pursue a robbery compl ai nt. Consequently, I recommend this inci dent be recategorised to attention and compl aints following the out come of the intervi ew with the victim

Forwarded for your inf ormation and attention please."

That is what he has written.
A. Would it help to look at the what the injured party said in their short statement?
444 Q. I am not reviewing the crime, I am not even reviewing the process?
A. Oh sorry.

445 Q. I am just bringing to your attention that the way this was initiated was by the gardaí being sent out to interview the victim, who apparently refused to cooperate?
A. Declined.

446 Q. A report was made by Garda Divilly and it led to this recommendation which was discussed. You may disagree about the crime counting rules, you may disagree about how and when something should be recategorised. Is this regarded by you as a form of bullying and harassment?
A. Yes.

447 Q. That they have downgraded this from serious to attention and complaints?
A. Yes. On the day, the updated Pulse version is updated at 23/9/2015. "Incident recategorised by" and it's registration number as the member:
"...as per di rections fromdistrict officer Athlone..."

That's the superintendent Athlone.
"I nj ured party ref used to cooper ate with investigation and ref used to make a statement of compl ai nt. No
evi dence. "

MR. KELLY: Page 228, Judge.
A. 227 is what I read. Oh, 228 , yes, as we11, yes, that has the Pulse narrative.
Q. CHA RMAN And?
A. Very quick to say how the injured party refused. The injured party didn't refuse. If the injured party said no, I am not making a statement whatsoever, fair enough. The injured party makes a statement and says, 15:40 yes, this happened, but \(I\) just don't want to pursue it. The injured party didn't refuse to cooperate. He said, yes, it happened, I just don't want to pursue this.
449 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: We11, I am only going on the reports to suggest that they certainly appeared to believe they 15:40 had a reason to do it and they did do it?
A. That's called --

450 Q. I want to understand how that reflects discreditably on you in terms of either bullying or harassment or targeting. That's where I am anxious to see where your 15:41 reputation etcetera comes in as a result of that?
A. Two things. One, in reclassifying it, essentially they're fiddling with the crime figures there. That's essentially what they're up to. In relation to the second part of this, where we go through the to-ing and 15:41 fro-ing, the to-ing and fro-ing back in the correspondence between, let's say, myself and Superintendent Murray, if we can root that out, I think that will answer al1 the questions.

451 Q. I am sorry, Garda Keogh, could I ask you to repeat that?

CHA RMAN The to-ing and fro-ing in the correspondence between you and Superintendent Murray.
A. Should clarify everything.

CHA RMAN That's all right, okay.
MR. MEGI NESS: we11, that's where we have come to. CHA RMAN Right.
452 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Your handwritten report, we have opened it there. That was enter up to the
superintendent by Sergeant Monaghan. Perhaps we will look at that, at page 233, first. This is from Sergeant Monaghan up to the superintendent. It's after your report of the 2 nd October, forwarding it.
"With reference to the above, please find attachment from Garda Keogh in rel ation to your report on the 23/ 9/15. He reports that the injured party was brought to the scene and that the area was searched. The i nj ured party was driven in the patrol car around town in an attempt to identity any suspects. There was no CCTV in the area where the inci dent took place. He was then brought home and placed in the custody of his mother. On ret urning to work on 19/9, he make cont act with the injured party to obtain a statement and the i nj ured party informed hi mothat he had al ready made a statement to the detective garda in Athlone, withdrawing the compl ai nt."

So, does that reflect what you did? You contacted the injured party? Am I wrong in that?
A. When I come back to work, I think I contact the injured party, yes.
453 Q. Yes. okay.
CHAN RMAN And is that correct?
454 Q MR. MEGI NESS: And is that correct?
A. Pardon?
Q. Is this sentence correct in terms of what the injured party said to you?
A. That he made a statement to the guards, was it, and didn't want to --

456 Q
Q. CHA RMAN No withdrawing his complaint?
A. Oh, yes.

457 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: Can I read it to you again?
A. Yes, please, sorry.

