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1 Q. MR. MRPHY: Good morning, Chairman. Good morning, Garda Keogh. I wonder if the witness could be shown Volume 25, please, at page 7304. Chairman, just to indicate to the Chair and to the witness, what I propose to deal with briefly is just a reference to issues raised by the witness that nothing was taking place in Garda Headquarters at the time involved, to address some of those points, if I might, in sequence.

Garda Keogh, the position is that in October of 2017 there were a number of people working in the Garda force who weren't guards, who were civilians working in senior management, I think you were aware of that, aren't you?
A. Well, I'm not sure exactly what went on.

2 Q. Sure. For example, you're aware from reading the papers and from your knowledge that Mr. Barrett was involved in human resources at that time?
A. Yes.

3 Q. Mr. John Barrett. I think you were also aware that Mr. Joe Nugent was involved as well in administration?
A. Yes, I'm aware of him.

4 Q. In fact, he was the chief administrative officer, the

CAO of An Garda Síochána, and had been appointed to that position in August of 2016 ?
A. Yes.

5 Q. I think this was part of a policy, again of which you're aware, whereby there were attempts to recruit people from civilian life who had expertise in particular areas of administration and bring them into work in the force?
A. Yes.

6 Q. This statement, which is at page 7304, deals with evidence of Joseph Nugent, who is the CAO of An Garda Síochána. Could I just draw your attention to a number of points, again to assist the Tribunal to understand what was taking place in October and November of 2017.
A. Judge, he'd be classed as the number three in An Garda 10:34 Síochána, technically.

7 Q. Thank you.
A. Yeah.

8 Q. Can I draw your attention to the final paragraph. He will say in his evidence that in October 2017, acting
Commissioner Ó Cualáin asked him to oversee matters relating to various complaints made by you and the liaison with the Policing Authority in respect of request for information in respect of their consideration of the promotion of Superintendent Murray 10:35 to the rank of chief superintendent. Were you aware of that at the time; that he had a role in this regard?
A. Oh yes.

9 Q. You were?
A. Yes.

10 Q. So that is something that you were aware of and were notified about?
A. I have already given in evidence that when we through -- I think it was through my solicitor wrote to 10:35 assistant commissioner, or deputy commissioner or acting commissioner at the time, to try and find out the name of the -- formally find out the name of the assistant commissioner that was conducting the disciplinary investigation, whether it was the affidavit or collusion, I'm not sure what, whatever. But he replied that Joe Nugent would respond, which he never did. But Joe Nugent, from reading the documents, I understand Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin, if I am correct, had a conflict of interest there and Joe Nugent....

11 Q. Not insofar as a conflict of interest, but he considered it best that matters be dealt with by one person who was not involved in previous aspects of the inquiries?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. So just in terms of the net bit, he will also say in evidence that he was particularly tasked to deal with queries that might arise in respect of complaints made by you against Superintendent Murray
and Commissioner Ó Cualáin did this because he was conscious of his previous involvement in aspects of this issue, in particular the Ó Cualáin investigation, of which you have given evidence.
A. Yes.

13 Q. Then I wonder if you could be shown book 36, please?
A. 7336 .

14 Q. No, sorry, book 36.
A. Oh sorry.

15 Q. I think just in terms of sequence, the position is that I think on the 3rd October, if you look, please, at page 10101. That's 10101. Sorry, Judge, that doesn't appear to be it.
A. An e-mail? after that meeting. If I just ask you to note first of a11, will you agree with me that the addressees include John Barrett, Fintan Fanning, Tony McLough1in, Alan Mulligan, Ken Ruane, James McCarthy, that's Inspector McCarthy?
A. Yes.

17 Q. James Don1on, Michael Broderick, sorry, Michae1 Don1on and Fiona Broderick. You will see there that Fiona Broderick appeared to be the sergeant who was involved in effectively annotating the details. She indicates of Human Resources?
A. Judge, it is probably nothing, but can I just see, there's a thing at the bottom of that page, e-mail,
yeah, there's something written there. It could be a mistake.
18 Q. It appears to be a photocopying issue. If you look on the right-hand side, there is also a tab reference as well. Could I ask you then please to turn to document 10102, please. You will see there that there is a list of actions arising from the meeting. Mr. Nugent will say that these actions were as outlined in this memorandum. First, that an assistant commissioner was to be assigned to conduct the investigation and this needed to commence with a statement from you. It was agreed that Mr. Barrett would appoint an assistant commissioner, do you see that?
A. Yes.

The second point was that a letter was to be drafted to your solicitor addressing matters and how it is proposed that An Garda Síochána wil1 proceed and Mr. Barrett was going to deal with that?
A. okay.

He will say, do you see that there was a litigation matter with the head of litigation services and Mr. Ruane, who is a solicitor in Garda headquarters, was going to deal with that?
A. Yes.

21 Q. Fourth, it was agreed that a visit to you would take place, and you were to be verbally informed about the case conference and what was being proposed?
A. Yes.

22 Q. It was agreed that Inspector McCarthy would visit you
to do that?
A. Yeah.

23 Q. I think he did so in the end; is that right?
A. Yes.

24 Q. That's just again so the Chairman has this in context. 10:40 That's the same Inspector McCarthy we referred to yesterday, who visited you, I think you, said five times in 2017?
A. Just for clarification, I said roughly five times. I don't know how many times, but in and around. But he visited you on the instructions of Assistant Commissioner Fanning?
A. Yes.
Q. Then the fifth was that Internal Affairs would be contacted with respect to the discipline GSOC matter 10:40 and Chief Superintendent McLough1in was to progress that task?
A. Okay. Again, just to put this in context, you have agreed you were told all about this by Inspector McCarthy?
A. Judge, we're going back to 2017 now, again I can't recollect every word.
Q. But you do accept it?
A. I'm not disputing anything so far.
Q. I just want to move this as expeditiously as I can.

