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

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

THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVS, ON MDNDAY, $215 T$ OCTOBER 2019:

MR. MEGI NESS: Good morning. Garda Keogh, please.

GARDA N CHOLAS KEOGH CONTI NUED TO BE QUESTI ONED BY MR. MCGU NNESS, AS FOLLOVG:

1 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Garda Keogh, when the Tribunal rose on Friday, you had been outlining your view that Assistant 10:34 Commissioner ó Cualáin had in some way assigned Superintendent Murray to the district -
A. Yes.

2 Q. - in order to get you out?
A. Yes.

3 Q. Now, have you any evidence of that?
A. We11, as I said, Superintendent Murray came from Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin's region. And in relation to the length of time, I had time to -- I was trying to think over the weekend, in relation to the time, judge, you asked me a question about why did it take me a year for it to happen. Just, the only two things that I was thinking of was: It's not -- Noreen McBrien was the superintendent at the time. It's not as a simple as just to pluck a superintendent out of
one place and put another superintendent in. There's a process. And the other thing is, like, I'd say they were still indecisive, you know, and they just didn't know. And that goes back to when I originally made --
when I made my disclosure on the 8th May and when I made Judge McMahon, and as I said, I had asked him to hand the affidavit but to hold onto the DVD. The relevance of that, Judge, is: I know how An Garda Síochána works, and I would have been aware that on the 10:36 evening of the 8th May, that they would have figured out who Garda A was. Because, as I said, it was public knowledge. It would have taken a couple of phone calls. By that evening they would have known who Garda A was. And they would have gone -- someone would have gone, $I$ assume, gone into B branch, if not that night the next day, removed the personne1 file and -MR. MRPH: I am sorry, Chairman, I wonder if I just might raise a concern at this stage. The witness appears to be speaking about matters which are entirely 10:37 conjecture and speculation, and talking about third parties he is not identifying. He appears to have no direct evidence of these matters at a11. I do object to the introduction of tertiary or even far removed evidence, is this even represents evidence at all.
CHA RMAN My understanding, Mr. Murphy, is that Mr. McGuinness recalled what Garda Keogh said on Friday.
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN And he asked him a simple question. what 10:37 evidence have you got for that?
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
4 Q. CHA RMAN I would like to know what evidence you have for that.
A. I have no direct evidence.

5 Q. CHA RMAN Because I will write down, one, two, three four.
A. No, I have no direct evidence.

6 Q. CHA RMAN Now, guard, let me put it this way.
A. Yeah.

7 Q. CHAN RMAN You, as a member of the Gardaí, know what evidence is?
A. Yes.

8 Q. CHA RMAN And you know what direct evidence is?
A. Yes.

9 Q. CHA RMAN And you know what hearsay evidence is?
A. Yes.

10 Q. CHA RMAN We may have our disagreements about the finer points of the law of evidence, I spent a great
deal of time discussing points of the law evidence, but the basic principle is pretty clear to the man on the street and to you and me. So, when Mr. McGuinness says, have you any evidence for that, what do you say to him?
A. No, no direct.

11 Q. CHA RMAN And when you say no direct evidence, I am waiting, his next question is: what indirect evidence do you have?
A. Well, Judge, to explain, I can give direct evidence in relation to when $I$ asked Judge McMahon to withhold the DVD.

12 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. This is evidence $I$ can give. At that point, I'm aware
there's two ways An Garda Síochána are going to deal with --
13 Q. CHA RMAN Hold on a second, so we know where we are going.
A. Yeah.

14 Q. CHA RMAN And we are not totally swithering around in a swamp of uncertainty. 8th may 2014.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin had not yet been appointed.
A. Yes.

16 Q. CHA RMAN So, I can take it we can rule out any intention on his part at that stage?
A. Yes, yes.

17 Q. CHA RMAN so, what relevance is it what happened on the 8th may 2014? I mean, listen, I am only trying to -- I want to write down what your evidence is.
Look, you know what I am here to do?
A. Yes, Judge.

18 Q. CHA RMAN I am here to try to make sense of all this. So, Mr. McGuinness says to you, what evidence do you have, you say, I have no direct evidence. Implying, when you say that, that somehow there is some other body of evidence. Because that's what it implies.
when you say, oh, I have no direct evidence of it, that ${ }^{10: 39}$ implies there is some other evidence?
A. I understand, Judge.

19 Q. CHAN RMAN so the evidence to nail Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin does not start on the 8th May?
A. No.
Q. CHA RMAN I know that?
A. Right.
A. He was appointed on the 9th, I think. I think it was 9th.
Q. CHA RMAN Right.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN But when you handed over your thing or didn't hand over your document, okay. So anyway, what evidence do you have to say that -- sorry, I will start again. what do you mean by evidence other than direct evidence? what are you talking about?
A. Okay. When I asked Judge McMahon just to withhold the other things, the other item, the primary evidence, the 10:40 DVD, the reason I did that was I knew there was only two ways An Garda Síochána would want to deal with this. One was head on and the other was to do what they had previously done in internal matters, to try and go down the road of a cover up. And I was
trying -- at the time, because there was no new commissioner --

24 Q. CHA RMAN So you didn't hand over the DVD?
A. I gave it to --

25 Q. CHAN RMAN You gave it to Judge McMahon?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN with some instructions that he was or was not to hand it over?
A. I asked him to hold onto it in case they went down the road of option B.

27 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Then at some point did you te11 him or ask him to hand it over to the Guards?
A. Yes.

28 Q. CHA RMAN when was that?
A. That was before I was to meet Detective Superintendent Mulcahy.
29 Q. CHA RMAN Okay, some short time before that?
A. The 7th June, was the day I was meeting him.

CHAl RMAN Okay. Now, back to Mr. McGuinness's
question: what evidence have you that Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin assigned Superintendent Murray to get rid of you?
A. I have no evidence. I don't think I have evidence. I don't think that I have evidence, only -- I suppose, I mean I was trying to -CHA RMAN I sorry, 1et me interrupt you. I can understand it if you say, I have no evidence but my suspicion is.
A. Yes.

31 Q. CHA RMAN I mean, I have no problem with that?
A. Yes.

32 Q. CHA RMAN But at least we know where we are going with that, do you what I mean?
A. Yes.

33 Q. CHA RMAN I write down, no evidence, his suspicion?
A. Yes.

34 Q CHA RMAN Is that the situation essentially?
A. That is --

CHA RMAN There is only one way I can look at it. I mean, apart from being heavily criticised, which is not a problem for me, I would be laughed at. I mean, there's only one way I can look at it. That's: what is the evidence? who says what, who knows of it? Do you know what I mean? That's the only way I can. But if Mr. McGuinness says, was it speculation, conjecture and opinion, that's okay, I understand that.
A. It is my belief.

CHA RMAN Yeah.
A. Even now, Judge.

CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MEGU NESS: I am sure you have seen, Garda Keogh, in Superintendent Murray's statement that he says that when he came in March '15, you know, a lot of the
witnesses had been interviewed, he didn't know what had happened and he wasn't privy to the investigation. But can I be clear, are you suggesting in some way that Superintendent Murray then interfered in the investigation as a result of being sent there by Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin?
A. No. I never, I never said or implied anything like that.

Okay. All right. Well, can we just deal with one small point. You complained in your statement, you know, that the criminal investigation went on for five years. But I think it seems from the chronology that Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin, having been appointed in May, reported, sent in his report to the DPP's office in November 2015, which was effectively a period of 18 months, for what looks like a complex investigation. You wouldn't think that was an unreasonable delay, would you, or would you?
A. No, no. No. But the criminal investigation, it transforms then into a disciplinary investigation.
A. After that, yeah.

44 Q. But from the point of view of the decision-making, I think you have probably seen that the assistant commissioner for the region appointed Assistant
Commissioner Jack Nolan to be ready to do the discipline?
A. Yes.

45 Q. I mean that's standard practice, if there are serious
allegations it will trigger the initiation of both, isn't that right?
A. Yes. I remember $I$ did receive a letter from Assistant Commissioner Jack Nolan saying he was appointed to deal with the disciplinary investigation.
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

47 Q. Now, I think is it not common practice that for the disciplinary investigation, it waited to see what was the outcome of the result of the submission of the file 10:45 to the director, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

49 Q. Obviously there is a delay, but it's a normal
procedural delay. You became aware that the director decided that no charge was being to be preferred as a result of the investigation?
A. Yes.

50 Q. So it was accordingly then proper then to try and progress the discipline side. I mean, put it this way: If there had hadn't been a disciplinary inquiry, you would be even more concerned that there was no genuine attempt to look at your allegations, I take it, if they decided they weren't going to look at discipline at a11?
A. At this stage, I think I have already gone to GSOC at this stage, in relation to the criminal investigation. 51 Q. We11, you certain7y made a complaint to GSOC as of the

2nd October 2015, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

52 Q. But as far as the disciplinary investigation is concerned, that then took its course and we will come to that obviously in a minute. But going back to your concerns about the Ó Cualáin investigation, one of them was that there was a failure to suspend any person suspected with concerns or consequences for potential witnesses. And you, I think, met the assistant commissioner on the 13th August. That was one of the 10:47 first concerns you raised on that date, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

53 Q. If we look at page 3960 of the documents, at the 1ast two lines there. This is the 13th, your meeting. This 10:48 is Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin telling you that the suspicion was a matter for assistant commissioner HRM and that he was in communication with HRM in this regard. Just go down the page then.
"Assured hi mthat Athl one Garda Station woul d no I onger be used as a base for enqui ries into matters rai sed by hi m"

That was another issue you raised at that point in
time. So, that would appear on its face there, if it's correct obviously, that your concerns were being addressed then when you raised them. But I am not sure, did you see in the papers that the assistant
commissioner had, in fact, written already to the assistant commissioner western region on the 11th August, two days before this, in relation to the issue of suspension?
A. Just sorry, ó Cualáin was the assistant commissioner of $10: 49$ the western region, I think.
well --
A. Just -- sorry, maybe...

55 Q. The assistant commissioner in HR is the person who gets consulted, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

56 Q. He wrote back. Perhaps if we look at that. Volume 38, page 10815. This relates to the issue. There's consideration obviously being given there, it states what the issues are under the policy. You know there's a policy document relating to suspension of members. The considerations are set out there on the left and the right, primary and secondary considerations. If we just scroll down. Were you not consulted in that context, to give permission for your statement to be given through HR?
A. Yes. Detective Superintendent Mulcahy did ask me about would I give my statement to HR and I said no. And the reason I said no was I didn't know, as I said I didn't know earlier on in all this any of the senior officers, ${ }^{0: 51}$ I wouldn't have known their names or known anything. So I didn't know who to trust or anything at that point. It wasn't fully explained to me that he couldn't have been -- that Garda A couldn't be
suspended unless -- unless a statement was provided to HR.

57 Q. Yes.
A. I just didn't know that at the time.

58 Q. Okay. Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin, in a statement 10.51 on the page that we were looking at, says at page 3961 that he gave a briefing document re Garda A's employment status to Assistant Commissioner Fanning.
"Fanni ng requested NK's statement of complaint to be
made avail able. NK ref used this. D/Superintendent Mul cahy and Assi stant Commi ssi oner Ó Cual ái $n$ theref ore felt the question of Garda A's depl oyment stat us could not be progressed. "

You weren't aware of that. You don't think it was a direct request for Garda A --
A. Garda A, is it?

59 Q. In relation to Garda A's suspension, that your statement was being sought?
A. No, you see, I didn't understand that. I don't think -- I don't think -- I just don't think it was explained to me properly. I didn't understand. what I was afraid of was, my statement went to HR, that there was a greater chance then of it being leaked some way.
A. I mean, I was thinking of obviously witnesses in the statement and different people I had named.

61 Q. Yes.
A. I had a concern there, you know. That was -- I didn't -- that was the main reason why, because I didn't know, I didn't understand what I understand now at the time, that I had to take that into consideration; that it could have been leaked and I was 10:53 very fearful of that.

62 Q. Right. If we scroll down that page. You see there that guidance was given by the assistant commissioner on the 16th September in those terms. He refers to the unwillingness and he goes on to say:
"The questi on of the suspensi on of Garda A was revisited in May 2015."

He wrote to the commissioner with an update in that regard. Presumably, you weren't aware of that at that time?
A. No. No.

63 Q. Were you aware or otherwise that Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin, in September 2014, had met with local management, including Chief Superintendent Curran and Superintendent McBrien in relation to the issue of suspension of Garda A?
A. I wouldn't have been aware of it at the time.

64 Q. okay. I am just high1ighting these.
A. I don't think I would have been aware of it.

66 Q. I'm highlighting these to suggest that your concerns in
relation to the possible suspension of the member were (a) identified, it would appear, by the assistant commissioner. He sought guidance from HQ , as it were, consulted with local management, who weren't aware of the content of your protected disclosures, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

67 Q. A decision was taken and it's perhaps one that you disagree with or would have wanted a different decision, but it seems on the face of it, would you agree, to have been receiving proper attention?
A. If I could go back in time.

68 Q. Yes.
A. I would have definitely given a statement -

69 Q. I understand that.
A. - in to HR.
A. But I have already outlined my reasons why at that time I didn't.
71 Q. Yes.
CHAD RMAN But that left them in a situation -
A. I understand.

72 Q. CHAI RMAN - of not having any evidence on which to justify a suspension?
A. I understand.

73 Q. CHAN RMAN Isn't that right?
A. Yeah. well, for $H R$, you see, the investigation team would have had evidence. It's a bit of a -- the investigation team would have had evidence, they would
have been aware of the -- they had the DVD and that at this stage. But in relation to the HR, as I said, I didn't know what $I$ know now in relation to how things work and that.
MR. MEGU NESS: Ultimately, we have touched on it before and I don't think I need to go into the documents, they are there and speak for themselves. It was revisited in particular in circumstances where somebody had come forward locally to Garda Ryan and had provided a new piece of evidence, which the superintendent brought to the investigation team. That led to a recommendation to headquarters from local management for the suspension, isn't that right?
A. Yes. I only read that in the documents, I was never aware of that.
75 Q. okay.
A. Yeah.

76 Q. I suppose it would seem to follow that you, having been become aware of the documents, didn't know that when you were making your complaints or statement to the Tribunal; that that had been the process?
A. In relation to going to HR?

77 Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I explained all that.

Does that allay your concerns that the issue of suspension was properly dealt with, to be able to see how now the process had taken its course?
A. I understand. As I said, I don't think it was properly -- I don't think it was explained to me, ever,
that there cannot be a suspension unless you statement goes to HR. I don't think that was said to me, it was just, will you disclose your statement to HR.
79 Q. Yes.
A. From my recollection. And, as I said, I was afraid in 10:58 case there were leaks then. I didn't know anything, who was in HR. Then I was afraid in case there would be leaks and the statement would go into the wrong hands.
okay. I mean, just in terms of process, I take it that ${ }_{10: 58}$ you understand that the mere fact that a disclosure is made under the 2014 Act, the Act doesn't provide for automatic suspensions of persons to whom they relate.
A. Yeah.

81 Q. It doesn't deal with it at all in that sense.
A. Yes.

82 Q. So, it seems as a matter of law and practice and policy it's is dealt with in the normal way?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
statements were taken from Gardaí in inappropriate circumstances at a time when a colleague accused by you was on duty and was able to be seen by witnesses.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}$.

86 Q. I think you have explained why you have said that. But 10:59 I suppose you knew what your allegations were?
A. Yes.

87 Q. The investigating team knew what they were?
A. Yes.

88 Q. And it was inevitable that they were going to have to interview all of the members in Athlone?
A. Yes.

89 Q. Isn't that right?
A. Yes.

90 Q. Obviously as a result of the publicity given to it
most of the members knew they were going to be interviewed?
A. Yes.

91 Q. So it wasn't a question, was it, of the investigating team's cover being blown, as it were?
A. Oh no, on this one now, on this one, this is different. On this one, as I have said, they could have gone -they had all the home addresses and phone numbers and that, they didn't have to do it in the station. I mean, Garda A, not alone was he on duty but he never left the station when the interview teams were there. Like, he just walked around the station all day. That was -- like, from recollection, he didn't go out on duty or patrol or anything, he just walked around and
was able to say see, you know, who was being interviewed and that. So that one, I can't concede there.
92 Q. I suppose there perhaps might have been three ways of dealing with it. Either he got suspended and it was proper to suspend him at some time, or, you got transferred, or, he got transferred or you were both put off side on some of administrative leave. But, you've seen the statements of Superintendent McBrien and Superintendent Murray, I mean there is no procedure 1:01 for transferring someone because they've made an allegation or because someone has made an allegation against you?
A. Yeah, I understand that, I do understand that and allegations are only allegations, yes.
So in the sense of it presenting a dilemma for management, if management weren't aware of the full detail of the complaints, it does make it more difficult for them to try and exercise normal, sort of, powers.
A. I understand that now, yeah.

MR. KELLY: Chairman, I hesitate to interrupt, but there is actually a fourth, at least, option. That is that the statements be taken somewhere other than --
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
MR. KELLY: But I think in fairness, it ought not be now put to the witness that there is merely three. CHA RMAN Well, I'm aware of it, Mr. Kelly. MR. KELLY: Yes.

