TRI BUNAL OF I NQU RY I NTO PROTECTED DI SCLOSURES MADE UNDER THE PROTECTED DI SCLOSURES ACT 2014 AND CERTAI N OTHER MATTERS FOLLOW NG RESOLUTI ONS PASSED BY DÁl LÉl REANN AND SEANAD Él REANN ON 16 FEBRUARY 2017

ESTABLI SHED BY I NSTRUMENT MADE BY THE M N STER FOR J USTI CE AND EQUALI TY UNDER THE TRI BUNALS OF I NQU RY (EV DENCE) ACT 1921, ON 17 FEBRUARY 2017, AS AMENDED ON 7 DECEMBER 2018

CHAl RMAN OF DI V SI ON (P): MR. J USTI CE SEAN RYAN, FORMER PRESI DENT OF THE COURT OF APPEAL

## HELD I N DUBLI N CASTLE

 ON THURSDAY, 17TH OCTOBER 2019 - DAY 102Guen Mal one Stenography Servi ces certify the fol lowing to be a verbatimtranscript of

?thei $r$ stenographi $c$ notes in the above- naned action.

GVEN MALONE ${ }^{-}$STENOGRAPFY SERM CES

## APPEARANCES



FOR GARDA N CHOLAS KEOGH:

I NSTRUCTED BY:
MR. MATTH AS KELLY SC
MR. PATRI CK R. $O$ BRI EN BL
MS. A SLI NG MLLI GAN BL
OHN GERARD CULLEN SOLI CI TORS MA N STREET
TOVFPARKS
CARR CK- ON SHANNON
CO. LEI TRI M

FOR SUPER NTENDENT NOREEN MEBRI EN:

I NSTRUCTED BY:
MR. PAL CARROLL SC
MR. J OHN FERRY BL
CARTHAGE CONLON
O MARA GERAGHIY MECOURT
SOLI CI TORS
51 NORTHUMBERLAND ROAD
DUBLI N 4

MR. PAUL MEGARRY SC
MR STEPHEN O CONNOR BL
SEAN COSTELLO \& COMPANY
SOL CI TORS
HALI DAY HOUSE
32 ARRAN QUAY
SM THFI ELD
DUBLI N 7

FOR GARDA FERGAL GREENE,
GARDA STEPHAN E TREACY \& GARDA DAM D TURNER:

I NSTRUCTED BY:
MR. PATRI CK MEGRATH SC
MR. JANES KANE BL
MR. EO N LAVLOR BL
M5. ELI ZABETH, HUGES
MS. EABHALL N CHEALLACHÁ N HUGES MURPHY SOLICI TORS 13 WELLI NGTON QUAY TEMPLE BAR
DUBLI N 2

FOR

1. COMM SSI ONER OF AN GARDA SÍ OCHÁNA
2. CH EF SUPER NTENDENT PATRI CK MRRAY
3. CH EF SUPER NTENDENT MARK CURRAN
4. DETECTI VE I NSPECTOR M CHAEL COPPI NGER
5. CH EF SUPER NTENDENT LORRA NE WFEATLEY
6. RETI RED DETECTI VE SUPERI NTENDENT DECLAN MLCAHY
7. ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER M CHAEL FI NN
8. CH EF SUPERI NTENDENT ANTHONY MCLOUGLI N
9. RETI RED ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER J ACK , NOLAN
10. RETI RED ACTI NG COMM SSI,ONER DONAL O CUALAI N
11. RETI RED COMM SSI ONER NÓ RÍ N O SULLI VAN
12. ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER ANNE MARI E MCMAHON
13. CH EF SUPERI NTENDENT J OFN SCANLAN
14. SUPER NTENDENT ALAN MURAY
15. SUPER NTENDENT AI DAN M NOCK
16. I NSPECTOR EAMON CURLEY
17. GARDA M CHAEL QU NN
18. RETI RED GARDA GERRY WH TE
19. CH EF MED CAL OFFI CER DR. OGHVBU
20. GARDA OLI V A KELLY
21. RETI RED DETECTI VE SERGEANT TOM J UDGE
22. MR. ALAN MLLI GAN, ACTI NG EXECUTI VE DI RECTOR
23. RETI RED DETECTI VE CH EF SUPERI NTENDENT PETER KI RMAN
24. MR. JOE NUGENT, CH EF ADM N STRATI VE OFFI CER
25. CH EF SUPERI NTENDENT KEV N GRALTON
26. I NSPECTOR BRI AN DONEY
27. MDN CA CARR, HEAD OF DI RECTORATE, HUMAN RESOURCES AND

PEOPLE DEVELOPMENT
28. MR. BRI AN SAVAGE
29. CH EF SUPERI NTENDENT ANNE MARI E CAGNEY
30. DETECTI VE I NSPECTOR SEAN O REARDON
31. I NSPECTOR LI AM MORONEY
32. ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER DAM D SHEAHAN
33. CH EF SUPERI NTENDENT MATT NYLAND
34. CH EF SUPERI NTENDENT M CHAEL FLYNN
35. SERGEANT K ERAN DONEY
36. ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER ORLA MCPARTLI N
37. CH EF SUPER NTENDENT MARGARET NUGENT
38. GARDA A SLI NG SHANKEY- SM TH
39. I NSPECTOR TARA GOODE

I NSTRUCTED BY:


MS. SI NEAD GLEESON BL
I NSTRUCTED BY:

REDDY CHARLTON SOLI CI TORS 12 FI TZWLLI AM PLACE DUBLI N 2

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

QUESTIONED BY MR. MCGUINNESS7

THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLONB, ON THURSDAY, 17TH

## OCTOBER 2019:

CHA RMAN Yes, Mr. Kelly. Take your time.
MR. KELLY: Chairman, thank you very much for having
given us the time. Having re-examined the relevant documents and taken instructions of Garda Keogh, we are of the view now that we don't wish to pursue that issue, Issue 8.
CHA RMAN Very good.
MR. KELLY: The view I personally take is, it's a matter for the Tribunal of Inquiry.
CHA RMAK Yes, but as far as you and your client are concerned, you are not pursuing that part of Garda Keogh's complaint.
MR. KELLY: Correct.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MRPHY: I am very grateful to my Friend for that clarification.
CHA RMAN Okay. Thank you very much. We11, it seems to me that the proper course for the inquiry to take is to note that. Mr. McGuinness will, therefore, not ask Garda Keogh any questions arising out of that. Any submissions that anybody wants to make as a consequence of that are another day's work. But witnesses will not 10:55 now be asked, subject to any application or whatever in due course, but for the present all we need do is simply to pass over issue number 8 as not being proceeded with in evidence by Garda Keogh. Isn't that
the appropriate thing?
MR. MRPH: Yes, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Is everybody happy with that?
MR. MGUU NESS: I think so, Chairman.
CHA RMAN That seems the right thing to do.
MR. MGUZ NESS: I am grateful to Mr. Kelly for confirming the position.
CHA RMAN Yes, thanks very much, Mr. Kelly.
MR. MEGU NESS: It assists the Tribunal.
CHA RMAN very good. So that's the way we will leave ${ }^{10: 56}$ it. That's the only thing we need to do, we don't need to debate anything else; any implications, consequences or anything of that kind. All right. Thank you very much. okay.

## GARDA N CHOLAS KEOGH CONTI NUED TO BE QUESTI ONED BY MR. MCGU NESS:

CHA RMAN Next business, Mr. McGuinness, then is which?

MR. MEGI NESS: It is issue number 10, Chairman. CHA RMAN Thank you.
1 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Good morning, Garda Keogh?
A. Good morning.

2 Q. Issue number 10 relates to a complaint concerning the denial of a request made by you for the cancellation of annual leave?
A. Yes.

3 Q. At the end of August of 2015. I think we looked
yesterday in a different context, Superintendent Murray came to your house -- or sorry, was it your house or the station, on the night of the 30th August. I think you noted, he served a regulation notice, a discipline notice on you, is that right? we looked at Superintendent Murray's note of that meeting, you recall that?
A. Yes. Yes, that's correct.

4 Q. Yes, you recall that. In your statement to the Tribunal, which is at page 131, and we might look at that on the screen, you say in your statement:
"I applied to cancel an annual leave day, namely $31 / 8 / 2014$, for the purpose of attending a GSOC appoi nt ment... "

If we just scroll down the screen there a little bit.
"... under the protected di scl osures. My Iine manager, Sergeant Mbnaghan, approved my request. Superintendent
Murray, who was aware of the confidentiality of GSOC cormuni cations with nenbers, count er manded this approval, citing absence of a proper expl anation, in circunstances where I could not provide any more specific explanation, given the confidential nature of GSOC di scl osures."

You refer to appendix 9. Perhaps we should look at that. Page 211 in the papers.

CHA RMAN Am I just being stupid or should that be 2015?

MR. MEGI NNESS: I'm sorry.
CHA RMAN Because Superintendent Murray didn't come until March '15. He came on the 9th March '15, is that 10:59 right.

MR. MEGU NESS: Yes, that's correct.
WTNESS: Yeah.
CHA RMAN So that really should be '15.
A. You're correct.

5 Q. CHA RMAN And the leave in question was 31st August 2015?
A. '15, yes, Judge.

6 Q. CHA RMAN Am I right in that?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Okay, thank you very much. I wrote down '15.

7 Q. MR. MEGMNESS: So page 211, I think relates to your application. That's addressed by to Sergeant Monaghan?
"Re annual I eave 31/8. Garda Keogh. With ref er ence to above, I took annual leave on 31/8/2015; however, I was required to meet GSOC that day in Portlaoi se and I requested to have the annual leave cancelled for that day, Mbnday 31/8/2015. Forwar ded for your consi der ation, pl ease. "

If you go down the page slightly there. It says:
"Garda Keogh appl i cation approved. Sergeant Mbnaghan."

It's date stamped the $2 n d$ September. I am sure you noticed that Superintendent Murray in his statement said a sergeant can't approve that under the regulations. I don't know if you agree with that or not?
A. I'm just not aware of that.

8 Q. okay. If we just go back up to the top then. It seems to be endorsed by Superintendent Murray there.
"Appl i cation ref used in the absence of any proper expl anation. "

That was I think communicated to you. Just perhaps if we look at it, at page 210. Sent down to you then by Sergeant Monaghan.
"Re: Application for cancellation. With reference to the above, Superintendent Murray has ref used
cancellation of this day's leave in the absence of proper expl anation. If you still wi sh to have this day consi dered for cancellation, can you forward a comprehensi ve report as to the reasons and attach same to your D9 and resubmit.

Forwar ded for your inf ormation and consi der ation."

That is signed by Sergeant Monaghan. I think it's
correct to say that you didn't, as it were, take that further in the sense of submitting any further report, factually, at that point in time?
A. Yes.
okay. Now, I just want to understand the position. obviously in your statement you say you applied to cance 1 an annual leave day for the purpose of attending a GSOC appointment. You had, in fact, attended before you made the application that we're looking at here, is that correct?
A. It's probably correct, I can't remember the sequence of events. Yes. Well, I may be misreading the statement that we looked at on page 131. If we just go back to page 131. Down the page there, at number 10 .
"I applied to cancel an annual leave day for the purpose of attending a GSOC..."

As I understand the position, and this is why I am
asking you to correct me if I am wrong, you hadn't applied in advance of the appointment, isn't that right?
A. It would appear to be.

11 Q. Yes. So is it the position then that you had the 31st August scheduled as an annual leave say, on that day?
A. Yes.

12 Q. This is one of the points made, I am sure you have seen Superintendent Murray's statement: when you met him on
the 30th, as it stood at that at that point in time, it appeared that you were going off duty and wouldn't be in the next day because of your annual leave?
A. Yes.

13 Q.
In fact, unbeknownst to him, if I am correct, and I may 11:04 not be correct, unbeknownst to him, you had a GSOC appointment, is that correct?
A. That's correct. I can't recall just exactly how that GSOC appointment -- I think, just from recollection, I think the appointment was not a long-term, it wasn't preplanned long-term. I think it cropped up fairly soon prior to the meeting. The meeting was arranged.
14 Q. CHA RMAN It wasn't a long arranged meeting?
A. Yes.

15 Q. CHAL RMAN okay.
A. I think it was a very short period of time that the that the meeting was arranged. Just from recollection.
16 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. It's a curiosity just, in terms of the regulations. Having taken the day of annual leave and obviously not done regular duty, can you apply to cancel that retrospectively?
A. I don't think there's anything wrong with applying to cancel it retrospectively.
17 Q. okay.
A. Under the circumstances, as I said, it wasn't a thing that $I$ knew, let's say, a month or two months in advance.
18 Q. CHAN RMAN It came up pretty quick7y, you say.
A. Just from my memory, yes.

19 Q. CHA RMAK You went and you made the -- it looks like you attended GSOC?
A. I did.

20 Q. CHA RMAN And then you applied to say, look, did I that on a day of leave and I should be entitled to undo 11:06 the leave so I save myself a day. That was it?
A. That's correct.