The next point is that the files at hand would be checked to see what has been sent to the DPP on matters raised by you, and Sergeant Donlon was assigned to that task?
A. Yes.

30 Q. The sixth issue is the issue of the superintendent and chief superintendent in the westmeath division is raised and their relationship, and Chief Superintendent McLoughlin outlined the matters currently to be looked at. Then the final issue, he will say, was sick leave recorded in relation to yourself. And Mr. Mulligan, will followed this matter up with Ms. Carr, not a guard we've heard about before, she was involved with all questions to do with pay related issues and that a manual sick certificates was to be conducted.

So, ultimately I have to suggest to you that Mr. Nugent wi11 say in his evidence that far from doing nothing, in fact, under his watch there was an elaborate meeting and a wide variety of tasks identified and people were assigned those tasks and you were told about that. I think there is no dispute, isn't that right?
A. I haven't disagreed so far with anything.

31 Q. Thank you. Could I ask you then please to turn forward 10:42 to page 10118? These are minutes of that meeting. And again, Mr. Nugent will give evidence in relation to this aspect of things. Basically, if I just identify a number of points. First of all, I think you will note that Assistant Commissioner Fanning outlined that he is 10:43 still in the file with respect to an allegation of bullying and harassment and he notes that you had been in contact with his office. was that contact through your solicitor or was that directly by you?
A. It wouldn't have been directly by me.

32 Q. Yes. I think that Assistant Commissioner Fanning then indicated to the meeting that he had received a file, that a number of issues arose, and he got chief Superintendent Scanlan to meet with you. He outlined a 10:43 concern he had with respect to the issues raised by you and that in his view the bullying and harassment policy didn't cover all matters raised.
A. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. Yes. But I presume that Inspector McCarthy would have told in the briefing at the meeting that this was the view?
A. Yes. I still -- the way it's sort of being portrayed here is that as a result of my meetings with Inspector McCarthy that I knew everything that was going on. That is not the case.

36 Q. But you did know about this meeting?
A. Sorry?
A. I presume, yeah, I presume he told me that there was a meeting but wouldn't have gone into the details on
anything.
38 Q. Sure. Then do you see there is a reference to Mr. Barrett, outlining that he and Chief Superintendent McLough1in had spoken to your solicitors?
A. Em...
$10: 44$
39 Q. In the middle of the page?
A. I would be aware of that, yeah.

So again, this is a situation, it's not that your solicitor wasn't being contacted, Mr. Nugent will say there had in fact been contact by Mr. Barrett and Mr. McLough1in.

Then you will see there's references to Mr. Barrett seeking a clarification from Assistant Commissioner Fanning on the criminal aspect of things. Mr. Nugent
will say that Assistant Commissioner Fanning outlined his views that -- he noted that you had said that you had been victimised by people since you had made the protected disclosure and he expressed a concern about making an appointment under the bullying and harassment policy. He thought that the investigation should be made under the Byrne McGinn model, which encompasses a wider investigation?
A. Yes.

41 Q. Were you aware of that in October 2017?
A. I don't know when I was aware of it, but I know I definitely became aware of it at some stage. I'm not sure if it was -- as I've said, I had become aware of it, $I$ don't know when $I$ became aware of it.

42 Q. Again, in the next paragraph Mr. Nugent will say that there was a discussion by Mr. Barrett about the files being sent to the DPP's office. Mr. Barrett also spoke, he said, on 2nd October 2017 to your solicitor, were you aware of that at the time?
A. Just one second, sorry.

44 Q. Just above that, in the sentence beginning:
"Harassment - John Barrett outlined that two files would be forwarded to the DPP"?
A. Two files?
A. Okay. Judge, can I just underline that?
Q. Of course you can. But if you just turn to the next line, please, which is what my question is about.
Mr . Barrett saying he had spoken to your solicitor the day before, on the 2nd October, weren't you aware of that?
A. Sorry, I was thinking of something else there. Excuse me, sorry.
47 Q. Please just focus on my question, if you wouldn't mind. 10:46
A. Yes.

48 Q. In terms of the 2nd October, it's recorded there that Mr . Barrett had spoken to your solicitor Mr. Cullen on the 2nd October, the day before the conference, were
you aware of that?
A. I mean, I can't dispute it.

49 Q. And that your solicitor had given Mr. Barrett a handwritten letter from you with issues that he believed had not been resolved?
A. I think that's what we covered yesterday.
A. Where the wording that emanated from me, I presume that's what we are talking about. Yeah.
Then it's also recorded Mr. Nugent will say that 10:47 Assistant Commissioner Fanning outlined that a person needed to be appointed to deal with all matters and that a statement needed to be taken from you and a process followed. Do you note that, in the next sentence?
A. This is where he outlines a statement needs...

52 Q. Yes:
"He outlines a statement needs to be taken from Garda Keogh and a process followed. Someone neutral needs to 10:47 carry out an investigation."
A. Yes.