CHA RMAN I think Mr. McGuinness said that there was two ways of doing it or three ways of doing it and then he gave a number of ways. But I mean, obviously the complaint is, whatever the situation, whatever the status of the allegation or the complaint, irrespective 11:02 of any of that, if you are conducting an investigation don't conduct it in a situation where a person crucially involved is hanging around, available or in a position to eyeball whoever it is. That's essentially the complaint, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Judge.

CHA RMAN So I am understanding that.
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
94 Q. CHA RMAN But, I mean, Mr. McGuinness is exploring various possibilities and so on, do you know. But I mean, that's the essence of your complaint.
A. Yeah.

95 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Nothing in my questions, Garda Keogh, suggest that I am unaware of your complaint. Your complaint is very clear in that regard. That was a matter which occurred obviously not as a reason of anything you were responsible for, that was the way they started the investigation, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

96 Q. Right. We will be hearing from those in charge in due course. I don't think I need to say anything more about that particular complaint.

CHA RMAN No. I think it's a pretty clear statement and we will hear what the other participants have to
say. You complained, as I understand, August 2014, that stopped, according to Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin.
A. I understand so.

97 Q. CHA RMAN You probably don't know the date?
A. Yeah.

98 Q. CHA RMAN But there came a time, you said something about it, and they said, okay.
A. Yeah.

99 Q. CHAI RMAN All right.
A. Yes.

CHAN RMAN Thanks very much.
100 Q. MR. MGGI NESS: obviously the issue of when it stopped or whether some members came back there is an issue we are looking at. Superintendent Murray, in his
statement, seems to suggest that at some stage when he had arrived there was some interviewing going on in Athlone, but that might have been re-interviewing, we are looking into that?
A. Yeah, that could have been interviewing going on where they were at this point going to the guards' housing or meeting them in hotels or something like that, perhaps, which would have been appropriate.

101 Q. Yes.
A. Just not in the station.

102 Q. You think some of it may not have been in the station?
A. I don't --

103 Q. You don't know.
A. No, no, I didn't say, I was actually trying to -- on
the contrary there, no. I think from when I pointed out to Detective Superintendent Mulcahy what, like -- I mentioned all this last week. But, no, my understanding is they didn't, they didn't go back and continue on the way they were doing taking statements in the station.
104 Q. Your perception was that there was a change?
A. I understand that. That's my understanding, that at some point they didn't continue on in the station, that they did it away --
105 Q. CHAN RMN Yes, but the fact that it happened at all you say is a serious complaint?
A. Yes. Judge, as I said, it was just too -- the allegation in itself was too big to be negligent. As I said, I mean, I would have been aware that --

106 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. I understand.

CHA RMAN Well Mr. McGuinness is helpfully pointing out that it may have happened notwithstanding the intention or decision not to do it. It may have happened that some further interviews took place. which would reinforce the point you're making. Okay. Right. Thanks, Mr. McGuinness. Now.
108 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. Just in terms of the issue of sharing and shifts. We've received a lot of A85s for your shift from, I think it's May?
A. May '14 to October '15.
Q. May '14 to October '15, yes. It shows a variety of different overlappings, but Superintendent McBrien in
her statement said that you have overlapped, that is page 832. Do you understand what she means by that?
A. I do, yeah.

110 Q. What do you think she means by that?
A. You see, this goes into the rostering system. where I 11:07 would have been on, let's say, unit C, regular duty and Garda A was attached at the time to I think the detective branch. Whatever unit that he was on, it would have had a, let's say, half overlap most of the time with my unit and at different periods there would be just different sort of overlap periods. I think -I think I worded it in my own statement that, like, not all of the time, but a lot of the time there was overlap, yeah.
111 Q. Yes. I mean, we have obviously looked at them and they're available to you and your team and everyone else, we see an overlap for 57 days in that period of just one hour, where you are sort of, as it were passing. We see, according to our view of it, that you were on duty on the exact same shifts only for eight complete shifts?

CHA RMAN On7y for which?
112 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Eight complete shifts?
A. They're complete shifts, okay.

113 Q. Yes.
A. But there were a couple of days there I recal1, where Garda A came into the station when he wasn't supposed to be on duty, into the station.

114 Q. Yes.
A. And I don't know, I just can't remember off hand where they are in the A85s.
Q. CHA RMAN That's a matter, if you like, to do with suspension.
A. okay.

116 Q. CHA RMAN That's clear. The shift question, do you agree with Superintendent McBrien about the half shift point?
A. Oh absolutely, yes.

117 Q
CHA RMAN okay.
A. Yeah, yeah.

CHA RMAK Now, Mr. McGuinness is putting to you a very specific thing. Is that the period May '14 to October '15 you're talking about?
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN Just give us those figures again. Garda Keogh, let's see what you think of them, if it sounds right to you.
MR. MEGU NESS: We11, I suppose there's three
different -- we see that during the 533 days between those dates, that Garda Keogh and Garda A were on duty together for 339 hours.
CHAN RMAN Hours?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes. And secondly, that between those dates they overlapped by at least one hour on 57 days, 11:09 and that between those days you were on duty on the exact same shift for eight complete shifts. The numbers may not be exact, because there's quite a number of illegible entries in relation to Garda Keogh
and a number of entries for Garda A where the shift details aren't filled in. The precise details may not be that important. I mean, the fact is that it was happening in a variety of ways at different days and different -- how do you think that ought to have been dealt with?
A. I mean, they can rejig, they can rejig the units around. The local management can rejig the units around. They do it every now and then. So they could have done that, that we wouldn't have been overlapping. 11:10
118 Q. Yes. But it would seem perhaps difficult for me to envisage that there would never be, sort of, contact or very hard to avoid contact or passing or seeing each other really when you're operating out of the same station?
A. Sorry, can you --

119 Q. You think it would have been easy to try and minimise that opportunity for contact?
A. Well, there was always the opportunity for some sort of -- like, even a simple thing like going to the bathroom, things like that.

120 Q. Yes.
A. You know.

121 Q. I mean, one of the things you mentioned in passing a number of times is the issue of Garda $A$ and access to arms?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}$.

122 Q. You relate a particular incident which you say occurred and you describe it as having taken place in the public
office, is that right?
A. Yeah, well the public office is divided into two. There's a wall and there's a gap and it goes out into the back, where the CCTV screens are. So technically it was between the public office and the back part of the public office, which is the CCTV area. But you describe it in the following way that:
"He takes out his gun fromthe safe behi nd mein the public office so that l can see himfrom where lam seated in the tinted glass in front of me. I remember saying to myself when l saw his reflection taking out his gun behi nd me, that if he shoots me everyone will know I was telling the truth."

Sergeant Haran, in his interview with the Tribunal investigators, said there isn't a firearm safe in the public office.
A. There's a safe, there's a safe in -- the first part of what I said there, actually, just on recollection, is not -- the first part of what $I$ said is not -- it's not that I could see him. I was sitting in a chair, in front of me is the glass part of the two hatches. There's the two hatches, as I described, when the two ladies came into the station, they both wrote their statements, where I described that. That glass part, when those hatches are closed there's a reflective glass, a reflective sealant or some kind of thing like sellotape on the --
Q. CHAN RMAN It's not a mirror?
A. No.

CHA RMAN
But you can see, as you can with a glass or a window?
A. Yes. So I couldn't -- it was in the glass, in the reflection in the glass that $I$ was looking at. I could see behind my shoulder, into that little part, where I was in between the public office and the CCTV area, the CCTV area, where there was a safe and he had a gun in his hand. Judge, I didn't ever say that he pointed the 11:14 gun or did anything or he didn't go and show the gun, parade the gun in front of him. I was just making the point, like I was there and he's is just around, just behind me with a gun and obviously I could see the handgun in his -- like he's holding the handgun.
MR. MEGI NNESS: Yes. But do you agree that the guns are not kept in the public office, they're kept down the hall in a safe?
A. You see, at the time there was renovations and there was -- there was a small -- there was one safe where I just described, in that gap area, because there was books, folders, like what's behind us, and underneath that was the safe. But there was another safe for a while around corner, in the back of the CCTV room. I'm not sure if that was the gun safe at the time. Perhaps 11:14 it's since been moved. There were doing renovations in the -- but I am nearly sure, I could be wrong, that the gun safe was around the back in the CCTV area at that stage, there was a larger safe than the safe that --

127 Q
Q. Sergeant Haran, in a statement at 11761, says there were two safes, the one in the public office, keeps, and presumably other things, but a book to record the issue or return of the firearm and that the guns are kept in a gun safe around the corner, down the hall, away from the public office?
A. We11, I don't know what -- around the corner, if around the corner is in the CCTV room, well, that's there. If that safe was moved somewhere else, it's very possible. I think the safe was only temporarily there for -- the 11:15 gun safe. I don't know like. That's what happened. That's the way --
CHA RMAR Can you give me a date for that incident?
A. Sorry.

129 Q. CHA RMAN Can you give me the date for that incident? I don't know if the date $I$ have is correct.
A. Judge --

130 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: I think you specified in your statement that I read there that it was on $5 / 5 / 2015$ ?
A. okay.

CHA RMAN 2015?
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. Page 129 of the Tribunal papers. CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
131 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: In your statement to the investigators.
A. Judge, my diary has it on the 4/5. Oh hang on, Judge. It's 6am, and there's the past midnight thing.

132 Q. CHAI RMAN okay. Just give me a date.
A. It would've been $5 / 5$, sorry.
Q. CHAI RMAN $20 ?$

## A. '15.

CHA RMAN Thank you. Thanks very much.
MR. MEGU NNESS: You mentioned this to Superintendent McBrien, isn't that right. Perhaps we will look at Volume 5, page 1295. 1295. The way she records it that:
"During the course of the intervi ew I had with Garda Keogh on this date, he expressed concerns that Garda A is carrying an official firearm bearing in mind the amount of pressure he could come under as a result of the current investigation being carried out by Det ective Superintendent Mul cahy.

Please report what weapons Garda A has access to. In addition, as his direct supervisor can you monitor the situation regarding Garda Keogh's well being and if you bel i eve there is foundation for Garda Keogh's concerns. If there is any change in Garda A's well being that causes concern, especially regarding his access to weapons, please bring it to my attention."

In her statement and her notes she portrays it in a sense, as I interpret it, that you weren't coming and a sense, and then obviously whether he should have access to a firearm, is that context, is that fair?
A. Yeah. Look, I'm aware of previous incidents that
happened in Garda stations where one guard shot another guard, turned the gun on himself. Then there's other incidents where other guards have -- I'm going back as far as the 1940s here and where guards have shot other guards and things like that.
135 Q. Wise to be cautious, I suppose. But she is seeking a report from Sergeant Curley. Perhaps could we look at page 492? You see on the second paragraph there:
"Recei ved a report dated $17 / 6$ seeki ng information on the nember's access... reported back to the district officer on my report dated 22/9/14 that I was satisfied with his fitness to carry a firearm..."
A. Sorry, which paragraph?

136 Q. It's the second paragraph, starting "I reported back".
A. Okay.

137 Q. I was reading too quick1y.
"I reported back to the di strict officer on my report dated 22/9/14 that I was satisfied with his fitness to carry a firearmand outlined his access to the official firearmstore in Athl one. I undertook to continue to nonitor the menber and report upon any concerns I have. In addition, on 22/9/2014 I outlined the wel fare sports 11:20 to Garda A, should he be in need of same. Please find a copy of such reports attached at appendix 17."

I think that's on page 554. Perhaps we will just look
at that. I am sorry, that is the original report. We will come back to Sergeant Curley's report there, 552, it's two pages back. Thank you. This is what he reported up.
"I note the attached report.

Garda A does not have an official issue firearm He does, however, have access to station issue firearms, whi ch incl ude four Smith \& Wesson revol vers and two SI G 11:21 pi stol s and the associ ate ammunition for each.

I have no concerns at this time regar ding Garda A's well being. I will conti nue to monitor Garda A and should I have any concerns, I will report same i meredi at el $y$.

On today's date l spoke with Garda A and outlined to hi $m$ the wel fare sports avail able."

So, there appears to be appropriate management concern and attention to the issue, would agree that is fair?
A. Yeah, that's fair enough.

138 Q. Yes.
A. Again, my point is really: should he. With this going 11:22 on and there's other people under a lot of pressure in the station and have access to guns.

139 Q. Yes. One of your other concerns was that there was a failure to revisit a crucial witness who had come
forward with vital information?
A. Mm-hmm.

140 Q. Did you have in mind the person you had met on the 10th May, the evening of the 10th May in Galway?
A. Yes, yes. Yeah.

141 Q. Perhaps we will look at --
A. Sorry, which statement? I know it's my statement you're referring to, but just, is it the one to the Tribunal the night before -- the night of the deadline that I sent in. I'm just trying to work out which statement.

CHAN RMN: Can I just help you. You made a series of statements, including a very formal one, I think assisted by your solicitor, prepared by a solicitor on your instructions. It was a very formal thing. And what we did then was to list the complaints.
WTNESS: okay.
CHA RMAN Do you follow me?
WTNESS: Yeah.
CHA RMAN So one might be in an original statement, one might be in a somewhat subsequent one, do you know what I mean?

WTNESS: Yeah.
CHA RMAN so it doesn't follow. so, for instance, the complaint about the interviewing of witnesses, off hand 11:23 I can't remember precisely which one that came in, but clearly that's a relevant complaint to be listed. This one is that you said a crucial witness had come forward with vital information and the investigation team met
in July 2014 but didn't go back to him for about six months and so on.

WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAK So that was one of the things you said. So that's a complaint you level at the ó Cualáin investigation. Do you follow me?

WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN That's where we are, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN Does that bring it back to you.
WTNESS: It does, yeah.
142 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: I just wanted to draw your attention to page 3902. This is Detective Superintendent Mulcahy's statement. If we just perhaps go up a couple of lines there. It says:
"Having attempted to cont act (bl ank) on several occasions on the number provided to me by the reporter, it appeared to be di sconnected. I brought this to the notice of the reporter on 1/7/2014 and he advi sed me
that (blank) had changed his number. Having got the new number fromthe reporter, I managed to make cont act at 19:50 on $2 / 7$ with (bl ank) and the person that had met with the reporter on 10th May 2014 and outlined his concerns regarding ME. B and Garda A. (Blank) agreed to meet with me on 3/7, he rang me back at 22: 22, stating he di dn't think he wanted anything more to do with it. I expl ai ned to hi mthat we could meet and get his story and that we would not do anything until l
could gi ve hi ma guarantee as to what would happen. He agreed to take a call at around 10:00pm on the 3/7. He was not sure as to how the process worked and I ensured that I would not do anything wi thout a meeting expl ai ni ng to him"

Can we scroll down. Right to the start of the paragraph there.
"He said he was worried about the consequences for hi m"

He describes then what happened.
"He agreed to meet us at his home later that day. Tol d 11:26 me to ring back at 1200."

Is goes on there to where that paragraph concludes:
"He declined to commit anything to writing but he agreed to consi der the matter."

And refers to a contemporaneous note. There's a lot of contact, attempted contact to be made then by Detective Superintendent Mulcahy in the next paragraph. If we go 11:26 down onto the next page. It outlines various attempts at contact and further meetings. So, would you agree that the team seemed very keen to, in fact, try and get a statement from this person?
A. Yes. Yes, Judge. Just in relation to the contact, what that -- like that is true in relation to that person dropping phones. Because, the person did stay in contact with me for a while and then dropped phones and then, sometime later got text messages from the person and eventually the person ultimately dropped the phone completely and I never had any contact with that person since.
Yes. But they actually obtained a signed statement, albeit that it was sort of saying that the person didn't want to say anything further or get more involved or do anything?
A. I understand. I understand.

144 Q. One of your other concerns then was that Garda A was treated unduly favourably in respect of his interview. How would you describe your concern in that regard?
A. Well, in that I would have argued firstly they would have had a power of arrest, could have made an arrest and done a proper interview.
145 Q. Yes. Obviously a decision to make an arrest in a matter such as this, it would probably normally be made at some sort of a case conference: will we arrest a suspect, or, when will we arrest?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

146 Q. But would you anticipate that that, in fact, would have 11:28 been an important step and that they may have decided not to take for a particular reason?
A. Obviously part of my argument is the particular reason, the road they went down.

Obviously if an arrest is made there can't be a rearrest unless there's significant evidence emerging after that. Presumably that --
A. That's a possibility. Look, that's a possibility.
Q. Yes.
A. But obviously as we go on and see how things end up. Yes. I mean, it seems to be the position of the detective superintendent in his statement at 3907 and 7339, that they wanted to have conducted all other relevant enquiries before they went to Garda A.
A. Oh yeah. As I said from the start, just to clarify: I wasn't attacking everything with the investigation.
151 Q. Yes.
A. Some things in the investigation were very thorough. 152 Q. Yes. I mean, one possible benefit of seeking a voluntary interview is that if it's refused you can proceed to an arrest or you can proceed to an arrest after it's taken place as well, isn't that right?
A. Yeah, yeah.

