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

# THE HEAR NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVS, ON MDNDAY, 4TH NOVEMBER 2019: 

CHA RMAN Thank you. Good morning. Now, Mr. Murphy, good morning.

MR. MRPHY: Good morning, Chairman.

## GARDA N CHOLAS KEOGH CONTI NUED TO BE CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. MRPHY, AS FOLLOVS:

MR. MRPH: Good morning, Garda Keogh. I wonder if you could be given Volume 12 , 3640. Judge, I propose to deal with issue 12 , which $I$ had stopped dealing with last week.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. MRPHY: On Mr. Kelly's behalf, to view certain documents.

CHA RMAK Thanks very much. So you're starting with issue 12 , is that right?
MR. MRPHY: Issue 12, Chairman, which is the
complaints by Garda Keogh in relation to misrecording of sick leave.

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Yes, I have it here, thank you.
MR. MRPHY: Garda Keogh, I think you remember that
Mr. McGuinness showed you documents in relation to the recording if your sick leave in the course of the first week of the Tribunal's sitting. I think you remember that.
A. Yeah, I just can't remember which document.

2 Q. I am asking you in general, do you remember he showed you those documents, yes?
A. Yes.

3 Q. I think he also put it to you that there was
10:33 effectively a system for recording sickness in relation to al1 members of An Garda Síochána?
A. SAMS system.

4 Q. SAMS system. I wonder if on the screen document 3640 could be put up, please. If you have volume 12 there, Garda Keogh, could I ask you to look at page 3640 . This is the statement of Olivia Kelly of Athlone Garda Station. I think you know Garda Kelly, she has been in Athlone Garda Station since April 2013. I think again there is nothing between us on this, you know that she held the position of district clerk at Athlone Garda Station since 1st December of 2014 ?
A. Yeah.

5 Q. I think also it's clear that one of her roles as district clerk was to look after the sickness and absence recording for all Garda members in the district. I think you would agree with that?
A. Yes.

6 Q. Just to put to you what Garda Kelly will say. She will say that when gardaí report sick, that the Member in Charge completes an SR1 form and this outline the member's details along with the reason for going sick. The type of illness in the majority of cases is not recorded on the SR1, were you aware of that?
A. I know about it.

7 Q. She will say that once she receives the SR1 form, she then creates the absence of SAMS, which stands for Sickness Absence Management System, and the entry on SAMS remains open until the Garda member returns off sick and she receives the SR1 with part B, resumption section, completed. She will say, Garda Keogh, that each illness is recorded in the same manner and no member is treated differently. Do you agree with that?
A. I am not disputing anything.

8 Q. Also she will say, just again to explain this to the Tribunal, that when members are on long-term sick leave, it is requested by HRM, that's human resources management, that when a member is approaching 92 days continuous absence, that all the medical certificates are scanned from the district office directly to the HRM 6 section and that's what she did in respect of you. I think she then said that presently she received medical certificates monthly. She scans them into the Athlone district selection mailbox, forwards them directly to the HRM sick section for their attention, to make sure the member is paid accordingly. She will say:
"I never devi ated or treated Garda Keogh' s si ckness any differently to any ot her member of An Garda Sí ochána in the Athl one di strict."
A. I never made any --

9 Q. Thank you.
A. -- accusation whatsoever that Garda Keogh did. There's no dispute.
10 Q. I appreciate that. I have to put these matters to you for the record to establish what was actually happening.
A. Okay.

11 Q. Thank you. I think that she will also say that you reported sick and resumed duty on 18 occasions since 20th December 2014, until your current absence, which began on 26th December 2014, and that none of the SR1 forms stated that your sickness was due to work related stress. I think you're aware of that fact, up to that date.
A. Just --

12 Q. Sure. I think she is saying that between 20th December 2014 to 26th December 2015, that none of the SR1 forms stated that your sickness was due to work related stress?
A. I can't answer on that, all I know is the medical certs 10:36 would have been work related stress.
13 Q. That is what I am putting to you. She accepts that while the SR1s didn't state any cause of illness, that your medical certificates when submitted all indicated "work rel ated stress". She will say that she received the SR1, created the entry on SAMS and the form didn't indicate the reason for your reporting sick, because there was no medical certificate attached at the time. She said she recorded a sickness as an ordinary
illness.
A. Yeah.

14 Q. She will also say in her evidence that at that time, when you reported sick and unfit for duty, there was no category on SAMS for "work rel at ed stress". She
recorded the certificates as they were submitted and e-mailed -- each of these were sent on to the HRM sick section and that copies of all of these certificates have been disclosed. So, first of all, I just want to put it to you that she will indicate that she was the person responsible for making the entries, do you accept that?
A. The original entries, yeah.

15 Q. She will say that there wasn't any category on SAMS for work related stress. And she will say that she effectively did this in relation to your certificates as she did in relation to all of your colleagues who reported sick during the same period of time. I think there is no disagreement on that point. Thank you.

Just moving forward, she will say that on 23rd May 2016, at around four o'clock in the afternoon, she received a phone call from Ms. Clare O'Regan from the HRM sick section. Ms. O'Regan informed her that your sick details were recorded as flu/viral, which was incorrect, and that the correct category should be mental health, due to your absence of being work related stress. She will say that she did not initially select this category due to the stigma
surrounding mental health and mental health was not the cause of the illness outlined in the certificates that she received. Do you understand?
A. Oh I understand.

16 Q. Yes.
A. But I did say last week, Judge, there's no way that Garda kelly can be made cannon fodder in relation to this. This is the -- the problems in relation to here are higher up and not to do with Garda Kelly.
Garda Keogh, we will come back to that point in a few moments, but Garda kelly's evidence will be unequivocal, that it was she who changed the illness reason to mental health at the request of Clare O'Regan from the HRM sick section, and Ms. O'Regan had indicated to Garda kelly that you had been liaising with the Garda Commissioner or the commissioner's office. On the same day she will say that Superintendent Pat Murray contacted her in relation to the changing of the illness category in SAMS, he looked for a report about this and she provided him with a report which outlined the anomaly which occurred and he duly reported this up the line.

So, first of all I just want to suggest to you that all of the evidence from Garda kelly suggested that she and $10: 39$ she alone was responsible for making the entries on all the documents that Mr. McGuinness showed to you. I think you accept that.
A. I can't dispute that.

18 Q. Yes. In terms of the forms, can I ask you please be to go shown Volume 32,9342 . This is an example of one of the SR1 forms that was shown to you by Mr. McGuinness.
A. 9342?

19 Q. Please. So here's one of the examples that was shown to you earlier, indicating in the left-hand box, under the heading "or di nary ill ness, category, pl ease tick one box onl y" the entry is ticked as "flu/viral", do you see that?
A. Yes.

20 Q. Do you note that underneath that there is a paragraph in writing, beginning with the word "an absence." Can I just read that to you? Do you see that?
A. Yes.

21 Q. It says:
"An absence must be categorised as ordinary ill ness until such tire a certificate in accordance with code 1137 has been issued by the chi ef superintendent. An absence must al so be categorised as ordinary ill ness until such time as it is classified as a critical by HRM or the CMD, at whi ch time the absence category must be amended accordingly."

So, just to put it in visual terms, do you see the next box, headed:

[^0]The position is under the system, I have to suggest to you, that you don't get into that box until the criteria in the lower passage has been fulfilled. There has to be an examination of the situation, there has to be an enquiry about what's the cause of the stress, there has to be a medical certification. This is all part of a system, I think you will agree. This is not particular to you, it's the system applied to al1 gardaí.
A. Yeah.

22 Q. Thank you. Again, I just want to put it to you that Garda Kelly will say that that's the system that she operated and that she alone made the entries in the boxes as the forms came into her office. But can I just move forward to volume 1, at page 148, please.
A. Yeah.

23 Q. Thank you. I think you will see here, this is a copy of the letter that you wrote, it goes over the next three pages, to the Minister for Justice and Equality, Francis Fitzgerald TD, on 14th June 2016. I presume you remember this letter?
A. Yes.

24 Q. Ultimately, $I$ think you will agree, this is a letter of complaint by you to the Minister?
A. More or less.

25 Q. Yes. Again, remember we've discussed over the last few days, Garda Keogh, the question of perception and reality. First of all, can I just ask you to turn over to the first page, in the middle of the page, do you
see, as follows, you say:
"I understand that superintendent Tony McLoughl in has corrected my sick leave record."

Then the next sentence:
"I was recorded as bei ng out sick with flu by Superintendent Pat Murray."

Do you see that?
A. Which page are you on?
Q. This is at page 148 , the middle of the page, middle sentence.
"I was recorded as being out sick with flu by Superintendent Pat Murray."

Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

27 Q. I have to suggest to you, now with the benefit of what you understand from Garda Kelly's evidence, would you agree with me that that accusation is factually incorrect?
A. It's probably factually incorrect for the period in relation to what we've heard, just the evidence or the statement from Garda Kelly. But we have clarified last week in relation to the disciplinary matter, which was in 2015, where I was disciplined in relation to the

AWOL incident, that there was no accident at that point in time. There could have been no -- there was no accident. It wasn't -- it was well known to Garda management. So on this part I can't agree with you on this. This letter is dated 14th June 2016.

28 Q. Yes. Si up to that time you're saying that the recording of being out sick with flu was being done by Superintendent Pat Murray. I have ti suggest to you that there is no evidence of that at all?
A. Sorry, there is. There is evidence in relation to -we dealt with the AWOL matter last week, where as part of the -- you made reference to I received a bunch of documents and there was reference to a statement that wasn't in the documents, which I said I never got. In that bunch of documents were my sick certs, work related stress. The statement that was withheld had work related stress within that statement. And that was an incident to do with 2015. This letter dates 2016. So I have already given in evidence, whatever prior to that in relation to misrecording me off sick, fair enough, but after that, from that incident, the AWOL incident, where the work related stress certificates and the statement that wasn't -- it was withheld from me, however that occurred, I can't agree with you on this part.
29 Q. You see, I have to suggest to you that the complaint you made was very specific:
"I was recorded as bei ng out sick with flu by

Superintendent Pat Murray."

Would you agree with me that's simply incorrect?
A. I would agree he didn't personally record it.

30 Q. Would you turn then please forward to page 150, two pages further on. And look, please, at the first paragraph. You say:
"Garda management woul dn't gi ve me a copy of my statement which I had requested due to the fact that । 10:46 had stated in it the amount of stress that 1 was under."

And here is the point I want to put to you, you told the Minister:
"Wilst they were deliberately recording me as sick with the flu."

I have to suggest to you that in the light of Garda Kelly's evidence that's also factually incorrect, would you agree with that?
A. No, I can't, because I'm just after going into this part, I've just previously referred to this part a moment ago.
Q. Yes.
A. This is connected with the last part.
Q. You see, I have to suggest to you, Garda Keogh, you have no evidence whatsoever that they, whoever they
were, were deliberately recording you sick with the flu, because Garda kelly said that she entered that entry and she entered the entry because of the reason she has outlined in her statement and will outline in her evidence, nothing to do with anybody else except her?
A. No, it is nothing to do with Garda kelly in relation to the part after -- from that incident in 2015, Garda Kelly cannot be blamed for that. It was known by Garda management that I was out sick clearly with work
related stress. The one statement that was withheld from me from that disciplinary incident was a statement which contained the amount of stress that I was under. And the medical certs were attached to that, to that file as well. So, I can't, I can't agree with you on that.
33 Q. Okay. Garda Keogh, you do understand what a record is, don't you? You understand these medical documents are records. You do understand that, don't you?
A. Yeah.

You understand that a record means that something is recorded by someone?
A. Yes.
Q. In this case we know it was Garda kelly, isn't that right?
A. Yes, who originally inputted the stuff.

37 Q. The record is her record. Now, I just have to suggest
to you that it's impossible for anybody else to have deliberately recorded you as sick with the flu when the only person who was recorded you as being sick with a flu is Garda kelly?
A. Judge, this is not -- this isn't entirely -- the way this is being spun is not quite right. Because Garda Kelly did what she did. There's no issue at all with Garda Kelly did. But after that incident in 2015, it cannot be blamed on Garda kelly, anything to do with work related stress, what I was out sick for. And bear in mind, Judge, they're then in December of 2015 having case conferences with the CMO to do with my sick, where the CMO seems to be left -- the chief medical officer seems to be left in the dark as to -- he is under the impression it's just flu.
Again, could I ask you to be shown volume 11, page 3094, please? This is a statement of chief Superintendent Pat Murray made to the Tribunal investigators. Can I just draw your attention to line 1316? He will say in his evidence that he had no role 10:49 in recording sick leave for anybody, including you, and that he never entered data on to the SAMS system, because that was done by the system a clerk in Athlone, Garda kelly. would you agree with that?
A. I can't dispute that, that part of it, but I mean, I had no role in -- like, I mean, I have never entered data onto the -- I mean, I wouldn't expect him to have entered data.
39 Q. Thank you. Then he will say in his evidence that in

May of 2016 an issue was brought to his attention insofar as it became apparent that Chief Superintendent wheatley told him that she had been called by Chief Superintendent McLough1in. And I think Chief Superintendent McLough1in had been liaising with you at 10:50 that time, isn't that right?
A. Yes. Yes. So he contacts Chief Superintendent wheatley and she then went to try and investigate what this was about.
A. Yeah, but again, this is in 2016. In December 2015 Chief Superintendent wheatley and Superintendent Murray are having case conferences with the CMO to do with my sick. So they can't say they don't know anything about it. It's simply not plausible. Your argument is not plausible.
42 Q. Just come back for a moment, Garda Keogh, just look very carefully at line 1316. Chief Superintendent Murray is saying:

[^1]That it simply wasn't in his territory at all, do you understand?
A. But role on, up until we come with the case conference with the CMO. I mean, they're having a conference with a Garda medical doctor and somehow he is not aware that work related stress is on the certs and that it's I'm going out sick with viral flu. So somebody is -somebody is withholding this information from the doctor. They know that at this stage.

43 Q. Again I have to suggest to you that that is incorrect. But I am going to put it to you also, if you look down to page 3095, please, just the top line, you will see that Chief Superintendent Murray will say from his enquiries into your allegation it seemed to have no foundation, that you had been recorded in the category of ordinary illness, subcategory of flu/viral for quite some time, including before his arrival, your arrival -- his arrival in Athlone. Would you agree that you had been recorded even prior to Superintendent 10:52 Murray's arrival?
A. That's correct. I have said already, Judge, previous7y in evidence that there could have been a mistake with the viral flu thing for a period of time. But once the discipline matter from the AWOL incident occurred, that 10:52 any mistakes or anything, there's no way a mistake can continue after that, because that whole discipline related to sick and sick and all the rest. So it could not have been missed. I don't know if I am explaining
it correctly. It just couldn't have been missed after that.

44 Q. Well, you see, Garda Keogh, I have to put it to you that insofar as there have been any issue in relation to the recording, it had nothing to do with Chief Superintendent Murray at all?
A. I can't -- I can't agree with you on that.
Q. Can I ask you just to move forward to page 3095.
A. Sorry, the recording. I can agree with you up until the inputting of the sick had nothing to do with him. But in relation to afterwards, he would have had knowledge of stuff.
46 Q. CHA RMAN Could you answer me a question?
A. Yes, Judge.

47 Q. CHA RMAN what role do you say Superintendent Murray ${ }^{10: 53}$ had in misrecording your illness?
A. Judge, none in the misrecording, but after the incident, the disciplinary matter of 2015, where there was case conferences then held with the смо, there doesn't seem to be a mention of work related stress, it's all flu viral.
CHAI RMAN Hold on. The complaint is, you may say, look, they should realised, they should have this, that and the other, but specifically misrecording. Now, that's the complaint.
A. Right.

49 Q. CHA RMAN Somebody wrote down wrongly that you were out with flu viral when you were out with work related stress, that's is the complaint?
A. Yes.

50 Q. CHA RMAN what did Murray have to do with that?
A. Initially he didn't record, he did not record the --

51 Q. CHA RMAN But it wasn't his job to record it?
A. No, no, no.

10:54
52 Q. CHAL RMAN Sorry, on what you appear to be agreeing, it wasn't his business to be doing that?
A. No.
A. Yeah, the point I am making --

54 Q. CHA RMAN what did he do wrong? That's the question I want to know.
A. He didn't inform the CMO or anything after that AWOL incident, the chief superintendent, the CMO, anybody there, that there's an issue with me going off sick with flu and work related stress that's on my certs. They had to have a11 --

55 Q. CHA RMAN I'm not understanding that.
A. They had to have known in relation --

56 Q. CHAL RMAN Do you understand what I am trying to find out? I can understand your complaint, I simply want to know, Superintendent Murray, in what way did he fall down in his job? In what way was it targeting or whatever? what did he do wrong in relation to the recording of your illness as flu viral and not work related stress?
A. In inputting nothing in relation to the input of it.

57 Q. CHA RMAN okay. But?
A. But after the incident where I was disciplined, where
you are holding case conferences in Dublin with the CMO and all that part of it, they held those case conferences on the --

58 Q. CHA RMAN wait now, Superintendent Murray was there at that?
A. Yes.

59 Q
CHA RMAN So he's one of the people there?
A. Yes.

60 Q. CHAl RMAN what did he do wrong?
A. Well, nobody informed the CMO that there was a problem where my medical certs --
61 Q. CHAI RMAK He should have said, by the way -- so he should have known about the medical certificates?
A. He had to have known.

62 Q. CHAD RMAN okay. I just want to get it clear.
A. Yes, Judge.

63 Q. CHA RMAN He had to have known because of?
A. Because when they disciplined me in relation to the AWOL, as part of their investigation file they had actually the certificates which said -- attached to their own files.
64 Q. CHAI RMAN Did Superintendent Alan Kelly not investigate that?
A. Alan Murray, yes.

65 Q. CHA RMAN Alan Murray. Sorry, what did I say?
A. Yes. So in that --

66 Q. CHA RMAN How did Patrick Murray know from that?
A. Judge, he -- when Alan Murray sent his file, it would have gone to Chief Superintendent wheatley and from

Chief Superintendent wheatley it would have gone to Superintendent Murray.

67 Q. CHA RMAN Right.
A. Now, at some stage it appears that one statement was removed, the statement in relation to the work related stress was removed. But what wasn't removed were the sick certs, which had the work related stress sick certs on them. At that point they had to have known --
A. Doctors --

69 Q. CHA RMAN Not just one relating to the AWOL period, is that right?
A. Yeah, the two, for two doctors -- from recollection for that, two doctors certs $I$ think that had work related stress. But all my work certificates at that period were all work related stress, Judge.

70 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. So that report, including a reference to a medical report talking about work related stress, that went to Superintendent Patrick Murray?
A. From Chief Superintendent wheatley.

71 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. So did he know what at that time that you were being recorded as flu viral?
A. He had to have known.
A. Well, I mean, he's the superintendent, he's organising the case file.

73 Q. CHAN RMAN You told me it was nothing to do with --
A. But equally, Judge --

74 Q. CHA RMAN Are you understanding me?
A. Yeah. CHA RMAN okay. Maybe he was right, maybe he was wrong. Maybe you were right, maybe you were wrong. But can we just focus on this point: The report from Superintendent Alan Murray that went to Chief

Superintendent wheatley and back down to Superintendent Patrick Murray -
A. Yes.

77 Q. CHA RMAN - contained information in two medical certificates relating to work related stress?
A. From recollection, two. At least one but -CHA RMAN At least one?
A. Yes.

79 Q. CHA RMAN Maybe one, maybe two. But a certificate or certificates relating to work related stress?
A. Yes.

80 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. So at that point he should have known that there was a medical certificate relating to work related stress?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAK But that leaves us with the question, how was he to know that you were being recorded as flu viral. You say, we11, he must have known. Okay, maybe he did, maybe he didn't. So that depends on his
knowledge of what was then being recorded; is that correct?
A. Yes, but, Judge --

82 Q. CHA RMAN Go on, tell me. I am not trying to catch you out. I am trying to clarify?
A. No, no, I understand.

83 Q. CHA RMAN Let me tell you where I am.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN So far, I on the point that says: If Superintendent Murray knew or ought to have known that you were out from stress, work related stress and not flu viral, okay, I can see your point, he should have done something about this when he got this certificate. That's your case, okay. But if he shouldn't have known, if there was no reason for him to have known about that, then that doesn't sound like a basis for criticising him, under this heading. Do you see, that's where I am at at the moment. I am trying to reconcile those?
A. I understand. Judge, on the very first day I met Superintendent Murray there was an issue --

85 Q. CHA RMAN Don't go on about that, I know about a11 that. He said you're not under stress and you said you were under stress. That's is not the point I'm asking you.
A. But he should have checked it out, Judge, then.

86 Q. CHA RMAN He what?
A. He should have checked it out and he would have found out then.

87 Q. CHAN RMAN Okay. Si at the first point he's wrong. okay. I see what you are getting at, right. would you like to help me on point of logic that $I$ am trying to put to you? If he should have known, if he knew or should have known that you were being recorded as flu viral and not work related stress, then I can see your point. If there was no basis for him to know it, then I can't see your point. Do you understand what I am getting at?
A. I understand.

88 Q. CHA RMAK Now, you can say more generally, we11, okay, let's go back to the very beginning. But that's not really the complaint that we have here. The complaint that we have here is misrecording of you being out sick.
A. Yeah.

89 Q. CHA RMAN what I am looking at is Superintendent Murray's role in that. That's what I'm looking at?
A. Judge, I can't, I can't go any further. Garda Kelly has stated her case and I can't, I can only guess behind the scenes, I can't give any evidence on behind the scenes.