458 Q. Have you got a good view of that, sorry? It says:
"On returning to work on 19/9/15, he made contact with the injured party..."

That's you he's talking about?
A. Yes, correct.

459 Q.
"...to obtain a statement and the injured party
informed himthat he al ready made a statement to the det ective garda in Athl one, wi thdrawing his compl ai nt."
A. That part is correct, yeah.

460 Q. So, I just want to be clear, are you telling me that the injured party, in fact, did make a statement outlining the robbery from his person on the night?
A. No. Not on the night.

461 Q. When did he make it?
A. I read his statement, I don't know what date, but it is in there somewhere.
Q. Ms. McGrath is showing me a handwritten statement made on the \(14 / 9\), is that the statement you're talking about?
A. I think, Garda A takes his statement.
A. Yes, that's the statement, yes.
Q. What did you take from, "informed by the injured party himself that he was withdrawing the complaint"?
A. He's entitled to, if he doesn't want to pursue the matter. He has reported the complaint, he doesn't want to pursue it. He is a young lad, I am not sure if he was sitting exams or whatever at the time. I just vaguely --
Q. Yes.
A. I can't even remember, but I think it was just he didn't need the hassle of court, let's say, or anything like that.
466 Q. Okay. So you had put it on Pulse originally yourself?
A. Yes.

467 Q. Now, is putting something on Pulse something that stands to your credit, such that if it's changed, does that affect your position as an officer in any way?
A. Like all these incidents have to go on, that's just standard, it has to go onto Pulse.
Q. Yes.
A. There's more stuff, I think there's more documents, is there not, here, in relation to --
A. Well, at that point, you know, there's no issue, that person doesn't want to make a statement. It doesn't affect Pulse. It's reported as a robbery from a person. I mean, that's fine. Again, I think as you go 15:47 further on into the thing, they are self explanatory. I am trying to understand, before we look at what Superintendent Murray did in principle, whether some entry that you make, if it's changed and changed
apparent, and I say apparent in accordance with the regulations, how can that sort of inure to your discredit or your reputation? Before we go on to look at the document, is there anything you want to say in answer?
A. I recall reading where there's a question mark whether this crime occurred at all. of course, I am the investigating officer, so am I wasting time essentially me investigating something that \(I\) should have had the cop on to know never even occurred? That's the way I perceived it. Then, of course, the day it's reclassified -- or do you want to move on?
474 Q. CHAN RMAN Tell us, go on, yes.
A. The date it's reclassified, I think on the \(23 / 9\), to attention and complaints:
"As per directions from di strict officer Athlone."

Superintendent Murray continues to write down to me, he had it reclassified to attention of complaints, and he continues to write down to me for a number of, I can't remember, let's say weeks.
Q. CHAI RMAN Yes.
A. About this serious incident, a robbery from a person, which he has already reclassified into something that there is no investigation into. They're the two, the documents that I am referring in the correspondence between myself and Superintendent Murray.

476 Q. MR. MtGI NESS: Let's look at them as separate issues and then we can join them together, as it were?
A. Yes.
Q. You have written your handwritten report of the 2 nd October?
A. Yeah.

Saying:
"It's nothing short of harassment."

Towards yourself, when you set out all details that weren't in your first handwritten report?
A. Because they were on the Pulse.

479 Q. We know that. But what I am coming to is simply this, he then gets this back, which accuses him of harassment and he maintains the correspondence and he writes a 1etter of the 13th October. That's at page 234 of our book. I think this is the one you wanted to get to, is it. Do you have that in front of you?
A. I was just going to say as well, like, this incident, somewhere between 3 and 4 am or so.