Mr. Nugent will then say that Assistant Commissioner Fanning suggested a full statement be taken and sent to 10:47 the DPP and to outline what had already been submitted on the file, and then when the DPP came back, all of the matters should be looked at under relevant policies and Mr. Barrett agreed with that?
A. okay.

54 Q. Mr. Nugent will say, turning over the page, that Assistant Commissioner Fanning expressed concern that things had been going on for a long time, he thought that everything needed to be investigated. Were you aware that was his view at that time?
A. I don't know -- like I don't know what he knew at that time. As I said yesterday, from my meeting with Inspector McCarthy, at first when we met, Judge, you have to understand it would have been the same as myself and Detective Superintendent Mulcahy, there's probably mistrust and that, so it takes time. But, from my conversation, Judge, I think they were in the dark in Athlone, Inspector McCarthy and Assistant Commissioner Fanning. That's my take on it.
Q. You see, I have suggest to you that this document indicates that's incorrect.
A. Okay.
Q. They are fully informed, they're at the table with everybody else. You will see --
A. Just in relation, you're probably just talking about in relation to bullying and harassment, $I$ am talking about the whole heroin thing and all the rest.
57 Q. Let me put it to you, you've agreed with me, that this note is clearly referring to lots of different issues. We have seen the action points, it's not just bullying and harassment.
A. I am not even sure, because that thing, this is the first I twigged that two files have been forwarded to
the DPP. Now I'm aware in relation to the collusion case that the file was sent and was resent a second time but...

58 Q. Garda Keogh, that's a distraction from what we are asking here.
A. Okay.

I am asking you to look at this meeting and to agree with me that this note, and Mr. Nugent's evidence, I am putting to you, will be that a wide range of issues were discussed at the meeting, not just bullying and harassment?
A. Okay.

60 Q. There's an attempt to coordinate a response to your various letters and complaints, would you agree, that's what this shows?
A. Yes.

61 Q. And would you agree that it shows that, for example, in the middle of the page, 10109, that Chief Superintendent McLough1in says there was nothing to preclude the organisation from conducting an
investigation and it was agreed that an assistant commissioner should be appointed to investigate and get a full statement from you?
A. Yeah.

62 Q. So again, here's Garda headquarters analysing the problem, coming back with a collective response. Then Mr. Barrett is recorded as being in agreement with the investigation. It was decided he would appoint someone at assistant commissioner level to do the
investigation.
A. Yeah.

63 Q. Yes. You see again it's recorded, as you I think accept, that Inspector McCarthy was assigned to meet with you and to inform you about this meeting and he did so?
A. Yes.

64 Q. You will see, therefore, and again, there is no need to go through each of these issues, but you will see that various other parties, Chief Superintendent McLoughlin, 10:50 Sergeant Donlon, Mr. Mulligan, they are all dealing with different issues. Just over the page, at 10120, we have that action list again. Do you see that?
A. Sorry?

65 Q. 10120?
A. Yeah.

66 Q. Can I ask you to look at that and confirm that you agree that that's the action that we talked about, with the various tasks being assigned, Mr. Nugent will say they were at the time. 10120 ?
A. We11, I can't agree, just I would have to read it before I can agree.

67 Q. Garda Keogh, just hold on for a moment.
A. Yeah.

68 Q. Let's be very clear about this?
A. Yeah.

69 Q. You accept you were briefed about this meeting?
A. Yes.

70 Q. You were told about this meeting?
A. Yes.

71 Q. You knew all about this meeting?
A. No, no, not all about. I knew there was a meeting. I knew there was a meeting.
72 Q. So there's no mystery about this, this is the meeting you were told about. So again you have given the impression at certain stages that you thought that the Gardaí wasn't responding to you, wasn't answering your letters, that you had no idea what was going on. I am just putting these questions to show that certainly at this stage we had very serious attention being given to what you are saying?
A. Yes, but on this matter, that's fair enough. On the other matter, in relation to Joe Nugent, and I have already said this, Judge, that where I wrote to -- we wrote to Commissioner Ó Cualáin to ask who was conducting the disciplinary investigation, the letter we go back was, Joe Nugent will be in touch with you and Joe Nugent never followed up on that. There was nothing more on that. So, in relation to this part, this is fair enough. I don't dispute anything here.

73 Q. That's the part we're talking about. So, insofar as that's concerned, I have to suggest to you that that indicates a comprehensive assessment of all of the complaints, and there were many of them, which you had made up to that time, would you agree with that?
CHA RMAK Say that again, Mr. Murphy, I didn't catch that.

MR. MRPHY: That this reflects a comprehensive
assessment by Gardaí headquarters of the very many complaints and different issues which had been raised by Garda Keogh?
A. Yeah.

74 Q. Thank you.
A. Just for clarification, like I wasn't at that meeting, so I don't know what -- I'm accepting this, what's being put to me, but.
Q. CHA RMAK I know you weren't at the meeting, are you saying you weren't aware of this?
A. Oh no, I was aware, inspector had called down, called to me and he would have said there was a meeting and he would have given me at different times paperwork.
76 Q. CHA RMAN I mean I don't expect you to remember everything about it.
A. Yes.

77 Q. CHAL RMAN But Mr. Murphy is saying were you aware that this was going on?
A. Oh yeah. Yes. Yes.

78 Q. CHAN RMAN Not with every specific element. okay.
79 Q. MR. MRPHY: Just to help you on that, Garda Keogh, could I ask you please to be shown 10103, please.
A. 10103?