90 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Anyway, you can see what I am trying to do here.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN okay.
91 Q. MR. MRPHY: Just can we pause there for a moment, Garda Keogh, please, because Chief Superintendent Murray will say that this was nothing to do with him
but it's brought to his attention that there's a difficulty and he communicates with chief Superintendent wheatley. But just before we move on to that, can I ask you please to be given volume 11, page 3096, please? You see there is a question and answer session between yourself and the Tribunal. Just pausing for a moment, Garda Keogh. The document I referred to earlier, the letter to the minister -- I beg your pardon, it's Superintendent Murray's interview. But there is a reference, a quotation from your interview in it. when we looked at the Minister's letter, the letter you wrote to the Minister, it was in 2016. That's the complaint you were saying it was Superintendent Pat Murray, it was deliberate, it was recording. If you please have a look at line 1342. This is you speaking to the investigators. Could I ask you just to read for a moment between 1342 down to 1346?
A. Yes, Judge.

92 Q. That is the question the Tribunal investigators were asking you?
A. Yes.

93 Q. Which was basically, did you have any information or evidence to support the accusation that you were making?

Do you see your response underneath, you said, line 1347:
"I cannot say it was Superintendent Pat Murray recorded ne as being out sick with the flu as opposed to work rel ated stress. I can only state that it is my view that Superintendent Murray may have been invol ved and that is as far as l can go."

Would you agree with me, that's a different statement to what you made in 2016 to the Minister, where you said it was deliberate, it was Pat Murray, it was they?
A. Well, when I wrote to the Minister, when we say they and refer to they as the cabal, Judge, that's in general terms. what I have said here in my statement to the Tribunal investigators is just worded differently to what I am just after saying to you, Judge.
94 Q. Garda Keogh, words do matter. So, would you agree with me that the words used in 2018 said something different to what you said to the Minister in 2016. Because here in 2018 you are saying, I can only state it's my view, my belief; is that right?
A. That's right. That's right.
Q. You see, I have to suggest to you that your belief is pure supposition and no evidence at all.
A. Em, you see, I dispute that, because after the incident we've referred to, which I don't know, is there a point 11:04 even in going into it again.
Q. In terms of your standard of evidence that you have in relation to this accusation, it's put to the Tribunal investigators as being based on your view. "That is as
far as l can go". Is that your evidence to the Chairman here today?
A. I have just said I can't say exactly what went on behind the scenes, but there's a serious anomaly in relation to my recording off sick.

97 Q. Garda Keogh, you're an experienced Garda investigator, I have to suggest to you that you know perfectly well. As your answers to the Tribunal investigators suggest, that a11 -- you know perfectly we11 that what you are basing this accusation on is a belief, not any evidence 11:05 at al1?
A. Well, there's evidence that $I$ have been misrecorded.
A. There is evidence he knew about it.
Q. Is there any evidence that he interfered with your sick recording at all?
A. By interfering he should have changed it to the correct -- or authorised it to be changed to the correct category. He should also have informed the CMO.

101 Q. You see, in terms of the issues concerning that point, I have to suggest to you that you are now beginning to change your position. I am suggesting to you that in fact the allegation you made to the Minister, the allegation you made to this Tribunal was a deliberate misrecording, a deliberate intentional interference
with your sick record by Superintendent Murray, and that's false, isn't it?
A. No. Somebody, somebody was -- somebody is deliberately involved in that.
You see, even from your perspective, and I don't agree with your perspective, as I put it to you formally, even on that perspective, what you have just said indicates that Superintendent Pat Murray had nothing to do with that at all?
A. He's the superintendent in the station where $I$ am being 11:06 recorded with the flu and I am clearly out with work related stress on all the certs that are sent in to that same station.
103 Q. Now, can I ask you to be shown a document at page 3795. I am not sure what volume this is in.
A. 3795 ?
Q. These are notes of the CMO. I think you have seen these before, haven't you?
A. Yes.

106 Q. Yes. They are dated 19/5/2016.
A. Judge, on the next page there's a couple of dates there, $7 / 6 / 16,12 / 7 / 16,26 / 12 / 15$. 19/5, that's the date that $I$ met the doctor. That's my writing, Judge.
107 Q. Just in terms of the first paragraph there, you see:
"Revi ew of clinical progress and fitness to preform work. Situation has not i mproved for himpersonally
and at this time the background circunstances and publ icity about the whi stlebl ower aspect is wei ghing very heavily on the menber."

So this is what you said I think to the CMO, in that note.
A. This is the CMO's writing, this isn't what I wrote, so...
Q. Yes. That kind of details information that you gave to the CMO, is that right?
A. That's correct, because that's at the meeting where he no idea that I was out with work related stress.

109 Q. Yes.
A. He thought it was the flu.

110 Q. In terms of the approach, in terms of the approach --
A. Just on another note, Judge, Mr. Murphy said there last week or the week before that I was stood down on a previous date, $I$ just see here on the CMO's notes here:
"If currently absent, date absence commenced, 26/ 12/ 2015. "

That's the date I said last week that I went sick. Mr. Murphy said, oh no, you were stood down the week before, the week I met him, which is the 19/5. I had said I didn't know anything about that because the doctor certainly didn't say it. That conversation was merely just about -- he was trying to find out about work related stress and the sick certs and all that.

111 Q. Yes. I will come back to that, Garda Keogh, in a moment. But in terms of the CMO, had you seen the CMO in 2015? For example, in May of 2015?
A. I could have. I just can't -- I can check my diary, like. Sorry May, what year?

112 Q. '15.
A. Just the date, please. Sorry, the 19th.

113 Q. 19th?
A. Yeah.

114 Q. So in the summer 2015, for example. Can I ask you to 11:11 be shown page 2220, please? Do you see here this is a note prepared by Superintendent Murray, it's dated $14 / 7 / 2015$. Do you see this?
A. Yes.

115 Q. I think we've touched on this previously. But at the 11:12 end of the interview, do you see where he recorded that you told him that you would continue to go sick at will and that he told you that he was going to request a case conference on you and was considering discipline for AWOL and would seek an explanation in writing? Do you see that?
A. I'm sure, I -- yeah, I see that.

116 Q. Okay. There was ultimately a case conference, was there not, in December?
A. Yes.

117 Q. I think we have seen that document before. 3791, please. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

118 Q. This is the CMO's note in relation to different issues.

You will see, for example, that in the second line it says:
"Si nce last seen further periods of short-termillness, some concern hi ghl ighted, 4-7July had forgotten he $11: 13$ was. . ."

Sorry:
"He had forgotten he was in service after calling in of f sick on 10/7/2015. Attributes this to drinking while off and taking Xanax with al cohol on 9/7/2015."

Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

119 Q. Now, insofar as that's concerned, I think that reflects detail that would you have given to the CMO; is that right?
A. Yes.

120 Q. Okay. Now, you had been speaking to the CMO earlier in 11:14 the year, isn't that right?
A. I could have been.

121 Q. Could you go back then to page 3790, please? Do you have that note?
A. Yeah.

122 Q. This is dated 19th May 2015. So this refers to a meeting between yourself and the CMO at that time, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Just pausing for a moment. Would you agree with me that at that time Chief Superintendent Murray did not know you were seeing the CMO?
A. No.

124 Q. In May of 2015, I have to suggest to you that Superintendent Murray did not know that you had been reviewed by the CMO in May of 2015.
A. Oh, just one moment. I don't know if he -- maybe.
Q. That's what he will say. So here we have a meeting that's taking place in May 2015 between you and the CMO.
A. Okay.
Q. At the outset it says that you were referred originally on account of concerns about high level of short absences, 48 days in 12 months from January 2014, with half coinciding with early hours. And records those details as well. Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

127 Q. You can see the note further down in relation to background, but would you agree with me that the focus of that particular discussion was alcohol?
A. Yes. Having said that, the note $I$ have for this on the 19th May was, 1 pm, he pointed out I ran out of annual leave and then went sick, stress. That although I would be under some stress it was not enough to keep me 11:16 out of work.

That's where I first brought up to him about the work related stress and that. But he doesn't actually know
it's on my sick certs. I presume he knows it's on my sick certs. But he doesn't actually find out or know it's on my sick certs until December of '15 You see, you say in the middle of the page that you told him that you had no alcohol since April, though you would have drunk excessively over the St. Patrick's weekend and between January and February and then goes on to say:
"Usually invol ving 12 pi nt bi nges."

Do you see that?
A. I see that.

129 Q. The GP is referred for new support interventions, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Then there is a reference to OHB, implications of continued misuse of alcohol on your expected effectiveness, do you understand?
A. Yeah.

131 Q. At the end he said that he agreed that you were fit to attend --:
"At present fit for duties, to be assigned, but the matter is to be kept under revi ew and liai son with the GP support."
A. Yeah.

132 Q. So, just taking that as an example of a meeting that
took place with the CMO, all those details recorded. I have suggest to you that that was a meeting that was between you and the CMO and of which Superintendent Pat Murray had no knowledge, either of the meeting or the content of the meeting?
A. I don't know if he had knowledge or not, so I can't agree with you on that.
133 Q. Yes. In terms of the position vis-à-vis 2015, again I have to suggest to you that from the point of view of the process, here you have the СМО will all of this information, but there is no change in the recording of your sick certificates during that time, isn't that right?
A. Sorry?

134 Q. There is no change in the recording of your sick certificates during that time, isn't that correct?
A. Correct. Yeah.
Q. What I have to put to you now is just details in relation to the system that exists. First of all, can I ask you to be shown volume 11, page 3219? Garda Keogh, do you see this is a management sickness absence policy, it's issued in 2010. First of all I want to put to you that this is the general system that applied to An Garda Síochána in 2014, '15 and '16. Are you familiar with this?
A. I am not familiar with it but...

136 Q. Again, to assist the Tribunal and you to understand the position, can I ask you just to look first of all at page 3219 ? At page 3219 there is a heading entitled:
"The roles of the chi ef medical officer."

Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

137 Q. It says:
"The CMD advi ses the Garda Commissi oner on member's medical fitness for policing duties. In forming a medi cal opi ni on, the CMD takes into account all redical inf ormation available at the time. When the CMD advises that a member is fit for full/light/restricted pol ice duties, the member will resume duty imedi at ely on being notified of the same by the member's di strict of ficer/superint endent. "

First of all, I would like to confirm, would you agree with me that the decision of the CMO as to whether you have fit for duties is an important function reserved to him?
A. Yes, but also, just something here, Judge.
"In forming a medical opi ni on, the CMD takes into
account all medical information available at the time."

138 Q. Yes.
A. That should include medical certificates.

139 Q. Yes. In fact, we know, and we will come to this later on, that the CMO in fact contacted your GP; isn't that
right?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. Yes. Insofar as the next page is concerned, page 3220, by way of example:
"Where the CMD considers that a nenber is fit for duty and the menber fails to return to work on the basis of a medi cal certificate, contradicting the CMO s advi ce, it is incumbent on the menber to forward an updated medi cal report within seven days to the assistant commissioner human recourses management HRM This will set out the details. Until the CMD revi ews the updated medi cal report, the Iast advi ces of the CMD will stand and remain in force."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.

141 Q. Would you agree with me that that demonstrates when it comes to certifying when a person is fit for duty, the CMO's decision is paramount?
A. I understand that.

142 Q. And ultimately it is based on his assessment of all the material information that's made available to him; is that right?
A. All the information?

143 Q. That's made available to him.
A. As in work related stress being on sick certs?

144 Q. Not just on his own, there's a connection here with HRM, Human Resources management, isn't that right?
A. Again, I don't fully -- I have an awareness of them but I don't know anything about the workings of HRM. Then would you just turn forward, please, to page 3222 ? Do you see under the heading "contact/visits":
"When a mentber is absent because of sickness for a conti nuous 7 day period, he/she will be contacted. Contact in this instance can be made by a visit to the member by prior arrangement"

It goes on to say:
"The nember shall be advi sed of all the services avail able (empl oyee assi st ance service, external specialists)."

And so on. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. In terms of referrals to the CMO, could I ask you to turn to page 3223? Do you see here that in the course of meetings on referral to the CMO, it says:
"Di strict officers and superintendents will ensure they meet each member who is referred to the CMD for revi ew and di scuss the reason that the member is being
referred to the CMD and is to determine thei redical fitness... and advi se the menber to forward all rel evant cases notes or details fromtreating doctors and test results to the Garda occupational heal th service. The
nenber should be assured that these reports will be treated in the strictest of confidence by the CMD, who should consult with the member's treating certifying doctors."

So, would you agree with me, that shows that the CMO is part of a system where he liaises with your doctor, he looks at the medical reports, he interacts with local management before he makes any decision that affects whether you are fit to work or not?
A. Yes, but again, once again, $I$ mean the CMO was completely kept in the dark that work related stress was on the certs.

147 Q. You see, I have to suggest to you that there is a factor here, which we will come to, which demonstrates that your assessment of this is incorrect. Can I ask you to be shown Volume 20, please, page 6144? Here you have Alan Mulligan, the director of HR, on 7th May 2015. Your absence in work between 20th April and 25th April have been noted. And also, do you notice there, that in the sick certificate there is a reference to the fact that this is stress related. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

148 Q. Then Mr. Mulligan says:

[^2]Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

149 Q.
"This branch requires a full report, referral formand medi cal certificates in accordance with Code 11. 34, rel ating to the above named menber's absence."

Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

150 Q. "Pl ease ensure that the menber is advi sed of the wel fare servi ce and any ot her support that is deemed necessary."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.

151 Q. So, I have to suggest to you that the system we're talking about kicked into action in May of 2015, but critical to the operation of the system what to identify what's referred to in the second line, "the source of the member's stress" do you see that?
A. Yes.

152 Q. Turning then, please, to page 6145, volume 20. 6145.
A. Yeah.

153 Q. You will see there is a letter there from Chief Superintendent wheatley. It's dated the 26th May. It is effectively forwarding a report from Superintendent Murray dated the 20th May. Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

154 Q. Could I ask you, just before we finish with this document, to move to the next document, which is 6146. This is the report that is sent to Chief Superintendent wheatley by Superintendent Murray. Can I draw your attention to the middle of the page, five lines down, and this will be Superintendent Murray's evidence. He says:
"When I met the menber..."

That's you
"... on 26th March 2015, I di scussed his work absences, incl uding the fact that his medical certificates were indi cating that he was suffering from work rel at ed stress. The member was qui ck to poi nt out that he was a confidential reporter and had certain protections in that role. He indi cated that assi stant commissioner western regi on was investigating reports and
allegations he has made to the confidential reci pient. Outside of di scl osing that the nember was reticent to di scuss the work rel ated stress he i ndi cates he is suffering from relying instead on the protections he has in the confidential reporting legi slation."

Then he will say that he reported up the line but in those circumstances he could not further explore the situation with the member. He said:
"I amaware anecdotally that a full investigation is bei $n g$ carried out into the member's claims of corruption and mal practice. I have no further inf or mation in rel ation to that investi gation. I understand that the member is engaging with the welfare service by way of the investigation he is invol ved in. I di d, however, advi ce himof its benefit to him"

Then he attaches to the letter, over the page, 6147, correspondence from Chief Superintendent wheatley, correspondence from HRM, the referral form to the CMO of 2nd April 2015, and the member's medical certificates.

So, just in terms of that particular report, that suggests that when Superintendent Murray went to you and said, I need to enquire what's the cause of this, that your reply was that you couldn't talk to him because of the confidential reporter process. Is that true?
A. In relation to that, but equally, I mean, reading this report, what jumps out at me is there is not a mention about the fact that I'm working alongside Garda A at this period.
155 Q. Garda Keogh --
A. This is somewhere in the 18 -month period.

156 Q. Garda Keogh --
A. This is very important. This is very important and
it's not here.
157 Q. Just listen to the question, please. In terms of this report, do you agree with me that you didn't tell him anything about your condition because you told him that you were a confidential reporter and you were effectively protected under that role and this was being dealt with by the assistant commissioner western region. Isn't that what you told him?
A. Yes, I did say that, yeah.

So, that being the case, that being what you told him, he then reports up the line. If you would turn back, please, to page 6145. Chief Superintendent wheatley, in the second paragraph, summarises matters and she says:
"The di strict officer in Athl one advi ses he cannot further expl ore the reasons for the member's alleged stress as the menber is not willing to further discuss the issue, which he states arises out of his invol vement and protections under the confidential reporting legi slation. "

I have to suggest to you that that's a fair summary of the position as of that date?
A. It also implies, Judge, that both Superintendent Murray 11:29 and Chief Superintendent wheatley haven't a clue what's going on and they don't know anything about -- I mean the investigation and Garda A working in the same station and tours on the same shifts as me. That goes
on for 18 months and they appear to be oblivious to this.
159 Q. You see, in terms of the approach towards this issue, I have to suggest to you that in fact a very important part of the overall system couldn't work because you wouldn't cooperate with it, isn't that right?
A. Equally, the other part of it is, it's local management that are also putting me under work related stress. So, I am then to report to the likes of Superintendent Murray, you know, stuff where he himself is involved. Actually, there's a document which appeared in Volume 53, I can't -- Judge, if I can have a quick look at Volume 53, I can get the document.

160 Q. Perhaps you might do that at the next break, but I would like to put a couple of questions to you on the documents you do have before you. Just, for example, on this point, just a moment ago you mentioned Garda A, could I ask you to be shown document 3790 again, please?
A. What volume, please?

161 Q. I think it's number 13. It's a document we looked at a few minutes ago, which is the CMO's report on 19th May 2015. Just take a moment to read this. But I think you will agree when you have read it, that there is no reference in this document, May 2015, to you telling the CMO anything about Garda A. Just take a moment to confirm that, please.
A. I didn't, I didn't tell him.

162 Q. You didn't tell him. Very good.
A. No, no. I didn't.
Q. So --
A. I told -- this is, which, 19th May. No, I had assumed that the doctor had seen my medical certs and knew it was work related stress. It wasn't until December that 11:31 we actually established he didn't know anything about work related stress.
Q. But you understand now, Garda Keogh, that if you told Superintendent Murray everything that was concerning you at the time, he would have reported that to Chief Superintendent wheatley, who would then have reported it to HRM and a full view of your position would have been made known?
A. You see, there's a number of factors in relation to work related stress. Garda A is not the main -- he's one of the sources, but it's Garda management --
Q. Garda Keogh, here we have a situation where Garda management, in accordance with the Code, are asking you to tell them what you believe to be the problem and you are saying, no thank you, I am talking to the assistant commissioner in the western region, $I$ am a confidential reporter.
A. I mean, it cropped up last week where I did ask Superintendent Mulcahy to speak to Superintendent Murray, you know, but he just said he couldn't get involved in that, which is fair enough. But there is that document, it's at the end. It'11 only take me a minute to find it, Judge.
Q. Again, Garda Keogh, just in terms of these documents,
can I ask you to look at Volume 20, page --
CHA RMAN Is it okay if we let Mr. Murphy finish his. WTNESS: Yes.

CHA RMAK Then you can refer us to the other. That's a convenient way to do it.

WTNESS: of course.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MRPHY: Chairman, subject to the chair's view, if I can proceed for another five minutes.

CHAL RMAN Very good.
167 Q. MR. MRPHY: So, Volume 20, page 6118, please.
A. Sorry?
Q. 6118. Just look, please, if you would, at line 651.

Chief Superintendent wheatley will say in her evidence that when you raised the issue of work related stress with Superintendent Murray in 2015, that you told him that you couldn't disclose the nature of the work related stress because you were engaged in the protected disclosure process and as a result of that she will say that she could not advance the matter any further and that she also communicated this problem to HRM.
A. That's what -- I can't comment --

169 Q. I appreciate that you may not have understood at the time, but do you understand now that by not giving the information at the time all that local management could do would be to report back to HRM that you would not cooperate?
A. Judge, there's a reason I couldn't cooperate with local
management. That's something I -- in the next --
Q. You see, I have to suggest to you that evidence will be that there was a system in place that was there for your welfare and your support. Here there is evidence, there will be evidence from these officers indicating they tried to, as they were ordered to, implement the system in your favour and you closed the door.
A. Judge, I have the answer in the point, I will come back to this.

CHA RMAN I understand that. As far as it goes, that appears to be the position, that you weren't willing to discuss it with Superintendent Murray.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN He reported that condition to Chief Superintendent wheatley, so as far as it goes that is the evidence and you don't quarrel with that evidence?
A. No.
Q. CHA RMAK Okay. But there's another point, you say, is that local management were themselves putting you under stress?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN That is what you say. Presumably it's something of that kind that you're going to be referring to?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN okay, thank you very much.
MR. MRPH: Do you see at line 654 , she will say in her evidence:
"Any decisions are a matter for HRM They are the only people authorised to issue instructions to Killarney regarding pay. "

Do you understand that now to be the case? Would you agree that that's true?
A. Sorry, just --
Q.
"Pay decisions are a matter for HRM "

Do you agree with that?
A. Yeah, they're a matter for HRM, but I mean, HRM just can't out of nowhere decide what's happening. There's a process of --
177 Q. Precisely, and they depend upon your cooperation. I have to suggest to you that in this case you decided for the reasons you outlined not to cooperate. Would you agree with the proposition that HRM are the only people authorised to issue instructions to killarney regarding pay?
A. I would accept that. As I said, I didn't -- I don't -I didn't fully know anything about workings.
178 Q. Just before we break, would you look, please, at top at paragraph 646. Chief superintendent wheatley will say in relation to the general recording of items in SAMS, 11:36 that the system was limited and the only place you could record work related stress was under mental health and that there was a reluctance to use that category?
A. I don't -- I can't fully agree with that because there's a number of tabs in relation to the SAMS system and there is -- I can't think of them off hand, Judge, but there is other options other than mental health that would have --

Garda Kelly will address that, as I said to you earlier on.
A. Yes.

