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CHAL RMAN Morning.

MR. KELLY: Good morning, Chairman.
10:30
CHA RMAN I am sorry, Mr. Kelly, I am looking in the wrong direction. Good morning Mr. Kelly. Yes.
MR. KELLY: Morning, Chairman. Garda Keogh is back.
CHA RMAN Very good. Thanks very much.
MR. KELLY: Yesterday, you very kindly gave everybody an opportunity to think about the position and I said I would make some very succinct submissions.

## CHA RMAN Yes.

## SUBM SSI ON BY MR. KELLY:

MR. KELLY: Our position is simply this, Chairman: We say that where a member is not available for duty as a result of an injury or work related stress, that effectively what it amounts to is there has to be an doesn't kick in because it's work related. we say that it follows, obviously, from that, as a matter of common sense, that local management is also obliged to address the issues causing the member's stress.

Be that as it may, it's my view that what we should do is just concentrate on the facts rather than get into submissions about what the regulations say at this
stage. That can come later.
CHA RMAN Yes, I understand that.
MR. KELLY: The legal framework. That's the way I would approach it, Mr. Chairman.
CHAI RMAN Are you happy with that, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MtGI NESS: Yes. Mr. Kelly was kind enough to
inform me of his view of the position and certainly, I mean obviously I went through the SAMS screen shots with Garda Keogh, and I wasn't intending to take him through regulations or --
CHA RMAN No, no, I understand. For my part, I have to say, I am grateful for the illumination of the issues. I mean, Mr. Kelly has now summarised it in a couple of sentences. I didn't know that that was the position. I now understand that that was the position, ${ }^{10: 32}$ as a result of the exchanges yesterday and the documents that were shown. So, as far as I'm concerned, I am completely happy with that.

Mr. Murphy, you don't have anything really to say about 10:32 this, do you? Or if you do, do you agree with the remarks of the last speaker.

MR. MRPHY: No, I don't think I do, Chairman. CHA RMAN No, I don't think so.
MR. MRPH: I think, as I understood, Mr. Kelly was indicating that that's his client's and his view of the regulations.
CHA RMAN of course. What Mr. Kelly is saying is, as I understand it, listen, the time for argument about
the scope and meaning of the regulations is another day, we don't need to trouble at this stage, merely the fact of the matter.

MR MRPHY: Yes, Chairman.
CHA RMAN I also think it's useful that Garda Keogh had the opportunity of saying, look, what's the essence of my complaint? whether it's correct or not is another thing, the essence of his complaint is: I was categorised under one thing, it should have been categorised under another, so that the question of the reduction does never have arisen. That's essentially as I understand what the situation is.

Okay, thanks for that, people. what do you say, Mr. McGuinness? So you are ready to proceed with Garda 10:33 Keogh.
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes, I am ready to proceed. In advance of that, I should just say something in advance to people for planning the next stage.
CHAN RMAN Please do.
MR. MEGU NNESS: I had set a target date or time that I might be finished with Garda Keogh's examination today and having reviewed the few issues that are left, I don't believe that I will finish my examination today.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: But I do hope that I might finish by Monday lunchtime.

CHA RMAN Right.
MR. MEGU NESS: Obviously, I don't want to curtail

Garda Keogh in any way.
CHAN RMN No, but your estimate --
MR. MEGU NESS: My estimate, all things being equal,
that I would expect to finish by lunchtime on Monday.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. MGGI NESS: That is without rushing myself or Garda Keogh.
CHAI RMAN So cross-examination would then begin.
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. Just for the assistance of
others, I have spoken to the various parties and the proposal which has been put forward, Chairman, for your approval, is that we would start over here with the representatives of the members, the sergeants, the inspectors and so forth and come around to Mr. Murphy then, who has got a very extensive list of clients who he represents and then Mr. Kelly.
CHA RMAN Mr. MCGuinness, if you and your colleagues have agreed on such a scheme, then I certainly won't interfere with it. obviously if it struck me that it was in some way not satisfactory, I would say so. But ${ }^{10: 35}$ otherwise, I am satisfied with that. There's no problem with that. So that's the way we will proceed. So everybody then knows what the general scheme is, and Garda Keogh knows sort of broadly speaking what to expect.
MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much. very good. Now, Garda Keogh. Thanks very much.

GARDA N CHOLAS KEOGH CONTI NUED TO BE QUESTI ONED BY MR. MCGU NNESS, AS FOLLOMS:
A. Good morning.

2 Q. When we were dealing with this issue last, which is issue 12 , concerning the misrecording of your sick leave, I think you probably were aware from Athlone Garda Station that it was Garda Olivia Kelly who was processing your sick absences onto the system in Athlone?
A. I read that. Like I know Garda Kelly was -- I know she was doing something upstairs, but I actually -- it's obvious that's her role.
3 Q. Yes.
A. As I said, I'm not au fait with anything to do the SAMS system or anything.
4 Q. Al1 right. Okay. Well, I am not going examine you in detail about what her function is, but I think from your point of view, when you or any other member
reports sick, that's often done over the phone?
A. Yes.

5 Q. Or by any other means of communication?
A. Yes.

6 Q. You will understand that a form, an SR1 is then process, as it were.
A. I understand that part of it, yes.

7 Q. Yes. Garda Kelly's job then, as she describes it in

Volume 12, page 3640, is that she receives a form and then she opens up the sickness absence management system on the computer, and then she creates an entry relating to the absence and then that entry is then kept there until the guard returns to work and she can then complete the details on the resumption of duty of the member.
A. I would accept that. As I said, I don't know how it works.
8 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

9 Q. She said that in the majority of the forms that the SR1 doesn't record the type of illness. I am going to open your forms to you, just a few selected ones. There's a large batch of them in the papers.
A. Yes.

10 Q. I am sure you have seen them. She said that she didn't treat your sickness differently than any other member. That you reported sick and returned to work on 18 different occasions between 20th December '14 until your current absence at the end of December '15, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

11 Q. According to her recollection, none of the SR1 forms stated that a sickness was due to work related stress but the medical certificates stated they did related to work related stress?
A. Yes.

12 Q. Now obviously, like any employee, she would have leave
and holidays and somebody else presumably substituted for her.
A. I read Garda Kelly's statement. I have no issue with anything there.
13 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

14 Q. So the point is that as far as your absences were concerned, she would receive the SR1, a medical cert wouldn't come in at the time she triggers the system. So when she creates the entry on SAMS, it's recorded as 10:38 an ordinary illness. And also, in particular, there was no category on the system for recording work related stress. I don't know if you accept that or not?
A. I think we established that yesterday. Yes. She furnished a report to Superintendent McBrien on 24th May ' 16 in relation to the changing of the SAMS category, and that was something that had come about as a result of your complaint arising from what you discover with the doctor, the CMO, in December of ' 15.
A. Yes.

16 Q. That led to the change being made from ordinary illness to mental health at that stage, in may '16, I think you would agree with that?
A. Yeah.

17 Q. It might be helpful then to perhaps look at some of the SR1s relating to you. These are found in volume 33 of the papers. Maybe if we commence at page 9314. It's just a sample. Some show nothing in the box, some show
handwritten entries. But these are the documents then on which, whether it's Garda Kelly or somebody in her absence, then input the information. That's one from August, for example. There is "other" ticked in that "ordi nary illness category". If we go down the page, this seems to be an important part of the system, as it were, this portion in black ink there.
"An absence must be categorised as ordinary ill ness until such time as a certificate in accordance with rule 11.37 has been issued by the chi ef superintendent. An absence must al so be categorised as ordi nary illness until such time as it is classified as critical illness by HRM CMD, at which time the absence category must be amended accordingly."

So it seems to be a presumption that it's is an ordinary illness until the system sort of finds it otherwise. I am not asking you to comment on whether that's is good or bad, but that seems to be the way. was that your understanding, in fact, at any stage or did you know? was that your understanding at the time as to how the system worked or did you know?
A. As I said, I wouldn't really know how the system worked.

18 Q. okay.
A. Like, on this one like, I suppose I wouldn't like to see Garda olivia kelly being put in a place of cannon fodder, let's say, between a thing with myself and

Garda management, that she is to be blamed for anything, that it was all her fault, $I$ don't want that.
19 Q. I am not suggesting that and nobody is suggesting that. I am just asking you to look at these ones as they relate to your illness. If we could just go back to the top of that page. It's obviously got your name and rank. This is a typed written one. There are several handwritten ones. But if we go on then to 9317. That's not your handwriting on the top? These forms are commenced by the member to whom you have probably reported in?
A. I have often filled those forms in. It would be the person usually in the public office that would take the ca11. I wouldn't fill in those forms, so I understand this.

20 Q. You have done it for others, that's what you are saying?
A. Yes.

21 Q. Exactly. There is a sort of non-specified one there. Maybe the member didn't say why he was sick or -- If we 10:43 go down then.
A. Yeah, I generally -- I don't know if I did write in, $I$ think it's sort of private as wel1, when people are going sick.
22 Q. Yes. If we go down to 9319. This related, in fact, to 10:43 one of the days in July that we were talking about, where you had been out sick and then you phoned in off sick and you forgot. It triggered the filling out of a SR1 in any event, on that occasion, and there was
nothing specified there. Then 9320. Sorry, that related to the 15th, this relates to the 9th, 9320?
A. Just in relation to that, like, they did a fairly comprehensive investigation in relation to that time, that incident, the AWOL incident, let's say, there is no way Garda management could have missed that I was -you know, that I wasn't sick, work related stress, could not have missed that in their -- that would my argument or point.

23 Q.
Yes, I understand, of course. Then 9322. This is where it seems to get a tick in the "flu/ viral" box, for whatever reason, in June of '15, at this initial reporting stage. If we go down to 9324 , there's a "not provi ded" one there. I think at different stages you had certificates from Dr. Bartlett, some of them related to abdominal pains?
A. That's years, that was -- we're going back a couple of years. The work related stress starts the end of 2014 and it continues on, it's all work related stress. But in any event, as it's reported here initially, it's a "not provi ded" one at that point in time. That is 9324. Then 9328 is an example that may be of some interest or relevance. This is 20th April 2015. Just scroll down a tiny bit more. I am not sure whose signature that is, you probably recognise that. But anyway, whoever made that entry, they put it under the occupational injuries box there.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$. the time of the handover from Superintendent McBrien Again, that phrase is put in handwriting, but under the other box, which is maybe of interest or relevance at some stage. Then 9342 , is in December '14, where we've seen the couple of Dr. Bartlett's certificates which were gastro, viral gastroenteritis, there is a tick there in this initial report at that point in time.

Then, if we just go to 9331, this is a notification then which seemed to follow on from you going over the 183 on the basis of ordinary illness at that point in time. I mean, I think it's clear what your evidence is going to be in relation to this question, but: when would you have phoned in sick, I mean, you yourself would never have mentioned flu viral?
A. Oh no.

27 Q. And you wouldn't have mentioned work related stress on the phone as such, in those terms?
A. No, I would have just rang in and said --
Q. You're sick?
A. Yeah. That would have been, when would I have been equally in the public office with other members ringing in, it's, will you just put me down as sick.
A. Yeah. I wouldn't have ever asked, what are you sick with or anything.

30 Q. It's just, I am trying to work through it
chronologically. In your statement, page 148-149, which is a complaint actually to the Minister of the 14th June, you complain that Superintendent Murray recorded you as being out sick with flu?
A. Sorry, the date to the Minister is on the --

14th June 2016?
A. Oh sorry, yeah. Sorry.
Q. I think you accepted that Superintendent Murray had no actual role in inputting the entries recording you as sick, flu viral?
A. Well, he had to have been aware of it.
Q. We11, that's a different question. But in terms of the actual misrecording of it, it would appear, through no fault of Garda Kelly's -
A. No.
A. Correct. No fault of Garda Kelly's.
Q. Exactly. Now, the issue of recording that, you seem to blame Chief Superintendent wheatley in some respect in that regard, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Why is that?
A. Well, obviously there's the issue with the -- as I said, there's the issue to do with this AWOL thing. So they carried out a very comprehensive investigation to do with me ringing in sick and whatever. It's fair enough that a mistake could have been made in relation to things with viral flu to work related stress genuinely. But up to that point, once that point --
there can't be any mistake. It's not like it's an accident, they have to have spotted it at that stage. Then, as I stated, there's the issue where I am allowed to appeal the discipline matter and I asked for the copy of the statement which I had referenced the stress 10:51 that I was under at work and I don't get that copy from Chief Superintendent wheatley. So I am not saying -- I don't know how -- I didn't get it, that statement when I looked for it. And it referenced work related stress in that statement.
37 Q. Well, perhaps there's also something else that you might want to rely in the sense that, you had actually gone to Dr. Bartlett on the 16th July and you had got the certificate and you put that in and that had formed, in fact, part of the paperwork in the discipline inquiry, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

38 Q. So I mean, that was before Superintendent Murray and Chief Superintendent wheatley, isn't that right? That certificate from your doctor was before them at that point in time?
A. Oh in front of them, yes. Sorry, yes.

Yes. Just to be clear about the different roles, I think I should put what Superintendent Murray says in his statement to the investigators at page 3094, which is in volume 11. He says there, 1316, if you scroll down slightly:
"I had no role in recording sick leave, incl uding Garda

Keogh. I never entered data onto the si ckness absence management system The di strict clerk in Athl one performed that role. This became an issue in May 2016 and I was very anxi ous to bottomit out and the district clerk was able to do that very qui ckly. It is 10:53 ref erred to in my statement. So on 23rd May 2016, I got a call from Chi ef Superintendent Wheatley and she said she had been called by Chi ef Superintendent MELoughl in, that Garda Keogh had phoned hi m while drunk and was compl ai ni ng about the category under whi ch his ill ness was recorded. I never had any occasi on to record on the SAMS system so l contacted the di strict clerk and she furni shed me with a report of the $24 t h$ May, whi ch I attach as exhi bit PM 95."

Garda Kelly confirms that.
"I forwarded her report to the chi ef superi ntendent West meath. Frommy enqui ries into the allegation, it had no foundation. Garda Keogh had been recorded in the category of ordi nary ill ness, sub category of flu viral for some time, including before my arrival in At hl one. "

Would you agree that that's factually correct?
A. Sorry, just something caught my eye previously.

40 Q. Yes.
A. I just recal1 reading Chief Superintendent McLough1in's statement, he refers to, you know, communications
between me and him. I don't remember him saying what condition I was in or anything like that. But I see Superintendent Murray here says that $I$ was drunk. I mean, I may have been or whatever, I don't know. But I am obviously concerned about the -- I'm ringing Chief Superintendent McLough1in in relation to the category or whatever. So, just it's interesting, I don't think, from recollection, I don't think Chief Superintendent McLoughlin goes into -- little comments, throwing in little comments is what I am saying. Sorry, if you can -- that part.
41 Q. You have been distracted.
A. Yes.

42 Q. That's perfectly understandable. It's really just what Superintendent Murray says about his role there and the 10:55 fact that this is the way it had been recorded before he came and he had nothing to do with the way it was being recorded. I think you would agree with that?
A. Physically, physically he would have had nothing to do with the way it's recorded. I would accept that.

43 Q. Obviously from the point of view of the system, we have seen the way the system require it to be ordinary illness, until it's certified as something else. This is where the issue arises that you have complained about, which is the duty to enquire into the causes of the stress, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

44 Q. Because, if and when enquired into and then certified, it can get you out of the category of ordinary illness,
perhaps into a category of occupational injury, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

45 Q. Could I ask you to look at a document relevant to that, from page 6144 onwards. This is from Mr. Mulligan in HR to the chief super. It says:
"It is noted that the above mentioned menber's absence from 20th April 2015 to the 25th April was stress rel at ed.

You should now intervi ew this member in order to establish the source of the menber's stress and if it is suggested as being work rel ated, a full i nvesti gati on should be carried out.

This branch requires a full report, referral formand medi cal certificates in accordance with....rel ating to the above named menber's absence.

Pl ease ensure that the member is advi sed of the wel fare ser vi ce. "

Then, if we go down to the next page, this is from Chief Superintendent wheatley.
"I refer to your correspondence dated 12th May and now forward the attached report of Superintendent Murray dated 20th May 2015.

As outlined in the attached correspondence, the di strict officer Athl one advi ses that he cannot further expl ore the reasons for the member's alleged stress as the nember is not willing to further di scuss the issue, 10:57 whi ch he states arises out of the invol vement and protections under the confidential reporting l egi sl ation.

The di strict officer Athl one, Superintendent Murray has 10:57 advi sed that the member is engaging with the welfare servi ce and has advi sed the menber of its benefits to hi $m$

Gar da Keogh was due for revi ew at the Garda occupational heal th service on 19th May 2015."

Then I think the next document is the report of Superintendent Murray. He says:
"I refer to your correspondence of the 12th May and that of Human Resources and Peopl e Devel opment dated 7th May 2015. In addition, I attach a copy of my correspondence to you dated 2nd April 2015. As I i ndi cated, Garda Keogh is provi ding inf ormation under Garda Sí ochána Confidential Reporting of Corruption or Mal practice Regul ation 2007.

When I met the menber on 26th March 2015, I di scussed
hi s work absence, incl udi ng the fact that his medi cal certificates were indi cating that he was suffering from work rel ated stress. The member was qui ck to point out that he was a confidential reporter and had certain protections in that role. He indi cated that Assistant Commissi oner Western Regi on was investigating reports and allegations that he has made to the confidential reci pi ent. Outside of disclosing that, the member was reticent to di scuss the work rel ated stress he indi cates he is suffering from rel ying instead on the protections he has in the confidential reporting I egi sl ation.

In these circumstances, I cannot further expl ore the situation with the member. I am aware anecdotally that 10:59 a full investigation is being carried out into the member's clai m\$ of corruption and mal practice. I have no further information in rel ation to that i nvestigation. I understand that the member is engaging with the welfare service via the investigation 10:59 he is invol ved in. I did, however, advi se himof its benefit."

He encloses these documents that were required by HQ . You see that?
A. Yes.

46 Q. Would you like to comment on that in any way?
A. We11, I mean, I suppose, look, I am under a lot of stress, I mean from the very start of this and then I
suppose, when I'm working, as I said, the very first month was extremely difficult. Then the next, is it after that, 17 months, I am working alongside Garda A and there's the investigations going on and all that. When Superintendent Murray, of course, arrives, he certainly plays his own role in part of that stress as far as I'm concerned. Yes, I understand that. But that would seem in an almost strange way to sort of buttress what he's saying there. You weren't in fact and didn't discuss any aspect of the stress with Superintendent Murray at any stage, I mean factually?
A. No, no, no. No, I did say, look, I'm under -- it's work related. well, as I said, the very first week he said to me twice, you're under no stress. And he said it twice. Like I mean, I don't think there is -what's the discussion? It wasn't, are you, or, what's wrong, or any question. It's, you are under no stress. 48 Q. In any event, the next document, 6147. I am sorry it must be 6148. Sorry, that is only the instruction to send out the report. If we go to 6169. This is dated 8th June and it's from Chief Superintendent wheatley. It recites the absence from work. It says there in the middle of the paragraph:
"Efforts have been made locally to establish the source of the member's work rel at ed stress. However, the member is rel uctant to di scuss the matter."

Did you meet, in fact, with Chief Superintendent wheatley, do you remember? Do you recall that?
A. Yes.

49 Q. You were obviously off duty, but did she call out to you?
A. She did, yes.
Q. Yes. Can you just tell us about that meeting?
A. If you can just give me the date?

51 Q. Yes. I think it was the 16th May?
A. '15?

52 Q. 16th May.
A. 2015?

53 Q. Yes.
A. We're on 2016, just for clarification?

54 Q. Yes. I beg your pardon.
A. I'm sorry.

55 Q. May I just read what she has said?
A. Yes.

56 Q. She said that you raised the issue in this context, that she undertook to explore the matter, she made enquiries with Superintendent Murray, Chief Superintendent McLoughlin and also looked at the system herself.
"It was established that, i ndeed, the menber's absence had been recorded as flu viral. The person keeping the records provi ded an expl anation as to why it had been recorded inthis manner. The system was limited and the onl y pl ace you could report work rel ated stress was
mental health and there was a rel uctance to use that category. Following her intervention, the records were amended to reflect certified absence as work related stress."