80 Q. Yes. Please. This is a letter I think from Inspector McCarthy or Assistant Commissioner Fanning addressed to 10:53 you on the 4th October, the day after the meeting. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

81 Q. Do you remember getting that letter?
A. This is one of the letters I would have just mentioned a minute ago, that there were letters that he gave on headed paper. I literally just said it a moment ago, Judge.
82 Q. In would've been not just a letter, Garda Keogh, there is also a reference in the second paragraph to a phone conversation on the day of the meeting, on the 3rd. Do you see:
"I refer to our phone conversation yesterday and our di scussi on regarding the outcome of the meeting hel din Garda Headquarters on the 3rd October concerning ongoi ng matters and I wi sh to update you accordingly."
A. Yes.

83 Q. Do you remember having a conversation with Inspector McCarthy on the day of the conference?
A. Can I check my diary, please?

84 Q. Please.
A. Em, my note, Judge, here is, for the 3rd is:
"Barrett called strategy meeting. Fintan and MELoughlin. AC to be appoi nted. "

85 Q. So, I think we can agree, therefore, that Inspector McCarthy efficiently and promptly contacted you, spoke to you, wrote you a letter and kept you appraised of developments, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

86 Q. As you said yesterday, you had been in frequent contact with him throughout 2017 as well?
A. Inspector McCarthy?

87 Q. Yes.
A. Yes. When we say frequent, Judge, it's not on a daily, 10:55 it's not even on a weekly basis.
88 Q. I think you said five in 2017 yesterday.
A. Roughly.

89 Q. I man, had you been in touch with him, for example, in 2016?
A. I don't think so. I don't know, wherever it's first written in my diary is the first time $I$ had been in contact.
Q. I see. Normally you record the first time that you meet somebody in your diary?
A. Sorry?

91 Q. Normally you record the first time that you meet somebody in your diary, is that right?
A. I'd like to think so.

92 Q. Yesterday, just on that point, I think yesterday -- I 10:55 wonder if transcript of Day 111 could be just brought up for a moment, please. At page 157. Thank you. Could you scroll down please to line 9 please. You remember yesterday I asked you a question:
"Q. Can I ask you to indi cate to the Chai rman what communi cation you had with Assi stant Commissioner Fanning bef ore that date in 2017?"

You replied:
"A. Judge, I don't thi nk I woul d have had any."

So, are you sure that that's right? Is that true?
A. No, no, no Judge, I don't know what way this -- I see what way it's written here. I met Assistant Commissioner Fanning in Athlone Garda Station in I think 2015, and we're talking about somewhere between one to two minutes passing through the station and I would have a note of that.

93 Q. Yes. I wonder if we could refer now please to Volume 47, at page 1335. This is your 2015 diary, the entry is for 30th November 2015, which I think is a Friday. Do you have that?
A. I have Monday for the 30th -- 30th November '15?

94 Q. I beg your pardon, it could be the 30th October, I'm very sorry. It has November at the top of the page but in fact it's the end of October, my mistake.
A. Yes.

95 Q. So, again just help us with your handwriting, please, if you wood. It says:
" $5 p m$ to 3pm PO. "

What does that mean?
A. Public office.

96 Q. Public office. So this is indoor duties?
A. Yes.

29101 Q. CHAN RMAN No, just the 1ast two 1ines?
A.
"printed Pul se recl assifications. Copied hi dden in station ot her smiggl ed in bat on pocket."

It sounds bad but I can explain it.
102 Q. CHA RMAN No, it doesn't sound bad, I am just wondering what it is?
A. When I printed the documents off Pulse, Judge, just for clarification, in Garda HQ they're able to monitor the Pulse computers and I would have obviously have known my pulse computer was being monitored. So, when I printed off the documents, the reclassification documents, what I did was I printed off the documents and then I obviously photocopied them and I hid one batch in the station, Judge, and the other batch, Judge, there's a baton pocket in a Garda trousers, $I$ rolled them up and I would have sneaked -- put them into the baton pocket to leave the station with them, in case someone would have perhaps tried to intercept them.
103 Q. CHA RMAN what were you going to do with them?
A. Oh, hand them over to wallace or Daly.

104 Q. CHA RMAN oh right.
A. I think these are the declassification, I think, stuff, that we previously mentioned, to do with reclassification of crimes.

105 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. It's not as simple as you just press print and can walk out. I'm aware of another incident with former

Commissioner Callinan and there was a similar type of incident, which I won't go into, Judge, but the reason is, I would have been aware that the Pulse computers would be monitored.

CHA RMAK There would be a record of who went in and took a copy?
A. They would actually live see it up in Dublin, they would be able to see everything was watching, they would be able to when I printed off on Pulse. So I had to move fast. And I had to hide one batch in the station, as $I$ said, one copy in the station because obviously it was the 1ast place I thought they'd look and the other copy I left the station with in the baton pocket, if that makes sense.
107 Q. MR. MRPHY: Just to assist the Tribunal, who were you hiding this documentation from?
A. Oh Garda management.
Q. And Garda Headquarters?
A. Sorry.

109 Q. And Garda Headquarters? The Pulse system is effectively monitored there, is it?
A. Yes.

110 Q. Can we take you didn't have permission to do that?
A. I didn't need permission to do that because this was to do with corruption and I was invoking Section 62 of the 11:02 Garda Síochána Act. So I was acting fully within the law, Judge.

