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

CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. MURPHY ..... 6

THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVS, ON VEDNESDAY, 23RD
OCTOBER 2019:

CHA RMAN Now, Mr. Murphy, morning.

MR. MRPHY: Good morning, Chairman, good morning,
10:31
Garda Keogh.
CHA RMAN Good morning.
GARDA N CHOLAS KEOGH CONTI NUED TO BE CROSS- EXAM NED BY

MR. MRPHY, AS FOLLOVE:

1 Q. MR. MRPH: Just to pick up where we finished yesterday, Garda Keogh, I think the position is that yesterday, at page 159 of the transcript, at question 608?
CHA RMAN Have you got that?
WTNESS: Not yet.
CHA RMAN Would you prefer the hard copy or would you prefer when we get it onto screen?
WTNESS: The hard copy.
CHA RMAN Take this one.
MR. KELLY: Judge, I just see the realtime transcript hasn't started yet, at least on my one.
CHA RMAN Has it stopped on your one? Art will be there in a moment.

MR. KELLY: Yours is out as well.
CHA RMAR Mine is out as well. How do you know that?
MR. KELLY: Just looking at it.
CHA RMAN Are you looking at mine?

MR. KELLY: No, but I am hopeful I am getting the same one as you. Not actually yours. It's just I have made the deduction that --
CHA RMAN I understand. We are up and running here. Art, would you look at Mr. Kelly's?

MR. MRPHY: Chairman, $I$ am sorry to add to the list of woes, we are in the same position.

CHA RMAN A11 right, let me just have a word. We will give him a minute or two. The poor guy is under pressure, wandering around the place. I will give you 10 minutes. I have to rise for ten minutes, because it takes me five minutes to get back to the office and five minutes to get down so, just entirely walking. We will have an early break. That's sooner than you thought you'd have. All right. I will come back at ten to, all right. Then we will get cracking again. Thanks very much.

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

## FOLLOVS:

CHA RMAN Very good, thanks very much. Now, okay, a11 set. okay. Take your time, there is no rush. Now, Mr. Murphy.
2 Q.
MR. MRPHY: Thank you, Chairman. Garda Keogh, I
wonder if you could be shown the transcript from yesterday, at page 159, please.

CHA RMAK Page 159.
3 Q. MR. MRPHY: Can I draw your attention to --

CHA RMAN Give him a chance. You have 159 there? WTNESS: Yes. CHA RMAN okay, yes.

4 Q.
MR. MRPHY: At line 7, I think you said:
"Equally the ot her guards in the station di dn't know what was goi ng on and was thi nking aml going to be reporting themfor somet hing to do with penalty points or M ckey Mbuse things. Sorry, I shoul dn't say --"

Then you go on to say at line 17:
"The younger guards in the station di dn't have a cl ue what was going on. "

Just pausing there for a moment, garda, can we take from that that you saw your function in putting this material on Pulse to letting the younger guards and local guards in the station know that this was not a Mickey Mouse matter but was a big matter?
A. Judge, still to this day the only record on Pulse -there is no record on Pulse of my original complaint. The collusion complaint or anything like that, there is no record on Pulse to this day.
Garda Keogh, if you just listen to my question. Would you agree with me that what you were doing here is letting, in your mind, the local gardaí and, in your words, the younger guards in the station know that what had reported was a big thing, not a Mickey Mouse thing?
A. I can't disagree with that. As I said, in that first month, I was under a lot of pressure in that first month.
6 Q. The trouble is, Garda Keogh, isn't it, would you agree with me, that by taking the steps that you took, in garda terms that meant that you were publishing this information to any sentient guard with access to the Pulse system in the country?
A. If I could have trusted management, Judge. The fact is, I couldn't trust management. That is also why I asked Judge McMahon to hold the DVD. At the very outset -- even today, if I was to go back to report this again, $I$ mean the reality is, and leaving out that I couldn't go to GSOC, I'd actually drive across the border and I'd try and make contact with someone in the 10:52 PSNI to get the information to Drew Harris directly.
7 Q. Garda Keogh.
A. I still couldn't go through the ranks today.

8 Q. Garda Keogh, that's not an answer to the question I asked. The question I asked was: would you not accept 10:52 that by doing what you did, in Garda terms you were effectively publishing this information to any guard in the country who had access to Pulse, not just the local grounds, not just the local young guards?
A. I wasn't thinking of every guard in the country at that 10:52 point.
9 Q. Again, we had this discussion yesterday, leaving your subjective mindset out, do you agree with me now, with the benefit of hindsight, that what you did was
effectively broadcast this to the ensure Garda membership in the country?
A. I can't agree, on the basis that I didn't trust them and I was right not to trust them. And there is no record of what should be on Pulse today from them.

10 Q. So again, Garda Keogh, that's not an answer to the question I asked. If I could ask you to be shown 122, please, of the materials. Could I draw your attention, please, to the bottom of the page, the second last paragraph.
CHA RMAN Beginning which, "such Pulse" or "I pointed out"?

MR. MRPHY: The paragraph "I poi nted out in my st at ement. . ."

CHA RMAN Yes.
11 Q.
MR. MRPHY: Volume 1, page 122 , the second last paragraph. So, this is your statement, Garda Keogh, to the Tribunal dated 9/8/2018. Can I just draw your attention to the last two lines of that paragraph, where it says, and I quote:
"Judge McMahon had specifically requested that I did not di scuss any matters rel ating to the internal police i nvestigation with any ot her members."

I think you will agree that was your evidence to the Tribuna1?
A. Yes, that's correct.

12
A. No, this isn't as simple, Judge, as a yes or no. I explained to Judge McMahon and I have already stated that Judge McMahon did -- I can't remember his words, but he very politely said that it probably wasn't a good idea or something like that. But I am sure I would have had to try and explain to him the circumstances $I$ was in within that month. Would you agree with me that you disobeyed the instruction received from him, his request that would you not discuss any matters relating to the internal police investigation with any other members?
A. It's again not as simple as that. I mean, a lot of this stuff was already in the public domain.
15 Q. You see, Garda Keogh, I have to suggest to you that it is quite simple. But moving on from that, I have to suggest to you, in the next paragraph, you say:
"I bel i eve this interference by Inspector Farrell or by Chi ef Superintendent Curran were i nappropriate interference with seni or Garda management in the i ndependent police investi gation headed by Assi stant Commi ssi oner Ó Cual ái n. "

Do you have that?
A. I see that.
Q. Again, I have to suggest to you that by your actions at that time you disobeyed the instruction you received from Superintendent McBrien, and you disobeyed the instruction you received through her from Chief Superintendent Curran?
A. Just for clarification, what instruction are you...
Q. Just to be clear, you are saying that the words were they say:
"Garda Keogh is to provide reports as to the reasons the enqui ry was made in rel ation to personal data."

Is not an instruction, is that your evidence to the Chairman?
A. No, that's not. But what's said -- this is, em -- if you wish to read out what's on page 160.
Q. Yes.
"Garda Ni chol as Keogh is to provide a report as to the reasons this enqui ry was made in rel ation to personal dat a. "
A. I supplied data to Detective Superintendent Mulcahy. 20 Q. So again I think in terms of this process, I have to
suggest to you, what's developing here is a sort of parallel universe, Garda Keogh, where you are following your own rights and your own interpretation of the CHIS system and then quoting Judge McMahon as protection, when in fact you disobeyed Judge McMahon?
A. No. That's -- I don't interpret it that way.

21 Q. Again, in relation to interpretation, Garda Keogh, I have to suggest to you that the rules which we are talking about are rules which are governed by a disciplined organisation and that you at that time were 10:57 ob1iged to obey orders?
A. It's supposed to be a disciplined organisation, and that includes the top ranks also.
22 Q. I have to suggest to you that that's an insubordinate view of a situation that ultimately at this time, the time we're talking about, you were disregarding the clear injunctions from your superiors?
A. That's is not correct. Because at this period in time, I haven't actually got -- as I said, Judge, to you earlier, $I$ have all this on my shoulders and it's not
until I meet Detective Superintendent Mulcahy that I can lift, shift this from my shoulders, give it to him.

23 Q. But, of course, it would have been possible for you simply to answer the questions directed to you by your superiors, wouldn't it?
A. I answered them as best I could.

24 Q. Again, we will have to disagree on that and it's a matter for the Chairman to decide what to make of it. Can I ask you to be shown volume 7, page 1812, please?
A. 1812?

MR. MRPHY: So, first of all, I think you're aware from this document -- you have seen it before, have you not?
A. Judge, this is the document we're referring to that I have in front of me. [INDICATING].
CHA RMAN Exactly.
MR. MRPHY: If that's form, that you have it, can I turn then to the evidence of Chief Superintendent Curran?

CHA RMAN Very good.
MR. MRPHY: Are you aware from your training as a member of An Garda Síochána of the importance of the CHIS system?
A. Yes.

29 Q. Are you aware from your training as a member of An Garda Síochána that management of the CHIS is not the sole or personal responsibility of any individual garda?
A. I would be aware of that. I know how the CHIS system works.

30 Q. Sure. Would you agree with me that it's understood that the CHIS system works for the benefit of the organisation, An Garda Síochána, as a whole?
A. I'd agree with that. As I said, Judge, I have handed persons to the CHIS system and I know how it works. This, Judge, was an exceptional circumstance, which I argue was not a CHIS matter.
31 Q. CHA RMAK Mr. Murphy will probably get to that. For the moment he says it works for the benefit of the organisation as a whole, do you agree with that?
A. I agree with that.

CHA RMAN You agree with that. Take it nice and easy in relation to the particular questions.
Q.

MR. MRPHY: Would you agree with me that the CHIS system provides for a system of control and supervision?
A. Yes.

33 Q. Would you agree with me that one member of a divisional advisory group is a member of superintendent rank with a role of controller?
A. I just can't remember that part, but I am not disagreeing with that.
34 Q. Chief Superintendant Curran will say in his evidence, that person is obliged to adopt what's referred to as an intrusive style of supervision in relation to all aspects of CHIS activity and to provide detailed reports to the divisional officer, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct. It would probably be a detective superintendent.
Q. In terms of the core issue, Chief Superintendent Curran will say that any member must have his source referred for assessment within the CHIS, otherwise the system breaks down?
A. Judge, yeah, but there's also certain criteria to qualify for the CHIS system. Judge, there's certain aspects where you can't be engaged in criminality and there's different -- there are qualification aspects as well as to who can and can't be CHISed. And as I have already stated, my view is firmly this was not a CHIS matter.
Q. Would you agree with me, by doing what you did, by placing this material on plus, you provided a predicament for the local management?
A. Judge, I had to also protect myself.

But having done that, you acted contrary to what you understood were your obligations as advised by Judge McMahon and had published this material?
A. Just can you repeat that question, please?

Yes. Rather than following the advice Judge McMahon had given you, you had published the material. whereas now you are acting in response to your superiors as if this material hadn't been reported.
A. As I said I think at the very start, you know, if this
was like a Dunnes Stores worker and a Dunnes Stores manager and I put that onto the computer system, there would be no questions about it. It was the fact it said senior Garda, high ranking officer, that's where they went bananas, Judge.

40 Q. Do you think therefore, as I understand your answer, that your standard of work is to be measured as that of a worker of Dunnes Stores $s$ opposed to a member of An Garda Síochána? Is that the attitude you had towards your work at that time?
A. No, in relation to -- this is to do with the whole heroin supply in the midlands, we're going back to this.

41 Q. You see, Garda Keogh, you know yourself from your own experience, do you not, that the management of informants is of particular importance to An Garda Síochána as a whole?
A. Sorry, can you just --

42 Q. You understand, do you not, that the management of informants is of particular importance to An Garda Síochána as a whole?
A. I understand that.

43 Q. Did you read or are you familiar with the Morris Tribunal reports?
A. I think at the very, end where he says certain aspects 11:04 are not -- if certain changes are not followed in relation to the criminality in Donegal, Judge Morris said, this will happen again.

44 Q. And all of your training, I suggest, following on from
that report indicated the importance of cooperating with the system of management of confidential information, enunciated by CHIS?
A. Well, I understand that.

45 Q. I think you agreed with me yesterday that the revised code of practice 12610, was placed on the Garda portal and was accessible to you and to every other member of An Garda Síochána?
A. It probably was. As I also said yesterday, I am not good with the Garda portal system. I'd be good on the Pulse system, but the portal system and in general computers, I just -- I'm not a technically minded person. I've no -- I never -- I mean, as a kid I was never into computer games or anything like that.
46 Q. I wonder could be shown volume 47, page 13145, please. 11:05 Do you have that?
A. 13145 .

47 Q. Yes, please.
A. which paragraph?

48 Q. If I can ask you to look at subparagraph (d). This is 11:06 a notice of grounds of appeal filed by your solicitor, Mr. Cullen, in relation to the Finn investigation. Can I ask you to look at subparagraph (d)?
CHA RMAN Would you read paragraph (d). It's all right, no, I have it. Thank you very much. No, no, 11:07 the relevant part is there. I didn't have it until a moment ago but now I have it. Thanks very much.
49 Q. MR. MRPFH: Just to show that I think you understood what was happening at the time, the way in which it's
put is:
"The findings say that Superintendent MEBrien was asking Garda Keogh to expl ai $n$ why he was checking another garda menber on Pul se."

And the answer is:
"It was because Garda Keogh was an active garda carrying out investi gations."

Just in terms of something you said the other day, did you understand yourself on the day you entered the Pulse to be a guard who was carrying out a parallel investigation in conjunction with the ó Cualáin inquiry?
A. Yeah, there's a gap, you see, there, Judge, and that gap is in that first month. Like, this is all my work from 2011, '12, '13, up until I meet -- '14, until I meet with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy on 7th June 2014, that is the day I hand everything over. My argument would be, up until that day everything is still in my hands, Judge.
50 Q. You see, I have to suggest to you that the circumstances that you created, both in relation to this incident and the incident in issue number 2 , on 18/5/2014, triggered a necessary and reasonable response from Garda management in your district?
A. Judge, they could have simplified that very easily, you
know. Instead of writing -- I have read all the documents, Judge, in relation to the to-ing and fro-ing on this thing. You see, it's like a hot piece of coal that none of them want to handle. Judge, it could have been dealt with very simply, in that I understand -from what I have read, Assistant Commissioner at the time, ó Cualáin, says he wasn't aware of this. Very simple, someone could have picked up the phone or written a letter and said there's this piece of intelligence here, Donal ó Cualáin is the investigating 11:09 member from the 9th, is it, he's appointed on the 9th May, but I don't get to meet him until the 7th June. So, all this could have been done fairly quickly and neatly in that regard.
51 Q. Can I put it to you that Chief Superintendent Curran wil1 say that your assurances that the substantive matter was being progressed through the confidential recipient process did not exempt him from his duty and his responsibility. He was obliged to enquire?
A. That's fair enough, but he could have equally written to the commissioner if was not aware that Donal Ó Cualáin was the appointed officer. He could have written to the commissioner and had this given to the appointed officer. There was a number of ways they could have dealt with this, instead of the way they dealt with it.

52 Q. Well just in the light of your last answer, where you've accepted, as I see it, that it was fair enough for Chief Superintendent Curran to enquire, do you
agree with me, therefore, if that's the case, that he was not targeting you in any way by making enquiries which he was obliged to make?
A. Initially, Judge, he was entitled, of course, to enquire as the manager of the CHIS system, is this source a CHIS source. But as I stated and I think I put it down in writing from the very start, this is not a CHIS matter.
53 Q. Again, he will disagree with you in relation to that issue. But I just want to understand this for the purpose of the chairman, because it appeared in the earlier phase of your evidence that you were making accusations of targeting, but now I understand you to accept that there was a legitimate duty to enquire on the part of Chief Superintendent Curran and Superintendent McBrien, is that the case?
A. There's a lot of -- there's a whole lot --

54 Q. CHA RMAN This is an important question.
A. Yes.
Q.

CHA RMAN I would certainly like a straight answer.
A. Yes.
A. I do.

57 Q. CHA RMAN From what you said earlier, it looks like you're saying it was okay for chief Superintendent Curran to make the enquiry?
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN That's what you said a few minutes ago?
A. Yes.

59 Q. CHA RMAN And Mr. Murphy is saying, if that's the case it wasn't targeting?
A. No, but --

60 Q. CHA RMAN Do you follow me? That's all, I just want to clarify where we are going here. What do you say to 11:11 that?
A. I have already replied to say it wasn't a CHIS matter and therefore --
61 Q. CHA RMAN No, no, don't let's get into this for a second. Sorry. Let's take it slightly differently. 11:12 Suppose he believed, wrongly, erroneously, suppose he believed it was a CHIS matter and suppose he was mistaken in that, was it okay to make the enquiry?
A. The initial enquiry, yes.

62 Q. CHA RMAN So the initial enquiry was okay? 11:12
A. Yes.

63 Q. CHA RMAN Is that right? I mean, I am not trying to draw you into making a concession or a comment, I simply want to be clear I know what you are saying?
A. In the initial enquiry, I would accept he is the CHIS
manager. But when I write back and I give my explanation, and I give a good lengthy letter at some stage to him, Judge.
64 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes.
A. And I do explain at the bottom -

## 65 Q. CHA RMAN okay.

A. - that I will fully comply with him after the investigation and comply with --
66 Q. CHAN RMAN No, just so we know where we are. The
initial enquiry by Chief Superintendent Curran, you say that's all right?
A. Yeah.

67 Q. CHAN RMAN You've no problem with that initial one.
A. The initial enquiry.

68 Q. CHAN RMAN The initial enquiry. Later developments are another day's work. okay, so the initial one is all right?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Okay, thank you. You have problems with the 11:13 later ones?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN okay, very good.
MR. MRPHY: I take it you agree, therefore, that Superintendent McBrien, against whom you make no complaint, also acted reasonably in relation to this matter?
A. In that, yes.

71 Q. Chief Superintendent Curran will say in his evidence that armed and burdened with the duty he had, that he was concerned as to whether he was compliant with HQ directive 12610, because what was happening here, as you said it, was unique and different?
A. Well, I hope we're all agreed on that part of it.

72 Q. But he considered that your conduct also was highly unusual?
A. Well, Judge, the question has the answer in this particular thing. In this particular thing the question actually answers -- contains the answer.

73 Q. Well if we look at --
A. where --

74 Q. CHA RMAN That sounds like something of a riddle and I think I am able to work it out, but don't let me work it out and get it wrong. Tell me. Explain.
A. The previous question -- sorry, Mr. Murphy.
Q. MR. MRPHY: Sure. Just to help you with the question. Could you turn to volume 7 , page 1787 ?
A. If you could just ask the question you previously asked?

76 Q. I am going to ask that question again but with the benefit of the document, so you can see it?
A. What page?

77 Q. 1787, volume 7.
A. which paragraph?

78 Q. Do you have the page?
A. I have 1787.

79 Q. Can you look, please, at the middle of the page? CHA RMAN what is the paragraph beginning?
MR. MRPHY: It begins "It should be borne in mind...". 11:15 do you see that?