I think she means under that heading. Then she continues on in her statement at page 6117 to 6118:
"Garda Keogh appears to be of the belief that work rel at ed stress automatically entitles himto full pay. He is mistaken in that belief. Wen Garda Keogh rai sed the issue of work rel ated stress with Superintendent Murray in 2014, he stated he coul dn't di scl ose the nat ure of work rel ated stress as he was engaged in the protected di scl osure process. We could not advance the 11:04 matter. We advi sed HRM accordingly. Pay deci si ons are a matter for HRM They are the only people authorised to issue instructions to Killarney regarding pay."
so, if we just continue on down there, she describes the operation of the system. Sorry, if we go back to 6169 to 71. 6169. This is a report then, we see in the second paragraph. If we continue down there, 6170, she refers to the second report of the 20th may that we have looked at. If we continue down, she does record a 11:05 discussion there in this paragraph, perhaps I should read it out:
"While Garda Keogh's absences from duty have been
intermittent at times, his current absences from duty have been for a protracted period and now exceeds 160 days. Wile Garda Keogh has ret urned to work on occasi on, he continues to attribute his absence to work rel ated stress arising fromthe matters being i nvestigated through the confidential reporting mechani sm This was apparent during my own recent meeting with Garda Keogh, when I enquired if he was anxi ous to ret urn to work. Garda Keogh advi sed me on that occasi on he attributes his current absence due to work rel ated stress by his invol vement in the i nvesti gations being progressed outsi de the West meath di vision. Garda Keogh intimated he would not be ret urning to work until these matters had been concl uded, as these matters were exacer bating his condition. Details of this meeting were outlined in correspondence to your office dated 19th May 2016 (tab E)."

So she reported of that meeting earlier.
A. And she is accurate in what she says. Just for clarification as well, from my meeting with Chief Superintendent wheatley, she's a lovely person, and anything I ever heard about her, and these are even in my circles, were very positive. But unfortunately just 11:06 on this, in relation to this she seems to have pitched her wagon to Superintendent Murray. I suppose that's why, apparently why she's here.
57 Q. Just to continue what she says next there:
"Despite a number of enquiries with Garda Keogh to establish the source of his alleged work rel ated stress, the member has continuousl y correl ated his i nvol vement as a confidential reporter to his absence through alleged work rel ated stress. I am al so consci ous that the menber's continued absence was the subject of a case conference in December 2015. It is apparent that while the member cites alleged work rel ated stress that the reason for his continued absence, addi ction treatment is al so requi red by Garda Keogh. If successful, a return to his workplace is to be accompl ished. This was borne out in the correspondence forwarded to Superintendent Murray by I nspector Downey following this case conference on the 9th December 2015. Revi ewed by the chi ef medi cal of ficer on 18th December 2015, determined that the member is unfit to attend for work or for regular policing duties at present. Wile I am not on recei pt of the advi ces of the chi ef medical of ficer following the member's revi ew at the occupational heal th service on 19th May 2016..."

We will come to that.
"...I contacted the chi ef medical officer on today's date and I amadvised that a previ ous advi ce in respect of Garda Keogh remai $n$ the same. The chi ef medi cal officer al so outlined that should the menber be deemed
fit to return to policing duties by his own medical practitioner, that any return to work would only be permitted following a revi ew at the occupational health service. I explained to the chi ef medical officer that I was eager to have a case conference in respect of Garda Keogh and was advi sed that same is bei ng arranged by his office.

Garda Keogh has never intimated that there were any inci dents which occurred in the workplace in Athl one whi ch were causing his alleged work rel ated stress. Garda Keogh has never made any report whi ch warranted investigation in accordance with the bullying procedure. Indeed, all possible supports to facilitate a return to work by Garda Keogh have been put in place by district management teamin Athl one and his wel fare has been prioritised through ongoing enquiries to ensure the menber is aware of and availing of the empl oyee assi stance scheme.

In view of the foregoing, it has not been possible to conduct a full investigation into Garda Keogh's absence through alleged work rel ated stress, nor do I believe will any further or specificinformation be provided by Garda Keogh whi ch would enable the further investigation of the claim However, to be clear and to avoid any doubt, I amto enquire if there is any requi rement to further investigate Garda Keogh's absence through alleged work rel at ed stress. In the
event that the further investigation of this matter is war ranted, I woul d recommend that permission be granted to appoint an inspector outside the West meath di vi si on to conduct the same."

Now, one interpretation of that letter is that Chief Superintendent wheatley is (a) reporting as required, (b) she has made what might be described as a reasonable and proper effort to investigate the issue, and (c) she is reporting accurately her view of the position and she is suggesting that if it can be done, it may be need to be done by way of an outside inspector. Would that not appear that she is (a) taking it seriously and reporting --
A. Again, there's something in that that $I$ just twigged. 58 Q. Yes.
A. I went sick, I went sick on 26th December 2015.

59 Q. Yes.
A. With work related stress and I stay out. Now, whatever way it's worded there, it appears to me it's like the CMO, when I visited him, said, you are not fit to go back to work. That wasn't the case, it was me that -I couldn't -- I just wasn't strong enough to -- my target was to keep going, to stay in work until at least 2016, but I just couldn't make it. I had only five days to go and I couldn't even do that. That was my own target I had set. But when Chief Superintendent Wheatley contacts me, we're in May, 17th May 2016, so I am already, what, let's say, five months out and no one
-- I don't think anyone has come near me in that five months. I think here there's every effort and all the rest. No one comes near me, just from recollection, in that five months. And again, there's stuff going on in relation to the whistleblowers in other arenas that prompt the Garda authorities to kind of do something, address matters. But it's only because there's other issues, I would argue, that are going on in political arenas and courts or whatever. I don't think anyone came near me for five months, to my recollection.
Could I suggest that the reason may be that the first issue over the misrecording of it was, in fact, raised by you in May 2016? Is that not right?
A. It could be, I'm not -- I remember, like, in relation to Chief Superintendent wheatley's previously thing you showed me, the previous thing was very accurate. Just on this one, there was one or two little things that I -- I suppose, just slight things that just needed to be clarified.
61 Q. Yes. But obviously Chief Superintendent McLough1in had been in touch with you by this stage, isn't that correct?
A. Just on dates, $I$ cannot remember. Again, it probably is 2016.

62 Q. Yes.
A. It is 2016, yes, when Chief Superintendent McLough1in -- yes, yes.

63 Q. Because at this stage, in June, at the time of this letter is being reported up, there's consideration
being given within HQ to the issue of work related stress and amending the code to provide for an extended definition, which would bring it within the categorisation of injury at work or occupational injury. Chief superintendent McLoughlin raised this in 11:14 an e-mail, which is dated the 4th June. It commences on 9695 , but if we go to 9696 , he refers to two guards, you are, I think, the first guard there. He poses the question there:
"I pose this question: Is it right that they go on reduced pay while the investi gations are ongoing and while the organisation decides on a new policy? These are sensitive cases and have attracted si gni ficant nedia attention. While this can't be used as a reason for change, nonethel ess it will bring consi derable pressures.

My own viewis that this situation needs to be revi ewed as a matter of urgency. It may well be the case that 11:15 pay should not be reduced until these matters are resol ved. The mentbers concer ned would argue that it is not their fault that they are sick. The organi sation carries a risk al so while resol utions are being found. "

That's part of a dialogue, if we go back a page, to 9695, Mr. Downey, who is there, if we just go down to what he replies back. I don't want to get into what this working group were doing, but Mr. Downey is
expressing a view in the second paragraph:
"However, the fact that causality is an issue presents an opportunity to deal with each case on a case-by-case basis based on medical assessment. If a GP's diagnosis of work rel ated stress is supported by the CMD, then I see no issue with categorising the ill ness as occupational injury or injury/illness on duty. This pl aces the matter firmy in the hands of the medical professi on and al so allows AGS to categorise work rel ated stress with a causality medi cally assessed as work rel ated occupational injury on duty."

So that goes up to Chief McLoughlin that you had been dealing with. If we go up the page. He's replying to that. It says in the second paragraph -- he's stressing obviously in the first paragraph the urgency of the two cases. He says:
"I don't think there is any di spute over the reasons for absence from work. Big leap to categorise them as injury on duty. There should be another category such as occupational injury, which in my view is safer.

The key point here is that they should not be on reduced pay until it is proven that there wasn't a causal link between reason for absence and work rel ated. We tend to reduce pay first while we wait on deci sions, thus increasing the stress and exacer bating
the problem"

Would you agree that HQ have identified the dilemma that the existing system had somebody like you in at this point in time?
A. I would agree. That's fair.

64 Q. Seemed to be intended to address the issue. If we go to 9694 , just looking at the continuing dialogue. This is addressed to a whole group of different people, including Mr. Barrett, the executive director. This relates to a particular proposal to amend the definition. Just to note that. If we could go on then to 9693 , this is the response of Ms. Carr, who has made statement to the Tribunal there. She is addressing a number of different reasons for not keeping the system as it is but proceeding in a cautious way, taking into account a number of different ones. But in her concluding paragraph she says:
"While it is not ideal to reduce the member's sal ary while they were absent on sick leave, AGS should conti nue to i mplement the current sick leave regul ations. Where sick absences follow appropriate i nvesti gations are determined to be an injury on duty or an occupational injury once the amendment to code 1137 has been approved or covered by the critical ill ness protocol, any money due to the menber will be ref unded. This will benefit AGS in the management of over payment of sal ary to menbers absent on sick leave."

That is sort of advocating for perhaps the system to be left on its own. There is an e-mail then 9693, where margaret Nugent says at the bottom:
> "Given the issues hi ghl ighted by Chi ef Superintendent MELoughl in, can the natter be revi ewed and the process agreed in the short-termto deal with such sensitive cases on a case-by-case basis? I look forward to readi ng your reply."

Then there's a further e-mail from Margaret Nugent addressed to Ms. Carr, it says:
"I met Garda X this afternoon as the acting protected di sclosures manager in absence of Chi ef Superintendent McLoughl in. Having consi dered all the circunstances of the case, l amsatisfied it is essential that a mechani smbe found to immedi atel y restore menber to full pay in this case while matters are being
i nvesti gated. Not to do so may be interpreted as management not supporting and protecting the menber. It might al so be regarded as penal isation."

She recommends that the matter be reviewed. So there seems to be a shift in management there towards adopting this position. Presumably you would be happy to see that?
A. Yeah. I am aware of it, with the certain controversies that were going on.

65 Q. Yes.
A. The Gardaí were obviously under -- had to do something in relation to whistleblowers. Chief Superintendent McLough1in got that incendiary role and one that obviously going to be -- it might look handy, having a cup of tea or coffee, meeting members and that, but really, the dangerous role in probably the entire An Garda Síochána. I have a feeling that he took some brave steps, big steps as well.
66 Q. Obviously the dialogue continued. If we just go to two more, I think. 9691. It's Ms. Carr who is responding to Ms. Nugent there at the top of the page. There's a process document being attached. This is Ms. Carr addressing Ms. Nugent.
"I am of the firmbelief that where menbers are deemed to be unfit for duty by their GP or treating doctor, thei $r$ absence should be recorded as ordinary si ck I eave and managed under the appropriate si ck leave regul ations until all rel evant investi gations have been compl et ed.

However, having di scussed matter with you, I am attaching a proposed process docurent whi ch would allow 11:22 GS support persons who feel unable to attend work due to having made di scl osures under the PD I egi slation.

I have hi ghl ighted issues whi ch may require further
consi der ation and l woul d suggest that the advi ce of head of Iegal affairs should be sought bef ore introducing this process.

If this process is to apply to any member currently availing of sick leave, the PDM should advi se the date on whi ch sick leave ceases and the date this admini stration leave commences. Thi s may require certification fromthe treating doctor. On recei pt of that information, the menber's sick leave record can be 11:22 cl osed and the member returned to full pay. PDM will al so need to advi se local management of the start date for the admi ni strative l eave. "

That goes up it seems, if we go to 9727. This was, I think, the recommendation or it's from -- if we just scroll down, we will see it's from Monica Carr, it's slightly later, but it reflects $I$ think the advice of the CMO, which resulted in a case conference which provided support you in terms of a treatment regime, which was put in place at the expense of An Garda Síochána at that point in time. I think an inpatient treatment regime, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, there was an undertaking for the full, but they ended up only -- it was two-thirds, I think. I had to -- I have seen in some statements, yes, they undertook to pay the full amount but -- and remember, I think I was on reduced wages at the time. One-third. I'm not making an issue about that, that is not relevant. As I
said, I had saved up, I was ready for a period where I know I've to go on long sick. So for me that is -we're going to enter the territory of siege warfare, let's say, in military terms. So I am sort of prepared for what's ahead of me. Yes.

67 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, could you explain that, what do you mean by that, Garda Keogh? You're prepared for siege warfare?
A. Siege warfare.

68 Q. CHA RMAN what does that mean?
A. When I know I have to go sick, full-time out of work, where basically --

69 Q. CHA RMAN But you were out sick full-time?
A. No, this is where I have to go out from the 26 th of December 2015.

70 Q. CHA RMAK December 2015?
A. My own target was just to get it into 2016.

71 Q. CHA RMAN No, don't mind that, just concentrate, siege warfare, what does that mean?
A. It means when I go out sick from work, I am not going to have my colleagues there, they're my colleagues, I'm not going to be in work, so I'm away from work. Then, of course, there's the penalisation of the financial things that are due to follow. That's what I mean, where essentially I'm --
72 Q. CHA RMAN what was the treatment? They advised treatment?
A. Sorry, yeah. That was where --

73 Q. CHA RMAN Did you get the treatment?
A. I did, yes.

74 Q. CHA RMAN what was that? In general. I don't want to be prying into your -- just what was the general nature of that? Was it inpatient?
A. Inpatient, yes. I didn't take it up at the start. You 11:26 see, you have to be ready yourself --
Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, wait now.
A. Yes.

76 Q. CHA RMAN A question:
A. Yes.

77 Q. CHA RMAN They suggested treatment. Did you get treatment?
A. Yes.

78 Q. CHA RMAN of a general nature, you understand, I don't want to be prying into private matters unnecessarily. okay, did you get the treatment?
A. Yes.

79 Q. CHA RMAN was it inpatient treatment?
A. Yes.

80 Q. CHA RMAN Over some fairly long period?
A. A month.

81 Q. CHAN RMAN A month.
A. Roughly, yeah.

82 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Did it work?
A. It did for 19 months, until the day I heard about a $\quad$ 11:27 certain promotion and then -- so for 19 months it did work.

83 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. That was when? when did that start? when did that treatment take place?
A. That was in around, I'11 tell you, it was when the world cup was on, sorry, the European championships were on. So that would be the summer of --
84 Q. CHA RMAN 2016?
A. -- 2016.

85 Q. CHAN RMAN The summer of 2016?
A. July, 14th Ju7y.
Q. CHA RMAN So July 2016 you had treatment of approximately a month?
A. Yes.

87 Q. CHA RMAN That did you a lot of good. When you came out then, let's say, from August 2016 you were good for more or less two years?
A. 2018 .

88 Q. CHA RMAN Is that what you said, did you say 18 months $11: 28$ or two years?
A. Nineteen months.

89 Q. CHA RMAN Over about 18 or 19 months?
A. Yes. 2018 was when I relapse.

CHA RMAN Okay. Thank you very much. Sorry, was that 11:28 the first time that anybody suggested that you have treatment for stress?
A. I didn't, it wasn't treatment technically for stress. I was using alcohol as a crutch and I suppose it was alcohol was what the treatment was for. But I was using alcohol as a crutch.

90 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, while I am on this subject, did anybody suggest treatment for stress?
A. I don't think -- I don't. No. Well, I have never -- I
don't think I have even heard of -- you're the first person.
91 Q. CHAN RMAN Nobody suggested that?
A. No.

CHA RMAN Okay. Thanks very much. Thank you.
92 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Just to go to 9690, this is just going back in time to see how headquarters appear to deal with the matter. If we just go down the page, we see Ms. Nugent there. It's about the process document. she is saying there:
"I have read the document. My onl y concern rel ates to having consult with local management regarding the pay. This may pose problems, particularly where local management practices may be the source of compl ai nt rel evant to di scl osure. Furthermore, the di scl osure has to be kept confidential. Can an arrangement be made whereby pay issues are sorted out in Navan, i ncl udi ng admi ni strati ve l eave, based on a communi cation with the protected disclosure manager."

Then there is reference obviously in respect of Garda X:
"In respect of Garda $X$ and further to $M$. Barrett's of the menber being on half pay for the last few weeks is restored. You may wi sh to run the process by HoLa. However, in the interimthe member's pay needs to be
restored in full, incl udi ng back moni es. I have advi sed the member that pay will be restored in full by 24th J une 2016."

I don't want to go into the innards of $H Q$, but you were 11:30 aware through different communications with Chief Superintendent McLoughlin and Mr. Barrett, that this process was in being, isn't that right?
A. Sorry, this process?

This process of addressing the issue of your pay and categorisation of the illness, as it were?
A. Yeah.

Can I ask you this: Have you received any communication from An Garda Síochána to confirm what your categorisation or medical classification on SAMS is at present?
A. Oh, I don't know. I don't know, I'm sorry.
Q. All right. My understanding from the summary of the SAMS entry is that your classification is sill ordinary illness, mental health. But that certainly for pay
purposes you have been categorised as being on full pay due to work related stress?
A. Yeah. I'm on basic pay.

96 Q. Yes.
A. You see, sometimes work related stress, where, we'11
say, full pay they give allowances, where you get all your allowances. I don't get those. I'm on what's called -- I think it's termed just basic pay, standard. It's fine, like is what I'm saying. I'm not giving
out.
97 Q. Yes. But just trying to draw all of the strands together from our discussion and your evidence, the complaints of targeting and discrediting, could I ask you to encapsulate what you say they are in relation to 11:32 this issue and how they arise?
A. I think the whole -- like, certainly, as we have established, in relation to that investigation into the AWOL incident, where there is a fairly substantial -as I said, there is room, and this just my opinion, there is room for human error in relation to the flu to work related stress back in around 2014 and that. You know, I would understand that. But by 2015 or 1ate whenever it is, but certainly that investigation, there's no way they would miss that I am out with work related stress. There's just no way. And I would say that is targeting, because they know I am out with work related stress.

98 Q. CHAN RMAN They being Superintendent Murray.
A. Murray.

99 Q. CHA RMAN If I understand this, please correct me if I am wrong, Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN You say, at least from the time of the AWOL incident, if we can call it that?
A. Yes.

101 Q. CHA RMAN From then on, Superintendent Murray had to be aware, you say he had to be aware that your absences were due to work related stress?
A. Yes.

102 Q. CHA RMAN And he should have and he failed, as you see it, and this was targeting, he should have instituted an investigation as to the connection between that condition and work?
A. Yes.
A. Yes, yes.

104 Q. CHA RMAN with a view to the SAMS issue that was bound to arise sooner or later?
A. Yes.

105 Q. CHA RMAK Is that right?
A. Yes.

106 Q. CHA RMAN The practical application was going to be that you were reduced in salary in due course?
A. Yes.

107 Q. CHA RMAN But he should have identified this, knowing that it could have implications for your pay, your sick pay?
A. Yes.

108 Q. CHA RMAN Is that a fair way of describing this?
A. That's a very fair way. And as I say, I did go down to $€ 220$ per week.
109 Q. CHA RMAN No, I am not concerned about the amount?
A. Okay.