21 Q. CHA RMAN It wasn't refused on the ground that it was retrospective?
A. Yes.

22 Q. CHA RMAN So it looks like there doesn't seem to be a logical reason why you couldn't do it. So either way, assuming that that's what happened. Anyway that's... MR. MEGI NNESS: In relation to the memo that we had looked at from Sergeant Monaghan back to you, I think you agreed with me a few minutes ago, you didn't take it further and you were asked by our investigators about this, if you may recal1, in the course of their enquiries with you. At page 58 and 59 of that. We may not need to see it, unless you want to. You said:
"No. They knew I was going to meet GSOC, as per my handwritten letter dated $1 / 9 / 2015$. But Superintendent Murray was looking for a comprehensi ve report of what I was going to meet GSOC about. The protected di scl osure 11:07 process is supposed to be protected and confidential. For mer Garda Commi ssi oner Ó Sulli van was saying publ icly she supported whi stlebl owers, but l feel Superintendent Murray was looking to ascertain
confidential information about my meeting with GSOC. I felt । had given an expl anation and did not feel । needed to give a further expl anation that I had al ready set out that I had to with GSOC.

The superintendent would have been aware that there were no papers served on me by GSOC in rel ation to any work rel ated investigation and that I was not a witness to any investigation bei ng conducted by GSOC, as this paperwork is al ways dealt with through the ranks.

As I have said, I believe that Superintendent Murray was aware that this meeting with GSOC rel ated to my protected disclosure and gi ven the protection as in that legislation, I felt that I had outlined as much as 11:08 l couldin my initial explanation in writing."

Can I just ask you a couple of questions about that
A. Sure.

24 Q. It's not evident from anything we have seen that
Superintendent Murray knew in advance that you were going to meet GSOC on the 31st. Would you agree with that?
A. I would agree with that, yeah.

25 Q. Okay. In terms of what you have said there, that the superintendent would have been aware that there were no papers served on you by GSOC, that's correct, isn't that right?
A. Yes. He, for his part, said in a statement that he wasn't aware that there was a GSOC involvement in your protected disclosure. Is there anything that you can point to which shows that he was or should have been aware that your attendance at GSOC related to your protected disclosure?
A. It would be common knowledge that I made a protected disclosure. He would be very well aware I made a protected disclosure.
28 Q. Yes.
A. I mean, I can't speak for him.

29 Q. Yes.
A. For Superintendent Murray.
Q. Yes.
A. But, the way it would work was, if a complaint, for example, had been made against me and GSOC were investigating, it would come through the super's office 11:10 and then come down to me. I'd be served papers. There was nothing like that. So my meeting with GSOC, I mean, it would have been common sense, it was something to do with protected disclosures.
31 Q. Yes. But as I understand it, you hadn't made a 11:10 protected disclosure to GSOC, nor had you made a statement to them until the 2nd October 2015?
A. Just one moment. You see, I had been in contact with GSOC for a while.
A. Well he shouldn't have been.
A. I hope he wasn't. Have you any reason to suggest that he was in fact aware that you were going to GSOC yourself or that you had been in contact with them about different aspects of the investigation?
A. I don't think he was aware and, as I said, I hope he wasn't.

Yes. I mean, we're obviously going to hear from Superintendent Murray, but he, for his part, having met 11:12 you on the night of the 30th, he didn't know you were going to GSOC. Then, when he got the explanation that you had been to GSOC, he thought it was sort of, slightly vague is the way he put it in his statement. He wasn't sure if it was genuine or not. I am wondering, would you have been able to produce any note of a letter or an appointment or anything to him, if he had taken it further, in a further report?
A. Well, if that were the case. And I understand exactly what you are saying.

43 Q. Yes.
A. If that were the case, it would be very simple for him to just write to GSOC and say, here, GSOC, there's an issue here.
A. Ken Isac and Ronan butler.

CHA RMAK okay.
MR. MEGU NNESS: The suggestion that you made about the Guards writing to GSOC, equally, on receipt of Sergeant Monaghan's notification of refusal, you might perhaps might have gone to GSOC and said, look, will you confirm that you met me on that day. Maybe that would have solved the whole problem. I am wondering, did you think of that? I am not criticising you if you didn't, but is it something you did think of?
A. That I should have gone to GSOC.

50 Q. You could have, yes. You could have, possibly, you could have gone to GSOC and said, look, my super doesn't seem to be certain that that's a good enough reason, but would you confirm that I did go to GSOC?
A. That's kind of six of one and half a dozen of the other.

I suppose it is?
A. He could have equally written to GSOC.

Then you might well have complained that he was, in fact, trying to find out, if he had written behind your back I mean?

CHA RMAN I don't think GSOC would have told him. MR. MEGU NNESS: well, they probably wouldn't.
53 Q. CHA RMAN If he wrote and said, did Garda Keogh -- but 11:15 I suppose you would say, I am just guessing, speculating, if Superintendent Murray's concern was, did Garda Keogh really go to GSOC on the 31st, or was he somewhere else and using this as an excuse. If that was the case, I suppose you would say, he could have come back to you and said, listen, please give me some confirmation that you were with GSOC. Is that a reasonable point of view? would that reflect your sort of point of view more or less? You didn't say that, but I'm sort of assuming that that's what you're...
A. Yes. Just, the notice that we had just on the screen to do with the -- it's gone off the screen.

54 Q. CHA RMAN Proper explanation, is it?
A. Yeah, proper explanation, yeah. The last thing that
came up on the screen.
55
A. But on the screen --

57 Q. CHA RMAN Sergeant Monaghan required a comprehensive, you are right he, wanted full details?
A. A comprehensive report.

MR. MEGU NESS: So did you take that, I don't want to put words in your mouth, as Superintendent Murray requiring you to explain why you had gone to GSOC?
A. That's the way it appears, comprehensive report is what I received. I don't know, like, I am not sure, it's a long time since I read the protected disclosures bill, I am not sure if it is even lawful that a person could -- that a senior officer would ask for a proper -- for comprehensive report, you know, as to a meeting with GSOC, when it is very apparent it is something to do with protected disclosures.saying more to him, more to Superintendent Murray in couldn't tell him any details about the fact of the appointment or that it stopped you going to GSOC and looking for a letter to say, look, I did meet you?
A. Any dealings with me and GSOC is supposed to be confidential. Just from recollection, that is a fairly big thing in their...
61 Q. Yes, in terms of any content obviously.
A. Yes.

62 Q. But you, in order to recoup the day that you had taken for annual leave, $I$ presume did have financial consequences if you were going to get it back, although not having been on duty, you had to yourself explain that you had gone to GSOC. That's the only context in which I raise the issue. Do you follow that?
A. Yes. And again, like, it is not that again I was looking for annual leave and they might have been down on manpower or anything like that. It was just to cance1 a day's annual leave. It wasn't a major thing operational wise on the ground or anything, it didn't affect anything there.
63 Q. Yes. But is it your evidence that what Superintendent Murray did in the circumstances was targeting you because of your original protected disclosure?
A. I am just trying to -- just one moment, targeting discrediting, $I$ am trying to get which category it falls under.

64 Q. CHA RMAN Victimising.
A. Yes.

65 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Either, or whatever?
A. Yes, the sergeant approves the thing. As I said, it's not a major deal because it's just to cancel a day's annual leave. The sergeant approves it and then

Superintendent Murray doesn't approve it and he's looking for explanations.
66 Q. Okay. You are saying it's targeting for that reason, is that right?
A. I think so.

67 Q. Did you feel that way at the time?
A. Oh yeah. Well I wouldn't put it in my stuff if I didn't feel it was proper.
CHA RMAN okay, very good.
MR. MEGU NNESS: I am going to pass on from that.
68 Q. CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Nothing else you want to say about that?
A. No.

CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
MR. MEGI NESS: The next issue, Garda Keogh, is issue number 11, which complains that you were confined to indoor duty.
A. Yes.

70 Q. On 22nd October 2015.
A. Yes.

71 Q. I am sure you recall that indeed. You say in your statement, page 135 , perhaps we might look at that:
"During this period..."

It's there on the screen.
"...I was reduced to indoor duty and confined to desk bound duties in the public office, carrying out,
ther ef ore, the most stressful job in the station, in circumstances where it was known to management l was suffering from work rel ated stress. Thus, on 22nd Oct ober 2015, Superintendent Pat Murray si mply, with i mmedi ate effect, reduced me to indoor duties. There was no anal ysis or right of representation. He said that he will revi ew the matter agai $n$ on 1st November 2015. He never di d."

Now, I think you elaborated on that in your statement to the investigators. Perhaps we should look at that, page 68 and 69 of your interview. You say there, in answer there, commencing on line 976:
"A. It was up in the superintendent's office.
Ser geant Mbnaghan said to me on the 22/ 10/ 2015 that Superintendent Murray was looking to speak with me. There was nobody el se present. Superintendent Murray said he was putting me on as permanent on the public of fice and he appeared to be using my sick record as a reason. At that time they (Garda management) were initially recording me out sick with the flu, while in fact I was out on intermittent work rel ated stress. It is my bel ief that they put me into the most stressful position within the Garda station, which is the public office. I suspect the real reason I was put on indoor duties at that time was it was just after Garda A had been suspended and he was the subject of my compl ai nt in October 2015. It was a message for everyone in the
station (a circul ar was issued to every sergeant in the district by Superintendent Murphy)..."

And you refer to the page.
"...so that every ot her guard could see they were making an example of me. Everyone in the station that I was desk bound and l believe that was a message for everyone. That's my belief."
A. That is my belief.

72 Q. You were then asked whether the issue of work related stress was raised or discussed at that meeting on the 22nd. At line 997 you say:
"A. No, there was no mention of me suffering work rel ated stress at this meeting but it would have been dealt with at a previ ous meeting. At a previous meeting Superintendent Murray said to me, you're under no stress, as referred to in my statement."

You were asked then, going to page 70, whether you were informed of the reasons, etcetera and you answer at 1ine 1004:
"No. He never gave me specific reasons.
Superintendent Murray mentioned it was in rel ation to my sick record but he did not gi ve me any specific reason for putting me on indoor duties. He said he was
goi $n g$ to have a case conference in rel ation to my sick record al so. My view is that the real reason for me being put on indoor duties, if you look at the timing, was because Garda A had been suspended. That is why I was put on indoor duties in my view. It was a ressage or other guards in the station as well. That's my bel i ef."

Is there anything else you want to add to that yourself at this point?
A. Yes, one thing, it caught my eye yesterday. It fits into this. You see, this is shortly after Garda A is suspended. Now, I had been working along pretty much, not constantly but pretty much on the same shift as Garda A for 18 months at this stage, which is very difficult. That's putting it mildly. So Garda A is suspended. But if you can just -- something that caught my eye on page 220, which is related to this, if it could be -- I can just point it out.
73 Q. Yes.
A. Page 2220.

74 Q. Middle paragraph.
"Brought up his whi stlebl ower...."

This is to do with -- oh this is to do with the phone cal1
Q. Yes.
A. The phone call we referred to yesterday.

76 Q. Yes.
A. It's the only phone call between myself and Superintendent Murray.
"Brought up hi s whi stlebl ower case and says he' s worried about Garda A and (blank), that they will get hi $m$ Has no answer when challenged. "

Just on that part there, the Garda A and (blank) informed Superintendent Murray

77 Q. Yes.
A. When I am put as permanent PO, Garda A is just gone. Like, as I said, I'm working 18 months like there in the station, with him, with Garda A. But Superintendent Murray, around the same time he puts me as permanent PO, he puts the garda that's marked blank onto the same shift as me. There's five units on the station, as we already confirmed, A, B, C and D. I'm attached to unit $C$ at the time. And puts that other guard, he didn't put him on $A, B, D$ or $E$, he puts him on unit $C$, on the same unit as $I$ have already pointed out, you know, I have clearly pointed out what I have said in relation to that paragraph. So Superintendent Murray was fully aware that the guard that is in that part blank, that $I$ have concerns about that guard. Superintendent Murray puts him on to my unit. Garda A is gone at this stage, so he puts that guard on to my unit. Then, of course, I am permanent PO, like public officer. I twigged that yesterday when it popped up on
the screen. Actually I had forgotten all about it, because there's a lot of stuff in all this.
78 Q. But you never complained about that before obviously?
A. Correct, yeah.

79 Q. And as I understand it --
A. I know.

80 Q. -- any guard on the unit would be out, whereas under this new direction, you were going to be in the public office rather than out on a unit, is that not right?
A. Yeah. But every guard that is coming on duty at some point is going in and out of the public office. I mean it's where you sign on and sign off.
Yes. But one aspect of the direction that you are complaining about is that you were being put on duty here while you were suffering from work related stress. 11:29 But these were days when you were fit for duty. When you were being certified off, you were being certified on the basis of work related stress by your doctor. But you're not suggesting Superintendent Murray was scheduling you for duty on days that you had been certified for work related stress?
A. I'm sorry? In relation to being a permanent public officer?
82 Q. Yes. The way you put it in your statement was that it was the most stressful job in the station?
A. Yes.

83 Q. In circumstances where it was known to management that you were suffering from work related stress?
A. Yes.

84 Q. But the certification for work related stress related to days that you were out sick from duty, isn't that right?
A. Yes. But I am under constant work related stress for -- this is, what -- for the last -- I mean, since -- I mean, even prior to making a protected disclosure I made back in 2014, which is not part of this module, but I am under constant serious work related stress all through, al1 throughout this.
We will obviously come to what happened in relation to the suspension of Garda A in terms of the management of it. I alluded to it yesterday. Superintendent Murray had received a report from a guard relating to suspicions which seemed to, on their face, increase the level of concern in relation to perhaps whether Garda A 11:31 should be on duty. They were acted upon and he was suspended on the 15th, including on the basis of a report from Superintendent Murray, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. Just to clarify one point, and I don't want to sound cheeky on this.

86 Q. Yes.
A. But I just want to get a point across.

87 Q. Yes.
A. In one of the documents behind me, it refers to Garda $A$ suspended in that, but $I$ don't recall reading any document there that says what specifically Garda A was suspended for. I have said on the first day giving evidence that I do believe there is a report that should be in there.