153 Q. But if there's an arrangement being set up to do a voluntary interview, I suppose there has to be an agreement reached as to the when and where of it?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

154 Q. Isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

155 Q. I mean, we'11 hear obviously the rationale of it
directly from the witnesses, but that perhaps mightn't appear that unreasonable in the circumstances. The wisdom of it is one thing, but do you see that as part of an attempt to discredit you, that they did that intentionally to target you in some way?
A. I would have at the time or perhaps making my statements. In hindsight again now, you've explained it very well there in your question. we have to hear the evidence obviously, but I am just putting the proposition to you that there may well be proper reasons for it. And I am asking you now, you having looked at the documents and the statements and looking inside the investigation, are you saying here today that that treatment was favourable, unduly favourable and that it was done to target you or discredit you in some way?
A. Well, it was very lenient, just from recollection, what I've read. It was very lenient. I'm not sure it was -- but it was a caution statement, I think, from recollection.

157 Q. Yes.
A. I think was it a statement, and this is just from -- I am not a hundred percent on this, is this a statement that he was able to do it, his solicitor handed in and -- I just can't remember actually there.

158 Q. Yes.
A. Because I have had no direct evidence to offer.

159 Q. I mean, I am coming to the end of this issue now in the next couple of questions, but this investigation,
you've seen the investigation report and the letter that went to the DPP.
A. You see --

160 Q. Into your protected disclosure allegations?
A. You see, I mentioned a couple of times last week and I don't want to go on about it, perhaps there's a reason or something, but I believed there was another report.
161 Q. I am asking you about Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin's report into your allegations. You have seen the whole of that covering investigative report sent to ${ }^{11: 33}$ the director?
A. I have seen the report that's in the documents here.

162 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

163 Q. Have you yourself been involved in an investigation as complex at that?
A. As this one?

164 Q. Yes.
A. oh, not as this one, no.

165 Q. Have you seen investigation files of that sort of magnitude, reflecting work over a period of 18 months?
A. Can you just rephrase?

166 Q. It was obviously a lengthy investigation.
A. Yes.

167 Q. Eighteen months to get to the crime file to the DPP?
A. Yeah.

168 Q. You've agreed it was complex.
A. Oh yeah.

169 Q. Are there elements of it -- you were probably
disappointed with the result but are there elements of it in any part which you see as targeting you or discrediting you?
A. The big thing with it, it's back to the thing in the station; the taking of statements and suppression. I mean, for any guards that were humming and hawing about telling the truth and to see that done, I mean you'd have to be very brave to come forward with the truth. Half brave and half mad.

Is that the only -- and I don't say only in pejorative way, is that the criticism you have? Does that lead you to the conclusion that this was an investigation which targeted you and refrained from properly investigating your allegations deliberately?
A. Yeah.

171 Q. Is that it?
A. It did discredit me. Like, the way they went and took the statements, I mean where Garda $A$ is in duty, on duty in the station. This was over a number of days. And doesn't leave the station, is just walking around the station, you know, for a guard -- like, it shouldn't have been done like that. If they wanted to get the real truth, they should have met individual guards off-site, at a hotel or at home or some other Garda station or somewhere else. Just not there.

172 Q. I mean, the investigation was intended to see what evidence there was to support your allegations?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

173 Q. You saw the assistant commissioner's conclusions in

MR. MEGI NESS: I mean, you would interpret the evidence differently, is that really what you are saying?
A. If it was me, I would -- I would -- fair enough, I mightn't be impartial. But if $I$ had that evidence with the videotape, with the coercion part as well I mean in there, and I understand it was found there was no coercion. Look, I don't know what to say to that.

177 Q. CHA RMAN Coercion?
A. This is coercion, in he statements, when the statements are being read out --

178 Q. CHA RMAN Coercion?
A. Where persons are sent out -- undercover guards -179 Q. CHA RMAN Undercover guards phone up people whose numbers they have and they say, will you tell me whatever it is?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. CHA RMAN You think that's coercion?
A. No, no, it's not as simple as that. The people that phones, the persons who phoned clearly had nothing and the undercover guards kept asking, can you get me whatever.
181 Q. CHA RMAN You think that's coercion, rightly or wrongly. I'm not saying it's not coercion, I am saying, well you think that's coercion. If somebody says I don't have any, well can you get me some?
A. It's not as simple -- just one more sentence.

182 Q. CHA RMAK You weren't here at the time, you were in Australia at the time when this thing happened, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

183 Q. CHAN RMAN So your knowledge is knowledge of what people told you after?
A. No, I have the statements in front of me and I have the prisoner in, Judge.

184 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. I read out over the statements and it's clear that these guys then have -- it's cocaine they're looking for.

185 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. They've no cocaine, they're saying they've no cocaine,
Q. CHAL RMAN They are saying --
A. One individual is saying, well, we will try and get you something from someone else.
187 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. And then they say, that person had nothing. And the guards have kind of duped them into thinking that they met them in a nightclub in Athlone prior to that and they knew each other. Then they go again to say, well, can you get me, it's for my girlfriend's birthday or something, a party, can you please try and get me something. And after they said, well, we don't have -that person didn't have anything, okay, we'11 try again. And they go to another drug dealer and they get the cocaine. They say, sorry, how much do you want? $€ 100$ worth of cocaine. Then they meet the guard, the undercover guards and they sel1 the undercover guards the cocaine for $€ 100$. So they don't even make anything out of it.
188 Q. CHA RMAN As you understand from the informants?
A. No, from the statements, Judge.

189 Q. CHA RMAN Right.
A. It's in the statements.

190 Q. CHA RMAN No, but making the money, let's focus, is as you understand from what people told you?
A. No. This is the statements.

191 Q. CHA RMAN Right, okay.
A. That I read out --

192 Q. CHA RMAN One way or another, you consider that to be
coercion?
A. Yes.

193 Q. CHA RMAN Okay, fair enough, that's what you think it is. okay.
A. There's a video, the DVD is there, it's in there, it's where I read out these statements.

CHA RMAN Yes.
A. The statements are very clear and I just read them all out. It's reading out the statements, I am kind of going, this is a bit mad.
CHA RMAN okay.
195 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: I am not obviously going to start a debate with you about his conclusions or the evidence on all of the particular issues in terms of detail, but I just ask you to comment on how he expressed them in the most general way as they are in the report at page 1182. It's under the heading "concl usi ons", which is part 16 of the report. If we scroll down there to conclusion. As recorded there, it says:
"A number of the allegations made by the reporter are pl ausi bl e and have subst ance. "

> That doesn't appear to discredit you?
A. No. We11, I mean, as I have said, I believe they downplayed this. Just on this, I'm confused, because, as I said, I understand there is another report and the investigation veers off into a different direction and it gets even more messier, it's stuff that I didn't
bring into it.
196 Q. CHA RMAN Wait now. On this report, we're talking now at this moment, Mr. McGuinness is asking you about this report. There are other reports but this report is the one that went to the DPP, based on your complaints, your allegations in the protected disclosure.
A. Yeah.

197 Q. CHA RMAN Do you understand. Okay. So 1et's just focus on this for the moment?

198 Q MR. MEGU NNESS: It continues:
"While the investi gation uncovered suspi ci ons of criminal behavi our by gardaí in Athl one, in particul ar the allegation surrounding the destruction of evi dence whi ch was facilitated by Garda A in the alleged tipping of $f$ of Mb . B and (blank). The circunstantial evi dence may fall short of what is required to bring a criminal prosecution.

The allegations made by the reporter, who was a member of the drug unit, stemfrombehavi ours and work practices he observed on that unit.

The poor work practices incl udes the management of sources outside the CHIS system by indi vidual s in the drug units, this exposed...indi vi dual members and, i ndeed, the sources themsel ves with danger.

The concerns raised by the reporter with the
confidential reci pient and referred to the then interim commissi oner having exami ned and set out in the investi gation file.

There have been recent devel opments whi ch may have bearing on matters cont ai ned in this file. On 9th Oct ober 2015 as a result of information recei ved by members of this investigation froma confidential source, warrants pursuant to Section 10 were obtai ned bef ore a judge of the District Court."

It details then that as a result of that searches were carried out and things were seized and they were under examination. I think you will have seen that the conclusions of that were then sent to the DPP again, who concluded that there still wasn't any basis for initiating a prosecution.
A. I understand that, yeah. I accept -- yes, I accept that.

MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, that's all I intend to ask 11:43 on this.

199 Q. CHAL RMAN Okay. Thanks very much. Anything else you want to say about the ó Cualáin report? Now, we have been over it and obviously people will ask you questions about it, anything else you want to say about 11:43 it?
A. Yeah, well, Judge, one of my last conversations with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy was where he asked me a number of questions in relation to two incidents,
Q. CHA RMAK So over and above the report or reports that we have been considering.
A. Yeah.

201 Q. CHA RMAN Went to the DPP ah the DPP decided there was not enough to mount a prosecution?
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Over and above that, you think there may have been a different investigation in which Detective Superintendent Mulcahy was concerned, is that correct?
A. I think, Judge.

CHA RMAN I just want to identify where --
A. Yeah. I think because of what Detective Superintendent 11:45 Mulcahy, that's -- I know he was definitely investigating seriously because he was aware of incidents, even one I didn't know about.

204 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. The other one he knew about, the first thing I was thinking to myself, how did he find out about that?
Q. CHAN RMAN Yes, I'm with you.
A. Theirs is no issue there.
Q. would you have some complaint about them?
A. I don't think, I think they identify -targeting or discrediting?
A. We11, yes.
Q. CHA RMAN okay, explain. underworld of Ath1one.

## Q. CHAL RMAN Yes.

 CHA RMAN But let me ask you this, Garda Keogh: Let's assume that there were other investigations in which Detective Superintendent Mulcahy was concerned, would you be satisfied that they were properly carried out orQ. CHA RMAN Do you understand me? I mean, from the point of view of targeting or discrediting, I have your 11:45 point about the Ó Cualáin report or reports, if you like. Now, if we look at the other one, assuming there is evidence about them, and I'm not sure I know anything about it, maybe I should but I don't, are you making any complaint about those in respect of
A. Because, Detective Superintendent Mulcahy obviously identified there's other problems here in Ath1one, he is clearly investigating and digging deep into the
A. He is clearly doing that. He is, in fairness, under the terms of the protected disclosures, keeping me informed of the progress he's making. But he did inform me there's another unregistered informant and
what he's saying is mad, we're going to have to open up a whole new investigation into this. I don't think there was a whole new investigation, I think that they realised they were going to go into quagmire of minefields and closed it down, the whole thing.

210 Q. CHAI RMAK But that's Detective Superintendent Mulcahy, you're saying, was concerned in closing this down?
A. No, I don't believe it was him. Because he told me -
A. CHA RMAN okay.

CHA RMAN Okay. So you think there was another inquiry or other inquiries?
A. Yes. And someone higher than super --

213 Q. CHAl RMAK Hold on. I understand, that were being or could have been carried out or could have been pursued to a better stage?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

214 Q. CHA RMAN And that would have tended to support the allegations that you were making; is that right?
A. I can't say that, because they would have -- yes, they would have -- you see, I don't know -- all I can go on is what the D/super said, what this other unregistered informant is saying, based on what he is saying, they're going to have to open up a whole new investigation.

215 Q. CHA RMAN Right.
A. Which spears -- where it comes out is --

216 Q. CHA RMAN But that doesn't have anything to do with your complaint?
A. Well it would, it would, because a lot of the same -CHAI RMAN It would tend to confirm or in some way corroborate the case that you were making?
A. Yes. And there's the same characters involved and things like that.

CHAN RMAN I see, okay.
218 Q. MR. MEGU NNESS: In any event, Garda Keogh, whatever about your natural curiosity in relation to that, this investigation looked at the complaints made in your protected disclosure. That's what we are concerned about in terms of targeting?
A. Yes.

219 Q. You understand that?
A. Yes.

MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you.
CHA RMAN Very good. Shall we take a break there? Is that a convenient time?

MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Very good, we will take a little break there. Thanks very much.

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

 FOLLOMG:220 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Garda Keogh, I am moving on to issue 12:03 18, which is your complaints relating to the bullying and harassment investigation carried out by Assistant Commissioner Michae1 Finn. As you are aware and as you've pointed out in your statement to the Tribunal
and at the interview with investigators, at that point in time that investigation was still ongoing, isn't that right? Earlier this year, just to give an overview of how it went, it may be helpful, Assistant Commissioner Finn ultimately reported to Assistant Commissioner o'brien, his appointing officer. You lodged an appeal against the findings, as you are entitled to do, under the policy document, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

221 Q. As part of that appeal, the deputy commissioner, as he is also apparently entitled to do, is to seek some expert advice for the purpose of allowing him decide the appea1. He commissioned Mr. de Bruir, that we have referred to, to offer his views in an audit that you have referred to. Then ultimately, the deputy commissioner too upheld the outcome of the bullying and harassment inquiry. You were informed of that and you were informed of each at the time it was being taken obviously. We will just look at the complaints then in relation to that. But to begin at the beginning, as it were, it would appear that the Minister for Justice sought a Section 41 report in Ju7y, at the end of July 2016, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

222 Q. Your solicitor, on your instructions obviously, had been writing, making a number of complaints and bringing a great deal of matters to her attention A. Yes.

223 Q. - at that point in time. As a result Section 41 was triggered, which enables or empowers the minister to seek from the commissioner a report?
A. Yes.

224 Q. A report was sought, to be provided within a month. In 12:06 that context, Chief Superintendent McLough1in, who had become the protected disclosure manager, whom you had been dealing with.
A. Yes.

225 Q
And it would appear satisfactorily at this point in time, in 2016, he wrote to Deputy Commissioner Ó Cualáin, seeking an update on the allegations that had been made by you, an allegation in respect of the investigations, what issues were included in it, including bullying and harassment, so that he could 12:06 properly advise the Commission of a report to the Minister, you would agree with that?
A. Yes.
Q. Chief Superintendent McLough1in, at page 3234, I don't think we need to look at it I think at the moment, but 12:07 said:
"On 16th August 2015, I recei ved a letter from Mb. Kathl een Hassett, informing me there was no record of Garda Keogh under sexual harassment and the bullying 12:07 pol icy."

I think it is the position, you hadn't made a complaint under the policy at that point in time?
A. Yes.

227 Q. Yes. Then further down there. Sorry, scroll back up, Superintendent McLough1in says that on the 18th, if we go over to the next paragraph:
"On the 18th l recei ved a letter from Garda Keogh dated 16th August 2016. In this Ietter Garda Keogh provi ded me with his consent in respect of certain actions he expected of me. He hi ghl ighted that the issue of most concern at that time was the har assment he alleged he endured fromel ements within Garda management. He continued by offering his specific views on the particul ars of the matter carried out by him"

So, Chief Superintendent McLough1in then details:
"On 19th August 2016, I carried out a number of actions in respect of Garda Ni chol as Keogh. Firstly, I wrote to GSOC seeking a report in respect of thei $r$ i nvesti gation. I al so sent an update on the progress made in respect of a Section 41(2) report that was di rected by the commi ssi oner. I wrote a letter to Garda Keogh advi sing hi mof matters in respect of his pay. I formally asked himif he had logged a compl ai nt regarding the bullying and harassment he had alleged and remi nded hi mof the structures pertai ni ng to prometi on competitions in An Garda Sí ochána. Lastly, I wrote to the civilian di rector HR in An Garda Sí ochána to enquire about the stat us of Garda Keogh's pay."

It would appear at that point in time, the issue of Superintendent Murray's promotion was concerning you also, is that right?
A. I just don't recall Chief Superintendent McLoughlin telling me that part; that I reminded him of the structures pertaining to promotion competitions. I don't recall that.
okay. okay. Well, in any event, he received a letter back from you, if we just go down there:
"On 5th Septenber 2016, I recei ved a handwritten letter from Garda Keogh dated the 1st Septenber. Thi s letter i nformed me that Garda Keogh had not reported his alleged harassment within An Garda Sí ochána, in keeping 12:09 with standardi sed policy practice. Instead, Garda Keogh had drawn the attention of named others to his alleged harassment. The letter al so referred to number of documents which Garda Keogh said he sent me on 28 th August 2016 in rel ation to the harassment he clai med.
When these documents referred to by Garda Keogh arrived at my office, I noted that they were a compendi um of di verse letters, statements, notes and Pul se printouts. I preserved that compendi umfor the record."

He says, on the next page, that he phoned you then on the $7 / 9$ ?
A. This is 2016?

229 Q. Yes, 2016. Just go down the page there. He says, just
highlighting there in the middle of the previous paragraph, dealing with the 8th September, he says:
"In this correspondence I hi ghl ighted the fact that it had now been confirmed that Garda Keogh had not made an 12:10 internal report about his allegations of bullying and harassment, but in its pl ace had rai sed such matters with others."

He then goes on to refer --
A. It's probably not a big deal, but just my record has that Chief Superintendent McLough1in rang me on the 8/9/2016.