And you don't disagree with her bona fides in relation to how she worked. Finally just on this point, can I ask you to look at line 649, where Chief Superintendent Wheatley will say that you appeared to be of the belief that work related stress automatically entitles you to full pay but you're mistaken in that belief. Do you now realise that that is incorrect. That even if work related stress was something that was certified, this would not change your pay. You know this from your experience, do you not?
A. No, that's to do with -- it's to do with if it's investigated and it's found there is work related stress, whereby it's to do with -- it is work related, yes.
181 Q. CHA RMAN It would have to go further than simply a certificate saying work related stress?
A. Yes.

182 Q. CHA RMAN But if it's flu viral you're cut off after 190 days and so on?
A. Yes.

183 Q. CHA RMAN The possibility, you say, exists. okay.

Thank you. Anything else, Mr. Murphy?

MR. MRPHY: Yes, Judge, just two quick points. Just turning back, please, to page 6117 , we can deal with this quickly, because it's territory trodden by Mr. McGuinness in part. You will see that the evidence 11:38 of Chief Superintendent Wheatley, 630, would indicate that there are two categories of absence: Injury on duty and ordinary illness and where a member is injured on duty he remains on full pay during his absence. In the case of ordinary illness, where a member reaches a threshold number of days, this changes. I think we have had this through other evidence. And that ultimately you only had access to sick pay within those new limits, resulting in your being paid effected in 2014. I think we have dealt with all this evidence in Mr. McGuinness's examination but just can I ask you, at 1ine 638, she will say that when she visited you in May 2015 on a welfare visit, you brought it to her attention that you were aware that you were being recorded on the system as flu viral and not work related stress as stated on the medical certificates. You also mentioned that your pay had been reduced and she said she would look into what was recorded on the system.
A. That's correct.

She will also say in relation to the point made by you, that you didn't discuss work related stress, that you raised the issue with her in that context. would it be fair to say that's the first time you have raised the
question of work related stress with Chief Superintendent wheatley directly?
A. That would have been the first time I directly would have raised it. But Chief Superintendent wheatley already is aware and in the know, because she was involved in the disciplinary matter which relates to the -- which has the certificates of work related stress, which is prior to this. the evidence has been that ultimately at these points of reference you were offered a chance to cooperate with the system but for your own reason chose not to do so and that blocked any further investigation at that time?
A. Look, it's very hard for me to turn around and say, report it to the people, some of the parties who are putting me under work related stress, and say, by the way, you're doing it. In fact, ironically, I actually did write on one document in relation to $I$ think the robbery from persons, to Superintendent Pat Murray, where I said this is nothing short of a form of harassment. So, I mean, it was -- and that was 2015 as wel1.

187 Q. Garda Keogh, I have to suggest to you that none of these people were putting you under work related stress 11:40 at all. And I have to put it to you that there is a profound disagreement between us on that part.
A. We disagree on that.

MR. MRPHY: Chairman, I'm not sure if this would be an
appropriate time.
CHA RMAN Okay, you are finished on this issue?
MR. MRPHY: I have perhaps a few more questions but the witness wants to look at a document to do with the issue.

CHAN RMAN We11, why don't you finish your questions, Mr. Murphy. I thought you had two more questions and you had more questions. We have actually covered that ground, I thought. So, I am sorry.
MR. MRPHY: Very good. Can I ask you please to see Volume 20, page 6169. This again is a document of 8 th June 2016. It's a letter from Chief Superintendent wheatley. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

189 Q. This is a letter to the human resources and people development manager. In the first page she deals with what we covered already, in 2015, in relation to the reports. Could I ask you to turn over, please, to the next page, at 6170. At the second last paragraph she wil1 say that during a recent meeting with you, that when she enquired if you were anxious to return to work, you advised her on that occasion that you attributed your current absence due to work related stress to the development of investigations being progressed outside the Westmeath division. You said that you would not be returning to work until these matters had been concluded, as these matters were exacerbating your condition.
A. Yeah.

190 Q. Is that what you told her?
A. I'm not sure about the first part but the second part is correct, Judge.
Q. CHA RMAN Tell me more, just explain that.
A. When Chief Superintendent wheatley asked me about going 11:42 back to work, I told her I'm not going back until
everything is finished with.
192 Q. CHA RMAN All this is going on.
A. Yes.

193 Q. CHA RMAN The investigations are proceeding.
A. Yeah.

194 Q. CHA RMAN It's a stressful situation. Is that something like you --
A. Yes, Judge.

195 Q. CHA RMAN So that would seem to be what she is 11:42 recording, is that more or less right?
A. Yes. Because there's the criminal investigation, then it's to go into disciplinary investigation and this --
196 Q. CHA RMAN That is all the ó Cualáin, Detective Superintendent Mulcahy?
A. Yes.

197 Q. CHN RMAN Detective Inspector Coppinger?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN That's what we are talking about here?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
198 Q. MR. MRPHY: The next paragraph, she will say that despite a number of enquiries with you to establish the source of your alleged work related stress, that you
continually correlated your involvement as a confidential reporter to your absence to alleged work related stress. She was also conscious that your continued absence was the subject of a case conference in December of 2015. She will say that at that time that it was apparent to her that while you cited work related stress as the reason for your continued absence, that addiction treatment was also required by you if a successful return to the workplace was to be accomplished. was that made clear to you in December of 2015?
A. Em...

CHA RMAN I thought we had been over that with the CMO, and the CMO had said -- I know this is going forwards and backwards a bit, but I thought we had explored that, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MRPHY: Very good, Judge.
CHA RMAN This is in the CMO's report.
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN Am I recalling that Mr. McGuinness -- yes. 11:44 okay.

199 Q. MR. MRPHY: If I just make one further point about this to you, which is that I think the note we will see in the inset, in the middle of the paragraph:
"The CMD revi ewed the issue and determined that you were unfit to attend for work for regul ar policing duties at present."

Then she makes reference to a further review in May of 2016.
A. Sorry, just what date was that?

200 Q. That is December of 2015.
A. Yeah. I don't -- I think we have seen a document 11:44 earlier on there which --

201 Q. Whatever about the dates, can I come back to the dates at a later stage?
A. Okay.

202 Q
But in terms of the actual conclusion, you do accept, do you not, that it was the CMO who decide in December 2015 that you were unfit to work at that time?
A. I can't accept that because he didn't say it to me.

203 Q. I see.
A. I went into work on the 21st December, no one said I 11:44 shouldn't have been there. And, as I said, I would have given anything not to have gone in, I would have been delighted in the CMO said, no, you can't go in. It was on the 26th December that $I$ couldn't take any more and I just went sick.
204 Q. Here we are in this letter, on 8th June 2016, in the middle of that page, 6171, would you agree with me that Chief Superintendent wheatley's record at that stage was she said she had contacted the CMO on that date in May of 2016, and was advised that the previous advice was to remain the same, that the CMO also will say that outlined that if were deemed fit to return to policing duties by your own medical practitioner, any return to work would only be permitted following a review at the
occupational health services. So these matters were May 2016?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN okay.
A. I do agree with that part.

CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MRPHY: Therefore, again, even in 2016, I have to suggest to you that in the final paragraph of that letter Chief Superintendent wheatley is again indicating, as she will say in her evidence, that it still wasn't possible to conduct a full investigation into your absence through alleged work related stress because she could not secure any further information from you on that point.
CHA RMAN okay.
A. Judge, it will only take me one --

CHA RMAN I know that. Don't worry, I am not
forgetting it, I am looking forward to hearing what you have to say. Have you finished, Mr. Murphy?
MR. MRPHY: No, I have a few more questions, but I will perhaps stop at this stage to allow the witness a break.

CHA RMAN I would prefer if you finish, Mr. Murphy. MR. MRPHY: Very good.
206 Q. Moving ahead please in terms of documentation, can I considered by people other than Superintendent Murray. So if we turn please to volume 34, page 9693.

CHA RMAN would you prefer to have this element
finished before you take a break?
WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN I think it's probably more sensible to be frank and you would be more comfortable and you would be able to face into the next phase. All right.
WTNESS: Judge, if I can root through the pages while he's asking me the questions.
CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Murphy, I was going to say, if there is a document that you want to refer to, I don't want if you can put your finger instantly on it, well and good, if you can't put your finger on it, you can return to it after the break. Don't be under any pressure about that. It'11 be a matter entirely for yourself. Okay. Now 9693 we're on, okay. This is June '16. okay.
MR. MRPH: So first of all 9693?
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MRPH: Volume 34. Now, Ms. Carr is a civilian, she is a civil servant and she is the head or the director of HMR. SHE will give evidence that
ultimately your case was being assessed. But she makes the point in the middle of the paragraph that:
"Not all work rel ated stress absences can be attributed to An Garda Síochána. A lot of the time it's down to the indi vi dual's perception of events."

She will say that that was her experience of many of these certificates. Do you see that?
A. I see, yeah.
Q. She will also say in her evidence that insofar as the dialogue assessing your case, in the next paragraph she says she:
"... ur ged caution in accepting thi s absences as occupational injury because thi s was potentially exposing An Garda Sí ochána to possi bl e litigation in circunstances where a menber's own actions or indeed i naction has preci pitated the instigation of a di sci pl inary i nvesti gation. "

## Do you see that?

A. I see.

209 Q. Now, she will also acknowledge in her evidence that at 11:48 that time she said perhaps it's necessary to look at absences as a result of work related stress where a member has brought a protected disclosure. She accepted this was more difficult due to the confidential nature of the disclosure. Do you see 11:48 that?
A. Yes.

210 Q. Then in the final paragraph, she will say her view at that time was that An Garda Síochána should continue to implement the current sick leave regulations where sick 11:48 absences following appropriate investigations is determined to be either duty on injury or an occupational injury once the amended Code had been approved. This would also be important, she felt, in
the management of the force. So, what I suggest to you is, she will say at that time her view was that the system should be applied to your position strictly and that ultimately the fact that there were certificates being sent in by you wasn't the end of the matter. There had to be an investigation to find the cause of the work related stress.
CHA RNAN Mr. Murphy, is it fair? I mean, what can Garda Keogh respond to that question? Suppose he says, you know, I don't agree about work related stress, I think that's all wrong. or, suppose he says, gosh, that's absolutely right. Does it matter what he thinks of that letter? That's a fact, there's a fact.
MR. MRPHY: No, I am simply putting to him evidence that the witness will give, Chairman. I can shorten it 11:49 in this way --
CHA RMAN But does it matter. I mean, if that's what the witness says, he makes a case, my sickness was wrongly recorded. That's what he says.
MR MRPHY: yes.
CHA RMAN I was doing this. Now, this analysis, which may be perfectly correct, I am just wondering, what can he reasonably respond to that? I mean, what is point, if I may, respectfully suggest --
MR. MRPH: Chairman, the point is this, I am putting to the witness that not just the Gardaí but also the civilian managers in the process required an investigation to take place, and it couldn't be progressed because the witness --

CHA RMAN But we have been over that. You say the system is, and he says, yes, I agree, I didn't explain my work related stress to Superintendent Murray, I didn't explain that, he says, and I did explain what Chief Superintendent wheatley says I explained, namely that there was a big investigation going on, and he said, rightly or wrongly, that the local management i.e. Superintendent Murray, was putting him under stress, and he didn't feel comfortable in saying -- he didn't say I didn't comfortable saying that, he said, they were part of the problem, not part of the solution. That's what he says.

MR. MRPHY: But also I'm putting to the witness that in fact the communications that he was being asked for were going to go through an entire system, not just those people but ultimately to people at a complete remove from his position and removed from his situation.

CHA RMAN okay.
MR. KELLY: Judge, I just point out at that point, in 11:51 the penultimate paragraph of that e-mail, what Monica Carr might well be pointing to is a systemic failure, which may be what we are talking about.

CHAN RMAN That's an issue, Mr. Kelly.
MR. KELLY: It is.
CHA RMAN You may we11 refer to that and Mr. Murphy may respond to that and anybody else may comment on this. My point is: It's a bit much to be asking Garda Keogh to be analysing the letter, agreeing with it or
not agreeing with it. It's a fact, that's what she said.
MR. KELLY: For what it's worth, Judge, I agree with you.
CHAI RMAN Thank you very much, Mr. Kelly. Okay.
MR. MRPH: Actually, Chairman, Mr. Kelly's statement to you clarifies another point, which is that the materiality of what we are asking goes towards the suggestion that is being made to Garda Keogh, that somehow the process was vindictive towards him, I am saying it wasn't.

CHAL RMAN Absolutely.
MR. MRPHY: So if I could clarify that point. Can I put it to you, Garda Keogh, that ultimately what's happening here is the system is being put in place, you are not being targeted or treated unfairly, this is the same system that would apply to any other guard in your position?
A. Judge, the system, fair enough, there's obviously clear problems with the system. But there is still issues where the CMO had been left in the dark in relation to work related stress, because when I met the CMO --

212 Q. CHA RMAK You say they knew or should have known what was really wrong with me because that was stated on my medical certificates and they should have put that right?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN That's what it comes down to.
213 Q. MR. MRPHY: I suggest to you the CMO knew everything
you wanted him to know because you met him and you talked to him. So it is preposterous to suggest he didn't know --
A. No, no, I dispute that. Is it May when I met the Cmo?

I presumed he knew I was out on work related stress. But it wasn't until December that we both established that I was marked out with the flu.

CHA RMAN okay.
A. And that's what, where --

CHA RMAN Very good. Thank you.
MR. MRPHY: The final point, Chairman. Can I just put
it to you, Garda Keogh, accepting as you do that the system was in place, and remembering the questions Mr. McGuinness asked you last week about Chief Superintendent McLoughlin, his intervention, I have to suggest to you, led to a re-thinking in relation to matters but ultimately anything that was done there was not to target you or to treat you unfairly, but was actually in your favour?
CHA RMAN Anything done by Chief Superintendent McLoughlin.
MR MRPHY: Yes.
CHAI RMAN He completely accepts that.
A. Yeah.

215 Q. CHAI RMAN You completely accept he was on your side? 11:53
A. Yes.

216 Q. CHA RMAN And delivered the very thing that you were looking for, which was, you were back on full pay?
A. Yeah. And it wasn't that he was completely on my side,
it was just he was fair.
217 Q. CHAN RMAN I am sorry.
A. He did his job fairly.

218 Q. CHA RMAN I am sorry, if I said that, no complaint against -- very good. Thanks very much. Now.
MR. MRPHY: Insofar that was dealt with, I have to suggest to you that in fact An Garda Síochána in its general treatment of you did not seek to target you or to treat you unfairly and, in fact, you may recall that
in 2016, did you require further rehabilitation treatment?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you receive financial assistance for that?
A. Yes. As I said, there was an undertaking to give a full amount, but they gave -- they did give two-thirds of the amount.

Again, I suggest to you that the evidence will
demonstrate that this was a decision agreed with by all of the management responsible for making that decision as well as the HRM authorities at the time?
A. I understand.

222 Q. Perhaps the very last document, just to help you. Can you be shown page 2519. I am going to finish on this point, Chairman.
CHAL RMAN Thanks, Mr. Murphy.
MR. MRPH: This is a meeting, reference to a meeting on $12 / 7 / 2016$, so you're out of work at the time, and that there's a conference. This is a note taken by Superintendent Pat Murray, so he was also present. So
it was Superintendent Pat Murray, the Смо, Chief Superintendent Wheatley, Chief Superintendent McLoughlin, Mick Quinn from the welfare section. It says:
"Doctor to link with GP re clinical management."

It goes on to say that Mr. M Quinn said that you were going for assessment for 28 days in-treatment, that there is with a financial shortfall in the region of $€ 6,000$ and there was a reference to chief Superintendent McLoughlin to contacted medical aid.

And then it says this, and this will be the evidence:
"Al I in agreement."

That's to say Superintendent Murray, Chief Superintendent wheatley and the others.
"A without prej udice gesture of support shoul d be made. Lack of finance shoul d not be an option to prevent treat ment..."

Providing that you were committed to the same.

So, I have to suggest to you that that indicates, as wil1 the other evidence, that in fact there were constant attempts to assist you in relation to your
issues, both before and after you went off duty, and there was no targeting or no harassment or no attempt to single you out for 111 treatment at all.
A. I dispute that. I'm not making an issue on the shortfall. They did say 6,000 , I think it was 4,000 was given. They did renege on the last two, but that is not the issue. In this document where does it say work related stress? Here on page 2519.
Q. well, you see, what it says at the end --
A. It goes into a case conference here and there's not a mention of work related stress anywhere in it.
Q. we11, there is a reference, if you go further down, to the fact that there are contacts and it says:
"Doctor is of the view that he is not fit for work now. "

Do you see that?
A. Just where is that? Yeah. You see, Garda Keogh, again I have to suggest to you that the person who is dealing with this from a medical point of view, the CMO, knows everything you wanted him to know. You can't be heard to complain about his decision when he gave you every chance to tell him? CHA RMAN Now, we have been over that, Mr. Murphy. I
think we have been more or less over that several times. Thank you very much. Thanks, Mr. Murphy. Now, do you have at hand the relevant document you want to refer to, or would you prefer to come back to it?
WTNESS: I can get it done in one second, Judge. CHA RMAN If you can get it done in one second well and good, if you can't get it done in one second we will take a break. Do you understand, if you just can't put your finger on it, we will come back to it after a short break. Assuming you would like a short break.

WTNESS: I would.
CHAN RMAN very good.
WTNESS: Judge, page 14915.
CHA RMAN Yes. Thank you.
WTNESS: Judge, this is on 10th June 2016. It's an e-mail. I will just make sure it's the right one. Yeah.
"I have read the attached and it is a very good
document. My onl y concern rel ates to havi ng to consult with management regarding the pay."

CHA RMAN what am I looking at here?
A. Sorry, Judge, the bottom, it's the bottom part, the bottom document.

228 Q. CHAN RMAN 14915?
A. 14915 .

229 Q. CHA RMAN A series of things. This is "hi Mbni ca"?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN From Margaret Nugent?
A. Yes.
Q. CHAL RMAN It is to Monica Carr, who is, as we have heard, the person in HR?
A. Yes.
"I have read the attached and it is a very good document. My onl y concern rel ates to having to consult with local management regarding the pay. That may pose 11:59 probl ens, particul arly where local management/local management practices may be the source of the compl ai nt rel evant to the di scl osure. Furthermore, the di scl osure has to be kept confidential. Can an arrangement be made whereby pay issues are sorted out i n Navan, i ncl udi ng admi ni strative leave, based on a communi cation with the protected di scl osure manager."
Q. CHA RMAN Now, I can read that and I understand it, but what significance, particular significance do you want to draw attention to?
A. They're in HR aware that there is problems between me and local management. I also note that that is cc'd to Donal ó Cualáin, who is the -- is he the deputy commissioner? No, he's deputy commissioner at the time.

CHA RMAN You say that's an acknowledgment of difficulties between you and local management?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Okay. It seems to me, Mr. Murphy, that in normal circumstances I might come back to you and ask you do you want to ask any questions out of that?
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN But if that's a matter of interpretation and Garda Keogh has given his interpretation of it, you may offer an alternative interpretation of that.
MR. MRPHY: I can simply say, perhaps it can be dealt with by way of submissions, but I can say, to save time, there is a bundle of documents which are part of a sequence of which this is one.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MRPHY: They are in volume 53.
CHAI RMAN Yes.
MR. MRPHY: what I can do is arrange is for the page references to be given to you so that you assess those. But I think what you will see in summary form is that there is a correspondence trail.

CHA RMAN This is a trail of emails.
MR. MRPHY: Yes, it's a high level discussion by
management.
CHA RMAN Where do you say we should start with this?
MR. MRPHY: I can give you the details. The reference is 4th June 2016, and that is at page 14895.
CHA RMAN 14895.
MR. MRPHY: This is same volume.
CHA RMAN It continues until 14915.
MR. MRPHY: To letter 14900 and ultimately all the way through to 14913 . So the letter that is being referred
to by the witness is I think the last in a series. CHA RMAN You say, to understand it properly, one should look at the whole context.

MR MRPHY: Yes.
CHAI RMAN But the particular part that Garda Keogh wanted to draw attention to was a specific sentence or two sentences. Have I got that right?
WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN That's what you wanted. Whatever it says in the others, you're not quarreling with or you're not referencing, you're simply saying here is something that I think is relevant.
WTNESS: Yes, Judge.
CHAL RNAN okay, thank you very much.
MR. MRPH: Chairman, what ultimately this will show
is a detailed assessment, pros and cons of policy change, they're not matters which are exclusively referring to the facts of this case but they are demonstrating how the system might adapt to deal with a protected disclosure, a new form.
CHA RMAN Leave that to me, Mr. Murphy, to understand or try to understand with the assistance of my team. Now, thank you very much, we will take a break at that point and we will come back. What time is it? If I said 10 minutes, 15 minutes, we will do the best we
can. Okay, as close to $12: 10$ as we all can. If I can get stuff neatly here. Thanks very much.

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

MR. MRPHY: Chairman, I propose to deal next with issue number 17, that is complaints made by Garda Keogh 12:15 in relation to the criminal investigation carried out by Commissioner Ó Cualáin.

CHA RMAN Thank you.
MR. MRPHY: Again, this may be slightly shortened by virtue of Mr. McGuinness' examination, so, with your leave, Chairman, I propose to try and focus on the issue which I believe are extant in this issue. CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
234 Q. MR. MRPHY: Garda Keogh, just to summarise at the outset, I think you have accepted in your evidence to date that the investigation conducted by Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and Detective Inspector Coppinger was a good investigation and that you believed they were tenacious investigators?
A. Two of them and their team. And their team, yes.
A. Yeah.