88
A. Garda A is suspended but nobody knows what Garda A is suspended for. I don't think it's is in anything there.

89 Q. I think you are actually wrong about that.
A. okay.

90 Q. We will come to that in due course. In the previous year, had you been approached for a consent to the disclosure of your protected disclosures, for local management, so they could discuss the issue of suspension back in 2014? Do you remember being approached to consent to a disclosure statement?
A. Oh yes, by detective superintendent Mulcahy.

91 Q. Yes.
A. To the head of HR, who was Assistant Commissioner Fanning at the time, I think.

92 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

93 Q. In the summer of 2014?
A. That would be right.

94 Q. I think you refused to consent?
A. Yes. Just to clarify.

95 Q. Yes.
A. When I made my protected disclosure originally, I knew nothing about -- I didn't know, I suppose, really anything about senior management. I might have known the name of my own chief, super, own chief. I would say that's all through my career, I wouldn't have even known the names of assistant commissioners or anything
like that. I didn't know, it was just that this was to go to HR, I didn't know who Assistant Commissioner Fanning or anything like that was. I knew nothing about them. Because I knew nothing about them, I obviously would be mistrustful of Garda management. I didn't want the statement to go to HR. In hindsight, of course, you know, what I am later to know as things go on, of course I made a huge mistake there. But at the time, what you have said is correct, yes.
Yes. You may not have known it, but there was, in fact, a sort of conference of all the stakeholders at that time to address the issue as to whether a suspension was either justified or appropriate at that point in time?
A. Yeah. Now just to clarify, I recall Detective Superintendent Mulcahy saying to me, will you consent to give your statement to HR , and I wouldn't. But I don't recall him saying the issue of suspension hinges on this. I don't remember that. I don't think that was explained properly to me, that. Perhaps he thought 11:34 I knew that it has to -- the suspension -- I didn't know that the suspension hinged on the statement going to HR. I didn't know again at the time. I was less knowledgeable than I would be now.
97 Q. Okay.
A. Yeah.

98 Q. We will come back to it in a different context, but you had, in fact, been agitating, and I use that is a neutral way, because it was something you wanted to
have achieved, the suspension of Garda $A$ at that point in time?
A. I think that's wrong, I had achieved is not fair wording.
99 Q. Well, consideration. You wanted more active consideration to be given to it at that earlier point in time?
A. Yes. In relation to the suspension, you see, there's a huge issue in that when statements were taken, Garda A was present, you know, in the station while the investigation team were taking the statements, you know. He was able to see every guard that was making statements, it was insane. I had given enough evidence back in 2014, where there was enough evidence to make a suspension and a start. As I said, I didn't realise it 11:35 hinged on my statement going to HR. I didn't know that.

100 Q. Okay. We11, I am just coming round to ask you about your assertion here that we have looked at, that, in fact, you were put in a more stressful and the most stressful job in the station, where in the circumstances Garda A was now off the pitch, if I can use that colloquialism. Would that not have, in fact, tended to perhaps alleviate the ongoing concerns that you have recorded in your diary and were talking about?
A. That's what I thought. When I got the word that Garda A had been suspended, I thought, right, they'11 back off from me now and things will get better and, you know, they'11 just leave me alone now. But, of course,
that's not what happens. I then get station bound into the public office. I got station bound into the public office. As I said, then there is Garda A's friend, let's say, is moved on to my unit. So it's a double whammy.

101 Q. He was always on duty as we11, in Ath1one too, that other guard?
A. Yes.
Q. You had never raised any concern about him either?
A. I am only after reading now where I had raised concern. 11:37 That's why I referred to page 2220 , which I spotted yesterday.
Q.

But I have to obviously draw to your attention Superintendent Murray's account of the meeting he had on the 22nd October with you. It's at page 2046 of our 11:37 papers. It's the bottom half of that page. You see the reference to PM39 and then it starts:
"I met Garda Keogh agai $n$ in my office in rel ation to this matter on the 22nd October 2015 to serve a form
I A14 on himat the request of chi ef superintendent, West meath. I noticed that Garda Keogh had deteriorated in that he di dn't seem well to me."

Do you agree with that?
A. You see, I can't agree with Superintendent Murray's notes, in that some parts are true, some parts are half truth and other parts are false.
Q. We will go through this and then we will look at his
notes. But were you well at that point in time yourself?
A. Oh in general, I was under serious stress. I mean, again, I was just -- we're in October now, Garda A is suspended, you know, there are people in the station as 11:38 well that think I made everything up, you know, it is a difficult time.
Q. No, I understand that. I understand that. But he said:
"I asked himabout his health and his drinking and he woul dn't answer."

Is that right?
A. That would be correct.
"I noticed his hand shaking a lot, to the degree that he could barel y si gn his name while acknow edging recei pt of formA114."
A. That's very interesting, because nobody else makes that -- people, let's say, I'm regularly working with or whatever don't make that allegation. what's interesting is, like, why would you put the person who has the shakiest hands in the station at the public counter, that's signing al1 the passports and everything else for the public. Like it makes no common sense to do that.

CHAL RMAN we11, he might be hoping that you wouldn't be, that the person's hands wouldn't be shaking. He might be hoping that the reasons why they were shaking would have been removed.
A. You see, as I said --
Q. CHA RMAN Do you what I mean?
A. -- I can't say my hands --
Q. CHA RMAN I don't know whether that's right or wrong?
A. As I said, if anyone else said -- if certain other persons said that, I would probably have said, fair enough or that. But with Superintendent Murray, there's so much, let's say, stuff that I cannot agree with in his notes, that $I$ just have difficulty with that.
A. Then, as I said, to put that person in pull public view and everything, if this is the case, why would you do that?

110 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: We11, he says:
"I di scussed with hi mhis frequent si ckness absence and his impact on his ability to follow up on work rel ated matters."

Did he do that?
A. Sorry, just...

111 Q. It's after the reference to the form A114?
A. I will just glance at my own notes. It's very short.

112 Q. Yes.
A. Yes, he spoke to me about sick leave, yeah.
"I expl ai ned that I had di scussed the lack of progress and some matters invol ving Garda Keogh with Sergeant Mbnaghan while going through his incident list at a PAF 11:41 meeting with Sergeant Mbnaghan on 19th October 2015. Garda Keogh di dn't seem with it to me and I asked him if he felt fit enough to be in work."

Do you recall that?
A. I don't recal1 that.
Q.
"He sai d he did."
A. I can tell you for a fact that "he said he did", I not alone have a note of it -- oh sorry, sorry. Excuse me, sorry. I am not sure just about that but I do recal1 in that meeting, I didn't even look at Superintendent Murray. So I don't know even -- I remember just looking out the window while he was talking away, he obviously has his own notes and a version of the conversation. I wasn't very chatty to him.

115 Q. Yes. On this point, did you say that you were fit to do the job?
A. I just can't recall on that.

116 Q. Just in terms of what you are describing about your demeanour in the meeting, were you sort of not bothering to pay attention to what he was saying?
A. Oh no, it's not that I wasn't bothered. Like, I had
stated fully Superintendent Murray's agenda. So, I mean, to put it mild7y, he's not in my circle of trust.
117 Q. okay.
"As a result of what I saw, I expl ai ned to hi mthat I 11:42 would have to assi gn himto indoor duty. I di scussed that with him expl ai ning the reasons why and referring to our conversation of the 30th August, where we had di scussed the possi bility of this happeni ng."

We looked at that note, I think, yesterday. Did he make reference to that?
A. Sorry, where is that?

118 Q. It's five lines up from the bottom there.
A. He did, he said he was assigning me, putting me on indoor duty. He said that. "Explained the reasons", I am not sure about that. "Possibility of this happening", that part I think is true. Oh:
"He appeared to me to agree with the course of action..."

I don't know how he could have... just:
"He appeared to me to agree with the course of action I 11:43 was taking".

Like I would have been just looking out the window. 119 Q. We11, he's not purporting to say that you said, yes,
that's fine, but he's saying you seemed to be taking it. I mean, did you raise any issue with it, from your side?
A. From my recollection again, I don't think I spoke really at all at that meeting. I think I just sat down, looked out the window and that was it.

120 Q. You neither expressly agreed or disagreed?
A. Yes.

121 Q. Okay. So that might have conveyed to him that you were going along with it, as it were?
A. I suppose anyone could interpret it in any different way.

122 Q. All right. It's just in your complaint, you seem to be sort of implying that you should have been given a hearing or charges or some right of representation in relation to the matter. I mean, you're not suggesting that he should have indulged in any greater degree of formality of procedure, or are you?
A. Oh, my view is that he put me, as I said, in the public office, it is the most stressful job in the station, there's no question, you're answering the phones, , you're dealing with the prisoners and dealing with all the members of the public that are coming in. It is by far the most stressful job in the station, and equally, for me, after all we have gone through yesterday, it's the place where you're most likely to get landed with complaints and things like that from members of the public. At that stage, of course, any interactions I am having with the public or investigations or anything
that's reported to me is scrutinised to such a level that, you know, I know my career is pretty much finished once I am put po, because essentially I am trapped there. You know, I'm a sitting duck in that position, because there's going to be people coming in reporting stuff to me and, you know, I am going to be under intense scrutiny of anything that's reported to me. So that's -- I think, we at the end of October. There's November. So yeah, I am on the way, let's say, I think I have two months left in my career.
123 Q. We11, that's as it turned out, of course, you went permanently?
A. Yes.

124 Q. On work related stress.
A. Yes.

125 Q. We will come to that in the next issue. His note at page 2256 effectively reflects what $I$ put in the paragraph there to you, except the last three lines aren't included. He has you recorded there as saying okay.
"He sai d okay."

Do you see the third last line? You don't recollect saying okay?
A. I don't, but I may have said okay. I may have said that. I just can't dispute whether I said okay or not.

126 Q. He has this in the note, it's not in the later statement. Nothing probably turns on that:
"I asked himif suspensi on of Garda A would allow hi m come to work more, as he used Garda A's presence up to now as an excuse for going sick. He made no answer."

Was there any discussion about that, what had happened the week before?
A. I just don't recall that. But again, I can't dispute it. I just can't recall that part.
127 Q.
okay. The document that he presented to you for signature is at page 2259, perhaps we might just look at that. Your signature appears to be down there at the bottom of the page.
A. That's my normal signature. There's nothing wrong with that. That is my normal signature, so I don't see anything wrong with that.
128 Q. His report up to the chief super is at page 2260, which sort of briefly describes what he says happened there. Then the instruction that he gave is at 2261, this is in your own set of papers as well.
A. Just on the signature, if you wish to compare it with any other signature, $I$ have no objection to that. That signature is perfectly fine.
129 Q. I am not going to turn myself into a witness or offer a view one way or another?
A. Right, sorry.

130 Q. We don't want to start down that course.
131 Q. CHA RMAN No, but you say that if it was as bad as is recorded, there should be some obvious differences.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN That's what you say.
A. Yes. I don't see any --

CHA RMAN I mean, it's not a question of a handwriting expert, but you say it should be obvious?
A. He definitely didn't say anything to me, like, oh your hand's shaking or anything like that. I know he didn't say that but I read it in other stuff.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MEGU NNESS: You're saying it wasn't reviewed, to your knowledge anyway, there was sort of a note there that it would be reviewed by the 1st November?
A. Yes.
Q. You weren't aware of any review?
A. I wasn't aware, but $I$ have since read in documents that 11:49 there was a review. I certainly want informed, from my recollection, about being reviewed.
Q. Yes.
A. Sorry, I'm aware he said it will be reviewed, just for clarification, but I wasn't aware of anything after that, whether the matter was reviewed or not.

137 Q. Yes. That issue then, you consider that targeting obviously, is that right?
A. Yes, yes.

On what basis did you consider it targeting?
A. Because for me, Garda A is suspended and it appears that Garda management are now going to -- as I stated, I thought, great, they'11 be off my back now, I'11 be able to go in and they'11 just leave me alone and I
will be able to get back, you know, working and whatever and things might get better. But when Garda A is suspended, they don't do that. In fact, it's like as if -- the way $I$ perceived it is, we are not going to allow this so-called whistleblower to be winning, is the way I think they viewed it. That they were not going to allow this guy to be seen as he is winning. Therefore, we are in charge and we're going to show we're in charge, you know, and therefore we're putting this guy in the public office. It's circulated to everybody else around the place that the whistleblower is going in to the public office. I think that's -now I may have that wrong but that's my belief.
139 Q. okay. I mean in the ordinary events, if people are changing units, you expect to see a circular saying that Garda x is now being assigned to this, and everybody be made aware of it?
A. Yes.

140 Q. There's nothing in the circular itself. It's the decision that you're complaining about. I don't know if you noticed it in Inspector Minnock's, as he was at the time. He said that:
"Pat Murray was trying to ensure hi gh standards whi ch gave confidence to public in policing and that the rationale for this decision appeared unrel ated to other matters."
A. I don't agree with that. Again, I could be wrong but
in relation to what was circulated about me going on to indoor duties, that just refers to me. I think around that time other members were moved units. They may have been on another sheet of paper. It was very clear what was circulated about me was me alone, what is circulated on indoor duties.

141 Q. It would appear that Inspector Minnock, in the papers that were sent to mr. de Bruir, said that he thought this was done in your best interest, to confine you to indoor duties. You don't agree with that point?
A. I absolutely would reject that. Absolutely.