111 Q. To whom did you invoke that?
A. Sorry?

112 Q. Whom did you speak to that about first?
A. I would have gone to Deputies Wallace and Daly. 113 Q. I see?
A. And would I have spoken to jockey -- John Wilson, Judge, because he knew all about the Section 62 Garda Síochána Act.

Did Mr. Wilson advise you then about how to go about taking the material from Pulse?
A. No, no, but that's common sense, how to take material is a matter of --

115 Q. The plan to give it to the TDs, did he advise you about planning to give it to TDs?
A. There was no plan to give it to the TDs. No, he did not. This was me. Me. I have already gone into this, Judge.
116 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. Where, on the back foot of Superintendent Murray's reclassification thing on that robbery from the person, and when I discovered that had been reclassified, I then went to look to see what else had been reclassified.

117 Q. CHA RMAN How did you do that search?
A. I went through all my cases to see what --

118 Q. CHAN RMAN A11 your cases?
A. Yeah, because I type in my registration number on the Pulse.

119 Q. CHA RMAN So, any of my cases, have they been reclassified?
A. Yes, my cases.

120 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes.
A. And I saw a lot of my cases, recent cases had been reclassified. One, which I already mentioned.

121 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. It was to do with a burglary in Kilbeggan at a petrol station and Superintendent Murray classified that down to criminal damage. It was actually the GIFC in Castlebar, the garda information services --
122 Q. CHA RMAN Don't get lost for a moment?
A. Yes.

123 Q. CHA RMAN You first checked your own cases?
A. Yes.

124 Q. CHA RMAN Your own recent cases; is that right?
A. Yes, yes.

125 Q. CHA RMAN Then what did you do?
A. I checked other cases as wel1.

126 Q. CHA RMAN How did you choose the other cases to check?
A. It would have gone through incidents in Athlone. Let's say, if I typed in burglary, all the burglaries within the one period for Athlone district or sub-district, I 11:04 can basically -- I can find on Pulse, if I wanted to look at burglaries in Buncrana, I could find them, or in Bray, you know, I would be able to find anything.
127 Q. CHA RMAN But specifically what you were doing in this case was to see if any were in the Athlone district?
A. For other reclassifications based on the reclassification that $I$ had found.

128 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. Based on the documents Superintendent Murray was
writing.
129 Q. CHA RMAN Hold on, I don't know the system.
A. Right. Sorry.

130 Q. CHA RMAN No, no, no. You picked burglaries; is that right?
A. No -- yeah, burglaries was --

131 Q. CHA RMAN I am asking you a simple question.
A. Yeah.

132 Q. CHA RMAK I understand your own cases.
A. Yes.

133 Q. CHA RMAN You said, look, you're going to be familiar with those ones and you looked up those cases. Okay.
A. Yeah.

134 Q. CHA RMAN How did you choose which other cases to check?
A. You see it was mainly my cases.

135 Q. CHA RMAN Do you understand me?
A. I do.

136 Q. CHA RMAN How did you pick them?
A. We11, I just had to click on to every one of them and read were they reclassified or not. It was very simple.

137 Q. CHA RMAN on your cases?
A. I could do it on my cases but I could do it on anybody else's cases.

138 Q. CHA RMAN So who else cases did you choose? Sorry, I mean, how did you -- I don't know how the system is. How did you choose? There must be millions or thousands of cases? were going to check up to see if they had been reclassified?
A. By way of example, Judge, if I typed in burglary, I would have typed in burglary and, let's say, the month of -- we're here on, let's say, October 2015.

141 Q. CHA RPERSON Yes.
A. So I just have to type in burglary between 1st October to the end of October and I type in Athlone, it'11 bring them up.
CHA RMAN Al1 burglaries will come up?
A. Yes. And I just have to click on to every one of them. It on7y takes a second.
143 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. And I can then see if it was reclassified or if it wasn't or what's the thing.

144 Q. CHA RMAN And how do you know if it should have been reclassified or if it shouldn't?
A. Well, you see, it would say in the narrative.
Q. CHA RMAN If it's not your case?
A. It would say on the narrative, theirs is a little box 11:06 where it would say reclassified.

146 Q. CHAI RMAN And?
A. Updated, reclassified as per direction of.

147 Q. CHA RMAN And ? How do you know that's wrong?
A. Well I don't until I read it.

CHA RMAN okay.
A. There could be a legitimate reason for reclassifying them as well, of course. But on the examples that I had given, there was no legitimate reasons. burglaries you were talking about?
A. Burglaries and obviously the robbery issue, the main robbery case.
Q. CHA RMAN So robberies would be different from burglaries?
A. Yes. It's obviously a different category, robbery.

151 Q. CHA RMAN Okay?
A. Then even, Judge, there's sub categories because obviously there is robbery from a person.
Q. CHA RMAK Clearly.
A. Burglaries are the same, you could have aggravated burglary, attempted burglary.
153 Q. CHA RMAN Robbery is always from a person, isn't it?
A. What?

154 Q. CHAI RMAN Robbery is always from a person?
A. Yes, but the --

155 Q. CHA RMAN Aggravated robbery. Am I right? It's a while since $I$ was wrestling with these matters, but I thought --
MR. MRPHY: It would, Chairman, it would be theft by violence.

CHA RMAN It would be one, of many others, in what used to be the 1916 Larceny Act, I know that has been
replaced, in case somebody wants to tell me, but the one I was particularly familiar with. Anyway, that is just me reminiscing.
A. A bank robbery, for example, wouldn't be robbery from a person, just to answer. It wouldn't be under robbery. If I was to go into a bank --
156 Q. CHA RMAN Look, we won't worry too much.
A. Yeah. It's just the classifications, Judge.