MR. KELLY: Sorry Chairman, I don't see it. The number I am looking at is 1787, have I got that wrong?
CHA RMAN No, that's correct. If you look at the paragraph beginning "It should be borne in mind", you may have to do some scrolling.
A. Judge, just before $I$ try to read it, who is the author of this report? Is it me?
MR. MRPHY: Chief Superintendent Curran.
A. Okay, sorry.
Q. Yes.
A. okay.

81 Q. Okay. So do you see there that in that paragraph and in the subsequent paragraph, Chief Superintendent Curran is indicating that in his mind at that time the potential implication of having this unresolved was that if the intelligence was accurate, that further criminality was possible and had to be addressed. He communicated with the assistant commissioner in the eastern region, who subsequently requested clarity and compliance with HQ directive 12610, do you see that?
A. I see, yeah. Subsequently requested clarity, yeah, yeah.
82 Q. Just to be clear: what this shows is not some kind of vengeful attack on you, but I have to suggest to you it shows Chief Superintendent Curran trying to ensure that this is actually locked down, that there is effectively confirmation that this matter is being investigated and that there is no looseness in the system in relation to 11:17 the treatment of an informant. That was his duty. Would you agree that that was something he was obliged to do?
A. At the start -- at the start we've already agreed on the initial thing, at the start. But by July 2014 the criminal investigation is in full flow at this stage. I mean, everyone else knows, all the gardaí know what's going on because the investigation team are in Athlone. The chief in Mullingar is certainly aware of what's
going on.
83 Q. Well, would you turn back please, just again to assist you, to the previous page 1786 . The second last paragraph, beginning:
"In around December 2014/J anuary 2015..."
A. Yes. If I'm reading into this...

84 Q. Do you see here what's taking place is that -- he will say in his evidence that, in fact, he was in contact with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy in December and January of 2015, do you see that?
A. I see that.
intelligence entry that were being pursued by Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin?
A. Judge, from what I've read in the documents, Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin claims he doesn't know anything about the Pulse entry.

86 Q. You will see there in the paragraph where he was talking to Detective Superintendent Mulcahy.
A. Yes, but I'm trying to link then, how come Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin --

87 Q. Don't mind the link for a moment, just in terms of what 11:18 was done.

CHAN RMAN Before we move, there's a word missing.
"Confidential --" if you look at the last ful1 line,
that's significantly relieved, assuaged, do you understand that? Look at the last full line of the paragraph that Mr. Murphy has referred you to. This is Chief Superintendent Curran, there is a word missing and I think it has to mean, that significantly relieved 11:19 or some word like that, relieved my concerns, do you follow?
A. Yes.

88 Q
CHA RMAN Just so we all know where we are going?
A. Yes.

MR. MRPHY: I am obliged.
CHAN RMAN Now, Mr. Murphy.
89 Q. MR. MRPHY: Just what actually what actually happened. what actually happened was, Chief Superintendent Curran did make enquiries beyond you, to satisfy himself that this matter was under investigation elsewhere. And again I have to suggest to you, what he did there was totally reasonable, proportionate and didn't involve targeting of you?
A. At the start?
A. At the start, I've agree with you in relation to the start.
91 Q. This isn't the start, this is December.
A. No, December -- December '14 is not the start.

92 Q. Yes.
A. May '14, May/June '14.

93 Q. Whatever time this was done, would you agree this is what you said a few moments ago was --
A. Sorry, you said this is the start.

94 Q. CHAI RMAN No, no, no. There is confusion here. You're agreed that at the beginning, that the first enquiry by Chief Superintendent Curran was reasonable.
A. Yes.

95 Q. CHAL RMAN And in accordance with his duty?
A. Yes.

96 Q. CHA RMAN You have agreed with that?
A. Yes, Judge.

97 Q. CHA RMAN But you say, what happened later constituted 11:20 the matter that you're complaining about as targeting or discrediting?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN More specifically targeting. Okay. Mr. Murphy now moves to December '14/January '15 and
Chief Superintendent Curran says, look, I have now been in touch with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and he has given me information about the direction of the inquiry, i.e. that it's going to cover this area or something like this area, and that reassured him?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN That's what he's saying?
A. Yeah.

100 Q. CHA RMAN And what Mr. Murphy is asking is, was that not reasonable of Chief Superintendent Curran? That's what he is saying. That's what he is saying. I'm not saying I agree with it or I don't agree with it because that's not my business. But that's the question. That's where we are at this moment. It doesn't concern

Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin or anybody else, Chief Superintendent Curran. Now, what do you say to that?
A. My answer is, that is fair, but it could -- should have been done earlier. Like we're talking about December '14 to January '15, it could have been done months prior to that.

MR. MRPHY: You see, prior to that, as we know from the correspondence, he has been looking for confirmation through the local channels, through Superintendent McBrien to you?
A. But I have written what I wrote on it, so I mean he would have been aware far earlier than December '14 to '15, so he could have done what he done in December '14 in around perhaps July of 2014.
102 Q. Garda Keogh, will you agree with me that what's contained here shows clearly no harassment or targeting of you, but rather an enquiry into matters the chief superintendent had to enquire into?
A. I'm not so sure about -- I just can't agree on this particular part of it. I am not so sure on that.
103 Q. Can I ask you then to turn, please, to Volume 7, page 1787?
A. Sorry.

104 Q. 1787, yes. Do you see the final paragraph "t her ef ore..." ?
A. See the what?

105 Q. The paragraph "Ther ef ore...". Can I just put it to you on behalf of Chief Superintendent Curran that he rejects any assertion by you that he sought to target
or to discredit you together with other members of the senior management?
A. Judge, that's his case and I have given evidence on that.

Exactly, and I am putting this to you because I must do so. I put it to you that in those circumstances, the reasons that he had to outline and had to enquire into those matters were because it was his duty to do so in accordance with the relevant principles under CHIS and to ensure that all matters were handled through the appropriate channels, nothing more?

CHA RMAN what do you say to that?
A. Well, Judge, I think we covered that. My argument is, in the first part he was totally entitled to do what he did, but after that he could have taken the course of action that he does in the previous thing, in December '14/'15, he should have done that in July '14 and then that would have ultimately -- it would have had the same outcome had he have done it months earlier, Judge.
MR. MRPHY: Garda Keogh, again we obviously disagree and it's for the Chairman to decide on that. But can I just say to you, in relation to both issues, 1 and 2, the same principles apply. What you have here is a situation, you have done something unusual, you have done something outside the norm and your superior officers have to enquire into it. Ultimately, the matter ends, isn't that correct?

CHA RMAN Is there not a difference, sorry, just help me, is there not a difference? I mean the CHIS system
applies in respect of the Pulse entry. You have been exploring that.
MR. MRPHY: yes.
CHA RMAN Garda Keogh agrees to an extent, at the beginning at least, in regard to the CHIS, in regard to 11:25 the entry. As he said earlier, he doesn't agree that it is correctly a CHIS matter. So there is a disagreement about that question. But on the other one, surely there's a difference, Mr. Murphy. It's a different situation, there's a complaint.
MR. MRPHY: yes.
CHA RMAN They pursue it and they say, why did you do that?
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN There is no CHIS question there.
MR. MRPHY: No, but there's a duty question. Perhaps I should elaborate on that.
CHAI RMAN I think that might be helpful, certainly. Do you understand?
A. I do.

108 Q. CHA RMAN I mean, they are related, they're in the same 24 hour period?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN But there are some distinctions. okay. Thanks, Mr. Murphy.
109 Q. MR. MRPHY: So in relation to the second matter, the point is that ultimately, $I$ have to suggest to you that in relation to the second issue, that once again it was legitimate and reasonable for the superiors in the
station to investigate what this meant, what the second entry meant?
CHA RMAN what the query meant?
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
A. This is in relation to the Pulse check of Garda A? CHA RMAN yes.
Q. MR. MRPHY: correct.
A. Yes, okay.

CHAN RMAN What do you say? Mr. Murphy is suggesting to you that the Garda enquiries as to why you had made the check, that those enquiries to you, why did you make the check, he is suggesting that they were reasonable, what do you say to that?
A. Judge --

112 Q. CHAI RMAN Do you follow me? 11:26
A. Yeah.

113 Q. CHA RMAN As I say, I'm just trying to summarise what the question?
A. Judge, I'm not sure if or when, just from memory, did I know the way that Garda A made a complaint? I don't know, I'm not sure. Superintendent McBrien perhaps, may have -- I just can't remember, Judge. I can't remember everything that --
114 Q. CHAN RMAN I understand. Don't worry about that. But at some stage Garda A realised that you -- and you are able to check who has checked?
A. Yes.

115 Q. CHA RMAN okay, you can trace the check. So Garda Keogh has been checking up on me on Pulse, I don't like
that and I protest about that, blah-blah-blah, and he writes his letter. You don't know about that, that's not important. Mr. Murphy is asking you about the response of the authorities. Superintendent McBrien writes to you and says, why did you make the enquiry?
A. Yes. I explained this in evidence last week, that is the first step that any guard in any case would do, would be -- like, I've to go and I'm going to meet with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy, I did go onto Pulse, just to see was there anything on Pulse, it could have been a minor little thing. As I said, like, a -- it could have been as simple as a traffic accident.
116 Q. CHAI RMAN Yes.
A. Some person in the car --

117 Q. CHAI RMAN Let me stop you for a second. Somebody may 11:28 say it was improper of Garda Keogh to make that query. Somebody may say that. If they do that, we will deal with that?
A. I dispute --

118 Q. CHA RMAN No, no, we don't need to -- I am just trying 11:28 to get something out of the way before I ask -- I am sorry. I am sorry. But the question is: Was it reasonable in your opinion, was it reasonable -Mr. Murphy is putting to you that it was reasonable of the guards in the circumstances to write to you and say, why did you make the query? That's his question. If I understand it, that's his question. Tell us the answer to that?
A. We know Garda A now had made a complaint.

| 119 | Q. | CHA RMAN It doesn't matter whether he made a complaint or didn't make a complaint. A11 we is, out of the blue you get a letter saying, why did you make a check on Garda A on 18th May 2014. Now, Mr. Murphy is saying to you that was a reasonable enquiry for the senior Gardaí to make, what do you say to that? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A. | My answer to you, Judge, is the same that I told Detective Superintendent Mulcahy. |
| 120 | Q. A. | CHA RMAN Just tell me again, just tell me straight. simple. What is the answer to that? <br> I had to check Garda A before go to make this -- |
| 121 | Q. | CHA RMAK That's not an answer to the question. That's not the answer to the question. Sorry, I don't want to be difficult. Let me explain. What's in my mind? I will tell you: Was it reasonable for Superintendent McBrien and, if necessary, behind her, Chief Superintendent Curran, to be writing to Garda Keogh saying, why did you make the enquiry? That's the question. No, don't answer me for a minute, because I am not asking the question yet. That's the question in my mind, did the senior officers act reasonably? That's the question in my mind. So, Mr. Murphy is suggesting to you that it was reasonable of them to say, why did you take the enquiry. Now, do you understand the question? |
|  | A. | I do understand. I am trying to think -- |
| 122 | Q. | CHA RMAN I know it's a bit complicated, because we are a sort of level away from it. But was it reasonable of Superintendent McBrien to make the query |

to you?
A. On the basis that she got the complaint from Garda A, I would say yes.

123 Q.
CHA RMAN On any basis whatsoever. You have made a check, is it reasonable for her to say, why did you make the check?
A. Well, Judge, a lot of checks were made on me from guards and no one has ever made an enquiry in relation to who checked me.

CHA RMAN So essentially you say it wasn't reasonable because nobody else made a check on you before. Nobody else queried you before about a check that you had made on Pulse?
A. Yes.

125 Q
CHA RMAN Is that right?
A. Yes.

126 Q. CHA RMAN I am just trying to understand?
A. Yes, Judge.

CHA RMAN okay. So you say, no, it wasn't reasonable?
A. Just for clarification, I am not sure when I would have 11:31 become aware of it if Garda A made a complaint. If he made a complaint then, as $I$ know he had, then, of course, $I$ 'd say they were entitled to on that matter.

127 Q. CHA RMAN Thank you for clarifying that. okay. You say, if Garda A did make a complaint, we know he did make a complaint.
A. Yeah. I don't know when I knew, found out that. CHA RMAN It doesn't matter when you knew. I am sorry, I don't mean to snap at you. So we know he did
make a complaint. We know that Superintendent McBrien responded to that complaint by writing to you and saying, why did you make it?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

129 Q. CHA RMAN In those circumstances -- I am not suggesting any answer to you, in those circumstances, do you say that it was reasonable or not reasonable?
A. I would accept, I would accept that's fair enough but, em... I would accept that's fair enough, but equally, I had to check Garda A before I went to...

130 Q. CHA RMAN You justify the fact that you made the check and you say, I had a good reason to make the check?
A. Yes.

131 Q. CHA RMAK And I don't care what anybody says, I am standing over that point?
A. Yes, Judge.

CHA RMAN Okay. I understand, it's a somewhat more subtle zone to be questioning whether it was reasonable. Okay, I have that answer. Thank you very much. Now, I am sorry for droning on for so long about 11:33 that. Thank you for your clarification of that.

132 Q. MR. MRPHY: Thanks, Garda Keogh. Just in light of what you now said, can I ask you to turn to Volume 47, page 13145, please. If I can ask that you be shown that. Do you have that, Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.

133 Q. Do you have that page?
A. Yes.

134 Q. If I can ask you to turn down to subparagraph (d) now.

Just to explain what this document. This document, it's Mr. de Bruir, the independent expert's summary of the complaints you were making about the Finn investigation. He is summarising what you said and then sometimes he refers to what is said by other people. But first of al1, in subparagraph (d) he says:
"The finding by Finn says that Superintendent MEBrien was asking Garda Keogh to expl ai $n$ why he was checking another garda on Pul se. The answer is that Garda Keogh 11:34 was an active Garda carrying out investi gations."

So he puts forward the question and he puts forward the response. Now, first of all, can I ask you, is it your evidence that in your mind at that time, when you made the entry, you were a guard, an active guard carrying out investigations?
A. Judge, this was my investigation at that time. And it doesn't become --
A. Yes.
Q. MR. MRPHY: Then, Garda Keogh, to come back to the words that you've used, because words matter, you have said this was "my investigation". But will you accept, would you not, that you were a guard at the time assigned to Ath1one Garda Station under the control of Superintendent McBrien?
A. Yeah. Oh yeah, of course.

137 Q. She hadn't assigned you to do any investigative duties,
isn't that correct?
A. Nobody knew sure what was going on, at the top levels, that I was going to -- what I was going to do, Judge.
138 Q. As at that time Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin hadn't asked you to carry out an investigations either?
A. Excuse me? Sorry, can you just repeat that?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Can you explain to the Chairman then, if you turn over the page, please, to volume 47, page 13146. I have to suggest to you, what we are going to look at now is your appeal against Assistant Commissioner Finn and this is what was said on your behalf at that time:
"By seeking to cl ose down Garda Keogh's report on Pul se, taking it as a di screte issue and preconditioned to any further intelligence gathering, it was ef fectivel y stymi eing such an operation."

Just pausing there for a moment.
CHA RMAN "Such investigation".
143 Q. MR. MRPHY: would you accept that Superintendent MCBrien, against whom you made no complaint, did nothing to stymie any investigation you were carrying on, whether it was authorised or not?
A. No, Superintendent MCBrien didn't, no.

144 Q. Now, the next paragraph might help us to understand, it says:
"A standard stratagemis empl oyed here, where an el ement only of the complaint is isol at ed as the essence of the complaint and then defended where a specific allegation in its totality is ignored."

Can you help the Chair to understand what your complaint was there?
A. Judge, I can't just recall.

CHA RMAN Consider yourself forgiven. Consider yourself relieved of that obligation. Sometimes,
sometimes you give instructions and sometimes your advisers, in enthusiastic pursuit of your case, may express themselves sometimes in colourful, attractive but not altogether crystal clear terms. So, we will have to crack what we think of that one. And this, after all, is what is written on your behalf -- sorry, this is Mr. de Bruir's understanding of what your side wrote in your defence, in your appeal. So if you feel like a bit of literary exegesis, then be my guest, but

145 Q.

I don't expect you or require you to do it.
MR. MRPHY: Just one more question on that point. Can I ask you to turn to subparagraph (f), where it says:
"Thi s is an example where i mperatives vaguel y i mportune, better policing, more inf ormati on et c, performed..."astrol ogi cal thi nki ng" whilst being mandated with menaces solacking in specificity that it is effectivel y meani ngl ess."

Now, that's a complicated sentence but can I ask you to agree with me -

CHAI RMAN Are you a popper or victim style man, I suppose. Everything is either a cloud or a what, everything in the world is a cloud or a something or other, or a machine.

MR. MRPHY: I only make this point, Chairman, to Garda Keogh because I think it's clear from the evidence today that Garda Keogh's has taken a much more reasonable view of the case than he did earlier on. CHA RMAK We11, that's a judgment, Mr. Murphy. As I say, my respect and enthusiasm, I think that's the cloud thinking, that's popper's cloud he's talking about there. I think we will leave that, thanks very much.

MR. MRPHY: Can I summarise points 1 and 2?
CHA RMAK Certainly, yes, go on.
MR. MRPHY: Garda Keogh, what I simply say in relation to points 1 and 2 is that individuals who I represent
who are connected with 1 and 2, Chief Superintendent Curran will say all they did was their duty, they didn't seek to target you, they didn't seek to hurt you, they didn't seek to interfere with any investigation you were carrying out, they just tried to 11:39 do their duty, nothing more and nothing else. Would you agree with that?
A. That's why we are here, I suppose. I haven't agreed on everything, I have agreed on certain things, Judge.

## 147 Q. CHAI RMAN Yes.

A. I hold my view on certain things.

CHAl RMAN Yes. Mr. Murphy, let me just say, I understand that a submission, so to speak, a summary of what you say is the result of the exchanges that you have had with the witness. But I think it's reasonable 11:39 for him to say, well, look, I have said what I have said. what implications or conclusions arise, it's difficult for a witness to say, well, that's a reasonable conclusion, a reasonable summary of all my thinking.
MR. MRPFH: Chairman, absolutely. No, I am merely putting forward at the end of that process what my client will say.
CHAN RMAN The essential point you're saying is, that you're clients, Superintendent McBrien and Chief Superintendent Curran --
MR. MRPH: In fact, Chief Superintendent Curran is my client, McBrien is not.
CHA RMAN I'm sorry, did no more than his duty in the
circumstances?
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
148 Q. CHA RMAN Well, that's is what he says. You have probably been over that ground and you have said yes to a point and no to a point.
A. Yes, Judge.

CHA RMAN He should have done it earlier, that's your case. So we will deal with that.

MR. MRPHY: Thank you, Chairman. If we move on to issue number 3, please.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. MRPHY: In relation to issue number 3, can I ask you first of all --
CHA RMAN Would you like a break before we go to issue number 3 .

WTNESS: No.
CHA RMAN Very good, thanks very much. Issue number 3, yes.
149 Q. MR. MRPHY: Could I ask you to be given volume 30, please.
A. The page, please?