142 Q. CHA RMAN Can I clarify something?
A. Yes.

143 Q. CHA RMAN AS I understand your point, your point, as I understand it, is: If I was in the condition that Superintendent Murray was talking about, then it was inappropriate, trying to use as neutral a word as possible, to put such a person as the station officer?
A. Yes.

144 Q. CHA RMAN Because it's visible, highly visible, people coming in and out, there's a lot of things about -- we would things about arrests and everything else and so on, presumably.
A. of course.

145 Q. CHAN RMAN would you have to do those things?
A. Custody records, I would have been the one dealing with al1 the custody records. I mean, even for the purpose of evidence in court, where custody records are written and all the rest, why would you put the person that --

146 Q. CHA RMAN Somebody being arrested would have to go to the -- are you the officer in charge in the station, is that the position?
A. I would have been over prisoners that would have come in, in that period.
147 Q. CHA RMAN An arresting guard would have to have you endorse the decision to keep the person in custody, is that right?
A. And detention, Section 4 detentions and all that.

148 Q. CHA RMAN That's what I am thinking of?
A. There would be a lot of legal stuff there. And again, like, I mean, if I was in that condition --
149 Q. CHA RMAN Just let me follow for a second. You are saying, if I was in that condition, if a person was in that condition, it would not be a sensible thing to put 11:54 such a person in that position?
A. Correct.

150 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. Yes.

151 Q. CHA RMAN You're not saying that that position is 11:54 necessarily a kind of punishment job? I mean, there must be somebody on duty in the station. Your point is, if you were in the condition as reported, is that right?
A. Yes. Yes. But on the other bit, the first matter you 11:54 brought up, usually the way it is done is, let's say there's eight on the unit, someone would usually be landed with the public office. You might have two more in patrol cars.
Q. CHA RMAN It wouldn't be the most enviable job?
A. Correct. The next day they would put somebody else into the public office and it would rotate again. But I am put on permanent.
Q. CHA RMAN It's regarded as a difficult job?
A. Oh, it's by far the most difficult. By far. In every station in the country.
154 Q. CHA RMAN You also say stressful and so on?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN So there's two points. okay, I have that. 11:55 Thank you. Do you want to ask anything arising out of that, Mr. McGuinness?
155 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Just a couple of matters. Sergeant Haran in his statement said he wasn't consulted in relation to the decision. I am not sure whether (Inaudible) or not. Sergeant Sergeant Monaghan said that the general minute was circulated there and he detailed you for duty in the public office. That you took annual leave on the 9th November. But he said you didn't raise any query in relation to this direction with him.
A. Sorry?

156 Q. Sergeant Monaghan.
A. Yeah. I mean, what do I raise? It's common sense what's going on. There's nothing to raise. We have heard, what we have gone through yesterday, all the paperwork would have been coming down through Sergeant Monaghan or Sergeant Haran. There's no point in me raising an issue, it's something that's so common
sense.
157 Q. Yes.
A. I mean in what's going on in general there, yeah.

158 Q. We11, Sergeant Haran has said that, you know, he was aware that you were unhappy with it and that he offered support and encouragement. He said you struggled to be on time for early shifts and talked about going on long-term leave. He tried to discourage you from doing that. But you thought this was a ploy at that stage, is that right, the confinement?
A. Yeah, yeah. As I previously said, once they had me in there, pretty much had me trapped in a place where I know I'm going to get nailed inevitably on something. I know that. That's inevitable. Yeah.
159 Q. But in your own mind then, your belief, you relate it to the protected disclosure. You think that's why it happened, is that right?
A. Oh sure it's all linked, like, the whole thing is all linked.
160 Q. Why do you say it's linked, just to be clear. Could you just, as it were, encapsulate why you say it's linked and it's targeting and discrediting?
A. The whole chain of everything that we've gone through so far, it's all linked. I never had any of this prior to making the protected disclosure. Nothing on -pretty much anything we have gone through or discussed, I had nothing. Once a year, perhaps, a sergeant might pull me in and say, listen, there's something to do with a file, or there's something not right or
whatever, roughly. I mean roughly once a year. This is just -- what happens here, $I$ just can't think of a word for it. It just avalanches after 2014, and, of course, into '15 and that, yeah.
161 Q. Okay. There's nothing more I want to ask you about this issue. Chairman, do you want to take a break? CHA RMAN Yes. I think that's probably a good idea. I know we started a little bit later but $I$ think we will stick with our original. That's all very well, but Garda Keogh has been sitting here, either waiting to give evidence or giving his evidence or consulting or whatever it was. We will take a break. Just give me two minutes, two seconds. okay. Thank you very much. We will take a break and then we will move on to the next issue. Thank you very much.

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

 FOLLOVG:162 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Garda Keogh, this complaint is
encapsulated in issue number 12 , which is complaints in relation to the misrecording of your sick leave and the reduction in salary. You make a point, which is obviously well made in the context of your early history of absences, that you had in fact very little, in fact no absences for a very considerable period of your career through illness?
A. I think 11 and a half years as a straight run, let's say, as a civil servant of the state, without taking a
single sick day.
163 Q. Perhaps if we just look at Volume 38, page 10725. You have probably seen these, they're manual records in the paper disclosure?
A. Yeah. 10725. At the top there, that's year ending March '01, ni1; year ending March '02; nil, the same for '03, '04. Then if we go up to the previous page, 10724, going down the page: '05 nil; '06 nil; '07 nil; Athlone three years there, '08, '0 9, '10, nil, nil, nil. Then if we go up to the preceding page, 10723?
A. Well, the year 2000 is missing, that was nil as well.

165 Q. We11, the first one runs from 2000 up to 2001?
A. Sorry.

166 Q. Then the first sick day is 5th October 2011. There were then eight six days between then and the end of the year. Then if we go to what is in reality a departure from the system of manual record keeping, to page 10721, where it picks it up from the tail end of 2011. If we go to the bottom of the page. We may have to magnify that slightly, to make it easier to read on the screen. But it shows -- six lines up then is the -- it goes into 2012 with sick days out, which finish on the sixth line up from the bottom, an
A. That's, yeah.

167 Q. Nothing to do with the protected disclosures or stress, is that right?
A. We11, you see, I don't think I even tell my doctor what's going on at the time.
Q. It's probably drink related, is it, to cover it in that broad category?
A. Yes. Yeah, it would be. But, equally, I don't know exactly when $I$ even tell my doctor what's going on. Because I break confidence in 2011 with a solicitor for the first time about just stuff that's going on, that's very mad, in Athlone. Yeah.
169 Q. In any event, we're not directly concerned with that. Going up the year then in 2012, there's another substantial chunk there of missing days obviously?
A. Yes.

170 Q. We don't need to go into that. Then there's a lot of single days. Sort of halfway up the page we get to the 12:23 end of December 2013, do you see that, in the middle of the page there? The cursor is on the right-hand side of the page, indicating where it is.
A. Yeah.

171 Q. Now, in fact, all of these are in the category "illness". They're all classified as "flu viral". We will hear more from the relevant witnesses about the system and what options are open on the system. But just going into 2014 then, we see it's "flu viral" there. I am going to switch pages and come back to this one in a moment, but if we go to the same volume, at 10649, we will see a summary from your doctor which related to a specific period, really going into August and into July 2015. If we scroll down a little bit.

There's three sick certs there, two viral there, in August and September, and then in December '14, that's the first work related stress one. I think every cert that you produce from your doctor, Dr. Bartlett, he has been dealing with you for quite a long time, you obviously have great confidence in him.
A. Yes.

172 Q. From there to date and continuing, it's all work related stress. There is no argument about that, we don't need to look at them at all. But just back then to the page we had been on, 10721, and putting the finger on the same end of year, that is the year 13 , the categorisation of it under the system, doesn't change. I mean, the viral gastroenteritis, it makes no difference to the categorisation, it would seem, at the 12:26 time. The witnesses will presumably bear that out. And the fact that work related stress certificates come in, they are not resulting in any change in the system.
A. Yeah.

173 Q. They're both categorised then as an ordinary illness. Just keeping my finger, so $I$ know where $I$ am here, from the beginning of 2014 onwards. If we go up to a date, which is a date in 2015 there, 22/3/2015. I will just take that date there because as at the time Superintendent Murray is writing his letter of the 2nd April, following the meeting with you on the 26th March that we have seen. Do you remember that meeting of the 26th March, his first meeting with you?
A. Mm-hmm, yes.
Q. I think you probably will agree, if it's a matter for argument that's fine, but under the relevant Garda finance and sickness day scheme, as it were, once you tip over 183 days and you are subsequently absent, you go onto a lower rate of remuneration called TRR?
A. Yes.

176 Q. That's the system?
A. It is, yeah.

177 Q. You got caught by that system on days that you were absence subsequent to this?
A. Yes.

178 Q. You would accept that?
A. Oh yeah.
Q. You would accept, therefore, that any pay related reductions directly arising from your absences were dealt with in terms of a reduction in pay on the basis of the regime in place rather than any individual decision-making that was punishing you for the absences?
A. Sorry, can you just rephrase that?
Q. Yes, perhaps it's slightly convoluted. I am suggesting that from that day onwards, when you were medically certified for absence, it had the automatic effect that each absence you were being paid on the reduced rate?
A. Yes.
Q. As a result of the system rather than anyone deciding they're going to reduce your pay. There was no individual deciding, now I'm going to get at you by reducing your pay because you are out sick. Do you take the point?
A. Your point, I am not sure, is your point that the computer is making a mistake?
Q. No.
A. I am not sure.
Q. It's nothing to do with the category. We will come to the category. I am sorry.
A. Right.

184 Q. I should have said that. My question is relating to the rate of pay?
A. Yeah.
Q. The amount of pay that you're getting?
A. Right.

186 Q. Is determined then by the system.
A. Oh yeah.

187 Q. Once you're over?
A. Yes, yes, correct.

188 Q. As it were, the rate of pay then isn't decided upon by any individual. I mean Super Murray had nothing to do with deciding your rate of pay?
A. The system, I accept, yes.

All right. Or Chief Superintendent wheatley, the rate of pay?
A. Just on the rate of pay.

190 Q. That's all we are talking about at the moment.
A. Okay.

191 Q. Just looking at this now, going back up to the top, the 12:31 category stays the same except for there's another one there, do you see that, $2 n d$ June '15. I am not quite clear that would have happened, but that's a drop down option on the SAMS system. You have probably seen the screen shots which includes that as an option. It seemed to allow you to specify what the other illness was. I don't know if you agree with that?
A. You see, unfortunately I am not au fait with the SAMS system.
192 Q. Yes.
A. For me to explain this, I am on...

193 Q. I am just taking you through this overall picture and then I am going to ask you to look at the SAMS printouts?
A. Right.
Q. If you don't mind. It comes up then at this stage to 26th December 2015, and then it says:
"SAMS, ment al heal th."
A. Yes.
Q. As I understand it, that reflects a change that was made arising from you learning at a consultation with the CMO in December 2015 -- if you just wait for the question?
A. I couldn't hear you.
Q. I beg your pardon.
A. Just someone coughed, I missed one word, that's all.

197 Q. I am suggesting, that seems to represent a change in the way it was recorded as a result of you becoming aware that your illness was being put on the system as flu viral, and raising an issue because your certificates had work related stress, isn't that right?
A. It was with the CMO, is when I discovered it.
Q. You discovered it?
A. Yes.
Q. As a result, when 2015 turned into 2016, you brought that as a concern obviously to your solicitor and the Garda authorities, in particular the new protected disclosures manager, Chief Superintendent Anthony McLoughlin?
A. Yeah.
Q. You raised that directly with him?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN It brought you back up?
A. Yes, it did.

CHA RMAN Isn't that right, Mr. McGuinness, the
correction brought it back up?
MR. MEGI NESS: It's sequential.
CHA RMAN Sorry.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAK That's what I thought.
MR. MEGI NNESS: when he corrects it and it gets corrected in May as a categorisation, in fact your pay, your TRR didn't change, you were on the reduced pay.
A. I was on the reduced pay.
Q. Isn't that right?
A. Yes, I don't think it changes until October.
Q. Indeed, that's what I am coming to.

CHA RMAR Sorry.
Q. MR. MEGUNESS: I am hoping we can agree the sequence
through. Because it's important. I hope, I don't want to mislead anyone. The status or classification got changed on the system from mental health in may and that didn't change your reduced rate of pay at that point in time. Your pay changed subsequently in october, when the issue of your being out on work related stress, as it affected your pay, melded together. Chief Superintendent McLoughlin, with whom you raised the issue, secured a result by enabling you to be restored to full pay, although there were public service regulations that came into effect and I am not going to say anything about whether they were applicable or how they should have operated, but he recommended that you be restored to full pay?
A. Yeah.

209 Q. Although your absences were continuing, they were exceeding the plateau by which ordinarily you would have been reduced to TRR rate, isn't that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.

210 Q. You're not subject then -- that was then backdated to this date at the top of the column there?
A. That's correct. He did backdate it, yes, he did. In fairness to him, he said he was going to look at it, he did. He backdated it. He did, he did everything he said he would do, yes.
211 Q. Yes. I think he has made a very long statement, I am not sure that $I$ need to put any of it.
A. My recollection is, I couldn't find anything in his statement that I have an issue with.

212 Q. Yes.
A. Just from recollection.

He has put in before the Tribunal, they're all before the Tribuna1, a large number of appendices which detail his interaction with you. As you would expect, obviously a very delicate position he's in, in terms of managing the process and all the different stakeholders?
A. The first thing I said to him when I met him, I said, you might think it's the handiest job, but it's far -- 12:38 it's probably the most difficult job in An Garda Síochána.