236 Q. And, as you are aware, Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin was the head of that team?
A. Yes.

237 Q. As I understood the position last time you spoke to Mr. McGuinness on the record in relation to this, your complaint in relation to issue 17 had narrowed down to a complaint that Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin had
somehow sabotaged or tried to sabotage his own investigation, is that right?
A. Yes.

At the outset, can I suggest to you that there is no evidence that support that acquisition at all?
A. I dispute that.
Q. Can I put to you just a number of issues. First of all, can I ask you to be shown page 3960, volume 38? This is an extract from acting Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin's statement?
A. Just one moment, please.

CHA RMAN 3960, isn't that right?
MR MRPHY: Yes, Judge.
CHA RMAN 3960.
MR. MRPHY: yes.
240 Q. So, this deals with the position in August 2014.
Acting Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin will say that on that date he met with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy at his office to discuss progress in the investigation and he was told that Detective Superintendent Mulcahy was getting a lot of calls from you regarding the case and that he advised you to put your concerns in writing and that you had done so and that you raised issues about a number of different points. First, a potential witness going to GSOC.
Then questions about Garda A. Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin will say that he said to Detective Superintendent Mulcahy that he will have to meet with you in early course to discuss your concerns and that
he telephoned you later that day. Is that all true?
A. I think that's correct.
Q. Yes. In terms of meeting on 13th August 2014, I think you met with acting Commissioner ó Cualáin and Detective Superintendent Mulcahy at Portumna Garda station?
A. That's correct, that's the second meeting we've had.

242 Q. I think that they went through your letter with you and they discussed with you the matters that you raised which are of concern?
A. Yes.

243 Q. I think you mentioned the question of the suspension of Garda A?
A. Yes.

244 Q. You also mentioned the fact that you were uncomfortable 12:19 with enquiries being conducted by the investigation team in Athlone Garda Station?
A. Yes. That was a major, major thing, while Garda A was on duty.
Q. I will come back to that. I think you also told them that the suspension of Garda A was a matter -- sorry, you were also told that the suspension of Garda A was a matter for the assistant commissioner HRM?
A. That, Judge, is something that I'm -- that was never explained properly to me, Judge. I don't know if perhaps they presumed I knew that it had to go to HR or that, because when I was sending in the letters to Detective Superintendent Mulcahy about the suspension and all the rest, I never got a letter back to say, we
have already told you, we cannot suspend Garda A unless your statement goes to HR, or anything like that. So there is a dispute in relation to that, that part of it.

Well again, he will say that that was the case.
A. Just for clarification, Detective Superintendent Mulcahy did ask me about giving my statement to HR, there's no issue there.

247 Q. Yes.
A. It's just on the explanation that there couldn't be a suspension, that part, that was never explained to me.

248 Q. And who was the assistant commissioner of HRM at that time?
A. I think it was Fintan fanning, I think.

249 Q. Yes. Now just in terms of the discussion, I think the position is that Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin addressed the different points that you raised and in relation to the enquiries being conducted in Athlone Garda Station, he indicated to you that Ath1one Garda Station would no longer be used as a base for enquiries into the matters raised by you.
A. Judge, the damage was done, because they had taken al1 the witness statements from the guards in Athlone and once a guard has made a statement under the declaration where they state in it anything which they know to be false or do not believe to be true, they are liable to prosecution. Judge, a guard cannot change their statement once they made their actual statement. So the damage was done there. .

250

Can I ask you to be shown, just briefly please, document number 3946, which is at volume 13. This is a note taken by Detective Superintendent Mulcahy in relation to the meeting. You'11 see in the first paragraph there's background information and in the second paragraph there's issues raised, and we have dealt with each one of those?
A. Sorry, which is it?
Q. Again, I have to suggest to you that that's incorrect. Insofar as the position is concerned, he will say that he gave an instruction verbally to Detective Superintendent Mulcahy, who was present with you at that meeting, and he did so at the conclusion of the meeting?
A. I don't remember him giving an instruction to Detective Superintendent Mulcahy in front of me, if that's what you are trying to say. Maybe I took it up wrong.
Q. I'm not saying in front of you but that's the direction he gave?
A. Right.
Q. 3946 , please. Do you see the document?
A. Yeah.
Q. If I can ask you to go down to the heading "Issues Rai sed" and it says:
"1. Nobody will talk unl ess he is suspended."

That is you speaking, I take it?
A. Yes.

255 Q.
"Garda or public re Garda A hanging around during the i nvesti gation. Concerned about this."

That was you speaking, was it?
A. Yes.

256 Q.
"AC. . ."

That's AC Ó Cualáin:
"...stated, we will try to do our intervi ews in another station if we can - take the focus of the investigation away from where he works."

Do you remember him saying that?
A. I mean, it didn't have to be in another station, they could have met them in a hotel or they could have met them at their homes or anything. They had the contact details of all the members there, you know. As I said, 12:23 the damage was done at that point.

257 Q. And again I have to disagree you on their behalf in that regard. But in the next point it says:
"AC to write to HRM regarding suspension - hi gh bar." 12:23

Does that reflect what you were told at the time?
A. Yes, he did say a high bar, I recall that part of it, yes.
Q. And "AC to write to HRM', that's the note that Detective Superintendent Mulcahy took at the time?
A. Okay.
Q. So I have to suggest to you that that was said?
A. Oh yeah, yeah, I recall Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin said high bar. Now, Judge, there's a lot of evidence handed in and I'm aware of other guards that get suspended on things where there's not such a high bar, but anyway...
Q. I think that you then said, it's noted that you had one 12:24 major concern:
"Do our investigation when he is not around."

Do you see that? He noted that you expressed a major concern to do the investigation when you were not around, rest days etcetera.
A. No, no, that's when he is not around. When he is not around.
Q. When he is not around, I see.
A. That's a big word now to make a mistake on.
Q. In terms of the next line, does that suggest that Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin explained that he, that's Garda A:
"... was entitled to be there but we will try to move the focus of the investigation."
A. I mean, Judge, even if they did it in the station, as
mad as it would be, when he wasn't working it would still be mad, but to actually do it when he's on duty and hanging around the station is -- and I am aware of an incident where a guard had made a statement and something cropped up where he couldn't remember in his statement and then something else cropped up, and he was in the difficulty where he had to seek legal advice because he had made a statement saying he couldn't remember anything. So there were issues in relation to that.

263 Q. I think the position is that, further down the statement, he noted that you were happy with the investigation, no leaks, etcetera, was that you speaking?
A. Yeah.

265 Q. Does that refer to you allowing your name being put forward in the Dáil?
A. It could be. I'm not sure. I'm not sure.
A. Yes.
Q. I think if you could be shown please, on the transcript, Day 103, page 143, please, in particular at 1ine 16. Mr. McGuinness was asking you questions about 12:28 this issue and he says:
"... and are you saying to your know edge and in your si ght that stopped and changed at some particular
poi nt?
A. It did."
A. Yeah.

269 Q. From your point of view, whether you were off duty or whether you were off duty, as far as you can see that process has come to an end?
A. Yeah, after I brought it up.
Q. That in fact it transpires that there were some interviews that did take place after that date but you weren't aware of them?
A. Okay.
Q. In Athlone Garda Station?
A. Right.

272 Q. Insofar as that evidence will be concerned, Detective 12:28 Superintendent Mulcahy will say that there were a number of statements which were taken after that time, and Inspector Coppinger will agree that that also occurred, and that the reason was to facilitate members who wished to be interviewed during their work tours, and then second7y, that it was necessary in some cases to obtain records that were in the station that would require to be copied for handing over to the investigators?
A. Okay.

273 Q. But I think it's fair to say that from your own evidence, you weren't aware of that, so whatever was done was done was done discreetly, that it was not obvious?
A. Yeah. that's a matter on which we disagree. Thereafter I think you have accepted that the investigation through that time and after that point was a very good investigation, that they continually came back to you and spoke to you?
A. Yeah.
Q. So, if we move on then in terms of the --
A. Just one other thing, on that. Judge, a letter came into the -- on this matter, a letter was sent on the 29th, just of October, with a 1ist of all the statements, redacted the names of the guards and then there was all the witness statements as well. Do you know the way? It hasn't been exhibited and there's no page number on it. It came from the Tribunal. But what's interesting is, the witness statements in that whole -- in that document, they're not in there even in redacted form. Judge, the whole -- there's a huge
chunk of that Ó Cualáin file is not in -- it's not here. There's bits and pieces of it here. There's parts in relation to the suspension, there's parts on the DPP. But the whole entire Ó Cualáin file, Judge, is not in these documents.

CHA RMAN Yes. I think that's correct. Am I right about that?

MR. MRPHY: I think the position is, Chairman, my understanding is that all material was discovered to the Tribunal, the Tribunal has put into the books those 12:31 part of the documents it considers to be relevant to the hearings.
CHA RMAN Is that right, Mr. McGuinness, that's my understanding of the situation.
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes, Chairman. We provided a complete 12:31 copy of the investigation report submitted by Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin. A decision was made as to the irrelevance of the actual contents of the statement.

CHA RMAN So that's correct.
WTNESS: okay.
CHA RMAN A11 the statements are not in it, no.
WTNESS: That's fine. Judge, I know I brought this up in the first week.

CHA RMAN That's no problem.
WTNESS: About a report that is missing, a further
report in relation to matters that is also not there. CHA RMAN Well, the best way to deal with this is for Mr. Kelly to mention it to counsel and if necessary your solicitor can follow it up with a formal letter.

WTNESS: We have done all that, Judge. CHAN RMAN very good.
MR. MRPFH: With no result, Chairman. It's not clear what is the subject-matter of the request.

CHA RMAN Oh, I'm sorry, this was the subject of
12:32

12:32
MR. MRPH: Chairman, just in terms of the material
information that's --
CHA RMAN Sorry, a report?
WTNESS: Yes, Judge.
CHA RMAN That ó Cualáin was dealing with?
A. Yes. There should be another report in relation to all the phone contacts and things, like there was four phones seized from Garda A in -- one phone, for example, had contact between Garda A and Ms. B and over a three-month period there was I think 1,672
communications.
277 Q. CHA RMAN Don't tel1 me something -- I mean I know what's in the ó Cualáin report. Let's just all be clear where we are going. If this was the subject, as I think it was, of correspondence between Mr. Cullen it and that's the position. So, the material we were furnished, we were satisfied was all the relevant material and in abundance and for the sake of being in
any doubt, anything that was dealt doubtful we submitted. Anything that we were satisfied was not material to the thing, we didn't. So, it's not a matter to be discussed at this stage, okay. Thanks very much. I don't resent the fact that you say it, but I'm going to tell you that that matter is closed off, rightly or wrongly, that's the decision we made. WTNESS: I was just curious in case the report hadn't gone to the Tribunal, Judge.
CHA RMAN I don't know whether a report has or hasn't gone to the Tribuna1. A11 I am telling you is that that matter was dealt with. As I understand it, that matter was dealt with in correspondence and closed. okay.
278 Q. MR. MRPH: Just three further points then, if I can. 12:34 Garda Keogh, could I ask you to be shown volume 13, page 3902, please? It's a document which we dea7t which I think on the first day of your cross-examination. I think we can deal with this briefly. You've seen the statement, Garda Keogh, and I 12:34 think you indicated previously you've no problems with the investigation conducted by Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and Inspector Coppinger. But in essence, they say in their evidence that they went to all the lengths they could to follow the leads which you gave them and to follow things up, and you agree with that?
A. Yes.

279 Q. Again, I can shorten this, at this page 3902 they tried to deal with a witness who you and they believed to be
an important witness and they detailed the attempt to speak to that person, to go back to him several times. If you turn, please, to 3903, you will see that they spoke to that person on $12 / 12 / 2014$. And that he stood over what he had told you but he said he did not wish to make a statement?
A. I understand, yeah.

280 Q. This is a situation which in your own working life you have come across before as well?
A. Yes.

281 Q. But where ultimately, despite all those meetings with witnesses, declined to participate in the process. They also detail all the exhibits that they seized. Can I ask you to turn then, please, to volume 39 at page 1142 [sic]. It's at page 11142, please. So this is the final section of the report sent by Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin, which ultimately would have gone to the DPP. I think Mr. McGuinness asked you about this as well. I think, subject to correction, I believe he may have looked at the file a number of times but ultimately made a decision not to prosecute?
A. Yes.

282 Q. The DPP took the decision that there wasn't sufficient evidence to prosecute?
A. Yes.

283 Q. You will see in a report at paragraph 15.8.1, Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin indicates that a key witness has declined to cooperate with the investigation and that has weakened the evidence to support the criminal
charge?
A. Yes.

284 Q. Then he goes on, having made comments about that person, to conclusions. At 16.1 he says:
"A number of the allegations made by the reporter are pl ausi ble and have substance. "

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. This is Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin communicating up the line to the DPP. At 16.2 he says:
"Wile the investigation uncovered suspicions of criminal behavi our surrounding the destruction of evi dence, the circumstantial evi dence may fall short of what is required to bring a criminal prosecution."

He then goes on at paragraph 16.5 to say:
"The concerns rai sed by the reporter with the confidential recipient and referred to the then interim Garda Cormissi oner have been examined and set out in the investigation file."

In paragraph 16, do you see over the page, he makes reference to further information, search warrants being executed and other details of that kind.

So fundamentally in terms of the process, I have to suggest to you that Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin, with his team, gathered what evidence they could, put it before the DPP and that ultimately it was the DPP's decision not to prosecute, not theirs.
A. That's fair enough. But, Judge, I have to elaborate, if can I on this. If I may.

## 286 Q. CHAl RMAN Yes.

A. Judge, out of this, let's say the information $I$ had given, let's say, Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin, Judge, other matters come out of that investigation. For example, there's the issue of these missing drugs, where there's clear criminality there, there's a clear power of arrest. Judge, they seem to be kept completely away from this. They're investigated entirely separately. The same is the issue with the phone, is it the second phone was seized by Superintendent Murray, where Garda A is trying to ascertain information about witnesses or something. Judge, that is investigated again separately. Equally, I don't know now what GSOC -have they given either of those files to GSOC or what? I don't know what they have given to GSOC. But those two investigations should have been included in all this, because it's all related, Judge. What they did was, they divided it all up. They divided what was in my affidavit up. This is what appears to me, Judge, they divided my affidavit up with a collusion investigation. Then there is the missing phone or the
seized phone is a separate investigation. Then there's the missing drugs, where there was clear mens rea in relation to altering -- Judge, this is where drugs went missing in 2012, they did not go into the property store, they disappeared for a number of years. I understand someone in the investigation team spotted this anomaly. But on the pulse computer system, the actual incident of the missing drugs was closed off with a different incident number, which shows that there was clear criminality, Judge, and premeditated criminality.

287 Q. CHA RMAN Let me stop you a second.
A. Yes.

288 Q. CHA RMAN There has to be some limit to this. You understand, as does I hope everybody in the room, what this inquiry is about? what's it about? It's about whether you were targeted or discredited?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN That's what it's about. You may say, we11, look, I would have done the ó Cualáin differently. Maybe I would have done it differently. Maybe any of us would have done it differently. Maybe there were things they should have done that they didn't do. I don't know. But I am not reviewing and reinvestigating the ó Cualáin report. I understand where we are at the 12:41 moment is that the evidence as of now is that you said Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and Detective Inspector Coppinger carried out an excellent and thorough report. Now, it went to the DPP under the
name of Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin and the director. Didn't refer it back for further material or investigation, as far as I know, but ultimately the decision was made. So, the case you make is, this represented -- you listed, as I understand it, I think we said about 10 or 11 items, 10 specific items where you said that represented targeting or discrediting of you. Now, can you is see my difficulty about this? You say they shouldn't have treated other issues that we have not investigated relating to missing drugs, and 12:42 it gives the impression that the Tribunal is trying to close down things, that the Tribunal is not looking at things it should be looking at and that's unfair. That's unfair to me, it's unfair to the team I am working for and it's a misunderstanding of the function 12:42 that I am exercising here and the only function I can exercise here. I am limited by precisely what's said in the resolution. That's it. If I go outside that, I am in the wrong and I could be judicially reviewed. But that's not the point, it's not that I could be judicially reviewed, the fact is I am not doing my job.

So now, missing drugs in 2012, I am not concerned with, all right?
A. Yes, Judge.

290 Q. CHA RMAN I am concerned with how you say that the Ó Cualáin report represented targeting or discrediting. That's fair enough, maybe you're right, maybe you're wrong, but that's what I am investigating.
A. Judge, I may have been taken up wrong in relation to the Tribunal.
Q.

CHA RMAN Maybe I'm misunderstanding it but that is the situation as I understand it?
A. Judge, what $I$ was trying to say is, in this criminal matter all of these should have been taken in under this investigation and that it was discrediting to me because they were all further pieces of relevant evidence that they divided them all up. Judge, there is -- I have -- there is a thing, Judge, in volume 40, it will only take a second for me to find the page.
Q. CHA RMAN I'm not sure that this is included in your catalogue of complaints against the Ó Cualáin report. I am looking at it here and maybe I am wrong, and somebody will tell me where this is included, because we would have then had an opportunity to say, well, that's excluded, I have ten points and then I have other un-enumerated matters are subject of different items of complaint. So, we're not concerned about the ones that are the subject-matter of different items of complaint. I have ten items. I will go through them if necessary but they do not include missing drugs, dividing it all up?
A. You're correct, Judge. I didn't know about any of this until I read the documents.

293 Q
Q.

CHA RMAN okay. Well, we're not concerned with missing drugs or dividing it all up, because they're not included in your complaint and the thing I am investigating are your complaints. Goodness knows,

Garda Keogh, you have not been slow to make complaints. We have a full list of complaints and, in fairness, that's not a criticism, you and your solicitor have, provided an extensive list of many complaints over, I don't know how many pages, but there is a succession of 12:45 documents. As I say, that's fair enough, but what we have tried to do is to list them into specific items and we have to attack them individually, subject to the point that I mentioned to you at the very beginning, that I could understand you saying look, even if you held against me on every point, the fact that there were so many. I understand that. So here we're doing this one.

Now, Mr. McGuinness, if I am understanding, this is not 12:45 one of the complaints?

MR. MEGU NNESS: No, it's not.
CHA RMAN okay, it's not one of the complaints, end of story. So that's not one of the complaints whereby we're going to say the Ó Cualáin investigation went wrong. All right. Very good.

294 Q. MR. MRPHY: Garda Keogh, in the course of your evidence on Day 103, if it could be placed on the screen, at page 108, please. Just by way of example. Day 103, please, of the transcript. Garda Keogh, we asked you several questions in relation to perception and knowledge and just one example, on that date, at page 108, you gave evidence --
A. Sorry, 108?
Q. 108, please. Day 103, page 108, 1ine 25. You may recall you gave evidence on that date saying that you believed that a telephone belonging to Garda A may have been wiped by a machine in Mullingar. If you turn down to the next line, then over the page?
A. I don't think I said it was wiped by the machine in Mullingar, $I$ made a point there was a machine in Mullingar that could have wiped it.
Q. You're quite right.
A. But there would be a machine in every division -- in every Garda divisional HQ for reading phones, would be the purpose of it.
Q. Garda Keogh, can I refer to you, you also said over the next page, at line 4 , when you were asked:
"Q. Did that person wi pe it? A. I don't know, I don't know. "

So, just to pause there for a moment, what you are suggesting is that there is a machine and you have insinuated that somebody has wiped it. But then and when you're asked did you know anything about it, you say you don't know. Do you see the danger of leaving suppositions hanging in the air without any evidence to support the insinuation or accusation contained in that?
A. Judge...

298 Q. By way of example, can I just put it to you this way: This is something you said and left longing in the air.

I have to put it to you that Detective Superintendent Mulcahy will say in his evidence that ultimately this was -- these machines were not wiped and that, in fact, considerable data was recovered from the phone in the course of the investigation. So you have a perception that there may have been something in relation to the telephone but the reality is completely different. Do you understand?
A. Judge, there's four phone seized.

299 Q. CHA RMAN Four phones?
A. So, my understanding is that there was information on two or potentially two, three or four, but not on one. To further confuse matters, there was previous information from the first phone which related to 2010, because a similar matter that $I$ had reported had been reported a couple of years prior and that's how they had phone records for 2010. That's where the figure of the 1,670 something communications in three months between Garda A and Ms. B come from. But when that phone was seized in 2014, Superintendent Mulcahy told me that it had been wiped. Now, that would not cause a major problem in that servers would still hold information from that phone.

Now, in relation to -- I don't know if Mr. Murphy is referring to phones two, three and four that were seized here, I don't know.

300 Q. On my instructions, considerable data was recovered from the phones, that will be his evidence.
A. I can only give you -- what Detective Superintendent Mulcahy told me was that phone number one when it was seized was wiped.
Again I have to suggest to you that that's incorrect.
So, can I conclude on this basis, that your fundamental allegation against the Ó Cualáin investigation, as made in your evidence directly to the Tribunal last week, was that Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin had attempted to sabotage his own investigation. I have to suggest to you that that's wrong and, in fact, there is no evidence to support that allegation?
A. I dispute that, because there is no way -- because, just what I have stated as well there, where it had already previously been reported a number of years prior, a similar allegation, Judge, they knew there was 12:50 a problem and they still went down to take the statements in the station while Garda A was present. That is outrageous. It is no mistake. There's no mistake in that. That was, I would argue, to prevent guards were being honest in their statements.
302 Q. You see, Garda Keogh, I have to suggest to you that what's outrageous is that you have suggested that Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin did that deliberately, did that with the intention of subverting his own investigation, a point on which there is no evidence whatsoever. This is yet another example, and there have been several, where you put forward complaints without any evidence to support them whatsoever?
A. The alternative is that he did it out of stupidity and

I don't believe that.
303 Q. In terms of speculation, supposition and conjecture, al1 of this is supported by those elements and not by any evidence. I have to suggest to you that what you are saying is wrong and that are you effectively speculating and inviting the Tribunal to consider your belief, your suspicions and putting pieces together as you see them when in fact there is no evidence to support what you are saying at all.
A. Judge, there is evidence, because the evidence is there 12:52 that they did take the statements at Ath1one Garda Station. The evidence is that Garda A was there when they were taking the statements. And without going into any other investigation or matters which we've just discussed, there were other matters which they -- 12:52 other strands of vital evidence which were just not encompassed into the main investigation to weaken the strand of the investigation.
304 Q. Again, on behalf of the gardaí we represent, we have to put it to you that that's completely incorrect?
A. Okay. We're on disagreement there.