110 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, and I don't mean to cut you off on that. The essence of it is, here was a situation, he should have identified that and realised the implications of it that might come up, were then coming
up, but might come up for reduction in pay, is that right?
A. Yes, yes.

111 Q.
CHA RMAN Because if it was work related after a proper investigation, your full pay was secure?
A. Yes.
A. Yes.

113 Q. CHA RMAN okay. Is that a fair way of describing your complaint in this regard?
A. It is, Judge.

114 Q. CHA RMAN Let me ask you this - sorry to interrupt, Mr. McGuinness - does that apply to anybody else, any other specific person?
A. I don't understand.

115 Q. CHA RMAK You say Superintendent Murray should have identified it, he was the district officer?
A. Yes.

116 Q. CHA RMAN And he should have appreciated that. should anybody else have appreciated that?
A. Judge, unfortunately, I think Chief Superintendent Wheatley, I'm not -- you see, unfortunately -- I'm not -- I would say perhaps, just from different things, in relation to the work related stress and the statement and all of that.
117 Q. CHA RMAN Should she have done the same thing, should she have realised?
A. I think so.

118 Q. CHA RMAN So she should have addressed that question?
A. She should have realised.
Q. CHA RMAN It's all right, there's no problem. Just to focus specifically. I have your complaint about Superintendent Murray.
A. Mm-hmm.

125 Q. CHA RMAN Do you make the same complaint about chief Superintendent wheatley in regard to the sick pay issue?
A. Yes. writing to Chief Superintendent wheatley, she appears just to take Superintendent Murray's side straight off.
Q. CHA RMAN I am not with you on this, you are losing me here.
A. It's the phone call where we -- the only phone call between myself and Superintendent Murray, where he rings me on the morning to ask me why I wasn't in work, in relation to the AWOL incident, where he writes down the 14th and I say it's the 15th in my diary.
121 Q. CHA RMAN Hold on. We had that?
A. Yes, we did.
A. In relation to Chief Superintendent wheatley is what I am trying to --
Q. CHAN RMAN We're talking across each other here?
A. Sorry.

126
Q CHA RMAN Okay. Thank you very much. And nobody else?
A. No. I don't think so.

127 Q. CHN RMAN That's okay. Thank you very much.
128 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Garda Keogh, obviously the 11:37 certificates were coming in to the district headquarters in Athlone, work related stress. You seem to be arguing for a position that Superintendent Murray knew that. So let's just assume that obviously, at the moment. But that on foot of it, that he had the responsibility to change your medical classification and he had a responsibility to change your pay then. But you've seen the way the system works, that something is, as it were, required to be classified as an ordinary illness and unless it's medically certified 11:38 to be something that puts it into a different category, no reclassification takes place. Do you agree with that; that you're perhaps burdening the superintendent with responsibility for, firstly, the original classification and, secondly, with a duty to reclassify 11:38 it himself?
A. I am burdening Superintendent Murray.

129 Q. Yes. He didn't start the classification of it as flu viral, ordinary illness?
A. No, no, I understand that.

130 Q. Then in terms of him changing that, it seems to be from the regulations that he doesn't have the responsibility to change that, that the change occurs as a result of a process of investigation and a subsequent medical
certification that it is, in fact, work related stress, to take it out of another category?
A. Yes.

Is that not...
A. Yeah, I think so.

132 Q. Can I put this portion from Dr. Oghuvbu's statement, Volume 13, page 2644. It's his understanding that the acceptance and classification of absence as work related stress by HRPD is not exclusively based upon information in the medical certificate. Do you see, I'm reading from number 2 there:
"It is my understanding that accept ance of cl assification of a period of absence as work rel ated stress by Garda HRPD absence section is not excl usi vel y 11:40 based on the inf or mation provi ded in medi cal certification submitted by the member. It al so i nvol ves HRPD absence section and Iocal management ascertai ning the work rel ated factors or stressors being reported by the member. I understand it is the practice of HRPD absence section to record absences of ordi nary ill nesses prior to the work rel ated circunstances bei ng establ ished. "
A. That's what it says, $I$ can't disagree with it.

133 Q. Yes. I have no more questions for Garda Keogh on this issue?

CHAI RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: But I think I should clarify one
thing.
CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NNESS: I think I suggested in a question that Garda Kelly's report of the 24th May was being sent to Superintendent McBrien, it was going to Superintendent 11:41 Murray, in fact. I transposed the superintendents in error.

CHA RMAN So that would mean that Superintendent Murray would have known about the work related stress, is that right?
MR. MEGU NNESS: No, no, he got the report from Garda Olivia Kelly as to how the system operated.

CHA RMAK oh right.
MR. MEGI NESS: And the change that was then made.
CHA RMAN when was that?
MR. MEGU NNESS: 24th May 2016.
CHA RMAN 24th May 2016.
MR. MEGU NESS: It's just an error in the superintendents.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much for clarifying that, but 11:42 nothing arises that you want to ask Garda Keogh about.

MR. MEGI NESS: No, indeed.
CHA RMAN Okay. Thanks very much. We will end on
that topic there, there's nothing else you want to say about that?

WTNESS: Oh no. It's a very monotonous topic. CHAN RMAN Don't worry about that. Did you say monotonous?
WTNESS: Monotonous.

CHA RMAN Don't worry about that. That's what we get paid for. That is not a problem, Garda Keogh. We will take a little break there, shall we, and then head into the next. which is the next one, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGI NNESS: The next one is issue number 15, relating to commendations.

CHA RMAN Right.
MR. MEGU NESS: Denial of commendations.
CHA RMAN Right. That is the next matter on the agenda. So, we will take a little break for a few minutes and we will come back to that. okay.

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

MR. MEGI NESS: Chairman, just before we proceed on to deal with this issue.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGUINESS: I should say that Mr. Kelly has told me that he's not requiring the Tribunal to pursue any
further inquiry into issue number 13 , the overtime issue.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Thanks, Mr. Kelly. MR. MEGI NESS: If we could have Garda Keogh back then, thank you.
CHAN RMAN Thanks very much.
134 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Garda Keogh, we're dealing with issue 15, which relates to denial of commendations. I think your complaint relates to three different incidents,
isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. The first relates to the stabbing of a taxi driver and that's on 4th August of 2014, is that right?
A. I can't remember the date.
Q. Yes. We will come to that now. The second relates to the arrest of the person for burglary?
A. Yes.
Q. Then the third relates to the rescue of a lady from drowning in the River Shannon?
A. Yes.

138 Q. If we just deal with the stabbing of the taxi driver. I think you detail at page 85 of your statement to the Tribunal that you were involved in securing the vehicle at the scene, removing blood stained clothing for
examination. You phoned GISC Castlebar to have the incident recorded on Pulse and you advised who the assisting gardaí were. Can I stop there. That's Castlebar and they record incidents that are reported in to them. You're required to do that and do you that 12:00 by phone normally from the scene or thereabouts?
A. That's correct.

139 Q. We have, indeed, seen the transcript of the call, the papers and you were asked, I think, on page 3, or maybe page 5, if you are the investigating guard and you said 12:00 that you are. But you were recorded on the Pulse as the investigating guard, is that the entry you put on it yourself?
A. Yes. But at that time, they have to put an
investigating guard onto the system, on that. So there's room for me to be -- there is room and it would be normal, where, if they have to put another investigating guard in, I would be then changed from investigating guard down to assisting guard, which would be the norm. But in this case I'm completely removed off the pulse incident altogether.
140 Q. Yes. You say in your statement you were recorded on the Pulse as the investigating guard until you noticed on the $8 / 8 / 2015$ that your name had been removed from the Pulse incident?
A. Yes.

141 Q. I think factually you were on duty on this night of the 3rd/4th August. I think you were going off duty the next day, is that right? You were on leave for the next few days?
A. I could have been, I just can't recollect.

142 Q. Okay.
A. Yeah.

143 Q. What you say about being taken off the case, according to your statement, on page 86:

[^0]know who removed ne from Pul se but I amsure this may be checked. I would have no issue if I was moved from i nvesti gating to assisting garda on Pulse, rather than being removed entirel y fromthe inci dent."

Obviously that triggered an inquiry as to the removal of it. I think you have seen a statement from Garda Shankey Smith, which is in our papers at volume 21, page 6202. She records there that on 20th May 2019 she received a request in relation to the history of updates for that incident. She said that:
"On 4th August 2015, at 12: 38: 50, i nvesti gating garda was updated from Garda reg number" which is you "to Garda Ni all Covi gan. I informed them that this was updated by Garda regi stered number, I nspector Curl ey."

Then there is a subsequent query that she passed on to Brian savage about whether the change could be still visible from the front end or not. Mr. Savage confirmed in his statement on the next page, in middle paragraph there, the essential part is:
"I can confirmthat if the investigating menber was changed $4 / 8 / 2015$, then on the Pul se front end there will be no evi dence in the IO list of the previous i nvesti gating member having hel $d$ that position. The information is onl y available fromthe audit data."

It would appear to be the consequence of that, that somebody looking at the incident thereafter, after the change had been made after midday on the morning of the 4th, they wouldn't have seen that you were the investigating guard, as such.
A. There's no issue. Just for clarifications purposes. 144 Q. Yes.
A. On that night, the suspects in that case were actually involved in two robberies, two serious incidents. It would be the norm for it to be the updated. Because they were so serious, it could also be the norm for the detective branch to take over that investigation. So it would be expected and there's no issue whatsoever that I am removed as investigating member. I mean, that would be just normal there. The issue is, I'm actually just removed completely off the whole incident.

As I stated earlier, what would normally happen is, I would be removed from role of investigating -- changed from investigating member just to assisting member and that would be normal, what would happen normally. But in this case, I am actually removed completely from the incident, as if I was never there.
145 Q. Yes. Sergeant Curley, in his original statement relating to this, didn't recall if a form was completed. That's an EPW1 form. I think just to outline the process for commendation. There is a procedure laid down for it, the EPW1 form is the
exceptional police work form, it's completed by the member who is making the recommendation for commendation, isn't that correct? It's submitted from the district office to the divisional office for consideration by a divisional board?
A. Yes. But, that has got stricter, that is the way it is, let's say, now. I have loads of commendations over the last, what, 20 years, for different incidents. I don't ever remember filling out any EP1, or whatever it is, I don't remember. For good police work, sometimes the chief superintendent would just send -- if he sees something that he thinks is good police work, he would just send out a commendation. I think there are perhaps different categories of commendations, I am not sure, but, yeah.

146 Q. Okay. Do I understand from what you are saying, that you don't yourself ever put forward a commendation normally for anything that you have done yourself. It would be a supervisor or somebody else who would nominate you, as it were, is that right?
A. Yeah. As I said, they changed this, I don't know whether they changed it or got more stricter on the policy, $I$ am not sure, but over the years I don't -perhaps, I may have, where a form comes out, where everyone in the unit gets a commendation and would you sign your name to it and the commendation would come out. Just any, anything to catch someone in progress of crime or something like that, you'd usually just get an automatic commendation.
Q. Superintendent Murray, in his statement to the interviewers, the Tribunal investigators, said that he had no knowledge of your involvement in the investigation and that you hadn't made a statement for the purpose of the investigation. Is the latter correct?
A. Just, I think he even goes further, I think he says he has little or no involvement at all, from just recollection, I read somewhere. At some point he says, he had little or no involvement at all.

148 Q. Yes.
A. That is just from recollection.

149 Q. Perhaps we will pul1 up 3092, just to deal with that. He gives his answer at 1281:
"Thi s was a robbery whereby there was a stabbing of an el derly taxi man on 3/8. To my recollection, I secured the vehi cle..."

Sorry, that is your answer that's being quoted. Could we go down the page. If we go down to the next page.
"I amnot sure if he is saying he was out of work bet ween 4 th and 8 th August."

I think you were in fact out of work, isn't that correct?
A. I can check.

150 Q. Yeah.
"I thi nk the inci dent happened in the early hours of the 4th August 2015. It was quite a serious incident. It followed on later with another inci dent of a similar nat ure and both were investi gated toget her. There was certain not oriety about it. I took a hands on approach with that case. I had no know edge of Garda Keogh's i nvol vement. I don't thi nk he supplied a statement to the investigation file whi ch went to the DPP. The file was done and compl eted through the inci dent room and the chi ef superintendent and I visited one of the vi ctims the evening after it happened. I had no know edge of Garda Keogh being invol ved in that one and to the best of my recollection and know edge there is no statement on the investi gation file fromhim So l would interpret that as hi mbeing very little or no i nvol vement. I bel ieve he handed in a pi ece of cl ot hing to the exhi bits of ficer. Anyone who accesses Pulse, leaves a foot print. There is an audit trail of anyone who went through the inci dent and I can't see anyone havi ng any reason to do what Garda Keogh al I eges."

Now, we have seen that, in fact, you were taken off the record. Perhaps we will look at the details of the incident, because it transpired that, contrary to the recollection of Sergeant Curley in relation to the issue of commendation and Superintendent Murray, a number of members were nominated for a commendation,
isn't that correct?
A. I saw that, yes.
Q.

MR. MEGI NNESS: Yes. There is a document that
Sergeant Monaghan I think has brought to your attention just in recent days, it had escaped the process. It appears to be an e-mail to Superintendent Murray on the 4th August at 4:33:25, half past four in the morning. That is volume 52. We have reached volume 52 I think. I think that's on the system.

CHA RMAN Well, tell us what it says.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes. There is a lot of detail about the incident. I don't think I need to read the details. But in the third line from the bottom, it says:
"Garda CCTV was vi ewed, further enquiries have to be carried out in rel ation to local CCTV. Family members were cont acted. Garda Keogh is i nvesti gating menber and will attend for further enquiries when he returns fromrest days. Search was carried out by members under the (blank) in the general area."

So that is a report, you've seen that, have you?
A. I can't see it here, but I --

154 Q. CHA RMAN 52, thanks.
A. I have no issue. I accept what's in that is accurate.
Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
A. Thanks.

MR. KELLY: Can I just say, Chairman, that these volumes came late and Garda Keogh has --
CHAI RMAN Absolutely.
MR. KELLY: I am not criticising.
CHA RMAN No, no, I understand, Mr. Kelly. He wouldn't have seen it. But it's in his interest, I think, to see this one.
MR. KELLY: Absolutely.
CHA RMAN It's good for him. We have it now up on the screen.

MR. KELLY: Absolutely.
CHA RMAN Obviously we try to process the material as quickly as we can, but this came in very late. I
appreciate your point. Yes. Just take a look at that.
WTNESS: Just for clarification, Judge, I didn't get to actually read 50, 51, I glanced at them and I haven't seen anything in volume 52.
CHA RMAN Don't worry in the slightest if you didn't get to volume 52. But anyway, you have the page there. WTNESS: Yes.

CHA RMAN And we're seeing it, yes.
MR. MEGI NESS: It is really just the last three
lines.
CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGI NESS: This would appear to be, I'm not sure whether it would be regarded as routine, but it would seem to be appropriate to have drawn the
superintendent's attention to a serious stabbing incident in the district on the night of the 4th. CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NNESS: And presumably that would be available to the superintendent whenever he checked his inbox at that point in time.

CHA RMAN Yes.
156 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: I was going to ask you to look at the details of the EPW1, which is volume 48, at page 13455. It describes the incident there. If we scroll down then, the details of the incident. Go on to the second page there, and down. It gives a list of members involved in the investigation. Onto the third page then. I think that's Superintendent Murray there, and he says:
"The investigative work carried out in these two cases was of a very high quality. The suspects were identified using sound police work as a basis for bringing the case to concl usion. The cul prits are before the Circuit Court."

It gets certified there by the Chief Super Gralton, Superintendent murray and this is the divisional board certification down the page there, isn't that correct? so there follows a number of commendations then from page 13459 onwards, the next page onwards. The next two pages onwards. There's several members and you're not included in that list.
A. No.

157 Q. You've seen that, I think.
A. Yeah.

158 Q. So, it would appear that the EPW1 process was gone through in relation to all of the people who participated in the investigation. I think your diary does confirm you were off for four days, is that right?
A. Yes. They were the rest days.

They were rest days, yes. Obviously we have to hear from Superintendent Murray, but it appears he singled out all of the people who did the investigation, in a sense that whilst the report from Sergeant Monaghan refers to you as "the investigating member that should attend to further inquiries when he returns from rest days". The narrative of the incident here, just to go back to it, on page 13455, details the different investigative steps taken from the 4th onwards. Can I just ask, from your recollection were you involved in any of the subsequent steps as a matter of fact?
A. No, no. In relation to not making a statement, I was never asked to make a statement.

160 Q. Okay.
A. I officially didn't exist at the scene. But one thing that has caught my eye when I seen the commendations, Judge, and this is the same for the next two incidents, 12:19 not alone am I not getting a commendation, none of the members of my unit are getting commendations, and that goes for the next two incidents as well. They should have got commendations in relation to this matter and
the next two matters also. I suspect they didn't get the commendations, you know, because I would have had to get a commendation.
161 Q. Obviously you respond to the incident and you report it in and you are asked whether you are the investigating member and who is assisting you.
A. $\mathrm{Hm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

162 Q. How would you describe in detail what you had done as an investigating member?
A. Myself, and I can't even remember the guard that was with me, we're the first on the scene. So, we met the injured party, who I vaguely remember was covered in blood, he was stabbed in the neck.
163 Q. CHA RMAN The taxi driver.
A. Yes, yes. He was an elderly man. So the priority was a duty of care to him, to get medical assistance to him. Just from recollection at the scene, we seized his car, not seized his car, his car for technical examination. I got clothing for evidence and I think placed it into an evidence bag. I mean, for the purpose of continuity of evidence as well, should that case have been -- I don't want to go into the case, because these were bad individuals who committed a very bad crime. But just, I am sure you know in relation to continuity of evidence and things like that, perhaps I should have been asked to make a statement. I wasn't asked to make a statement or anything like that.

CHA RMAN what is the process? Do you have to get asked to make it or do you make it?
A. No, no. You see, when I'm -- sorry, when -- in normal procedure, normally, where I am off and because there were serious incidents -CHA RMAN Don't mind about being off or on or anything else?
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAK I understand. Now you have that. Now you go back to the station. Do you make a statement about that?
A. No, what happened then, I think at the scene, at the scene, we were there at the scene for a good while and I then ring, I think just from recollection, GISC in Castlebar, who then put the incident onto Pulse. They need an investigating member or a reporting member in order to put the incident onto Pulse, to have it recorded. It can't be recorded otherwise. So at that moment I put myself down as the investigating member.
CHAI RMAN of course, for the reasons you have expressed?
A. Yes. I put all the other members, Sergeant Monaghan was there overseeing everything and there was the rest,
other members in my unit would have arrived. As I said, when I came back a couple of days later, at some stage, I am not even sure when I noticed, but I notice on the incident -- as I said, there's no issue, it's a normal thing that I would be removed from investigating, changed.

CHA RMAN In the normal way, here's my question, I am sorry to interrupt you. In the normal way would you have made the statement about your involvement in the matter or would you wait until you were asked by somebody else?
A. I would wait, wait in a case like this, because the detective branch take this over as a serious matter.
170 Q. CHA RMAN I understand that. So who would ask you to make a statement?
A. There would be a Book of Evidence in this kind of case. CHAN RMAN I understand.
A. So the person doing the Book of Evidence, whoever is in charge.
172 Q. CHA RMAN which would probably be a detective?
A. A detective sergeant.

173 Q. CHA RMAN Would come back to you?
A. Can I have a statement in relation to, let's say, for evidence.
174 Q. CHA RMAN what record would you make at the time?
Q. CHAN RMAN When you went to the station?
A. I would have just taken a note, I presume I took notes off the injured party.
CHA RMAN Are you with me? Do you understand me?
A. Not --

177 Q. CHA RMAN If somebody comes back three months later and says, remember that incident, we want a statement from you about the preservation of the evidence. It doesn't take much to work out that defence counsel might be very interested in a gap and what you could remember or couldn't remember. So I am just wondering what the process is and what records you made about your involvement in the case?
A. I would have made notes in my Garda notebook.