214 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

215 Q. He appears to have followed through on -- he made the 12:38 recommendation on your behalf. I am not going to express any view as to whether it was a pragmatic one, but it was a very practical solution which executive hierarchy took on, as it were, and followed through to put you back on full pay, backdated to the 26 th, which is the date you went out fully on work related stress?
A. Yes.

216 Q. I suppose the upshot, I want to suggest to you, is that you -- and the rationale appears to be that, in fact, it was because you were in this, as it were, new appears to have been resulting in a concern, a worry that it might be seen as penalisation and that they didn't you to feel penalised. And they haven't
penalised you, I suppose is the upshot of my question; that you have been in fact restored to full pay on that basis?
A. You see, for me, the pay and that was not my focus really, it was my complaint was my focus.

217 Q. I'm sorry?
A. The complaint was the thing that would have been circulating in my mind. I would have obviously known, just from other, let's say, guards whistleblowers, pay is a thing you're going get hit on. So I had actually saved up money, I was ready for the reduced pay rate, if you know what I mean, I had saved up.
218 Q. I don't want to enquire into your financial --
A. Just one other thing as wel1, in October of 2015, another issue is, as I previously reported, a report, there was a report in the Sunday Times on 2nd October 2015, which appeared on the front page, to do with my main complaint as well. That probably -- it was in the public domain again for a while. But that's not taking away from Chief Superintendent McLough1in, way prior to 12:40 that, he took to do what he said he would do, he was a hundred percent on that.
219 Q. Yes. The upshot of my last long question, preceded by lots of statements, $I$ should have asked a shorter question, which is this: Would you agree with me now that firstly the misrecording of your illness doesn't appear to have been as a result of any decision to target you, it was the operation of the system insofar as it related to a reduction in pay at the time you had
reduced pay?
A. I couldn't agree with that.
Q. Pardon.
A. I couldn't -- if I am taking -- if I am understanding your question correctly, $I$ couldn't agree with that. It's as if -- now, I may have mistaken or misunderstood your question. It would be as if they didn't know that I was going out with work related stress and it was just the system kind of and it was a mistake. I wouldn't agree with that.
Q. We11, perhaps I confused you as well as maybe myself. I thought we had got to maybe a stage where you had agreed that the misrecording of it as such didn't affect your rate of pay, once you tripped over the $183 ?$
A. I had gone down at some stage to 220 a week or McLough1in -- I've already said this.
Q. Yes.
A. I'm sorry.
McLough1in -- I've already said this. I am sorry to inter rupt, Mr. McGuinness. If I understand: At the beginning, now I am not saying I agree with this, but here's what I think is the issue, at the beginning it doesn't seem to have mattered whether it was flu viral or work related stress for your pay. At the beginning, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

224 Q. CHA RMAN For whatever reason, whether somebody did it deliberately, accidentally or for benign or malevolent
motives, it didn't make any difference to your pay until you reached the threshold whereby your pay dropped?
A. Yes. There are two categories on the SAMS system for recording.
Q.

CHA RMAN Yes.
A. And one is -- there is a category --

CHA RMAN Let's keep it simple for a moment?
A. Okay.

227 Q. CHA RMAN Before we get to categories, let's keep it very simple. Up to the point -- I'm sorry, I just want to get it absolutely clear. Up to the point where you met the threshold, it didn't matter, it didn't matter what it was called. But the question seems to have been that at a certain point it was considered, this isn't just ordinary illness, which would get my pay reduced, this is work related, which, in fairness, may be in law as well, but anyway, it shouldn't affect my work because it happened due to work. It's not just that I was, you know, suffering from something that unfortunately hit me, if that was the case I would get reduced but in this case ultimately it seems to have been recognised. Is that essentially the position?
A. Yes. Yes. I think that's -- I think.

228 Q. CHA RMAN Now, what we are on go and what Mr. McGuinness is enquiring about, if I understand, is that at the beginning, whether somebody wrote down flu viral or whatever else they wrote, didn't actually make any difference. There came a point when it did make a
difference, but until it got to that point, it didn't matter what it said?
A. I think so, yeah

CHA RMAN A sore neck, you know, bad back, whatever it was, it didn't matter. Am I understanding you correctly, Mr. McGuinness? Have I got it halfway right or am I correct so far?

MR. MEGI NNESS: We11, Chairman, 1 think the issue is as follows, which I hope is correct: Once something is recorded on the ordinary illness category, whether it's 12:45 described as anything, it makes no difference at all. But the only way it becomes an issue for a member is that once you go over 183 days.
CHA RMAN You're reduced.
MR. MEGU NESS: You're reduced. But that doesn't have 12:45 a categorisation of --

CHA RMAN No, it doesn't matter what it's called, sore neck, bad back, headaches, it doesn't matter.

MR. MEGU NESS: It's based upon the categorisation of
it as an ordinary illness.
CHA RMAN Right.
MR. MEGU NESS: The fact that it was being put on the SAMS system as flu viral under ordinary illness, meant that once he tripped over the 183 day, the reduction came in as a result of the system. And the same reduction --

CHAL RMAN And Garda Keogh, as I understand, agrees.
MR. MEGU NESS: Pardon?
CHN RMAN Garda Keogh agrees that, indeed, it operates
automatically on the computer, assuming it is one of those ordinary things.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes. And the same reduction applies whether if the classification is changed from flu viral to work related stress, as long as it's obviously entered under the category of ordinary illness. So his pay, as I understand it, wasn't changed as a result of the reclassification in May, but the events that then overtook that.

CHA RMAN Were Chief Superintendent McLough1in's. MR. MEGI NESS: Were Chief Superintendent McLoughlin. CHA RMAN Okay. That's the issue then. We're agreed so up to this point, the automatic we're agreed on. As I understand, and Mr. McGuinness has now very helpfully clarified it, that it didn't matter whether it was work 12:47 related stress, if that had been written down all along from the beginning, your pay would still have been reduced. That's what he's saying. I don't know whether you agree. Now, do you agree with that or not agree with it? Obviously that can be explored with other witnesses and so on.
A. In work related stress, under the garda regulations as I understand it, they're supposed to mount an investigation to see if there is work related stress and if tere was, then they class it as injury on duty.
CHA RMAN That's what I thought. MR. MEGU NNESS: I was going to come to that, because you did make a complaint in your statements that that was something that should have been done. I am going
to come on to that. What I am going to suggest to you on this, the categorisation of it in May 2015 as mental health, it didn't effect the operation of the system, reducing it to TRR, because it was still categorised as an ordinary illness?
A. As I did say at the very start, I'm not au fait with the SAMS system. So this is something that -- forgive me if $I$ am stumbling on that.
231
Q. Not at all.
A. Yeah.

232 Q. We're going to hear, we hope, from the experts in charge of the system too.

233 Q. CHA RMAN Do I understand that your essential complaint is this: That the authorities put you down as flu viral when they should have been putting you down as an injury at work?
A. Work related, yes.

234 Q. CHA RMAN In a sense, I know it's work related stress.
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN But they should have been saying, it's not an ordinary thing that he just got, this is something that happened to him at work?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN Don't worry about the details for the moment, but that's essentially your complaint?
A. You see, what they should have done is --

237 Q. CHA RNAN No, leave aside what they should have done?
A. Yes.

238 Q. CHA RMAN Just to get a clear, I am sorry, but just to
get it clear. For the simple person like myself, I just want to get this clear. They should have alerted themselves, they should have realised and written down work related?
A. Yes.

12:49
for what it's worth and you may as well know it, my understanding is that your complaint is, the authorities wrote down a wrong thing?
A. Yes.

243 Q. CHA RMAN They did it knowingly.
A. Yes.

244 Q. CHA RMAN And it didn't come to hit you until such time as the normal process of the computer realised.
A. Yes.

245 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Had they put down the right thing, whatever else might have happened, it wouldn't have resulted in that. Is that the essence of it?
A. Yes. I think $I$ am on the same page.
Q. CHA RMAN I think I am understanding that?
A. Judge, as I said, this is not a (Inaudible) of mine, as 12:51 in the SAMS system and that. Like, when I meet the CMO.

## 247 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.

A. That's where I find out what they're up to. But they have already held a case conference to do with me with 12:51 the CMO. But he himself is not aware of work related stress. The Garda CMO is not aware of work related stress.

CHA RMAN I am understanding that. okay. Now, I am sorry, Mr. McGuinness. We11, I'm not that sorry but I 12:52 may as well explain to you what I'm thinking.
MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN I hope that's helpful, I'm not certain.
248 Q. MR. MEGU NNESS: Thank you, Chairman. It's always
useful to know. Just going back to that meeting with the смо. I mean, the CMO doesn't get the certs and classify you on the basis of certs from your doctor. I think you know that.
A. I didn't know that.
A. There were already case conferences in relation to me and my sickness. Somebody forgot to inform the CMO that I was going sick with work related stress.
Because I meet him after these cases conference and he seems to have no idea about work related stress whatsoever and they've held case conferences to do with my sick. When I met him, he still seems to be in the dark. He doesn't know anything about work related stress. So they have held case conferences to do with my sick records and absences and they don't inform the CMO anything about work related stress.

250 Q. We are going to hear from the parties who were at the meeting, but the purpose of the meeting wasn't to review your classification or, as I understand it, to look at the issue of how your pay would be dealt with, whether it was classified one way or another. So we will come to that in a due course.
A. But one would imagine someone would have to inform the CMO, if they are discussing sick, what's on the sick certs he's going sick with.

251 Q. What I wanted to ask you to look at is these screen shots of the SAMS system, the sickness absent management system. They're at volume 42, page 11789 to
11794. If we start at the first one. My understanding is that these are in sequence and what you see is options when you click on the ordinary illness categories. So the screen comes up, you are being asked to categorise it and you can choose these options, four different options. Then, if you choose the ordinary illness category, which is the one selected in the box there on the top, it gives you four options, if you turn the page then, if we go on to the next page?
A. Just, I see there is another category there, just if you go back up, you will see, if you go onto the ordinary illness, you see at the top, if one is to click on the occupation injury, what categories -CHA RMAN No, follow him for the moment. Mr. McGuinness says, assume, he has high1ighted one -we will do it slowly. He has highlighted one, now here are the options under ordinary injury. He is not forgetting the other point.
MR. MEGU NESS: This is presented to us on a step-by-step basis, what happens when you choose each or other of them.

CHA RMAN This is ordinary illness category now. MR. MEGI NNESS: when you select the ordinary illness category, you go onto the next page and it gives you a sub drop down list and there's flu/viral, mental health, musculoskeletal, not provided, other - please specify, post pregnancy, pregnancy related, surgery/post op. Those are the ones on the system at
the time certainly, it may well still be the same system, the options that are available. Then, if we go onto the next page, it shows you what happens in terms of the screen that comes up. If you have chosen the flu viral reason, it gives you, you know, the information that you're meant to include there on that. If we scroll over to the left-hand side of the page, to see the way it's meant to operate. These are meant to be included. It's quite a long page. So the next page shows the, the far right-hand corner of it, if we scroll over the page, taking it fully to the right. That gives you a full view of what's meant to be put on the system for sickness absence management if you select flu viral under ordinary illness. Now, if we go back then to, or further on, to the next page, if you have selected the critical illness category, you just get a single --
CHAN RMAN Just give us a second.
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes, I am sorry.
CHAN RMAN To bring it around.
MR. MEGI NNESS: You just get a single option if you get critical illness, covers a multitude I am sure. Then the next page, anticipating the question you were answering there, 11794, if you select the occupational injury/illness arising from duty, you get these drop point in time for putting in work related stress, if that has been the diagnosis obviously following investigation, I presume. So that's the way the SAMS
system operates. Now, as it was done in your station, I think you know that Olivia Kelly was the clerk responsible for the operation of the system, isn't that right?
A. Yeah. I only read that in the documents, yeah.
Q. Yes.
A. Sorry, I just find that incredible. There is no tab for work related stress. If I have read this correct, it's nearly as if I was the first guard in the history of the State to have gone out with work related stress. 12:59 If I am reading this correctly, they don't actually have a tab for work related stress.
253 Q. Well, it appears that they did not have such at the time, isn't that right? That is right, I am told. We can explore that, if necessary. Just coming on to what 12:59 Ms. Kelly said in her statement?

CHA RMAN I think maybe we wil1 1eave it at that point, is that convenient? Is that a good point, before we move on to Ms. Kelly? Thank you. Okay. Very good. Right, two o'clock.

THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED FOR LUNCH AND RESUMED, AS FOLLOVS:

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Sit down there for a 14:12 moment, Garda Keogh, resume your normal position just for the moment, your unofficial position. As people will have known, we have had a somewhat longer time for lunch. I have been consulting counsel, not about the
evidence but about some of the processes that we have. People will realise that some of the material, specifically the subject that we're exploring today, is technical and complicated, requiring a very impressive analysis and mastery of the subject by Mr. McGuinness. But he has to put that material and everybody concerned relevantly with it has to follow these documents.

We also have some other topics where the same issue arises. So, what I was discussing with counsel was what was the best way to proceed with that. It seems to me that it would be useful to give people an opportunity, give everybody, which includes obviously, Garda Keogh, but not simply Garda Keogh, everybody an opportunity of exploring, looking at, acquainting themselves with this material. And that, if we did that, the process would move forward more smoothly, even more smoothly than it has been progressing so far. I also think it's fair and reasonable that people should have that opportunity.

So, in the circumstances I am very pleased that we have made so much progress in our inquiry to date, in areas that cover a huge amount of ground. So that's why I have decided that we will suspend our proceedings at this point today and we will resume at 10:30 in the morning.