305 Q. Chairman, that concludes my questioning on this issue? CHA RMAN Thank you very much. What time is it? Very good. So we will be moving on to another topic.
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN which one is next?
MR. MRPHY: The next one will be relating to item number 18, Chairman, in relation to the complaints made by Assistant Commissioner Finn.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. We11 then that is a convenient time, we will break and we will resume at two o'clock.

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

## FOLLOMS:

MR. MRPHY: This afternoon, Chairman, the next area to be dealt with is issue number 18.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MRPHY: Complaints by Garda Keogh in relation to bullying and harassment, investigation conducted by Assistant Commissioner Michael Finn.
306 Q. Garda Keogh, I think the position is that you didn't make a complaint of bullying and harassment in 2015, is 14:01 that right?
A. I think that's correct, yes.

307 Q. Yes. And I think that you were talking at various stages in 2016 to Chief Superintendent Tony McLough1in in relation to a variety of issues. I think he raised with you the question of were you or were you not making a complaint under the policy?
A. That's correct.

308 Q. I think he explained to you what the policy was?
A. Yes.

309 Q. Just again for the record, that's a document within An Garda Síochána which indicates procedures to be followed by members who wishes to make a complaint of bullying and harassment against another colleague.

Again, covering the territory that Mr. McGuinness dealt with you, I think that on the 24th October, Chief Superintendent McLough1in received a letter from you indicating that you wished to proceed with the complaint of bullying and harassment?
A. Yes.

310 Q. That seemed to set the ball in motion at that time. Now, insofar as that period is concerned, that was your choice, but I think in the month that followed there was more correspondence, nothing in specific turns on this, but I think you went to your solicitor, Mr. Cullen, and I think that in December 2016 matters progressed to a more formal stage of making a complaint. I wonder if you could be shown volume 35, 9898, please. I think it is fair to say briefly that this is the first formal invocation by you of the harassment and bullying policy?
A. I think so, yeah.

311 Q. So it's at the end of 2016. So I think --
A. Just for clarification, the law has changed in relation to the protected disclosures, whereby you can go to GSOC at this period. I discussed the matters with GSOC and GSOC said that I had to invoke the Garda policy first. So, I didn't take it at the time, but yes is the answer.
312 Q. But again, I think there is no question of you being targeted in relation to Chief Superintendent McLough1in's communications; he was trying to find out
what approach you were seeking to adopt?
A. Yeah.

In fact, I think we will come to this later on, some people who were the subject-matter of the complaint ultimately were concerned about how long it was taking for this matter to progress as well. So, if we move then into 2016/17, you were aware of the fact that issues arise in relation to you making a statement about this. And that seemed to take quite some time as well?
A. Yeah.
A. One second. Yeah.
Q. You will see then, perhaps four lines later down, he will say that he received correspondence from the chief superintendent in Portlaoise containing a 17-page statement on 27th March 2017. That was signed by yourself, by Chief Superintendent Scan1an and Detective Inspector Dunne at Portlaoise Garda station?
A. Yeah, I see that. I don't think any of the appendices -- there's a question here about the appendices that were with that statement, there was a large amount of appendices, documents which were obvious7y submitted for the Tribunal but they were attached to that statement.
Q. I will return to this in a moment. You're aware of the fact that you furnished your statement in that way, is that correct?
A. Yes.

318 Q. I think thereafter the document was considered and assessed within An Garda Síochána. I think if I could ask you to be shown volume 37 , page 10478, a document you were shown by Mr. McGuinness. You're familiar with this document, Mr. McGuinness showed it to you last week. Just take a moment but I understood you to accept that that was the explanation given by Inspector McCarthy, who you know, and who worked with Assistant Commissioner Fanning?
A. Sorry, I worked with?

319 Q. Could you just turn forward to page 10481? If you turn forward four pages. You will see this is a letter from
inspector James McCarthy on behalf of the Assistant Commissioner Fintan Fanning?
A. Yes.

This is a document that you saw about two weeks, which was shown to you by Mr. McGuinness. Just to shorten matters, did $I$ understand you to agree that that sets out -- you accept that that's what Inspector McCarthy will say, you are not cavilling with that, you don't disagree with that?
A. I don't think so. I don't remember reading anything in 14:08 this that...






324

324 Q. Again, perhaps it won't be a problem, we see the
timeline. Could I ask you then to turn back, also in Volume 37, to page 10476, please. okay? what this deals with, this is an e-mail trail, you will see, starting at the bottom of the page, on 30th March 2018 from Assistant Commissioner Finn and it's addressed to Assistant Commissioner Fanning. Do you see at the bottom? Perhaps I can just point out to you what I'm referring to, it reads as follows:
"Fintan, just assist me finish off the Ni cky Keogh i nvesti gation. He makes reference to the del ay in i nvestigating his origi nal compl ai nt made to John Scanl on. I took a statement fromJohn Scanl on, he confirns he took a statement last March and sent it on to you. Can you give me somet hing in rel ation to the route that it took from Scanl an until l was appointed I ast Novenber."

So here is Assistant Commissioner Finn trying to address your complaint about delay in the early part.
Then, if you look please up at the top of the page, as I understand this is the evidence Assistant Commissioner Fanning will give, there may be no need, if you agree with him. I think the position is, at least he says:
"On the specifics, my memory is that Garda Keogh made an ori gi nal compl ai nt to someone in HRPD. Thi s appeared to have been some months bef ore the file came
to me. There may have been some consi derable activity prior to my invol vement and l sense it's probably best to approach HRPD regar ding that.

Once the file was recei ved here, I gave the matter very caref ul consideration. I sought clarification from HR as I interpreted that it was neither clear the nature of the complaint nor the identity of the persons compl ai ned of. This was very i mportant as it would determine which policy was to be used."

If I can just pause there for a moment. You do know now, do you not, that the policy did require any investigator to identify exactly who were the people who were being complained of?
A. Yes.

325 Q. This is Assistant Commissioner Fanning who is saying that this was very important because it would determine which policy would be used. Moving on then in terms of his approach, I think you would agree that that was a responsible approach by Assistant Commissioner Fanning at that time?
A. Yeah.

326 Q. That wasn't discrediting you or targeting you?
A. No, no.

327 Q. Then I think he says in the e-mail:

[^3]Then he says:
"I commenced a process. This process led to your appoi nt ment."

That's the appointment of Assistant Commissioner Finn. So, I think you will agree with me that the person who effectively started the process and led to the appointment of Assistant Commissioner Finn, was Assistant Commissioner Fanning?
A. Yes.

328 Q. In terms of the next paragraph, he said:
"As the process is ongoing and I have to consi der (a) 14:12 your report and (b) consi der any potential revi ews, I am not inclined to get invol ved as l need to approach the matter with a 'clean hand' and onl y consi der what ever you may put in your file and that of any application for revi ew. "

So, can we take it from that, the position was that Assistant Commissioner Fanning was starting the process, was not going to get involved in the process, but ultimately he saw that he would be the person to whom the final report would be delivered?
A. Yes.

329 Q. Did you know that at that time?
A. I did. Oh, I'm not sure, I just can't remember because
firstly there was -- it was Assistant Commissioner Fanning I think had said Chief Superintendent Scanlan was to take the statement and then I had something else from somewhere else, that Chief superintendent Roche was to do the same thing. So I don't know. I don't know what was going on there.
330 Q. Sure. I think it's fair, would you agree with me, that Assistant Commissioner Fanning's letter doesn't indicate any admission by him that there was any problem; he is simply describing how the matter required careful consideration?
A. Yeah.

331 Q. There were issues there about him having clean hands and not being directly involved that made the whole process slightly slow. But he is also explaining that he felt, in the paragraph:
"Correspondence after my invol vement, post my invol vement, the correspondence should in the main be with the 'process owner', the executive di rector HRPD. I wi sh to point out, I was summonsed to a meeting with the CAO and there may or may not have been a subsequent meeting I was not invited to. I have written to the acting commissioner on the file too."

Again, I have to suggest what indicates is that there was administrative consideration of your very detailed complaint and careful consideration about how the process could be directed and who should be appointed,
would you agree with that?
A. Yeah.
Q. Then finally, Assistant Commissioner Fanning says:
"You can feel free to contact Inspector MECarthy at my office to clarify any admin issue, etcetera. If you do so, can you pl ease advi se Garda Keogh that your investigation incl udes the enquiry at regi onal office but not of me, so there is no potential misunderstandings by him"

So ultimately, this is an explanation that was given and read in conjunction with the last document we saw, that's to say Inspector McCarthy's chronology, I have to suggest to you that what that shows, that's the chronology at page 14078 onwards, what that shows is that a lot of detailed consideration was taking place and there were complicated matters that required to be attended to, but during that period of time you're not accusing Assistant Commissioner Fanning of targeting you in any way?
A. No.

333 Q. I have to suggest to you that that delay, such as it was, is not something that could be regarded as targeting you in any way?
A. Judge, just to clarify, again it's similar only on the opposite side of things to what -- I only, again from reading the volumes, can understand about the delay. At the time I didn't know.
Q. Sure. Is it fair to say, Garda Keogh, that this is one example that with the benefit of hindsight you can see that there was good reason why things took time?
A. Yes. The same as with the break, it was on the other side of the coin but, yeah.

Again, Mr. McGuinness has dealt with a lot of what has occurred in the intervening period. But can we move forward to the first meeting that you had with Assistant Commissioner Finn. I think all the dates, Chairman, I don't propose to go into for ease of reference but counsel for the Tribunal has opened those details to date.

So, can I ask you please to be shown Volume 14, page 4220 please. In fact, sorry, for completeness could I ask you and the Chairman to look at 4219, I beg your pardon. 4219. I think this is a minute of a meeting which took place on 1st December 2017 at Mullingar Park Hotel. You're familiar with this meeting?
A. Yes.

336 Q. And this document I think as well?
A. Well, just in relation to the document, Judge, my recollection is the document was written in longhand, it was never read out. I never got a chance to sign it, from recollection. As a result of that meeting, Judge, when Assistant Commissioner Finn was trying to organise a second meeting, we asked for the second meeting to be recorded, so that there would be no disputes over what was said or anything like that.

That was declined and there was no second meeting, Judge.
337 Q. Now, just in terms of the minutes concerned, I think that you wil1 confirm that Assistant Commissioner Finn told you that he had been appointed by Assistant Commissioner Fanning to investigate the complaint?
A. Yes.
Q. He also indicated that he had no prior knowledge of the background to the circumstances of your complaint?
A. Yes.

339 Q. He said to you and he explained to you, just to put it to you --
A. Sorry, just one moment, he had Inspector Kennedy, Judge, and when she first contacted me, I did tell her, I asked her to get a copy of my complaint, to read it, to have an idea of what it's about, instead of just going in and me starting off from the whole thing. So that she would have -- they would have a copy of the complaint. So that part, he some knowledge in relation to --
340 Q. But insofar as the meeting was concerned, I think you will agree that he was confirming his appointment, number one?
A. Sorry?

341 Q. I think you will agree that he was confirming his appoint?
A. Oh yes.

342 Q. He was telling you that he wanted to speak to you about the scope of the complaint you had made?
A. Yes.

343 Q. I think you agree with me that he asked you did you want mediation and you said you did not?
A. Correct.

344 Q. I think you will agree with me that he asked you were you aware of welfare services and you said you were?
A. Yeah.

345 Q. Then you were asked, who do you send this report to, was a question that you raised? Do you see that, at the end of the page, that you asked him who do you send 14:19 the report to?
A. Okay.

346 Q. He told you that it would be sent to Assistant Commissioner Fanning because he appointed Assistant Commissioner Finn?
A. Right.

347 Q. He gave you his contact details at that stage. Would you just turn over to the following page, please. This is Mr. Cullen I think speaking, he suggested that the complaint was originally lost, made in March of 2017. He says it appears odd that things happened and went missing. Then he was asked the question, who was the complaint made to and he was told it was to John Scanlan. So at that stage it's established that the statement is being made, it's being submitted.
Assistant Commissioner Fanning asked you, just at the top of page 4220 , did you accept that he was neutral and Mr . Cullen said he accepted the assistant commissioner's bona fides. Do you see that? The top
one-third of the page.
A. okay.
A. He did ask me on numerous occasions, yes.
Q. We know from Assistant Commissioner Fanning's note, which we saw a few minutes ago, that that was an integral part of the policy, isn't that right? we now know that? against, do you remember that?
A. Oh yeah.
Q. Yes.
A. Bear in mind, they have the complaint there, so the complaint is obviously in writing, so it's very clear who I'm making the complaint against.
Q. There is another factor $I$ will show you that may help you understand what I am asking. You see you answered:
"Pat Murray, superintendent and two chi efs in Mullingar, Mark Curran and Lorrai ne Wheatley. There was a sergeant in the chi ef's office who may have been pulling thei r strings, l'mnot sure but your investi gation will show this."

Is that what you said?
A. Certainly the issue with the sergeant in the chief's office.
Q. Yes.
A. It was could be, could be. That was the thing to investigate, to see if there was --

354 Q. Would you agree with me that you had named a lot of people in your correspondence, in your complaint? There were many names.
A. Many names but they weren't all complained about.

355 Q. Assistant Commissioner Finn will say that he needed to know exactly who the complaints were made against. when he asked that question, he will say that Mr. Cullen interjected and said:
"Yes. He gets on with most people. There may be ot hers but some are more central."

Do you remember Mr. Cullen saying that?
A. I don't actually recall but I see it's written here.

356 Q. So at that point, again Assistant Commissioner Finn wi11 say, once that was raised he had to proceed to clarify exactly who was the complaint made against. You will see how that would have been a reasonable query for him in the light of what Mr. Cullen said. Mr. Cullen's statement by saying, can you just be precise about who exactly you are making the complaints against?
A. okay.

357 Q. okay. And then you respond:
"Pat Murray, that's crystal clear. Mark Curran, yes."

And then you said:
"I'mnot making a compl ai nt agai nst Noreen MLBri en and Lorrai ne Wheatley."

Do you remember saying that?
A. I mean, I know I had to complain about Lorraine Wheatley in that she was linked with the Pat Murray stuff.
358 Q. Also, I think you said in your evidence earlier that you thought that Chief Superintendent wheatley was, in your words, lucky, she was somebody you got on well in the past?
A. No, I didn't say -- I never said that, no. I think you're getting mixed up.
359 Q. CHAN RMAN Superintendent MCBrien.
A. Yeah.

360 Q. MR. MRPHY: Very good. In terms of the complaints, you then said:
"I am not making a compl ai nt, I have an issue with John Scanl an because the compl ai nt went messing."

So Assistant Commissioner Finn says:
"So agai nst Pat Murray and Mark Curran?"

And then you reply:
"My mind is open to Mark Curran. I thought it was him because he was friends with Ai dan Glacken. I knowit's coming fromthe chi ef's office but I am not sure who is doing it."

Do you recall saying that?
A. Yeah. Excuse me, yes. That part rings a be11. A11 my problems, Judge, in the 2014 period and a lot -especially the 2014 period, seemed to all emanate from the chief's office in Mullingar. I said there's obviously the chief there, but I did point out there is a sergeant there and I said, that sergeant is friends with Garda A on Facebook and as part of the investigation can we see, you know, maybe it's not the chief, maybe it's someone else pulling the strings here on that. So that part, yes, is correct. I understand, I don't think it was ever investigated, by the way, but...

361 Q. Just to be clear from the Chairman's point of view, is it the case then that the basis on which you were making a complaint against Mark Curran was you thought he should be complained against because he was friends with Aidan Glacken?
A. No, no. No, no, no, no. There was an awful lot of
going back to the Olivia O'Nei11, the Liam McHugh. A11 that stuff was emanating from the chief's office. All the stuff from 2014 appeared to emanate from the chief's office in Mullingar.
In terms of the position concerning Chief
Superintendent Curran, can I take it then that you had no evidence against Chief Superintendent Curran, apart from your supposition that he was friends with Aidan Glacken and this must be coming from the chief's office? Is that a fair summary of the evidential strength of your case at that time?
A. We11, I mean, that would probably be a factor. But also there's the evidence, the appendices, where I have all this documentation coming from the chief's office in Mullingar, so...
Well, did you have any evidence that the chief superintendent was targeting you deliberately with an attempt to do you damage?
A. You see, I suppose that's why we're here. I mean, there is a lot of stuff which is emanating from Mullingar which we dealt with, and that's the purpose of the investigation as well.

364 Q. Sure. Can I invite you to look at the last line on that page:
"I' m not sure who is doing it."

So Assistant Commissioner Finn said at that stage you were saying you weren't sure who was doing this but you
were going to throw out an allegation against --
A. No, no, that's not quite accurate. You see, as I said, these notes are -- I can't -- I couldn't go so far as to say everything in these notes are exactly as was said. But I did make the point, look, there's somebody 14:26 in the chief's office that $I$ think is involved in this and I said, look, there's the chief, Chief Superintendent Curran, I also pointed out that there is a sergeant there that might be worth to have a look at as well.
So your position was just make a complaint against Chief Superintendent Curran anyway?
A. He's the person in charge. here, you thought it was him? Is that the way you framed it, just because you thought it was him, you suspected it was him, that that was the position?
A. I had appendices to the documents, appendices which obviously didn't arrive with the statement. I had a lot of appendices, documentary evidence. So, I was in a position to back up -- to at least point the finger,
you know, at the --
369 Q. Would you agree with me, at this point in this meeting you're waddling backwards and forwards, you're not sure of exactly who you are making the accusation against, is that right?
A. No, because I already had made the statement and Assistant Commissioner Finn just over and over again kept asking me who $I$ was making complaints against. And in the end I just remember going, look, Superintendent Pat Murray, Chief Superintendent Lorraine Wheatley and Chief Superintendent Mark Curran, and that was it in the end. But he kept going on and going about who I was making a complaint -- he already had it in writing in front of him.
You see, I have to suggest to you that you were very unclear about what you were doing at this stage. Even by using the words "my mind is open to Mark Curran". Can I suggest to you that that it's clear that all of the other people at the meeting from their assessment were entitled to consider that you were unclear about who you were accusing?
A. I mean, look, as I said, the record that we have of the meeting is -- after that meeting we looked for the next meeting to be recorded on tape. I can't stand by these notes.

371 Q. Let's just stick with this meeting, Garda Keogh, if we can please. Just in response to that, would you turn over the page. Mr. Cullen is recorded as saying that you were complaining about adverse treatment but that
you can't always pinpoint who was doing it. It's a matter for the investigation. It's up to you.

Was that your view at the time; that you couldn't always pinpoint who was doing what you considered to be 14:29 adverse treatment?
A. Like that would be the purpose of the investigation, to actually find out where the problem -- where the problems are. You know, I have just pointed the finger, look, here, the chief's office in Mullingar is one place to start.

372 Q. We11, you got a bit further than that, you're heading towards making an accusation of a very serious kind against Chief Superintendent Curran and it's not clear that you really think he did it?
A. No, no, no, no.
Q. You're not sure, is that right?
A. That's not true. Because it's in the original statement that I have already made, and it's more than a might. Like I have actually -- I can't remember what 14:29 I put into that statement, but it's fairly clear when we go down through --
Q. In fact, on the contrary, it seems that Mr. Cullen wasn't very clear about exactly what you were doing, because he is saying you can't always pinpoint who is doing it?
A. I can't answer that question.
Q. Is it possible that you're mistaken, for example, as you were mistaken a few moments ago in relation to your
description of Chief Superintendent wheatley?
A. It was you that was mistaken.
Q. Can I just ask then, perhaps if you can be shown the transcript please for Day 103, page 27, 1ine 21 . Would you mind reading into the record your answer to the question at line 21?
A.
"A. And she is accurate in what she says."

377
Q. Yes, just read on please?
A.
"J ust for clarification as well, frommy meeting with Chi ef Superintendent Weatley, she's a lovel y person, and anything I ever heard about her, and these are even in my circles, were very positive."

378 Q. I think you wi11 agree with me that what you said a few moments ago was wrong, is that right?
A. Just one second, I see it's written down here.

379 Q. CHA RMAN why don't you read the next sentence.
A.
"But unfortunately just on this, in rel ation to this she seens to have pitched her wagon to Superintendent Murray. I suppose that's why, apparently why she's here. "

380 Q. MR. MRPHY: You said this now two weeks ago, not in 2018 or 2016. So I have to suggest to you that recollection can be faulty but you do seem to have
difficulties in remembering things, isn't that correct?
A. I mean, if we're going back, like --
Q. That is going back two weeks?
A. This is very easy, Judge, for a question to be posed on a particular instant. As I said, I have to remember stuff going back as far as 2008 on numerous investigations. But just on this, we'11 keep going on this anyway.
Yes, we will, Garda Keogh, yes. But insofar as this is concerned, the interview then proceeds, where Assistant 14:32 Commissioner Finn told you that he wasn't here to investigate criminal complaints but that the policy he had to investigate was limited. He described those procedures to you. Do you remember that?
A. The thing with the criminal complaint, he did, I recollect that. And what was the other one?