178 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. You know, the normal details.

CHA RMAK I follow.
A. Day, date, time, place, name and address of injured person, date of birth. I have to take those notes actually in order to record the incident onto Pulse. about the man's clothing or the car, whatever, that would also be in your notebook?
A. I just can't recollect, I presume.

181 Q. CHAN RMAN okay.
A. But I can't remember.

182 Q. CHAN RMAN Thanks.
A. In relation to the clothing and that, I think I just from recollection, I think Sergeant Monaghan was at the
scene, so he would, let's say, take charge at the immediate scene of the area to say, the car, someone is to take the car, to organise the car to be moved.
183 Q. CHA RMAN Can I ask you this, did somebody make a statement on the night?
A. There would be no statement. CHA RMAN No statement.
A. On the night.
Q. CHAl RMAN okay.
A. Yeah. As I said, a Book of Evidence then would have commenced.

CHA RMAN I am a little surprised at that, to be honest. I am a little surprised that nobody would actually write down a statement, an account of what happened?
A. Well, Judge, we are at the scene, we are a good while at the scene.
Q. CHA RMAN I understand.
A. We've to do the --

188 Q. CHAI RMAN So you've enough to keep you busy.
A. Busy.

189 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. Judge, that wouldn't be the normally, that you immediately make a statement on the night.
190 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. We were busy with that and the norm in a thing like that would be, when the book of --
Q. CHA RMAN When the Book of Evidence came to be done.
A. Yeah. When the are investigating it, they would write out then, can we have a statement. A bit like the Tribunal.
192 Q. CHA RMAN I am with you. You would have the relevant information, the essential information in your notebook?
A. Yes.

193 Q. CHA RMAK Everybody would have noted in their notebooks and so on. okay.
A. And equally, there's a Pulse record then which would contain the GPS of the location. Everything. There is 12:27 a lot of stuff that has to be done.
CHAN RMAN Thank you. Thank you very much.
194 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Just looking at your diary at page 13323? Do you have that with you there? we will just put that up on the screen. I can read it out if you wish. 13323?
A. The date on that?

195 Q. I'm sorry, the 3rd August?
A. '15?

196 Q. Yes, I beg your pardon. Do you have the original there?
A. Mm -hmm.

197 Q. I think you have there:
"Ni ght taxi man stabbed at Bl oomfi el d Drive."

Then "rest day". "Rest day". Entries about that. "Rest day". And then on the you have:
"I noticed I was removed on Pul se fromstabbing of taxi man. I sei zed cl ot hes and..."

CHA RMAN "And car" for examination, I take it. "FE", for examination, I am just working that out.
A. "TE", technical examination.

CHAN RMAN Technical examination, sorry.
MR. MEGI NNESS: Sergeant Monaghan's initial report to Superintendent Murray said that you would be tending to further enquiries on your return from rest days. You obviously then discovered you were taken off Pulse. So 12:29 did you find out what was happening, as it were, in relation to the investigation?
A. You see, I was aware that there was -- I think there was another very serious -- I think it was a robbery as we11. I think it was the same suspects. I am not sure.

199 Q. CHA RMAN That's right, from the description we have just seen, yes.
A. So, other guards were obviously at the scene for that robbery and I had nothing to do with that.
200 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: That's what I was going to ask you?
A. Yeah.

201 Q. The commendation recommendation deals with the two Pulse incidents?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}$.

202 Q. And all of the offenders who were then caught in relation to both of them. The commendation seems to be related to the sort of joint criminal acts that were brought to book by the police, which resulted in the
commendation then by Superintendent Murray. So, you had, as it were, an important part at the commencement of the first one?
A. Yes.

203 Q. No further or other part in the investigation of that and then no part in the other one?
A. Yeah.
Q. Are you telling us that Sergeant Monaghan was left off as well?
A. I think -- no, Sergeant Monaghan -- I don't think I saw 12:30 Sergeant Monaghan's name on the page.
Q. Who else was involved at the early stage with you?
A. There was, from recollection, Garda Séan Glennon. I can't remember, I think he may have been in the patrol car when we arrived at the scene and then we would have -- because of the seriousness, we would have had to call Sergeant Monaghan, he would have arrived down, just from recollection, with some more guards, let's say, from my unit, the unit that I was working, attached to. None of us get a commendation whatsoever and, as it happens, I only notice it was me that was removed off Pulse. I think they are all left on Pulse. But I also would argue they should all have got commendations.

206 Q. CHAN RMAN why should they have got commendations?
A. Because it was excellent police work, the preservation of the scene and gathering the evidence.

207 Q. CHA RMAN Was that not routine?
A. It was routine but it --

208 Q. CHA RMAK I mean, to see to the man, to take the car and so on?
A. It was, of course, it was routine. But when a case like that then ultimately ends up as a big successful case.

CHA RMAN It deserved a commendation you say, then everybody involved, in fairness, should have got it.
A. Everybody.
Q. CHAL RMAN okay.
A. That would be my argument.

CHA RMAN okay.
211 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: But when you went in on the 8th, did you check who was on the Pulse for every bit of the investigation or not?
A. Em...

212 Q. I mean obviously you noted that you were off. Were you concerned to check to see whether others were off?
A. Oh yeah, no, I think I was -- I can't even remember why -- I don't think I even checked. I don't think it was like that I went on to Pulse to check, oh am I, what's -- I think I checked to see what's happening with this incident or something. Something along those lines. And then, I saw the investigating member was I think Niall Cogavin, just from recollection, I'm not sure, from recollection, and as I said, there is no
issue, that would be the normal issue there. So I think just scroll down to see -- like presuming I'm down then, moved to assisting member. That would have been fine. But then I noticed my name is completely
removed off Pulse. That would be -- I have never seen that before. For example, the only time I have ever heard of someone being removed completely off an incident on Pulse is where you ring in to Castlebar, the GISC, and you might call out Garda Murphy was -let's say we were in a station down in Cork, Garda Murphy was with me and the person on Pulse says, do you know Garda Murphy's long registration number and you say, no, and you might say Garda John Murphy and they might record a John Murphy.

213 Q. CHA RMAK The wrong person.
A. Which is a different John Murphy.

214 Q. CHA RMAN That could be changed and deleted, you'd say, no, it was Garda Pat Murphy or Garda Murphy 36250, as opposed to 266 , whatever it was?
A. That person would then be removed off Pulse because they clearly weren't there or involved.

215 Q. CHA RMAN A clear mistake?
A. Yes.

216 Q. CHA RMAN But otherwise, you say, it wouldn't be the case?
A. Yes.

217 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. I have never seen it before.

218 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Just in terms of Garda Cogavin, is he part of the detective branch?
A. He was, yes.

219 Q. You said in your statement that you seemed to have no trouble with the detective unit taking over the case.

Would that not be de facto, you being replaced as investigating member?
A. Oh yeah. I have given that here now, yes.
Q. I mean, are you blaming Sergeant Curley for targeting in respect of this changing of it?
A. Changing is not the issue, that's the problem. I wasn't change, I was completely removed.
221 Q. Yes.
A. Someone removed me. So, yes, it was targeting. From recollection, I don't think any of the other members that were there at the scene were just removed.
Q. Yes. This is a difficult question, because it's hard to un-know something you have now learned, but: You made your complaint against Superintendent Murray, was it, originally?
A. Yes.
Q. You made your complaint without the knowledge that other guards had got a commendation for involvement, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, yeah. I think so.

So you must have presumed that all of you who attended at the scene of the first stabbing incident were unfairly denied a commendation and you didn't know anyone else had actually got one, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. That's correct.
A. The issue is in relation to the remove off Pulse, it was removed off Pulse. Like it wasn't that it was just -- in the normal run of things, it would have been just changed to assisting member and that's end of story. But I actually disappear. I was never at the scene officially.
okay. So the fact that the investigating team that dealt with the two incidents get commendations, that has got nothing to do with it then?
A. Sorry?

227 Q. The fact that the two investigating teams that sort of solved the two crimes and brought the culprits to book, the fact that they get commendations has got nothing to do with your complaint, their removal from Pulse?
A. I am not sure whether -- I presume -- I would imagine I 12:36 would have presumed that there were commendations going to come out of this, because I was aware it was a big thing and it was a successful outcome. So I would have presumed there were commendations in the pipeline for somebody. I was obviously aware I didn't get a commendation and obviously I was aware that I had been completely removed off Pulse. But what was news to me and I am surprised, is that no member of my unit, including Sergeant Monaghan, they never even got commendations.

228 Q. Yes. Do you know whether the first responders in the other taxi investigation got commendations?
A. I don't know that. But if -- if somebody was being cute about it and being vindictive, they wouldn't have
given them commendations if they weren't -- if they were to keep me out.
229 Q. CHAN RMN We're going to keep him out, therefore we better make sure that we keep the others out as well?
A. I think that is -- yes.

230 Q. CHAI RMAN Okay. But your real point is this, you say two things: when the detectives got a commendation, you say it would be normal for everybody who was concerned with it in any sort of realistic way, for everybody to get a commendation?
A. Yes.

231 Q. CHA RMAN Number one. And number two, related to that is the fact that your name was removed from Pulse,
A. Yes.

232 Q. CHA RMAK which you say would also be a very unusual, if not unique situation?
A. That's correct.

233 Q. CHA RMAN So they're interrelated in that way, is that right?
A. Yes.

234 Q. CHAI RMAN Okay. Thanks very much.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Turning on to the next issue. CHAN RMAN This is the burglary arrest.
Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. You complained that you weren't commended for the arrest of a burglary?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that right?
A. Again myself or my partner on the night was not -neither of us, is my understanding.
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Q. Who was that?
A. I think it was Ciarán Dempsey.
Q. okay. It's been confirmed that there was no commendation issued to anyone in respect of that offence at any point?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}$.
Q. I presume you accept that?
A. Yeah.
Q. Just going back to the previous incident for one moment, it does appear to be a curiosity that at the time you made your complaint you didn't know that anyone else had been commended and Superintendent Murray nor Inspector Curley, Sergeant Curley referred to the commendations. Did you enquire from anyone as to whether they had got a commendation or that they were in for it?
A. Sorry, are you referring back --

241 Q. Yes.
A. -- to the previous incident?

242 Q. Yes, just go back to that for a moment.
A. Sorry. Did I? I don't think so, I don't know.
Q. If you hadn't heard of it, would it be surprising that you wouldn't have heard of it? Is there some possibility it was kept secret from you?
A. I don't know, I don't know. I just can't recollect the 12:40 sequence.
Q. Al1 right. The burglary then, what was -- perhaps without going into any detail about the accused or the --
A. I won't name names.

245 Q. Yes. What were the circumstances of the burglary such that it might entitle you to consider you should be considered for a commendation?
A. Yeah. Just very briefly, I will just give -- outline the incident.

246 Q. Yes.
A. Myself and Garda Dempsey were out on patrol and at such -- I don't know if we received a report or an alarm went off, it was a bakery shop, just from recollection, 12:41 but whatever way, we were right there on the scene. We saw broken glass at the window and the two of us
straight out of the car, in through this, where the window was smashed, and we gained entry into the shop, the bakery. It was in darkness. We had our torches. 12:41 We searched the rooms and the back rooms, let's say, of the bakery. It was actually -- we were kind of nearly on our -- we didn't notice anything and we were -- I think we were getting ready to, you know, just whatever we were doing. But I, just on the way out, 12:41 shone the torch, there was a coat rack with a load of coats and there was hoods from the coats hanging off the coat rack. I remember just something, as I was walking out, the torch, I saw a pair of shoes, a pair of runners at the bottom of the coat rack. I just turned the torch back onto the pair of runners and there was --

CHA RMAN He11o, he11o, he11o! what have we here!
A. Then I saw a pair of legs and there was a person with a
hoodie, with the back turned up to me, blending in with the coats, which I hadn't seen, neither of us had spotted it the first time. Standing perfectly still even with the torch on him, didn't move an inch. of course, we brought him -- we arrested him for burglary. 12:42

247 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Good work.
A. That was the incident.

248 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Presumably you submitted an investigation file in relation to that?
A. I presume, I can't just remember.

249 Q. Was it prosecuted to conclusion?
A. I presume, I presume. The burglar was caught in the act. I can't remember what happened after that.
Q. CHA RMAN It doesn't necessarily follow that he pleaded guilty, of course, as we know. But you think, anyway, the matter was a successful conclusion from your point of view obviously?
A. From recollection, I don't think the individual denied or tried to make any reasonable excuse to be in the shop. Actually, vaguely, I think the individual was nearly sure kind of he was going to get away with it, because we had been in there for a while searching. MR. MEGU NESS: I mean, sometimes judges commend gardaí in courts and then that can lead to a process of commendation obviously. But the normal procedure seems 12:44 to be that a member's immediate supervisor would kick off the process. who was your supervisor in that case?
A. I'd say it was Sergeant Monaghan. But he wouldn't -that -- I don't -- as I said, over the years --
sergeants never had to write on -- it wasn't standard that a sergeant would have to write onto something where a commendation comes down. Actually, I think I have submitted something, it's probably more relevant to the next issue, but, no, it's usually I think from the chief's office, when they look down at serious incidents and they see certain incidents, certainly the likes of a burglar caught in the act, it would send out an automatic commendation and there's no filling in forms, EP, whatever they call them. As I said, I don't ${ }_{12: 44}$ even remember -- I never filled one out ever, just for myself, from recollection.
252 Q. Do some members do that?
A. They do now. They're tightening up on it, I understand, now. They're tightening it. And I think 12:45 it's wrong as well, that any member can claim they did great police work. If they rescue a cat from a tree, they can then write a report, I'm a great fella, can I have a commendation.
253 Q. It's just Mr. de Bruir drew attention to the wording of 12:45 Directive 2603, which does provide that any member can do it. So that if somebody felt themselves worthy, you could in fact do it yourself. And some members do do it.
A. Some do. And my point, my argument is: I don't think 12:45 I ever applied for a commendation for myself for anything but yet I would have a lot of commendations over the years.
254 Q. Yes.

255 Q. CHA RMAN And this is one, you would have expected somebody to say, well, that was pretty good work to alert or to notice, you know, you would expect that somebody would knowledge that?
A. Judge, if I wasn't a whistleblower, myself and Garda Dempsey would have received commendations for that incident.

CHA RMAN who did that go to? who did your report go to?
A. The report would have been on Pulse. So the Pulse report would be the official report. Like, what I am trying to say is: The chief in Mullingar, let's say, would have spotted that whenever he was --
257 Q. CHA RMAN On Pulse?
A. At nine o'clock between Monday and Friday, whenever he would -- he would have spotted that. CHA RMAN I was just wondering, what would the process be? How would it go? would it go through your sergeant?
A. Sometimes the sergeant will write, if the sergeant feels -- you know, sometimes the sergeant will write. 259 Q. CHA RMAN Would it go through the inspector or go to the superintendent?
A. It would. If the sergeant writes on it, then it would go inspector to the super. But the sergeant doesn't necessarily have to write for a commendation. As I said, I have often received commendations where no one has written anything and a chief would spot something and say, that's good work, give them commendations.

260 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Superintendent McBrien describes the process in her statement at page 6204 onwards to 6207. But the process is fairly simple as set out in the directive. Everyone knows about it, isn't that right? Everybody knows about the process?
A. Of the EP...

Yeah, of initiating it?
A. Yeah. As I said, I have never used it. The only time I would have ever signed one of those EPs is where someone -- it could have been for, let's say, a unit and everyone in the unit would sign for just a commendation, as in the group. But I have never done one for myself, if that makes sense.
262 Q. Yes. Perhaps we will look at just what she says on page 6268. I mean, your story of the arrest does, of course, display initiative and awareness etcetera. I am sure this was retold in the station. But she is being asked here about the burglary and she says:
"Is there any attempt to deny Garda Keogh a commendation for a performance and if so, supply details."

She has been advised of this complaint of yours, which does relate to her period, doesn't it?
CHA RMAN This is when Superintendent MCBrien was there.
A. Yeah. Judge, just to clarify, I think all the commendations that I would have got, for some reason I
think they came from the chief's office, not the superintendent's office.
MR. MEGI NESS: But in any event, she says -CHA RMAK But Superintendent Murray had nothing to do with this one?
A. Oh yeah, I would accept that, yeah.
" No. . . . "

This is about an attempt to deny you a commendation.
"No, I actual ly compl ement ed Garda Keogh on his duty at one point informally."

Do you recollect that?
A. I can't recollect but I wouldn't dispute it.

265 Q. On the date that you refer to she was on leave. what I just want to get around to is: You've put this in as an element of targeting and bullying, that this thing, this process didn't happen and didn't apply to you and you didn't get this award. who are you blaming, as it were, for the targeting and the bullying or the discrediting in this regard?
A. I would say the chief in Mullingar.

266 Q. Chief Superintendent Curran?
A. Yes.

267 Q. You think he got the file and decided --
A. He would have seen it on Pulse.
Q. Okay. So this should have stood out to him and you think he must have seen it and he decided you weren't going to get it?
A. As I said, if I wasn't a whistleblower, I definitely -I have got commendations for way less.
271 Q. okay. Like what?
A. I mean, I can't off the top of my head, you know. I have one -- there's one incident I know of but I wouldn't call it less. But I mean, it could be anything. You could get a commendation for even the successful theft of a shoplifter. You know, it could be anything you could get commendation for good police work.

CHA RMAN But the basis is that he should have seen it on Pulse and deduced from that that this was good police work.
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN He wouldn't have any other information, he wouldn't have reports or anything like that?
A. I have seen -- I have got commendations from --

274 Q. CHAN RMAN Straight off Pulse?
A. Straight off, from the same chief superintendent, back, 1et's say, 2013, you. But again, from 8th May 2014, my commendation days are over. And, as I stated, anyone that's working with me, they're not getting commendations either.
CHA RMAK okay.
Q. MR. MEGU NESS: The third incident related to the rescue of a lady from drowning?
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. In your statement at page 137, you say:
"Sergeant Mbnaghan applied for commendations for the whol e unit but nobody recei ved any."
A. That's my recollection.