So anybody who wants then to consult Mr. McGuinness as
to where he is going next or what materials might well -- I am sure that Mr. McGuinness will be happy to let people know. People can have a look at the material and it will make it easier for us to progress tomorrow with the other issues.
MR. KELLY: Thank you very much, Chairman. I will certainly will be making, I hope, a relatively short submission to you when we resume, on this very topic of the sick pay classification and so on.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: I want to do a bit of further research. CHAL RMAN I can quite understand. I mean, frankly I think, if I may say so, we are all learning more about the SAMS system and the options and methods. I have to say, it's material that's new to me, if I can make that $14: 16$ confession. So, thanks very much. That's what we will do. All right. Thank you very much.

THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED UNTI L FRI DAY, 18TH OCTOBER 2019 AT 10: 30AM
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:26, 49:5 } \\ & \text { dealings }[1]-21: 1 \\ & \text { dealt }[4]-14: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 29 \\ & \text { different }[6]-8: 1, \\ & 17: 7,30: 27,37: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 9,43: 26,61: 29 \\ & 62: 26,62: 27,63: 12 \\ & 68: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EGAN }[1]-3: 25 \\ & \text { eight }[2]-43: 27, \\ & 47: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52: 16 \\ & \quad \text { excuse }[3]-19: 19 \\ & 35: 16,39: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 24: 18,51: 4,65: 21 \\ \text { debate }[1]-7: 12 \end{gathered}$ December [4] - | 56:7, 66:6 <br> difficult [5] - 25:16, 33:7, 44:5, 44:6, | double [1] - 32:4 <br> down [29]-8:17, <br> 9:16, 9.28, 10:16 | $\begin{gathered} \text { either }[6]-13: 12, \\ \text { 18:10, 21:26, 30:13, } \end{gathered}$ | executive [1] - 56:18 EXECUTIVE [1] - |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { December [4] - } \\ 48: 16,49: 2,53: 3, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 7,44: 5,44: 6 \\ & 56: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 16,9: 28,10: 16 \\ & \text { 11:15, 15:21, 21:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 32:9, 46:10 } \\ \text { elaborated }[1] \text { - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 12 \\ & \text { expect }[2]-41: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:10 } \\ & \text { DECEMBER }_{[1]}-1: 9 \\ & \text { decided }_{[2]}-52: 6, \end{aligned}$ | difficulty $[1]-34: 13$ <br> DIGNAM [1] - 3:23 <br> direction [3]-27:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 6,39: 12,39: 27, \\ & 44: 27,47: 6,47: 10 \\ & 48: 29,52: 18,58: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:10 } \\ & \text { ELIZABETH } \\ & \text { [1] - } \\ & 2: 29 \end{aligned}$ | ```56:5 expert [1] - 40:5 experts [1]-62:11``` |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:25 } \\ & \text { deciding }[3]-51: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 27:13, } 44: 20 \\ \text { directly }[3]-48: 10, \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 59:27, 61:16, 62:14, } \\ \text { 62:16, 63:3, 63:9 } \end{array}$ | EMMA [1] - 3:26 enabling [1] - 55:9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { explain [4]-20:13, } \\ 21: 9,52: 26,64: 26 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 51:16, } 52: 8 \\ & \text { decision [6]-41:20, } \\ & \text { 41:26, 43:7, 44:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 51:3, 53:29 } \\ & \text { DIRECTOR }[1]-3: 12 \\ & \text { DIRECTORATE }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63: 13,63: 19,63: 20 \\ & 64: 3,64: 10,66: 26 \\ & 68: 25 \end{aligned}$ | ```encapsulate [1] - 45:21 encapsulated [1] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { explained }[4] \text { - } \\ & 30: 20,35: 3,36: 5, \\ & 36: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| $51: 6,57: 27$ <br> decision-making ${ }_{[1]}$ | 3:15 <br> disagreed [1] - 37:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DOWNEY [2]-3:14, } \\ & 3: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:21 } \\ & \text { encouragement }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | explaining [1] - 36:7 explanation [10] - |
| $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline-51: 6 \\ \text { DECL } \end{array}$ | discipline [1] - 8:4 | downs [1] - 67:26 <br> dozen [1] - 19:6 | $45: 6$ | $8: 23,8: 25,10: 13$ |
| definitely [1] - 40:6 | $13: 25,14: 14,15: 6$ | Dr [1] - 49:4 DR | $38: 8,47: 17,47: 20$ | 14:16, 17:17, 19:28, |
| degree [2] - 33:18, $37: 17$ | $15: 9,15: 11,15: 12$ | DR [1] - 3:11 <br> draw [1]-32 | 48:16, 49:12 | 19:29 |
| deliberately [1] - | $21: 20,28: 6,29: 9$ | drink [1] - 48:3 | $47: 8$ | $20: 4,20: 10$ |
| 58:29 | 29:12, 29:24, 45:16, | drinking [1] - 33:11 | endorse [1] - 43:7 | explanations [1] - |
| delicate [1]-56:6 <br> demeanour [1] - | DISCLOSURES [2] - | $66: 26,67: 25$ | enquire [1] - 57:13 | explore [1] - 68:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 35:27 } \\ & \text { denial }[1]-7: 26 \end{aligned}$ | 1:2, 1:3 <br> disclosures [8] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dropped [2] - 59:3, } \\ & 63: 11 \end{aligned}$ | enquiries [1] - 13:19 enquiring [1] - 59:26 | explored [1] - 61:20 <br> exploring [3] - 20:10, |
| departure [1] - 47:19 | 8:19, 8:26, 15:24 | DUBLIN [6]-1:17, | ensure [1] - 41:24 | 69:3, 69:15 |
| Deputy [1] - 16:7 | $20: 16,20: 21,29: 9$ 47:28, 53:26 | $2: 19,2: 24,2: 31,3: 28$ | entered [1] - 61:6 | express [1] - 56:17 |
| ```described [1] - 60:11 describes [1] - 39:18 describing [1] -``` | 47:28, 53:26 <br> discourage [1] - 45:8 discovered [2] - | 4:5 <br> duck [1] - 38:4 <br> due [4]-6:27, 29:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { entitled }[1]-13: 5 \\ & \text { enviable }[1]-44: 1 \\ & \text { EOIN }_{[1]}-2: 28 \end{aligned}$ | expressly [1] - 37:7 extended [1] - 47:26 eye [2] - 25:11, $25: 18$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 35: 26 \\ & \text { desk [2] - 22:28, 24:8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 53:20, } 53: 21 \\ \text { discrediting [2] - } \\ 21: 22,45: 22 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 59:19, } 65: 23 \\ & \text { during }[1]-22: 24 \end{aligned}$ | EQUALITY ${ }_{[1]}-1: 8$ equally [4]-18:23, | F |
| detail [1] - 56:4 <br> detailed [1] - 44:18 <br> details [3]-20:7, | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { discussed [6] - } \\ 24: 13,34: 21,35: 3, \\ 36: 6,36: 9,45: 26 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:5, 23:27, 24:29, } \\ & \text { 25:3, 25:5, 42:2, 42:6, } \\ & \text { 42:10 } \\ & \text { duty [18] - 12:2, } \end{aligned}$ | ```essence [1] - 64:12 essential [1] - 62:13 essentially [3] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { face }[1]-28: 14 \\ & \text { fact }[21]-11: 8,12: 5 \\ & 17: 5,19: 11,20: 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20:27, 62:24 <br> detective [1] - 29:13 <br> DETECTIVE [5] - 3:3, | discussing [2] - $65: 25,69: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:20, 21:9, 22:17, } \\ & \text { 22:28, 27:10, 27:14, } \end{aligned}$ | ```38:3, 59:23, 62:25 ESTABLISHED[1] - 1:7``` | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 23,30: 11,30: 28 \\ & 31: 20,31: 23,35: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { 3:4, 3:12, 3:13, 3:17 } \\ \text { Detective }[1]-30: 15 \\ \text { detention }[1]^{-43: 9} \\ \text { detentions }_{[1]}-43: 9 \\ \text { deteriorated }_{[1]}- \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dispute [2]-38:27, } \\ & \text { 39:8 } \\ & \text { district [1] }-24: 2 \\ & \text { DIVISION [1] }-1: 12 \\ & \text { DOCKERY }[1]-4: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:16, 32:6, 36:6, } \\ & \text { 36:16, 43:22, 44:18, } \\ & \text { 61:25, 67:25 } \\ & \text { DÁIL [1] - 1:4 } \end{aligned}$ | etcetera [1]-24:23 <br> event $[1]$ - 48:10 <br> events [3]-11:12, <br> 41:14, 61:8 <br> EVIDENCE ${ }_{[1]}-1: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 20,49: 17,50: 2, \\ & 54: 22,56: 24,57: 2 \\ & 60: 22 \\ & \text { factual }[1]-20: 22 \\ & \text { factually }[1]-11: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| determined [1] - | doctor [6] - 27:18, $48 \cdot 1,48 \cdot 6,48 \cdot 27$ | $E$ | 21:18, 28:28, 31:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fair }[3]-31: 3,34: 10, \\ & 69: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| DEVELOPMENT ${ }_{[1]}$ - 3:15 <br> diagnosis [1] - 67:28 <br> DIARMAID ${ }_{[1]}-2: 6$ <br> diary [1] - 31:25 <br> difference [5] - | ```49:4, 65:3 document [2] - 28:26, 39:10 documents [5] - 6:7, 28:24, 40:15, 68:5, 69:7 domain [1] - 57:19``` | ```EAMON [1] - 3:9 early [2] - 45:7, 46:24 easier [2]-47:22, 70:4 effect [5] - 23:5, 51:11, 54:10, 55:11,``` | ```69:1 evident [1] - 14:20 exactly[3] - 12:8, 17:24, 48:6 examined [1] - 6:6 example [2] - 15:19, 24:7``` | ```fairly [2] - 12:11, 21:2 fairness [2] - 55:23, 59:17 fait [2] - 52:23, 62:6 falls [1] - 21:23 false [1]-32:28``` |