383 Q. That he also talked about that he had to go to the people under the procedures in chapter 8 , do you remember him talking about chapter 8 ?
A. He could have, I don't know.

384 Q. Then you said that you wanted to read from your statement, the statement that you had given to Chief Superintendent Scanlan. Can you recall reading an extract from that?
A. What page are you on?

385 Q. Just the middle of 4221?
A. Okay. I see that's in there but...

386 Q. Can you remember doing that? Can you actually remember reading out part of your statement?
A. I don't recal1. I mean, I can't say -- when I say -I'm not disputing whether I did or I didn't, I just don't remember it, that's all.
387 Q. That's another thing you can't remember. If we move on then, please, further down, you see about three paragraphs further on Assistant Commissioner Finn will say that he said to you:
"I need to be clear about what I am doing. I am i nvesti gating bullying and harassment agai nst persons. Going on the definition..."

And by this he means the definition in the regulation.
" -- I need to know who your compl ai nt is being made agai nst."

Do you remember him saying that?
A. He did ask me over and over again who --

I think you agreed with me earlier, that's the same type of question that asked or referred to by Assistant Commissioner Fanning as being a necessary question?
A. This was already in writing. The complaint was made, it was in writing and it was clear. We11, do you see what Mr. Cullen says next on your behalf, he says:
"There's a lot of documents and it's in there." Do you recall Mr. Cullen saying that?
A. I don't recall but $I$ see it here.

390 Q. Can you appreciate, therefore, if that was said, that Assistant Commissioner Finn needed to ask the next question "I need to know the people" that was a reasonable question?
A. Yeah, but you're asking me to recite every word in a conversation here. when I say I can't remember, you're going oh. Like there's no way I can remember every word that was said in a meeting back in, when is this, 2017.

391 Q. But you can recal1, I have to put it to you, Garda Keogh, whether you were accusing particular people or not?
A. I was.
Q. Let's just see the sequence again. I have to suggest to you Assistant Commissioner Finn will say he needed to establish exactly who the complaints were made against and when he asked you "I need to know the peopl e" he will say that you said:
"Superintendent Pat Murray is one. I'mnot sure about Mark Curran but my mind is open."
A. Look...
A. Not that's not accurate because I had Chief Superintendent Curran already in the statement. We11 then what do you think was meant by the words "my
A. I don't know what... that's if it was said.
Q. Would you agree with me that's not a ringing certainty in terms of its expression of identifying a person against whom a complaint is to be made?
A. Look, if towards the end, if these are in any way accurate, I'm sure it's ironed out somewhere along the line. I see here on page 4223, I have named the three names, Pat Murray, Mark Curran --
Q. Sorry, Garda Keogh, you are trying to evade the question. We're on page 4221, you know that. I have just asked you a question about what you said, that you 14:35 weren't sure about Mark Curran. You are saying this in the presence of your solicitor, in the presence of Assistant Commissioner Finn, in the presence of two other gardaí, it's an important meeting. I have to suggest to you, that indicates that you knew at that stage you hadn't got any clear evidence against Chief Superintendent Curran at all? mi nd is open"?
Q. Yes.
A. We have no recording of this meeting, unfortunately.
Q. Assistant Commissioner Finn will say that is what you said, I am putting that to you, and that's precisely why he had to keep on asking these questions.
A. Can he remember everything word-for-word?
Q. He took a note at the time, which it seems you didn't.
A. Sorry, he didn't take a note, Inspector Kennedy took the note.
Q. Very good. Well then inspector Kennedy will also support that. Then you said after having said your mind is open:
"When he left..."

That's when Mark Curran left:
"... Lorrai ne Wheatley came and she is sound."
A. I've already said, I think was it last week, that I have heard nothing bad at all about Lorraine wheatley, that she's a lady, you know. I have said that's what she is in this because I obviously have a certain amount of evidence here. That's the way it is.
401 Q. You see, Garda Keogh, I have to suggest to you that you didn't have any evidence to support this complaint. You went on to say:
"She' s sound. The sergeant all the time and he's friends on Facebook with Garda A. "
A. Yes.

402 Q. So you did say that?
A. Oh yeah, yeah. That part -- well, it mightn't have been said, I don't know, word-for-word, but that definitely was an issue.
Q. Assistant Commissioner Finn then said:
"If it's the sergeant but if I don't get a complaint agai nst himthen $I$ won't be putting in a compl ai nt agai nst him"
A. I have no evidence against the sergeant, I had evidence against the two chiefs.
404 Q. Then again I have to put it to you that you didn't have such evidence. But you went on to say:
"I' m not sure who is responsible for the Mullingar thing. If you go to Mark and Lorrai ne and say they were busy and just si gn the document."

What did you mean by that?
A. Sorry. "If you go to Mark and Lorrai ne and..."

I have no idea what that's about.
405 Q. Well, in terms of:
"I' m not sure who is responsible for the Mullingar thing."

What was the Mullingar thing? Can I assist you? Isn't 14:38 that where the chief's office was?
A. Yes, yes.

406 Q. Yes. And there you are saying to Assistant Commissioner Finn that you weren't sure who was
responsible for the chief's office issue, isn't that correct?
A. My thing was that where a lot of this stuff is emanating from the chief's office in Mullingar, the chief superintendent is in charge. I did throw out the 14:38 possibility, if it wasn't the chief's, there is this other guy you can look at, he is friends with Garda A on Facebook, if you want to look at that. That was it but that's for them in the investigation to carry out. And they didn't do that.
You see, Garda Keogh, you have had a lot of time to think about this. We are now at a point in 2017 when you have had months and months and months to think about this, to brood about this, to look at documents, to assemble appendices, to talk to your solicitor. I 14:39 have to suggest to you that at this stage you're not in a position to identify who is responsible for the Mullingar thing?
A. That's not the case. That was the whole purpose of making the -- I mean making the -- and the other thing that you said there, like months and months, you know, to think about, what? This one particular document in amongst, how many, 15,000 pages of stuff, that's not quite fair.
408 Q. We know you didn't make a complaint in 2015, isn't that 14:39 right? In the whole of 2015 you didn't invoke a bullying policy?
A. No.

409 Q. Isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

410 Q. And in the vast majority of 2016 you didn't do so either, isn't that correct?
A. AS I have already stated, I did speak to GSOC about how to go about it and it had to be done under the Garda policy first.

411 Q. This meeting is now taking place 12 months later, and you're not clear about who you wish to make a complaint about?
A. No, I mean, it is very clear. I mean it is clear who I 14:40 have made the complaint about because it's in writing in my statement and it's in this thing.
412 Q. You see, I have to suggest to you that when Assistant Commissioner Finn asked you yet again, this is page 4222, the second line:
"I need to find out who you are saying is responsi ble so l can put it to the people."

Then Mr . Cullen is recorded as responding:
"It's in the documents."

And further down, you said:
"Pat Murray and Mark Curran but my mind is left open on hi m"

Do you see that?
A. I see it here, yes.

413 Q. So again there is extensive dialogue taking place and not for the first time it comes to Mark Curran, you're hesitating and saying my mind is left open on him, and then you say:
"It is Pat Murray and Mark Curran."

Do you recall saying that?
A. Again, I can't recall word-for-word what was said in that meeting.
Q. Then when you're asked about the sergeant, you say:
"No, I don't have enough evi dence."
A. That's true, I didn't have enough evidence. That was the point where I said there is a sergeant, he is friends with Garda A on Facebook, might be worth having a look here to see, you know, is there something else here. But I had no evidence -- I had no evidence to do 14:41 with the sergeant, it related to the chiefs.
Q. But you did know, Garda Keogh, that you had to have evidence to place a valid complaint?
A. I had evidence in relation to the two chiefs and the superintendent.
416 Q. And your mind was open, as you said, in relation to Chief Superintendent Curran?
A. I've already explained this, I said there is a possibility, more or less, if it's not Chief

Superintendent Curran that there is somebody else in the chief's office. That was it. But I had no evidence against that person, so I couldn't bring it any further.
417 Q. Then there's reference to the complaint about a delay, with a delay in the investigation?
A. Yeah.

418 Q. Mr. Cullen is recorded as saying:
"It appears the compl ai nt was lost. We're not sure who 14:42 or where this happened."

And you said:
"No, it's all of bullying. The whol e way in everything, it's me that has to push thi ngs."

So, is it the case that you were saying to Assistant Commissioner Finn that all of this was a valid bullying complaint?
A. In relation to me having to push things, Judge. And at first, when I tried to invoke the Garda policy, I think it was Tony McLoughlin I was in communication with in relation to invoking it, but we had to send solicitors letters then to actually get -- to get the statement -- 14:43 to get someone -- to get it started basically.
419 Q. You see, Assistant Commissioner Finn will say that such was the level of uncertainty here that he then asked again:
"I need to be clear, who do l need to approach and i nvesti gate. "

And you replied:
"Ri ght now the compl ai nt is agai nst Pat Murray and Mark Curran. "

Do you recall saying that?
A. I mean, it's all here and it's the same -- I mean...

420 Q. Then Assistant Commissioner Finn will say that he said to you -- sorry, that you said to him:
"Mark Curran says it was someone el se."

He then asks you:
"Then I will come back to you and we will take it from there."

Do you remember him saying that?
A. Again, I don't remember him saying that but that would have been in relation to the sergeant in the chief's office. So I would accept that that part of it is accurate.
421 Q. And then the next thing he will say that you said was:
"Throw in Lorrai ne Wheatl ey so."

## Did you say that?

A. I mean, I can't remember saying that.

422 Q. Again, he will say that that's what you said. I have to suggest to you that that indicates a very reckless approach on your part, because you knew you had no evidence against Lorraine wheatley?
A. I have -- there is evidence against Lorraine --

423 Q. At that time you knew you had no evidence against Lorraine wheatley?
A. No.
A. No, no, I had evidence against -- I have already said I had evidence against the two chiefs and the super. I didn't have any evidence in relation to the sergeant.

425 Q. Why did you just throw in Lorraine wheatley so? Did you understand this was a serious thing, to make an allegation of this kind against one of your superior officers?
A. You see, again as I said, this document was written in 14:44 longhand, it wasn't read over to me. So I don't know what -- I mean, I am looking at what in general it appears to be, it appears to be accurate in general over all, but again, it just takes one or two lines not to be accurate and I can't remember word-for-word what 14:45 was said.
Q. You see, I have to suggest to you, Garda Keogh, that what Assistant Commissioner Finn will say in his evidence indicates that you were chopping and changing
throughout the course of the interview, and on7y then towards the end you use this throw away phrase "throw in Lorrai ne Wheatley so", is that the basis on which you would ordinarily investigate a criminal offence or any internal investigation you were involved in?
A. No, Assistant Commissioner Finn was asking me over and over again about who $I$ was making complaints and all the rest, so I mean, I don't know if it was him, if I got confused at any stage it was merely to do with the way he was asking me over and over again. So do you think you were confused about Chief Superintendent wheatley?
A. No, I wasn't confused, because it was in the statement that I had already made in March.

428 Q. Can you explain why you hadn't identified her in detail up to that point as a definite suspect?
A. Just for clarification, was she in the statement in March? I actually can't remember. If she was in the statement in March, then I mean...
429 Q. Again it's a matter for the Chairman but I have to suggest to you that that indicates a very reckless approach towards making complaints against your colleagues, on your part?
A. Judge, I made the same complaint here to the Tribunal. It's the same, I mean... so...

430 Q. Do you see the next question, where Assistant Commissioner Finn asked you:

[^4]> Do you see that?
A. Just what page is this?

431 Q. The same page, 4222. The second last line?
A. Yeah, I see it.
Q. Again, Assistant Commissioner Finn will say at this time you appeared to be going backwards and forwards?
A. I'd be saying the same about him.

434 Q. Again, I have to suggest to you that isn't correct. But if you look at the next entry, his evidence will be Mr. Cullen said:
"I amhappy that under a bullying and harassment compl ai nt these three people but it may be el sewhere."

So again I have to suggest to you, this indicates that there is a degree of confusion on your side as to exactly who are the people the subject of your complaint?
A. No.
Q. If I ask you to turn over to page 4223, there's a discussion that took place about bullying and harassment being different agreements. You mentioned Chief Superintendent Scanlan. Do you see that?
A. Yeah.
Q. Then, having gone through the different issues, you
say, towards the middle of the page:
"I've named three names, Pat Murray, Mark Curran and Lorrai ne Wheatley."

Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

437 Q. Assistant Commissioner Finn again will say that he once more said:
"If you need to thi nk about this...."

That he will send you another document about grievance procedures for clarity, because they are different things under the Garda Code. Do you see that?
A. Yeah, I see it here but I mean -- what's coming back to me is, and I don't see it here, he asked me on numerous occasions was this a corporate complaint or some other -- I just don't happen to see it in here. But he asked me a couple of times about a corporate complaint or... and I didn't really know what he was on about, a corporate complaint, but anyway.
438 Q. So effectively in relation to that meeting, the parts that you can remember from the meeting I have to suggest to you indicates a confused picture, where
you're approach towards, in particular, chief Superintendent Curran and Chief Superintendent wheatley was very off hand and you seemed unclear as to whether you really were going to make an allegation against
them. I have to suggest to you that's because you knew that you had no basis to make an allegation against him at all?
A. That's false. Because I already had named in the statement. This has just come back to me now, which isn't in the notes or $I$ haven't seen them here. Because on numerous occasions he's on about corporate, is this a corporate complaint or is it some other complaint. This sort of stuff was going on as well and that doesn't seem to be in here. So...

439 Q. But you understand, Garda Keogh, this is an important meeting with your solicitor present, with an assistant commissioner of An Garda Síochána, something that you delayed for period of two years making, you had time to consider it, you had written a statement. Assistant Commissioner Finn will say that these were your responses to the questions that you were asked?
A. A lot, a lot of it is fair enough, but there's stuff here that is -- it's not -- it's just not verbatim or accurate.

440 Q. You see, I have to suggest, Garda Keogh, that it's a lot more accurate than your recollection as outlined in your evidence today.

But let's move from that. That concluded that meeting documentation concerning the investigation conducted by Assistant Commissioner Finn. I don't propose, Chairman, to put each and every sequence detail to this
witness because he would not be aware apart from the written word. But if I can move forward to the end of the report and to the conclusion itself that Assistant Commissioner Finn came to.

Presumably when you received his report, that you read it?
A. What page?

441 Q. When you received Assistant Commissioner Finn's report, you read it?
A. which is what page?

442 Q. But did you read the report?
A. I would have read, I would have read any report that I got.
443 Q. Before you made complaints against him, did you read
14:51 his report?
MR. KELLY: Chairman, it would be helpful to the witness if Mr. Murphy actually identified the document which he is asking the witness whether he has read or not.
MR. MRPHY: Certainly, Chairman.
CHAI RMAN That might be helpful, Mr. Murphy, thank you. It's the Finn report, but Mr. Murphy is going to identify it exactly, so you will be able to refresh your memory.

MR. MEGU NESS: volume 18, appendix 65.
CHA RMAN Volume 18 , appendix 65 . Thanks very much. MR. MRPH: If the witness could be shown volume 25 , please.

CHA RMAN Well, Mr. McGuinness says it is volume 18, appendix 65.
MR. MRPH: It appears in several places, Chairman. CHA RNAN very good. If you're happy that that's the right one.

MR KELLY: 5521.
CHAN RMAN 5521, Mr. McGuinness, is that all right? Just for the moment at least.

MR. MRPH: Yes, I am looking at 7469, so I will use the internal page references of the report for ease of reference.

CHA RMAN Mr. Murphy, we won't do it that way. You want to refer to page what?
MR. MRPFH: 7469, please.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Thanks very much orla. 7469, so we are all looking at the same thing. would you take back so. Would you give that back. 7469.

Thanks very much. That is more satisfactory, Mr. Murphy that everyone is looking at the same thing.
MR. MRPFY: Chairman, thank you.
CHAL RMAN If you need a moment to familiarise yourself with that, just let me know, that's not a problem. Well maybe, Mr. Murphy, ask a question but bear in mind, Garda Keogh, in relation to any question that Mr. Murphy asks you, if you need just to get yourself up to speed about the report, just let me know. Okay. WTNESS: Thank you, Judge.
CHA RMAN Proceed, Mr. Murphy, and if Garda Keogh has a reason why he wants to have a look at it, or even if
he doesn't have a good reason, if he feels that he would like to do that, then that won't be problem.
444 Q. MR. MRPH: If the witness could please turn to page 7507, which is the summary at the end of the report.
CHA RMAN 7507, thank you very much.
MR MRPH: Garda Keogh, do you want to take a moment to read that summary?
A. Please.

CHA RMAN Are you going to go on, Mr. Murphy, and deal with more specific questions arising out of that general summary?

MR MRPH: Very few, because I think if I elicit the answer I think will come, that should shorten matters. CHA RMAN Thank you very much. why don't you ask your question, because I can see that Garda Keogh will probably want to go back to the more specific areas.
MR. MRPPH: yes.
CHA RMAN Do you understand?
WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MRPFH: I was going to deal with, Chairman, by dealing with the appeal process.
CHAN RMAN Certainly, absolutely, no problem whatsoever.
MR. MRPHY: Thank you, Chairman.
446 Q. Just in summary, Garda Keogh, will you agree with me, you disagreed with these conclusions and summary?
A. Sorry?

447 Q. You disagreed with the summary conclusions?
A. Oh yeah.

448 Q. Just to be clear, what Assistant Commissioner Finn found was, he said that each of the officers who were under investigation fulfilled their obligations, conducted their duties to ensure accountable, professional policing service was being delivered to the public. He also found that their actions were examples of a proactive management, that ensured appropriate governance and supervision was maintained to achieve their policing objectives and this could not 14:56 be construed as either bullying or harassment. Next, he also found that their interaction with you was both legitimate and proportionate. He felt, from his conclusions, he was satisfied that they were cognisant of the personal stress and issues which you were encountering and that each of them had ensured that appropriate supports were in place for you on an ongoing basis. He finally concluded:
"For example, each of the issues raised, I'mof the opi ni on that Superintendent Murray, Chi ef Superintendent Curran and Chi ef Superintendent Wheatley acted legitimately within thei r respective roles and responsibilities to manage the issues and policing demands in thei $r$ areas of responsi bility and in particular thei r interactions with Garda Keogh. "

So, those were his conclusions. Do I understand your complaint to be that you disagree with the result?
A. I disagree with the whole, the whole thing. Just even what we touched on earlier, where I said about there could be a sergeant in there, never even looked at that. That was never examined. There's a whole lot of stuff. In relation to the Liam McHugh incident, which was dealt with in relation to Mark Curran's involvement there, like, in relation to Aidan Lyons' statement, sergeant Aidan Lyons' statement that he has made to the Tribunal, I think he has said that he had no further -he wrote this report in relation to the meeting with Liam McHugh, I am pretty certain it says that no one came back to him, no one came back to him in relation to this, to the map, that he didn't know what happened. As a result of the Assistant Commissioner Finn investigation, it's then obviously appealed and goes on and into the de Bruir -- but the findings actually appear to go further than -- basically, it's my hand that appears to go into Mr. McHugh's pocket, where there's no additional evidence of any sort. So this whole thing, Judge, I reject this whole investigation.
449 Q. Garda Keogh, do I then understand that because he disagreed with you, it's your case that Assistant Commissioner Finn was targeting you, is that your case?
A. It's not that he --

CHA RMAN If I am understanding correctly, you're going to be more specific, you've said I disagree with the conclusions and you were about to go on in more specific terms about it. That's obviously somewhere that you're going to be exploring, Mr. Murphy, as to
the more specific elements. We have a general conclusion.
MR. MRPHY: yes.
CHA RMAN And Garda Keogh says, yeah, I reject the whole thing, disagree with the whole thing. I know where you're going. So we will stop there, we will take a short break and we will come back to that in the more specific. You can take a break and, you know, you don't have to be reading this when you're taking a break, when we come back, if you find something specific that you need to sort of look at or just refresh your memory about, just mention it. There's a lot of material we're covering, you know, I quite understand that. okay.
WTNESS: Thank you, Judge.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much.

THE HEARI NG THEN ADJ OURNED BRI EFLY AND RESUMED, AS
FOLLONS:

CHA RMAN Very good. Thanks. Now, Mr. Murphy. MR. MRPHY: Chairman, thank you. Chairman, can I mention one point out of sequence that I ought to have mentioned before the break?

CHA RMAK of course, you take your own course.
MR. MRPHY: Just before we move onto the issue of the objections to the final report.

450 Q. Can I ask you please to be shown Volume 12, page 3635 please? So, Garda Keogh, do you have that document?
A. I see it here on the screen.

451 Q. Thank you. Just the top left-hand side, this is a note taken of a meeting on Friday, 15th December 2017, at the Killeshin Hotel in Portlaoise. You met I think with Chief Superintendent Anthony McLough1in and John Barrett, do you remember that meeting?
A. Yes. Can you give the date again please?

452 Q. Sure, it's 15th December 2017. Will you see there is a date in the top left-hand corner, it's small writing I appreciate?
A. I recall that.

453 Q. Just to be clear, I think you've indicated at every stage in your evidence that chief Superintendent McLough1in was somebody who was very clear to you, is that right?
A. Yeah, I always found him to be.

454 Q. He's not somebody who was ever targeting you or pursuing in any negative way?
A. I didn't perceive anything there.

455 Q. Mr. Barrett was a civilian and he was the new head of HR at that stage; is that right?
A. Yeah.

456 Q. I think he's also a person whom you described in your diary as somebody who was an ally, isn't that right?
A. Sorry.