277 Q. You say in your statement to the investigators that:
"It's my belief that no commendations were granted as I was the one who rescued the lady fromthe water, but nobody told me that. In my experience, a rescue such as this would bring about commendations fromthe Gar daí . "
A. Sorry, just to clarify that, that self praise that I've
done there is not accurate. The person actually behind me that was holding me by the waist, the guard behind me, I would have gone into the water as well, the way -- where the woman had gone so deep down into the Shannon.
Q. Yes.
A. I had to jump into a submerged boat, to try and lean over and when -- the only part of her I could grab onto was her hair, because she had gone down under, but her body weight was pulling me down. Another guard came, he grabbed me by the -- around the -- as I was about to go over, by the hips and he counteracted with his body weight behind. That was the way, we were able to drag her around by the head of hair, around to kind of the pier. Then, with the other -- called for the other guards or I think there might have been an ambulance as well, that we were all able to then get her up out of the water then at that stage. But I, of course, had the belt, I had handcuffs and batons and boots and clothing. If that other guard hadn't grabbed me, I would have gone in with that woman and, of course, we would have ended up both going down together, because naturally instinct, if one is drowning, you grab onto anything. So, look, it was that. The guard behind actually was -- and I shouldn't have just -- that makes $12: 54$ myself out to be --

279 Q. CHAN RMAN What time of the day did this happen?
A. Sorry.

280 Q. CHA RMAN what time?
A. This was roughly 3 or 4 am at night.
CHA RMAN Totally dark?

```

\section*{282 Q. CHA RMAN There was street lighting?}
A. Street lighting, yes.

CHAN RMAN Okay. Thanks very much. Sorry.
MR. MEGI NESS: Anyway, there is a description of it in your initial statement. But page 91, you described it there:
"Sergeant Mbnaghan was the sergeant present at the scene. Later applied for commendations for everyone."

I think that's disputed. It seems to be the case that no commendations were applied for, for anyone?
A. Just my recollection of that night was, I thought Sergeant Monaghan said he was going applying for commendations. That's just my recollection of that night.
A. I don't want to get into any dispute with Sergeant Monaghan on whether there was or wasn't, it's irrelevant. The thing is, again, I'm aware of previous instances where other guards would have saved persons from the River Shannon, because there's a bridge there and it's an urban area and people do things, and they would have got -- they would have got a commendation. In later times, of course, it was Irish -- the water Safety Council, so they would have got both a
commendation from the guards and the Water Safety award, they would have got both of those. In this one, that's fine, we get an award from the water safety Council. The point is, we don't get any recognition from the Guards. There's no commendations for any of us on that incident again on the unit. And that, as I said, that was a real team effort there on that one. I think, if I'm correct, I think there was ambulance there was well. I think they were there as well.
Yes. I mean, this incident happened on 22nd September 2015. Within two months, Superintendent Murray had nominated you with the other members for the Seiko Just in Time award?
A. Why two months later? I spotted that. I was curious, why would you do it two months later? I am just curious about that.

286 Q. We11, we will come to that date and its importance in a moment, but what you say in this portion of your statement is that:
"In my belief, no commendations were granted as I was the one who rescued the Iady fromthe water but nobody told me that."

Now, just to pause there. You do record in your diary \({ }_{\text {12:57 }}\) that Superintendent Monaghan told you he had applied for a commendation and you put in your diary:
"But I doubt I'II get one."

> Isn't that right?
A. I may, I just don't remember.

287 Q. Right.
A. If you give me the page number.

CHA RMAN 22nd September '15.
MR. MEGU NESS: It's at page 1330.
A. Yes, I see it now, yes.

289 Q.
"Ser geant Mbnaghan said he would look for commendation for unit. I doubt I will get one."

We have been told by the Chief State Solicitor's office that no commendations are on file and nobody applied for commendations. It would appear, perhaps inferentially, that it's because Superintendent Murray applied and nominated you all for the Seiko Just in Time award on 11th November 2015
A. That has absolutely nothing to do with commendations from the Guards.

290 Q. Yes.
A. I have no issue, the thing with the award is a completely separate thing. I am talking about the commendations from the Guards. I've read -- they have 12:59 this in glowing light all over about this water Safety award, that's fine, there's no dispute on that.

291 Q. That is a public award?
A. Yes, but the norm would be you would get commendation
from An Garda Síochána and you would get the award. But we are talking about allegations of bullying and harassment, or targeting or discrediting by Superintendent Murray; isn't that right?
A. Yes.

What you say in your statement:
"Unusually in this situation, only Irish Water Safety gave an award. This award was gi ven on 8th Novenber 2016, whi ch was over a year after the inci dent occurred 12:59 on the 22/9. It's my belief that the recommendation bel at edl y triggered by An Garda Sí ochána for an award fromthe Irish Water Safety coi nci des with the issuance and service of the Garda's recei pt of your application to the Personal Injuries Assessment Board in respect of 13:00 my ci vil proceedings agai nst the Gardaí. It is my bel i ef that this was a gui se to counteract the recei pt of the said application as it was difficult for the Gardaí to performa U-turn of their earlier position not to follow Sergeant Mbnaghan's recommendation for a commendation. Hence the unusual role of the sole award fromlrish Water Safety."

That's at page 91. You seem to be very clearly saying that this was a reaction to the issuing of the authorisation for your civil proceedings to go ahead. That the Guards then belatedly triggered this application for a water safety award?
A. Yeah. Yes, but again, like, just going back, I mean
with the two-month gap between the incident and Superintendent Murray, I did find that absolutely so curious in the timing. That two months later he just decides to -- you know, will all different things happened. why didn't he do it -- you know, why would he not have done it straightaway or within that week? Like, why two months later does he apply for this award? And equally, my argument is that it's nothing to do with the award, it's the commendation, didn't get a commendation from An Garda Síochána and to back it up, just, in 2013 and I think I have submitted it somewhere in the first few volumes, I may have it in there, of commendations. In 2013, as an example, I was off duty, I was involved in an incident, where there was a group of people badger baiting in offaly and with the national parks, wildlife rangers, we went down and at the scene confronted eight individuals, five of them -- was it three of them are juveniles, five of them were adults. So there were successful convictions in that incident. The national parks wrote a commendation 13:02 to me to the chief superintendent of mullingar and the chief superintendent in Mullingar also wrote out his own commendation to me on that incident. If that makes sense. There was no application from me.
294 Q. Okay.
A. There was no -- this is where my argument is, you would have got the water safety award and a commendation from the Guards. And I gave that previous 2013 incident by way of example.

295 Q. Yes. We11, could we just look at page 671 before we break for lunch?
CHA RMAN I would be hoping that we could complete this thing, if that's all right.
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN If you are happy enough and then we will break enough, going on to a new one, you know. You don't have much more, Mr. McGuinness, I am sure.
MR. MEGI NNESS: I will be five minutes, perhaps.
CHA RMAN Perfect. Thanks very much. If you would prefer not, just let me know.

WTNESS: Oh no, no.
296 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: This is your Plenary Summons, which was issued on 13th April 2017, which is on the preceding page. But it recites the authorisation that was issued by the PIAB board?
CHA RMAN 28th October 2016?
MR. MEGI NESS: 28th October 2016, yes.
297 Q. CHA RMAN In other words, the point you made in your statement appears to be wrong. You said, the only reason why Superintendent Murray put in the application for the Just in Time award was because the PIAB authorisation had come through for my proceedings. The dates don't support that.
A. That 's fair. That's fair.

298 Q. CHA RMAN The PIAB authorisation is 28th October -hold on a second, hold on. Maybe it`s wrong. It doesn't matter. But the PIAB authorisation is 28th October 2016 and the recommendation for the Just in

Time award is the 11th November 2015. Are you with me?
A. I am, yes, Judge.

299 Q. CHA RMAN Now, what do you say to that?
A. I accept it, the statement I made to the Tribunal on the night of the deadline --

300 Q. CHAN RMAN It doesn't matter. Mr. McGuinness is saying, that particular point appears not to be valid?
A. That point.

301
Q.

CHA RMAN Because the dates don't match up?
A. I accept that.

302 Q. CHA RMAN You still say I still should have got the two awards.
A. The commendation.

303 Q. CHA RMAN I understand that. But as to the specific date, he didn't sit down and say, \(I\) will fix this now, because he has got PIAB authorisation, I will fix that by sending in an application and I will cover myself.
A. I have erred on that part.

CHA RMAN That's fine. Mr. McGuinness wanted to clarify that so we have the facts and the chronology correct. You're happy with that?
A. I am. And I did say in that particular statement, there are a number of things in that statement that I --
Q. CHAN RMAN okay.
A. But my point is : I didn't get a commendation from the Guards. Nothing to do with the water award.
Q. CHAL RMAN okay.
A. The commendation is the point.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NNESS: This passage from your statement that I quoted from page 91 , this is from the statement to the Tribunal investigators here last year in 2018, in August 2018. So you're making the allegation that he readied up the recommendation for the Seiko award as a response to this document that was issued by PIAB. Let's be clear about that.
A. It appears I'm wrong in that.

308 Q. Pardon?
A. It appears I'm wrong in that.
Q. Yes.
A. I'm only human, I have obviously made a mistake on that. perhaps we will just look at that, Volume 32, 9210. This is the 22nd September, by the way, on the day of the incident.
"I wi sh to draw your attention to an excellent pi ece of 13:07 work carried out by the members invol ved, led by sergeant (bl ank) who, in a case at 3amin the dark I ocated Mb. (Blank) and saved her life. The actions of the sergeant and his team warrant mention. I have asked that they notify Irish Water Saf et y so their good 13:07 work is acknow edged."

Then, if we can go on to the next page. That's going up to the chief super obviously. You're all on Pulse
for that, I think, isn't that right?
A. oh yes, yeah.

311 Q. Then, if we go up to page 2383. Sorry, if we go to page 2053 first. Could you go down the page?
"On 11th Novenber 2015, I nomi nated seven menbers, i ncl udi ng Garda Keogh, for a Sei ko Just in Ti me award. I attach a copy of the correspondence PM 58. The awards were presented to menbers on 8th Novenber 2016 at a ceremony in Dublin Castle. This was the second occasi on on which I nomi nated menbers for recognition of Sei ko Just in Ti me awards. The members I nominated on the first occasion were al so recogni sed, recei ving Sei ko watches as their rescue efforts put themin great danger. There was not an ulterior notive for nomi nating Garda Keogh for this award."

Then if we go to PM 58, that's at page 2383-6. You're there under Sergeant Monaghan there at the top, you're expressly named. There's quite a clear summary of what 13:09 happened there. And a high recommendation that you all be considered for that. Then if we just look at the next couple of pages as well. So, this is then the 2nd November. There's notification of the award. If we go down then, down to Sergeant Monaghan, you were given an 13:09 invitation there. Then the next page -- I'm sorry, that's the SAMS absence page. Nothing to do with it.

I don't know whether you would regard a commendation or
an award in public in the castle as equal to or better or inferior one to the other, but it seems to be inconsistent with the targeting, that on the one hand I won't give a commendation to all of the members because I want to get at you, but I will nominate you for an award. It seems on its face perhaps inconsistent.
A. It's like this, if I wasn't a whistleblower, I would have perhaps got the award, but if I wasn't a whistleblower I would have got a commendation along with the rest of my unit for that event from An Garda Síochána. There's no issue, the award, it's kind of a separate matter altogether. From An Garda Síochána there is no commendation, and that is my point. Me and the rest of my unit normally would have got a commendation from An Garda Síochána. And I have given the example of prior thing from 2013.

312 Q. It appears from your diary that Sergeant Monaghan told you he would apply for commendations. Do you think he applied and it was refused or did you ever ask him his happened his intention?
A. He said it on the night that he was going to apply for commendations. I am not sure after that, like what the sequence of events were. I don't know. Like, again, I mean, it's possible, that -- again, we spent a bit of time at the scene again.
313 Q. Yes.
A. Although he may have said what he said, let's say, I do recall back at the station and, ah, my boots and everything were all wet from the submerged boat. There
was a bit of work to do. So he mightn't have had time equally, if he didn't. I'm not going to dispute what Sergeant Monaghan did or didn't do.
314 Q.
We will hear from him in due course. But the final question on this issue: Was there a lot of grumbling among all the people who jumped in the Shannon and searched the river bank, that they didn't get a commendation? From the others?
A. I don't -- you see -- I finished on -Perhaps I overstated it, but you jumped into a boat anyway?
A. I jumped into a boat and the other guard had to jump into the same boat to grab me as well.

316 Q. Yes.
A. And this is, again as I said, from -- what's -- I go -- 13:12

317 Q. CHA RMAN From the end of December?
A. The end of December.

318 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. So, where is this? We're in September, is it, or October?

CHA RMAN September.
MR. MEGU NESS: Well, this is September?
319 Q. CHA RMAN October, November, so there's three months really?
A. Yeah, there is. I don't remember.

CHA RMAN Okay.
320 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: okay.
A. Again, as I said, there's never, oh -- a commend ation, it's not a huge thing.

Q
A. It's tiny, symbolic thing.

CHA RMAN But for what it is worth, you say, you would have expected to get both. You think it is sinister and significant that you didn't get both?
A. And the normal --

CHA RMAN That's fine. Mr. McGuinness wanted to clarify that so we have the facts and chronology correct. You're happy with that?
A. I am. I did say in that particular statement, there are a number of things in that statement that I --

326 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. But my point is: I didn't get a commendation from the Guards. Nothing to do with the water award.
327 Q. CHAN RMAN okay?
A. It is the commendation, is the point.

CHA RMAN Yes.
Q. MR. MEGU NNESS: This passage from your statement that I quoted from page 91 , this is from the statement to
the Tribunal investigators here last year in 2018, in August 2018. So you're making the allegation that he readied up the recommendation for the Seiko award as a response to this document that was issued by PIAB. Let's be clear about that.
A. It appears I'm wrong in that.

329 Q. Pardon?
A. It appears I'm wrong in that.
Q. Yes.
A. I am only human, I have obviously made a mistake on that.

331 Q. Yes. So, Superintendent Murray's recommendation, perhaps we will just look at that, volume 32, 9210. And the details \(r\) this is the 22nd September by the way. On the day of the incident.
"I wi sh to draw your attention to excellent pi ece of carried out by sergeant bl ank at 3amin the dark I ocated Ms. Bl ank and saved her life. The actions of ser geant and his team warrant mention and I have asked that they notify Irish water safety so thei r good work is acknow edged. "

Then if we go on to the next page, that is going up to the chief super obviously. You're all on Pulse for that. I think. Isn't that right?
A. Oh yes, yeah. Yes.

332 Q. And then if we go up to page 2383 , sorry if we go to page 2053 first. Could you go down the page?
"On the 11th Novenber 2015 | nomi nated seven menbers i ncl uding Garda Keogh for Sei ko Just in Ti me award. I attach a copy of the correspondence PM 58. These the awards were presented to members on the 8th November 2016 at a ceremony in Dubl in Castle. This was the second occasi on on whi ch I nomi nated members for recognition with the Sei ko Just in Time awards. The menbers I nomi nated on the first occasi on were al so recogni sed, recei ving Sei ko wat ches as thei \(r\) resi due put themin greater danger. There was not an ulterior motive for nomi nating sac for this award."

If we go to 2383-6, PM 58 and you're there under Sergeant Monaghan there at the top, you're expressly named. There's quite a clear summary of what happened there. And a high recommendation that you all be considered for that. Then if we just look at the next couple of pages as well. So, this is then the 2nd November. There's notification of the award. If we go 13:09 down then, down to Sergeant Monaghan, and you were given an invitation there and then the next page -- I'm sorry that is the SAMS absence page. Nothing to do with it.

I don't know whether you would regard a commendation or award in the castle as equal to or better or inferior one to the other, but it seems to be inconsistent with the targeting, that on the one hand \(I\) won't give a
commendation to all of the members because I want to get at you but I will nominate you for an award. It seems on its face perhaps inconsistent
A. It's like this, if I wasn't a whistleblower, I would have perhaps got the award, but if I wasn't a whistleblower I would have got a commendation along with the rest of my unit for that event from An Garda Síochána. And there's no issue, the award is a -- it's kind of a separate matter altogether. From An Garda síochána there is no commendation. And that is my point. Me and the rest of my unit normally would have got a commendation from An Garda Síochána and I have given the example of prior, 2013.
333 Q. It appears from your diary that Sergeant Monaghan told you he would apply for commendations, do you think he happened and it was refused or did you ever ask him his intention?
A. He said it on the night that he was going to apply for commendations. I am not sure after that, like, what the sequence of events were. But I don't know. Like, again I mean, it's possible, that -- again we have to spend a bit of time at the scene again.

334 Q. Yes?
A. Although he may have said, what he said let's say, I do recall something back at the station and ah my boots and everything were all wet from the submerged boat there, was a bit of work to do, so he mightn't have had time equally, if he didn't. I'm not going to dispute what Sergeant Monaghan did or didn't do. . 4



335
Q. We will hear from him in due course. But the final question on this issue: was there a lot of grumbling among all the people who jumped in the Shannon and searched the river bank that they didn't get a commendation?
A. I don't -- you see -- I finish on --
Q. Perhaps I overstated it, but you jumped into a boat anyway?
A. I jumped into a boat and the other guard had to jump into the same boat to grab me as well.
Q. Yes.
A. And this is, again as I said, from, what's -- I go.
Q. CHAN RMAN From the end of December?
A. From the end of December.
Q. CHA RMAN Yes?
A. So, where is this? We're in September, is it, or

October?
CHAN RMAN September?
MR. MEGU NESS: Well, this is September.
Q. CHA RMAN October, November, so there's three months 13:12 really?
A. Yeah, there is. I don't remember.

CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MEGU NESS: okay.
A. Again as I said there, a commendation, it's not a huge 13:12 thing.
Q. CHA RMAN No, I understand.
A. It's a tiny, symbolic thing.
Q. CHA RMAN You don't want to make too much of it?
A. Usually they come down, you get one, it's thrown in your locker. Oh, I got a commendation. And pretty much, you wouldn't put it in a frame or anything. It's just another sheet of paper. But the point is, it's
the acknowledgment from Garda Síochána.
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
343 Q. CHA RMAN But for what it is worth, you say, you would have expected to get both and you think it is sinister and significant that you didn't get both?
A. And the normal --

344 Q. CHAL RMAN Yes I understand?
A. -- the normal thing is we would have got both. I don't want to sound...
CHA RMAN That is the whole point. Thank you very much. Are you happy with that? 2:15, thanks very much.

\section*{THE HEARI NG THEN ADJ OURNED FOR LUNCH AND RESUMED, AS} FOLLOWE:

MR. MEGI NESS: Thank you, Chairman. Mr. Kelly has informed me that he is no longer requiring the Tribunal to pursue number 16 any further at this point in time. CHA RMAN Number 16, Mr. Kelly. which, just remind me?

MR. MtGU NNESS: It relates to phone tapping.
CHA RMAN Oh yes. Thank you very much. we can forget number 16. Thank you very much.
MR. MEGU NESS: I thank Mr. Kelly for that
communication.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. MEGU NESS: We concluded number 15, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: So I was going to proceed on to issue number 17.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: Complaints by Garda Keogh in relation to the criminal investigation carried out by Commissioner Donal ó Cualáin.

CHA RMAN Yes.
345 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Obvious7y in context, you became aware of his appointment very shortly after your protected disclosure?
A. Probably within two weeks.

346 Q. Pardon?
A. Roughly two weeks.

347 Q. Are you talking about the first contact or becoming aware of his appointment?
A. I think he sent me a letter.

348 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

349 Q. Obviously you met him and his team a large number of time and you were in communication over quite a period, over the phone and by letter as well?
A. I initially met him and Detective Superintendent Mulcahy.

350 Q. Yes. In terms of keeping in touch with him and his team and vice versa, there was a lot of contact over
the period of the investigation?
A. Yes. It was mainly with Detective Superintendent mulcahy.
Q. Yes. He was the lead investigator under the assistant commissioner?
A. Yes. Obviously you weren't part of the investigation team. You naturally had an interest in what might be happening. You make statements, as required, dealing with all different aspects of it that you were aware of or had evidence of or suspicions or beliefs?
A. That's correct. Essentially I was their informant and I handed the knowledge that I had and things that I was aware of to them and any persons that had come forward, I handed everything over to them, yes.
Q. Yes.
A. But didn't go into detail in the affidavits because it's more complicated, yes.
Q. I am really just focusing, I suppose I should have been
more clear, in terms of first hand evidence. You didn't have a lot of first hand evidence to provide to them yourself?
A. Well I had one piece of primary evidence, which is the DVD.
Q. Yes.
A. That was linked with the affidavit, yeah.

357 Q. Yes.
A. In relation to the main thing, a lot of circumstantial, a lot of circumstantial evidence, yes.
358 Q. Yes. In terms of --
A. Sorry.

359 Q. The DVD, I think that was a DVD, was that of an interview you had conducted?
A. Yes.

360 Q. With the suspect, the alleged -- the person who was arrested anyway?
A. Yes, yes.

361 Q. Yes. The significance of it appears to be, correct me if I am wrong, that Garda A's statement was read during 14:21 the course of the interview?
A. Yes.

362 Q. That statement contained the wrong address and, therefore, the wrong sort of misidentification of the suspect in that respect?
A. That's correct. There was also, though, other statements I read out and there was a pattern of collusion -- or sorry, not collusion, sorry, coercion, excuse me, coercion contained in the DVD. Sorry. .
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Q. All that was on the DVD was the official Criminal Justice Act record of the questioning of the suspect in the police station?
A. Yeah.
Q. Isn't that right?
Q. CHA RMAN Can I just intervene. As I understand, in the course of operation Loki, a person was misidentified, that person was arrested?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, there was a search, you conducted the 14:22 search.
A. Yes.
Q. CHAL RMAN That person presented himself subsequently and you questioned him?
A. That's correct.
Q. CHA RMAN Isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN During the course of that, it became apparent to you that he was not the correct person and you became confirmed in that view, that this was a misidentification, this person had nothing to do with the case, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. Yes.

CHA RMAN okay.
Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Am I wrong in my recollection that, in 14:23 fact, Garda A at one stage looked in and said, that's not the right person?
A. Yes, I think you're correct there, yeah.
Q. So whatever steps or misrecording of the address or the
belief that it was X of particular address, he came in and said, that's not the X , who had the same sort of name as the actual suspect, isn't that right?
A. Yes. Yeah, there was -- it came in, I think it was after the interview. I just can't remember.
Q. Yes.
A. But it was definitely --

373 Q. CHAI RMAN My understanding is he came in during the interview, at a time when you were already pretty satisfied that this was the wrong person, he looked in and confirmed that this was the wrong person. That's my understanding of the descriptions that we have the epi sode?
A. I'm not sure, because it was if it was during the interview I would have been sitting across from the suspect.
Q. CHAl RMAN Yes.
A. There is a DVD which shows what happened anyway.
Q. CHAL RMAN It's not important. But at any rate, at some point, at some point during this process, Garda A confirmed to you -
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN - that this was the correct person, this was a misidentified person?
A. That's correct, yes.

377 Q. CHAI RMAN Okay. And you presented the DVD of that, you obtained a DVD of that, had it in your possession and you presented that to the investigating officers, the ó Cualáin?
A. No.
Q. CHAL RMAN No?
A. I presented that to Judge McMahon.
Q. CHA RMAN okay. Presumably it made its way to --
A. That's correct.

CHAN RMAN Okay. Thanks very much.
Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Now, in your statements you maintain that there were serious and deliberate flaws with regard to this investigation?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAK Yes. This is the Ó Cualáin investigation? MR. MEGI NESS: The Ó Cualáin, I beg your pardon, Chairman, yes.
381 Q. Would you say that the investigation was thorough?
A. It's very complicated. Parts of it were thorough. Parts of it were thorough. There's a load of problems with the investigation. That's why -- and it was a very complicated investigation.
382 Q. Yes. But was that one of the serious and deliberate flaws, that it wasn't thorough in some parts?
A. Well, you see, there was so many problems with the investigation. Like to me, the stand out thing was, when I presented the evidence to the investigation team, there was enough evidence there if they wished to look at a suspension or go down that road, but what happened was, they conducted the investigation and when they were taking the statements in relation to Garda A, it was in Athlone Garda Station.
383 Q. Yes.
A. while Garda A was on duty.
Q. Yes.
A. He was hanging around the station and he was actually watching everybody that was called in and out to make their statement.
Q. We will come to that. That's part of it?
A. Yes.

386 Q. But my question was really related to the thoroughness and you seem to be saying it wasn't, parts of it weren't thorough. Are you in a position just to help us from your perspective as to what you thought wasn't thorough?
A. I mean, when the first phone was seized from Garda A, I understand, it was Detective Mulcahy told me that the phone had been wiped, that was the first phone that had 14:27 been seized from him. So that was in June or July I think 2014.

387 Q. Yes, I think you're correct, it was seized on 13th June, during the course of the taking of your statement, isn't that right?
A. I don't know. I can't remember when but \(I\) know it was seized. But it was obvious that Garda A had prior knowledge that his phone was to be seized. Because from my recollection of what Superintendent Mulcahy told me, that the phone had actually been wiped. As
in, there's a machine -- I'm not an expert on phone -the way these phone reading machines work, and I could be wrong on this, but \(I\) think they can also delete information off phones. There was one of those
machines in Mullingar. There was a member of the drugs unit in mullingar that operated that machine.
388 Q. Did he wipe it?
A. I don't know. I don't know.

389 Q. Do you know when it was wiped?
A. I don't know. Other than Superintendent Mulcahy told me it had been wiped, that the information on the phone had been wiped, which would -- sorry, yeah.
390 Q. Sorry, do you think that the suspect guard, do you think he knowledge that there was an investigation?
A. well he clearly knew there was an investigation.
well, we're talking about the 13th June, when it was seized. So he didn't know of any statements being taken at that point in time. How do you think he may have learned that there was an investigation or might be an investigation?
A. Judge, the phone was wiped. He obviously had information that his phone was going to be seized.
394 Q. How do you think he might have suspected that?
A. Somebody would have had to have tipped him off.

395 Q. Tipped him off about what?
A. His phone being seized.

396 Q. CHAI RMAN About what?
A. That his phone was to be seized.
Q. MR. MEGUNESS: Have you any information to suggest that some of the investigation team tipped him off? was that a lack of thoroughness?
A. No, I don't know, I have no idea, like I don't who tipped him off.
Q. But you believe he was tipped off?
A. We11, I assume he was tipped off if the phone was wiped, all the information --
399 Q. CHA RMAN Could he not have worked out that it was likely that somebody was going to come around and say, 1et's have your phone? Could he not have worked that out?
A. That's a possibility as well Judge, yes.
400 Q. CHA RMAN I mean, if he looked at the television and he saw the report of ming Flanagan?
A. Yes.
401 Q. CHA RMAN Bizarrely, that might te11 him there was something afoot?
A. Yeah.
402 Q. CHA RMAN But just to be fair to you now, I don't want 14:30 to say, we have all the allegations that you have made. I counted them up. Specific criticism, I understand that. But it sounded like you were saying that somebody from the investigation team tipped him off?
A. I can't -
403 Q. CHA RMAN why get your phoned wiped? That's a new one. Now I haven't seen that before. I want to be fair to you. I mean, if are you making that, well and good, okay. People will ask you about that. But is
```