150 Q. Could you turn, please, to page 8683. Do you have that?
A. Yes.

151 Q. If I can just ask you to turn please to the next page,
8684. This is a document we saw last week, which was shown to you by Mr. McGuinness. I think you told us last week, on the second day, day 100 , at page 37 of the transcript, that you have no complaint against

Garda Treacy?
A. That's correct.
A. That s correct.
Q. In terms of the report that is contained from Garda Treacy, you can see that at page 8684 she is setting out what she recalled was said to her by Ms. O'Neill?
A. Yes, we covered all this in detail.
Q. I am hoping to do this rather quickly, if I can. But I think the position is, is it fair to say that by what you indicated last week, you accept that you have no complaint against Garda Treacy and the enquiry into what Ms. O'Neill said actually stemmed from what Garda Treacy said, not from what the top management said?
A. Sorry, can you repeat that part? Or where is that?

154 Q. Sure. Would you agree with me at the start of this particular issue is the report made by Garda Treacy, that's where it starts?
A. The paper trail starts there.
A. No.
Q. You accept that Garda Treacy is the person who effectively initiated this enquiry?
A. Judge, I have explained that this was a very simple thing. This was something like Chinese whispers, where 11:43 this comes out on this particular matter. I think I have explained to you the best even, you know, how that -- just, wording and everything, just minor little bits of wording got mixed up in relation to this and this is
triggered.
157 Q. Garda Treacy, you're not saying for a moment -- sorry, Garda Keogh, you're not saying for a moment that Garda Treacy was told to say this by somebody else?
A. oh no.

158 Q. You accept she is --
A. No, no, no I never said that. No.

159 Q. You're not saying that?
A. No.

160 Q. So we understand this comes from Garda Treacy, it's her 11:44 recollection of events, nothing more, nothing less?
A. Yeah.

161 Q. Thank you. So in that situation, I have to suggest to you, that a superior officer in the station, confronted with an ordinary Garda member saying, I have witnessed 11:44 the following things, as are set out on page 8684 , was reasonably entitled to enquire into what had taken place?
A. Oh yes.

162 Q. If you look, please, back at page 8683, can I suggest 11:44 to you that part of what would be what chief Superintendent Curran did on that page, where he said:
"Pl ease ensure that a statement is obtai ned from Ms. O Neill in rel ation to the information di vul ged to 11:44 Garda Treacy on 28th May 2014."
A. I see that. But, Judge, on this particular -- where they veer off here on this, they become very eager to
get a statement about me as opposed to whatever it is, Ms. O'Neill, this is solved or whatever, or whatever it is, what she's saying. This is where there starts to be -- and this is -- it appears to be Chief Superintendent Curran. And when you put all -- I know we are dealing with each one of these things one at a time, but like, for me it's death by a thousand cuts, when you put all these, amalgamate them all together, Judge.
163 Q. Garda Keogh, can we take the question of perception again. That's the perception you've outlined repeatedly to the Chairman. But looking at the reality, the two documents we have looked at, 8683 and 8684, represent basic communication between a guard and a response from a chief superintendent. There's nothing wrong with those communications, is there?
A. There's not -- em, Like it's not as simple as a guard responding to a chief superintendent, even the question is inaccurate. It goes through the guard, to the sergeant, to the inspector, the super, to the chief.

164 Q. Would you agree, even taking this circumstance away and saying you weren't involved in this at all, and 1et's say this wasn't in Ath1one, if an ordinary Garda member reported to her superior that something which may have revealed coaching by another member to a civilian witness had taken place, would you agree with me that as a matter of policing that would need to be investigated, checked out to see whether it was correct or not?
A. Yeah, of course. How could anyone say otherwise?
Q. Well, thank you. So, I am just simply saying, applying that to the present case, that's what happened here. Now, I know that you take exception to the fact that there were further enquiries, but can we deal with that 11:46 now. Could you be shown volume 3, please?
A. Just the page, please?
Q. Page 487, please.
A. It's the statement of Inspector Curley.

167 Q. Again, this is a document we saw last week?
A. Yes.

168 Q. To try and shorten matters, can I just say that in relation to this statement, if you turn to page 488 , please. On the second paragraph, can I draw your attention to the fact that this is Inspector Curley's statement and he says that he was assigned the task to interview Olivia O'Neill regarding information divulged by her to Garda Stephanie Treacy. That on 30th March 2014, he says:
"I met with Oivia O' Neill. I invited her to make a statement outlining the details of the information di vul ged and she declined. I was aware that such inf ormati on was di vul ged. I was asked for a copy of the report of Garda Stephani e Treacy. "

Just taking that paragraph, would you agree with me that indicates that Inspector Curley was directed to take a statement?
A. He was directed, I accept he was directed to take a statement.
Q. And would you agree there is nothing in that statement to indicate he was directed to take a statement that was hostile to you?
A. I don't know what -- was there a statement taken? I don't think there was a statement taken.
Q. No, here we have the situation, in terms of the invitation to Ms. O'Neill, the invitation was declined?
A. Yes. So he couldn't have taken a hostile statement to me if he --
Q. Again, Garda Keogh, can we stop for a moment. I have to suggest to you, you have no evidence to suggest that Inspector Curley was told to go and get a hostile statement, a statement hostile to you. Instead, he was 11:49 told to invite Ms. O'Neill to make a statement and she declined to do so. That's what actually happened.
A. Judge, em, I'm not sure. Like, the question is confusing, in that it has, you know that he was sent tout take a hostile statement, or took a hostile statement when there's no statement taken at all. So...

172 Q. CHA RMAN Counsel is suggesting, Mr. Murphy is suggesting that the approach here was reasonable and proper and not wrongful or targeting. In other words --
A. Again --

173 Q. CHA RMAN No, hold on, listen to me for a second. I'm sorry. That is what he is suggesting. And he says,
look, Garda Treacy made a statement, in light of that statement the chief superintendent said, follow it up, get a statement from Ms. O'Neill. Inspector Curley went out and Ms. o'Neill didn't want to make a statement. End of story. So, Mr. Murphy is asking you, was that not reasonable?
A. Judge, it's some period of time, I've already written on this and I have clearly set out what I have given in evidence that -- I didn't word it as this, just may perhaps --

174 Q. CHA RMAN Take your time.
A. -- a misunderstanding or something, but, you know, I have written on this at some point.
175 Q. CHAD RMAN I understand. My recollection of your evidence is that you drew a distinction between this case and the Liam McHugh case?
A. oh major.

CHA RMAN And you were careful to say, as I recal1, but I may be wrong and I don't want to be giving evidence, but I recall that you said you could put all this down to a misunderstanding. In other words, that olivia O'Neill, with knowledge that she may have -sorry, with opinions, beliefs, suspicions or knowledge that she may have possessed, may have interpreted what you said in a way that you didn't intend to say and so she made a statement and that the whole thing could well be a misunderstanding. That's is my understanding that you said. But Mr. Murphy is asking you, would you agree, he is asking you to agree that the steps that
were taken by the gardaí, including Chief Superintendent Curran, were reasonable?
A. Again, on the first attempt or first approach I'd say, yes. Again, on the first attempt were reasonable.
177 Q. CHA RMAN Tell me more about that.
A. I understand there was a second then. I write at some point on this and I say -- I can't remember what I wrote but I wrote, I addressed this in writing. But my understanding is then there was a second attempt to take statements from Ms. O'Neill.

178 Q. CHA RMAN So as far as this went with Inspector Curley going out, you are happy enough, you're not complaining about that?
A. The first part of it.

179 Q. CHA RMAN okay. But you think that there may have been a second approach to Ms. O'Neill and if and insofar as there was a second attempt, you say that goes beyond the line?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MRPHY: And again I have to suggest to you --
MR. KELLY: Judge, I should just say, that as I read the papers, $I$ note that, if one is looking at the statement, $I$ think what's missing from the question, with respect, is, on the face of it there does not seem 11:53 to be anything hostile. Then you had raised, Judge, the question of misunderstanding. One of the issues for the Tribunal may be whose misunderstanding. CHAN RMAN Mr. Kelly, I understand, I am trying to
remember the evidence from last week and the evidence given by Garda Keogh. If I am wrong, please point out that I am wrong or anybody will point out that I am wrong, but my memory was that he -- Garda Keogh, my memory was that you were looking at this and saying, the whole thing could well have been a misunderstanding, based on Ms. O'Neill's beliefs, opinions or suspicions about what was going on and something she interpreted in what you said, so she may have understood -- that's what I thought you said. But 11:54 I mean, I am not even saying that that's right.
A. No, it's even more simple I think, in that it's -Judge, just if I can just try, it'11 only take a minute to explain.
181 Q. CHA RMAN Take a minute, yes, it's your evidence we are concerned about, not mine.
A. Judge, Ms. O'Neill comes to the -- as I said, there's an incident up there, she's sent down by whatever guards that are at the scene.
182 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. She arrives to me, she's talking about Ms. B and then she goes -- she lives up beside Ms. B, so whatever she knows, she knows. She then veers off in the conversation. At some -- I say -- the crux of this particular thing is, I say to her, name names and name guards. So she goes in to give her statement to Garda Treacy and she obviously names names and names a guard and when she names the guard, Garda Treacy obviously said, who told you to say that, and she said, Garda

Keogh, or whatever she said. which all is actually --
Q.

CHA RMAN I understand.
A. Which all is true in a sense. I just didn't tell her the name of the guard, which is the matter they --
CHAL RMAN That's what I am understanding. Anyway, you 11:55 say up to the point, as far as you're concerned, of Inspector Curley going out and speaking to Ms. O'Neill, you say that's all right, but any further pursuit of Ms. O'Neill you would consider unreasonable and targeting?
A. And I am now aware there was a second time, Judge. CHA RMAN Very good. That's what he says, Mr. Murphy. MR. MRPHY: Again, I have to suggest to you, Garda Keogh, that anything that was done in relation to this matter was purely with a view to clarifying, if possible, exactly what had taken place. If I can ask you to turn to Volume 21, page 6254, please. Do you have page 6253, please?
A. 6253?

186 Q. Yes, please. This is a statement of Superintendent Noreen McBrien made to the Tribunal, do you understand that?
A. Yes, yeah.

187 Q. Now, she says she wasn't in Athlone on $28 / 5 / 2014$, but nothing turns on that?
A. No.

188 Q. But on the second page, she says:

[^0]was to establish what happened. My concern would be to ensure that everything was being done right for everyone in the station and for O ivia O Neill and for her daughter."

So that's Superintendent McBrien speaking, a person against whom you make no complaint?
A. And that would be her style.

189
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

190 Q. So again, the further enquiries are reasonable in her mind and I have to suggest they are reasonable objectively as well. Then she says:
"I was di rected by Chi ef Superintendent Curran to find out what happened. "

Again, $I$ have to suggest to you that was reasonable?
A. Okay.
Q. Then she says she made contact to ask you for a report And I have suggest that was reasonable?
A. Okay.
Q. She will say, at line 756 , that she rang you with a view to meeting you before you went on leave and that you were in great form. Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

193 Q. Effectively, she then went on to say in the course that conversation, she talked to you, I think it was about Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin, in general terms?
A. okay.
Q. Yes. And then further down, she says on the 10th June she received correspondence from Chief Superintendent Curran looking for a report and met with you on the 9th June. Do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. No. And then she will say that on the 9th June she outlined to you her role as manager of the district and whilst supporting you she had to know what was happening. That she had your safety and the safety of the public as paramount priority and she says you told her that you appreciated her position; is that correct?
A. Oh yeah.

197 Q. Fine. Then she advised you to address any residual concerns you had with Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin and you said you heard that members were asking people to make complaints against you?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

198 Q. Do you see that at line 768?
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you see her response to you, she said:
"I outlined to hi mthat asking somebody if they wanted
to make a statement was different to a person making a compl ai nt and that he shoul dn' t conf use these two."
A. Yes. So we are still on -- are we still on the first
approach to Ms. O'Neill?
Q. We are still on 6254?
A. Just for clarification, is that the first approach to Ms. O'Neill.

201 Q. This, as I understand it, appears to everything, this appears to her superintendents on the issue.
A. Okay.

She is saying that all the personnel were a concern to her as manager of the district, she was only trying to establish what happened in the Olivia o'neill incident, rather than aiming it at a particular outcome. Because if an issue was brought to her attention, she had to look into it. I think she then records, just the next line, 772 , she said, $I$ understand she will say that you replied that you totally understood?
A. Yeah, yes. And just for clarification, Judge, in relation to this in comparison to the last two things, where they're a bit more complicated, in this and the next one, Ms. o'Neill and the next matter have nothing to do -- those persons have nothing to do with the main 11:59 investigation. So I am obliged to comply with management in that.
Q. CHA RMAN I understand?
A. So I fully, in relation to these, do comply and tell them everything that I know and my version or whatever 12:00 way you want to put it.
CHA RMAN okay.
204 Q. MR. MRPFH: I think finally, she indicated that she was concerned for your safety and she didn't want to
pry into your confidential report. I think you said that you would give any information to the assistant commissioner; is that right?
A. That would be correct. But again, I mean, whatever the -- can we go to the date of the conversation, so I can just refresh my mind?

205 Q. Sure. Just before you do that, can you just turn to the next page, page 6255, just to finish on this point. what she will say is:
"I was cogni sant of my obl igations as district officer and the need to bring the Olivia O Neill matter to a concl usi on. "

So she confirmed to you that no one under her control was trying to get people to make statements against you, they were simply trying to confirm what had taken place. Do you remember her saying that to you?
A. I can't remember it, but $I$ am not disputing that.

206 Q. okay. So again, in fairness to you, if you are not disputing it, then $I$ have to suggest to you that in effect this particular episode is one where you may have misunderstood what was being said by various people but in effect there was no attempt to target you, no attempt to damage you, no attempt to get a statement made hostile to you by any member of An Garda Síochána under the control of Superintendent McBrien?
A. In relation to this, this is the first attempt to obtain -- in the first attempt, again I say that's fair
enough, no problem. I write on it myself. I give Superintendent MCBrien my version of whatever happened. But then I understand there's a second attempt to obtain statements from Ms. O'Neill.

MR. KELLY: Chairman, I just point out that the witness 12:02 had a few minutes ago asked to refer to his diary.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: Mr. Murphy moved on.
CHAL RMAN Do you want to refer to your diary?
MR. KELLY: Perhaps he would like to refer to his
diary.
207 Q. CHA RMAK Just to confirm this, you say you believe there was a second attempt to get a statement from Ms. O'Neill and that is something that you regard as objectionable and representing targeting?
A. Yes, Judge. And, Judge, just to back there, during the second attempt, they roll the Olivia O'Neill thing and the Liam McHugh into -- it comes down on the one sheet of paper as well at some stage. I remember seeing it last week, on the one document, where they roll a couple of these into the one thing.

208 Q. CHAI RMAN Okay. So we have to put an asterisk beside this question because at some point you would like to return to that question and to have that explored because you're saying there was a second attempt, a from her?
A. Yes. And I understand, you see, it was because the two incidents happened in the same week, the second
attempt, from my recollection, they go -- when they -it's the same scenario at the start, let's say, for the Liam McHugh as well, where I would say, yeah, fair enough to the first attempt, but I understand they then go on with a second attempt with him also. But on the Olivia O'Neill matter, there's a second attempt. And, Judge, $I$ have already, you see, written on this, because it does emanate from something very simple in this particular matter.
CHA RMAN I follow. So up to this point you don't have a complaint, except for the fact that you say there was a second attempt and that is across the line of targeting and is not just investigation, that's your case?
A. Yeah. And, Judge, bear in mind, I have already written, like I am writing to Superintendent McBrien, I can't remember what I wrote but I have written whatever I have written.

210 Q. CHA RMAN Explaining the Olivia O'Neill situation, is that what you mean?
A. I think so.

211 Q. CHAN RMAN okay.
A. I don't want to say anything incorrect because I just can't recollect what I wrote.
212 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. We now know have that situation. Now 12:04 there is a point that Mr. Kelly has reminded us about, and that is that you wanted to check something in your diary to come back to Mr. Murphy. Can you remember what it was that you wanted to check in your diary?
A. It was to do with a conversation with Superintendent McBrien, but I can't --

MR. KELLY: The date mentioned was 9th June.
213 Q. CHAI RMAN Thank you very much. 2014.
A. Okay. What I have written on this is:


#### Abstract

"9-10pm meet with Super MEBrien. Conversation inforns me that another compl ai nt, Li am MkHugh to be approached to take statements. I nformher was..."


The rest -- no, there's another -- there's another -- I think it's further on, Judge, this crops up again. Because there's phone calls then also with myself and -- yeah. Okay, Judge, the 8th July. If I can read it first, $I$ don't want to have people bringing stuff up on screens if they're not relevant. It will only take a second.

214 Q. CHA RMAN If you would like to just read it for the moment, we can understand. 8th Ju7y 2014.
A. My note is on the 8th July 2014, 9pm:
"Met with super, who informed me she is sending people out again to try get statements from OON..."

Olivia O'Neill.
". . . and LMH."

Liam McHugh.
"She under pressure. Told her I was meeting Judge Mbnday re this and I knew who was behind it. She di dn't reply. "

That's the note I have.
CHA RMAN Okay. So this is relating to a conversation you say you had with Superintendent McBrien at 9pm on the 8th July. which leads you to suppose that there was a second attempt to approach -- there was a second approach, I should say.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Not a second attempt. A second approach to olivia o'neill. okay. Mr. Murphy, you may or may not wish to explore that or you may wish to return to that. 12:07 MR. MRPHY: Yes. Perhaps this might be an opportune moment for the Tribunal to rise briefly.
CHAL RMAN Certainly. You don't have to return to it this moment.
MR. MRPHY: yes.
CHA RMAN You can leave it for the moment. I think if that comes as something that Mr. Murphy may not have anticipated, then he may want to check it out and see what his position is in relation to it. okay.
MR. MRPH: Yes. I think the position is that I don't ${ }_{\text {12:07 }}$ represent Superintendent MCBrien.
CHA RMAN I follow.
MR. MRPHY: And that's the issue that -CHA RMAN I follow.

MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN which is a bit -- anyway, there it is. who represents --

MR. CARROLL: I do, Chairman.
CHAL RMAN Oh, yes, thanks very much. Obviously that's 12:07 something that we may have to check out and return to. okay. So what are suggesting now, you're going on to --

MR. MRPHY: Chairman, I am going to move on to issue number 4.

CHA RMAN A11 right. I was wondering, depending on how you're feeling, I am quite happy to carry on and maybe break about 12:40, something like that, it's probably more continuous and easier, given that we had a slow start. But if that changes and you feel things are a bit confusing, let me know, okay.

WTNESS: Thank you, Judge.
CHA RMAN A11 right. We will break at about 12:40. okay.
MR. MRPHY: Thank you.
CHA RMAN Now issue number 4.
216 Q. MR. MRPHY: Issue number 4. In relation to issue number 4, relating to the investigation into Liam McHugh's complaint to Garda Aidan Lyons on the $31 / 5 / 2014$. Can I ask you to look at volume 5, page 12:08 1029, please?