457 Q. He's somebody you describe in your diary on 1st January 2018 as an ally?
A. Yeah, I understand he exposed the fraud and the embezzlement in Templemore, the mass fraud embezzlement
thing in Templemore, is my understanding.
458 Q. I have to suggest to you that that's nothing to do with the question I asked you?
A. Oh right.

459 Q. And that you just said that to get away from the question I asked you.
A. Okay.

460 Q. Nothing to do with this case at all. In your diary of 1st January 2018, had you marked him down:
"Mr. Barrett is an ally."
A. As I stated in the answer when that was first put to me, your enemy's enemy is your friend.
461 Q. So the answer to the question I think is, yes, you did consider him to be an ally. So you're at a meeting with Chief Superintendent McLoughlin and Mr. Barrett, both of whom you say are not targeting you. If I can ask you to turn over to the next page please, to page 3636. I think this is Chief superintendent McLoughlin's note. Do you see the middle of the page, the fourth bullet point, he will say that you said to him on that occasion that you had no issue with Mark Curran, it was the chief's office. Do you remember saying that to him that day?
A. I don't recall saying that. But I've already said previously there, I mean the issue was with -- I had an issue with the chief's office and I said, look, there's the chief and there is this sergeant here and that was
the purpose to investigate. I previously said, I had no evidence against the sergeant there but I had evidence against the chief. It was for Assistant Commissioner Finn to investigate in relation to that part of it.
462 Q. Sorry, this is several weeks after the meeting we talked about before the break, isn't it?
A. This here? This meeting?

463
Q. It could have been?
A. okay.

464 Q. It was, wasn't it? It was on the 15th December, we agree on that?
A. Right.

465 Q. So, two weeks after you set in motion the bullying and harassment complaint against chief superintendent
Curran, you're telling two people, Mr. Barrett and Chief Superintendent McLough7in, that you had no issue with Mark Curran. And at the same time you have set in train a bullying and harassment complaint which is going to take years to complete against him?
A. Yeah, I have named him in my statement, so there was an issue.

466 Q. How is it possible for you to say with a straight face that you had no issue with Mark Curran when you spoke to Chief Superintendent McLoughlin and Mr. Barrett?
A. I cannot explain this. This is -

467 Q. Do you understand?
A. - Chief Superintendent McLoughlin 's note and I --

468 Q. Do you understand, Garda Keogh?
A. I understand.

469 Q. It can't be both. Chief Superintendent Curran can't be the accused and at the same time the person against whom you have an issue; isn't that correct?
A. I understand exactly where you're coming from. But also, I made the statement in, is it in March, where I had named Chief Superintendent Curran in the statement, which predates both the Mick Finn meeting and this meeting.
Just to be clear, so the Chairman understands your position, it's your evidence that it's all right to make an allegation of bullying and harassment against a superior officer and in the same breath to say you have no issue?
A. No, you see, it's not as fair -- I've already explained that there was somebody in the chief's office that seemed to be involved in certainly targeting me, is what I believed and I had evidence there, documents from Mark Curran and the chief, and that was as far as I could go.
471 Q. Garda Keogh, is this a bit like Chief Superintendent wheatley, it's just a question of throwing in Mark Curran as well?
A. No.

472 Q. You had no evidence against him, but you were throwing him into the mix?
A. I had nothing against her but I had evidence.

473 Q. Again, I have suggest to you, this is a further indication of an extraordinary approach to making
complaints made by you?
A. I made a statement in March, it was all dealt with, a sworn statement.

474 Q. Again, I have suggest to you, Garda Keogh, the unfairness here is making allegations against superior officers or any colleagues when you don't have the evidence, and that's what's been occurring here?
A. I dispute that, I had the evidence. Judge, I made a sworn statement and these are notes that are being referred to. At the end of the day, I think my argument would be that my sworn statement should be -is more legally binding than unsigned notes.
Q. So is it the case then that you think that your discussions with Assistant Commissioner Finn were not legally binding on you or him, is that what you are saying?
A. No, the sworn statement $I$ had given is legally binding. The notes that he has, there's stuff in those notes, as I said just a moment ago, that are not in there. Not everything is accurate in those notes, to do with corporate complaints and all the rest. So, I can't say those notes are fully accurate.

476 Q. You see, Garda Keogh, I have to suggest to you that in substance they are and I have to put it to you that what you are done here is grossly irresponsible, which is to make an allegation against chief Superintendent Curran and in your own words you have nothing against him?
A. Judge, if the notes which are previously referred to in
relation to Assistant Commissioner Finn is as they were, when he went looking for a second meeting, we asked that the second meeting be recorded, because there was obviously issues with what was being said at that meeting and twists and whatever.

477 Q. CHA RMAN How do you mean issues?
A. Well, in general, with this corporate -- is it a corporate complaint? who are you making complaints about? And all this. We asked for the second meeting to be recorded.
Q. CHA RMAN Yes, I understand.
A. They reneged on the second meeting. Some of the stuff of in -- there's stuff in those notes that I just can't --
Q. CHAN RMAN You think they're wrong?
A. Well, Judge, there's certainly the thing about corporate complaint jumps out at me because he asked me a number of times about that and that doesn't appear to be in those notes. Just at a glance now, just glancing at it.

480 Q. CHA RMAN It strikes me, Garda Keogh, your solicitor was present at this meeting?
A. Yes.

481 Q. CHA RMAN He must have made notes. He must have a record of the meeting.
A. I don't know, Judge.

482 Q. CHAN RMAN We11, I mean, why else was he there?
A. I know he wrote the letter looking for a further meeting to be recorded, to be audio recorded.

483 Q
Q. CHA RMAN Do you know what I mean? I mean, here we have a meeting between you, assistant commissioner, other people taking notes and your solicitor?
A. There was Chief Superintendent Myers and there was an Inspector Kennedy.
484 Q. CHA RMAN She was taking notes?
A. She took the notes, yes, Judge.
Q. CHA RMAN So there was going to be a note of this meeting?
A. Yes.

486 Q. CHA RMAN That was a fact?
A. Yes. One note. But I don't think it was even read out or anything.
487 Q. CHA RMAN No, I appreciate about that, you didn't have an opportunity to reflect on it, comment on it and consider it. But there was somebody else there on your behalf?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN okay.
MR. KELLY: Chairman, I think you might find it a
little help to look at volume 36.
CHA RMAN In relation to this point?
MR. KELLY: Yes.
CHAN RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. KELLY: 10307.
CHA RMAN Say again, Mr. Kelly.
MR. KELLY: 36, page 10307.
CHA RMAN 10307, thank you very much. Thank you very much. Yes. Can you scroll that down? Thanks, Peter.

Oh, I remember this one. Yes. Fragmentation. Yes. which particular part of this, Mr. Kelly, do you think is relevant to the question of --
MR. KELLY: Forgive me one moment.
CHA RMAN That's all right. Mr. Cullen's note of the meeting --

MR. MRPHY: I have no objection if Mr. Kelly wishes to --

CHAN RMAN Absolutely.
MR. KELLY: Judge, my understanding is that my
solicitor did take some notes of it, he doesn't have the entire file with him, but this letter arose or was done virtually very soon after the meeting, setting out the concerns that we had about it.
CHA RMAN Yes. Could you refer me to the particular part that you think is relevant? I mean, look, you can see my situation.
MR. KELLY: Yes, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Garda Keogh says, and I understand he says, look, I am not sure this is an accurate record of the
meeting. That I understand. He mentions particularly corporate and the references to corporate, the issue of corporate responsibility. That, I understand and how it would come into a bullying and harassment question. Obviously we await information on that. But in relation to this, I am just wondering, and I know Mr. Cullen wrote a lengthy letter, not the simplest 1etter, it has to be said, but a lengthy letter, complaining about the methodology, as I understand it,
of Assistant Commissioner Finn. Mr. Kelly, may I take it like this: Look, I asked the question, you say and Mr. Cullen says, look, this has relevance or materiality to this question, I will take that into account. I will put that there. Obviously this matter 15:25 can be expanded upon as you see fit and in relation to any other evidence. Is that a satisfactory way of leaving that?
MR. KELLY: It is, yes.
CHA RMAN Okay, thanks very much.
MR. MRPHY: Garda Keogh, if we can then move forward to --

CHAN RMAN Do you understand, Mr. Murphy?
MR MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN I am saying, okay, that's a letter that has relevance to this question. It's not immediate, there isn't a line in it that says, by the way, I don't like the way you're writing down the note, but there is a thrust in the letter that is complaining about the methodology.
MR. MRPHY: Yes. It is the one which features the procrustean bed.
CHA RMAN Is this procrustean, it was procedural fragmentation, which sounds a bit procrustean to me when we get to it.
MR. MRPHY: Conceptual fragmentation as wel1.
CHA RMAN Thank you. So we know the letter you are referring to.
MR. MRPHY: If I can move forward, Chairman, in ease
of reference.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
Q.

MR. MRPH: I wonder if you could be shown please Volume 25, at page 7469, where we were just before the break.

CHAN RMAN Yes. The summary conclusions.
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
490 Q. Just before we go to the main part of the report, just to pick up on a point you mentioned a moment ago, can I ask you to go to page 7506 please? Do you have that, Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.

491 Q. Do you see, please, the heading at the bottom of the page "corporate bullying"?
A. Yes.

492 Q. This is one of the chapters in the report. You will see that Assistant Commissioner Finn said that the allegations made by you and quotes you as saying:
"It became evident that seni or management would use any excuse to hypercriticise me, they were trying to activel y demean me, damage, harass, demean me and treat re Iike a Di ckensi an school boy."

So there is a reference to, as it were, the structure picked up from your complaint. Can I suggest to you that is probably what was being referred to in the course of your meeting?
A. No, no, no. I recall him, he asked me on a number occasions at the actual meeting about, is this a corporate complaint or is it some other -- I can't remember -- I remember the word corporate.
493 Q. Very good. Insofar as he did, he seems to have taken it into consideration at the end. Can I just say to you, if you look over at page 7507 , and this is common throughout the report:
"On examination of the compl ai nts and issues rai sed by Garda Keogh in a statement of compl ai nt, l found no evi dence to support the allegation that any bullying and/ or harassment has occurred agai nst Garda Keogh. "
A. That was his findings. No evidence.

494 Q. Again just to shorten matters, throughout the whole report, that was the approach he adopted. He analysed the evidence, he expressed a view, he indicated why he expressed that view and you disagreed with his view?
A. There's a lot evidence.

495 Q. Insofar as your criticisms of him are concerned, he will say that he carried out investigation in accordance with the Terms of Reference and carefully considered all the available evidence, he came to his conclusion which he believes was reasonable. But let's 15:28 not just stop there for a moment. Could I ask you to turn to page 7446 in the same volume, please. This is Mr. Cullen's letter written on your behalf on 19th March 2019. So a couple of points here. First of a11,

I think you will agree that this is the letter written on your instructions to complain about the Finn report. Did you ever see this letter?
A. I would have, I am sure $I$ have seen it.

496 Q. I am sure you would have then looked at all the criticisms to make sure that they were accurate before you instructed your solicitor to write them. Have you seen this document before or can you remember, Garda Keogh?
A. I can't recall actually. There's a lot of pages in it. Keogh, because this is your informal complaint against Assistant Commissioner Finn, isn't it?
A. It would be, yes, for the appeal.

498 Q. Is there any doubt about that?
A. No, no, it's for the appeal.

499 Q. So, can I ask you just to look at page 7447? I think your first complaint was that Assistant Commissioner Finn's investigation was a desultory investigation, paragraph one:
"... a desultory investi gation whi ch has now resulted in this intellectually outré whitewash."

First of al1, can I suggest to you that those aren't your words?
A. Correct, yes.

500 Q. Again, you appreciate that I have to put this to you, that Assistant Commissioner Finn will say his
investigation wasn't desultory and wasn't in any way a whitewash, that he went about his job as thoroughly as he possibly could in all the circumstances?
A. I don't agree with that.

501 Q. In the second paragraph, do you see there is reference there is to:
"Superintendent Pat Murray has been pronoted in the interim while this complaint was either lost or in transit and is now lost in the Iabyrinthine di gressions 15:30 and mists of this report."

Did you see some connection between the promotion of Superintendent Murray and this report?
A. And this report? This here report?

502 Q. Well, what has Superintendent Murray's promotion to do with this report or this complaint?
A. No, I had made a complaint to Assistant Commissioner Finn.
Q. Yes.
A. Superintendent Murray was one of the three persons I complained about and then he got promoted.

504 Q. So, did you make it in relation to bullying and harassment in the hope that this might stop Superintendent Murray from --
A. No, no, because I had reported back in 2016 to Chief Superintendent McLoughlin, issues in relation to Superintendent Murray.

505
Q. You were also making complaints to a lot of other
people in 2016 hadn't you, to Deputy Finn, Deputy wallace, Deputy Flanagan?
A. No, not Deputy Flanagan, he was gone.

506 Q. I see. We will be dealing with that in the next issue. But you're well experienced in making complaints at this stage. You make the point about Superintendent Murray, he has been promoted. And again, you go on to say in the third paragraph:
"This was an irrational report, an opaque report, wanting in neutrality. Di sgui sed as the el ephant in the roominadequacy in the (still unconcl uded) i nvesti gation into police drug pedalling in Athlone. "

It goes on to say:
"It's full of logical fallacies, pl atitudi nous, evasi ve and partial."

And anecdotal evidence. Again I have to suggest to you, all of these comments are very high criticisms, but in fact Assistant Commissioner Finn's report is structured, factual and based on the evidence.
A. I dispute that. The other aspect of this is, Judge, Assistant Commissioner Finn is the person investigating my bullying and harassment complaint and Superintendent Murray is one of the three persons I complain about. Assistant Commissioner Finn, ironically, is the person that then signs off the clearance form to the Policing

Authority for the promotion, to say that there is no allegation or anything against Superintendent Murray. Judge, he's the person who is investigating the same.
507 Q. Did you ever object to him investigating the case throughout the course of 2017?
A. Assistant Commissioner Finn?

508 Q. Yes.
A. I don't think so.

509 Q. No, you didn't. So the position is that you were aware that Superintendent Murray was promoted, weren't you?
A. Yeah.

510 Q. Yes. That's public1y available information?
A. Sorry?

511 Q. That's publicly available information?
A. Yes.

512 Q. You were aware of that?
A. Yes.

513 Q. This investigation I think took nearly 12 months?
A. Yeah.

514 Q. So at the end of this, with no objection being taken by you, I suggest that what is contained in this letter is just a lot of repetitive attacks which have one thing in common, which is you're just not happy with the outcome. Because he disagreed with you, you're attacking his report?
A. I disagree with the whole --

515 Q. Yeah.
A. There was a load of evidence in those appendices, whereby for every one of them to not stand is just...

516
Q attack on Assistant Commissioner Finn's report is completely unbalanced and unfounded. For example, if you look at page 7455 , it says, in the third line:
"The camera-like focus of the di scourse again caprici ousl y switches fondly to what was described earlier as Garda Keogh's vul nerabilities. The camera now pans dotingly on the favoured focus of what's now descri bed as a long standing and establ ished clinical condi tion. "

Is it not the case that Assistant Commissioner Finn was aware of the fact that you had an established medical condition and a problem with alcohol?
A. Yes.

517 Q. Yes.
A. But as $I$ have said, $I$ mean $I$ was drinking a lot.

518 Q. Yes.
A. Because I was under so much stress. And I did turn to drink, $I$ said it at the very start, $I$ used drink as a crutch and that...

519 Q. You see, the drinking a lot, Garda Keogh, has a lot to do with this case, I have to suggest to you, because it's clear if one looks at the factual background, each 15:35 of these complaints seems to suggest that Assistant Commissioner Finn didn't look at the facts and I have to put it to you that he did look at the facts?
A. No, I can't agree with you on that.

520 Q. You will see that you take on each of the headings by way of chapter numbers 1 through 17. Again, what I have to suggest to you is that there is no substance to this objection at all, it's just based on the fact that you disagree with the result?
A. Well, the whole -- I mean as I said, I just gave the example earlier on in relation to the one particular thing, the Liam McHugh matter, where no further evidence seems to come to light, but yet, as a result of this investigation, there seems to be -- it seems to sway in an angle very much against me in the absence of any new evidence. This whole -- the whole investigation, where -- and any of the evidence I supplied, where there was good documentary evidence, just seemed to have been either downplayed or ignored.
521 Q. Garda Keogh, I have to suggest to you that's incorrect. Would you agree with me that you seem by this stage, in 2017 and '18, to have adopted the view that if somebody disagreed with you, that they were somehow targeting you?
A. That's -- I mean, there's plenty of people disagree with me and --

522 Q. Can I put it this way: Did you believe as confidential recipient number 1 , that you had a right or an entitlement to have your complaints upheld as being correct?
A. We're dealing with something in 2017. We established, was it last week, that I only found out that I was CR 1 in 2018, and at that I wasn't even sure, I was
surmising I was CR 1 because somebody else was CR 2. So that question doesn't even come into play on this. I think by this stage you considered that you were a very important person, you were the first
whistleblower, on your own account, you had been interviewed by assistant commissioners of An Garda Síochána, you had been visited by TDs, you've made complaints but TD throughout the whole of 2016. I have to suggest to you that at this stage it could appear to a reasonable observer that you were taking the view that anyone who disagreed with you was failing to uphold your rights?
A. No, that's not true. Judge, even the first question where you referred -- and you mentioned it last week, about CR 1 and was I important and all the rest. AS I stated, it wasn't unti1 2018 that I actually found out anything about CR 1. I didn't know -- I don't think I even knew what it meant at the time but it obviously means confidential reporter 1.
524 Q. You see, I have to suggest to you, and again it's a matter for the Chairman, if one looks at the tone of the complaints that have been made on your behalf, that these are all framed on the same basis. Just to give you one example, to perhaps help you with the question, could I ask you, please, to be shown Volume 20, page 5969.

CHA RMAN Sorry, have you finished with this document, Mr. Murphy?
MR. MRPHY: I wil1 be coming back to this document.

CHA RMAN That's all right.
MR. MRPHY: Just as the witness was raising issues. CHA RMAN No, no, that's okay, I just wanted to be clear. You're referring now to?
MR. MRPHY: I'm referring to Volume 20, page 5969, please, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Thank you. okay.
525 Q. MR. MRPHY: This is a statement of yours dated 23rd Apri1 2019, do you remember writing this statement? Does it look familiar?
A. Just one moment, 5969?

526 Q. Please. It should be the first tab of the volume please.
A. 5969. Okay.

527 Q. Do you have it? Is this statement one with which you 15:39 are familiar?
A. Can I just read it?

528 Q. Sure. You did sign it.
A. okay.

529 Q. So, I think you do remember writing this statement on 23rd Apri1 2019?
A. I don't remember writing, but I'm not disputing its...

530 Q. Are you sure you don't remember it?
A. We11, I don't remember actually writing the statement, but I'm not --

531 Q. Do you remember signing it?
A. I'm sorry?

532 Q. Do you remember signing it?
A. What $I$ have here is not signed. I'm not disputing that

I made the statement, I just -- I mean, I have made a lot of statements.

533 Q. Sure. Do you see where it says:
"I hereby decl are the statement is true to the best of my know edge and bel ief. With reference to item number 18 on the list of items for consi deration by the Tribunal entitled compl ai nts by Garda Ni chol as Keogh in rel ation to the bullying and harassment investigation carried out by Assi stant Commissi oner Mchael Finn, I bel $i$ eve the out come of this investigation as comprised by Assistant Commíssioner Finbar O Brien constitutes a failure to uphold my rights and entitlements as a Garda officer in that there is no acknow edgment what soever of the correct ness of my compl ai nts."

Do you see that?
A. I see it.

534 Q. Can you see that to an objective observer, and not through the concept of objectivity, but to an objective observer looking at this, what you are saying there is that the Assistant Commissioner Finn investigation and Assistant Commissioner O'Brien's investigation are a failure, are invalid, because they did not uphold the correctness of your complaint?
A. Judge, I never met Commissioner O'Brien. The only -the only -- like the only basis he would have for his investigation would be based on the Assistant Commissioner Finn investigation, which I've always said
from day one was -- I can't remember what way I worded it had before but it wasn't great.
Garda Keogh, can you see what you are saying to the world in this statement, your statement, you are saying to the world and to this Tribunal and to me and to everybody else who has come to this controversy late in the day, that you, Garda Nicholas Keogh, have a right and entitlement as a Garda officer to have your complaints upheld as correct. I have to suggest to you that is bizarre. Can you see now how outside persons looking at this would appreciate that you got into a stage, for whatever reason, that you believed that anyone who disagreed with you was trampling on your right to be upheld as correct?
A. No, I accept, Judge, it could have been worded a little 15:42 bit differently al1 right in that part.

536 Q. But it wasn't, Garda Keogh, was it, because in truth this is the central problem that confronts your approach towards these issues, which is that if somebody disagrees with you, you immediately consider that they have trampled on your right to be upheld, to be vindicated?
A. No.

537 Q. That you must be believed?
A. No. That's not -- I mean, there was a load of evidence 15:43 with the Finn investigation. There was a lot of problems with that. I've only outlined the one jump out problem that really annoys me to do with that Liam McHugh thing. But...
Q. Can we continue, Garda Keogh, for a moment. I just want again to ask you to help the Chairman to understand perspective and reality. Okay? The reality is you don't have a right in law to be upheld every time you make a complaint?
A. I accept that. obviously I accept that part.
A. Yes.

541 Q. And if the person who hears the appeal decides against you, that's the end of the process, isn't that right?
A. I understand that, yes.
Q. If that person decides against you, then sometimes you might have an appeal, isn't that right?