CHA RMAN I know. okay.
157 Q.
MR. MRPH: Garda Keogh, just in relation to the entry 11:08 in the diary, why did you make this entry in the diary at that time?
A. which part?

158 Q. The part about meeting with Assistant Commissioner Fanning and what he said to you?
A. He's an assistant commissioner. I met -- I mean, I take a note of I think any senior officer that I am meeting with. It's a fairly significant thing I thought. Because firstly, as I said, assistant commissioner came into the station, he knew who I was even though he have never met. He said he appreciates what I am doing and couldn't really talk. So like I recall the conversation because where it occurred was, I was in the public office and another -- at some stage I went into the back CCTV room, he asked me just to show him around. This is the CCTV, the back part, where there was the issue with the gun safe that is disputed. But anyway. It was there, that's where he said he appreciates what I'm asking. Then some other
guard walked in and that was it. That was the end of it. When the other guard walked in, that was pretty much it. Like, it was only -- it was even a minute. Is there any connection between that conversation down the bottom of the page, where you are referring to the printing Pulse --
A. oh, no, absolutely not. Definitely not, no. No, no, Judge, I have explained that. Absolutely not. Just to help us to understand the position, you regarded it as a friendly approach by the commissioner?
A. Yes. Well, like in my position, Judge, for an assistant commissioner to come up and -- I know in the public arena Nóirín o'sullivan was coming out with all this stuff publicly, but reality internally what was happening in the Guards was totally the opposite. But 11:09 for an assistant commissioner to actually say that to me, that -- he was the only one and to this day he's the only one.
161 Q. Sure. You considered that to be a big event. So why did you say yesterday when you were asked the question, 11:10 what communication did you have with Assistant Commissioner Fanning and you said:
"J udge, I don't thi nk I would have had anythi ng."

And you were asked:
"None at all?"

And you said:
"I don't think so."

How could you forget this meeting in 2015?
A. I don't know what the sequence of questions that happened before that, perhaps over the phone or something like that. Judge, I have always maintained -- I never disputed that meeting. I think it even cropped up last week.
Q. CHAN RMAN And it's there in your diary?
A. Oh yeah.

CHA RMAN which has been circulated.
163 Q. MR. MRPHY: Then I think you refer to a second meeting. When was that meeting?
A. The second meeting was this year. It was a disciplinary meeting, it was discipline for treble homicide, Judge.
164 Q. I will come back to that. Very good. Just moving back to Volume 36, I wonder if you could be shown 10110.
This is a RTÉ broadcast, it's a transcript of a RTÉ broadcast, 6th October 2017. The heading is
"Recording of sick I eave of Garda Ni chol as Keogh. "

Do you see in the first paragraph it says:
"According to documents seen by RTÉ's Thi s Week programme, Garda Ni chol as Keogh. ..."

And your number is places, your Garda number is placed.
". .. absence from work from An Garda Sí ochána was recorded fromall of 2015 as flu/virus and from
Decentber 2015 onwards and for the following 200 days approxi matel y of work it is recorded as mental health."

Then there's details about your sick certificates and other materials.
A. Yes.

165 Q. Is it the case that this is information that you provided to RTÉ?
A. Yes, to John Burke, I see his name there, yes.

166 Q. Is that information you provided to him after the case conference of the 3rd october?
A. I don't know.

167 Q. Sorry?
A. Like I don't know when I provided the information.

168 Q. Is it possible that information was given after --
A. It's possible.

169 Q. In terms of this letter, this is a letter, it's addressed to the Press office and there's a series of questions which are indicating materials there. Turning over to the second page, 10111, you will see there is reference to correspondence from July 2017 to Mr. Barrett?
A. Judge, sorry 10111?

170 Q. The very next page, please, 10111.
A. Yes.

171 Q. There's reference there to a letter to Mr. John Barrett of 9/7/2017?
A. Just which paragraph, sorry?

172 Q. The third paragraph, please?
A. Okay.
Q. Starting with "In his letter.."?
A. Oh yeah.

174 Q. So, can you confirm that that's documentation that you would have provided to RTÉ as well?
A. I presume I did. I mean, I can't remember but I recal1 talking to Mr. Burke. I don't know, I'm not sure about the documentation but.

175 Q. And if you look down further to the next paragraph and the paragraph after that, will you agree with me that that indicates that there's a reference to correspondence to your solicitor, Mr. Cullen?
A. Okay.
Q. That obviously was correspondence which, I think you will agree, you furnished to RTÉ as well?
A. More than likely.

177 Q. So, at this stage then was it standard practice for you to copy documentation that you received from An Garda Síochána and copy it to the press?
A. Look at the year. What year? We're into 2017 now, and 11:14 all this thing is still going on. I mean this started on the 8 th May '14, '15, '16, we're now into '17 at this stage. So, I mean, I'm making no apologies if I spoke to the media or anything like that.
A. No, no.
Q.
A. No, no, this is showing what has happened to me. You know, this is showing what happened to me. That here -- like I mean this goes back to these case conferences and all this craic. I am being marked out with the flu, viral flu, and my doctor certificates are work related stress.
180 Q. Garda Keogh --
A. That's a fairly big issue.