CHA RMAN Just while we are getting that.
Mr. Carrol1, you may wish to have a look at that and then make an application at some point. But it doesn't
have to be even today, we can come back to that question and we will consider any issues and probably have a word with Mr. McGuinness.
MR. CARROL: It may clarify itself in
cross-examination.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. CARROL: If it doesn't clarify itself, I can address it.
CHAI RMAN Thanks very much. Now, 1029. Thanks very much.

MR. MRPPY: This is document that have you seen before, given to you by Mr. McGuinness, it's a report from Garda Aidan Lyons. I think you have read through this report and you are familiar with it?
A. Yes.

218 Q. Can you just turn over to the next page, which is in volume 30, page 8712, please?
A. Sorry, excuse me, the page.
Q. I am going to ask you to be give answer different volume?
A. Sorry.

220 Q. Now, in terms of the documentation, do you see there that it indicates the letter of 23rd July 2014?
A. Yes.

221 Q. Again to summarise, that's Superintendent McBrien McHugh?
A. Yes.

222 Q. And at the end there is the report. It says:
"I wi sh to report I met Li am McHugh at 21:50, 19/7/14, Church Street, Athl one, while on the beat. Prior to that I had no contact or deal ings with Li am McHugh over the past three months."

Then your text, which is page 8713, you refer to.
A. $M m-h m m$.
Q. And then Volume 5, please, page 1157 ?
A. Okay.

224 Q. So, just before we proceed into dealing with this, we have communication between you and your superintendent. Thus far, would you agree that that's entirely normal communication between you and your superior?
A. Sorry?
Q. Would you agree with me that it's reasonable for her, that is to say Superintendent McBrien, to ask you to indicate what your response was to the references to Mr. McHugh?
A. Sorry, Judge, I'm at 1157 and it is in relation to -it starts -- sorry, I'm confused.
Q. 1157?
A. 1157, okay.

227 Q. And 1158, do you have that?
A. Yes.

228 Q. So this is a letter of Superintendent Noreen McBrien?
A. Yes.

229 Q. It's 5th August 2014?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

230 Q. Do you see under the heading "conversation with Li am McHugh"?
A. Yes.

She is sending this up to the line to the chief superintendent, addressed in the top left-hand side?
A. Yes.
Q. In that paragraph she is giving an explanation for what you had said to her?
A. Yes.
Q. Over the page, you will see that she records that you said you knew nothing about this. Then, at the end of the letter, she says that your assertion that you had not been in contact with Liam McHugh was consistent with your conversation with her on 9th June 2014, which is covered in previous correspondence.
A. Okay.
Q. Yes. Just in terms of your response, going back, if you would please, to volume 30 , page 8712 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So your response at that stage is:
"I wi sh to report I met Li am McHugh. "

A factual response, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. In your handwriting?
A. Oh yeah, yeah.

237 Q. So, would you agree with me at that stage you never say this is an outrage or this is something improper or
this is something unnecessary or this is trumped up or bogus, isn't that right?
A. Judge, I don't know what the Liam McHugh allegation is about. I have been called up: what's your interaction was Liam McHugh, and all the rest. And I haven't a clue what it's about. I am actually trying to find out internally in the station, through the other guards in there, lads, do any of you know what's going on, anything, are you hearing anything about this Liam McHugh craic? I don't have a clue what this is about, because there's no actual -- the allegation is not put to me until, I can't remember the date, but it's a good while after. It's the date where Superintendent McBrien actually shows me the allegation with the name of Aidan Lyons withheld from me. That's actually the day that I find out what all this is about. Up to this then I don't know.
238 Q. You see again, Garda Keogh, I have to suggest you that here is another example where something is effectively reported through the system and there is a legitimate response and I have to suggest to you that the response of your superiors to this was that it had to be checked out, and that was reasonable?
A. Yeah, checked out, to check it out being reasonable, I understand that part, but this becomes very different. I mean, this is -- there'11 be a clash now on this one, Judge.
239 Q. Again, you see, Garda Keogh, I think this becomes very different, because as with some of the other positions
and the other issues, you begin to inflate things as time goes by and to read into them things which are simply not present at all.
A. Oh, I don't -- I mean -- hang on, in the same week with the olivia o'Neill thing and where they're sending people out later on, twice, and then there's this Liam McHugh thing, which I know nothing about. The way it is -- the whole way that this Liam McHugh thing is done, the fact that they don't even take into account that Garda Lyons is Garda A's partner, the fact they don't go down the road of looking for a statement from Garda A about his interaction with McHugh, which they were obliged to do, I would argue, the fact they don't -- I don't think they write anywhere, can you find out who these other two guards are. It is solely -- the maddest part of this complaint, Judge, is, from my reading of what I have read, it's not whether me and three guards committed a crime, it's actually whether I told McHugh to report the crime. This is -- this whole thing is bizarre. The way Garda management deal with this is also very bizarre. They deal with this in a very unusual manner, Judge, and on this one --

240 Q. You see, I have to suggest to you, Garda Keogh, that you're wrong and what's happening here is what's happening, as we have seen over the past couple of days, that are you adding together different things and forming your own subjective conclusion, which is in fact not a reality but just your perception?
A. Oh, I dispute that completely.

241 Q. Can I ask you, please, to be shown volume 7, page 1789? Do you have page 1789, please?
A. Yes.

242 Q. They're can I address you to and an extract from the statement of Chief Superintendent Curran, made to the Tribuna1. The first point I want to make is that he will say that the enquiries necessary to test the veracity of the intelligence were twofold, in that the Gardaí had to account for their actions with Liam McHugh and in addition a statement was sought from Liam McHugh to outline his recollection of events. Now:
"There was no further information to substantiate the inf ormation contai ned in the report, following further enquiries with Garda menbers and Li am McHugh decl ined to make a statement on the matter."

That's where the matter ended, isn't it?
A. Oh, Judge, no, it's not as simple as that, because I -- 12:18 I didn't just say, when I was called up to the office about this, that this never happened or something. I can't remember the word -- I would have left it in no doubt that this is actually -- I wouldn't have used the word vindictive or something, but this is -- there's simple as I've just said, you know. I don't know anything about this.
Q. Garda Keogh, do you agree that you have no evidence to
show anything was sinister going on here. what you are saying to the Tribunal is, you thought or believed that this was sinister?
A. No, no, no. Now, the evidence is in the way Garda management actually deal with the particular matter. The evidence is there. I dispute that. How can you say that, Garda Keogh? when Garda management investigate, nothing is found and the matter is closed?
A. Where three guards are involved in such a serious thing 12:19 and they don't take statements, they don't -- they're obliged to look for a statement from Garda Lyons. Garda Lyons -- a guard does not have the same right to silence as a normal civilian. Garda Lyons is obliged to give them a statement. No, no, this is a different 12:19 scenario, Judge.
245 Q. You see, I again suggest to you that what you are doing here is inflating something to a level of importance that it's not. But also he will say that in addition to that, that from his perspective it was necessary and 12:20 incumbent upon him to cause enquiries to be carried out in respect of this matter.
A. Again, like the previous two or three matters, Judge, on the first round, first round, fair enough, he'd be entitled, yes, of course the chief is entitled to carry 12:20 out these enquiries, but equally, the way this is done, they do the digging on this before they even put the allegation to me and the way even it's done, where I don't get to see the author of the report, which is

Garda Lyons, I don't find that out until years afterwards. Judge, the whole way this is dealt with is not normal Garda policy. It's not the way things are normally dealt with and I will dispute -- I am standing
my ground fully on this one, Judge.

246 Q. You see, Garda Keogh, I suggest to you that you are wrong and that this will fit into a number of your other complaints. Because here we have an example of information coming to the Gardaí, a query being raised and the matter being investigated and finalised. You seem to have a problem in some cases with matters being finalised, like crime files, for example, which we will come to later on. But $I$ have to suggest to you, all that occurred here was standard, normal policing.
A. No.

247 Q. And the matter ended at that point.
A. I dispute this. What was investigated? The crime wasn't investigated -- sorry, the alleged crime wasn't investigated. The on7y thing that was investigated was whether I went out to tell this guy to report the yesterday, I think, that this is a guy that walks around and sells the Big Issue. Like, this guy is not a criminal. He's not in -- he's not involved in anything. This is different. The whole way, the whole 12:21 approach from Garda management in relation to this is not normal, what they did.
248 Q. Are you suggesting to the Chairman that if an allegation was made about somebody else, not you, that
a person, a civilian being searched by a number of gardaí, who seize money from him, that this is something which the Guards shouldn't investigate?
A. Did they actually investigate that? My reading -what's written -- the first thing, what I view on this is, where it's put to me in writing is to do with my interactions and eventually, did you say to Mr. McHugh to report it, and I'11 back you up, is essentially I think the allegation. Did you tell Mr. McHugh to report this and that I allegedly said, and I'11 back you up.

249 Q. Garda Keogh, at the end of the Garda investigation, would you agree with me, there was no evidence to support any further enquiries?
A. There was no evidence because it didn't happen.
Q. There was no evidence because they enquired into it and discovered that the person from who allegedly the information had come, wouldn't make a statement. So there was no evidence?
A. Excuse me, sorry, can you just repeat that question again. But from the point of view of the Gardaí, would you accept they would have to investigate Mr. McHugh, who didn't wish to be interviewed?
A. Initially. At all.
A. As I said, the first strike on this one, they're entitled, of course, they're obliged to find out what's going on. But, again this is -- this is where it becomes sinister. They send people out again a second time for statements in relation to this, and as I said now, I do bump into Mr. McHugh, of course, on the street. I mean, obviously, as I have said, Judge, I was trying to find out in the station, what's all this about. But Mr. McHugh, when he came cover to me, he's mentioning something about the guards looking to take a statement from him and I obviously -- obviously I ask what, do you know what it's about. But he doesn't appear to know what it's about either.

I have to suggest to you, Garda Keogh, that this is another example of an incident which ended after a very simple investigation, which you're seeking to convert into something that it's not?
A. But sure there was no investigation into this alleged theft whatsoever.
Q. Again, Garda Keogh, I have to suggest to you that's incorrect.
A. Judge, they never even took a statement or asked for a statement from the guard that reported this, who was also Garda A's partner.
Q. Garda Keogh, I think that you said and understood a few moments ago that you hadn't been told anything about the conversation with Liam McHugh, is that right?

CHA RMAN Say that again, Mr. Murphy.
MR. MRPHY: As I understood it, you said you weren't given any indication as to what was the allegation contained in the statement of Mr. McHugh. Did I understand you to say that?
A. Yeah, I don't find out -- .

CHA RMAN He says the first time he was merely asked for his interactions over the previous three months. He responded to that, and when he was told by Superintendent McBrien, he wasn't told the name of the person and he only learned that some years later?

MR. MRPHY: But I think in terms of the content of what was content in the report, you were given that information, were you not?
A. Sorry?

260 Q. In terms of the report that was provided by Garda Lyons, that was read over to you, was it not?
A. The report was read over by Superintendent McBrien but the name of the author was concealed.

261 Q. Yes. That took place on 19th July 2014?
A. Just one moment, please.

262 Q. Sorry, the 2nd June?
A. Sorry.

263 Q. I beg your pardon, this is the 2nd June.
CHA RMAN Sorry, don't say anything for the moment. Mr. Murphy, you want to clarify the date on which you suggest Superintendent McBrien informed Garda Keogh of the nature of the allegation?
MR. MRPHY: It may assist if the Tribunal could please
put on the screen page 1157.
CHA RMAN 1157. Okay, thank you very much. Very good.
264 Q. MR. MRPH: That is Volume 5, please.
A. Sorry, just the page number, please?

Yes, sorry, page 1157, please. This is from the statement of Noreen McBrien.
A. This is a report to --

CHA RMAN Not what it looks like.
266 Q
MR. MRPHY: Do you see the heading "conversation with Li am McHugh" please.
A. Yes.

267 Q. And she says --
CHA RMAN Just go down a bit.
268 Q
MR. MRPH: This is Noreen McBrien reporting to her superior and she says:
"I attach for your inf or nation correspondence recei ved from Garda Ni chol as Keogh dated the 27th July regarding Li am McHugh. He states that apart from meeting Liam M H Hugh on the 19th July on the beat, he had not met him in the past three months. On the 19th July, Garda Keogh sent me a text message to say he was on the beat and MzHugh came over to me."

You have given evidence about that before.
"In addition, I met with Garda Keogh by arrangement on this date. This is the earliest opportunity we could
meet. I read out the allegation as outlined in the report of Garda Lyons dated 2nd June 2014. He requested to view the allegation. I allowed himto do so without di scl osing the identity of the member making the compl aint. He was informed it was a member in the At hl one Garda Station. "

So you don't dispute that that is what occurred on that day, do you?
A. No, no.

CHA RMAN The date of that, Mr. Murphy.
WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN Can you scroll down.
MR. CARROLL: The 5th August, is my understanding.
CHAN RMAN We11, we will see the date of the letter.
5th August 2014.
WTNESS: The 5th August is in my diary also, Judge.
269 Q. CHA RMAN okay. The superintendent, as I understand it, says that she met you on that date?
A. $M m-h m m$.

270 Q. CHA RMAN when this conversation took place, when this interaction took place, when she showed you the statement, but not the name.
A. That's correct, yes.

CHA RMAN Okay. Thank you.
MR. MRPHY: And I think as of that date, Garda Keogh, far from containing any targeting of you, her report ends with the conclusion, which is page 1158, where she said that your assertion that you had not been in
contact with Liam McHugh is consistent with your conversation with her on 9th June 2014, covered in correspondence. That is how she signed off on that. Do you accept that?
A. Yes.
A. Just my note, Judge, just in relation to that is, like, this is going on from -- where are we? This allegation I think starts in May, the month of May, and here we are -- there I am writing, to-ing and fro-ing with this conversation and then it gets rolled in with the olivia o'Neill thing and all the rest. And I mean, this allegation is not put to me -- at this stage they've sent guards out twice, to my knowledge, to both Ms. O'Neill and --

273 Q. CHA RMAN Your complaint is not that this was investigated, your complaint is that it wasn't investigated. That's your complaint?
A. Judge, it's even worse.

274 Q. CHA RMAN I mean, rather, it wasn't investigated to the extent that the allegation warranted. That's your case.
A. And I write a letter, Judge --
Q. CHA RMAN Is that right?
A. At the end to --

276 Q. CHA RMAN I don't know whether Garda Keogh agrees, but that's his case.
A. Sorry, sorry.

277 Q. CHA RMAN As I understand, your case is, look, all the
features of this, you say indicate a sinister element?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN Mr. Murphy doesn't agree. Mr. Murphy says it was a standard relatively -- I won't say routine, because clearly that wouldn't be routine, but it was a standard response in the mode of investigation and you say, no, it wasn't because other issues were revealed that should have alerted the authorities to a more serious element or elements. There's the debate. Mr. Murphy says they went and tried to get a statement from Mr. McHugh, he wouldn't give them a statement and that's the end of the matter, they couldn't progress any further. That's the case he is putting to you?
A. Judge, my understanding is Mr. McHugh didn't give them a statement or couldn't give them a statement, I don't think he knew what it was about either. That's my understanding.
279 Q. CHAN RMAN But whether he did or he didn't --
A. I certainly didn't.
Q. CHA RMAN whether he did or he didn't, Mr. Murphy is putting to you that the Gardaí approached Mr. McHugh for a statement, he declined or refused. They considered that was the end of the matter. And Mr. Murphy says that is a reasonable and proper approach and you say oh no, it isn't. That's what you say.
A. Judge, they went again a second time to Mr. McHugh to try and get statements.

281 Q CHA RMAN I am torn between thinking whether that was
reasonable or unreasonable, because if $I$ understand your case, it might have been perfectly reasonable of them to go back to Mr. Mchugh and say, come on, give us more information about this. Do you understand me?
But I mean, the basic point you are making, the
difference between the two sides, Mr. Murphy has
identified and he has put to you that it's a proper and reasonable investigation and you say, for the reasons that you outlined to Mr. McGuinness and here, you say, no, it wasn't. That goes beyond that, you say, that's something sinister. That's what you say.
A. Judge, even the facts as we established -

CHA RMAN Is that right?
A. - like this is a serious complaint, three guards are involved in a theft.
Q. CHAN RMAN I am not missing any of that.
A. Oh yeah, and the date. Yeah. Okay. Like, it's not reported for, is it, two days later.

284 Q. CHA RMAN Well, we don't need to go back over it.
A. Sorry.

CHAN RMAN There's the distinction.
MR. MRPHY: Yes. And that's response to my question. CHA RMAN That's fine, thank you very much. So we know where we are going, we know where the dispute arises. Thank you.

285 Q. MR. MRPHY: The next issue, Chairman, is issue number 5.

CHA RMAN We're now on to Superintendent Murray. MR. MRPHY: Yes.

CHA RMAN Isn't that right? This is the beginning of Superintendent Murray.

MR. MRPHY: In relation to number 5, there was one issue which I was going to address to Mr. McGuinness perhaps before we began the questioning, which is the extent to which this issue remains live and current. CHA RMAN Yes.

MR. MRPHY: Perhaps Mr. Ke1ly and I will talk about it.

CHA RMAN I was going to say that it would be fair and 12:33 reasonable to take a break at this point because we're moving on not only to a new issue but to a new phase of issues. In other words, all the questions, which will take us some considerable time, which is the matters involving Superintendent Murray.

MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN Okay. Because they fit into a category of their own. Okay. So we will take a break then and we will take it up, since we didn't have a break, we will take it up at two o'clock. A11 right. Thank you very much.

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

FOLLO/S:

CHAI RMAN Now, thanks very much. Yes.
286 Q. MR. MRPHY: Chairman, Garda Keogh, I think the position is that the next issue relating to the alleged micro supervision of Garda Keogh by Sergeant Yvonne

Martin, Sergeant Cormac Moylan and Sergeant Aidan Haran. Just to see if we can shorten this in the light of your previous evidence, garda, $I$ think that in the course of your evidence on Day 100, at page 113, in the first line you were asked by Mr. McGuinness about the assignment of Sergeant Haran, to which you had no objection. Mr. McGuinness put it to you that you wrote negatively about Sergeant Martin to the Minister for Justice in 2017 out of some suspicion, and you replied:
"That's correct. In hi ndsi ght I shoul d not have -there was an inci dent to do with what was dealt with in the previ ous module of the Tribunal."

And further down, at line 18 , you said:
". "

Further down at line 18 you said:
"In fairness to her she di dn't bother me, kind of."

And line 21, you said -- sorry the question was asked:
"She wasn't mi cromanaging you then. "

You said:
"No, she wasn't no. No, no. The sergeants, as I sai d,
were okay. But Superintendent Murray was trying to get themto micromanage me."

So, just at the outset, can I ask you to confirm, you are making no complaint against any of the three sergeants?
A. That's correct.

287 Q. You also accept that you should not have written to the Minister for Justice about Sergeant Martin in the terms in which you did?
A. I fully accept that, Judge, I stated that if there were certain things, if I could back in time, you know, what I know now and that. Look, I totally, fully accept that. And I apologise as well to Sergeant Martin also for any distress that I caused her, because I know she had been through a lot in all of this as well.