that what you are saying?
A. I have no evidence it was someone in the investigation team that tipped off. Like what is possible is, somebody in the investigation team, and again, may have said to somebody --
404 Q. CHA RMAN But if you say that, it implies that you believe that some garda tipped him off. And the possibilities are somebody in the investigation team or somebody elsewhere. And I am concerned to know, are you actually saying that? I mean, look, everything is possible?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}$.

405 Q. CHA RMAN You know, everything is possible. But are you saying that you think somebody tipped him off, given that he could have worked it out himself?
A. Yes.

406 Q. CHA RMAN If he watched the television?
A. Correct, he could have worked it out himself. Equally, he could have been tipped off. I cannot -- I don't -I cannot go any further.
407 Q. CHA RMAN But if you leave it in the air, you are leaving it in the air?
A. Unfortunately --

408 Q. CHA RMAN Now, you know as a garda what's evidence and what's allegation and everything else, you know that?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}$.

409 Q. CHA RMAN So are you leaving it in the air or can I forget that?
A. I can't, I can't prove --

410 Q. CHA RMAN But do you think -- I know you can't prove it, sure that's perfectly obvious that you can't prove it. Sorry, I don't want to be unfair. I don't want to give you a hard time and I don't want to be unfair. I have 10 criticism of the ó Cualáin report. All I want to know is, do I write down 11, somebody tipped Garda A off? Is that what you think or can $I$ forget number 11 and leave 10 where they are? Do you know what I mean?
A. Yes.

411 Q
CHA RMAN The last thing I want to be is unfair to you?
A. I am trying to think.

412 Q. CHA RMAN But equally, I don't want to leave something hanging in the air that says, well, it could have happened. I know it could have happened. Everything could have happened, do you what I mean? I mean Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin could have popped around and said Garda A, you know. But there's no suggestion. That would be, I hope, an absurd suggestion?
A. I would doubt it was anybody in the investigation team in that --

413 Q. CHA RMAN was it anybody from any team that tipped him off?
A. Oh, I can't say that, I can't say that, Judge.

414 Q. CHA RMAN As I say, sorry, look it, it sounds like I am giving you a hard time, I'm not. I am just concerned with making that $I$ focus on the allegations and I understand the ones you are making. Okay.
Q. MR. MEGU NESS: I mean, perhaps equally, if not more reasonably plausible, part of the allegations that you had made against Garda A were that he had tipped somebody off about disposing of their phones?
A. Oh yeah.

That was one of the allegations that was contained in your list, isn't that right?
A. Yes, yeah.

418 Q. So, from your perspective, you knew that Garda A was capable of dealing with phone evidence that he didn't want police to see or have, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

419 Q. Now in that context, do you think Garda A, if Garda A was involved in these matters, do you think the speech in the Dáil could have alerted him to the possibility that his activities were going to come under scrutiny?
A. Oh of course, yes.

420 Q. If the phone was wiped, and I have no idea what was on the phone or when it was wiped or whatever, but is that something, that the announcement might possibly well have triggered such an action, if such an action was done by Garda A?
A. I can't dispute the argument you're making.

421 Q. Yes.
A. But when I say the phone was wiped, my understanding is
when -- this is an official State phone and when detective super -- I can't speak for the detective superintendent.
422 Q. Yes.
A. This is just my understanding, is that, it contained nothing, like no phone numbers, nothing at all. It was completely blank.
423 Q. Yes. But was there some other reason why you think that there might be evidence on the phone?
A. Well, that would have been a huge part of the main part 14:36 of the collusion investigation, was to do with contact between Garda A and Ms. B.
424 Q. Now, you have been obviously very careful and accurate to say yourself that your own affidavit didn't go into any of the details?
A. No, what I did was --

425 Q. Sorry, go ahead?
A. Sorry, the way I did it was, I did it, I think, just from recollection, my affidavit at point 8, the last one, where I mentioned about the Operation Loki. In my 14:36 initial dealings with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and Commissioner ó Cualáin, I said, look, here's this affidavit but this is what I really want to talk to you about, there's a separate thing here which is really in my affidavit. Commissioner ó Cualáin said, we're only 14:37 dealing with what's in the affidavit. Detective Superintendent Mulcahy read through the thing and I was just saying, look, there's this bigger thing here, and I said, it is linked on point 8 , I think it's point 8 ,
and Detective Superintendent Mulcahy said, yes, that is linked, he said, yes, it's linked.

426 Q. CHA RMAN That's in, in other words.
A. Yes.

427 Q. CHA RMAN what you wanted to talk about was covered by 14:37 the heading in point 8?
A. Detective Superintendent Mulcahy said yes.
Q. CHAN RMAN okay.
A. Yeah.

429 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: I am not in any way critical of you for keeping your powder dry, if I can put it that way, but had you told Deputy Flanagan when you provided him with the draft affidavit, look, there's evidence that I am concerned about on a state phone that this guard has and don't mention anything about that?
A. Oh, I mean, I can't remember. And just for clarification with the affidavit, it wasn't as simple as -- and people may, including myself, thought that I'11 just speak to Deputy Flanagan and I'11 go shouting and roaring in the Dáil, it wasn't like that. Deputy Flanagan said, I want an affidavit from you before we go any further.
430 Q. No, I understand that.
A. Yeah.

431 Q. Am I correct in saying you drafted it in his office? 14:38
A. I'm not sure where I drafted it. I remember getting it signed by a solicitor in Tullamore.

432 Q. Yes. But I suppose a more direct question is: Did you have any discussion with Deputy Flanagan about phones
being an important part of it?
A. I am sure I did, but I can't, I just can't remember.

433 Q. okay.
A. We're going -- when I started talking --

434 Q. CHA RMAN We're going back a long time, yeah.
A. Sorry, when I start talk to Deputy Flanagan is, oh, it's -- I don't know, I can't remember.
Q. CHA RMAN The protected disclosure is the 8th May?
A. oh yeah.

436 Q. CHA RMAN when he mentioned it in the Dáil and you hand over your protected disclosure to Judge McMahon?
A. Yeah.

437 Q. CHA RMAN Does that help?
A. It's not as simple that.

438 Q. CHA RMAN No, I understand.
A. I didn't wake up on the 8th May and just decide I'm going to make --
439 Q. CHA RMAN Precisely. The only reason I mentioned that, is that you were trying to get a timescale and I thought that's a helpful date?
A. Yes.

440 Q. CHA RMAN To remind you of, if that helps you?
A. Well, that a date I'11 never forget.

441 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. That -- it was -- I was months previously working -had made contact with Deputy Flanagan. It could have been even as far as back as 2013, but it was maybe the early months of 2014, I can't recall. I will just have a glance. You see, I wasn't taking notes at the time,
because I don't start taking notes until I meet Judge Mcmahon on the 8th May. That's because, in fairness to Judge McMahon, he advised me, you know, in this process, my advice is, don't write anything about this in your Garda notebooks, get your own notes and keep notes, because this could go on. In fairness, I wouldn't be able to provide any evidence, anything really, if I didn't --
CHA RMAN Anyway, you think it went back a number of months, certainly to the beginning of 2014, possibly even into the latter part of 2013?
A. '13, yes.

443 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Am I right? Possibly?
A. I have no date, but I distinctly remember, it was the night there was a garda shot in Louth, I know there was 14:41 two guards killed up there in around the same time, but there was a -- it was the night one of the guards, I think, were being buried, I am not sure it was Adrian -- it doesn't.
444 Q. CHA RMAN Garda Adrian Donoghue, is that right?
A. Yeah, it might have been him, I'm not sure. But Luke Ming Flanagan was on Vincent Brown and I happened to be watching it. Unfortunately, he started on that night talking about Garda corruption and it was the night of the garda funera1. And what he was saying was correct, 14:41 but he was saying it at the wrong time. But either way, I was watching this and I then said, I actually have the evidence to back up what Deputy Flanagan is saying. And also, one-third of Athlone is in County

Roscommon and he was the TD for Roscommon. So, that's how that kind of -- at some point --

447 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Just going back to the phone issue, because you do make the case there was a delay in seizing evidence during which mobile phone evidence was erased. Now, I suppose just starting at the beginning, all of the incidents that you complained of dated from several years prior to this date in June '14, isn't that right?
A. This is do with the Ó Cualáin investigation?
Q. Yes, when that started?
A. I'm sorry, straight out, I actually can't remember what the allegations $I$ have made.

449
Q. Yes.
A. But I'11 know them if they're just...

450 Q. I will run through them briefly. The operation Loki 2008/9/10?
A. Yeah.

451 Q. The theft of DVD on searches, February '11?
A. Oh, these are the affidavits in my complaint? Yes.

452 Q. The issue about being photographed, 2010; planting evidence, December '12; preferential treatment --
A. Sorry, photograph? Photographed?

453 Q. You complained in one of your statement about the suspect being photographed and a photograph being put on Facebook as evidence?
A. Oh, yes.

454 Q. That was 2010. Preferential treatment in courts, March 14:44 '11; heroin in custody, November '09; cronyism, 2009; public order and the phones, September '08; drugs concealed, 2008. So those sort of nine incidents that were being investigated, as it were, related to a period between six years and two years before you made your disclosure?
A. Yes.

455 Q. Isn't that right?
A. I think it did, yeah.

456 Q. You knew because you had some evidence yourself that 14:44 this suspect had colluded with a suspect to dispose of phone evidence, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

457 Q. You hadn't, and I am not criticising you, just
mentioned phones in your protected disclosure?
A. Sorry?
Q. You didn't mention phones in your affidavit of protected disclosure?
A. Right. I just can't, I can't recall what $I$ put in.
Q. Yes. It doesn't appear that you mention phones as an important part of the case to Judge McMahon when you met him on the 8 th.
A. As I said to you, the affidavit is only --

460 Q. I understand.
A. Is the minor part there. In the main complaint that I made to Detective Mulcahy, phones are a huge, massive part of that.
461 Q. Yes. But in terms of the seizing of a phone, is it the case that you would have discussed an issue like that with Judge McMahon
A. I may have. I may have. I just can't --

462 Q. okay.
A. It's quite possible, but $I$ can't remember. Because I was in contact with Judge McMahon for a while after, after the initial 8th May. And then -- yeah, then the law changes and the protected disclosures comes in and Judge McMahon then is no longer the confidential recipient.
463 Q. Yes. But I am only talking really about the 8th May, 14:46 when you made it to him, when you met him outside Dublin for that purpose and handed him the affidavit?
A. Okay.

464 Q. I'm just wondering, have you a positive memory of
mentioning phones or the importance of phones being seized to him when you were meeting him for that protected disclosure?
A. I just can't remember. No, I can't. I just can't remember. I think the only note $I$ have in relation to that is just on the 8th May, I have:
"M ng announces allegations in Dáil and names me while I reet Judge McMahon."

That's the only note for that day part, because I have to go into work then that night and it's strange.
465 Q. Okay. Judge McMahon, in his statement to us, said he was very surprised when he heard of Deputy Flanagan reciting the details of the protected disclosure and identifying you in the Dáil that day. That's as may be. But the Pulse entry that you put in on, that we have already dealt with, $I$ just want to touch on it, just from this point of view. Now, I am not assuming that many gardaí watch Dáil debates, but a lot of gardaí might have picked up on Deputy Flanagan's allegation?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

466 Q. You would accept that?
A. Yeah.

467 Q. Local guards would have said, look, there's something rumbling here, there's something started in this process?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes.
A. Because there were guards there, especially with younger guards, they didn't know like what was going on. And then they thought -- I mean, they obviously were probably thinking, you know, this, is it about me and all the rest. And the older guards, as I said, would have know, they were grand because they would have known, had a fair idea of what I was going to be saying.
471 Q. CHA RMAN But Garda A knew that you had checked him out on the 18th?
A. I don't know when he --

472 Q. CHAL RMAN I'm sorry, I put that wrong. You checked him out on the 18th?
A. Yes.

473 Q. CHA RMAN If he had seen fit to look up his own thing,
he would have seen it. At some point he became aware of it because he wrote protesting about it?
A. Yes, Judge, there's no issue that he would have been aware from the 8th May that --
474 Q. CHAI RMAN He was in the frame?
A. There was something coming, yes.

475 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. What Mr. McGuinness is asking you is this: You're blaming the ó Cualáin investigation for not grabbing the phone at an earlier time - just hear me out for a second - whereas, in fact, in the circumstances there was ample opportunity for a suspect to wipe the phone if that was in a person's mind. Do you follow me?
A. Yes, I do.

476 Q. CHA RMAN what do you say to that?
A. I take your point and you are correct. Your argument is --

477 Q. CHA RMAN No, no, Mr. McGuinness is asking you, this is a criticism you make, you say, look, they didn't get started fast enough. I know you say they should have
come round to you or you should have got your thing earlier, there was delay, I understand that. But on this one, Mr. McGuinness is saying, okay, you say, look, the phone was wiped, and he is asking you, was there not ample opportunity for the phone to be wiped, notwithstanding, even if they had been as efficient as possible?
A. You're correct. And that would also tie in with -where the DVDs were stored in that storeroom, I
understand, they were all moved in the first week.
478 Q. CHA RMAN Don't mind the DVDs, he will ask you about the DVDs in due course or he won't or whatever. But on the phone thing, you think there was opportunity?
A. There was opportunity. I will concede --

479 Q. CHAN RMN Should we be absolving or at least reducing the criticism of ó cualáin to take account of that?
A. Yeah, in relation to the phone --

480 Q. CHAL RMAN The wiping of the phone?
A. -- and the DVDs, I accept there was that, yeah, that that -- I can't blame them for that.

481 Q. CHA RMAN Okay.
A. Yes. I concede on that.

CHAI RMAN okay, thank you very much. I am not trying to get to you concede, I am just trying to follow up the logic of where the exchange between you and Mr. MCGuinness is going, do you understand?
A. Yes. And the logic is correct, what you're saying, yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: Conversely, following the logic through, is the suggestion, and again it's not a criticism, if you perhaps had not organised with Deputy Flanagan to make the announcement in the Dáil or hadn't put the matter on Pulse, the suspect, whoever he may be, may not have been aware of the onset, initiation or 14:52 likelihood that an investigation team could seize the phone?
A. You're correct there, but what's not being taken into account is, Deputy Flanagan's point was, if you're not
named in the Dáil and -- if you are not named in the Dái1 and they go after you -- basically he did that to have in on the public order for my protection.
484 Q. For your protection?
A. For my protection, was his point of that.