181 Q. We have covered the certs before. I am just asking you to confirm that in the light of all this information this was material you were hoping would be broadcast by the press in an effort to damage Superintendent Murray, at that time, isn't that right?
A. Judge, I can't -- you see, there was a slight twist on this. This is not just -- I said yesterday, Superintendent Murray was -- it was ó Cualáin was the
person I hold responsible even for a lot of Superintendent Murray's actions. But, an issue in that Superintendent Murray should not have been on the promotion list until the investigation was over. That has always been my statement. And, Judge, as well, 11:15 what was put yesterday to me, to bring down Superintendent Murray and all the rest. That is not the case. It was merely that he should not be promoted until the investigation is over. .
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Q. You see, I have to suggest to you, as I did yesterday, Garda Keogh, that in fact it's much more than that and it's clear that you were attempting to bring down, your words, to bring down Superintendent Murray. But can I put it to you that at this stage, this is just an example of what I am putting to you, is a pattern of action by you to seek to damage Superintendent Murray. But here we have a situation, will you agree that, that Mr. Nugent, Inspector McCarthy, Garda management are all dealing with you, writing to your solicitor, speaking to you, meeting you in some cases, seeking to address your complaints, but your response is to copy the correspondence they sent to you and send it to the media. Because this is part, I have to put it to you, that this is part of a pattern of putting effort and pressure on the authorities to block the promotion of Superintendent Murray?
A. Judge, I have answered all this. This is what, we're into 2017, I made that -- I've reported that bullying and harassment back in 2016. You know, I don't think -- I don't know where was that bullying and harassment investigation at this stage? I don't know. But either way...

183 Q. Can I ask you to turn forward to page 10121, please?
A. 112?

184 Q. 10121. This is a letter from Mr. John Barrett addressed to Mr. Cullen, your solicitor?
A. Yes.
Q. It's dated 13th October 2017?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

186 Q. You have seen this letter before, haven't you?
A. I'm sure I would have.

187 Q. Yes. The first point is that your solicitor is writing saying:
"Chi ef Superintendent MELoughlin..."

Sorry, I beg your pardon, the writer is saying, that is to say Mr. Barrett is saying:
"Chi ef Superintendent MLLoughl in very mach appreci ated your time to engage with in the course of our tel ephone call on 2nd October 2017."

So, were you aware that your solicitor had had a telephone call with Mr. Barrett and Mr. McLoughlin on that date?
A. I'm sure I was.

188 Q. Yes.
A. Because at some period, Judge, we had a meeting with Chief Superintendent McLough1in and Mr. John Barrett.
189 Q. If just turn over the page, to deal with this as swiftly as we can, but in terms of the next page, that's 10122, I have to suggest to you that it's clear that Mr. Barrett specifically addresses in chronological order matters raised by you in your 1etter of 17th September 2017, do you see that?
A. what number again?

190 Q. That's 10122?
A. Yes, but what --

191 Q. The next page?
A. Yes, but what paragraph.

192 Q. You will see there's paragraphs 1 through 7, do you see 11:18 those?
A. Yes.

193 Q. I don't propose to read them into the record, but would you agree with me that they are responses to seven points which --
A. Oh yes.

194 Q. So He here is an example where you have written a letter in September, do you agree? Do you agree? You wrote a letter on the 17th September?
A. Well, I may not have, but my solicitor may have.

195 Q. It's followed up by a discussion between Mr. Cullen and very senior management, Mr. Barrett and Chief Superintendent Mr. McLough1in, do you agree with that?
A. Yes.

196 Q. It's then followed up with a letter, this letter, indicating what response is to be made, point by point, isn't that correct?
A. That's what it appears to be.

197 Q. Then if you turn over the next page, please, 10123:
"A further update. It has been agreed that regul ar cont act with the empl oyment assistance service will be suppl emented by a visit, as has happened in the past, to your client fromlnspector MECarthy and this will
take place shortly."
A. Yeah. There's no issue there.

198 Q. Then finally, you are being told:
"This office....".

That's Mr. Barrett's office:
". .. has now assumed coordi native responsibility for the 11:19 matters at issue and will seek to progress the issue transparently with all due Élan."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.

199 Q. So again, here is your solicitor and you being informed that very elaborate steps are being taken by Garda management at the highest leve1 to respond to your various queries?
A. At that point.

200 Q. At that point. And I have to suggest to you that's a far cry from the picture you sought to paint in the course of your evidence of your complaints going unheard and not responded to?
A. No, no. No, no, we agreed, Judge, just there at that point. There was huge issues going on. Bear in mind, I made -- this is 13th October '17, I reported that bullying and harassment in '16, I didn't get to make a statement until, was it March '17, here we are on the

13th of October and it's still -- so it's not as simple. And I think under the policy document, Judge, I think it's all to be done within 28 days. Now, we have agreed that it would impossible to do this in 28 days, but there's a lot of problems. So I am agreeing with Mr. Murphy just up to this point. Garda Keogh, would you agree with me, parallel with this correspondence and these meetings with Garda management, at the same time and in the same month, as we have seen yesterday, you're doing things to leak information to the press, speak to TDs, provide them information, in the hope that they will target and criticise Superintendent Murray?
A. Judge, there's a number of other things parallel going on as well. Because there's the GSOC investigation is somewhere there, I don't know what happened with that. Again, back then, in 2017, I didn't know what was going on with that either. Then there is the disciplinary investigation. I don't even know who was appointed to investigate that. Because that's - where are we?
October 2017, Jack Nolan is retired. So I'm trying to find out what's going on with that. Then there's this whole thing as well. Like I mean, I am trying to highlight a whole load of issues here. It's not just one particular matter. There's a number of stalling points that I have to highlight.
202 Q. What you are trying to do is provoke critical conclusions in relation to Superintendent Murray. Can I ask you to turn forward to page 10141, please. This
is a 1etter of 18th October 2017. Just by way of example of cause and effect. Perhaps if I can first of a11 ask you, have you read this letter before?
A. Em, I may have read it in the documents but I'm not au fait with this.