288 Q. I think in substance and, in fact, therefore, you can confirm to the Tribunal that you were not micromanaged by any of these three sergeants?
A. That's correct.

289 Q. Yes. So if we can come then please to your first meeting with Superintendent Pat Murray. I wonder if you could be given volume 8, page 2187, please. Now, if you have that?
A. Page 2187?

290 Q. Yes, please.
A. Yes.

291 Q. This is a note taken by Superintendent Murray following your meeting on the $26 / 3 / 2015$, when you met between 4
and $5: 50 \mathrm{pm}$. Do you recall 1ast week you had given evidence about the first meeting?
A. Yes. Just one moment. 26th March, yeah.

292 Q. You reminded Superintendent Murray that you had been in Bray or in Wicklow in the past on duty?
A. Yes. I think you were saying that you were reticent to discuss the ongoing investigation which inspector ó Cualáin was dealing with and your role in that investigation. Do you recall that?
A. Yes. Well, he shouldn't have been asking me about the investigation.
Q. Well again, I have to suggest to you there is nothing improper about him asking you that. But insofar as he did, he will say that he then explained to you that he was anxious about your in and out sick days since he had arrived in Ath1one?
A. Yes. And just back to the first part, I dispute that, I shouldn't have been asked. Under the protected disclosures, I don't agree that he should have been asking me about the investigation.
Q. Again, we disagree on that. But can I ask you to confirm that he did indicate to you that he was anxious about your in and out sick days?
A. Just one moment, until $I$ just -- yes, he did, yes.
Q. Yes. And there had been in and out sick days on your part, had there not?
A. Yes.
Q. And again, would you confirm for the Tribunal that this
was sick days in which you had been affected by alcohol?
A. Yes. Well, yes, but I mean, my sick certs say work related stress, Judge, and at this time I am being marked out with the flu.

298 Q. In terms of what was actually happening on the ground, the position was, you were drinking to excess?
A. Well, they were marking me out with the flu.
Q. I am just asking you what you were doing, Garda Keogh. I think you were drinking to excess; isn't that correct?
A. Judge, I have already stated I did use alcohol as a crutch and I haven't denied that.
Q. And were you taking Xanax with the alcohol during that time?
A. Not all the time, Judge.
Q. Not all the time?
A. No, no.
Q. So, for example, if I could go to your diary for a moment. Would you please go to page 13303, which is diary for 2nd March 2015.
A. Excuse me, for clarification, is this the 2nd March?
Q. Yes, please.
A. 2015?

304 Q. Please. If I can ask you to confirm that on the 2nd and the 3rd and the 4th and the 5th and the 6th and the 7th and the 8th, you yourself recorded that you were sick?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was from drinking?
A. Em, Judge, I don't have drink written in this part. Normally I write in when I go drinking, I write it into the diary. I just don't --
Q. The same applies I think for the next week, the 9th and the 10th and the 12th, 13 th, and the 14th. Were these days where you were otherwise meant to be on duty? They're not marked down as rest days. RD is what you normally put down when you're having a rest, is that right?
A. Yes. The 9th and 10th, I think they're marked down as rest days, they're rest days.
Q. If we look, please, forward to 13304, on 24 th March and the 23rd March, which are Mondays and Tuesdays, you were sick as well?
A. Yes.
Q. So I think you will agree with me that Superintendent Murray wasn't imagining that there was a difficulty that you were experiencing or suffering at that time, because your work record was clearly indicative of being out sick over the previous two weeks substantially?
A. Yes. Well, I mean, I am under a lot of stress. As I said, Judge, earlier in my evidence, I am still working alongside Garda A during this period.
309 Q. Did he ask you what exactly was the problem?
A. Judge, I told him. Judge, I told him I was under a lot of stress and I think I said work related stress, but he replied twice to me, you're under no stress.

310 Q. Superintendent Pat Murray wil1 say that that's incorrect, that he never said those words to you and that, in fact, he recorded in his notes afterwards that he considered that you were effectively under pressure and that he discussed work related stress with you?
A. Judge, I have read stuff in those volumes, I just can't think of them off hand, where he questions -- in relation to stress.
311 Q. Let's just look at what he wrote down. Can we take it, you didn't write a note just after this meeting, did you?
A. This is, which date?

312 Q. This is the date of your meeting on 26th March 2015?
A. Yes, I did, yeah.

313 Q. okay. In terms of that particular discussion, can I bring you back to Superintendent Murray's note?
A. This is page 2187 ?

314 Q. That's right.
A. okay.

315 Q. And he said:

```
"I di scussed work rel ated stress in terms of you're coming to work today, if work rel ated stress was the i ssue. "
```

And that you said you had certs from your doctor. Did he ask you or did he not ask you about your claim of work related stress?
A. There was no question, he said: You're under no
stress. And then, to reinforce it, he said it again. when I tried to answer, he said, you're under no stress.

Again I have to suggest to you, your recollection is wrong in that regard, he is absolutely clear he did not 14:10 say that?
A. I dispute that.

317 Q. He wil1 say he asked you had you been to the CMO, do you remember that?
A. The CMO did crop up.

318 Q. Right. You told him that you hadn't been to the CMO?
A. No, I wouldn't have said that, because I would have been with the CMO before.

319 Q. When was the last time you went to the CMO, before that date?
A. Oh, I haven't a clue, I don't know.
Q. So you hadn't been to the CMO in relation to 2015 difficulties that you experienced, had you?
A. I just can't remember.

321 Q. We11, I can suggest to you that it is clear that you
hadn't. Then he will say you told him that, no, you hadn't been to the CMO and he said that he will send you to assess the stress because the in and out appearances did not, in his view, support what you were saying and what was causing it?
A. We11, when I was with the CMO in December 2015, the CMO wasn't aware of work related stress. A11 the CMO had was that I was out with viral flu. Because it was the CMO then, when I discussed my work related stress, that
actually went -- he got the records, he showed me that I was marked out with the flu and then he said is work related stress on your sick certs and I said, yes, it is, and he said, since when. That's when he then started -- I don't know started rooting in files or something, I don't know what he found but he said, this is very serious and I am going to talk to someone high up about this. And bear in mind, Judge, they had a case conference I think a week before in relation to me about that and for some reason the CMO was kept in the dark, that work related stress was on my certs.

322 Q. In terms of the position here, I have to suggest to you that you hadn't been to the CMO in the recent past and you told him that you hadn't been and he told you that he would send you there so that your issue of alleged stress could be dealt with because the way in which you were coming in and out of work didn't seem to support what you were saying about the causes of stress. And he will say that you declined answering the questions and instead you asked him to contact Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and Superintendent McBrien.
A. That part is true. Just the last part, contacting Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and Superintendent mcbrien.
323 Q. He said he wouldn't contact anyone for anecdotal answer or not. Do you remember him asking you were you doing any work at the time?
A. I do, he did say that, yes.

Do you recall that he mentioned an assault or harassment case?
A. No, that's not correct. what happened there is not correct, Judge. It was me. Judge, he asked me was there any investigations that are difficult, something to do with, have you any difficulty with any investigations. I told him there's no difficulty with investigations but I said, there's one awkward investigation to do with a harassment case. I think I explained it, Judge, it was just where -- it was to do with a lady and her partner and there had been previous 14:14 complaints made before of a similar nature and this lady always withdrew her statement. It wasn't -- like I had no difficulty in dealing with it, Judge.
328 Q. He will say that he noted that you said that you had
been neglecting the investigation?
A. That's false.
Q. I again suggest to you that it's true, but also he then recorded, if there was a sergeant available for you to link into, but you didn't really answer that question?
A. I don't recall that part of it.

But he was asking you the question and you didn't really answer?
A. I mean, I can't recall that. I don't -- I don't think this is correct, because this was my first meeting with 14:16 Superintendent Murray and at the time, like, I would have given him the benefit of the doubt. Like, you know, I would have --

334 Q. That was very generous of you, Garda Keogh, but can we move on to what actually happened here. I think in those circumstances he said, I was asking Sergeant Yvonne Murphy to link in with you in relation to all workplace issues and you asked why her and you didn't know her, do you remember that?
A. I don't think that's the case.
Q. Just have a look, if you would please, at page 2188 ?
A. Sorry, excuse me, you said -- sorry, just two clarifications. One, you did say Sergeant Yvonne Murphy.
Q. Sorry, Martin?
A. Yeah, Sergeant Martin. I have a note here:
"Sergeant Martin to liaise with me."

Then he asked me who my solicitor was and I told him that was private.
Q. In response to Sergeant Martin, that he said the very reason that she was new and that she would be a support to you to allow you to attend work regularly?
A. You see, I can't -- I just -- I'm not sure about that, Judge.
Q. Can you recall, and he will say that you could discuss any difficulties with the assault and harassment case with her and that she would put supports in place to ensure thoroughness in the investigation and that you agreed with that?
A. No.

339 Q. You that agreed to avail of help from Sergeant Martin?
A. No, definitely not, in that because the way -- what case was very a simple thing and I have read some of the stuff in the volumes where he makes it out that I kind of go to him to say, oh, there's a desperate,
terrible problem with this case that I can't deal with and I need help. It was nothing like that, Judge.

340 Q. So in those circumstances, I think even looking back at your note from your diary, you accept that the CMO was mentioned, don't you?
A. Yes.

341 Q. You accept that the appointment of Sergeant Martin was mentioned?
A. Yes.

342 Q. Yes. In both of those issues, Superintendent Murray will say these were his response to his concern for what appeared to be your difficulties and the welfare issues which your behaviour was showing to him. This was something he saw as being assistance to you and for your welfare?
A. That is kind of a statement you've made, it's not a question.

343 Q. Do you agree with him? I am putting to you what he wil1 say?
A. Sorry?

344 Q. I am putting to you what he will say and asking you do you agree or disagree with that?
A. That's his version, Judge. Parts of it are correct, Judge, in relation to the CMO and Sergeant Martin and that, there are certain parts that are accurate. I think the next thing that was spoken of was in relation to travel claims?
A. Yes.

346 Q. He will say that when he raised this issue with you, that up got, in his words, slightly annoyed; would that be right?
A. Not -- I don't -- I'm not sure, Judge. I know he brought up the thing, the issue with the tax.
Q. Did he tell you that he had been onto the tax office?
A. He did, yes.

348 Q. And that he wanted to be sure that the vehicle wasn't wrongly taxed?
A. Sorry? Excuse me?

349 Q. He has recorded down in the note that he has, that you admitted it was taxed as goods and shouldn't be but you just kept on doing it. Is that the explanation you gave?
A. I said it was -- what $I$ had was a vehicle with two seats, it was a commercial vehicle, and it was taxed as a commercial. And as I said earlier, Judge, it was one of the first things, when I did make my disclosure, I had everything right in my car, I recall getting new tyres and everything on it, so everything -- being a policeman, $I$ would know if there is something going to, let's say, look at the car -- there's always something wrong with a car, an older car, with the exception of one you would drive out of a garage from buying it brand new, there's always -- you'11 always find a problem with a car.
350 Q. Garda Keogh, wasn't the facts that the car was taxed incorrectly and subsequently you did tax it correctly, is that a fact?
A. Yes. That's -- you see, Judge, that is correct, but the car was commercial and should I have argued my case in court or that? I'm not sure if $I$ would have accepted the discipline that was to come after in relation to that.

But you told him that you would do that and you would you produce evidence of the taxation within one week?
A. I did say I would sort it out, I recall that, yes.
Q. And you told him -- sorry, he told you that he would deal with you. In the circumstances he would effectively deal with anybody else in the same way and that ultimately you then became annoyed and then you began to became them, but you wouldn't say who you meant by the word "them". Do you remember blaming --
A. Sorry?
A. I mean, I could have been. This is on the backdrop of the whole episodes that we have heard earlier with Olivia O'Neill and Liam McHugh. You know, as I tried to explain, Liam McHugh, $I$ believe him being set up, and Garda management are completely ignoring that factor.
Q. Do you remember blaming third parties?
A. I may have.
Q. Do you remember being annoyed?
Q. You see what he recorded at page 2188, he said that you 14:22 criticised Chief Superintendent Curran for trying to create complaints against you. Middle of the page?
A. which paragraph?
Q. 2188, middle of the page, last line in the second
paragraph.
A. That's possib7y, yeah, that -- I mean, I don't remember it, but I'd say that part is -- that would have been my mindset at the time. So $I$ can't dispute that part.
Okay. You will see he also recorded next and what you told him afterwards was that you hadn't thought what was for you in the organisation but that you could stay out sick long-term. Did you say that?
A. I have to read this first, sorry, one second.
Q. Please.
A. He may have said that, $I$ don't recollect, but that would sound fair enough.
Q. Okay. Would you say that it's also likely that you said to him that you hadn't thought about your future and that you told him you joined the force in 1999 and that you had served in Bray, Ballynacargy and Athlone?
A. I'd accept that, because during the thing in Bray, I think I reminded him of an incident where we briefly met for a couple of seconds, $I$ think down in wicklow Circuit Court at some stage.
360 Q. Then at the end he just says that he went over three issues to discuss again and he says one, your ad hoc appearances at work and referral to the CMO, as he was sceptical about your excuse and he felt that the CMO could put supports in place for you?
A. Well now, Judge --

361 Q. Do you recall him saying that?
A. Sorry, that answers what was put to me earlier on in relation to the work related stress, where he says he
was sceptical re his excuse.
362 Q.
Q. Well ultimately we know, in relation to the CMO, that the treatment that you had received both before this date and after this date was alcoholism, isn't that right?
A. Equally Judge, I'm marked out with the flu.

It has been as clear as day from yesterday and before, and you admitted that the treatment that you received both before 2015 and after 2015 was in relation to alcoholism?
A. Oh yes.

Yes. That's what he is obvious7y concerned about it. The second point, he confirmed to you that Sergeant Martin was to be your contact in relation to workplace issues, to support your renewed attendance at work. This is something to help you to come to work and to work more happily in the future?
A. That part, I mean, I would read into that a different way, when the letter comes out to me.

366 Q. Okay. would you just please turn over the next page. He will say that the correction of your tax on the car and the payment of yours claims, it would be dealt with 14:25 together and that he would deal with you himself using regulation 10.
A. The first part is true and the second part is completely false.

367 Q. Again I have put it to you that he will say that he did mention regulation 10 at that time?
A. Absolutely did not.

And he will say that you said to him, look, other members had issues with cars, and you told him not to worry, that he was going to have everyone checked, do you remember that?
A. I pointed out I wasn't the only one, I wasn't the only one that had the car, commercial, taxed as commercial. That's all I think I said. I wasn't the only one that had it. Something to that effect.
Q. Then he will say that you withdrew your allegation, saying that you didn't want that as people would know about your tax and they would blame him for any wider search?
A. I don't recall that at all.
Q. Would that have been your sentiment at the time; that you would prefer this to be a matter between -- not to trigger a wider assessment of all of the members?
A. Well, I mean obviously I wouldn't have wanted any overspil1 from what was happening, let's say, with what is now becoming a conflict with me and management, to overspil1 to other members in the station in Athlone. A lot of them are already under enough pressure between this, what we're dealing -- what we're dealing with now 14:26 and other issues that were going on in Athlone at the time.

371 Q. Do you recall he told you that he would make a decision taking your views on board but he would treat everyone
the same and fairly and that you shook hands and left?
A. That's correct.

He also noted in the course of his statement that he saw Garda A in the station throughout that evening, up to the time he left at 7 pm , and he just noted that, and $14: 27$ this is his note, the presence of Garda A, great skepticism about your excuse of work related stress as explained by you to him.
A. Judge, my reading into that line is -- perhaps I am reading that line completely wrong, but, I don't know how to answer. Like, I would say that that backs up what I am saying, what we earlier pointed out, that he's questioning my -- he's basically implying that I wasn't under any stress. That's the way I read it. But perhaps --
373 Q. Garda Keogh, can we pause there for a moment and perhaps look at it a different way. Superintendent Murray's view is that there was clearly something wrong and that he wanted to find a cause. That's where the смо came in; to try and find out the cause. And we know that months later the cause was confirmed beyond doubt. So, insofar as he is looking for a cause, can I suggest to you what this note and what his evidence confirms is that he was concerned about your welfare, he wasn't trying to target you or to discriminate against you, he was trying to assist you?
A. No, I dispute all that. I mean that last line, just again, perhaps $I$ am reading it wrong, but:
"His presence creates skepticismre Garda Keogh's excuse of work rel ated stress as explained by him"

I don't think I can explain it any better.
374 Q. And in terms of the position, we know also that after that, at page 2190, volume 8, you have seen this document before?
A. Yes.
Q. This was the authorisation being put into place, the measures that were decided by him?
A. Yes.

376 Q. Here we have the presence of the three sergeants and I think you've indicated they did nothing wrong to you, is that right?
A. That's correct.

377 Q. And they didn't micromanage you?
A. Correct.
Q. They're all three experienced sergeants?
A. Yes.

379 Q. They were people who showed you friendship, kindness and assistance?
A. Yes.

380 Q. I have to suggest to you in those circumstances, Superintendent Murray did nothing wrong by asking him to assist you, as his letter clearly indicates, in relation to any issues that might arise?
A. Judge, that's not a fair question because I didn't really know Sergeant Martin. Sergeant Haran and Sergeant Moylan, we already would have had a good
relationship anyway prior to meeting Superintendent Murray.
381 Q. At the end of the note, Sergeant Moylan, the person with whom you had the very good relationship, is the very person who he directs, Superintendent Murray directs to sit down with you to go through your notebook, Pulse, the DPP, the crime file lists and to see if you need any help in relation to the harassment case. So, in fact, he takes into account what you say about sergeant Martin and he delegates the experienced Sergeant Haran, who is known to you, to deal with you and to help you in that regard. It was Sergeant Haran who went to help you?
A. Sorry?

382 Q. Sergeant Moylan, I beg your pardon?
A. Judge, just for clarification as wel1. This report, like $I$ know it's marked confidential, this was in every pigeonhole in the station for everybody to say. Everyone got to see this in the station, this, what's marked down as confidential.

383 Q. Sorry, this is marked for the attention of the sergeants, is it not?
A. Well, look...

384 Q. It's marked for the attention -- let's be clear, for Inspector Farre11, sergeant in charge and the three sergeants?

385 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, go back up. Inspector Farre11. what do you say to that? It's directed to Inspector Farrel1 and the sergeant in charge.
A. Judge, I don't know. Oh, on that, okay, there was sergeant -- Inspector Farrell, there was the sergeant in charge and then there was -- I may be incorrect, then there was those three sergeants who had to have got a copy of this. So we have four sergeants and the inspector that would have had.
A. But there's pigeonholes, what $I$ am calling pigeonholes, Judge.
Q. CHA RMAN of course.
A. And they throw in the sheets of paper. So like any -they're unit pigeonholes, so the sergeant of each -what would go into this unit pigeonhole would be for the sergeant and a11 the guards on the unit. So Sergeant Moylan was the sergeant in charge of unit $C$, that was my unit; Sergeant Haran is community policing; Sergeant Martin is in charge of a different unit. So every guard in those three units would have been able to see this, along with the sergeant in charge that would have a -- the sergeant in charge didn't have a pigeonhole, they had a tray on their desk where you'd leave those documents up. This was -- a lot of people could see this confidential report.
388 Q. CHA RMAN Basically everybody could see it, according to you, is that right?
A. Well not everyone. Technically not everyone but a lot of people. Any of the guards.