That is generally the end, yes.
542 Q. Well, I have to suggest to you, it's always the end of the process, Garda Keogh, because --
CHA RMAN Well you can always get leave to go to the Supreme Court.
MR. MRPHY: Yes. But even if the Supreme Court are willing to hear the case --
CHA RMAN You say sooner or later you come to the end and that's the end. As the Supreme Court said, they're not final because they're infallible, they're come to the end. That's Mr. Murphy's point.
A. I was going to say, Judge, the Tribuna1. But just to go back a bit, where $I$ had consulted with GSOC in
relation to this and they said I had to go through the Garda policy. So it actually wouldn't have been the end in the normal circumstances. I would have -- if this Tribunal was not --
543 Q. CHA RMAN Well, sorry, let me ask you, I wanted to ask 15:44 you about that?
A. Yes, Judge.

544 Q. CHA RMAN I understand your point in relation to the Ó Cualáin investigation?
A. Yeah.

545 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. I can see that you could go to GSOC about that. But you had in mind that you could also go to GSOC under a bullying and harassment?
A. Yes.

546 Q. CHA RMAN Okay, I see what you mean, if that didn't 15:45 succeed?
A. But, Judge, they --

547 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes, they said you have to exhaust domestic remedies first.
A. Yes.

548 Q. CHA RMAN You have to do the internal stuff and come to an end. okay, I have that.
A. Yes.

549 Q. MR. MRPHY: So I have to suggest to you, Garda Keogh, that what's happening here is, going through all the processes, Assistant Commissioner Finn, the review, the final decision, that's the system that you have engaged with?
A. Yes.

550 Q. It's held against you. And I have to suggest there is nothing wrong about that, there is nothing targeting about that, there's nothing bullying about that, there's nothing designed to hurt you about that. That is the fair outcome of the process, I have to suggest.
A. Look, the findings that Assistant Commissioner Finn has, Judge, I did appeal them and I would have appealed them to GSOC or followed through with GSOC, this Tribunal obviously has occurred and I have made an issue of it here to the Tribunal.
551 Q. Garda Keogh, it gets a bit more complicated again. If we just go to the end of the statement for a moment, because there's one further feature I would like to draw your attention to. Do you see at the end you say:
"I have been confirmed in my opi ni on that the O Brien report and the investigation conducted by Assi stant Commissioner Finn amounted to a conscious and del i berate failure to protect me fromharassment and bullying within the force by reason of the concl usi ons reached by Assi stant Commi ssi oner Finn."

Just pause for a moment. You're saying not only do you have a right to have your complaints upheld, and I think you acknowledged that was a bridge too far, you're saying that that not having taken place, in your opinion both Mr. O'Brien and Assistant Commissioner Finn were guilty of a deliberate failure to protect you from harassment. Can you see how bizarre that
statement is now with the benefit of hindsight?
A. Judge, the only issue there $I$ would have is that Mr. O'brien -- look, he just based his findings on Finn investigation. So, I mean -- so I don't, I shouldn't --

552 Q. Garda Keogh, this is April 2019, this Tribunal is gearing up, getting ready to take part in its processes, but you're solemnly saying in a statement of this kind that my client, Assistant Commissioner Finn, is guilty of a conscious and deliberate failure to protect you because he disagrees with your complaint. I have to suggest to you that's completely irrational on your part?
MR. KELLY: Judge, I hesitate to interrupt.
CHA RMAN yes.
MR. KELLY: That particular question is just simply construed as no more than an argument. The courts are well accustomed to situations where parties believe irrationally in a particular decision that has been made, sometimes years, sometimes generations later, courts come back and make a different point. I really am at a loss to understand where this line of hammering away, you're irrational because you think you were right, no I'm not, is actually taken up. It seems to me as no more as having a go and it's a deeply unattractive.

MR. MRPHY: My Friend's objection, I think it's more in the nature of a submission, which, in our respectful submission could be dealt with at a later stage. what

I am seeking to do with this witness is put to him that the accusations he has made against my client are rational, that the accusations made against my client Assistant Commissioner Finn have no basis.

CHA RMAN I understand.
MR. MRPHY: And that the accusation made is based on a particular premise, which I say is ludicrous and unsustainable.

CHA RMAN Mr. Murphy, isn't it clear that Garda Keogh is dismissing the Finn investigation as being wholly unsatisfactory?

MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN Not only that, but manifestly incompetent, so to speak, or inept. why is that? He says, well, I reject each and everything, everything in the conclusions. He says, it says there was no evidence. He says, yes, I provided evidence. The implication being that the Finn tribunal irrationally dismissed or trivialised or overlooked the materials in his appendices. That's what he said, that's his evidence. When you were going through the Notice of Appeal against the findings, $I$ think any of us would recognise that the language was not the language of a client, let me put it that way, although it's expressed on his behalf. And it is in the nature of general objections. 15:50 Of course, when we see conscious and deliberate, immediately we appreciate the origins of that phrase and I suppose it occurs to people the extravagance of language is not always to be -- and I think here's
where I agree with Mr. Kelly's observation, that one can really get into an argument by demanding that the client acknowledge -- I mean, he's in a difficulty because -- here's what is being said on his behalf. Essentially what he is saying is, the whole thing is rubbish. But he also said, first of all, I provided some evidence, I provided evidence in the appendices and another thing, the Liam McHugh episode as dealt with by -- which I was waiting for some specific -where is the specific challenge, he says, the facts in the appendices no doubt to be explored, or not as you judge, but he says Liam McHugh. So that's a specific thing he says is wrong.

Now, I am listening to complaints in general terms and this is a complaint in general terms. I note and did note previously the language as used and I noticed and I did think, for what it's worth, Mr. Murphy, at this point it appears to me that your interpretation is a correct one, that the statement in the letter says, I reject it because it doesn't agree with me.

MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAK That's what I think that letter says. But he actually says he has more specific things.
MR. MRPHY: Yes. In relation to that distinction, I am very grateful for that direction.
CHAI RMAN Yes.
MR. MRPHY: Insofar as the letter by way of appeal is concerned, I fully accept, Chairman, that that's within
the language of -- but I do urge the Tribunal to consider that this statement is not a submission, it's a statement.
CHA RMAN Absolute7y.

MR. MRPH: Therefore, it's status is different, it
15:52 reflects the thinking of the person who made it. CHA RMAN Sorry, it's also fair, I think Mr. Kelly is also -- let's face it, from our own experience, the fact that somebody continues to believe he is right would scarcely make him a unique client.
MR MRPHY: No.
CHA RNAN Not withstanding the judgment of the court of Appeal even.
MR. MRPHY: My question, Judge, is directed towards
the witness to help him to acknowledge that the problem ${ }_{\text {15:53 }}$ is not that he has that view, it's how he characterises those who disagree with him.
CHA RMAN That's right. You say that whenever somebody disagrees, he rejected it as being --
MR MRPHY: Deliberate.
CHA RMAN An example --
MR MRPH: A deliberate or negligent failure to
effectively protect his rights, as opposed to a legitimate third party issue.
CHA RMAN You say that goes further than simply a

MR. MRPHY: yes.
CHA RMAN It is an accusation and you say an unwarranted or unfounded, evidentially unfounded
serious allegation against a police officer.
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MRPH: Chairman, I make the case that ultimately
this is something which flows through this witness's view of all the areas.
CHA RMAN I understand that.
553 Q. MR. MRPFY: I will perhaps return to that in submissions itself. So, insofar as this is concerned, we know that this appeal document was filed, but you know that this issue was also reviewed by Mr. de Bruir, Mr. McGuinness has asked you about that?
A. Yes.

554 Q. Again, I think you will accept Mr. de Bruir is not a member of An Garda Síochána?
A. Correct, yeah.
Q. He is an independent expert outsider?
A. Yes.
Q. Qualified in law. You have seen, and again I don't propose to take you through it in detail, you will have 15:54 seen what he has said and that he has taken a view that the investigation of Assistant Commissioner Finn was not flawed in the way in which you have suggested?
A. You see, unfortunately again, the de Bruir investigation is based on Assistant Commissioner Finn's 15:54 investigation. I never got to meet Mr. de Bruir, Judge, and the part of the Liam McHugh thing there, where --
557 Q. CHAL RMAN No, just on the de Bruir thing, I know you
are pointing -- that was a paper review.
A. Yes.

558 Q. CHA RMAN on the documents?
A. Yes.

559 Q. CHA RMAN Isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

560 Q. CHAN RMAN okay.
A. But, Judge, even in the de Bruir report it has -- it appears that it was me that was involved in theft of money from Liam McHugh. If you were to go back to the original whole thing with the Liam McHugh scenario, that it was me that allegedly -- it's alleged there was a theft but it was alleged then, what was investigated by the Guards was that I asked Mr. McHugh to report it and I'11 back you up. But it's gone from -- as I said, 15:55 in Garda Lyons' statement, he's not -- nobody goes to him or he doesn't know what happened with it afterwards, but it seems to go then, it seems to actually grow arms and legs from the Finn investigation that to actually put my hand almost in McHugh's pocket. 15:55
561 Q. MR. MRPHY: So you disagree with Assistant Commissioner Finn's findings on the McHugh element of the complaint?
A. Oh, that was just the one -- that was the one that obviously really got to me.
562 Q. At this stage, Garda Keogh, as we sit here today, we know the position is that Assistant Commissioner Finn made his decision, Mr. de Bruir made his decision, that decision is then reviewed at a later stage and case has
come to an end?
A. Yeah, but the problem --

563 Q. What is really happening here, Garda Keogh, I suggest to you, is you are trying to reopen matters that have been fully ventilated before Assistant Commissioner Finn?
A. No, you see the problem, Judge, is, like on the face of it, if one looks at the -- I never got to talk to -Mr. de Bruir never -- I never got to talk to him, so he never got my side of the story. But leaving that aside, the --

564 Q. CHA RMAN I don't want to make too much of it, but I thought that your side or your solicitor made submissions to de Bruir?
A. Yes.

565 Q. CHA RMAN He put a thing in writing?
A. Yes.

566 Q. CHA RMAN I understand your point that it's not as good as if you had met him or if he had said, we11, look here, let me look into this. I understand your point about that. But at least you had some opportunity of making a case to him?
A. Yes.

567 Q. CHA RMAN Isn't that right?
A. Sent in the original complaint, bullying and harassment, with all the appendices, because they seem --

568 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. I don't know what fiddling went on with them, but
there's issues over the appendices that I originally submitted at the very start making my bullying and harassment complaint. I don't know what exactly was in there. But we sent Mr. de Bruir the whole lot then.

## 569 Q. CHAN RMN Okay.

A. In the end. But de Bruir investigation, of course, was like a house, it could be fine, look fine, everything could have been perfect, but it was built on the Mick Finn investigation, which I would say is like quicksand. So no matter how well the de Bruir thing would appear to be, it was based on the Mick Finn investigation.
570 Q. MR. MRPH: But you see, Garda Keogh, I have to suggest to you that this is a counsel of despair on your part because you did make appeal and you did make submissions. I wonder if you could be shown, please, volume 47, page 13162. This is part of the de Bruir audit report, Chairman, which refers to the McHugh complaints. So, do you have that there, please?
A. 13162?

571 Q. At page 13162, please.
A. Yes.

572 Q. You will see at paragraph 8.11 he refers to the investigation that took place at local level. The first point is that, you see at paragraph 8.11:

[^5]> We know that's correct?
A. Yeah.

573 Q. Then he says, 8.12:
"There was no submi ssi on in the appeal that Garda Lyons was incorrect or inaccurate in his recording of what was said to himby Li am MkHugh and Oivia O Neill on 31st May 2014."

Just pausing there for a moment, this is Mr. de Bruir saying, well, there isn't any submission that Lyons' was incorrect. At 8.13:
"There is no compl ai nt agai nst Garda Lyons, there is no suggestion he is instructed by any superior officer to fabricate the account he reported of the conversation with Li am MkHugh. Garda Lyons' integrity or the accuracy of his report has not been challenged. "

Then, if we move down to paragraph 8.16:
"Observation: The fact that the names of the ot her two guards were not gi ven to Garda Keogh would appear to be because Li am MzHugh di dn't gi ve a name to Garda Lyons and/ or of the di scussi on bet ween Garda Keogh, if the di scussi on bet ween Garda Keogh and Li am MtHugh di d take pl ace, whi ch deni ed. In the appeal submissi on it appears that the names of the two gardaí were not gi ven
to Li am McHugh. Li am McHugh in response to Garda Lyons questi on if the inci dent had actually happened, he sai d, no, not at all, l'm not going to bring trouble on myself."

Turning over to the following page --
A. Judge, sorry, there is one big issue here, and that is: I didn't make a complaint against Garda Lyons. I didn't find out that Garda Lyons was the author of the report I think until, was it last year, at some stage. Like, so I couldn't have made a complaint against Garda Lyons when I didn't know he was the person who was the author of the report.
574 Q. But, you see, what happens here, I am going to suggest to you, without going through every single line of this, some of which has been dealt with by Mr. McGuinness, if you just go forward to 8.21. This is Mr. de Bruir, who has no axe to grind, he's an independent person and he says this:
"A comprehensi ve i nvesti gation was carried out in rel ation to this matter and that the findings of $A C$ Finn leading to the decision of $A C O^{\prime} B r i e n ~ a r o s e ~ f r o m a$ fair and impartial investigation."

That is the view that was adopted by -- I appreciate you disagree with it but $I$ have to suggest to you that there is nothing to demonstrate this was, in the words from your previous statement, a deliberate or negligent
effort to damage your rights?
A. Judge, even on this, this part here, I mean Mr. de Bruir is obviously under the impression that I know that it's Garda Lyons involved in that. Like, I didn't know Garda Lyons was involved in that. But Mr. de Bruir is under -- seems to be under the impression that I knew that and I didn't make a complaint about it. I always from day one, Judge, said that I didn't have -not alone did I have anything to do with it, that I knew nothing about it, but $I$ went as far as to say the whole thing was false. That was right back in May 2014, when it first started to pop its head up.
Q. Garda Keogh, again $I$ have to suggest to you that it's a further example of you attempting to re-running investigations which have already completed. Would you 16:01 into the agree with me that Mr. de Bruir, looking at the methodology used by Assistant Commissioner Finn, said that it was fair?
A. That assistant commissioner --

576 Q. Does he identify any flaw in the procedures adopted by Assistant Commissioner Finn?
A. We're just after identifying a massive one here just a moment ago.
577 Q. Sorry, Mr. de Bruir. I am asking about Mr. de Bruir's report?
A. No, no, Mr. de Bruir's report, Judge --

578 Q. Would you agree with me, just for a moment just listen?
A. Yes.

579 Q. Would you agree with me that Mr. de Bruir upheld the
findings of Assistant Commissioner Finn and he concluded that this was in his view fair and impartial as an investigation?
A. That's -- I mean that's -- he just -- I mean --

580 Q. CHAI RMAN You think he rubber stamps Assistant Commissioner Finn's report. That's your point?
A. Essentially. But equally, Judge, on the face of it, if you didn't know anything about what went on, Assistant Commissioner Finn's report might look fine, you know, and that. But the likes of this stuff here, the Garda Lyons things and I didn't make a complaint against him and all that, like Mr. de Bruir, of course, is not to know, because in all the reports, in the Finn investigation on this part, they have Garda Lyons received this information in good faith, in virtually every one of them, and there's not one mention in any of the reports anywhere that Garda Lyons was Garda A's partner or that from day one I always disputed that whole allegation. It's just not there. That's not Mr. de Bruir's fault, like he's only basing his -making his findings on the Finn investigation. 581 Q. You see, I have to suggest to you that the Finn investigation, as this appeal reveals, was fair and thorough and did take into account all relevant situations and was rational as well?
A. No, I don't agree with that.

CHA RMAN okay. I am proposing to break there, Mr. Murphy, unless there's a question or two that you are dying to ask and that won't wait until tomorrow.

If there are we will do that but otherwise we will wait until tomorrow.

MR. MRPHY: Chairman, I think this would be an
appropriate moment to break.
CHAL RMAN Thank you very much. Okay. We will break 16:04 until tomorrow. Thank you very much.
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| $35: 25,36: 25,40: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 175:12 } \\ & \text { updated [2] - 39:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $73: 8,76: 14,85: 16$ 86:14, 91:10, 98:15, | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 26,47: 11,48: 14 \\ & 49: 15,50: 24,51: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 20,83: 22,83: 25, \\ & 84: 1,84: 7,84: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 45: 6,45: 20,46: 8 \\ & 49: 20,50: 27,53: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 39:12 } \\ & \text { upheld }[7]-157: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $99: 12,100: 20,102: 2$ | $52: 6,53: 2,53: 4$ | 85:8, 136:27, 137:19, |
|  |  | 107:14, 135:26, | $54: 13,55: 5,58: 9$ | 140:15 |
| $53: 25,59: 12,62: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { upheld [7]-157:25, } \\ & \text { 161:9, 161:14, } \end{aligned}$ | 135:27, 135:28 | 62:5, 66:2, 66:19, | witness [23]-54:4, |
| 97:22, 101:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:24, 175:29 } \\ & \text { uphold }[3]-158: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 136:1, 140:28, | 110:25, 112:9, | 58:21, 61:15, 61:18, |
| 115:15, 119:18,126:5, 132:16, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 147: 21,150: 4 \\ & 158: 25,159: 5,172: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:13, 112:16, } \\ & \text { 116:11, 118:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 61:26, 61:29, 62:13, 71:1, 73:25, 75:23, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { uphold [3] - 158:12, } \\ & \text { 160:13, 160:24 } \end{aligned}$ | volumes [1] - 106:28 | 118:13, 123:11, | 82:24, 82:27, 85:29, |
| 156:20, 163:13,175:3, 175:6 | urged [1] - 60:6 | vulnerabilities [1] $156 \cdot 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:14, 129:29, } \\ & \text { 130:7. 130:10 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 86: 1,86: 27,135: 1, \\ & 135: 18,135: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 156.8 | 130.7, 130:10, 130:16, 131:3, | $135: 28,137: 3,159: 2$ |
| underneath [2] - | V | W | 131:12, 132:6, 133:4, | $166: 1,168: 15$ |
| $48: 24,72: 26,100: 23$ undertaking [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { valid }[2]-127: 23, \\ & 128: 19 \end{aligned}$ | waddling [1] - 116:3 <br> wagon [1] - 118:23 | 144:22 <br> WHEATLEY ${ }_{[1]}-3: 4$ Wheatley's [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { witnesses [2] - } \\ & \text { 86:12, 88:19 } \\ & \text { wonder [5] - 6:11, } \end{aligned}$ |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 7:9, 98:15, 150:3, } \\ & \text { 172:16 } \\ & \text { wondering [2] - } \\ & 61: 22,148: 26 \\ & \text { word }[14]-12: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 94:16, 95:14, 134:14, 143:20, 165:20 yourself [6] - 28:6, 34:27, 59:14, 99:28, 136:21, 136:25 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 122:28, 123:28, | $€$ |
| 135:2, 151:4 <br> word-for-word [4] - | ¢6,000 [1] - 66:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 122: 28,123: 28, \\ & 127: 10,130: 25 \end{aligned}$ | É |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 161:1, 161:15 } \\ & \text { words [9] - 29:16, } \\ & 29: 17,112: 17, \\ & 115: 22,116: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ÉABHALL }[1]-2: 30 \\ & \text { ÉIREANN }[2]-1: 4 \text {, } \\ & \text { 1:5 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:20, 145:27, } \\ & \text { 152:26, 174:28 } \end{aligned}$ | Ó |
| 50:22 <br> workplace [1] - 56:9 <br> works [1] - 77:14 <br> world [2]-161:4, <br> 161:5 <br> worry [1] - 58:17 <br> worth [4]-63:3, <br> 115:9, 127:18, 167:18 <br> write [4]-53:19, <br> 77:25, 78:1, 152:7 <br> writing [17]-12:12, <br> 31:25, 32:7, 33:20, <br> 73:23, 110:14, <br> 116:14, 120:24, <br> 120:25, 126:11, <br> 141:9, 149:18, 159:9, <br> 159:20, 159:22, <br> 159:24, 171:16 <br> written [9]-105:23, <br> 107:23, 111:20, <br> 118:19, 130:20, <br> 134:15, 135:2, <br> 151:28, 152:1 <br> wrongly [4]-21:27, <br> 61:19, 62:7, 85:7 <br> wrote [8]-13:18, <br> 21:27, 28:12, 29:10, <br> 32:7, 139:10, 146:28, <br> 148:27 | Ó ${ }_{\text {[35] }}-3: 7,55: 19$, 69:24, 72:7, 72:23, 72:29, 73:9, 73:17, 73:26, 74:4, 75:16, 77:10, 78:5, 78:23, 79:16, 83:1, 83:4, 83:17, 84:15, 84:23, 86:17, 86:27, 87:11, 88:2, 88:11, 89:20, 89:25, 90:1, 90:27, 91:13, 92:20, 95:6, 95:8, 95:23, 163:9 |
| X |  |
| Xanax [1] - 34:12 |  |
| Y |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { year }[3]-33: 5,34: 21, \\ & \text { 174:10 } \\ & \text { years }[6]-89: 5, \end{aligned}$ |  |


[^0]:    "Occupational jury/illness arising fromduty category".

[^1]:    "I have no role in recording sick I eave for anybody, i ncl uding Garda Keogh. "

[^2]:    "You shoul d now intervi ew this member in order to establish the source of the menber's stress and if it is suggested as bei ng work rel ated, a full i nvestigation should be carried out."

[^3]:    "I outli ned an approach whi ch i nvol ved Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an and this was approved."

[^4]:    "You are happy with this? Do you want some time out?"

[^5]:    "It is known that no compl ai nt of bullying or harassment was made agai nst Inspector Farrell or Det ective Sergeant Curl ey."