## 230 <br> Q. Yes.

A. I'm sure it's not --
Q. Perhaps we will go back up to that page and see what reference there is to the phone call. He says there:
"Accordingly, I made a phone call to Garda Keogh on the 7th September at $1: 15$. In summary, I informed himthat bullying and har assment was a matter for An Garda Sí ochána. I i nf or med Garda Keogh that if he wi shed to pursue hi s bullying and harassment allegation, then it was necessary for himto make a formal compl ai nt in keepi ng with the policy."

He says he has a note of that. Do you recall that phone call, whether it was the 8 th or the 7 th?
A. Whether it was the 8 th or the 7 th, I don't know, or
probably irrelevant in this case. I have it down as the 8th. I don't recall the phone call but obviously I have a note of it and he has a note of it, there was a phone call.
232 Q. Yes.
A. I have:
"Chi ef Superintendent McLoughl in rang re harassment wages to be paid."

So the same thing we're talking about.
233 Q. Yes. He goes on to detail, on page 3237, dealing with sick pay issues first. Just towards the bottom of the page there, he refers to this phone call about full pay etcetera?
"The very next day, on the 7th October I phoned Garda Keogh to both informhimabout his restoration to full pay and to enqui re after his well being. In this regard Garda Keogh informed me that he was well but said that he was unhappy that his bullying and harassment compl ai nt was to be i nvesti gated in An Garda Sí ochána. Garda Keogh alleged that as the commi ssi oner was a party to this harassment, he was of the view that an i nvesti gati on into his circumstances ought to be written to the $M$ nister about this matter."

Then, if we just go down to the paragraph dealing with
the 12 th:
"The next day, on the 12th October, I wrote to Garda Keogh at his home. I formally advi sed himof his return to the payroll. I al so requested that he i ndi cate in the interests of clarity and compl eteness, if it was his intention to make a compl ai nt under har assment policy in addition to ot her compl ai nts made by him On 24th October 2016, I recei ved from Garda Ni chol as Keogh a handwritten letter dated 20th October 2016, from whi ch I gat hered that Garda Keogh di d wi sh to formally proceed with his compl ai nt of bullying and har assment. And so, on the 26th October, l wrote to the di rector of civilian HR and confirmed that that was so."

I think that was the first occasion, despite all the things that had happened and despite all of the correspondence which complained of it, that you actually made the decision to invoke the policy, isn't that correct?
A. Yes. I think -- I think I had gone to GSOC about it and they said, you have to go through the -- invoke the internal policy before you can come to us, from recollection.

234 Q. Yes. I think you were informed of the appointment of Chief Superintendent Scan1an, is that correct?
A. Yes.

235
Q. You raised issues in relation to that. I think a
decision was made that he would take your statement but he wouldn't investigate it?
A. Yes.
Q. You were happy with that?
A. Yes.

Accordingly, you met him on the 27th of March, isn't that correct?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. He took a statement from you. I think you complained that that went missing then?
A. Yes.
Q. Perhaps we will just look at Volume 14, page 3868. This is a letter dated 31st March 2017, enclosing a copy of your statement. It's addressed to the assistant commissioner eastern region. I think that was Assistant Commissioner Fanning at that point in time?
A. Yes, just from clarification.

240 Q. Yes.
A. When you say I took issue with Chief Superintendent Scanlan, it was actually for him, because he had been my superintendent prior, when I was talking to him I said, this is going to be messy, be better off staying out of this. That was -- you know, and I told him, I said, like, you know, I would have worked under you.
A. In other words, that could be a get out clause to get out of getting involved in this, because it is very messy stuff.

242 Q. Yes. Assistant Commissioner Fanning describes what he did, I think on page 6451. If we just look at that. There's detail that we don't need to go into, but four lines from the bottom there, he says:
"On the 31st March..."

If we go up a few lines. Scroll up.
"On the 31st March, I recei ved correspondence from chi ef superintendent Portlaoise contai ni ng a copy of a 17-page statement dated 27th March 2017."

Then he goes on to say, three lines down:
"On the 5th April, I wrote to executive di rector human resources to informhimby way of interimreport that chi ef superintendent Portlaoi se had sent me one part of a two-part report from Garda Keogh. Fromexamining it and fromearly per usal of the file, it appeared to be much wi der than a bullying and har assment matter. I stated that I would revert to himon recei pt of the next phase of the report. I recei ved further correspondence from chi ef superintendent Portlaoise dated 12th April 2017, whi ch contai ned a five-page statement dated 2nd March 2017, unsi gned. "

```
He says:
```

"On 21st April 2017, my office wrote to executive di rective human resources and peopl e devel opment encl osing a report dated 12th April 2017 from chi ef superintendent Portlaoise, together with a document of Garda Keogh dated 2nd March 2017, wi th rel evant appendi ces and outlined that I would gi ve the matter further consi der ation and report more fully in early course the correspondence acknow edged by executive di rector human resources and people devel opment on the 28th April 2017.

On 16th May 2017, I corresponded with Garda Ni chol as Keogh, informing himthat I was on annual leave and I was anxi ous to proceed with the matter. I al so enquired if he had any further material to offer and to 12:19 respond to my office bef ore 30th May 2017."

He then details that you contacted Inspector McCarthy. So it would appear that you were being kept informed as to what was happening at that point in time. You appear to have told him there, sort of line 6 onwards:
"Garda Keogh indi cated that he was satisfied that al of his issues were incl uded in both his si gned and unsi gned statements and that I was examining the matter 12:20 and would correspond further in course."

There's further correspondence then informing you of the matter, resting with the executive director. He
appears to be writing then to the executive director, urging that there be no delay in the matter. But you hadn't heard yourself directly from anyone else at that point in time, is that right?
A. In relation to the -- there's a lot in it, sorry, this 12:20 is complicated even for me.
Q. Yes.
A. So I just --

Inspector Fanning there on the last -- or Assistant Commissioner Fanning was saying on those last few lines 12:20 there that he wrote telling you that the matter was effectively with the executive director at that point in time?
A. Right.

245 Q. Do you recall getting that?
A. Look, I can't recall just getting --

246 Q. Yes.
A. I got a lot of letters over --

247 Q. Yes.
A. I would accept that.

248 Q. Yes. It would appear, whatever the circumstances, Assistant Commissioner Finn wasn't appointed until the middle of November 2017. Were you yourself aware of any reason why it had taken so long?
A. No. Look, all I knew is there was a delay. But I had made my statement to Chief Superintendent Scanlan in Portlaoise, was in March. We're on 2017, isn't it? March 2017. The next thing, for a period of six months I don't know anything about it, from my recollection.

249 Q. Yes. But in any event, you came to meet Assistant Commissioner Finn, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

Would you like to describe that meeting?
A. Yeah. I think it was in Mullingar. There was my solicitor, there was Assistant Commissioner Finn, Chief Superintendent Myers and a female inspector, I can't remember her name. Basically, at the meeting I had submitted my complaint in writing, so he had that in writing.
A. And it clearly outlined who I was making complaints about. Assistant Commissioner Finn kept asking me over and over again, but who are you making your complaint about, is it a corporate allegation or is it some other 12:22 allegation. And I just said, look, I said, I'm making a complaint about -- I named three people out, and I said, that's it, like I'm naming them out, it's in writing. He kept going on after that, but like, who are you making your complaint after? This is the way it was, as if I didn't know who I was making my complaint about. It was in writing and I verbally just told him and told him a number of times during the meeting. He kept asking me this question over and over again: But who are you making your complaint about?
252 Q. Yes. I mean, when Chief Superintendent Scanlan sent the report in, it did seem to be an issue in headquarters as to who precisely, because, I, mean you've seen the bullying policy itself, it does appear
to be, I don't say rigid, but it's obviously very formalistic in the sense that it lays down the structure of the investigation. Because those in respect of whom the allegations are made are meant to be made aware of them at a very early stage, given the allegation and giving a chance to respond and be interviewed and review the documents. That'd be a pretty normal set of fair procedures in the circumstances then, I take it?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Ultimately, it was confirmed further in writing, through your solicitor, who the three were, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And by you then in statements, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Al1 right. Now, I suppose the issue of delay is one that concerned you. Can I just ask you, knowing the bullying policy structure, are you satisfied or not that Assistant Commissioner Finn followed the procedure 12:25 set out in the policy?
A. I don't know. I don't know. I can't -- a lot -again, a lot of the stuff, what $I$ thought again and what I read in the volumes there, I really don't know

257 Q. okay. We11, it seemed to follow then that you haven't made any explicit -- it's not part of your complaints that he failed to adhere to the policy or follow it as required?
A. I don't know. I can't remember exactly what's in the policy.
Q. Yes, okay. It obviously required going to those persons whom your complaints related to and getting their account and giving them an opportunity to answer them, isn't that right?
A. Mm-hmm.

259 Q. I think by June 2018, am I correct in saying, that he was in a position to serve on you then all of the documents and responses, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

260 Q. You, with your solicitor presumably advising you, had a reasonable opportunity to reply to all of the defences, as it were, put in by the officers, and you did that at 1ength?
A. Yeah.
Q. The issue of delay, could you articulate in your own words how you say Assistant Commissioner Finn targeted you or discredited you as a result of your protected disclosures?
A. Well, the first meeting, that meeting, that meeting in Mullingar.
Q. Yes.
A. As I said, most of the meeting was just: But who are
you making your complaints about? And I'd name the names. But you're not sure who you're making your complaints -- And I said, well, it's in the names that are in the statement and the names I'm just after telling you. This went on and on. And then, just from recollection, from reading the Finn report or the way it was investigated, like, it would appear I make complaints about like nearly everyone in Athlone, when it was just the three, the three senior officers that I had made --

263 Q. I think Assistant Commissioner Finn kept notes and they are part of the papers. Perhaps we will just look at those, at 4220, 4221 and 4222. There's some discussion now about the complaints and then, at the bottom of the page, it says:
" Who are you making compl ai nts agai nst?

Pat Murray, two chi ef s in Mullingar, Mark Curran and Lorrai ne Weatley. There was a sergeant in the chi ef's 12:28 of fice who may have been pulling their strings, but l'm not sure that your investigation will show this.

You will have to tell me who you are making the compl ai ns agai nst.

There are a lot of peopl e named in the correspondence, I need to know who the compl ai nts are bei ng made agai nst."

And you say then:
"Pat Murray, that is crystal clear. Mark Curran - yes.
l'm not making a compl ai nt agai nst Noreen McBrien and Lorraine Wheatley. I've an issue with John Scanl an because the compl ai nt went missing.

So agai nst Pat Murray and Mark Curran?

My mind is open to Mark Curran. I thought it was him because he was friends with Ai dan....l know it's coming fromthe chi ef's office but l'm not sure who is doing it."

It just goes on. Mr. Cullen is then recorded. Assistant Commissioner Finn says:
"My scope is limited to the pol icy."

It just goes down there into a bit more discussion about the procedure. Just scroll down there. At the bottom of the page we go back to identifying them.
"Superintendent Pat Murray is one. I'm not sure about Mark Curran but my mindis open. When he left Lorraine Wheatl ey came and she's sound. And that sergeant is there all the time and he's friends on the Facebook
with A.

If it is the sergeant but if l don't get a complaint agai nst hi m, then I won't be putting a compl ai nt agai nst him

I am not sure who is responsible for the Mullingar thing.

If you go to Mark and Lorrai ne and they say they were 12:30 busy and just si gned the document.

I need to find out who you are saying who is responsi ble so that I can put it to the people.

It's is in the documents."

There's more discussion about it there. You still seem to be leaving it open there on Mark Curran and then you say:
"It is Pat Murray and Mark Curran."
A. They're already in the statement.

264 Q. Yes.
A. Just to point out, these are Garda notes.

265 Q. I understand, I am going to ask you whether you think they're accurate. Perhaps if we just go on down there. If we scroll down a bit further. Assistant

Commissioner Finn says:
"I need to be clear whoml need to approach and i nvesti gate. Ri ght now the compl ai nt is agai nst Pat Murray and Mark Curran. Ni ck, you will need to tell me 12:30 if he wants me to put allegations to other persons or 1 won't go to other persons."

You say:
"If Mark Curran says it was someone el se?

Then I would come back to you and we' d take it from there."

You say:
"Throw in Lorrai ne Wheatley so."

Assistant Commissioner Finn:
"You're you are happy with this. Do you want some time out?"

Do those notes give an accurate reflection of the discussion?
A. Somewhat, somewhat accurate.

266 Q. Yes.
A. It is true, Lorraine wheatley, I know I am humming and
hawing in that, in relation to in relation to Chief Superintendent wheatley, but, of course, just on review of evidence kind of, to work out in my head, just for continuity of stuff, she is -- I've to make a complaint against both her and Mark Curran.
Q. For consistency, is it?
A. Yeah, and continuity -
A. And that's what I mean by just continuity of the documents and things like that. Continuity. Superintendent wheatley was the senior officer who received reports from Superintendent Murray, that you think it's necessary to name her as being involved in bullying and harassment?
A. Yes.

272 Q. CHA RMAN I'm having a little difficulty with that, to be honest.
A. Yeah.

273
Q. CHAN RMAN

Because I can understand you say, look,

Superintendent Murray was guilty of bullying and harassment. That makes sense. I am not saying it's write, but that makes sense.
A. Yes.

274 Q. CHA RMAN But if it just happens that whoever it is, chief superintendent, it could be, you know Chief Superintendent Keogh or Chief Superintendent Ryan or anybody else, whoever it was, you throw them in as we11. I'm not understanding -- there's no personal involvement, in other words, at that level, is that correct?
A. Yeah, I think I've clarified --

275 Q. CHA RMAN Yes, that's that is what I want to you do?
A. In relation to Chief Superintendent wheatley, the thing where she -- for the purpose of the appeal, where she appears to completely side in relation to the phone ca11 with Superintendent Murray. Then there's where I don't get -- I'm looking for the statement that I made to Superintendent Alan Murray and I don't get that. involved in a process at different times that you say represented bullying and harassment, and included in that is the response that she made to Superintendent Alan Murray and your appeal about that. That's bullying and harassment? I am not saying it's not bullying and harassment or it doesn't look like it, I just want to know, is that the essence? That's where Chief Superintendent wheatley comes in, is that right?
A. Yeah. Judge, I am nearly getting confused myself.

CHA RMAN Don't get confused. We're not here to have confusion. Mr. McGuinness says to you, you're there talking to Assistant Commissioner Finn and his team?
A. Mm-hmm.

CHA RMAN Okay. You complain, I mean, I am just trying to use as neutral a word as possible, you complain that he keeps sort of badgering you to name the people that you say are guilty of bullying and harassment?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

280 Q
CHA RMAN That's where we are at the moment?
A. Yes.

CHAL RMAN Mr. McGuinness asked you, why did you nominate her as being guilty of bullying and harassment. Now, nobody is suggesting that she was or she wasn't or that you are right or that you are wrong, 12:36 nothing like that. And you said, for continuity?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

283 Q. CHA RMAK And I said, I don't understand that. And you said, well, there's a chain of command. That, of
course, I do understand. So I was wondering, was it just because she was the senior officer over Superintendent Murray, that you were blaming her or accusing her of bullying and harassment, or was there something else?
A. As I've just stated, there was that incident to do with the appeal, where she appears to have taken a side on that.
Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. And she could have, if she wanted to, like she could have dealt with -- just whether -- right or wrong in relation to the thing.
Q. CHAN RMAN That's okay.
A. To just establish -- there's obviously a different version from the chief superintendent and the guard, 12:37 and as a chief I would have said, perhaps she could have been impartial, get the phone records and establish the date of the phone call, is one thing.
Q. CHA RMAN They are response to your appeal in respect of the Superintendent Alan Murray issue?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN Is that right?
A. Yes.

288 Q. CHA RMAN Her response to that -
A. Yes.

289 Q. CHA RMAN - you say represented bullying and harassment.
A. Yes.

290
Q. CHAN RMAN

And that's something you wanted included in

Assistant Commissioner Finn's report?
A. Yeah. That was all, 1 think, in my statement.
Q. CHA RMAN Don't mind whether it was or wasn't. Don't mind that for the moment. That is another day's work, if you like, whether it was or not. Somebody is going to debate that. But that's an involvement directly with you of Chief Superintendent wheatley?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Okay. Besides that particular involvement, do you say that as the superior officer of Superintendent Murray she also had responsibility?
A. I don't know that.

293 Q. CHA RMAN Do you understand me. I am just trying to wonder what the complaint is about Chief Superintendent wheatley?
A. I mean, I don't know, I don't know what went on behind the scenes.

CHA RMAN of course. okay. I hope I understand that. I think I do. Thank you very much.
MR. MEGU NESS: Just to draw something to your
attention, I don't think we need to look at it, but Assistant Commissioner Finn says on page 4124, the following, I will just read it out for you:
"At the behest of Garda Keogh, I procured a copy of the 12:38 statement that he made to chi ef superintendent Scanl an. I read the statement prior to my meeting with himon 1st December 2017. I was not aware until I met himon 1st December 2017 that Garda Keogh wi shed to have the
content of his statement to Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an in March 2017 incl uded in my investigation. I was not aware until l met himon 1st Decenber 2017 that he wanted to incl ude additional material as part of his compl ai nt. It was not confirmed to me until l recei ved further correspondence fromthe sol icitor dated 13th Decenber 2017, that the onl y persons agai nst whom Garda Keogh was specifically making the allegation of bullying and harassment were Chi ef Superintendent Wheatley and Mark Curran and Superintendent Pat Murray."