389 Q. CHA RMAN Mr. Murphy is shaking his head. I am just thinking, your contention is that this was left where
everybody could see it?
A. Where half the station could see it. CHA RMAN okay, half the station could see it.
MR. MRPHY: I have to suggest to you, on my
instructions that's wrong because it's clearly addressed to a select number of middle ranking officers who have an interest in managing gardaí of ordinary rank. It's not put on Pulse, for example.
A. There is nothing to put on Pulse in relation to this. The point $I$ wish to make in that regard, in terms of the micromanaging issue, $I$ have to suggest to you that you that the complaint you have made has no foundation whatsoever, because there wasn't any micromanaging?
A. There wasn't any micromanaging because the sergeants didn't go down that road. But I mean, it's very clear on the last three lines:
"Go through his notebook, Pulse, the DPP and crime file lists and ascertain if he requires hel $p$ with any ongoing cases as he mentioned. "

Judge, I'd replace that with -- you know, that word is stuck in there to make it appear that -- as things progress, Judge, it was to find fault with anything. I had never -- I had never been scrutinised in any way at 14:33 this level ever before in An Garda Síochána. I mean, okay, when you're in your probation, Judge, a probation guard would have their notebook examined by a superintendent or a sergeant or something. Like I'm
years out of probation at this stage and have all this, everything, everything basically, all my work is micromanaged. Well, the order is there essentially for it to be micromanaged
You see, Garda Keogh, you're retreating back to your original complaint. I have to suggest to you what you are ignoring is the evidence, which you yourself accept, that at the time you had been drinking, you did have issues. We will go very briefly to see what the sergeants say, because they don't say the same as you at all. If, for example, you look at page 590 of volume 3, Sergeant Haran. I just want to match this against your perception that everything was fine.
A. Sorry, I didn't say -- I don't think I said everything was fine.
CHA RMAK You didn't say everything was fine. WTNESS: Did I?

CHA RMAN No.
393 Q. MR. MRPH: No, but I am suggesting there was a reason why you needed to be scrutinised. This will evident from these extracts. So, page 590, volume 3.
A. Yeah.

394 Q. An extract from Sergeant Haran's statement, he will say, paragraph 3.15:
"In general terns, I was glad to assist Garda Keogh in doing files and reports. He readily admitted it was a weakness on his part. On occasion l would sit down with himand he would literally empty out his post
locker and bet ween us we would tidy it up. I advi sed himon how he might deal with some files in order to clear his desk."
4.3, please, down at the end of the page:
"Following his di sclosure, I continued in my role and on occasi ons I supervi sed Garda Keogh. He struggl ed at times to keep things going and would speak to me about his drinking bei ng a problemand his preferences for worki ng ni ghts when the authorities were not working. I did not witness any bullying or overt or, indeed, any under hand behavi our directed towards Garda Keogh by any management in At hl one. "

So, would you agree with me that his evidence suggests that he thought you needed help and he readily and willingly gave that he1p?
A. What jumps out at me is the line:
"Hi s preference for working ni ghts when the authorities were not working."

395 Q. If you just turn over, please, to the following page, 591, just commenting on Superintendent Murray's style, this witness will say that Superintendent Murray introduced stricter practices and regimes.
CHA RMAN I think it's 5.1; is that right?
MR. MRPH: 4.5, page 591.

CHA RMAN Sorry, I just I misheard, sorry.
MR. MRPHY: 4.5, that Superintendent Murray introduced some stricter practices in Athlone regarding the creation of a robust system, a management system,
including a new crime file:
> "Thi s and ot her oversi ghts were for all members to follow and I can say they were excellent in rei nforcing good practices."

Just based on that, can I suggest to you that the evidence indicates that Sergeant Haran thought that these work practices were good, they were an improvement, they were new and they were excellent in reinforcing good practice. They may not have happened before, but they were practices which actually increased the standard. Would you agree with that assessment?
A. Judge, this is -- I can't comment on it, Judge. This is what Sergeant Haran has to say.
396 Q. CHA RMAN He says that Superintendent Murray was stricter. He was a new broom and he introduced stricter practices and he says they were better, but stricter practices than were there before. He doesn't mean the ones before were wrong, but that's what he
A. You see, unfortunately, Judge, I have that much going on with the investigation and all the rest, that $I$ don't witness -- and my dealings with Superintendent

Murray, I have a different viewpoint to probably Sergeant Haran would have had.

397 Q. CHAN RMAN Explain that to me a bit more.
A. Yes, sorry. Like, I had that much going on in relation to the disclosure and the investigation that was going on, because at the time it would have been one of the biggest internal investigations in the country within An Garda Síochána.
A. Judge, I mean --

CHA RMAN Okay. So as of the time of your first meeting with Superintendent Murray, are you saying that 14:38 you were sort of distracted?
Q. CHA RMAN Do you know what I mean?
A. Yes, I do know what you mean. And, Judge, obvious7y, yes -- that's what I am trying to say. I would have -- 14:38 all the stuff that's going on in the background, the elephant in the room and the heroin in the investigation and all that, that side of things.
400 Q. MR. MRPHY: You see, Garda Keogh, you make a heavy point of saying to the Chairman that this kind of thing 14:39 hadn't happened before, and I am putting it to you that this was happening right across the station, because these were new practices with a new emphasis on a new crime files system, which we will come to later on. But could I ask you just to look back at paragraph --
CHA RMAN I think he said it hadn't happened to him before.

MR. MRPHY: Yes.
401 Q. CHA RMAN He hadn't been questioned, is that right?

402 Q. CHA RMAN But just before you leave that, Mr. Murphy, sorry, my understanding is that you say the three sergeants didn't in fact do anything. However they helped or didn't help, they didn't do anything that you considered unreasonable or targeting or, you know, getting at you?
A. Yes, Judge. That is correct.

CHA RMAN Yes. So whatever instruction Superintendent Murray gave, it didn't result in any trouble to you?
A. That is correct, but, Judge, it's the motive.

CHA RMAN But as I understood from when you were answering Mr. McGuinness, I understood you to say, whatever the kind words that Superintendent Murray was writing, he actually meant the opposite, number one, and (b), the sergeants either understood or didn't understand but the sergeants didn't carry out what he wanted to do, which was that he wanted to get at you?
A. Judge, yes.

406 Q. CHA RMAN Now, maybe I put it crudely but that's essentially the point?
A. Yes, Judge. Look, Judge, Superintendent Murray is not going to write a report like this and use the words go after this fella and find every mistake you can find so we can hammer him. They're not going -- he's not going to write a report like that.

407 Q. MR. MRPHY: And he didn't either, did he?
A. Well, he didn't word it --
A. Sorry? Volume 3. I think you have that.

MR. KELLY: I think he is referring to 591 in that, the paper copy, you can look at that.

WTNESS: I have 591 here, yeah.
MR. MRPHY: You see at paragraph 4.4, Sergeant Haran again wil1 say that Inspector Farre11 and he spoke about you on occasion and:
"I nspect or Farrell al ways spoke in a way about anything we could do to assist Garda Keogh in reducing his probl ens, but unf ortunat el y Garda Keogh was not perceptive at that time. I spoke about Garda Keogh to various managers over time, incl uding Superintendent MEBrien and Superintendent Murray, neither spoke in any 14:41 way that suggested ill feel ing..."

Towards you.
A. Yes. Just for clarification, Judge, in relation to the thing with Inspector Farrell, I think I addressed it yesterday, it's the same thing, it wasn't anything personally with Inspector Farrell, it was do with his friendship with another guard. -

CHA RMAN Yes, I understand.
A. Yeah.

411 Q. CHA RMAN That was why you were brusk, if you like, and rejecting when he spoke to you?
A. Yes.

412 Q. CHAL RMAN I understand that, yes.
A. But not -- just that, the way it is worded there, it's worded as if I wasn't cooperating.

CHA RMAK Receptive. Not cooperative is another way of putting it.
A. Sorry, yeah.

413 Q. CHA RMAN That is what he is saying. That's exactly what he's saying?
A. That I wasn't --

414 Q. CHAI RMAN They were trying to help you and you wouldn't accept the help, that's what he is saying.
A. We11, I am very -- I'm confused here on this, Judge, I'm sorry.
415 Q. CHAN RMAN Calm down for a moment.
A. Yeah.

416 Q. CHA RMAK Let's stop. Mr. Murphy is quizzing you about your contention about Superintendent Murray having it in for you?
A. Yes.

417 Q. CHA RMAN okay. That's what he is saying. He is citing this instance from the report of -
A. Sergeant Haran.

418 Q. CHA RMAN - Sergeant Haran, to say, here is evidence to show willingness to help, no ill feelings towards you, that is what he is suggesting, as a result of
this.
A. Yes.
Q.

CHA RMAN This paragraph says they were willing to help you, although you weren't willing to accept the help, that's what he's saying. It doesn't mean it's right but that's what he is saying. And that's what the paragraph says?
A. Yes. Judge, just for clarification, I have explained the thing with Inspector Farre11, I had a good working relationship still with Sergeant Haran.

420 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. I just wanted to clarify it.

421 Q. CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
A. To me it reads that I was totally blanking Sergeant Haran and Inspector Farrell, which wasn't the case, 1et's say.

CHAN RMAN A11 right.
422 Q. MR. MRPHY: Just in terms of Sergeant Moylan, can I ask you to turn to page 606, please, the same volume, at paragraph 3.3. And he refers to the request from Superintendent Murray to assist you. And he says:
"I did go through Garda Keogh's Pulse, crime file, DPP lists. I don't recall going through his notebook. bel ieve I was satisfied that all rel evant incidents going through the lists or issues in rel ation to Garda Keogh, I was showing hi m what I was submitting bef ore submitting the same to ensure he was satisfied with the
line being taken."

So again, I have to suggest to you, that is further indication of a collaborative effort by people working with you to help you improve your work
A. I accept everything that is in that part there from Sergeant -- is this Sergeant Moylan, yeah?
423 Q. Moylan.
A. Yeah, I have no issue with that, I accept that.

424 Q. Can I ask you then, please, to turn to volume 4, at page 695?
A. 695?
Q. Please, in the middle of the page. This Inspector Minnock's statement. He notes your complaint about three sergeants supervising you, but he actually says, in his evidence he says, this is what he will say, this was not the position. Do you want to take a minute to read the paragraph?
A. It starts on page 13.

426 Q. on page 13, yes, please.
A. Yes, I have no issue with that paragraph, Judge.

427 Q. Okay. Would you just go over to the next page, please, for a second, to the first paragraph at the top of the next page?
A. Down to the words "constant contact".

428 Q. Yes, please.
A. I have read that.

429 Q. Just in summary, would you agree with me that superintendent Minnock's assessment is that your view
of three people supervising you wasn't correct, that Sergeant Haran linked in, in an unofficial capacity to provide welfare and supports, that he thought sergeant Martin was a good person to assist you. And the last part, at the top of page 696, he says:
"This provided a distinction in the role of supervisors, allowing Sergeant Mbylan to performhis role as supervising sergeant and a separation of the role Sergeant Martin providing wel fare and support structures."

And that you also had support from Garda Mick Quinn, the welfare officer, with whom you had constant contact?
A. I have no issue with that.

430 Q. Here are three other officers against who you are not making any complaints. They are saying, look, what was taking place here was prudent management, reforming management, all calculated to help you and not to hurt 14:47 you, not to target you, not to discredit you, but to help you?
A. Judge, the report -- I mean, to go through my notebooks, my crime files, my -- to go through everything, my reading in that is to find mistakes and, 14:48 of course, as we go on into things I think it becomes evident later on, but this is just the start of, I suppose, Superintendent Murray's tenure in Athlone.
431 Q. But, Garda Keogh, you have admitted that paperwork
wasn't your strong point, haven't you?
A. Yeah, but for clarification, Judge, I never -- I never had an issue. Like I never had a problem in court to do with files or anything like that. I was, I suppose, motivation to sit down, I would want to procrastinate, try and put off doing a file and stuff like that. But I always got -- I always had my files in on time and there was never -- there was never any major issue with my paperwork. There would have been minor, minor things. Like I don't dispute what Sergeant Haran has said. And also, it does obviously become an awful lot tougher on me as a guard after I made my protected disclosure. Then, of course, I'm working alongside Garda A for 18 months.
432 Q. Garda Keogh, just in terms of what you said about the protected disclosure, is it the case that you were annoyed with this type of intervention by Superintendent Murray because you considered that your role as a whistleblower was leading you to engage in much more important work in conjunction with the
Ó Cualáin investigation?
A. Judge, there was problems with the investigation at the time. As I've said, some parts are very thorough and some parts were -- there was serious problems with other parts of the investigation and they were -- they would have been probably a priority on my mind. But that doesn't mean that $I$ was neglecting in any way injured parties or anything like that. We have gone into the evidence last week of injured parties, where

I'm bringing them in and they're actually witnessing -they take part in the investigations themselves, in fact, to do with CCTV. They know there's stuff is being investigated.
433 Q. Garda Keogh, the reason I ask the question is because on Day 100, at page 24 of the transcript, if it is possible to see that, please. Thanks. Page 24. Do you see at line 13 you said:
"So all this stuff, you know it's just stuff, they kept firing down all this Mckey Mbuse paperwork at me, when I was al ready fully compl ying with the investigation team "

You've used that phrase several times since you gave evidence. Did you regard these paperwork tasks, which the superintendent was seeking to provide you with assistance on, as Mickey Mouse activity compared to what you were doing as a whistleblower?
A. Judge, again, it's easy for -- as I said last week, they just change the hands here. They have a new set of -- a new superintendent, a new chief. So I'm still the same person, having gone through the previous year with all this, writing on this olivia O'Neill, the Liam McHugh and all this, all of these other matters. So trying to say is, to be in my shoes, I would view things differently from, you know, the way where a new superintendent would come in and they just -- they
don't take that into account, that there's been a lot of stuff already gone in, going on.
434 Q. Can I ask you to go to Day 100 at page 131 please, of the transcript?
A. Page 131.
A. Yes.

436 Q. I think that this dealt with your evidence about bringing in the documentation to show the tax disk had been paid, do you remember that?
A. Again, the question is not -- the question is not quite the way it happened, Judge. I was asked to get the documentation. Because I recall going down -- when Superintendent Murray asked me, he asked me -- he never mentioned discipline or anything the first day and then, when he said, did you get the tax, this is, from recollection, on the second meeting, and he said, did you get your tax sorted, something to that effect, and I said, yes. He said, can you get the documents? I went down the stairs. They were in the car, because I keep all my tax and insurance documents in the car. So when I got whatever documents, that's when he took them and he ran straight to the photocopy and then he said, I'm going to discipline you. That was the first I knew about discipline.
437 Q. Now, again I have to suggest to you, it wasn't the first you knew about this, because Superintendent Murray will say he did speak to you about regulation 10 , as he recorded in his note. But could I ask you to
go back to page 117 of the same transcript, this is Day 100. 117, please?
A. 117?

438 Q.
117, please. I think this is where you describe in your evidence that you met Superintendent Murray, you said, the first thing he did, instead of just taking my word, he said, can I see them.
"The minute he had them ran over to the photocopi er, and that's when l knew this boy -- what he's up to."

Do you remember you said those words?
A. Just where is this.

439 Q. The top of the page, if you start at line 2 , page 117 ?
A. okay.

440 Q. Please take a moment just to read that paragraph.
A. Yeah.

441 Q. Superintendent Murray will say that he was actually on his way out of the office when you approached him. That he turned around and went back in, made use of the 14:54 photocopier and I think he provided with you a copy as well, did he, or the original?
A. No, no. I remember, I had to go down the stairs to the car to get the documents and that's when I remember, like, you know, can you not just take my word, I got the tax sorted. I told him I got it sorted and what does he want the -- does he not believe me, kind of, that I didn't get it sorted. That was -- no, no.

442 Q. I have to suggest to you that the way you describe

Superintendent Murray's activity there, the steam at which he used the photocopy, from which you induce the fact that he was up to something, is paranoid in its approach, that's simply reading far too much into a situation where he will simply say he simply took a
A. That's his version.

443 Q. Did you time him taking photocopies on the photocopier?
A. Sorry.

444 Q. Did you time him taking the photocopies on the photocopier? what point were you trying to make? CHA RMAN It wasn't the speed of the photocopying, it was his thirst to get them photocopied. He says he ran to the photocopier. So it's the speed in getting to the photocopier.
MR. MRPHY: Yes. He will say he was on his way out of the premises.
CHA RMAN I understand.
MR. MRPHY: Went back in to do this task and went back out again.
CHA RMAK And what Garda Keogh is saying is that when the superintendent was given the documents into his hand, he ran to the photocopier. In the whole circumstances, he deduced or inferred that this was not a friendly copying act.
MR. MRPHY: Yes. And again on behalf of
Superintendent Murray, I have to say there is simply no basis for that, Judge.
CHA RMAN Yes, you disagree with that.

WTNESS: Just for clarification, Judge. I used the words he ran to the photocopier, I didn't mean he literally ran to the photocopier.
CHA RMAN That is what you did say.
WTNESS: Obviously he walked towards it, walked briskly towards the photocopier.

CHA RMAN You say the fact that he photocopied them, is that right, was a straw in the wind?
A. I was wondering what -- I mean what's the --

446 Q. CHA RMAN If he raised the issue, would it not be normal for him to check it out, to say, show me the documents?
A. Yes.

447 Q. Nobody was accusing anybody of, you know, lying. Would it be enough to say, I've sorted that out, don't worry about it. Oh, very good, thanks very much, off we go. Even when they raised an issue about it, if somebody said that, would you not have photocopied the documents?
A. Well firstly, it would be a very serious thing for a guard to lie to a superintendent.

448 Q. CHAN RMAN But you are suggesting something that strikes me as being altogether a bit casual. That you meet him and you say, oh, I sorted that out, and that he should accept it and if he doesn't accept it, that's 14:57 an indication of some hostility. I am finding that hard to believe, to be honest?
A. Yeah, I understand.

449 Q

## CHAN RMAN:

I see your point about, okay, taking them
and photocopying them, you might say, well, maybe if he looked at them and satisfied himself that might be -okay.
A. Yes. Judge, again, when he has the copies, I think then it goes -- he then proceeds with the discipline then. I didn't know anything, like he never mentioned the discipline the first day.
Q. CHA RMAN So you didn't think that disciplinary proceedings were a reasonable response, that's really it?
A. Yes, Judge. In relation to this incident, for continued -- from the very start, this is where I understand now that it was Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and the investigation team that notices there is an issue with my car tax. Obviously this is known to Garda management for what, approximately a year at this stage.
451 Q. CHA RMAR Apparently, I don't know, my guess is, until I hear something different, that casually he is walking with Superintendent McBrien and he notices, being of a noticing sort of person, they notice your car and he says, by the way, look, that's commercial. Something like that.
A. Judge, well what I --

452 Q. CHA RMAN We will hear all about that. You say they 14:59 had it for a long time, they knew it for a long time?
A. Yes.