I understand. You may take it that I would have the height of respect for Deputy Flanagan in the sense that I wouldn't anticipate that he would do anything deliberately to try and prevent an investigation that you had come to him to help launch, as it were, or that ${ }_{14: 53}$ he would want to see completed?
A. Yes.

486 Q. You accept that?
A. I didn't personally want -- I didn't want to be named in the Dáil. But, like, he is correct, I think. He said, this is for your protection, you know, to have it on public record.
487 Q. Yes.
A. And I do -- in hindsight, I think he was correct there, yeah.

488 Q. So, I mean, it may be a combination of matters, both, I suppose the publicity, perhaps an alternative course of not having said anything, might have led to the seizure of the phone without the suspect realising it was going to be seized?
A. Sorry?

CHA RMAN If things turned out differently -- we11, that follows Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.

CHA RMAN And Garda Keogh agree was that.
MR. KELLY: Judge, I am getting a little concerned that we are embarking on a course where there is just a succession of invitations to speculate. Now I understand why that is, but I wonder how helpful it is in the end.

MR. MEGI NNESS: $w e 11$, it's helpful because it goes directly to the issue of an allegation of delay in seizing evidence.
CHA RMAN But I think Garda Keogh has very fairly, if I am understanding, has very fairly said, listen, that seems to be a reasonable proposition as a matter of logic. He has explained, look, there's a difficulty, name, not name and so on, and those were issues that were canvassed, I think. But you agree that we can at least dilute the criticism of Ó Cualáin in this respect, taking account of the opportunity that presented itself for anybody to dispose of any incriminating material.
A. Yes. And that goes both for the clearance of that storeroom and the seizure of the phone.

489 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. Yes. I have already said I conceded on that.

CHA RMAN I think that deals with that particular point.
490 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: Except that there is a consequential issue, the first time then the phones were mentioned by you were in the course of the taking of your statement, in June of 2014. Your statement I think was commenced
on the 7th June.
A. Yes.

491 Q. It went to the 11th and 13th?
A. Yes.

492 Q. Then signed on the 18th?
A. Yeah, you're correct, yes.

493 Q. It was at the stage on the 13th, the statement was interrupted and once the phones, I think, were mentioned during the course of that day or morning, Superintendent Mulcahy said it became a priority once they realised and were told for the first time that the phones were important?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

494 Q. The phones were seized on that day, on the 13 th?
A. I don't dispute it.

495 Q. Yes. It's just I want to suggest to you that it would appear as a consequence from the conduct of the investigation that they seized the phone at the first opportunity possible, on the day they learnt of it?
A. Yeah, that is correct. Again, I didn't know, I didn't know what the procedures were.

496 Q. Yes.
A. And I suppose it's is fair in hindsight to say they didn't know either really. So...
497 Q. I understand that.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MEGU NNESS: One of the other complaints you made was a delay in commencing the investigation, during which evidence disappeared. Leaving aside now the
phones and the DVDs, is there anything else that comes under that category of your complaint, is there any other type of evidence?
A. They should have come to me sooner than a month after. Really, if they had just met me even or sent someone out to me or something, other than a letter, much sooner than a month later. As I said, that month was particularly difficult, that month. I said, everyone knows I am here waiting to make this complaint, I'm just waiting. I think I used the term --
MR. KELLY: Sorry to interrupt. It's probably my fault, but has the transcript stopped running? CHAL RMAN Did the transcript stop running?~ MR. KELLY: if you follow.
CHA RMAN Art has gone to sort it out. We can assume he has gone to sort it out, Mr. Kelly.
MR KELLY: That's fine.
CHA RMAN You have a bit to go on this issue.
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. I have no problem taking a break
if we can sort out the feed.
CHAL RMAN We will take a break and we will sort it out. I am pretty sure it possibly is, but we will check out what the situation is anyway. we would have been taking a break sometime soon. okay. That's grand. Thanks very much.

THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED BRI EFLY AND RESUMED AS

## FOLLONG:

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. MEGU NESS: we are back on line.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
MR. MEGUNESS: I think I should say, Chairman, we haven't lost any of the transcript.
CHA RMAN Oh no, I would have thought so. Yes.
500 Q. MR. MEGU NNESS: Garda Keogh, I was just asking you
about the issue of delay in the commencing of the investigation. I think on a previous day I suggested to you that it was Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin who phoned you on the 15th May and it was you who nominated the 7th June for the commencement of the process of interview?
A. I don't -- I don't think I can agree with that. On the 15th May assistant commissioner contacts me. Oh yeah.
"He says I understand there is another matter."

The other matter is obviously in relation to the conclusion. I say:
"Far more serious than what's in the affidavit and we have a job to do."

But em, I don't know, I didn't pick -- I picked the location, not the date.

501
Q. He says you nominated?
A. No.

502 Q. You don't recollect that?
A. No, I dispute that.

503 Q. You dispute that?
A. I dispute that I picked the date.

504 Q. okay.
A. I was available, sure I wanted to go get it started as quick as possible.
Okay. Well, perhaps we will look at 7339, just on that 15:12 point. You see point number 1 there:
"I was appoi nted on the 9th May 2014 and spoke to Garda Keogh within a week. The date of the first meeting was det er mined by Gar da Keogh. "
A. No. No.

506 Q. Okay. Anyway, let's assume that the 7th June comes and you haven't made your statement obviously. They have what they have. You know what you have given them.
There's nothing -- you sent up nothing in the interim. I mean between the 15th May, you had sent them nothing further, or did you?
A. No. I had asked Judge McMahon, when I gave him the DVD --
507 Q. To send?
A. I asked him just to hold onto the DVD. If you could just send in the affidavit and to hold on to the DVD for a while is what I -- yeah.
Q. Okay. Let's take that delay anyway and let's not assume anyone is either responsible for it or that it wasn't deliberate. Do you accept it wasn't a deliberate delay, on the part of the investigating team?
A. You see, I don't know, I don't know. As I said, this was the new process for me.
Q. Yes.
A. It was also a new process for them. But I really do believe they should have come to me way sooner than a month later.
Q. Okay. That amount of time passes and you've complained, during which evidence has disappeared. Now, I am not going to go back into the phones and the DVDs?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. Is there any other category of evidence that you think was disappearing or had disappeared by the 7th June when they came to meet you?
A. Well, there was drugs, I think it was commercial opium or something like that in the storeroom with the DVDs, a couple of kilos of it. I mentioned that to Detective Inspector Mulcahy.
512 Q. On meeting him, was it, or during the statement, is it?
A. I would have -- I would have perhaps mentioned it on the first day I met him. But I am not sure other than I definitely mentioned it at some stage, because $I$ put it into my statement I think as well.
513 Q. I mean, might that have been subject to the same issues
we were discussing about the phones and the DVDs?
A. Correct, it would have, yes, because it was in the same room as the DVD. So I would be conceding in relation to -- it's the same, yeah.
514 Q. Okay. Obviously at the beginning I looked at your overview of the serious and deliberate flaws with regard to this investigation. when you say deliberate flaws, can I just ask you to expand on that from your own perspective.
A. The thing about the interview, the guards, interviewing the guards in the Garda station while the suspect guard is on duty is insane. You wouldn't see it in Police Academy. It was just insane. Like, they have the phone contact details and addresses of every guard. There was nothing to stop them meeting guards at their own homes or inviting them to meet somewhere else, some other location. To get them to start making statements in Athlone Garda Station in itself was absolutely insane. Then, to do it while Garda A was present in the station, because obviously I am aware that he was then going approaching everyone that was being interviewed and asking them, we11, what were you asked and what was said and this sort of stuff.

515 Q. Well, we will come to that. There is certainly -- I think you did raise a complaint or somebody raised a complaint that he was seeking to ask questions in the station about the investigation team. It was brought to Superintendent McBrien's attention, as was a suggestion that you were making enquiries about the
team. She sent Sergeant Curley to tell each of you separately not to ask anything about the team, is that right?
A. I don't -- no, not with Sergeant Curley. My recollection of this from reading through there's an investigation going on, there's an investigation team appointed to do it. She told me, I'm calling you, saying the same thing as I'm saying to you and a number of others, but I don't want anyone talking about this investigation while it's going on or 15:17 anything in the station, I want everyone just get on with their police work and let the investigation team do their own work. And how -- she used a term, I don't want you going off doing solo runs. That stuck out in the notes, because I remember her saying that to me. Like, I didn't have a note of that but I clearly remember Superintendent McBrien saying that to me. 516 Q. Okay. But I suppose I am just headlining in my own mind, in my question, deliberate flaws. Because it would appear from the report that they followed a recommendation on the Morris Tribunal and they had a trained incident room coordinator, which was established as an incident room, and that was in Athlone Garda Station.
A. Sorry?

517 Q. Do you think that was a deliberate mistake or deliberate in the sense of something more sinister?
A. Can you just - the incident -- I don't -- the incident room I don't think was in Athlone Garda Station.

518 Q. Okay. So it was just the interviewing then is in Athlone?
A. The interviewing, yeah. I think the interview -the -- what was the --

519 Q. The incident room coordinator?
A. Yes. I think that was in Oranmore Garda station, I think.

520 Q. All right. I mean, I don't know the rationale for them deciding to do interviews, but obviously most of the guards who might be available would be on duty in

Ath1one obviously. Do you say that was in some way not just a careless or a bad decision, but are you saying it was improper and in some way corrupt or malicious or de1iberate1y --
A. Oh yeah, I do, yes.

521 Q. In what way?
A. I do.

522 Q. I would be anxious to hear your view on that?
A. Yes, my view on this.

523 Q. Yes.
A. It was designed so that guards were not going to come forward with information.

524 Q. You think.
A. That is what I believe.

525 CHA RMAK So assume that everybody has views about that and they can be discussed in due course. Mr. McGuinness is focusing on a statement saying, where you say:
"I believe this was deliberately facilitated in an effort to suppress honest statements being made by way of informal intimation."
which says that the investigators were frustrating their own investigation and doing it deliberately. It wasn't just a stupid thing -- sorry, it wasn't just a mistake or negligence, that they were deliberately, and that's a big thing to say. Now, I mean, if you're saying it, that's what you're saying
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN But are you really serious about that?
A. I have to be serious about it, because, Judge, why e1se would they do that? They couldn't be that negligent.
They couldn't be that negligent, to do that in the same station while the same -- while the suspect garda is on duty. In the same station and while he's on duty, I just, I cannot say, I couldn't say that that's just out of negligence, it's too big a thing under the circumstances to be negligent.
MR. MEGU NESS: we11, can I just touch on a few strands of your statement. I am looking at them together and I hope not unfairly. I just want to raise them, each of them, in this context now that you've talked about it. On page 35 of your statement, you say 15:22 that:

[^1]A. Yes.

534 Q. Are you implying something from that, or is the Chairman to take some connotation of an improper or over --
A. I can't say, I don't know what happened behind the scenes. But what subsequently transpires the way $-I$, the way it appeared to me, is ultimately that they were at the time, $I$ believe, trying to suppress obviously people, discussed that, people coming forward and there was problems with the investigation, as I have said. Superintendent Murray, I'm of course paying, if -if -- my argument, if they were trying to cover it up or whatever, my argument was that I was there and present, I was working in the station and obviously I was hearing as well who was being interviewed, what's being said, what's going on. I was in the know, as was Garda A. I was obviously finding and hearing new information, I was passing it on to Detective Inspector Mulcahy. I believe that Ó Cualáin then, when Superintendent Murray arrives, the objective of -- one of his objectives was to get me out of Athlone, so Ó Cualáin could conduct the investigation in the manner -- in whatever way he wanted to do it and I was basically a torn in his side, because I was kind of trying to, I suppose, push them, get them -- I was trying to encourage them, there's evidence here, if you can look that way, let's say.course, wasn't implicated in any of your allegations that you made Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin?
A. Oh no. No.
Q. No.
A. No, no.

537 Q. So I mean, he had no interest, it would seem, in suppressing an investigation into those historic allegations that had occurred in relation to the district before he had arrived, years before he had arrived. Is that not a fair comment, a fair question?
A. Not really, because again, as I said, the motive on this, the motive on this, this is what I believe:

Ó Cualáin sent Murray in -- just to simplify it, sent Murray in to get me now. It would leave them free to do a cover up investigation. If he got me out, he would be rewarded with promotion and that's -- that's the way I see it, to make it very simple.
Q. Self interest of Superintendent Murray to sort of do favours for Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin, is that part of it, what you're saying?
A. Do favours, follow orders. In the Guards, I mean if a 15:26 senior officer tells you, listen, if you can do this, is it an order?

539 Q. Yes.
A. Like, you disobey...

540 Q. I understand. When you Ó Cualáin put him in, I mean, 15:26 are you talking about his assignment to Ath1one by Garda $H Q$ ? Are you saying his appointment there to be the district officer?
A. I would think so, because Ó Cualáin -- he is --
Q. CHA RMAN Assistant Commissioner, wasn't he? Then he was acting Commissioner later, but at this stage he was Assistant Commissioner?
A. He was assistant commissioner, and I think Noirín is acting commissioner.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Commissioner O'Sullivan?
A. She's acting, I think.

CHA RMAN At the time she may have been acting commissioner before she became commissioner. okay.
A. Which means that Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin is the second in command in An Garda Síochána, so he is a very powerful person.

544 Q. CHAN RMAN Surely the deputy commissioner would have been the second in command, if we are speaking in that way?
A. No. Well, there is no commissioner --

545 Q. CHA RMAN I thought it went commissioner, deputy commissioner, assistant commissioner?
MR. MEGU NESS: I think there are two deputy commissioners.
CHA RMAN Yes. But the order, if I am an assistant commissioner I may get promoted to be a deputy commissioner, am I right about that?
A. You are correct. But what I am trying to say is: I think Nóirín O'Sullivan was the acting commissioner at

546 Q. CHAl RMAN Yes?
A. And Donal Ó Cualáin then was, he was assistant commissioner and during the investigation he becomes

547 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. All right. But whether or which.
A. I actually recall congratulating him --

548 Q. CHA RMAN whether or which.
A. -- at one meeting, that.

549 Q. CHA RMAN whether or which.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN okay.
550 Q.
MR. MEGI NNESS: But certainly as of this period in 2014, Commissioner Callahan had gone on the 25th March 2014, Deputy Commissioner O'Sullivan was acting as acting commissioner and at the time of --
A. That's what I was trying to say, yeah.

551 Q. But at the time of Superintendent Murray's assignment in -- I suppose, the decision must have been made in early 2015, but he's in over you for March 2015, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

552 Q. So (a) he has got nothing to do with you or what is happening in the investigation between May '14 and he coming in, in March '15, isn't that correct?
A. Technically, yes. Technically.

553 Q. So it is Superintendent McBrien under whose command between May '14 until her departure at the end of February '15 that the investigation team is in Athlone 15:29 doing the interviews, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

554 Q. Okay. Did you protest to her about that?
A. I just can't recall.
Q. Right.
A. But I know -- you see, I can't recall, I am not sure whether I did there, because I was dealing with Detective Inspector Mulcahy and I definitely protested with Detective Inspector Mulcahy. There was one stage, 15:29 like, for example, $I$ happened to be in public office. There was Detective Inspector Mulcahy, Detective Inspector Coppinger and Garda A, the four of us. Garda A happened to be photocopying or something while they were talking to me. And Detective Inspector Mulcahy said, come on, we'11 go down to a back room, have a private chat. So myself and Detective Inspector Mulcahy were talking and I was actually saying, this is a joke, like, that you're conducting the investigation when Garda A is on duty. And actually when I opened the door in the private room, down the back of the station, Garda A walked by. He had been up in the public office when we were up there and then when Detective Inspector Mulcahy, when we went down to a back room in the back part of the station, he then -as I said, I opened the door, Garda A walks by and I just look back at Detective Inspector Mulcahy, I didn't say anything, because I didn't have to, I had already previously said this is a joke, what's happened.
556 Q. Just to go back to the point at issue, your suggestion that Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin put Murray in to get you out --
A. Yeah.

557 Q. -- now, had he responsibility for appointing him there
or assigning him there as divisional district officer in March '15?
A. They would have, they would have known each other because Superintendent Murray would have worked under Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin. Assistant

Commissioner Ó Cualáin was based in Galway. And he was in command of the western region. Superintendent Murray was under that command. He at the time was, he was both in Gort and in Roscommon.
558 Q.
Yes. But at the time we're talking about, when Chief Murray is there over you, in March, April, May '15, has al1 the interviewing not ceased in Athlone station?
A. Yes.

559 Q. And it had ceased before Super Murray was assigned there?
A. Yes.

560 Q. So what did Super Murray do while he was your chief, as it were, to either frustrate willingly or deliberately the investigation or the interviewing of witnesses?
A. Em...

561 Q. You seem to be suggesting he was deliberately put in by the assistant commissioner to get you out --
A. Yeah.

562 Q. -- of the way --
A. Yes.

563 Q. -- while the interviews were taking place? Did I misunderstand that?
A. No, no.

564 Q. Sorry.
A. The investigation is still going on, ongoing. The statements, Detective Inspector Mulcahy does, -obviously I made protest about the way the statements are being conducted, he then obviously does it, you know, the proper way and he starts -- he doesn't continue -- it's not done in the station or anything. And when it becomes, when he is meeting, taking statements outside of the station, whatever, I actually don't know what's going on at that stage.
Q. Yes.
A. Which is probably the -- and when I don't know, I don't think anyone else then is...
Q. I mean in fairness to you, you identified this as an issue early on, and I think you raise the issue in mid August perhaps that you were unhappy that this was taking place. And are you saying to your knowledge and in your sight that stopped and changed at some particular point?
A. It did.

567 Q. And were they doing interviews off-site, somewhere else 15:33 in Athlone?
A. Yes. Well, I don't know where they were doing them -568 Q. okay.
A. -- but they were still, yes. The investigation went on, you see, in to 2015. '14, '15. Yeah.
569 Q. But that's why I am not quite sure what allegation you're suggesting that the Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin had in putting Murray in to facilitate, to getting you out to facilitate the sabotage of the
investigation?
A. Yeah, yeah. Because, I'11 give you, by way of example: There was one particular day, Garda A denied that he was the person who had the official phone, which was the first phone that was seized from him, he denied that and both him and chief superintendent I think both said, no, this is a phone that is a drugs unit phone and everyone has access to it.
570 Q. Shared by everyone?
A. Yes. And that wasn't the case.

571 Q. Yes.
A. That wasn't the case.

572 Q. There was a variety of evidence, but tended to show, did it not, that Garda A had it most of the time if not all of the time, is that what you are saying?
A. All of the time.

573 Q. Is that right?
A. Mm-hmm.

574 Q. But, what are you saying? Garda A, he didn't agree with that, is that your point?
A. No, sorry, my point was: I got annoyed over -- I was obviously fuming over this, so I then went to get the station, the record for just members with the phone numbers for every guard in the station, which was held in the public office. And I went to photocopy that
number to show that Garda A's name is beside that particular phone number. That, in other words, this is not a unit phone, he has commandeered this or whatever as his own phone, which is irrelevant. But when I went
to photocopy that, the old phone records from another chief superintendent, a former superintendent's time in the station, I found a list of the old phone numbers that were hidden in, it just happened to be under the sheet when I went to photocopy it, and on that I found a phone number which was a different phone number to Garda A's phone number. So I then went back and I checked notes of what I had received from the person on 10th May 2014, various --
575 Q. CHA RMAN In Galway, yes.
A. Yeah.