480 Q. Yes.
A. Whatever time, the early hours of the morning.

481 Q. Yes.
A. So after we conducted our search of the area, take details, put it on Pulse, drop that young lad home, it's nearly time to finish work as well. So, I mean, I am just writing the report in addition to what's on the Pulse. I just leave it \(I\) think on the sergeant's tray and that's it like, as in, this is a serious thing, can
someone just look at this, I'11 be gone for the next few days. The details, it's all detailed on Pulse.
All they have to do is turn on the pulse, which they would be doing anyway.
CHA RMAN Did you put that in your statement: Please see all the details because I didn't have enough time.
A. I am not sure, I don't know if I put that in it, I just don't know.

483 Q.
CHA RMAN okay. But you say it was there anyway to be seen?
A. Yes.

484 Q. MR. MtGU NESS: Garda Keogh, I am asking these questions because I don't know what is meant to be done. I mean, I appreciate these matters, everyone working at night, coming off duty and they come from a crime scene, attending to a victim, as you were obviously, but what is the procedure? Are you meant to write up a report in relation to that night, even if you are going off duty?
A. Yeah.

485 Q. Or is it customary for members to stay on and do it? Is there any rule or practice?
A. No. The report, everything has to go onto Pulse. Pulse contains the report with all the information. The so-called scant report that I wrote was just a note, look, this is serious. At the very top line of this, I refer to Pulse incident such and whatever number, this is a serious incident, I won't be around, can you get someone else, someone from the detective
branch to deal with this. This is serious. All the details that Superintendent Murray is on about, are all on the Pulse incident number. But again, of course, he then reclassifies -- has it reclassified, sorry, to attention and complaints and he continues to write down 15:52 to me for a period of time about, I think, we will be getting on to them about the serious robbery from a person, where he has already reclassified it to non-crime.

486 Q. Now, he did write to you on this date, I invite you to look at it, page 234 , he says:
"I note Garda Keogh's response to date, which is far fromsatisfactory. In order that I can be assured the organi sation's objectives regarding the investigation of crime are met in this case, Garda Keogh would be well advi sed to take caref ul note of his stat ut ory obl i gation to account, as set out in Section 39 of An Garda Sí ochána Act 2005, whi ch appl i es to every menber of An Garda Sí ochána equally and its i nextricable link to An Garda Sí ochána di sci pline regul ations. If the member feels he is in some way removed fromhis stat ut ory obl i gations, then there nay be remedy open to hi munder the policy document ' Wbrking Together to Create a Positive Wbrking Envi ronment'."

I think that is a reference to a bullying and harassment procedures document. It has got a long title like that, hasn't it?
A. Sorry, I just want to draw your attention to a line you left out. I am not being critical of you or anything, but the top line he has here:
"Robbery fromthe person."

The date is what, 13 th October '15. Superintendent's office. I mean, we are here on an update on the 23/9/2015:
"Incident recategorised, as per di rections of di strict officer Athl one."

It is reclassified to attention and complaints. There is no crime. There is no crime. He has it to attention and complaints, where it's closed off, it's finished. But he continues to write down to me under the heading "robbery from the person".
487 Q. I see. what do you take from that?
A. Here it is, if you reclassify the thing as case closed, it's over, it's finished, there is no investigation. He is writing down to me in relation to a robbery from a person, which I originally had put on. He is the one that had it closed down to attention and complaints. Apart from the fact that it should never have been closed off as attention and complaints, it is closed. But he continues then to write down to me about robbery from person.
488 Q. I see that. Everyone sees that, Garda Keogh. I am not
sure it's your best point. We will come to what may be a stronger point, or maybe not. But he says in the second paragraph:
"In the meantime, I await for a proper response..."

CHA RMAN I am not sure it's for you to say. MR MEGU NESS: No, it's the heading.
CHA RMAN If you don't mind, a minor asterisk beside that comment.
MR. KELLY: If you look at page 234, the very last paragraph.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: And linking that to the question which
Mr. McGuinness asked.
CHA RMAN Hold on a second, 234.
MR. MEGI NESS: We have it, I was going to ask the witness about it.