453 Q. CHA RMAN That indicates that it wasn't so serious a matter that it called for (a) immediate attention,
because it didn't get immediate attention and it was unreasonable to make a disciplinary issue out of it?
A. Judge, at any period of time while they knew, they could have said, listen, Nick, can you just get -there is a problem with the your car tax, can you get it sorted. Judge, that was it. If, let's say, it was a completely illegal thing, they knew --
CHA RMAN I understand.
A. And they let me, you know.

CHA RMAN Right.
MR. MRPHY: Garda keogh, you do understand that regulation 10 is perhaps at the lowest level of informal resolution of a disciplinary issue, by caution, by warning or by advice?
A. I understand that now. As I said, I was never
disciplined before. I didn't know anything about discipline.
456 Q. My understanding is this doesn't leave a mark on your disciplinary record. But insofar as this transaction was concerned, this meeting at the photocopier, isn't it the case that finalising this matter made provision for the allowance of your travel claims to be processed?
A. Yes.

457 Q. So there was a benefit to you of getting this done Superintendent Murray was doing?
A. There's very little shortfall, like it wasn't to do with the money or anything like that, we're talking
about $€ 50$ or something in the difference.
CHA RMAN Of which?
A. Between car tax and the allowances that was to be paid, like, it was a tiny, it was smal1, roughly $€ 50$ or something was the difference. If it's implied that I on7y did it to get the payment for the subsistence allowances, if that's what is being implied, I am not sure, in the question.
CHA RMAN The amount owed to you for expenses compared with the deficiency in tax between the commercial and ordinary, that's what you're referring to?
A. That's what I am trying to explain.

CHA RMAN Thank you.
MR. MRPHY: I think if you look, please, at Volume 4, page 682?
MR. KELLY: Judge, I wonder whether that would be a convenient moment for the garda to have a break.

CHAL RMAN Sure, yes.
MR. MRPHY: I only have a few more questions on this issue, I have five minutes on this issue?
CHA RMAN You can finish on this issue in five minutes, perfect, we will take the five minutes and then we will have a break because you didn't have one this morning. okay.
MR. MRPHY: Volume 4, page 682.
CHA RMAN Yes.
461 Q.
MR. MRPHY: Statement of inspector Minnock. Can I ask you to look at the second last paragraph on that page, 682.
A. It starts with "I rel ayed".

462 Q. Yes, please. Prior to that, we know from previous evidence that has been given, Superintendent Minnock made an enquiry of offaly County Council in relation to your car. He relayed this information to
Superintendent Murray. Superintendent Murray says in his evidence, appeared to be anxious to deal appropriately, swiftly and fairly with the matter. Thereafter, he was advised that the tax classification had been rectified. He says this and will say in his evidence:
"I amaware that your clai ms were pai d, that you recei ved a regul ation 10 for using a vehicle whi ch was i ncorrectly taxed. This was consistent with matters of this nature coming to the attention of district management teamand to my attention."

So he's saying that what occurred here was consistent with practice that he had seen at that time. It was
not something that was special to you only.
A. Oh, I dispute that. Because he then -- you see, he gives an amnesty to every other garda in the station, member of the Garda Síochána in the station, he gives an amnesty in relation to two months for them. Bear in 15:03 mind, Judge, they're aware for about a year there's a problem, a minor problem with my car tax and everybody else then gets an amnesty for two months to get problems with their vehicles in order. And like, one
of the issues is that Superintendent Murray says he's aware that there's basically members of An Garda Síochána driving with no insurance on this. And they get an amnesty I would argue that was completely illega1.

463 Q. Garda Keogh, don't you know this from reading the statement before, but if you turn over the page to 683, you will see that Superintendent Murray will say this was consistent practice, that Superintendent Murray initiated a certification process for driving licence, tax and insurance for all members.
A. Yes, but --

464 Q. Sorry, I think you acknowledge that took place. Just look at the end of that paragraph, he says:
"I bel ieve another garda member had to regul arise the tax classification on his vehicle following this process and that a regul ation 10 was al so recommended for this situation. "
A. Judge, I know --

MR. MEGU NNESS: Chairman, may $I$ just intervene on that point. We sought to clarify that matter and we haven't yet been provided with any such regulation 10 notice for another member.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MEGU NNESS: It has been confirmed that there is no such one in the Athlone district.
CHA RMAN It's been confirmed?

MR. MEGU NESS: That there is no such one in the Athlone district.

CHA RMAN okay.
WTNESS: Judge, if I can be of assistance here.
CHA RMAN Yes.
WTNESS: There was another member in a sub-district outside of Ath1one that did get a regulation 10 but months after these events.
CHA RMAN okay.
WTNESS: So they're not --
CHA RMAN So we have a question mark over whether somebody else was in the same position as you. It looks as if in Athlone there wasn't some such person and your real point is, irrespective of that -- let me finish for a second. Irrespective of that, your point is that all the others were given, $I$ don't know that amnesty is the correct word, but they were given the opportunity of two months in which to put their things right without any question of a regulation $10 ?$
A. Yes. And my understanding is that months afterwards, one of these -- a garda didn't avail of the opportunity.
465 Q. CHA RMAN Very good. You say it's a different situation entirely?
A. Correct, Judge.

CHA RMAN A11 right.
466 Q. MR. MRPH: Isn't it the case that the regulation 10 can be used informally, in a non-documentary way?
A. Sorry?

467 Q. Isn't it the case that the regulation 10 process can be used informally?
CHA RMAN Can be used informally?
MR. MRPHY: Informally, that it's an informal process. CHA RMAN But in his case was it used. He was given a 15:06 notice.

MR. MRPHY: Yes, absolutely, but I'm saying in relation to the other --

CHA RMAN I'm sorry. So it could happen that there isn't a notice about it. Anyway, I think we have the point. But Garda Keogh's point essentially is, look, I was treated differently because the others were given the opportunity of doing it. That's his point.
MR. MRPHY: Then finally, can I ask you just before the break, Volume 8, page 2196.
CHA RMAN 2196. Thank you. okay.
468 Q. MR. MRPHY: Just to confirm the finalisation of this process, because we went through this last week and I won't waste time on it, but I think you accepted when it was put to you last week that it was Superintendent McBrien who actually initiated this whole question of travel and tax compliance. So this was a legacy issue that was left over to Superintendent Murray. You will see that in this letter, page 2195, he writes to the chief superintendent Mullingar, he indicates what steps 15:07 he has taken, he has indicated that:

[^1]That he met you. That you admitted tax on the vehicle in that class. That he gave you a chance to correct this. That he dealt with you by way of regulation 10 . Then the final sentence:

"The matter is now cl osed."

would you agree with me, at the end of the process that matter was closed as far as An Garda Síochána were concerned and you were left without any serious disciplinary mark on your character?
A. I'm not so sure about the € 377 , Judge. I am not sure about that. But it's not an issue anyway, there was a shortfal1. The matter with the car tax, yes, it was closed, Judge.

469 Q. Superintendent Murray will say that from his point of view that was finished, you were free to receive your allowances, the tax had been paid, the matter was closed?
A. Ultimately that was the end.
Q. Sure.
A. But bear in mind, Judge, if I had been served -- I didn't know anything about discipline, if I knew about it I would have perhaps contested that, but

471 Q. CHA RMAN Contested what?
A. Contested the thing in relation to the thing with the issue with the commercial, the fact that you couldn't
actually -- I couldn't -- I could not tax the car in -sorry, I couldn't put the car -- the car was commercial, it only had two seats, the actual vehicle was a commercial vehicle.
472 Q. CHA RMAN Hold on a second. If I buy a car that used to be a van, however it is, do you say I'm entitled to tax it as a commercial vehicle?
A. Sorry?

473 Q. CHA RMAN If somebody buys a van, some shop owns a van and somebody buys it when it's secondhand, are they entitled to use -- if I bought it, am I entitled to use it as a commercial vehicle? Say look, you know, it has, whatever it has, Tesco on the side, and it used to be commercial.
A. I'm not sure, Judge. I have been trying to find out the law.

474 Q. CHA RMAN Listen, you're a guard, we've both been at this business for long enough. It sounds a bit iffy to me.
MR. KELLY: Judge, with respect, I think there might be a difference of legal opinion on that. If the question is, at what point does a van become a car, I think it might actually -- a lot of courts spend a lot of time --

CHAI RMAN We11, Mr. Ke11y, hum hum, is what I say to that.

MR. KELLY: Yes, but another court may say something different.

CHA RMAN Very good. We don't have to worry about it.

But you took the view that, look, whatever it was and you paid up the tax. We don't have to worry too much about that particular little issue. I can't say I came across it much in the course of my career, Mr. Kelly, no more than I expect have you come across it that much.

MR. KELLY: Well, I think we're both lucky in that. CHA RMAN I think so. Thank you very much. We will take a little break okay. Okay, thanks very much.

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

## FOLLOWE:

MR. MRPH: Chairman, I wonder if Garda Keogh could be shown his diaries, please.
CHAI RMAK Yes, of course.
MR. MRPH: For the balance of the Tribunal, it's page 13318, it's in volume 47/48?
CHA RMAN You have it in front of you. The date?
MR. MRPH: The date, if I can ask you to move to the date of 8th July 2015.

CHAN RMAN Thank you.
MR MRPH: This, Chairman, is to deal with issue number 7.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. MRPFH: which deals with the disciplinary investigation in relation to the sick leave of Garda Nicholas Keogh during July of 2015.
CHA RMAN Yes.

476
Q. MR. MRPHY: Garda Keogh, do you have that passage?
A. Yeah.
Q. Thank you. I think under the 6th July, it was a rest day for you, is that correct?
A. Yes. best, as you very fairly acknowledged, to help you with your welfare issues?
A. Yes. He is the welfare officer, Judge, that deals with me, yes.
Q. Was it your practice to tell him that you intended to go drinking?
A. Em...

481 Q. Or would that suggest that you were intending to go drinking for a long time?
A. Sorry?
Q. Did that indicate to him that you were to go drinking for several days?
A. You see, unfortunately, Judge, when I go drinking, it's a bit like a car with no brakes. I might intend to go 15:24 drinking for one night or whatever but sometimes it's to hard to -- stopping is the problem, Judge.

483 Q. Just looking at that page, which deals with the week, we can see that Monday is a rest day. Can we take it
from that, that the rest of the days of that week were in principle days where you were meant to be working?
A. I see Tuesday is a rest day as well.

484 Q. I see, thank you. So, just looking at the entries and again, I think you can confirm, from that date onwards, 15:25 we have entries on that date for drink, the next day for drink, Thursday drink and sick, Friday sick, then it says:
"Friday, of f sick while drinking, di dn't remenber.
Thought I was still okay."

## Did you write that in after that date?

A. I would have had to, Judge.

485 Q. Then, I think the next day you have, AWOL drink, AWOL drink. And then the 13th July, AWOL drinking. There is a reference there to "trial starts" can I ask you to help me define what that is, please?
A. I just see I have "[blank] trial starts" I think. It's nothing to do with this.
486 Q. Was it a trial in which you had a part as a witness or were you organising?
A. No, I don't think so.

487 Q. okay. I just wasn't sure why it was there?
A. I don't know why, I just can't -- I don't know why I have it in.
Q. Then on the 14th there's the AWOL also mentioned.
A. Sorry?

489 Q. On Tuesday, the 14th, you also have the letters AWOL
entered?
A. I see that, yes.
Q. If you could be shown volume 1, page 135. This was a statement which you made to the Tribunal. If I could refer you to paragraph 14, please, in the middle of the 15:27 page? I just want to deal with this for a moment because this is how you characterised your complaint at the earliest stage of the Tribunal process. You're were saying:
"There was an issue of a mix-up about my si gni ng of $f$ sick and then not reporting for duty.

I had apparently rung in of fick. I was on the contrary sick. It was at most a mistake. The medi cal certificate materialised retrospectivel y to certify my si ckness during the period. In any case, this medi cally certified absence was irrationally turned by Superintendent Murray into a charge of being absent wi thout I eave.

I was find €300. Superintendent Pat Murray, in breach of fair procedures, acted as witness, prosecutor and enforcer inthis case. Superintendent Pat Murray was wrong at least about the date on whi ch he alleged he had tel ephoned me."

So, I think that's a fair gist of the complaint that you made at the outset?
A. Judge, I clarified this last week and I clarified this as quick as I could with the Tribunal, when I made my statement to the Tribunal, and I did explain, in this particular statement, we dealt with this, where I believed at the time there was a deadline for the 13th March to have the documents in. This particular statement, it was a very rushed thing, and there are this and there's a couple of other things that are just not correct.

491 Q. CHA RMAN I thought this was the statement you made to 15:28 the Tribunal.
A. No, this was the statement I sent in to the Tribunal.

492 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. That I believed there was a deadline.

493 Q. CHA RMAN Anyway, we have been over that and you agree 15:29 that it was incorrect?
A. Yes.

494 Q. MR. MRPHY: I think that corrective statement was made by you on $9 / 8 / 2018$ to the Tribunal investigators. CHA RMAN That's what I thought.

495 Q. MR. MRPH: Just to go back for a moment to the original statement, can I ask you to turn to page 136. Do you see there in the third paragraph it says:
"Pat Murray then vi ndi ctively requested an
acknow edgment of this finding to him in circunstances where it was a contest bet ween my version and that of Pat Murray. He acted as formul at or of the charge, judge, witness, gi ving untrue testimony and now
enf orcer of a cap in hand acknow edgment."

So I think you would agree, the acquisition that you were putting at the beginning to the Tribunal was against Pat Murray and was put as an example that he was unfair, loquacious and that he was lying in terms of the testimony he had given, isn't that so?
A. Judge, as I said, this is linked to what I previously said. There are a couple of issues, not just with this part, in this particular statement. I explained all this. Just the issue there was, I think where he sent an acknowledgment out to acknowledge that I had been disciplined. As if I didn't know I had been disciplined.
496 Q. Can you explain to the Chairman how it took you so long 15:30 to correct such a glaring error?
A. I mean, Judge, there was so much going on between this and the Tribunal and even whenever I read this statement, I didn't -- I was wrecked the evening we got that statement in on the 13th, I think of March. Am I correct? 2018? I mean, I remember, I didn't really read over that statement that night. I don't even know when I read over it. I would have been way -- it would have been afterwards I read over the statement. I saw a lot of problems in that. I just said, look, I will deal with all them when $I$ am meeting the Tribunal thing. Also, in that period then, I think is there the Finn investigation, and then there's also the McMahon investigation going on and all that.

497 Q. But, Garda Keogh, I have to put it to you, you knew both Pat Murray and Alan Murray to see, didn't you?
A. Yes.

498 Q. You could have been under no doubt that they were two separate people. At the same time, in this situation you instructed your own advisers to put forward this complaint in relation to Pat Murray, with the added detail that this was irrational, untrue and unfair. I have to ask you, how can you have made a mistake between those two? Or are you saying that you were so careless that you were willing to throw out an allegation against Pat Murray without even reading it?
A. Judge, I have explained that in relation to this particular statement, $I$ think $I$ even said it at the end of last week, I said there are problems with this
statement. No, I don't think I even got -- as far as I can remember, $I$ didn't even read over it that night, because I believed there was a deadline and it had to be in. I have explained all this.
499 Q. Again, Garda Keogh, you have emphasised many times and you have protested that you weren't treated fairly. Would you agree that it was unfair of you at the very least to allow this statement be issued in your name, to stay on the record until 2018, and only correct it when the investigators showed you what they believed to 15:32 be a dichotomy between what you were saying and what the evidence demonstrated?
A. I don't know if that's correct. I don't know. I know I corrected it. I think the bottom line on this is,
that I did correct it, Judge. I corrected the statement when I met the Tribunal investigators.
500 Q. When it was brought to your attention but not before, isn't that so?
A. Sorry.
Q. When it was brought to your attention by the investigators and not before?
A. Oh listen, I just cannot remember, I can't -- I just can't remember that.

502 Q. I see. In terms of can't remember, do you have a lot of memory difficulties? Because you used that phrase a lot during the course of your testimony. Do you find that as a result of your alcohol consumption and Xanax that your memory has suffered over time?
A. Well, Judge, a lot of stuff I have to rely on goes back 15:33 as far as 2008 and we're now in 2019. There's so many investigations and I am only human and there's certain things I remember because they take priority and there's lesser things that, over time, I forget, even certain things in the diary notes, you know, this is going on years, Judge.

503 Q. Again, this could be of assistance to the Tribunal and its assessment of your ability to give evidence accurately. Is it your evidence to the Chairman that you forgot the difference between Pat Murray and Alan Murray until 2018?
A. Judge, I have explained this. I know the difference between Pat Murray and Alan Murray, there's a very big difference between both of those gentlemen.

504 Q. Can we just move on for a moment then, and I wil1 perhaps return to that point, to page 606 of volume 3 please. Could you please turn over to page 607? 1 think you have seen this document before, it was shown to you by Mr. McGuinness, it's the extract from Sergeant Moylan's statement. Do you see that?
A. Just sorry, which number?
A. Okay. Just 4.1?
Q. From 4.1 down. Just take a moment, please, just to read from 4.1 down to 4.5 , as the Chairman suggested, and then I wil1 ask you a question. So, Garda Keogh, can I ask you, do you accept that that recitation of fact is outlined by the sergeant?
A. Yes.

507 Q. So there can be no doubt but that you were missing for the days that he mentioned?
A. I am not disputing that.

508 Q. Just leaving the dates out of it for the moment, I think you would accept that the circumstances of this withdrawal meant that your colleagues had to find replacement for you and to fill the gap left by your absence during those days?
A. I would have to accept that, Judge.

509 Q. Would you agree with me that that would have left them 15:37 having to perhaps work harder than normal or to be left with a difficulty which they weren't aware of in advance?
A. Judge, look, I recall because at some stage it was one
of my colleagues that said -- at some stage they had made contact with me and they said, whatever you do, make sure and get in contact with Cormac, Sergeant Cormac Moylan. My colleagues were looking out for me. You see, I had no credit in my phone, that's why I didn't even think of the texting him on Facebook and then eventually I think one of them actually said, look, just send him a text on Facebook. And that's ultimately what I did.
510 Q. Can we try and keep this part simple, Garda Keogh. There is no dispute but that you pleaded guilty to being absent without leave during these days?
A. I did.

511 Q. Isn't that right?
A. I did.

512 Q. Yes. So, in terms of the impact on your colleagues, all of what occurred there is I think clearly established. Can I just move please, to Volume 8, page 2220. If we just take that document. First of a11, I think this is a note taken by Superintendent Pat Murray 15:38 of a conversation with you on 14/7/15. We will come back to that date in a moment. That conversation did take place insofar as he says that there was a report to him by Sergeant Moylan that you had been AWOL for four days, from 11th to 14 th and that he phoned you at 15:39 12 noon.
A. He says he phoned me at 12 noon on the 14 th.