| ```51:16, 52:7 indoor [12] - 22:17,``` | 67:29 <br> investigations [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { keeping [2] - 47:19, } \\ & \text { 49:21 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 8,46: 22,62: 27 \\ & 68: 17 \end{aligned}$ | M |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22:28, 23:5, 23:26, | 37:29 | Kelly [6] - 6:4, 7:6, | left [2] - 38:10, 67:7 |  |
| 24:29, 25:3, 25:5, | investigator [1] - | 7:8, 68:2, 68:16, | left-hand [1] - 67:7 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { m a d }}$ [1] - 48:9 |
| 36:6, 36:16, 42:2, | 18:11 | 68:19 | egal [1] - 43:11 | MADE [2] - 1:2, 1:7 |
| 42:6, 42:10 | investigators [2] | KELLY [7] - 2:10, | legislation [1] - | magnify [1] - 47:22 |
| indulged [1] - 37:17 | 13:17, 23:11 | 3:11, 6:5, 6:11, 6:16, | 14:15 | main [1] - 57:18 |
| inevitable [1] - 45:14 | involvement [1] - | 70:6, 70:11 | LEITRIM [1] - 2:13 | MAIN [1] - 2:12 |
| inevitably [1] - 45:13 | 15:5 | Ken [3]-18:10, | less [2]-19:24, | major [2]-21:15, |
| inform [3]-65:8, | involving [1] - 35:4 | 18:11, 18:20 | 30:23 | 21:28 |
| 65:16, 65:24 | Isac [3]-18:10, | Keogh [20]-6:7, | letter [5] - 13:23, | malevolent [1] - |
| information [3] - | 18:11, 18:20 | 6:23, 6:29, 7:23, 9:21, | 17:22, 20:29, 49:25, | 58:29 |
| 10:27, 14:1, 67:6 | issue [32] - 6:9, 6:28, | 10:1, 19:15, 19:18, | 50:1 | Malone [1] - 1:24 |
| informed [3]-24:23, | 7:21, 7:25, 17:29, | 22:15, 32:19, 32:22, | level [2]-28:15, 38:1 | MALONE ${ }_{[1]}-1: 29$ |
|  | 21:11, 22:15, 24:12, | 35:4, 35:7, 46:10, | LIAM ${ }_{[1]}-3: 17$ | management [10] - |
| 26:10, 40:16 <br> initial [1] - 14:16 | 29:10, 30:12, 30:18, | 46:20, 60:27, 60:29, | likely [1] - 37:26 | 23:2, 23:21, 27:27, |
| injury [4] - 61:25, | 31:9, 37:2, 38:16, | 68:26, 69:14 | line [6]-8:19, 23:13, | 28:11, 29:10, 29:26, |
| 62:16, 66:14, 66:1 | 40:22, 44:29, 46:6, | KEOGH [3] - 2:10, | 24:14, 24:24, 38:24, | 30:5, 40:27, 65:29, |
|  | 46:15, 46:21, 53:18, | 5:3, 7:16 | 47:25 | 67:13 |
| 67:25INQUIRY | 55:6, 55:9, 55:29, | Keogh's [1] - 6:15 | lines [3] - 36:14, | manager [2]-8:19, |
|  | 56:26, 57:15, 58:23, | kept [1] - 54:6 | 38:18, 47:23 | 53:26 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1:8 } \\ & \text { Inquiry }[1]-6: 12 \\ & \text { inquiry }[2]-6: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 60:8, 60:12, 61:12, | KEVIN ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ - 3:14 | linked [5] - 45:18, | managing [1] - 56:7 |
|  | 65:21, 69:9 | KIERAN [1] - 3:19 | 45:19, 45:20, 45:22, | manpower [1] - |
|  | Issue [1] - 6:9 | kind $[4]-7: 13,19: 6$, | 45:24 | 21:14 |
| ```69:23 insane [1] - 31:13 insofar [1] - 57:28 Inspector [2] - 41:21, 42:7``` | issued [1] - 24:1 | 43:21, 58:9 | list [2]-35:5, 66:26 | manual [2]-47:3, |
|  | issues [1] - 70:5 | KIRWAN [1] - 3:13 | listen [2]-19:21, | 47:19 |
|  | itself [1] - 41:19 | knowingly [2] - | 45:28 | March [6] - 9:5, 47:7, |
|  |  | 63:20, 64:5 | LITTLE [1] - 3:27 | 47:8, 49:26, 49:28 |
|  | J | knowledge [3] | local [1] - 29:9 | MARGARET [1] - |
| $42: 7$ <br> INSPECTOR [7] - |  | 15:1, 15:10, 40:11 | logical [1]-13:12 | 3:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3: 3,3: 9,3: 14,3: 17 \\ & 3: 17,3: 21,4: 1 \end{aligned}$ | JACK [1] - 3:6 | knowledgeable [1] - $30: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { long-term [3]- } \\ & \text { 12:10. 12:11. } 45: 8 \end{aligned}$ | MARIE [2]-3:7, 3:16 MARK [1] - 3:3 |
| INSTRUCTED [7] - | JAMES [1] - 2:28 | known [7] - 23:2, | look [22] - 8:10, 8:28, | marked [1] - 26:16 |
|  | $\mathbf{b}[11]-23: 1,27: 25$ | 27:27, 29:26, 29:29, | 10:16, 13:4, 18:25, | MARRINAN [1] - 2:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3: 25,3: 30,4: 4 \\ & \text { instruction [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $31: 21,35: 24,37: 20$ | $30: 10,57: 8,68: 28$ | 19:3, 20:29, 22:22, | mastery [1] - 69:5 |
|  | $37: 24,43: 21,44: 1,$ | knows [1] - 29:2 | $23: 11,25: 3,32: 29$ | material [5] - 69:2, |
| 39:19 <br> instructions [1] - 6:7 <br> INSTRUMENT [1] - | 44:5, 56:10, 56:11 | L | 35:18, 39:11, 47:2, | 69:6, 69:16, 70:4, $70: 15$ |
|  | JOE [1] - 3:13 |  | $54: 6,55: 23,65: 21$ | materials [1] - 70:1 |
| ```1:7 intense [1] - 38:7 intention [1] - 16:27 interaction [1] - 56:5 interactions [1] -``` | $2: 16,3: 8,3: 29$ | lack [1] - 35:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:27, 70:3 } \\ & \text { looked }[8]-7: 29, \end{aligned}$ | MATT ${ }_{[1]}-3: 18$ matter [20]-6:12, |
|  | John [1] - 16:7 | landed [2]-37:26, | $8: 5,11: 14,13: 15$ | 16:19, 18:9, 18:17, |
|  | judge [1] - 64:15 <br> Judge [1] - 9:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:28 } \\ & \text { large }[1]-56: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $31: 19,36: 11,37: 6$ | 18:18, 20:26, 23:7, |
|  | JUDGE [1] - 3:12 | last [5] - 19:29, 28:5, | $50: 1$ | 32:20, 37:16, 40:21, |
| 37:28 | July [1] - 48:29 | $38: 18,38: 24,57: 23$ | looking [11] - 11:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 25,50: 18,59: 13 \\ & 60: 2,60: 5,60: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| interest [1] - 42:9 <br> interesting [2] - | June [1] - 52:17 | law [3] - 16:2, 16:11, | 21:13, 22:2, 23:17, | $60: 18,61: 15,63: 7$ |
| $33: 22,33: 25$ | just.. [1] - 34:26 | 59:18 | $35: 20,36: 28,52: 15$ | mattered [1] - 58:24 |
| intermittent [1] - | JUSTICE [3]-1:7, | lawful [1] - 20:17 | 69:15 | MATTERS ${ }_{[1]}-1: 4$ |
| 23:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1:12, 2:2 } \\ & \text { justified [1] - 30:13 } \end{aligned}$ | LAWLOR [1] - 2:28 <br> learning [2] - 53:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { looks [2] - 13:1, } \\ & \text { 13:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { matters [4]-34:23, } \\ 35: 4,41: 27,44: 13 \end{gathered}$ |
| interpret [1] - 37:11 <br> interrupt [1] - 58:21 |  | $70: 13$ | LORRAINE [1] - 3:4 | MATTHIAS[1] - 2:10 |
| interview [1] - 23:12 | K | leave [27] - 7:10, | lost [1] - 50:7 | McBRIEN ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ - 2:16 |
| INTO [1] - 1:2 investigating [1] - |  | 9:22, 9:24, 10:21, | lower [2]-50:11, | McCOURT [1] - 2:17 |
|  | KANE [1] - 2:28 |  | 50:22 | McGARRY [1] - 2:21 |
| $15: 20$ | $\operatorname{KATE}_{[1]}-3: 25$ | $12: 3,12: 20,13: 5$ | Luke [1] - 16:7 | McGRATH[2]-2:7, |
|  | $\operatorname{KEANE}_{[1]}-4: 3$ | 13:6, 21:7, 21:13, | LUNCH [1] - 68:22 | 2:27 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:8, 14:9, 15:2, } \\ & \text { 16:10, 16:14, 16:27, } \\ & \text { 17:8, 31:11, 61:24, } \end{aligned}$ | keep [3] - 43:7, 59:8, | 21:15, 21:29, 31:29, | lunch [1] - 68:29 | MCGUINNESS ${ }_{[2]}$ - |
|  |  | $35: 1,40: 29,44: 19$ | LYONS [1] - 4:2 | $5: 5,7: 17$ <br> McGuinness [57] - |


| 2:6, 3:24, 6:22, 7:4, | memo [1] - 13:14 | 35:6, 44:16, 44:23, | MURPHY [4] - 2:30, | night [2]-8:3, 17:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7:6, 7:9, 7:19, 7:21, | memory [1] - 12:29 | 44:28 | 3:22, 6:18, 7:2 | nil [9] - 47:8, 47:10, |
| 7:23, 9:3, 9:7, 9:18, | mental [4]-53:5, | Monaghan's [1] - | Murphy).. [1] - 24:2 | 47:11, 47:13 |
| 12:18, 13:14, 18:16, | 55:3, 62:2, 66:26 | 18:24 | Murray [37]-8:1, | nobody [3] - 23:18, |
| 18:18, 18:19, 18:22, | mention [1] - 24:16 | Monday [1] - 9:25 | 8:21, 9:4, 10:4, 10:10, | 29:2, 33:22 |
| 19:14, 20:4, 20:11, | mentioned [1] - | money [1] - 57:11 | 10:20, 13:24, 13:29, | NOLAN [1] - 3:6 |
| 21:26, 22:10, 22:15, | 24:27 | MONICA [1] - 3:15 | 14:12, 14:21, 15:16, | NOREEN ${ }_{[1]}$ - 2:16 |
| 34:19, 40:10, 44:12, | message [3]-23:29, | month [1] - 12:26 | 16:22, 17:15, 20:9, | normal [4]-39:14, |
| 44:13, 46:20, 54:15, | 24:8, 25:5 | months [5]-12:26, | 20:12, 20:25, 21:19, | $39: 15,64: 8,68: 26$ |
| 54:17, 54:19, 54:21, | met [7]-11:29, | 16:11, 25:15, 26:13, | 22:1, 23:4, 23:17, | NORTHUMBERLAN |
| 54:29, 58:21, 59:26, | 17:15, 18:26, 32:19, | 38:10 | 23:18, 24:19, 24:27, | D [1] - 2:18 |
| 60:6, 60:8, 60:15, | 56:9, 59:13, 65:13 | morning [3] - 7:23, | 26:3, 26:10, 26:15, | note [8]-6:22, 8:6, |
| 60:19, 60:22, 60:28, | methods [1] - 70:14 | 7:24, 69:27 | 26:24, 26:26, 27:19, | 17:21, 35:16, 36:11, |
| 61:3, 61:11, 61:14, | MICHAEL [4] - 3:3, | MORONEY ${ }_{[1]}-3: 17$ | 28:12, 28:18, 34:11, | $38: 16,38: 28,40: 11$ |
| 61:27, 64:25, 64:27, | 3:5, 3:10, 3:19 | MORRISSEY [1] - | 35:19, 41:24, 42:16, | noted [1] - 8:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 64: 29,66: 16,66: 20, \\ & 66: 24,67: 19,67: 21, \end{aligned}$ | middle [2]-25:22, | 3:25 | 49:25, 52:7 | notes [6]-1:26, |
| $69: 5,69: 29,70: 2$ | 48:16 | most [10]-23:1, | MURRAY [2] - 3:2, | $32: 27,33: 1,34: 13$ |
| McLoughlin [5] - | might $[18]-8: 10$, $18: 24,18: 25,19: 10$, | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 24,27: 25,31: 20, \\ & 37: 20,37: 24,37: 26, \end{aligned}$ | Murray's [6] - 8:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 34:28, 35:21 } \\ & \text { nothing [15] - 15:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $53: 27,55: 8,57: 20$ 58:17, 61:11 | $21: 13,22: 22,29: 26$ | $44: 1,44: 6,56: 11$ | 11:29, 19:17, 32:14, | $22: 11,29: 25,30: 3$ |
| 58:17, 61:11 MCLOUGHLIN [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 1,34: 3,37: 9 \\ & 39: 11,41: 2,43: 28 \end{aligned}$ | motives [1] - 59:1 <br> mount [1]-61:23 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 32: 26,36: 1 \\ \text { musculoskeletal } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 4,38: 29,39: 14 \\ & 41: 19,44: 25,45: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3:5 | 45:27, 56:10, 56:28, | mouth [1]-20:12 | -66:27 | 45:27, 46:5, 47:28, |
| McLoughlin's ${ }_{[1]}$ $61 \cdot 10$ | 64:11, 70:1 | move[3]-46:14, | must [1] - 43:22 | 51:23, 52:7 |
| 61:10 <br> McLYNN [1] - 3:30 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mildly [2]-25:16, } \\ & 36: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $68: 19,69: 17$ | MÍCHEÁL [1] - 3:23 | notice [5] - 8:4, 8:5, |
| MCMAHON ${ }_{[1]}-3: 7$ | mind [3] - 45:15, | $42: 3$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | noticed [4] - 10:4, |
|  | mine [1] - 64:15 | 2:5, 2:6, 2:7, 2:8, | nailed [1] - 45: | notification [1] - |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { mean }[26]-15: 14, \\ 15 \cdot 33 \quad 16 \cdot 00 \quad 17 \cdot 14 \end{gathered}$ | MINISTER [1] - 1:7 | 2:10, 2:10, 2:16, 2:16, | name [2]-29 | 18:24 |
| 19:12, 27:11, 28:5, | Minnock [1] - 42:7 | 2:21, 2:21, 2:27, 2:28, | $33: 19$ | noting [1] - 50:2 |
| $28: 6,33: 3,34: 6,36: 2$ | MINNOCK [1] - 3:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 28,3: 12,3: 13,3: 16, \\ & 3: 22,3: 23,3: 23,3: 24 \end{aligned}$ | named [1] - 1:26 | November [4]-23:7, <br> $38.9,40 \cdot 12,44 \cdot 19$ |
| 37:2, 37:16, 40:4, | 41:21 | $3: 29,3: 30,4: 3,5: 5,$ | namely [1] - 8:13 | NUGENT [2] - 3:13, |
| 41:14, 42:27, 43:12, | minute [1] - 44:17 | $6: 5,6: 11,6: 16,6: 18$ | names [1] - 29:29 | $3: 20$ |
| $43: 21,44: 24,45: 3$, $46 \cdot 1,49 \cdot 14,52 \cdot 7$ | minutes [2]-13:16, | $7: 2,7: 4,7: 6,7: 9$ | nature [1]-8:25 <br> nearly [1] - 68:9 | number [7] - 6:28, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 46: 1,49: 14,52: 7 \\ & 57: 12,65: 2,70: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 46:13 | $7: 17,7: 21,7: 23,9: 3$ | nearly [1] - 68:9 necessarily [1] - | $7: 21,7: 25,11: 15$ |
| 57:12, 65:2, 70:12 <br> meant [5] - 60:23, | mislead [1] - 55:2 <br> misreading [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 7,9: 18,12: 18 \\ & \text { 13:14, 18:16, 18:18, } \end{aligned}$ | 43:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:16, 46:21, 56:4 } \\ & \text { NYLAND }[1]-3: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 67:6, 67:8, 67:12 | 11:13 | $18: 22,19: 14,20: 4,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { necessary }[1] \text { - } \\ & 68: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { Ní }{ }_{[1]}-2: 29$ |
| MEDICAL [1] - 3:11 <br> medically [1]-51:10 | misrecording [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:11, 21:26, 22:10, } \\ & 22: 15,34: 19,40: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:15 } \\ & \text { neck [2] - 60:4, 60:18 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { meet }[7]-9: 23, \\ 13: 22,13: 25,14: 22 \end{gathered}$ | missed [1] - 53:14 | $44: 13,46: 20,54: 17,$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { need }[7]-6: 27,7: 11 \text {, } \\ \text { 13:20, 48:14, 49:10, } \end{gathered}$ | 0 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 20:29, 64:16, 65:10 } \\ \text { meeting }[25]-8: 6, \end{gathered}$ | 48:12 | $60: 8,60: 15,60: 19$ 60:22, 60:28, 61:3. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 55:27 } \\ & \text { needed }[1]-14: 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 12:12, 12:13, 12:17 | mistake [4] - 30:8, | 60:22, 60:28, 61:3, $61: 11,61: 27,64: 27$ | neutral [2] - 30:29, | o'clock [1] - 68:20 |
| 14:1, 14:13, 15:22, | istaken [1] - 58:6 | 64:29, 66:20, 66:24 | 42:17 | O'CONNOR [1] - |
| 18:7, 20:19, 24:13, | istrustful [1] - 30 | 67:19, 67:21, 70:6, | never [5] - 23:8, | 2:21 |
| 24:17, 24:18, 24:19, | misunderstood [1] - | $70: 11$ | 24:26, 27:3, 32:9, | O'HIGGINS [1] - 3:23 |
| $32: 14,35: 6,35: 18$ | $58: 6$ | MS [10] - 2:7, 2:11, | 45:24 | O'MARA [1] - 2:17 |
| $35: 27,37: 5,49: 26$ | module [1] - 28:7 | $2: 29,2: 29,3: 24,3: 25$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { new }[4]-27: 8,53: 25 \text {, } \\ 50 \cdot 5 \cdot 15 \end{array}$ | O'NEILL [1] - 3:29 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 49: 27,49: 28,65: 1 \\ & 65: 19 \end{aligned}$ | moment [9]-15:28, | $3: 25,3: 26,3: 29,4: 3$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 56: 25,70: 15 \\ \text { next }[13]-7: 19,12: 3, \end{array}$ | O'REARDON ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| meetings [1] - 18:12 | 21:21, 48:26, 52:13 $59: 8,62: 25,66: 15,$ | muddied [1] - 63:28 <br> Mulcahy [2] - 29:13, | $22: 15,38: 16,44: 2,$ | O'Sullivan [1] - |
| melded [1] - 55:7 | $68: 26,68: 27$ | 30:16 | 46:15, 66:10, 66:25, | 13:27 |
| MEMBER [1] - 2:2 | Monaghan | MULCAHY [1] - 3:4 | $67: 3,67: 9,67: 15$ | O'SULLIVAN [1] - |
| member [1] - 60:12 | $8: 20,9: 19,10: 1$ | MULLIGAN [2] - | 67:23, 70:1 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { members [4] - 8:22, } \\ 37: 23,37: 27,42: 3 \end{gathered}$ | 10:17, 10:29, 13:15, | $2: 11,3: 12$ <br> multitude [1] - 67:22 | $\begin{gathered} \text { NICHOLAS [4] - } \\ 2: 10,4: 1,5: 3,7: 16 \end{gathered}$ | objection [1] - 39:22 <br> obvious [2] - 39:29, |