## Yes.

A. The first part of that, just the first part of that, might it be read out again? It's just something that I...

CHA RMAN Yes. Just check that again. Take your time to have a look at it.
295 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: You had, through your solicitor, I think, made it clear that --
CHA RMAN Just give him a chance, Mr. McGuinness. MR. MEGU NESS: Sorry.
CHA RMAN For a moment.
A. Just this line stands out:
"I was not aware..."

It's in the second paragraph, the third line, halfway through the third line.
Q. MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
A.
"I was not aware until I contacted Garda Keogh that he had previ ously made a statement to Chi ef Superintendent Scanlan. I was not aware until I met himon 1st

Decenber 2017 what matters he now wi shed to have i nvesti gated by me, nor was it clear to me who he was making a compl ai nt..."

Just that part, "I was not aware..."
297 Q. CHA RMAN He says he didn't know -- when he met you, he says he didn't know -- you may agree or not agree, but he says when he met you he didn't know about the Superintendent Scan1an statement. That's what he says. what do you say about that?
A. No, I had rang -- I was in contact with the female inspector that was under Mick Finn.
Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. And I remember saying to that lady, you're going to have to get the statement, there's a lot in the statement, you know.

299 Q. CHA RMAN This is the Scanlan statement.
A. The Scanlan statement, to speed it up for them, because there was a good lot of stuff in that. So he would have been aware of...
MR. MEGU NESS: I think there may be a different reading of it. He seems to be saying that that when he first contacted you he hadn't been aware of the statement. Prior to the meeting then, which
subsequently took place on the 1st December, he had got the statement and had read it.

CHA RMAN I'm sorry.
MR. MEGU NNESS: But he wasn't sure how much of it or what part of it was going to be included within his investigation?
CHA RMAN That's right.
301 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: You may not have taken that up on the day?
A. Obviously all of the statement was to be included, because that is the purpose of why I made the statement of bullying and harassment.
302 Q. Yes.
A. There's one other thing, there was a whole list of appendices and documents, supporting documents as well, attached with the statement.

303 Q. Yes. But he, for his part, and we looked at the notes, you're entitled to say whatever you like about the notes if you want to but, he for his part seems to have been focused on the people that he would have to go to. 12:42 So he wanted you to fix that definitively and you then did that in correspondence.
A. Yeah.

304 Q. But to be clear about the outcome of his investigation, he conducted it and made his enquiries, you responded 12:43 to all of the defences, if I can put it that way, that were put in, and he reached his conclusions. Now they're contained in Volume 18 at appendix 65 . We can go through them one-by-one if you wish on all of the
complaints. But what is your complaint about his conclusions? Is it that he just came to an adverse conclusion to you?
A. Yeah, Judge, there's plenty of supporting documents in the -- plenty of supporting documents to back up certain things I was saying. He seems just to have ignored parts of it and downplayed certain things.
Q. And are there any that particularly stand out?
A. We've gone into a lot of this last week.
Q. Yes.
A. Last week.
Q. Yes.
A. Stuff where there was very strong evidence on, he just finds, oh, there's no evidence or nothing to see here, kind of. Like there was evidence, there was evidence, some form of evidence kind of, that they shouldn't have been just, oh, the evidence isn't strong enough, or no evidence on certain matters.
Q. okay. So you're of the view that he should have come down in favour of your complaints by reference to the material you sent him?
A. I think there was enough evidence there to back up those complaints. Perhaps not all, perhaps not all of them.
Q. Yes.
A. But certainly some. He finds, he finds the thing in its entirety.
Q. Yes.
A. It's like it's just, no, nothing to see here at all.

311 Q. But from his point of view or from anyone looking at his point of view, without adopting it obviously, he hasn't been involved in the ó Cualáin investigation into your disclosures.
A. Yes.
A. I understand that, yeah.

So on what basis do you say that his conclusions were intended to or did target you because of your protected disclosures?
A. Like, his conclusions, my complaints are against just a smal1 group, just three senior officers. I have plenty of evidence in, in parts, like, as I said, not in -perhaps not in everything, but $I$ had enough to hold them up, to get them to the points that they were actually -- I could put on paper and sign my name to them that they were a complaint. He seems to have just, I think at this stage, just a circle, the wagons exercise, protect the senior officers. Because as well, he seems to divide it up then and there's -- from recollection, there's notices on other members, virtually anyone $I$ named in the complaint gets served a notice that I'm making an allegation against them,
It's kind of --

314 Q. We11, it seems to indicate on the one hand that obviously those people responded as if you had made a
complaint?
A. Yeah.
Q. But looking at it from the point of view of the investigator, was he not gathering evidence from parties who were involved in it, who were in a position 12:47 to say something about the events that you were complaining about?
A. Yeah. But, the other side is, I don't know exactly what sort of an investigation Assistant Commissioner Finn carried out. I don't know. I just got the findings really at the end. I accept there was certain documents where I reply back and that. But then there was the findings, I read them and then $I$ believed that I had a case to appeal it and that's why I appealed it. Yes. But are you making the case that he, Assistant Commissioner Finn, through his conduct of it and his findings, targeted you because you had made the protected disclosures that you had made?
A. I mean that would be my -- that would be -- I would -I would -- at this point, at this stage, I wouldn't be the flavour of the month with senior officers because I'm still pursuing and pushing.

317 Q. Yes. But is that the basis upon which you're expressing that view?
A. Yeah. We11, yes, that would be one, yeah.

318 Q. Okay. In terms of the delay in the conclusion of the report, he was appointed on the 15th November and he reported on 20th December 2018, a period of 13 months. Does that appear an unreasonable period as far as you
were concerned?
A. 13 months.

319 Q. Yes.
A. To conduct that complaint
Q. Yes.
A. I think their own policy has 28 days or something like that. But I accept that was -- they would never have achieved that in 28 days, obvious7y.
321 Q. Yes.
A. Because this would be more complicated. But 13 months 12:49 is stretching it a fair bit.

322 Q. Yes. In terms of the period from March '17, when you first made your statement to Scanlan, until Assistant Commissioner Finn actually was appointed, it would seem that he, Assistant Commissioner Finn, was keen to establish what happened during that period. Could I ask you to look at page 6451? If we go down here, we have seen some of this earlier, but if we continue down.
CHA RMAK This is explaining the period between 27th March 2017 and the appointment of Assistant Commissioner Finn?

MR. MEGUNESS: This is Assistant Commissioner Fanning's involvement at this stage. If we proceed on down there.
CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Perhaps there is an easier and quicker way of doing it. If we go to page 10475. CHA RMAN Thanks very much.

MR. MEGU NESS: It will be slightly easier.
CHA RMAN Was Assistant Commissioner Finn involved in the period between late March and his own appointment, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Involved?
CHAN RMAN Involved in the process.
MR. MtGU NESS: No. No, he wasn't.
CHA RMAN Well, then I'm sure -- I'm sorry.
MR. MEGI NESS: He's writing here to Mr. Barrett.
323 Q.
CHA RMAN Yes. Let me just ask, Garda Keogh, it looks like, that's what I am just checking, I am checking with Mr. McGuinness, he says that between March 27th, when you made this statement, and the appointment of Assistant Commissioner Finn in November, okay, so March to November, looks like a long time to initiate an inquiry.
A. Yes.

324 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. But it doesn't appear, whoever is to blame for it or what systems or person or persons are to blame and whether it was targeting or not, it doesn't appear that Assistant Commissioner Finn is one of them. Maybe I'm misunderstanding. Are you with me?
A. Yes, I am. And, of course, I assume, incorrectly, I assume, it's only again having read these documents.
325 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. I assume that John Scanlan had withheld the documents. And again, in relation to that, $I$ see he didn't -- he did send the documents on the --

326 Q. CHAL RMAN whether he did or he didn't.
A. Yeah.
Q. CHAL RMAN You made your statement?
A. The 17th.

CHA RMAK No, no, I am confusing you. You made your statement at the end of March.
A. Yes.

331 Q. CHA RMAN 27th March 2017?
A. 2017, yeah.

332 Q. CHA RMAN Assistant Commissioner Finn was appointed, I think on the 15th November, I will be corrected if I am wrong, in November, yes, 15th November 2017. So we have 27th March, 15th November. Okay?
A. Yes, yes.

333 Q. CHA RMAN Assistant Commissioner Finn was appointed?
A. Yes, so he couldn't have --

334 Q. CHA RMAN It would appear to clear him for any delay up to then.
A. Yes.

335 Q. CHAN RMAN whoever else may be at fault or not at fault, we don't know.
A. Yes.
Q. CHAN RMAN Are we happy with that?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN okay. Is that the situation, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGI NESS: Yes, if we just see that page, he seems to be enquiring into there.
CHA RMAK Assistant Commissioner Finn is enquiring as to why it took so long to get to where we are, okay.
MR. MtGU NNESS: Yes. And then on the next page there
is another e-mail from Assistant Commissioner Fanning
to Assistant Commissioner Finn, where he gives him sort 12:54 of a quick response.
CHA RMAN Accounting for the --
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGUN NESS: But then, much more significantly, 12:55 Inspector McCarthy, on behalf of the Assistant Commissioner Fanning, gives a blow by blow of what happened, between pages 10478 and 10481. I don't know, Garda Keogh, whether you have seen those four pages in

Volume 37 before, but if we scroll down there, it gives a chronology, starting at that date on the 20th. CHA RMAN He describes the paper trail.
MR. MEGU NESS: Exactly.
CHA RMAN of exactly who consulted -- everybody was consulting everybody else.
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. Now there may be some individual periods of time when there's delay in responding to correspondences but that was material sent to Assistant Commissioner Finn because you and your solicitor were complaining of the delay in completing his investigation and so were the others, the subject of it, isn't that correct?
A. I understand that.

338 Q
A11 right.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Okay.
339 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: That would perhaps seem to indicate that Assistant Commissioner Finn was keen to respond to the complaints that all sides were making as to the lengthy period it was taking.

CHA RMAN Maybe it took him too long.
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN Maybe somebody else would have done it faster. Maybe he should have done it faster. That doesn't sound like targeting to me.
A. But there is, Judge --

340 Q. CHA RMAN I have your o other point, but the fact that it takes him 13 months when somebody else might have
done it in 11?
A. Perhaps I may be incorrect on this, but there was -you see, there was -- at some point Superintendent Murray is going on for promotion.
A. And I mean, for me --
Q. CHAN RMAN Yes.
A. -- the way I look at it, you know, was he trying to facilitate --

CHA RMAN I understand that point. I think that
Mr. McGuinness may get on to that point at a later stage. You say, look, he was dragging out the investigation so as to leave the field clear for Superintendent Murray to get his promotion. That I understand as being something that is targeting and discrediting. But on its own, if it takes me three months to produce the judgment as opposed to two months, I don't think anybody can say they were targeted, do you know what I mean?
A. Yes.

344 Q. CHA RMAN But if you say it was deliberately -- I have that point. Okay.

345 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: But certainly as of the day he first met you, 1st December 2017, I think Superintendent Murray's promotion came through in January '18, isn't that correct?
A. I'm a bit mixed up, because he's promoted, his promotion is backdated, his promotion was backdated.

346 Q. I understand that.

CHA RMAN Could we leave -- if it's convenient. That is the next and I think the final issue, is that right? MR. MEGI NNESS: No, no, there's some other issues. I am leaving this issue and I am finished with this issue.

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. So, I have your point and you want to say, look, you're uncomfortable about the delay that took place, not so much because it took 13 months, although you think that's rather a long time for it, but because you think that it might have or did or was intended to facilitate Superintendent Murray's path to promotion.
A. Yes.

347 Q. CHAN RMAN okay.
A. And, Judge, just again, as I said, I know we have said there's no evidence or -- but from what I believed earlier into what I -- what my perception was, that Superintendent Murray was put in to get me out and that he would be promoted, this is further backing up, let's say, my belief on what Garda management are up to.
348 Q. CHA RMAK We11, I'11 te11 you what now, we're just leaving this at this moment because, we're not leaving it forever, because there is an issue, you say, concerning -- and it's one of the agreed issues, concerning the promotion of Superintendent Murray to chief superintendent?
A. Yes.

349 Q. CHA RMAN So we will leave that for the moment. Have we now completed -- can I just ask you one question:

My understanding of your complaint, apart from this one about delay and Assistant Commissioner Finn, my understanding is that you say he shouldn't have reached those conclusions, he was wrong to come to those conclusions.
A. I believe that.

350 Q. CHA RMAN Lawyers would say, in respect of a report, when they want to get around the fact that they don't like the conclusions in the report, what we would say is, no reasonable body, no reasonable person could have reached such a conclusion, is that essentially what you are saying?
A. Yes.

351 Q. CHAL RMAN Based on the evidence, no reasonable person could have come to that conclusion?
A. Yes, Judge.

CHAI RMAN Okay. Thank you very much.
MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, just one final question. CHA RMAN yes, please.
352 Q.
MR. MGGU NNESS: In the context of the appeal that you took to Assistant Commissioner o'brien, your complaint is that he failed to uphold your appeal and that that constitutes -- in the words of --:
"There's no acknow edgnent whatsoever of the correctness of my complaints of havi ng been Iongly harassed by garda officers, which has arisen since । made my protected discl osures."

CHA RMAN It's the same complaint, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

353 Q.
CHA RMAK Insofar as anybody endorsed the report of Assistant Commissioner Finn, the shorter form applies?
A. Yes, Judge.

CHA RMAN Okay. Thank you. Mr. McGuinness, so we can let Garda Keogh stand down now for the moment, is that right?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes. Lunchtime, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Very good. Thanks very much. That leaves us with, well, whatever it leaves us with, we will get on with in the afternoon. Thanks very much. okay around two o'clock. Thanks very much.

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

 FOLLOVS:MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, the next issue listed is issue number 19, concerning whether the disciplinary investigation carried out by Assistant Commissioner Annmarie McMahon constituted discrediting or targeting of Garda Keogh.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: Chairman, just before we go on to that, I arisen in relation to that, that $I$ flagged up with Mr. McGuinness and he is looking into it.
CHA RMAN I am sorry, say that again, please,

Mr. Kelly, I'm sorry.
MR. KELLY: There is a matter in relation to 18 that arises, which I have flagged up with Mr. McGuinness.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: He needs a little time to look into it. He 14:03 is doing that. I am just flagging it at this stage. CHA RMAN Very good. So we may have to come back to number 18. Happy with that, Mr. McGuinness.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes, Chairman, I have undertaken to do that.

CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
MR. KFLLY: That's the point, $I$ thought it right to mention it to you.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much, that's very helpful. Thank you very much.
MR. KELLY: Thank you.
CHA RMAN So we are on to Assistant Commissioner McMahon.

MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. In context, Assistant Commissioner McMahon was appointed on 26th April 2017 to conduct a disciplinary inquiry which embraced a person that we are not concerned with here in this Tribunal at the moment, and others, including Garda A. She conducted her inquiry and reported on 27th February of 2019. That was considered by way of a peer review of Assistant Commissioner McPartlin and was the result then of a decision by Assistant Commissioner Sheahan, which was reviewed in the context of the peer review and Assistant Commissioner Sheahan's original decision
was on 17th May '19 to appoint Assistant Commissioner McPartlin to do this peer review. She reported on the peer review on 19th June 2019. Assistant Commissioner Sheahan took account of that, and by decision of the 27th June of 2019, decided that no disciplinary proceedings and the assembly of a board requiring the disciplinary regulations was not going to take place for the reasons set out in their statements.
CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NNESS: But, Garda Keogh, that's the sort of timeframe. Obviously, we touched on this before, you knew there was going to be and there was a disciplinary inquiry into the matters arising from your protected disclosures?
A. Yes, as I have already stated, I received a letter from Assistant Commissioner Nolan.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Assistant Commissioner McMahon conducted that under the discipline regulations?
A. I never got any letter from Assistant Commissioner McMahon.

357 Q. No, but I mean, she wasn't obviously investigating you, but she had your statement which you had made in relation to Superintendent Mulcahy and Inspector Coppinger. You don't know?
A. But I don't find out for a long -- I'm aware, Assistant Commissioner Nolan has retired at some point.
358 Q. Yes.
A. I am trying to find out who is doing that investigation.