576 Q. CHAN RMAN Go on.
A. I am not sure if it was that date, or, as I said, that person contacted me by way of text or phone calls a few times after that.
577 Q. CHA RMAK Don't mind that, go on. And that was the meeting in Galway or some other occasion?
A. Afterwards. And I found another phone number for Garda A and when I matched that other phone number for Garda A, I saw then that what the person who had come forward 15:36 and had recited a phone number from five years of his own recollection, five years previously, that of the ten digits in the phone number he had seven of them correct and he was only out slightly towards the end, I think, on three digits. And I then informed Detective ${ }_{\text {15:36 }}$ Inspector Mulcahy that this was, that this was the phone number that the person who had come forward was actually referring to. This was the correct phone number.

578 Q. CHA RMAN Even though they weren't precisely the same, they were sufficiently close to give you the belief --
A. Yes

579 Q. CHA RMAN -- the conclusion --
A. Yes.

15:37
-- that this was the number, okay, for Garda A?
A. Yes CHA RMAN okay.
A. And Superintendent Mulcahy agreed with me on that. He 15:37 agreed with me on that. And he then, he then, in fairness to him, he started making progress then on phones and on that stuff. And Detective Inspector Mulcahy, he -- and when I am critical of the Garda investigation, he turned -- he was a top class investigator when he got his teeth into it. It took him a while to get his teeth into it, but when he got his teeth into it, he was a top class investigator.
582 Q. CHA RMAN This is Superintendent Mulcahy?
A. Mulcahy, Mulcahy, yes. Yes, so that's an example of -- 15:38 583 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. -- I am in the station, I found this piece of evidence. And if someone was interested in covering the whole thing up, the last thing they want is someone like me finding something like this, which it turned out to be 15:38 possibly a very important piece of evidence, so...
584 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: okay. I mean, if you found it there, it had been left there and obviously if somebody had wanted to destroy it, it might be taken --
A. No, no, no, sorry, it was found by accident. It was on a slip -- the original sheets of paper --
585 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, your point, I am understanding this. Your point is that it was unhelpful -- Sorry, having somebody on board and in the station who was alive to a11 the issues meant that that person, i.e. you, might we11 turn up something of relevance?
A. Yeah.
Q. CHA RMAN which is what happened, you say, in this particular case?
A. Yes.

587 Q. CHAI RMAN Admittedly more or less by accident?
A. It was completely.

588 Q. CHA RMAN or entirely?
A. Yes.

589 Q. CHAN RMAN I am sorry, entirely by accident?
A. Yes.

590 Q. CHA RMAN And therefore, it made sense to get rid of such a person?
A. That's what I believe.

591 Q. CHA RMAN That's really the logic.
A. Yeah.

592 Q. CHA RMAN So you think -- and when I say you think, you believe, suspect, conclude that the assistant commissioner was keen to get rid of you in case you might do some more sleuthing around the place and come up with more stuff?
A. That's correct. That is correct. And I actually read a note somewhere in the documents where Assistant

Commissioner ó Cualáin at some stage wrote, where he said something, something along the lines of, if this complaint were proven it would have very negative, it would be very negative for An Garda Síochána as an organisation. Something along those lines. Something along those lines.
CHA RMAN I mean, you do realise that it's a very serious allegation to make?
A. Mm-hmm. I know.

594 Q. CHA RMAN That he comes down ostensibly to carry out an investigation, but he is actually trying to undermine it at the same time.
A. No. No. what I am saying is -- no, I am making that, the allegation towards Ó Cualáin, not Mulcahy. Not Mulcahy or Coppinger.

595 Q. CHAN RMAN Okay?
A. What I am trying to say is: when Mulcahy and Coppinger, they get their teeth into it and they're --
596 Q. CHA RMAN So they prevent, they prevent -- I mean, I am just trying to get this straight to know what you are saying. They prevent their superior from frustrating the process?
A. I don't know what went on behind the scenes.

597 Q. CHA RMAN Is that right? Am I getting that right?
A. I don't, I wouldn't -- they, all I can say is --

598 Q. CHA RMAK They tried to prevent?
A. They were tenacious, both of them were tenacious investigators.
599 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. And were they straight up --
A. Yes.

600 Q. CHA RMAN -- doing the best they could?
A. Yes, they were. Originally, at the start I think I previously said, myself and Detective Inspector Mulcahy, there is no, there isn't much trust at the start, and if you just go --

601 Q. CHA RMAN No, but that builds up?
A. That builds up.

602 Q. CHA RMAN And you're satisfied?
A. Yeah.

603 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. But you say this was the intention of the assistant commissioner and did he achieve that?
A. I don't think so. Because I managed to stay in work long enough and gather enough evidence, that look, I think they were six years, the investigation ultimately 15:41 transforms into this.

604 Q. CHA RMAN Okay?
A. So they're six years messing around in total with this investigation.
CHA RMAN Let me ask you this, Garda Keogh: If he wanted to, if the plan was $I$ wil1 put in Superintendent Murray -- I am just trying to understand where you're coming from.
A. Yes.

606 Q. CHA RMAK If the plan was I wil1 put in Superintendent 15:42 Murray to get rid of this awkward fellow, why didn't he do it earlier? why did he wait for a year? It's not a year. It's March. But why didn't he do it earlier?
A. I don't know. I don't know.

607 Q
Q. CHA RMAN Wouldn't it have been much more efficient to do it earlier?
A. You see when I find that phone number, I can't, I think it's a good while --
608 Q. CHA RMAN Do you follow me? 15:42
A. Yes, I understand.

CHA RMAN I am just trying to understand it. And you are saying that this is the case. And I am saying, well why wouldn't he do it, I will fix this situation now, I will put my man in to get rid of him, leaving aside all the other issues, why would he wait until March, the next year? okay. That is what is occurring to me. okay?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Al1 right. Now, where are we? How much more have you got to go, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGU NNESS: There is a very considerable amount in this and then --
CHA RMAN No, I understand. Thanks very much.
MR. MEGU NNESS: I am not going to be finished by four
o'clock.
CHA RMAN Well, I appreciate that people have arrangements and people have travel arrangements and things. Anyway, I dare say you are probably glad for a break after the week of evidence. Well, there's more

Mr. McGuinness will be finished on Monday, and we will get started. So, you know, you're probably more than halfway through. Okay. Thanks very much. Thank you
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very much.
MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you Chairman.

THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED UNTI L MDNDAY, 21ST OCTOBER 2019 AT 10: 30AM




| burdening [2] | 54:23, 57:7, 60:20 | 35:29, 39:26, 57:6, |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 47:18, 47:22 | 62:22, 64:12, 64:16, | 78:7 | $62: 28,63: 4,63: 7$ | 13, 117:20, |
| urglar [2]-77:12, | 65:13, 70:3, 70:5 | RTAIN [1] - 1:3 | 63:15, 63:26, 64:7 | $18: 3,118: 7,118: 1$ |
| 78:8 | 29, 77: | certainly [11] - 7:7, | 64:14, 64:17, 64:20, | 26 |
| urglary [7] - 51:7, | 85:14, 92:22, 105:22, | 9:18, 24:6, 42:20 | 22, 64:25, 65: | 9, 123:5, 123 |
| 74:23, 74:25, 75:27, | 118:20, 120:7 | 43:7, 43:14, 46: | 65:4, 65:6, 65:15 | 18 |
| 76:2, 77:5, 80:18 | 120:15, 144:10 | 78:7, 117:10, 132:24, | 65:17, 65:21, 65:25, | 24:2, 124:6, 124:9, |
| ried [1] - 117:18 | 144:12, 147:10 | 140: | 65:27, 66:4, 66:7 | 124:12, 124 |
| busy [3] - 66:20, | 147:25, 150:8 | certificat | 66:9, 66:12, 66:18 | 125:27, 126 |
| 66:21, 66:26 | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 4,35: 9 \\ & \text { cases [4] - 32:14, } \\ & 33: 18,35: 9,60: 17 \\ & \text { Castle [2] - 93:10, } \\ & 98: 6 \\ & \text { CASTLE }[1]-1: 17 \\ & \text { castle [2] - 94:1, } \\ & 98: 27 \end{aligned}$ | 13:10, 18:14, 18:20, | 66:20, 66:22, 66:25, | 126:10, 126:2 |
| buttress [1] - 2 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48:10 } \\ & \text { certificates [6] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 28,67: 3,67: 7, \\ & 67: 12,68: 3,68: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 126: 24,127: 26, \\ & 128: 13,128: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| [14] - 1:4, 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2:11, 2:17, 2:22, 2:29, |  | 11:26, 15:15, 16:7, | 68:17, 69:25, 69:28, | 128:18, 128:21, |
| 3:25, 3:30, 4:4, 5:5, |  | 21:18, 23:2, 47:6 | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 1,70: 6,70: 9 \\ & 70: 11,71: 11,71: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:4, 129:6, 129:9, } \\ & \text { 135:3, 135:8, 135:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 5:9, 6:15, 10:1 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { certification }[4] \text { - } \\ & 37: 9,48: 1,48: 17, \\ & 60: 25 \\ & \text { certified }[5]-20: 23, \end{aligned}$ | 70:11, 71:11, 71:13, <br> 71:18, 71:20, 71:23, |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:14, 135:18, } \\ & \text { 135:25, 136:12, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | 74:15, 74:18, 74 | 139:1, 139:8, 139:1 |
| CAGNEY [1] - 3:16 | 51:16, 51:19, 63:21, | 60:23 | 74:23, 76:28, 77:6, | 139:17, 139:21, |
|  |  |  | $77: 14,79: 1,79: 8$ | 139:27, 140:2, 140:4, |
| Callahan [1] - 140:10 | 71:4 | certify [1] - 1:2 | 79:14, 79:17, 79:22, | 140:6, 140:8, 145:10, |
| cannon [1] - 13: | cat [1]-78:17 | Chairman [16] - 6:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 26,81: 4,82: 27, \\ & 83: 2,83: 5,83: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:12, 145:16, } \\ & \text { 146:1, 146:4, 146:6 } \end{aligned}$ |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 3:15 | 147:25, 149:26, | 86:1, 86:3, 87:26, | 139:11, 139:14 | sensitive [2] - 32:14, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Resources [1] - | 150:10 | 88:8, 88:13, 88:22, | secondly [1] - 47:20 | 35:8 |
| 22:22 | ring [2] - 63:20, 71:4 | 92:25 | secret [1] - 75:24 | sent [8]-49:4, |
| respect [11] - 17:19, | ringing [3]-16:24, | salary [3] - 34:20, | section [3]-48:15, | 102:20, 128:5, |
| 28:27, 29:5, 41:22, | 17:26, 20:5 | 34:29, 44:15 | 48:18, 48:21 | 130:21, 130:22, |
| 41:25, 72:5, 75:4, | rings [1] - 46:12 | sample [1] - 12:29 | secure [1] - 45:5 | 133:1, 138:12 |
| 88:15, 104:25, 125:7, | risk [1] - 32:24 | SAMS [10]-7:8, | secured [1] - 56:17 | sentences [1] - 7:14 |
| 126:17 | River [2]-51:10, | 10:16, 12:10, 12:17, | securing [1] - 51:14 | separate [5] - 87:24, |
| respond [1] - 62:4 | 85:25 | $19: 12,42: 15,42: 19$ | see [40]-13:28, | 94:12, 99:9, 103:22, |
| responders [1] - | river [2] - 95:7, 100:4 | 44:9, 93:27, 98:23 | 20:2, 23:25, 26:22, | 114:24 |
| 73:26 | road [1] - 107:25 | SANDRA [1] - 4:3 | 33:7, 35:28, 37:17, | separately [1] - |
| responding [1] - | ROAD [1] - 2:18 | satisfactory [1] - | 39:6, 41:7, 41:8, | 133:2 |
| $36: 12$ | roaring [1] - 115:20 | 9:20 | 42:25, 44:2, 45:22, | September [11] - |
| response [3] - 34:13, | robberies [1] - 54:9 | satisfied [4] - 9:21, | 48:10, 57:20, 58:27, | 86:10, 87:7, 92:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 92:7, } 97: 4 \\ & \text { responsibility [5] - } \end{aligned}$ | robbery [3] - 56:16, 68:14, 68:20 | $\begin{gathered} 35: 18,106: 10,149: 9 \\ \text { savage }[2]-53: 19, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 9,63: 1,63: 7 \\ & 68: 13,70: 1,70: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 19,95: 21,95: 22, \\ & 97: 14,100: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| 47:11, 47:12, 47:19, | role [11] - 10:14, | 53:20 | 70:21, 70:27, 78:7, | 100:18, 100:19, |
| 47:27, 141:29 | 17:9, 18:29, 19:3, | SAVAGE ${ }_{[1]}-3: 16$ | 82:8, 87:9, 95:9, | 119:17 |
| responsible [1] - | 20:15, 23:5, 24:6, | saved [4] - 38:1, | $100: 6,107: 21$, $113: 15,116.29$ | sequence [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:2 } \\ & \text { rest }[15]-31: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 5,36: 8,54: 20, \\ & 88: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85: 24,92: 23,97: 19 \\ & \text { saw [8]-58:2, 69:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:15, 116:29, } \\ & \text { 125:11, 130:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 75:26, 94:23, 99:20 } \\ \text { Sergeant [32] - } \end{gathered}$ |
| 58:23, 61:8, 61:9, | roles [1] - 18:23 | 70:23, 76:12, 76:24, | 131:6, 132:12, | 54:25, 57:27, 58:7, |
| 61:14, 63:29, 67:27, | room [14]-43:10, | 76:29, 110:15, 145:20 | 138:16, 141:2, | 61:12, 63:28, 65:29, |
| 67:28, 68:9, 94:10, | 43:11, 52:2, 57:10, | SC [10] - 2:6, 2:7, | $143: 25,150: 3$ | 68:7, 69:8, 69:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 94: 14,99: 7,99: 11, \\ & 122: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 132:3, 133:27, | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 10,2: 16,2: 21,2: 27, \\ & 3 \cdot 223: 233: 234 \cdot 3 \end{aligned}$ | seeing [1] - 59:23 <br> seeking [1] - 132. | $\begin{aligned} & 69: 11,69: 17,72: 4, \\ & 73: 24,75: 13,77: 28 \end{aligned}$ |
| restore [1] - 35:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:28, 134:5, } \\ & \text { 134:10, 135:19, } \end{aligned}$ | SCANLAN [1] - 3:8 | seem [8] - 17:18, | 83:17, 85:11, 85:17, |
| restored [3] - 41:28, | 141:11, 141:16 | scene [24]-51:15, | 24:8, 47:7, 59:29, | 85:21, 87:11, 88:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:1, } 42: 2 \\ & \text { result }[4]-6: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $141: 20$ | 51:21, 61:23, 62:11, 62:17. 63:7. 63:18. | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 24,108: 9,138: 5, \\ & 142: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93: 19,93: 25,94: 17, \\ & 95: 3,98: 15,98: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | rooms [2]-76:16 |  | sees [1] - 55:11 | $99: 14,99: 29,118:$ |
| resulted [2]-37:19, | $\text { 118:1, } 142: 9$ | $66: 16,66: 17,68: 19$ | Seiko [10]-86:12, | $133: 1,133: 4$ |
| 68:29 | roughly [3] - 39:23, | 69:15, 69:27, 72:11, | 87:18, 92:6, 93:7, | sergeant [13]- |
| RESUMED [4] - 6:1, | 85:1, 102:17 | 72:22, 73:6, 76:11 | 93:12, 93:14, 97:3, | 64:21, 78:2, 79:19, |
| $50: 13,101: 18,129: 1$ | round [1] - 123:21 | $85: 12,89: 17,94: 25$ | $98: 3,98: 8,98: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 20,79: 21,79: 24, \\ & 79: 25.85: 11.92: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| resumption [1] - | routine [4]-59:28, | 99:22 <br> scenes [2] - 137: | seize [1] - 124:26 <br> seized [17]-62:17, | $92: 24,97: 18,97: 20$ |
| ```11:6 reticent [1] - 23:9``` | $\begin{gathered} 69: 28,69: 29,70: 3 \\ \text { rule }[1]-13: 11 \end{gathered}$ | 148:23 | $62: 18,68: 2,108: 13$ | SERGEANT [5] |
| RETIRED [7] - 3:4, | rumbling [1] - | scheme [3] - 9:18, | 108:16, 108:18, | $3: 12,3: 19,4: 2,4: 2$, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3: 6,3: 6,3: 7,3: 10 \\ & 3: 12,3: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 121:27 | $9: 23,29: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:22, 108:23, } \\ & \text { 109:18, 109:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4:3 } \\ & \text { sergeants }[2]-9: 13, \end{aligned}$ |
| retold [1] - 80:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { run }[3]-41: 28,73: 3 \text {, } \\ & 119: 3 \end{aligned}$ | screen [3] - 7:8 | 109:27, 109:29, | $78: 1$ |
| retrospect [1] - | unners [2] - 76:25, | 59:12, 67:15 | 121:2, 125:25, | serious [15]-54:9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 122: 4 \\ & \text { return [6] - 27:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 76:26 } \\ & \text { running }[2]-128: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { scroll [5] - 15:24, } \\ \text { 18:26, 37:17, 60:10, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 127: 14,127: 18,144: 5 \\ \text { seizing }[3]-118: 21, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 11,57: 3,60: 1 \\ & 63: 3,64: 13,68: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 28:12, 29:1, 29:2, | 128:13 | 70:27 | 120:14, 126:9 | 78:6, 107:8, 107:19, |
| $29: 15,68: 9$ | runs [1] - 133:19 | $\text { scrutiny [1] }-113: 20$ $\operatorname{SEAN}_{[4]}-1 \cdot 122 \cdot 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seizure [2] - 125:23, } \\ & \text { 126:21 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:25, 132:6, } \\ & \text { 136:12, 136:13, } 148: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| returned [3]-11:19, | rushing [1] - 9:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SEAN [4]-1:12, 2:2, } \\ & 2: 22,3: 17 \end{aligned}$ | selected [1] - 11: | seriously [1] - 30:14 |
| returning [1] - 27:14 | RYAN [2] - 1:12, 2:2 | SEANAD [1] - 1:5 | self [2] - 83:29, | seriousness [1] |
| returns [3] - 11:5, | S | search [3]-58:23, | $138: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:16 } \\ & \quad \text { served }[1]-136: 28 \end{aligned}$ |
| review [3]-22:15, |  | searched [3]-76:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 11,55: 13,78: 8 \\ & 130: 26,130: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { service }[7]-21: 22, \\ \text { 22:12, } 22: 16,23: 20, \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:21, 29:3 } \\ & \text { reviewed [5] - 8:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 143:29 | searches [1] - 119:6 | sending [1] - 91:17 | $28: 21,29: 4,88: 14$ |
| 28:16, 32:19, 35:7, | sac [1] - 98:12 | searching [1] - 77:22 | senior [1] - 138:21 | Services [1] - 1:24 |
| 35:25 | safer [1] - 33:23 | second [12] - 26:23, | sense [8] - 6:24, | SERVICES [1] - 1:29 |
| rewarded [1] - | safety [3]-88:28, | $26: 24,33: 1,33: 16$ | 18:12, 61:12, 80:13, | set [3]-8:21, 30:27, |
| 138:15 | 89:27, 97:21 | 51:6, 60:11, 90:27, | 89:24, 125:7, 134:3, | 80:3 |
| rid [4] - 147:18, | Safety [8] - 85:29, | 93:10, 98:7, 123:10, | 147:18 | seven [3] - 93:6, |







[^0]:    "What I mean by being taken of $f$ the case, is the record of $m y$ invol vement was erased fromPulse. It is possible that the detective unit took over the case and 12:02 I have no issue with that. I just include it in my statement because I was removed fromthe Pul se entirely though I had worked on the case and where any commendations arose, I would not be incl uded. I do not

[^1]:    "Murray had served under Assistant Commissioner Ó Cual ái n at the western region. "