CHA RMAN Thanks very much, Mr. Kelly. No, no, I just thought your commentary on the value of his point, I
thought --
MR. MEGI NNESS: It's the heading of document and we understand --

CHA RMAN It's a minor matter.
489 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: "I \(n\) the meantime.." and this is 15:56 perhaps important to you, obviously:
"In the meantime, I await a proper response as to the actions taken on the ni ght this matter was reported."

I take it that you regarded your entry on Pulse as a proper account of it. And also the letter, the handwritten letter report that we just looked at before as also a proper response?
A. That was just a note to let them know I'm not going to be around, this is serious, you know.
490 Q. He goes on:
"I al so expect to see some written record as to what the injured party alleged, to incl ude a description etcetera of his assailants and an answer as to why my instructions of the 18th August were not complied with. "

Now what did you take from that?
A. You see, a lot of the time I don't think I even knows this is closed. I don't find this is closed off even until later on as we go down through the thing. So I am still replying to a thing I think is an open investigation to a robbery from a person. He keeps writing down to me and it's only at some stage when I have to go on to Pulse to look at the incident in order to reply to all these things, that \(I\) actually see \(I\) am replying to stuff that has been closed off I think nearly a month previously.

491 Q. Yes. But what he seems to be saying there is, you know, he wants to see a written record. From your point of view, the document at 232 , would you regard
that as an appropriate written record of the incident sent to the superintendent?
A. 232 was a reply to whatever he was looking for. All that's on 232 is pretty much all on the pulse report.
492 Q. Okay. We11, I mean, the other way of looking at it is perhaps to ask this question: In terms of what you have recorded in 232, was there anything else you could have added to it?
A. I'm not sure. I think injuries I think or something like that, perhaps something -- I think, perhaps
injury. I'm not sure. I mean, I can't remember. No, I don't think there's any major -- there was no major injury or if there was or whatever, I can't even remember.
On the medical side, what injuries had he got or what had happened?
A. I don't know did he say his leg hurt or something. No, I don't think there was any visible injuries or anything like that.
494 Q. Yes.
A. It wasn't a robbery by way of force -- sorry, I think there was a knife or something used.
Q. CHAN RMAN Threats.
A. Threatened, there was a knife held.

496 Q. CHAI RMAN He was threatened.
A. Pointed at him or something.

497 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: It's just, I am wondering, would you like to say or can you say, is there anything else that you could have added apart from that?
A. I don't think so. I think I had everything in it. CHA RMAN okay.
498 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: You then wrote back on the 29th October, some 16 days later. We see that response at page 235. You must have written this as a sort of back 15:59 sheet on the page.
"Wth reference to overleaf, I have complied in full with Section 39 of the Garda Sí ochána Act 2005 I note with the exception of how it was reported the i nj uri es."
A. "And injuries", sorry, that's my writing.

499 Q.
"Garda Mk[inaudi ble] and I were in the patrol car at
Church Street at 4am when a taxi parked besi de whi ch had come fromthe direction of... the injured party got out of this taxi and reported the inci dent to me. The i nj ured party di d not want medical treatment and stated he would go to the doctor in the morning if his leg was 16:00 still at him After pointing out the scene, he requested to be brought home, whi ch we duly obliged. I al so wi sh to point out that this inci dent was recategorised by Superintendent Murray fromrobbery from persons to attention and compl ai nts on 23/9.
Forwar ded for your inf ormation pl ease."