| route [2] - 18:5, 18:6 | 37:13, 49:15, 50:6, | shorter [1] - 57:24 | 2:11, 2:18, 2:22, 2:30, | 68:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| run [1] - 46:28 | 58:24 | shortly [1] - 25:12 | 4:4 | statements [5] - |
| runs [1] - 47:14 | select [3]-66:24, | shots [2]-52:20, | solution [1] - 56:18 | 31:9, 31:11, 31:13, |
| RYAN [2] - 1:12, 2:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:14, } 67: 24 \\ & \text { selected }[2]-66: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:28 } \\ & \text { show [1] } \end{aligned}$ | solved [1] - 18:27 <br> someone [3]-43:27, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 57:24, 61:28 } \\ & \text { station [22]-8:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
| S | 67:16 | shows [4]-15:7, | 53:14, 65:24 | 23:1, 23:25, 24:1, |
|  | sends [1] | 47:23, 67:3, 67:10 | somewhat [1] - $68: 28$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 7,25: 6,26: 14 \\ & 26: 18,27: 25,31: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { salary [2] - 46:23, } \\ & 63: 11 \end{aligned}$ |  | $23: 22,24: 28,25: 1$ | somewhere [1] - | $31: 21,32: 1,32: 2$ |
|  |  | $28: 2,35: 1,39: 4$ | 19:19 | $33: 5,33: 26,37: 20$ |
| 63:11 <br> SAMS [11] - 52:19, | $\begin{gathered} \text { sense [6] - 11:2, } \\ 15: 23,33: 29,44: 24, \end{gathered}$ | $46: 22,47: 1,47: 16$ | soon [1] - 12:12 | 37:24, 42:18, 43:2, |
| $52: 23,52: 28,53: 5,$ | 45:1, 62:18 | 47:24, 49:1, 50:16, | sore [2] - 60:4, 60:17 | 43:22, 44:7, 68:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 59: 4,60: 23,62: 7 \\ & 64: 16,65: 28,67: 29 \end{aligned}$ | sensible [1] - 43:15 | 51:17, 63:18, 65:9, | sorry [27]-8:2, 9:3, | status [1] - 55:2 |
|  | $\text { sent }[2]-10: 16,42: 8$ | $65: 13,65: 16,65: 25,$ | $18: 8,27: 22,34: 26,$ | stays [1] - 52:16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 64: 16,65: 28,67: 29 \\ & 70: 14 \end{aligned}$ | September [2] - | $65: 26,70: 9$ | $35: 16,35: 17,36: 13$ | stenographic [1] - |
| SANDRA [1] - 4:3 <br> sat [1] - 37:5 | $10: 3,49: 2$ <br> sequence [3] | sickness [5] - 34:21, <br> 50:20, 65:8, 65:28 | $39: 26,40: 19,44: 22$ | 1:26 |
| SAVAGE [1]-3:16 <br> save [1] - 13:6 <br> saved [2]-57:11, |  | 50:20, 65:8, 65:28 67:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 15,51: 8,51: 24, \\ & 54: 18,54: 28,57: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ste } \\ 1: 24 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | ```11:11, 54:29, 66:2 sequential [1] - 54:17``` | side [3]-37:3, 48:17, | 58:19, 58:21, 59:11, | STENOGRAPHY [1] |
|  |  | 67:7 | 62:29, 63:28, 64:25, | - 1:29 |
| saved [2]-57:11, $57: 12$ | 54:17 <br> Sergeant [17] - 8:20, | sign [3]-27:12 | 67:19, 68:7 | step [2] - 66:21 |
| $\text { saw [1] - } 36: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 19,10: 1,10: 17 \\ & 10: 29,13: 15,18: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 33:19 | sort [9]-17:18, | step-by-step [1] - |
| SC [10] - 2:6, 2:7, |  | signature [7] - 39:11, | 19:23, 19:25, 30:11, | 66:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2: 10,2: 16,2: 21,2: 27, \\ & 3: 22,3: 23,3: 23,4: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 10:29, 13:15, 18:23, 20:6, 23:16, 35:4, | 39:12, 39:14, 39:15, | 35:27, 37:14, 39:18, | STEPHANIE [1] - |
|  | $35: 6,44: 13,44: 16$ | 39:21, 39:22, 39:23 | 40:11, 48:15 | 2:27 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCANLAN [1] - 3:8 } \\ & \text { scheduled [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 23,44: 27,44: 28, \\ & 45: 4 \end{aligned}$ | signed [1] - 10:29 | sound [1] - 28:20 | STEPHEN [1] - 2:21 |
|  |  | significance [1] - | specific [4]-8:25, | stick [1] - 46:9 |
| $11: 26$ scheduling [1] - | SERGEANT [5] - | 50:13 | $24: 26,24: 28,48: 28$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { still [5] - 10:22, } \\ 61: 17,62: 4,65: \end{array}$ |
| 27:20 | 4:3 | simple [5] - 17:27 | 28:26, 69:3 | $67: 1$ |
| scheme [1] - 50:20 screen [13] - 8:11, |  | 18:4, 59:8, 59:11, | specify [2] - 52:21, | stood [1] - 12:1 |
| screen [13]-8:11 $8: 17,19: 26,19: 27$ | $44: 16,45: 27$ | 63:1 | 66:28 | stopped [1] - 20:28 |
| $8: 17,19: 26,19: 27$ $20.1,20: 5,22 \cdot 26$ |  | simply [3] - 6:28, | speculating [1] - | story [1] - 18:3 |
| 20:1, 20:5, 22:26, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { serious [2] - 28:8, } \\ & 33: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 23:4, 69:14 | 19:17 | straight [1] - 46:28 |
| $65: 27,66: 4,67: 4$ |  | single $[4]-47: 1$ | spotted [1] - 32:11 | STREET [3] - 2:12, |
|  | servant [1] - 46:29 | $\begin{gathered} 48: 15,67: 17,67: 21 \\ \text { SINÉAD }[1]-4: 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { stage }[8]-16: 10, \\ 25: 15,26: 27,37: 28 \end{gathered}$ | 3:27, 3:31 |
| scroll $[4]-8.17$, $48: 29,67: 7,67: 11$ | served [4]-8:4, | SINéAD [1] - 2:7 | $45: 9,53: 2,58: 12$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { stress }[39]-23: 3, \\ 23: 23,24: 13,24: 17 \end{gathered}$ |
| ```scrutinised [1] - 38:1 scrutiny [1] - 38:7 SEAN[4] - 1:12, 2:2,``` | $14: 7,14: 27,15: 21$ | $\text { sit [1] }-68: 25$ | 58:15 | $24: 20,27: 15,27: 18$ |
|  | service [1] - 55:11 | sitting [2] - 38:4, | stakeholders [2] - | $27: 21,27: 28,28: 1$ |
|  | Services [1] - 1:24 | 46:10 | 30:11, 56:8 | $28: 4,28: 8,33: 3$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SEAN [4] - 1:12, 2:2, } \\ & \text { 2:22, 3:17 } \end{aligned}$ | SERVICES [1] - 1:29 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i x }}[4]-16: 11,19: 6,$ | stamped [1] - 10:3 | $38: 14,47: 28,49: 3$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2:22, 3:17 } \\ & \text { SEANAD }_{[1]}-1: 5 \\ & \text { second }[2]-43: 13, \end{aligned}$ | set [2] - 14:4, 39:20 | 47:17, 47:23 | standards [1] - 41:24 | $49: 9,49: 17,53: 19$ |
|  | shakiest [1] - 33:26 | sixth [1] - 47:25 | start [6] - 16:5, | 55:7, 56:21, 58:8, |
|  |  | slightly [4]-9:28 | 31:15, 39:27, 47:6, | 58:25, 61:5, 61:16, |
| seconds [1] - 46:13 | $34: 2,34: 3,40: 7$ | 17:19, 47:22, 51:9 | 62:6, 66:1 | 61:22, 61:24, 62:18, |
| Section [1] - 43:9 | SHANE [1] - 3:22 | lowly [1] - 66:17 | started [2] - 16:10, | 63:17, 64:22, 64:23, |
| secured [1] - 55:9 | SHANKEY [1] - 3:21 | SMITH [1] - 3:21 | 46:8 | 65:9, 65:11, 65:15, |
| see [27] - 13:20, | SHANKEY-SMITH | SMITHFIELD [1] - | starts [1] - 32:17 | 65:17, 67:27, 68:8, |
| 15:28, 24:6, 25:12, | $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-3: 21} \\ & \text { SHANNON }[1]-2: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 2:24 | State [1] - 68:10 | 68:10, 68:12 |
| 31:8, 31:12, 32:16, |  | smoothly [2] - 69:17, | STATE [1] - 3:26 | stressful $[8]-23: 1$, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 32: 26,34: 5,38: 24, \\ & 39: 15,40: 3,41: 15, \end{aligned}$ | SHEAHAN [1] - 3:18 | 69:18 | state [1] - 46:29 | 23:24, 27:25, 31:20, |
|  | SHELLEY [1] - 3:24 | o-called [1] - 41:5 | statement $[23]-8: 9$, | 31:21, 37:20, 37:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 48: 1,48: 16,48: 24 \\ & 48: 27,52: 17,52: 23 \end{aligned}$ | SHELLEY [1] - 3:24 <br> shift [2]-25:14, | SOLE [1] - 2:2 | $8: 11,10: 4,11: 6$, $11: 13,11: 29,15: 4$ | struggled [1] - 45:6 |
| $57: 4,61: 24,62: 26$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shift [2] - 25:14, } \\ & \text { 26:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { solicitor [2]-48:7, } \\ & 53: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 13,11: 29,15: 4, \\ & 15: 27,17: 19,22: 22, \end{aligned}$ | stuff [7]-22:7, 27:2, |
| $\begin{gathered} 66: 2,66: 11,66: 12, \\ 66: 13,67: 8 \\ \text { seem [8] - 13:11, } \\ 19: 4,32: 23,35: 7, \end{gathered}$ | 26:17 | SOLICITOR [1] - 2:8 | $23: 10,24: 20,27: 24$ | 34:12, 38:6, 40:8, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shifts [1] - 45:7 } \\ & \text { SHIP }[1]-3: 27 \\ & \text { short }[3]-12: 16, \\ & 34: 28,70: 7 \end{aligned}$ | SOLICITOR'S [1] | $29: 12,30: 6,30: 17$ | 43:11, 48:8 |
|  |  | $3: 26$ | $30: 22,31: 16,38: 29,$ | stumbling [1] - 62:8 |
|  |  | SOLICITORS [5] - | 44:14, 55:26, 55:29, | stupid [1]-9:1 |