359 Q. Yes.
A. I have not got a letter from Assistant Commissioner McMahon and we write -- when I say we write, through my 14:06 solicitor, at the time, to acting Commissioner

Ó Cualáin to find out who is doing this investigation. He sends a letter back to say Joe Nugent will be in touch with you. He's the CAO for An Garda Síochána. We don't get to find out then. Then, at some point, Clare Daly writes to the Minister for Justice in relation to the same thing, who is conducting this investigation. I think he can't get involved or something. Then we later write to Commissioner Drew Harris, who is doing this investigation. He acknowledges the letter, but in the end I find out it's Assistant Commissioner McMahon.
CHA RMAK okay.
360 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: when do you say you found that out?
A. I can't -- you see, at first I heard, I would have heard a rumour firstly. Because I was really trying to find out who was conducting that investigation. So I had heard a rumour at some stage and I didn't know and I don't know when I, let's say, formally found out. I can't even remember.
Assistant Commissioner McMahon says in her statement at page 5994 that on:
"2nd February 2017, I am aware that Superintendent

Lacey and Detective Inspector Maher met you by appoi nt ment to seek consent from you to vi ew statements previ ously made by you to Detective Superintendent Mul cahy for the purpose of the internal investigation."
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. You gave that permission?
A. Yes.
Q. You did that. I think Detective Inspector Maher spoke with you on the telephone then the following year, in march of 2018?
A. Judge, I have no note of that. It's a very strange thing, I saw the thing, I don't remember that conversation, I have no note of it. I am not saying it didn't happen but it's a very curious thing the way that thing was done.

364 Q. Okay. We11, in any event, what you say at page 116 of your statement is the following:
"What one knows at this stage is that Garda A has now
been suspended for colluding with criminals, ot her than such very minimalist and unavoi dable light touch regul ation garda collusi on in serious drug crime have been met here obfuscation, censorship, di version, a systematic failure to investi gate in accordance with basic policing protocols, a ref usal to search for and preserve incriminating el ectroni c and documentary evi dence, a fragmentation of lines of inquiry and a deferential refusal to inter rogate or prosecute seni or
gardaí. Thi s police collusion in drug crime with a pervision of the course of justice... onl y of proper el aborate smoke and mirrors charade, using di rect fair procedures to mask a cast iron guarantee and immity fromprosecution of gangs of seni or Garda and managers."

In your statement, though, to the investigators, you don't in fact name or include Assistant Commissioner McMahon as those who have allegedly targeted and discredited you?
A. Again, I don't know am I aware of Assistant Commissioner McMahon. As I said, I did meet those two investigators, Superintendent Lacey and Inspector Maher in Portlaoise Garda station. I am not sure, you see, I 14:10 am not sure when Assistant Commissioner Nolan retires and when Assistant Commissioner McMahon -- it's in the -- I just can't remember.

365 Q. CHA RMAN No, I understand. What complaints have you got, if any, as to Assistant Commissioner McMahon?
A. We11, having head the documents, Judge. I see Ms. B has made a statement of admission there, like I mean, I would argue that she was obliged to make an arrest at that point.
366 Q. CHA RMAN Assistant Commissioner McMahon? 14:11
A. Yeah.

367 Q. CHA RMAN I don't think that's in any document that you have provided to the Tribunal?
A. No.
Q. CHA RMAR It's not one of the issues we have to investigate. Should she have investigated, was she at fault in failing to arrest?
A. Judge, I didn't --
Q. CHA RMAN Question: Did Ms. B withdraw that statement?
A. Yes. Five minutes later, Judge.
Q. MR. MEGUNESS: That was a statement, correct me if I am wrong, that in fact Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin's team had procured as part of their investigation, is that right?
A. I don't think so. No, I think it was out of Assistant Commissioner McMahon's investigation into the disciplinary matters. I read it in the documents. I didn't know anything about it.
CHAL RMAN okay.
Q. MR. MEGUNESS: Perhaps I will stand corrected, but she did withdraw it and make allegations against those who had taken the statement from her in her house.
A. I understand that.
Q. CHA RMAN Would that affect your view as to whether somebody should have been arrested?
A. No, because five months, she doesn't withdraw it until five months later.
Q. CHAN RMAN Yes.
A. Judge, I would argue --
Q. CHAL RMAN So in the meantime, before she had withdrawn it, you say Assistant Commissioner McMahon should have made an arrest?
A. Yes. Yes. But, Judge --
A.
Q. CHA RMAN How is it discrediting you?
A. Yes, Judge, but this --
Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, hold on. Let's get to the bottom of this in the end. You say that's is targeting you, because she didn't arrest?
A. No, but it's is discrediting, I would say discrediting.
A. Because I have made a statement back in 2014, I understand Ms. B is not cooperating with the investigation team there.
Q. CHAL RMAN Yes.
A. And then, years later, are we get into 2018 I think, as 14:12 I said, I didn't know anything about this, Ms. B makes a statement of admission.

379 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. Which is a fairly significant thing in the whole run of things, Judge.
Q. CHAL RMAN Yes.
A. And it's five months later --

381 Q. CHA RMAN when she withdraws it?
A. Yes, Judge.

382 Q. CHAN RMAN So your point is, in the period of five months during which it's live, so to speak, if I can use that term.
A. Yes.

383 Q. CHA RMAN During which it's not withdrawn. In that
period, and this is a criticism levelled at Assistant Commissioner McMahon, she should have arranged for the arrest?
A. Yes.

384 Q. CHA RMAN of a relevant party named in the Ms. B statement?
A. We11, yes.
Q. CHA RMAN Is that correct?
A. That would be correct, yes.

MR. MEGU NESS: But you will have seen that the assistant commissioner, it would appear, partially based a decision or a view on that, that a breach of discipline perhaps should be, should be put forward in that regard. Did you see that in the report?
A. I did.
Q. Presumably that's is making the point that are you making, really. Whether she should have arrested Ms. B in the course of a discipline thing is perhaps outside the scope of it, but she appears to have considered the 14:14 various statements made by and about Ms. B to be relevant to a discipline charge which she was concerned with?
A. Like, Ms. B made the statement, I would say there was
Q. Could we stay on focus here, because we're talking the discipline inquiry?
A. okay.
Q.
okay. I understand the point you are making. But, from the point of view of what use she is making or could make or did make of Ms. B's position, she did seem to use that as the basis for a recommendation that a charge of breach of discipline was warned in that instance?
A. What else? I mean --
Q. But how do you say that sort of acting upon -- let's take it for granted that you are the trigger for the inquiry that takes place in relation to that contact between those two persons, but if a view is expressed by an officer that there appears to be grounds to have a breach of discipline on that issue, I mean surely that's substantiating your complaint in that regard? CHA RMAN Do you follow the point he is making.
A. I do, yeah.

CHA RMAN Are you sure?
A. The fact that Ms. B is making a statement.
Q. CHA RMAN Hold on, do you follow the question?
A. Can you just repeat the question, please?

CHA RMAK okay.
Q. MR. MEGI NESS: You have made a number of original
allegations?
A. $\quad \mathrm{Mm}$.
Q. One of them related to the contact between Garda $A$ and
enough grounds then to arrest Garda A.
this Ms. B and an issue concerning the disposal of phones?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

397 Q. I am suggesting to you that the assistant commissioner, having Ms. B's statement and other evidence relating to 14:16 it, although it was withdrawn, that founded the basis for her decision to actually recommend the possible convening of a board of discipline, to deal with that issue in particular. Now, surely you can't say that that's discrediting. That is, on any view, sort of substantiating your complaint?
A. Yes, but I didn't know anything about this and as I said, Assistant Commissioner McMahon never gave me notice that she was conducting that investigation after Assistant Commissioner Nolan retired and I never met Assistant Commissioner McMahon at any point. She never came to me and said, I am dealing with your complaint, what's your view, what's your version of events.
Q. I wonder is that right, in this sense: Assistant Commissioner Nolan, he retired on 20th April 2017, she is appointed on the 26th April?
A. This is 2017, is it?
Q. Yes, 2017.
A. She is appointed.

400 Q. Yes. He retired on the 20th April 2017, so she is appointed six days later. But the investigation that had been estab1ished had already secured permission from you to use all your statements?
A. Yes.
Q. You're not the focus of the alleged breach of discipline?
A. No.

402 Q. No. So is it not up to the investigating member, within the 2007 regulations, to proceed on the basis of all of the material she had from you? I mean, it's not about you now in this sense, within the context of the regulations; it's about the wrongdoing of others, that you have said presumably everything you wanted to say in the statements?
A. Yes. Except that, when I met Superintendent Lacey and Inspector Maher, I actually pointed out, there's four members that's being disciplined but two of them shouldn't be disciplined. That they were spreading, spreading, let's say, the wrongdoing out to make it appears maybe basically less serious. Spreading it out. I pointed out to them that two of those I believe shouldn't have been disciplined in relation to that. They were two persons from the national drugs unit and I pointed out that I didn't believe they should be disciplined, because I didn't think they should have -they had done anything wrong. We11, I mean, Assistant Commissioner McMahon, I mean she notes that while she is not personally named by you and in the absence of any clear differentiation between the criminal or discipline investigation within your statement, she once again reaffirmed that her investigation was conducted with absolute professionalism, complete impartiality and progressed
as expeditiously and diligently as possible. Insofar as she seemed to express a view in relation to one of your allegations, would you agree that there doesn't appear to be any basis to suggest that she was targeting you, in what she did and what she reported?
A. But how long did that discipline -- while it was in Assistant Commissioner Mcmahon's care, while she was in charge of it, like it's dragged out again for a lengthy period of time again, from early 2017 up to 2019 then on this one, I think.
404 Q. Well, so it's a delay you're concerned with?
A. There is a delay.
Q. There is a passage of time, certainly. But have you anything to suggest that that delay was deliberately caused with the intention of punishing you for your disclosures?
A. At the time, somewhere in this period of time I am writing to Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin, trying to find out who is doing this investigation. And I'm not -- like, under the protected disclosure bill, under my understanding of $i t$, someone is supposed to keep me informed as to what's happening, and I am here writing into them because I haven't a clue who is even investigating this particular part.
406 Q. I mean, that may be an interesting question of law. you think you were obliged to be kept informed of the progress of any disciplinary inquiries as well?
A. Well, it emanates from the actual disclosure.

407 Q. But are you suggesting that a failure -- I mean, it's
not in the documents as a complaint, in terms of delay, but are you suggesting that the failure to keep you up-to-date was in some way designed to target you because of your disclosures?
A. Yes. Yes. Because like, Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin at this time I think is the acting commissioner. He obviously knows a lot about it. McMahon?
A. Yes.

409 Q. CHAN RMAN If you wouldn't mind?
A. Sure.

410 Q. CHA RMAN Now, what counsel says is, look, Assistant Commissioner McMahon conducted a disciplinary investigation, that was her job, not a criminal investigation, a disciplinary investigation and she reported that a disciplinary process be started?
A. Mm-hmm.

411 Q. CHA RMAN what was wrong with that?
A. You see, I don't know --

412 Q. CHA RMAN It doesn't matter whether you knew or not. Now you know. That sounds brusk and rude and I take it back straightaway and I apologise for it. I don't mean that in the slightest. Sorry. Leaving aside your point that you should have been kept informed, to be debated, were you entitled -- leave that aside for the moment, okay. Maybe you should, maybe you shouldn't be. But as far as it went, the disciplinary investigation recommends that disciplinary proceedings
be started. How can you make a complaint about that?
A. But I don't know, I don't know what -- I don't know what's happening.
413 Q. CHA RMAN I understand that. We have that. You should have been kept, I understand that. But as a matter of objective fact, once she came to the conclusion that there should be disciplinary proceedings, does that not --
A. I only read that in the documents.

CHA RMAN I understand that. Now that you do read it ${ }_{\text {14:23 }}$ in the documents, does that let her off the hook, except about the point about keeping you informed?
A. And there is the Ms. B incident.

415 Q. CHA RMAN And the fact that she should have been -even though it was disciplinary, she should forget that ${ }_{\text {14:23 }}$ and make sure that Ms. B is arrested or somebody else is arrested?
A. well...

CHA RMAN okay.
A. It's new evidence which has come to light from something that's being investigated since 2014.

417 Q. CHA RMAN I see your point. Okay. Thanks very much.
418 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: In any event, an incident occurred in November 2018, in relation to a phone call or several phone calls that you made on the emergency service number, which seem to relate to Assistant Commissioner Mcmahon's husband?
A. Yes.

419 Q. Were you unaware at the time then that Assistant

Commissioner McMahon was doing the disciplinary investigation?
A. I'd say I was aware at that time, yes, Judge.

420 Q. We don't need to go into the phone calls I think for any particular reason at the moment, but the fact of that led to Assistant Commissioner McMahon putting a recommendation for a peer review in the report and perhaps without which there wouldn't have been a peer review. You saw that Assistant Commissioner McPartlin came in then?
A. Yes.

421 Q. Then the matter was considered by Assistant Commissioner Sheahan, both before the appointment of the peer reviewer and after the appointment. They took a decision, which is explained by them. You have seen 14:25 the explanations given in relation to the ultimate outcome?
A. Yes.

422 Q. They will be giving evidence obviously, if necessary. But that's the outcome of it. Apart from the fact that 14:25 obviously you would have wished a different decision, you would have wished a different outcome, full blown disciplinary proceedings.
A. At this stage of the game, at that stage of the game $I$ was just wishing it would all be over, because you have 14:25 to remember, this is dragged -- for each one of these assistant commissioners that we are naming out, they've only, let's say, one to two years, whatever, each in what they are doing. Like $I$ have gone -- this is going
on for me for years.
423 Q. Yes.
A. They do appear to me to be dragging it out.

424 Q. Deliberately?
A. I think so.

We11, it seems if are you looking at it from a bureaucratic point of view, there is a sequential process going on in each case that has to be followed, which inevitably takes time.
A. Reasonable time.
Q. Reasonable time.
A. Mm-hmm.

427 Q. But is that the only basis upon which you say then that you were being targeted, because they were dragging it out?
A. That would be my case there on that. Like all these investigations, with the exception of the first one, like they call seem to be dragged out. Like it goes on, this whole episode has gone on for years, for, whatever, 8th May 2014 and we're now at the end of 2019.

428 Q. I mean, I am not defending anything, but there is no prescribed time for a sequential set of complex investigations and procedures such as have been followed. Obviously that's your major point on this then?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Two things: Dragging it out and failing to make arrests.
A. Yes.

429 Q. CHA RMAN okay. Sorry, three, failure to keep you informed?
A. Oh, yes, yeah.

430 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: I am going to pass on from that issue to issue number 20, complaints by Garda Keogh in relation to the promotion of Superintendent Murray to chief superintendent?
CHA RMAN Right.
MR. MEGU NESS: There's a statement in the additional addendum to the Finn investigation, where you say at page 322 of our papers, I don't think we need to open it, you say:
"I did not realise that the bullying and harassment
compl ai nt had gone missing until we found out that Pat Murray was on the promotion list."

Now, are you differentiating between the first and second promotion lists?
A. I can't remember off hand, but I presume it's the first promotion list. Like, you have to understand, I don't know whenever Superintendent Murray applies for his promotion, I don't know that.

432 Q. Yes. Well, according to the statement he applied on 18th January 2016 for promotion. That's at page 2062. You met Deputy Wallace on the 5th May, according to your diary and the notes of the deputy. Then, on the 16th May, you wrote to the Minister complaining about

Chief Superintendent Murray, is that accurate?
A. Yeah.
Q. You are, yes, indeed.
A. Yeah, about trying to trigger the bullying and harassment matter.
Q. Yes. But you apparently wrote on 14th June 2016 to the Minister, the police authority and GSOC, casting aspersions on his selection for promotion?
A. I don't think casting aspersions is the... I think I just --

436 Q. Well, these are his words.
A. Oh right, sorry.

437 Q. You wrote to those bodies about the possibility of him being promoted in an adverse way?
A. From my recollection, and I could be wrong, but I thought a11 I sent to the policing authority was a copy of my statement.
Q. CHAL RMAN You said he shouldn't be promoted.
A. I could -- I can't remember -- can you --

439 Q. CHAI RMAN That was the case you were making?
A. Oh yeah, of course.
Q. CHA RMAN This man should not be promoted?
A. Until the investigation is finished.

441 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. Yeah.

442 Q. MR. MEGU NNESS: There's reference to another letter of yours of the 2nd September 2016, again concerning the same issue, you would agree with that?
A. Yes.

443 Q. Deputy Daly, according to Superintendent Murray's statement, mentions the promotion issue in the Dáil on the 5th october. Do you remember that happening?
A. There was a lot of things in the Dáil, so $I$ can't remember which one.

444 Q. Yes.
A. But I accept, yes.

445 Q. According to the diary, you appear to have met them, your own diary, on 27th September 2016?
A. '16.

446 Q. That's page 13356, Volume 47 of our books.
A. November '16?

447 Q. I'm sorry, the 27th September.
A. Sorry. Yeah. Yes, that's correct, the 27th September.

448 Q. Yes. Have you noted another meeting on the 16th November about the promotion? 13358.
A. Yes.

449 Q. That seems to have been it in December in 2016. Superintendent Murray says he was informed on the 20th December that he wouldn't be promoted to chief superintendent.
A. Right.

Yes. Superintendent Murray refers to Deputy wallace apparently mentioning him and his possible promotion on the radio on 14th February 2017, does that ring a be11?
A. No.
Q. So you knew his hat was in the ring, to put it colloquially?
A. At that stage I would have.
Q. Without suggesting it was a personal animus, you thought it inappropriate that his promotion should be considered or happen until the bullying allegation had been looked at?
A. Correct, yes. From my point of view, fair procedures and due process and all, that would have been --
Q. That's your view.
A. If he were to be promoted, they should have just done the investigation first, then promote him. But while the investigation was ongoing, to promote him was -appears to be what happened.