That's the only extent to which you could add to everything you had already said?
A. That's correct. Actually, as I say, it's only then when \(I\) am replying to all this reams of stuff, like this is going on months, rough1y, where it had been reclassified into a non-investigation. There is all these reams of paper coming down with this sort of stuff. It was in reply to the previous thing, it's going to Pulse, and then \(I\) find out this is already reclassified to attention and complaints, to non-investigation. And, of course, what I'm replying to in this, and this is on the 13th October, the letter 16:01 at page 234, which again Superintendent Murray, again headed "robbery fromthe person". He has closed it off. He has it closed off, it's officially attention and complaints, but he's still writing that to me as robbery from the person.
500 Q. Garda Keogh, I don't think the Chairman want to get involved into an overview of the wisdom of rules about categorisation or when they should be done or why they should be done. We know it was done here and we have drawn attention to it, particularly here, when it came to your knowledge. But can you just help me in this regard: How did the recategorisation in your mind affect you or how do you say it constituted either targeting or discrediting or do you say that?
A. It's targeting, it's discrediting. You've three in 16:02 this, you've targeting, discrediting and, of course, as a result when \(I\) find this being reclassified, I then look at some of the other incidents that I put on Pulse and I realise they're reclassified.
Q. CHA RMAN Just sticking with this one for the moment?
A. Yes.

502 Q. CHA RMAN If I understand, correct me if I am wrong, if I understand, your point is (a) it shouldn't have been reclassified?
A. Yes.

503 Q. CHAN RMAN You had given the information; (b) you shouldn't be criticised for not giving sufficient information because you had put everything on Pulse?
A. Yes.

16:02
504 Q. CHA RMAN (c) it is inconsistent irrational and wrong for the superintendent to continue to challenge you about your reporting of the incident when it has already been reclassified as in effect a non-crime?
A. Correct.

505 Q. CHA RMAN Is that about the size of it?
A. Yes.

506 Q. CHAN RMAN You say those are the complaints. It doesn't mean that they are right, we have to hear everybody else on it but essentially that's the case you make?
A. That's my case, Judge.

507 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. Just to have dates, like this is reclassified, I have here, 23/9/2015.
508 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. My last correspondence --

509 Q. CHA RMAN Is October?
A. It's months.

510 Q. CHA RMAN That's the very point I am inviting you to agree with. I am trying to summarise what I understand to be your real complaint in respect of this episode.
Is that right?
A. Correct.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Are we happy with that, Mr. McGuinness? Have you much more to go? MR. MEGU NESS: Little enough on this. CHA RMAN Could you stick it out for a few more minutes?
A. I will.

512 Q. CHA RMAN We will finish one this item. If you are okay and you are comfortable with it, that would be great assistance because we would then be able to tick off another one for the moment. okay.
MR. MEGI NESS: In relation to that reclassification, what effect do you see that it has on you?
A. I mean, he's belittling my police work. You know, he is going out of his way to belittle -- I mean when you look at it with, when you go back to some of the previous things, the thefts and whatever, there seems to be a build up here of, and lengthy reports and a lot of time and effort put into a lot of these reports, and essentially none of them are going anywhere from, let's say, his point of view. You know, he is discrediting, he's discrediting my police work. whereas, you know, incidents now \(I\) am dealing with he is effectively saying they never happened, obviously that has to affect me as a policeman. what am I doing in work? Am

I am wasting police time, going around -- I mean it is nearly as if I just brought the young lad home or something. I don't know. But in fairness as well, this is a very difficult period, because again this is October 2015. October is a significant month as well in what is going on, in the elephant in the room, with the investigation. Because at some point in October Garda A suspended. And that whole investigation is cooking as well. And every day I am coming into work I am met with all these reams of, you know, exclamations into, you know, the taking of the statements, is ridiculous, up to this robbery from a person where I mean it really -- for me, I am aware, as well, that my time in An Garda Síochána is coming to an end very quick1y, because I can't -- no matter what I deal with at work I am going to be pinned in on, it is going to be scrutinised to such an extent that, you know, it simply won't be -- and then --
514 Q. Sorry, I didn't want to cut across you, but in terms of the effect of the recategorisation, I mean I can understand how perhaps a victim would be fairly sore if they felt they were badly treated. But a recategorisation of some entry that you put on Pulse, it doesn't go on your record in any way.
A. No.