513 Q. I will come back to the date, Garda Keogh, but I think the date is largely irrelevant to this?
A. Well, look, I would dispute the date is irrelevant on this particular thing. That's part of the issue in relation to the appeal mechanism in relation to this part of it.
514 Q. It`s my understanding that the superintendent wil1 say it was the 15th, we can clarify that point. But insofar as that's concerned, you had a conversation, of that there is no doubt.
A. On the 15 th $I$ had a conversation with Superintendent Murray.

515 Q. You told him that admitted to being AWOL; isn't that right?
A. I put my hands up straightaway, Judge.

516 Q. You also said to him that you had reported off sick from 10th Ju7y, a fit of drinking, after drinking for a 15:40 few days, and then you said that you had forgotten and had reported off sick, so you didn't go to work. You admitted to Chief Superintendent Murray that you had a drink problem and that you had stopped going to AA, do you recall that?
A. Judge, I'm not disputing -- the only thing I'm disputing really is the date.

517 Q. I think you told him that you still find it hard to sleep before earlies, that you drank beer and wine, mostly cans of beer. You brought up your whistleblower 15:40 case and you said you were worried about Garda A and that they would get him?
A. Garda A and another guard who Superintendent Murray subsequently later puts on the same unit as me, after

Garda A is suspended, Judge.
518 Q. You have no answer when challenged and you talk about that issue. I think Chief Superintendent Murray then says to you, asked you why you didn't answer the sergeant who was trying to contact you over the AWOL weekend and you say that you had no credit. But you agreed that credit was not required to answer a call.
A. Judge, I have answered this last week. The fact of the matter is, here I am answering the superintendent on the phone. And I have a great working re relationship with the sergeant. It wasn't that -- it wasn't that I typically didn't answer the sergeant. I mean, Judge, I have said this, $I$ have answered this question last week.
519 Q. Garda Keogh, he will also say that you then said to him, you indicated that you would continue going sick at will?
A. I don't know, I don't know what --

520 Q. Is it possible you did say those words?
A. I don't know if I would have said --

521 Q. It will be his evidence that he recorded that as what you said?
A. You see, I mean, I am trying to think here on the spot and to give the most factual answer. I mean, I don't remember, like I don't remember everything in the conversation back in 2015 of one phone call.
522 Q. Can I suggest to you that it's more likely to be true in the sense that he hadn't been on a binge for four or five days and he took a note, isn't that correct?
A. I don't dispute I was on a binge.

523 Q. Yes.
A. I think I have it marked in my diary sure I was drinking. Like I'm not -- it comes back to the earlier incident to do with where $I$ was sick, where it wasn't marked in my diaries that I was drinking. Judge, I have clearly marked in my diaries -- I suppose, look, isn't it handy for the whole Tribunal, the fact I've marked in my diaries when $I$ was drinking and not.
524 Q. Isn't it the case that later you admitted to the CMO that you had been drinking and taking Xanax during that time, during those days?
A. I can't --

525 Q. Okay.
A. I'm not sure if -- I think I have a note whenever I took -- so that could be the case. Just...

526 Q. Just for the sake of completeness, can I ask you be to shown 3791, please? Just so we can be absolutely clear about this, I think this is a note, an OHP consultation note dated 18th December 2015. A statement from the CMO. There's just one part I'd like to refer to for this purpose. Can I ask you to look at first starred bullet-point, just near the top. It says:
"Si nce last seen, further periods of short-term absences. Some of concern hi ghlighted (4/7in July had forgotten he was after calling of fick on 10/7/2015; attributes this to drinking while off and taking Xanax with al cohol on 9/7/2015)."

That will be Dr. Oghuvbu's evidence, that that's what you told him at the time, would that be fair?
A. Yes, that's correct. I think that's the date that I find out that they are marking me with the flu. During 15:44 all of this --

527 Q. Leaving the classification to one side, it's irrelevant for the purposes of this issue. what's relevant is, you admitted to him you had been drinking excessively and taking Xanax during the period where you were AWOL. 15:44 You admit that?
A. Doesn't it show I wasn't lying to the doctor.

528 Q. So, can I ask you, please, to go back to Volume 8, page 2220?
A. I wasn't lying to the doctor but somebody was withhold information to the same doctor in relation to what was on my sick certs at this time, Judge.
529 Q. I'm not saying anyone was lying to the doctor. In this case you were telling the doctor the truth. We will deal with the other separately, which is irrelevant to this question. So, going back to 2220, Chief Superintendent Murray will say that he told you that he was going to request a case conference for you and was considering discipline for AWOL and would seek an explanation in writing from you. Do you remember that? 15:45
A. Sorry, I didn't get a chance just there. Can you --

530 Q. Just look at the end of 2220 , the last three lines?
A. Yeah.

531 Q. He said he was going to request a case conference and
was considering discipline for AWOL and would seek an explanation in writing from you?
A. Yes.

532 Q. And that's what happened?
A. Yeah. well, Judge, my recollection from reading
through documents there, is that Superintendent Murray I think wrote two reports and there's something to do with discipline in one of them and there isn't something -- there's no mention of discipline in the other report, Judge. Just from reading the documents. 15:46 well, the position, Garda Keogh, that's of central relevance here to this issue, is that you were referred for a disciplinary process, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

534 Q. Now, the first point I want to put to you, going back to your earlier criticism, I have to suggest to you that the position that Superintendent Murray found himself in was one in which he responded rationally and reasonably to what he perceived to be a breakdown of discipline?
A. Judge, I am -- Judge, my certs are to do with work related stress. I am under serious work related stress. I have already heard-- from the very start Superintendent murray is questioning the stress levels that I am under. I am being marked out with the flu.
535 Q. I would have to suggest to you that any senior officer of his rank would have had to do the same as Superintendent Murray, when confronted with a position where a person such as yourself had been off duty for a
number of days and had, on his notes, said that you were going to continue going sick at will. That wasn't irrational, was it?
A. Judge, I put my hands up straightaway. I mean, the thing about not answering the phone to Sergeant Moylan and then I answer Superintendent Murray and I put my hands up straightaway to Superintendent Murray. Would you agree with me that you put your hands up because you knew that your colleagues and your friends had had to fill the gap that you left. This wasn't the 15:47 way things should be, was it?
A. Like, that's sort of a twisted question there. I mean -- I just -- no naturally, naturally I would have put my hands up. It's not that, you know, I had any ulterior motive for putting my hands up.
Isn't it the position, Garda Keogh, that a sergeant who you respected had filled out the form saying dead pan, this is what happened and you didn't dispute that?
A. I didn't dispute that.
would you agree with me that if everybody in the station was to do that or even if the majority of people were to do that in the station, discipline would break down entirely in the force?
A. I understand.

539 Q. Yes. So, all I am trying to say there is not to in any 15:48 way demonise you, but to say that in the circumstances, on my instructions, Superintendent Murray will say he had to do what he had to do to maintain discipline, he wasn't trying to target you, he wasn't trying to hurt
you, but he was trying to effectively assist you, to regain discipline in your engagement with the force?
A. It's not as simple as that, Judge, because there's the issue of the date from the 14th to the 15th, which has relevance in relation to the appeal and it implies, of course, that I refused to answer my sergeant, which I take issue with on that. That's the way -- there was an appeal --
540 Q. Garda Keogh, can I ask you just to confront something I asked you to confront yesterday as well on a couple of occasions, reality and perception. The reality is that you let your colleagues down, that you were AWOL. You admitted it, and you were drunk and you were on Xanax, and you were in breach of the disciplinary code. The perception you're putting on top of that is completely ignoring that fact and trying to work out dates and irrelevant factors. Do you understand now with the benefit of hindsight that this disciplinary breach was a significant matter, that the dates are irrelevant?
A. No, I don't think the dates are irrelevant on that.

541 Q. CHAI RMAN Tel1 me the relevance of the date?
A. The date was to do with the phone call, because the date was -- when -- during the disciplinary thing Superintendent Murray said he phone called me often the 14/7.
542 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. He's saying I wouldn't answer the sergeant or I wouldn't, whatever, contact the sergeant.
543 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. You see, I had texted the sergeant later on.

CHA RMAN Yes, the Facebook.
A. Yes. And, you see, my note was that the call was on the 15th.

545 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. Now, although I was the one, when it was a question of perception and reality, that had been on the beer, my note is correct, Judge, and Superintendent Murray was incorrect on this issue.
CHA RMAN okay. So, what difference does that make?
A. Well, that was to do with the -- in relation to the appeal part of the process.
547 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Still, what difference does it make?
A. Well, look, in relation to the first part, I put my hands up, totally.
548 Q. CHA RMAN But in relation to any part. what difference does it make? The appeal or the first thing?
A. It's to do with the sergeant that --

549 Q. CHA RMAN No, it's to do with you being AWOL. That's 15:50 what Mr. Murphy is saying. It sounds right to me. But tell me where it's wrong. what difference does it make if it was the 15th or the 14th, when you had the phone cal1 with Superintendent Murray?
A. It's to do with where he implies that I wasn't making contact or answering, deliberately not answering the sergeant.

550 Q. CHA RMAN So he was wrong, you were still AWOL?
A. Yeah.

551 Q. CHA RMAN Do you know what I mean?
A. Yes, I do of course, yes.

552 Q. CHA RMAN I mean, don't just agree with me, and you can come back to this if you want to, if you still think the date is relevant, come back to me. Do you understand me?
A. Yes, Judge.

553 Q. CHA RMAN If, having thought about it overnight or at the end or whatever it is, if you still think, because I am not understanding why, assuming he is wrong about the date, which I do, which seems to be accepted, that he is wrong about the date, it leaves you off the hook for not answering -- I don't mean -- sorry, that's too casual a way of phrasing it. It leaves you not to blame. I have the point about the Facebook. But I am still not understanding. But if you want to come back to me and tell me, having thought about it, why the date is still important, feel free to do it. Is that okay?
A. Yes.

554 Q. CHA RMAN Because just so you know, at this moment I am not understanding how the date is relevant, because I think you came along, you pleaded guilty. As you say, you put your hands up, you appealed, okay. Now, I have the point about the date, having thought about it, 15:52 feel free to come back on that. But as of now, I am thinking that the date is not relevant. okay, that's my present state of mind, but if you can say why it is, be my guest. Do you understand me?
A. Judge, if we leave out the date, Judge, I put my hands up straightaway.
Q. CHA RMAN That is what I understand.
A. I've answered the phone call to Superintendent Murray, it wasn't a deliberate thing that $I$ wasn't answering Sergeant Moylan, I have explained that last week. I put my hands up, I didn't try and give any sort of nonsense excuse.
CHA RMAN No, I understand that. Because you have mentioned the date a number of times last week and you have mentioned it here, now we can leave the date, if you don't come back to me, that is all right. You know what I am thinking about the date --
A. I do.

557 Q. CHA RMAN -- and you equally know that you are free to 15:53 come back to me to say, hold on, the date is of more importance than you think it is. A11 right.
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN okay thank you.
MR. MRPHY: Garda Keogh, just short matters. That
process continued, you pleaded guilty to one charge, you were found not guilty of the second, the on1y charge that was the subject-matter of the appeal was the first charge, you appealed that and there was no change. One issue you raised when you gave evidence whether you received a copy of the statement when the report of the interview was served on you. And you seemed to feel that you had not. I have to put it to
you that on my instructions you were, when the documents were served on you.
A. No, Judge.

And insofar as you are maintaining that they weren't served on you, you are incorrect?
A. Judge, I don't ever remember reading that statement until it was in the volumes there. And in fact, like, I have made an issue out of it, I wrote to Chief Superintendent wheatley and, you know -- so...

CHA RMAK okay.
A. Just in relation to that part.

560 Q. MR. MRPHY: Can I ask you to be shown Volume 8, page 2045 please.
A. Sorry, the number?

561 Q. Volume 8, page 2405 please. So this is a statement, an 15:54 extract from a statement of Pat Murray in relation to these matters. Could I draw your attention just to the last paragraph? And he says:
"On Sunday, 30th August 2015 at approxi matel y 9pm I met Garda Keogh at my of fice to serve the Form1A12 on him on behal $f$ and at the request of the superintendent Mullingar who had been appoi nted by the chi ef superintendent West meath to inquire into Garda Keogh's absence without I eave."

He says that you acknowledged receipt of that Form 1 A 12 .
A. Yeah.

562 Q. And I think it is during that process that that bundle of documents would have incorporated the statement that you say you didn't receive?
A. Yeah, but there was a bundle of documents, Judge, and I had to sign to receive the bundle. I didn't go through 15:55 every page.

CHA RMAR And you think that the statement was not in the bundle of documents?
A. Well, Judge, if it was I certainly didn't see it. Because --
564 Q. MR. MRPHY: Did you ring back the next day saying I haven't got the statement?
A. No, but I wrote -- I wrote --

565 Q. No.
A. At different points I wrote, I wrote to the Chief Superintendent wheatley looking for that statement.

566 Q. But can I just suggest to you, as I already have, it is irrelevant in our submission, $I$ will come back to it later on, but $I$ am just saying as a matter of fact Superintendent Murray will say that was served on you.
A. No.

567 Q. He will say also that it was clear to him that you were annoyed with him, would that be correct?
A. That's possible. That's possible. And, Judge, in relation to that statement, you see in that statement I 15:56 explained to Superintendent Alan Murray, you know I say look, I'm under an awful lot of stress here with everything that is going on and I put my hands up there with Superintendent Alan Murray. He will say that based on what he was looking at, looking at your condition, looking at your actions, that he was becoming more and more concerned, that he worked your work standard with you and he also, if you just please turn over the page, he will say that he indicated that if your drinking was going to continue impacting on your work that he might have to consider taking you off outdoor duty. Do you remember that?
A. I think, yeah, he may -- I think I recall something on those lines. But I mean if he was so concerned about me, you know, would he not have taken into consideration the fact of my sick certs had work related stress and they're still marking me out with the flu on this and the CMO is not informed of work related stress. It's kept -- he is kept in the dark from this.
570 Q. Garda Keogh, I am going to come back to those at a later stage, but here you are, here is a classic example: You're obsessed by the label of the designation of the form, but Chief Superintendent Murray is concerned about the sickness which is
affecting you tragically, the alcoholic sickness that is affecting you, that is interfering with your work, he is trying to get to the heart of the matter and you want to talk about forms. Do you see a difference of perspective? One is seeking to try and address the problem, fix it and the other is a bureaucratic answer: Is it the right form? Is it the right document? Is the T crossed? Do you see what I mean? Even at this stage with the benefit of hindsight can you see that Chief Superintendent Murray was trying to get you to address this real problem in your life?
A. Judge, if he was he would have addressed -- someone would have informed the CMO that there's other issues in the background here. The CMO is kept in the dark of the other issues, of the other matters, investigations, the fact I'm working in the same station as Garda A, a11 this stuff, and the fact it's dragging on so long as well, Judge. I mean it's only human -- I can only take so much, Judge, as well, as a person.
571 Q. Garda Keogh, can I just suggest to you that in this situation that he will say that he said that if you have any issues -- sorry, that you effectively, you replied to him that if he, Superintendent Murray, had any issues that he should send them to you in writing and in the meantime, he, Superintendent Murray, could do what he liked. Do you remember saying that?
A. I mean, I don't remember saying he could do -- I don't remember saying that. I don't know. Is this on the phone call, the phone call? Is this to do with --

572
Q. This is a meeting.
A. Oh right. okay.

573 Q. This is face-to-face. And what he will say is that ultimately at this stage your response to his outreach was to say effectively that he could do what he liked, that you would do what you liked and that you weren't prepared to deal with the issues at that time?
A. Just, sorry, what date is this meeting, please?

574
Q. This is the date of the 30th August 2015 at 9pm.
A. I just have the note. CHA RMAN okay. Go on.
A. Just a short note:

## "Sunday 9pm

Superintendent Murray arrives to station to serve regul ation 15 papers on me."

That is all I have.
575 Q. CHA RMAN Is that the regulation 14 that I am talking about the --
A. This is -- yeah.

576 Q. CHA RMAN I think there was a regulation -- maybe it is regulation 15 , but whatever it was, those were the papers we're talking about, that you said didn't include the statement that you were looking for?
A. Must be. I can't even recollect, Judge. I just see I have a note of it here.

577 Q. CHAN RMAN That seems to fit in, does it?
A. It does, yes, Judge.


CHA RMAN So the meeting took place and then Mr. Murphy has put to you this account.

MR. MRPHY: Yes. Chairman, I don't mean to dwell on the Alan Murray investigation, but $I$ think that it is accepted as a matter of fact it took place, there was a plea of guilty and finding of not guilty. Thereafter I think you made a complaint that this was affirmed on appeal, but do I understand your primary criticism to be that you say you didn't receive the statement? Apart from that, it seems to be nothing else is in dispute.
A. Curiously, Judge, that statement relates to work related stress, is the only state -- like, it's the only thing that I did. It wasn't -- I didn't see it. I have say, $I$ don't believe it was in those documents and I don't read that statement until I get the documentation from the Tribunal and it is a statement that I had requested from Chief Superintendent wheatley in order for my own, in relation to the appeal on the matter and that's...

CHA RMAN So this concerns the appeal to Chief Superintendent wheatley, is that correct?
A. Yes, Judge. And in the statement, you see, I had explained to Alan Murray about my work related stress, that was the relevance of that statement. That with the flu all along, Judge. And in fact, from recollection --

CHA RMAN But stick to Superintendent Alan Murray.
A. Yeah.

581 Q. CHA RMAN You're explain to him what?
A. I explained, I just put my hand up --

582 Q. CHA RMAN I thought you pleaded guilty to this?
A. I did.

583 Q. CHA RMAN You challenged the other one. There was another somewhat complicated charge, but I think we know what it meant.
A. Yeah.

584 Q. CHA RMAN We don't have to worry about that, because he found you not guilty of that, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

585 Q. CHA RMAN So, okay. So does that mean you have any complaint about Superintendent Alan Murray?
A. Oh no, no, no, no.

586 Q. CHA RMAN That is okay. I just want to clear that up.
A. No, no, no.

587 Q. CHA RMAN But your complaint is in respect of the appeal that you made after that?
A. Yes. And in relation to this question is, where it was 16:03 put to me that $I$ received this statement --

588 Q. CHA RMAN Wait now, we don't have to go back to that just for a minute. But just, your appeal, nothing against Alan Murray, but yes, now we're on to the appeal and there I think we will leave it and we will
move to the appeal in the morning, if that is all right. And bear in mind at some point think about the date, the 15th/14th, and if you think it is relevant come back to me. You don't have to come back to me
tomorrow but at some point, okay. WTNESS: Thank you.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. A11 right. Thank you very much.
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[^0]:    "From my understanding, the purpose of the enqui ries

[^1]:    "As a result, a loss of revenue to the State of $€ 377$ resulted each year."