No. In any event, according to his own statement, he then applied for promotion again on 28th March 2017. Were you aware of that at the time?
A. I wouldn't have been aware, you see, when he was applying or anything like that.
Q. Yes.
A. I wouldn't have known that at the time.
Q. Yes. Deputy wallace, according to again Superintendent Murray, on the 30th March mentions the promotion in the justice committee?
A. Is this ' 17 or '18?

457
Q. In '17.
A. I don't think I have a note of it but I would accept that.

458 Q. Yes. I think your diary records you meeting Deputies wallace and Daly in relation to the promotion on the 10th Apri1. That's at 13365.
A. 10th April 2016?

459 Q. 2017.
A. Ah sorry. Sorry. Sorry, the date of that?

460 Q. The date was 10th Apri1 2017. It seems to read:
"Met Mck Cl are Dubl in re PM "

That's Pat Murray I presume you're referring to, is that right?
A. Judge, I'm looking at my own, I'm looking at April 2017, 10th Apri1 2017, and it's just not the same, that's all, just to clarify.
461 Q. Oh! What's written in your box for the 10th April? Is that April we're looking at?
MR. KELLY: You're looking at May.
MR. MEGI NESS: I am looking at May, am I?
REG STRAR: what page are you looking for?
MR. MEGUNESS: I thought it was 13365.
A. 10th May, sorry, yes.

REG STRAR: 13365, yes.
CHAN RMAN It looks like it is May, Mr. McGuinness.
MR. MEGI NNESS: Let's go back to look at April, I will have to confess my error.

REG STRAR 13364.
CHA RMAN Portlaoise.
462 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: That must be the 10th May, that's my mistake. Apologies. Superintendent Murray says that he was informed on the 30th June then, 2017, that he was successful for promotion?
A. Yes.

463 Q. Your diary then for the next few days has -- the 3rd July, if we look at that?
A. Yeah.

464 Q. That seems to say:
" 5 pm Four Courts."

Is that:
"Solicitor Mck and Clare. Meet "somebody." Juni or counsel about Hi gh Court injunction pronotion list."
A. Yes, Joe1 Jackson, junior counse1, about high court

465 Q. Then the 5th there:
"Under pressure trying to stop promtions."

On the 9th:

> "Wite letter to GSOC. John Barrett."

And:
"Leo Varadkar promotions."

So you had, in fact, have been aware of his aspiration to be promoted from early 2016.
A. Yes.
Q. A11 through 2016. You didn't make your bullying complaint yourself until you told Chief Superintendent McLoughlin in November '16 that you were now going to make a bullying complaint?
A. Yes, but I'm not aware at that time that Superintendent Murray has applied for a promotion to chief, at that point. Like I wouldn't have known that. I am trying to make it, fair enough around the same time, the bullying and harassment complaint, but I am not aware of the fact that he has applied for promotion. I wouldn't have known that.
Q. That's why I put all those other dates to you, from writing in May ' 16 right up until he is told at the end 14:39 of September that he won't be promoted. The deputies that you were briefing were agitating it, that's a neutral word, about the issue of his promotion. was that not at your behest?
A. I would have been meeting with -- I would -- when Deputy Flanagan went to Europe, I then was working with Deputy Clare Daly and Mick Wallace, they took over.

468 Q. I don't want to use the word in a sinister sense, but you recruited them to raise the issue politically?
A. That's not fair, because there's the whole -- I am trying to -- there's the whole other investigation, the main thing is the bulk of the concerns and obviously then, a lot of what we have gone through already in relation to the bullying and harassment, I mean, of course I keep them up-to-date with everything and then I find out at some point that he is on --

Superintendent Murray is on the promotion 1ist. And I would have gone through everything, shown them documents with certain things, you know. And I would have --

469 Q. CHA RMAN Counse1 is saying that you were making the balls for them to fire?
A. Well --

470 Q. CHA RMAN They wouldn't have been protesting about Superintendent Murray's promotion from it weren't for you.
A. I provided them with the information. CHA RMAN That's right. Yes.
471 Q.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Just in terms of the sequence of events then. It got as far as this, that you were -was it you who seemed to be contemplating proceedings or seeking advice on an injunction?
A. That --

472 Q. I don't want you to reveal any legal advice obviously. 14:41
A. Yeah.

473 Q. But I mean, were you attending there as a witness or to --
A. As a witness.

474
Q. Yes. But in any event, you were in touch directly with the policing authority yourself, were you?
A. No. No, I was never directly -- from recollection, I sent them a copy of the bullying and harassment complaint. I think it was more or less, look, I have made a complaint here. I think there was -- my argument would have been due process, fair procedures, to put them on notice, perhaps this should be dealt
with first and then they can work away. But that this, there is something, there is some sort of an investigation supposed to be going on here.
Yes. But as far as Superintendent Murray is concerned, he says at page 3111 of our papers, he states that he had no involvement in the delay of the bullying and harassment investigation. He cooperated fully with it from early 2018 and he was concerned about the delay himself.
A. I saw that.

482 Q. Yes. That he and chief Superintendent wheatley queried the delay and they were anxious it be concluded as:
"...it was hanging over us."

Presumably you would understand that
A. "Over us"?

483 Q. Well, he's talking about the two of them there in the one sentence just?
A. Yes. Again, I suppose that would answer a question that was previously put to me earlier on in relation to Superintendent Murray and Chief Superintendent
wheatley. As I stated, as I said in evidence some day last week, I believe that she just hitched her wagon to Superintendent Murray and that's why she was here.
But, sorry, going back to --
484 Q. They seem to be at one in expressing a desire to have the investigation, the Finn investigation dealt with quickly, that's I think all that --

| 485 Q. | It woul <br> on7y me |
| ---: | :--- |
| A. | Mm-hmm. |

486 Q. So if Superintendent Murray is correct, he has twice applied for promotion, the second time he gets to the board, the policing authority make the decision on the 30 th June that he be promoted, of '17?
A. Right.

487 Q. I mean months before you -- Assistant Commissioner Finn 14:45 is appointed, he's appointed in November '17?
A. Commissioner Finn -- sorry, for clarification.

488 Q. Yes.
A. Commissioner Finn is appointed on?

489 Q. November '17 and meets you on 1st December '17.
A. Okay, yeah.

490 Q. So he is in fact appointed a number of months after the decision had been taken by the police authority that Superintendent Murray be promoted?
A. I'm not sure about that. You see, when Superintendent Murray is promoted, the promotion is backdated.

491 Q. Yes. No, it's backdated to 26th October 2017.
A. Right, okay.

492 Q. You're probably aware that Assistant Commissioner Finn was involved in the certification process?
A. I saw that.

493 Q. Isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

494 Q. And that's in September 2017, again before he's appointed to the disciplinary inquiry. Do you accept that?
A. Just to get the -- he is appointed in September of -this is 20 --
495 Q. '17, we're talking 2017 now?
A. Right.

496 Q. Sorry, perhaps if I go back over the three important dates. Superintendent Murray says he was successful in the competition to be appointed for promotion to become a chief super on 30 th June '17. You have no reason to 14:47 doubt that.
A. Yeah.

497 Q. Because it is the subject-matter of then public discussion. But you know that the process then requires a certification from the commissioner's office?
A. Yeah.

498 Q. Isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

499 Q. Assistant Commissioner Finn was involved in September 2017, in writing a report, in fact, to Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin?
A. Yes.

500 Q. For transmission to the policing authority?
A. Yes.

501 Q. That happened, those things both happened in September 2017?
A. Yes, I think so. I thought I saw two separate -- two different reports, or perhaps I was reading the
statement, I'm not sure.
502 Q. Yes. Perhaps we will just look at page 3967, this is Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin's statement: Just there now. It's six lines down.
"On 6th September 2017 the secretary to the policing authority wrote to Commi ssi oner Ó Sullivan seeking clearance of a number of candi dates, incl uding Pat Murray for appoi nt ment to rank of chi ef superintendent. Thi s correspondence was forwarded to assi stant commi ssi oner gover nance and accountability for the necessary enqui ries to be carried out for compl etion of the forns (A31). Assi stant commi ssi oner M chael Finn, governance and account ability, responded directly to the policing authority on 17th September 2017 with the compl et ed clearance forns for three candi dates, i ncl uding Pat Murray. I was appoi nted by government as acting commi ssi oner on the 11th September and I was aware that police authority now required the clearance forms be formed by the commissi oner or someone at deputy commi ssi oner level.

On 19th September 2017, having consi dered the report submitted by Assistant Commi ssi oner M chael Finn, whi ch showed there was nothing unf avourable on Superintendent 14:49 Pat Murray's record, I signed the clearance forms for three candi dates, incl uding Pat Mur ray, and forwarded themto the policing authority."

Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. That appears to have taken place a couple of months before the appointment of Assistant Commissioner Finn and before he works through, you say perhaps in a delayed fashion, works through the bullying complaint, from the time he met you onwards?
A. Yes. But I don't see anything then -- from when Assistant Commissioner Finn is appointed to investigate the bullying and harassment, I didn't see any letter from the assistant commissioner to the policing authority to say oh, by the way, this has cropped up and I am investigating it.
504 Q. Yes. You will have seen from Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin's statement that he says he wasn't aware of the 14:50 bullying complaint at the time he furnished the certification?
A. I don't -- I don't believe that.

505 Q. Yeah.
A. He's the acting commissioner.

506 Q. I am just asking you, you have seen that?
A. Yeah.

507 Q. Yes. He will be giving evidence in relation to that.
But it would appear that the policing authority required a report into those before they would sign off 14:50 on the appointment?
A. Yes.
Q. They got one in respect of it from Assistant Commissioner Finn, as to what was involved, what was
the timescale, etcetera, etcetera. But they seem to be happy to sign off on the appointment or the promotion in the middle of January 2018?
A. I think, yeah, but I don't think he gets promoted until March 2018. I don't think it's until March.
509 Q. We11, Superintendent Murray, in his statement, says that:
"Ms. Hall on 29th January 2018..."

Following a meeting.
".. confirms the promotion and backdates it to 26 th October 2017."

That's at page 2077 of his statement. You think it wasn't done until March?
A. I just have to -- perhaps -- Sorry, I thought I had a note of something there.
510 Q. okay.
A. I just can't find it.

511 Q. Maybe there are further things to be completed. But he says he got a call then and was told that it was -
A. Promoted.

512 Q. - being done. Can there be delays in the promotion of other formality to it?
A. I don't know. This is a new process.

513 Q. Yes.
A. In that the Policing Authority are for the first time taking over the promotions.
514 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. Where it previously was done by the Minister or the government I think.

MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
515 Q. CHA RMAN The sense you have, if I understand it, and the intention that you had with your solicitor and your contacts with these various people was, I have serious complaints of bullying and harassment against this officer and the promotion shouldn't go ahead until those matters are disposed of?
A. Dealt with, yes.

516 Q. CHA RMAN And whatever the sort of technicalities of the dates and who said what to whom, that is the essence of it, is that right?
A. That is my case.

517 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Superintendent Murray has provided his notes, I don't know have you seen them, but on page 12413, it's a note relating to a phone call with Mr. Nugent. He says:
"Phoned J oe Nugent 18: 09, no answer, left message. He phoned back 18: 55 for two and hal f minutes. He sai d he met PA as he said he woul d."

That's the Policing Authority.
"He said PA real ised they can't continue treating me in
the same fashi on by postponing. He said that they wanted to make a decision in two weeks time at their next meeting. He said he had undertaken to them and is doing the same to me, that he is going provi de them with everything they want to allow them nove on with my 14:54 case. He said he is working with M Finn to provide a report to the Policing Authority, an understanding of where Mr. Finn is with the investigation by way of provi ding an update re allegations, possible concl usions, time lines etcetera. He said the PA realised they were being unfair to me, he expected a positive out come and would contact me if anything cropped up to change that. He said he was going to incl ude details in his report to the PA of my total cooperation in every aspect of the matter. He asked I phone himon Friday, 19/1 at the same time."
A. Sorry, something has sought my attention. "He said he is worki ng" this is "he said he is working with Mck Fi nn". Basically, now I could have this wrong, but is Joe Nugent named, did I see him there? He's the CAO, or am I seeing things?
518 Q. He is the chief administrative officer?
A. Yes. Basically these are in contact in relation to this promotion.
519 Q. Yes. It became an issue for the Policing Authority, and obviously we're not inquiring into how they do their business, we are not suggesting anything about them, but they became aware of the issue and they were
keen, it would seem, to have more information, because they had gotten from you your complaint?
A. Yes.

520 Q. So, it would seem natural that they would take some time or trouble to find out what the answer was or what 14:56 was happening with them, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. Of course, at this point in time, I don't know -- I don't know --

521 Q CHA RMAN You don't know what's going on exactly?
A. -- what's going on, exactly, Judge.

CHA RMAN No.
MR. MEGI NNESS: But in terms of Mr. Finn delaying the bullying and harassment inquiry, it would seem on the timescale that he, having only come into place from the middle of November, it seems that the inquiry, which took as long as you have complained it did, doesn't appear to have been delayed. I mean, what appears to have happened is that the Policing Authority had made their decision and they themselves postponed it because of your concerns, which appears to have delayed the promotion rather than delayed the bullying inquiry?
A. Okay.

523 Q. I don't know, do you agree with that?
A. I'm not sure.

524 Q. Would you like to comment on it?
A. Em...

525 Q. I mean you will have an opportunity to hear all the witnesses?
A. Sure.

526
Q. Yes.
A. He has written to the -- he has signed off on the promotion of Superintendent Murray, to say there's no allegations against Superintendent Murray. Then the Policing Authority are writing out, and as I said, I only found this out lately.
529 Q. Yes.
A. But the Policing Authority are writing out to say, obviously, is there anything there. At no point does he come back afterwards and say, by the way, there is a bullying and harassment complaint and I am to say.
CHA RMAN I thought he did communicate.
530 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: I thought that was the point; that the Policing Authority, because he had -- I mean, it may or 14:58 may not be because he had signed a certification, but they asked him then to furnish a report on what the allegations were and what he was doing and when it would be dealt with.

531 Q
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN Meantime you were briefing Mick and Clare, who are raising it wherever they could raise it, Dáil, radio, anything else, don't promote this guy, there's a serious complaint against him. Deputies wallace and Daly, I should say, rather than referring to them by their informal names. But I mean, Superintendent Murray complains to us that you were conducting a campaign against him through the media, the Dáil, the radio and anywhere else you could do it. That's his complaint to us. You have seen that?
A. Yes.

533 Q. CHAN RMAN Leaving aside the words complaints or campaign, I mean it's true that you were trying to stop him?
A. Yeah. I wanted the complaint to be dealt with as wel1 also.

534 Q. CHA RMAR Sorry, you wanted two things, you wanted your complaint to be upheld and you wanted him to be stopped?
A. I can't disagree.

CHA RMAN That's the reality. You say, I'm right, he's wrong, he has been mistreating me. That's your case?
A. Yes.
Q. CHAN RMAN That's part of why we are here.
A. Yeah.

537 Q. CHA RMAN You say he was mistreating me and so on. So, the Policing Authority, as I understood, must have heard something of this. So they write to the Guards and say, what's up?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Am I missing that, Mr. McGuinness?
538 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: That seems to be the sequence of the to-ing and fro-ing. Obviously we have referred to some 15:00 of Superintendent Murray's notes. There's another note at 12311, it's a day before this. It's a cal1 from, it seems, Assistant Commissioner Finn to Superintendent Murray. It says:
"Call from M Finn. He said he sent me an e-mail. I said he hadn' $t$ but he said he thought he did but might not have. Said it was a courtesy call to tell re Ken Ruane said..."

He's a legal adviser.
"He said he would send me the advi ce in an e-mail and I could talk to Ken myself. He said he knew my promotion situation and wanted to do it quickly. I asked if the Policing Authority were waiting for the result and he sai d they were and it was hol ding my pronotion. I asked Inspector Farrell, who was present, to make a note of the fact that pressure was coming on from

Policing Authority to compl ete the i nvestigation."

That appears to, as it were, document what the concern was to get some report from the Policing Authority at that stage on what was happening?
A. I understand all that now. Judge, at the time $I$ don't know.

539 Q. CHAN RMAN Absolutely.
A. I'm blaming the Policing Authority. In particular, when I find out the promotion was there, I have more venom for Josephine Feely than I have for Noirín O'Sullivan at the time. Like I couldn't blame the -- I started looking at the whole front, I am fully aware of how the State was formed and up to the separation of powers and the Policing Authority. I believe the Policing Authority then go and make the promotion without writing any of this stuff. So my mind totally goes bananas and I start blaming the whole State at this stage, Judge.
540 Q.
CHA RMAN okay. As you say, you didn't know any of this stuff was going on. Yes.

541 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: I think I am going to pass on from that issue?

CHAI RMAN Thanks very much.
542 Q. MR. MEGI NESS: Garda Keogh, unless there is anything you would like to add to that.
A. I don't think so.