515 Q. Or, there is no procedure relating to either notifying you of it or it having any effect on you in your career, is that not right?
A. Well essentially what is being said here is that this
crime never happened. I mean, that's what's in the official thing. And then \(I\) read in the Tribunal documents that the injured party actually confirms, that, you know, made a statement to say yes, look, I was robbed but I just don't want to pursue it. And you 16:07 mentioned there about the injured party, and his parents do not know that this is on Pulse, he effectively is logged onto Pulse as effectively a liar, that he falsely reported something as well. I mean...
516 Q. Again I don't want to cut across you. I am not sure that whilst you're the investigating or the original officer at the scene, I am not sure whether you can stand in the shoes of a victim to claim to be affected by a recategorisation. I mean, the recategorisation isn't published within the force as something that you have done wrong or were careless about. Nobody is challenging you on this, are they, the fact that it was properly categorisation initially as a robbery from the person, is that not right?
A. It was a robbery from a person. It can't be classified 16:08 as anything other than a robbery from a person.
517 Q. Again, I don't know about these rules because we're not inquiring into the rules. But you I think brought this to the attention of Deputy wallace, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

518 Q. And your views were aired in Dáil Éireann in relation to this, according to Superintendent Murray's statement, isn't that right?
A. It would have been in general, in general, this -- as
all this, \(I\) perceive is clear harassment at this point and I would have -- yes, I did go to Deputy wallace. And he raised the matter in the Dáil in December of 2015, airing effectively your views on it, is that right?
A. He would have. I just can't be -- he aired a number of things, so I can't remember exactly which one. But yes.
Q. That's according to the chronology. You're obviously correct to point out that as of the date of this correspondence you had been confined to indoor duties.
A. You see, am I still out on outdoor duties? I am in the patrol car when the incident is reported. You see, some period in the first to the second week of October I think Garda A is suspended so --

521 Q. He is suspended on the 15th?
A. Okay.

522 Q. You are just put on indoor duties on the 22nd.
A. Yeah. There's about a week between.

CHAN RMAN 22nd October.
A. Roughly a week. So yes.

523 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: So whatever about any of these events, and I am not commenting on them, but certain7y as of the time --
A. Just for clarification --

524 Q. -- Superintendent Murray is writing to you, you hadn't yet been confined to indoor duties and Garda A had been suspended. But that was the position when you were replying to him on the 29th October?
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Yes.
A. Yeah. As I said, there's a lot going on.

CHA RMAN Yes.
A. At this stage, 18 months working alongside someone who was accused of such serious things. So it is not an easy place in work. Then when Superintendent Murray is firing all this stuff. I am coming in every day to have all these, everything I send up, everything is coming back questioned. That never happened before and 16:11 certainly not on the scale of this.

525 Q. CHA RMAN Were you suggesting there was something corrupt about changing the classification?
A. I don't think he's entitled to change the classification.

526 Q. CHA RMAN No, I understand that. That's: You know, you're wrong, and I don't agree with you.
A. Yeah. Corrupt, I don't know -- I don't think I could say corrupt in relation to that.
527 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. I would say just fiddling the crime figures.

528 Q. CHA RMAN I understand. But you think that was fiddling with the crime figures?
A. Yeah, but again, I wouldn't go into corruption.

529 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, forget that. That is what I was understanding. And I don't want to use too extreme a word, but you were saying that represented fidd7ing with the crime figures. Okay?
A. Just a clarification. You see, it's when you spot that

I then go on to Pulse and see there's other stuff which he has reclassified, and a lot of it is to do with me. And then, that of course -- like, we are bringing this to Deputy Wallace's attention, just to clarify the question that I was asked previously.

CHA RMAK I understand. Just let me explain. We're pursuing these things, as we have to do, individually. But Mr. McGuinness will ask you more generally about the atmosphere, so you won't be -- You know what I mean? The fact that we are concentrating discretely because we have identified these and everybody has agreed these are specific issues, okay?
MR. MEGI NESS: One question. CHA RMAN Yes.