MR. MEGU NESS: okay.
CHA RMAN AS I say, this will be ventilated, do you
know what I mean, fully.
MR. MEGU NESS: I am passing on, Chairman, to issue -MR. KELLY: Perhaps it might be a good time to take a break.
CHA RMAN Certainly, just two seconds, Mr. Kelly. Yes.
A. Having read the documents there, just to say, I don't -- I shouldn't use the word venom, the Policing Authority, I start looking at the Policing Authority, GSOC and everybody, thinking this is all a big, you know -- having said that, my thinking at the time was not correct. Thankfully I have read all the documents and I'm back to normal in my thinking, my thinking.
CHA RMAN I understand that. And the more material comes out, obviously it affects your own understanding of what was going on and one of the things maybe that you may have considered, it strikes me that you have considered, that the Policing Authority would be coming back to you, treating you, so to speak, as a party to the affair and you may have felt something of disappointment or grievance that they weren't. I don't know whether that's right and it doesn't matter whether it's right or not, you have explained the situation as you find it when more information comes in.
A. Yes, Judge. I wrongfully assumed that the Policing Authority aren't writing to the Guards to say is there more to this or anything. I, of course, when I hear there's the promotion, I just say --
543 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. Yeah, I then form a different view, which I now can say was incorrect and $I$ was kind of blaming the whole State, all the organs of the State and everything. But I didn't understand the Policing Authority were actually doing -- no one informed me that they were. I 15:04 didn't --

CHA RMAN Does that affect your view, does that affect your -- we have 1isted complaint number 20, complaints by Garda Keogh in relation to the promotion of Superintendent Patrick Murray to chief superintendent in 2017?
A. This is all linked. CHA RMAN What we have been talking about here, does the information that you have garnered or the understanding that you have, does that change your complaint?
A. No, because Assistant Mick Finn -- from what I read, Mick Finn never --
546 Q. CHA RMAN I am not asking you to change it or anything like that. It hasn't changed?
A. No.

547 Q. CHAN RMAN okay.
A. Because I understand Mick Finn did not write in to the Policing Authority at any point, or Donal Ó Cualáin, to say, by the way, there actually is a complaint.
548 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: At the original time they certify it, is that it?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAK Anyway.
A. Or afterwards.

549 Q. CHAI RMAN wait now. Garda Keogh hold on. Let's keep this simple. Thanks very much. We have been over a lot of this ground. All I wanted was to say, given that you said, look, I now know and understand an awful lot more than I understood at the time, had I known all or some of that material, I might not have reacted as excitedly as I did at the time. You're maintaining your complaint nevertheless?
A. Yes. CHA RMAN Okay, thank you very much. Yes, we wil1 take a little break. Have we much more to do? MR. MEGU NESS: we have two further issues, chairman. CHA RMAN Very good. Thank you very much.

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

## FOLLOVG:

550 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: Garda Keogh, the next issue is issue number 21 , relating to the issue of the Tribunal order being withheld. I think you are obviously aware, the Tribunal was estab1ished on 17th February 2017, and that Judge Charleton made an order under the Acts relating to the preservation of evidence. Perhaps we will look at that. Page 11468 first. Not perhaps the best copy of it, but it refers to David Taylor's protected disclosure and Maurice McCabe also. You're probably well aware, or were you at that time, that the allegations relating to those were contained in the
first set of issues?
A. Yes.

551 Q. Then, Garda Harrison's issue was (o)?
A. Yes.

552 Q. ( n ) and ( o ) and other people who were in similar positions, and (p) was in a separate category?
A. P for parked.

553 Q. Did you pick up that phrase parked from the Chairman?
A. Yes.

554 Q. Did you attend his opening on the 27th February?
A. No.

555 Q. This order then seems to be in the context, in terms of what it requires, is the preservation of everything, but it deals more specifically with all sorts of issues which are peculiarly related to the earlier modules. Do you see that the essence of the order is one of preservation. There is a heading there down there at the bottom:
"It is hereby ordered that the Commissioner of An Garda 15:27 Sí ochána, her servants or agents preserve the following evi dence until further order."

So, it didn't have an expiry date, isn't that right?
A. It appears.

556 Q. The date that it did have related to whether the commissioner wanted to make an application in relation to the scope of the order. If we go to the second page of it, it says at the very bottom of that page:
"In the event of you wi shing to object to the terns of the within order, by reason of the period it covers and/ or the breadth of the order, or any other issue i ncl uding privilege agai nst di scl osure, application may 15:28 be made to the Tribunal sitting in Dublin Castle within ei ght working days."

So it allowed the commissioner to apply, if necessary, within that timescale if there was any problem with the 15:29 order, you see that?
A. Yes.

557 Q. That order was served on the commissioner, I think it was subject of dissemination throughout the force in terms of informing the membership of An Garda Síochána of its existence in effect.
A. Just for clarification, I think Donal Ó Cualáin is the acting commissioner at this time, 2017. No?
558 Q. No, I think Commissioner O'Sullivan had been appointed?
A. Sorry.

559 Q. Now, you didn't get the order at or immediately when it was to be disseminated?
A. No.

560 Q. Certain7y, whatever about your intentions, you didn't come and presumably you knew you didn't come within (a) 15:29 to (o)?
A. Yes.

561 Q. Because you had been consulting obviously with the deputies, and they were, as it were, negotiating for a
category of others who had similar complaints that ought not to be shut out?
A. Yeah, that's -- yes.

562 Q. You knew of their efforts and you knew that they had succeeded in that respect, obviously?
A. Yes.

563 Q. May I take it then, that you knew your one, (p), wasn't going to be dealt with for perhaps --
A. Correct, yes.

564 Q. As you have expressed it in your statement, you thought 15:30 that you should have been made aware of the order because a failure to make you aware of the order possibly prevented you from presenting your evidence in relation to another guard within an eight-day period. Is that not what you understood?
A. Em, I'm not -- I'm not -- my allegation on this is I think simple. I'm not sure about that.

565 Q. A11 right, go ahead.
A. Yeah. It's basically, I understand that when the order came out, basically it was served on me after the date of the -- after the date that it was supposed to, that I was supposed to have documents in for. There was deadline on -- I think there was a deadline for statements for the Tribunal, a deadline. So what I have, I think, is the 13th March, would have been the deadline to have statements in for part ( $p$ ).
566 Q. Yes. I am drawing your attention to the order to show you that it is an order of preservation of evidence in the categories set out and it doesn't deal with the provision of statements to the Tribunal.
A. Right.

567 Q. The order doesn't require anyone to provide statements, nor does it fix a date by which they should be provided.
A. I don't -- all I -- was there another order for module (p).

568 Q. No. What you may have in mind is, in fact, the Chairman sat in public on 27th February 2017, to announce the existence and the business of the Tribunal.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

569 Q. He made a request for those in possession of information to furnish statements, insofar as practicable, by the 13th March. It related obvious7y to modules (a) to (o). Perhaps we can look at just a few lines of the opening statement. It's a transcript of the proceedings on that date. Just to read it there, from the second last line, it says -- this is towards the end of his address:
"Today the Tribunal is calling for all those people with know edge of matters in Terns of Reference (a) to (o) incl usi ve to provide a written statement and to forward this to Elizabeth Mullan, solicitor to the Tribunal, at Dublin Castle. That statement should be detailed and should be recei ved by close of busi ness on this day fortni ght, the 13th March. In that statement any person should indi cate whet her they wi sh to assert
any formof ostensi ble legal professional privilege agai nst di scl osure of evi dence or documents or any form of ostensible.... as to privilege. If there is any such assertions and it is gi ving a compl ete account of events, then that's not ruled out, but at least we know 15:34 what needs to be expl ored."

The Tribunal goes on then to refer to its orders, orders preserving and then it talks about witnesses and interviewing. Then it talks about thereafter. And then he says finally:
"Let me finally say, Terms of Reference (p) is not now being consi dered unl ess there is some extraordinary striking similarity that someone wishes to bring in in unambi guous terns to the Tribunal's attention. For the moment p stands for parked."

So, I think that would appear to be where you got the 13th March from.
A. Possibly.

570 Q. Okay. You will have seen that the call for statements related to (a) to (o) issues. Your statement, which you did rush in, obviously deals with all of your own issues too, isn't that right, in (p)?
A. In (p), yes, and I think I got that in for the 13th March.

571 Q. You did, yes.
A. Yeah.

572 Q. But what I am going to suggest to you is that the failure to serve the preservation order, whether within a week or two, wasn't a --
CHA RMAN Didn't make any difference.
MR. MEGU NESS: It didn't make any difference?
573 Q. CHAN RMAN Garda Keogh, as far as it goes, we have the meaning of the preservation order, we have what Judge Charleton said, it would appear from what they've said that there is no basis in this complaint. That would appear to be the case. If you are happy to let that matter stand, no doubt your counsel and solicitor will be examining that matter and we can return to that matter. But on the face of it, assuming what Mr. McGuinness says is correct, it would appear that I am drawing a line through that issue. But never say never, if somebody turns up an interpretation that has an impact on that, we will revisit it. Are you happy with that? Because I don't want to be challenging you on the meaning of the statement by the Chairperson, Judge Charleton, or anything else. But it looks as if that's a mistake. It looks as if your complaint there is a mistake. Now anybody can ask you anything they like about that. They can say it's a deliberate -- or whatever it is.
A. Yes.

15:35

574 Q. CHA RMAN I am not concerned with that, but for the moment I am assuming that I'm drawing a line through it for the reason that Mr. McGuinness has just said, subject to revisiting it if counsel wishes to do so.

Is that al1 right?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Are you happy with that, Mr. McGuinness?
Q.

MR. MEGI NESS: Yes. I was just going to ask:
Inspector Minnock was asked to provide a report in relation to the matter.
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. I don't know if you recall seeing that. But he explains it in the way that $I$ have explained it, in the sense that that's how he analyses the issue. I mean, 15:37 there is no doubt that you didn't get the order when the others got the order. But Inspector Minnock then tried to serve the order?
A. This is the part, you see, I dispute, the service of the order and that version of how it was served.

577 Q. Yes.
A. That's where I have --

CHA RMAN Let's put it this way, if you want to challenge Inspector Minnock on it, Mr. Kelly and his colleagues will make a judgment on that. And if somebody objects to any challenge -- but as far as I'm concerned, if I have drawn a line through it and unless somebody says that's wrong, then you have made a mistake about it and it doesn't matter who tried to serve it or didn't try to serve it, unless there is some other relevance in their efforts to serve it. Do you follow me? who knows where this may take us but for the moment, Mr. Kelly, that seems to be the sensible thing to do, isn't it, to leave it on that
basis?
MR. KELLY: Yes, leave it for now. I will have a look at it.

CHA RMAN Have a look at it, if you wish to come back,
yes.

MR. KELLY: Yes, on that basis.
CHA RMAN And equally, somebody might say, that's all very well, that we're not dealing with number 21 , but the efforts of Sergeant Minnock to serve you, they have something to do with the inquiry, because they
demonstrate something else. I can't see that. But if somebody says that, we will debate that in due course. That seems to be the best way to leave it.
MR. KELLY: That's right, there may be some relevance. There may be some relevance in that.
CHAN RMAN which remains to be revealed to us.
MR. KELLY: Yes. The Guards clearly thought that that same date operated as this witness did, but be that as it may.
CHA RMAK okay.
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN All right, Mr. McGuinness, that seems to be sensible, doesn't it?
MR. MEGI NNESS: I should have just said for the record that obviously Inspector Minnock's statement and report, are 11488 to 11489.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
579 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Issue 22, Chairman, complaints by Garda Keogh that the Section 41 report was withheld
from him. This is a statutory report under the Garda Síochána Act of 2005, whereby the Minister for Justice can request that the Garda Commissioner provide a report within the meaning of the section. That was triggered and an interim report was sent to the Minister on 9th September 2016, followed by a full report on 11th October 2016. You may have recalled earlier, we saw Chief Superintendent McLoughlin's efforts to garner information together for the purposes of the report?
A. Yes.

580 Q. Now your complaint, it's not addressed in your statement, original statement to the Tribunal or the investigators, but it was an issue that was raised in a considerable degree of correspondence between your solicitor and the Minister, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

581 Q. Ultimately, it led to applications to the Minister under the Freedom of Information Act and under the Data Protection Act. The Minister made decisions refusing access to the documents that you were looking for, invoking different statutory grounds for doing so. Including, I think, the fact that the reports had been referred to GSOC also. I am not going to ask you about the detail of those requests or the legality of the decisions. The decisions were taken.
CHA RMAN by the minister.
582 Q. MR. MEGI NESS: By the Minister and the Tribunal isn't reviewing the Minister's decisions. You understand .

87 Q. The section 41 report?
A. I am actually not even certain on this one.

588 Q. CHAL RMAN Sorry?
A. I'm not certain on this one.

589 Q. CHA RMAN I think you are right not to be certain of
this one, because I think it has nothing to do with me.
A. Yeah.

590 Q. CHA RMAN You may be right, you may be entitled to say the Minister should have given it to me or the minister shouldn't, but it's not within the Terms of Reference as I see it. So I am inclined to drop that one, unless persuaded -- sorry.
MR. MEGU NESS: I beg your pardon.
CHA RNAN Tell me what you were going to say before I plunge in erroneously, Mr. McGuinness, you'11 save me from myself.
MR MEGI NESS: I was going to say, Chairman, that it could well and perhaps maybe should be the subject-matter of legal submissions, as to the duty of the commissioner to provide it or otherwise insofar as it relates to An Garda Síochána. But we can't involve the Minister in the sense there is no jurisdiction. CHA RMAK If it's is a report to the Minister, I would require to be persuaded -- look, if the Minister writes to the commissioner and says, I am invoking section blank of the Garda Act and requiring you to provide me with a report, that is a report, as I understand it, when it comes that is, so to speak, owned by the minister, not by the commissioner. The commissioner is there to provide the report.

Unless persuaded otherwise, I don't think that a failure by the Minister to give a garda the report is in any way a matter for this Tribunal. If somebody
suggests otherwise, well and good. I would have thought that on your behalf, but maybe I'm wrong, I am entirely wrong, that Mr. Kelly and his team have more than enough to concern themselves with than this particular little knotty legal problem, if you know what I mean.
A. Judge, I can't remember anything about this particular part.
CHA RMAN No complaint whatsoever. There is no suggestion of any complaint that you have put in. At least, sorry, unless somebody else comes to it, I am not conscious of any complaint of putting in. I am just telling you where I stand. So, insofar as it arises, we will debate it, if it has to be debated, but for the moment, Garda Keogh, you and I can leave it and 15:44 rest easy about this particular one. Okay.

591 Q. MR. MEGI NNESS: Thank you. Garda Keogh, I have finished my examination of you as regards the 22 issues, but can I ask you this: You've made obviously a large number of statements and provided the Tribunal with a large number of documents.
A. Yes.

592 Q. Can I take it that you would wish and you would be anxious for the Chairman to consider all of those statements of yours and documents for the purpose of his consideration at the end of the day in writing a report?
A. of course.

593 Q. Yes.
A. I don't think I have anything to hide, I supplied -CHA RMAN In other words, rather than producing each one and saying, do you stand over that and would you like to make it evidence, you're taking the whole lot of your complaints?

WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN You are saying, in addition to everything I have said here, I would like those to be taken in account.

WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN And anybody be a cross-examining you equally can take it that you are standing over those documents. WTNESS: Yes. There's one, just one statement, the statement that I submitted on the 13th, that one, just for the record, as I said, there's mistakes in that one 15:46 due to I thought there was a deadline and I was rushing to get that in.

CHAN RMAN okay.
WTNESS: I didn't get to read over that. I amended, to my knowledge, everything that was in that when I met 15:46 the Tribunal investigators.

CHA RMAN Right. So having made that qualification, as I say, anybody can ask you anything about it. Anything else, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGU NESS: No, Chairman. Obviously in terms of the sequence of procedure, Garda Keogh will be cross-examined then by those members represented by solicitor or counse1 and then by his own counsel and team at the end of that cross-examination and then, if
we have further issues or queries, which we hope not, hope to minimise it, we will raise that with Garda Keogh at that stage.
CHAN RMAN Raise that at the end. okay.
MR. MGGI NESS: He will be completed in his evidence, 15:47 subject to, I suppose, a very remote possibility of recall at some stage. But that's a theory.
CHAI RMAN Just let me say at this stage, Garda Keogh, thank you for taking us through all the complicated stories that we have been investigating and all the many areas that are matters of concern for you and for us here in the Tribunal. Thank you for doing that as clearly as you did and your assistance in that. while I am on that subject, I think I have to thank and express my appreciation of Mr. McGuinness's mastery of the material, which has brought us to a level of understanding of these matters that I think would not otherwise have been the case. So thank you both for your contribution to the Tribunal, I am most grateful for it.

Now, it being 15:47, cal1 me a work shirker, but I am not hugely enthusiastic about having people embark on cross-examination for 13 or 12 minutes by the time $I$ finish saying this. So I think we will break there and 15:48 we will come back tomorrow morning. Al1 right.

MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you, Chairman.
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CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
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