\section*{MR. MEGU NNESS:}

Just at this point in time it becomes apparent from Superintendent Murray's statement that he is being made aware of information relating to the ó Cualáin investigation concerning Garda \(A\) and he takes steps to bring a number of matters to the attention of Detective Superintendent Mulcahy to assist him in his investigation into Garda A. Presumably you wouldn't think that was aimed at discrediting you?
A. No, no, I read that in the documents. Of course not. But again, it's another garda that actually brings that to Superintendent Murray's attention and obviously Superintendent Murray does what he has to do. There's no great heroic thing in that. He passes it on to -it's his job, yes.
532 Q. And brings a number of other matters to his attention
as we have seen in the statement. Does that change your view as to Superintendent Murray's attention towards you, that he was taking these other steps to assist?
A. You see, again it reads like that when you read the documents. But like, when that, \(I\) think there's a disciplinary investigation or something in relation to that, that is kept away again from my main, the criminality that the investigation team -- for some reason it's not included in it, it's kept a separate thing away from all of that all, and there's missing drugs allegations, they should all have gone into that main investigation. And you see, they start dividing a11 this stuff and it weakens the strand, in an attempt to weaken -- instead, if they all went into the main allegation it would have strengthened the evidence, all the other evidence in strands, but they don't. They keep it separate for some reason. Curiously as well, I mentioned about another report --
CHA RMAN Can I bring you back for one second?
A. Oh, yeah. Sorry, Judge.

533 Q. CHA RMAN I understand and, as I said, in a general we can understand and we may well like to know what it felt like and so on, but Mr. McGuinness is just asking you do any of these pieces of information affect your view of Superintendent Murray or do you stick to the fact that in all these respects he was gunning for you?
A. My view is still the same and it is very simple. He was sent in there to get me out of Ath1one, so

Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin could investigate in -- let's say, do the investigation whatever way he wanted to investigate. That is my feeling.
534 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. And he carried out that instruction.
A. Yes. 16:15 CHA RMAN okay. Very good. So that's the end of that item.

MR. MEGU NESS: I will review it overnight but I wouldn't think there is anything else.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Thank you for holding 16:15 on a little bit longer than normal. Okay. Thanks very much Philip. Right.
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\hline \[
122: 19,144: 22,153: 5
\] & 134:27, 135:11, & stopped [2] - 38:27, & suggesting [2] - & \[
72: 17,74: 8,78: 16
\] \\
\hline stand [2]-121:1, & 135:25, 135:26, & 39:13 & 126:2, 153:12 & 79:18, 80:23, 81:5, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 151:13 } \\
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\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 136:2, 136:6, 136:8, } \\
& \text { 136:9, 136:11, }
\end{aligned}
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\begin{aligned}
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\end{aligned}
\] & \[
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\] \\
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\hline 13:16, 13:18, 18:21, & 58:19, 70:11, 70:25, & strands [1] - 155:17 & 31:9, 33:19, 52:15, & 115:21, 115:28, \\
\hline 20:20, 81:29, 128:18, & 71:1, 71:7, 71:15, & Street [2]-130:16, & 52:24, 52:25, 115:11 & 116:1, 117:3, 118:1, \\
\hline \[
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\]
\[
77: 19,78: 3,78: 16
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\begin{aligned}
& \text { 118:24, 120:19, } \\
& \text { 121:23, 122:6, }
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\] \\
\hline \[
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\end{aligned}
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24: 15,125: 6,
\] \\
\hline \[
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\text { stal }
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\] & \[
84: 4,84: 16,84: 25
\] & 3:27, 3:31 & \[
-7: 22,7: 23,10: 5,
\] & 125:11, 126:4, 126:9, \\
\hline starts [5] - 31:13, & 87:21, 87:26, 88:2, & & 40:15, 44:22, 45:19, & 128:2, 133:28, 134:4, \\
\hline 53:9, 92:1, 112:7, & 91:23, 150:11 & 155:16 & 47:15, 49:14, 51:15, & 137:28, 138:19, \\
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51: 18,51: 23,51: 26
\] & \[
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\] \\
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stating [1] - 109:15 \\
station [28]-20:14
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\] & \[
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\end{aligned}
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\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
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\end{aligned}
\] \\
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46: 17,46: 18,46: 25,
\] & \[
72: 23,76: 6,76: 8,
\] \\
\hline 90:13, 91:15, 96:27, & 14 & 66:4 & 47:6, 48:2, 48:3, & 76:24, 78:3, \(78: 5\) \\
\hline 102:29, 106:2, & till & \[
109: 4,109: 12
\] & 48:19, 49:2, 51:3, & 78:21, 78:23, 78:28, \\
\hline 106:21, 107:28, & 44:18, 107:6, 144:20, & & 51:10, 51:24, 53:22, & 89:2, 89:5, 89:13, \\
\hline 108:21, 111:2, 118:1, & 146:21, 147:14, & & 54:20, 56:11, 57:7, & 90:24, 104:19, 106:5, \\
\hline 118:10, 118:21, & 152:12, 155:28 & & 58:2, 58:14, 58:21, & 109:5, 115:26, \\
\hline 121:23, 125:4, & stolen [6]-91:4, & & 58:24, 59:19, 59:21, & 116:12, 116:27, \\
\hline 127:20, 129:19, & \[
91: 14,101: 25,
\] & & 59:26, 59:28, 60:6, & 118:20 \\
\hline 129:24, 130:3, 130:4, & 102:28, 111:27, 127:3 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 25:18, 53:29, 65:13, } \\
& \text { 65:28, 101:1, 116:13, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 60:27, 60:28, 61:5, & suspected [1] - \\
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\end{tabular}
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\text { suspects }[15]- \\
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Thursday [2]-27:14,
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\begin{aligned}
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\begin{aligned}
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& \text { 119:4, 120:17, }
\end{aligned}
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teased [2]-54:8,
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
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& \text { tick }[4]-97: 4,99: 8
\end{aligned}
\] & transpires [1] - 7:10 transport [5] - 15:12, & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 32:29, 47:20, 100:14 } \\
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\end{gathered}
\] \\
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\begin{aligned}
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\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
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\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
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\end{tabular} & \[
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& \text { 103:13, 103:17, }
\end{aligned}
\] & 106:16, 107:2 & undermine [1]-66:9 \\
\hline & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 103:18, 103:23, } \\
& \text { 103:24, 103:25, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Tuesday }[6]-30: 3, \\
31: 19,33: 19,33: 29,
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { underneath }[2] \text { - } \\
& 50: 15,102: 8
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline \(€\) \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \boldsymbol{\epsilon 2 0}{ }_{[1]}-127: 3 \\
& € 300[2]-28: 23, \\
& 28: 26
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline É \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ÉABHALL }[1]-2: 29 \\
& \text { Éireann }[1]-151: 26 \\
& \text { ÉIREANN }[2]-1: 4 \text {, } \\
& \text { 1:5 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Ó \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{O ́}_{[4]}-3: 6,11: 2, \\
& 154: 18,156: 1
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline \\
\hline
\end{tabular}```


[^0]:    "I rel ayed this information to Chi ef Superintendent Murray and di scussed the matter with himbriefly.

[^1]:    "16: 15 ring Ni ck Qui nn, tol dim was goi ng drinking."

[^2]:    "On Tuesday, the 14th Decenber, contacted the menber by

[^3]:    "The details that should be included are: Date, time, pl ace of occurrence, bri ef and conci se narrative

[^4]:    "In rel ation to the stol en trailer, who supplied CCTV? No statement fromthat person on file. Has any effort

[^5]:    "The inci dent regarding the theft of the trailer requi res further expl anation in rel ation to the CCTV.