203 Q. Right. Perhaps to help you and perhaps to help you just to summarise matters in this letter?
A. Right. by the Department of Justice on behalf of the Minister to the Commissioner, acting Commissioner ó Cualáin, asking him for a report on matters raised by you?
A. Yes.
Q. This is known as a Section 41 request?
A. Just for clarification, is this under Minister Fitzgerald's? This is under Minister Fitzgerald.

206 Q. It's a Section 41 request?
A. Yes, I'm aware. Yes, yes.

207 Q. So, up to this state, all the things that you had been doing have given rise to this letter. Can I just ask you to look at this for a moment and see, first of a11, there's a reference to previous requests in the second paragraph, do you see that? Just take a moment to read the second paragraph. It says:
"In July 2016 a request was made by the then M ni ster under Section 41 for a report..."

On the matters raised by you.
"... and how these matters had been deal t with by the Gardaí to date. Reports were submitted on 9th Sept ember 2018."
A. Sorry, just one moment. Sorry, you said the second paragraph.
Q. Yes. The first paragraph:
"I amto refer to the department's requests".
A. Right. okay, sorry.
Q. The second paragraph "In July 2016"?
A. I saw there is July down in the last paragraph. Excuse me, my fault.
Q. No difficulty. And there you will see that the reports were submitted on 9th September 2016, 11th October 2016.
"These reports provi ded details of the investigation by An Garda Sí ochána of the allegati ons made by Garda Keogh, as well as wel fare interventions regarding Garda Keogh. "

Do you agree with that?
A. Yeah, there were reports sent, Judge, I'm aware there were reports.

211 Q. Do you see that in the second, sorry, the third paragraph, again without reading it into the record,
will you agree with me that that suggests that there was also communications in December 2016?
A. Yeah. Judge, just one second. I have an issue here, Judge, with these reports.
"Reports were submitted on 9th September 2016 and the 11th October."

Judge my recollection of that is, the 9th September report was an internal report, the 11th October was a more detailed report. Now, what is written here is:
"These reports provi ded details of the investigation by An Garda Sí ochána of allegations by Garda Keogh as well as wel fare interventions regarding Garda Keogh. "

Judge, my recollection of having read those reports and those volumes is there were more -- there wasn't a whole lot of detail in them, more or less the Guards weren't telling the Minister a whole lot in those reports. It was more put a lot of words on paper.

212 Q. You see, I have to suggest to you that in fact the Minister was being fully reported to by the Gardaí.
A. I don't think so.

213 Q. If you look, please, at the next paragraph, there is a 11:25 reference to somebody who I think you make no complaint about, that's Chief Superintendent Tony McLoughlin. Do you see the reference to him?
A. Yeah.

214 Q. What's recorded there, I put it to you, is that it's indicated that:
"Garda Keogh was advi sed to forward it to Chi ef Superintendent McLoughl in."

As you didn't wish to refer to your own chief superintendent, and that an investigating officer would be appointed on receipt. It was reported that you were happy with developments and that you be put back on the 11:25 payroll?
A. Yeah.
Q. That is Chief Superintendent McLough1in's report?
A. Yeah.

216 Q. Then also that the department had been advised that a chief superintendent had been appointed to investigate Garda Keogh's bullying complaint. Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

217 Q. Then there's a reference to the department looking for an update in July 2017, after your solicitor wrote to the Minister in similar terms in relation to your case?
A. Yeah. Judge, I think I mentioned yesterday in relation to Minister Fitzgerald, she was -- she did -- any time I wrote to say -- as I said, I was able -- felt that I was actually able to, as a guard, write to the Minister 11:26 and Tánaiste, she would always -- there was always a reply and she was very fair. There's no issue in that part. The issue $I$ have is what the Guards were telling the Minister.

218 Q. Garda Keogh, just turning over the page. On 17th August 2017, your solicitor submitted further correspondence, isn't that right, complaining about the absence of progress in relation to the bullying and harassment case?
A. okay.
Q. Do you agree with that?
A. Wait, just can I find -- where are we now?

220 Q. The first paragraph, page 10142?
A. Sorry.

221 Q. I think there's no dispute here, Garda Keogh, this confirms that your solicitor was writing to the Minister.
A. Yeah.

222 Q. Making further complaints?
A. okay.

223 Q. Then, do you see further down, two levels, it says:
"The $M$ ni ster has continued to recei ved correspondence from Garda Keogh's solicitor on this these matters."

So there is more correspondence taking place.
A. Yes.

224 Q. Then in October there's a report in the Irish Independent, we referred to it yesterday, that references will be made in the Dáil to an allegation that the harassment complaint from you had not been received by the head of Human Resources?
A. Yes.

225
Q. Again, all of those things are part of a pattern that we've discussed over the last 24 hours of action by you?
A. Sorry, Judge, that's is not -behind the scenes. I am not understanding what that means.
A. It should have been only one chief superintendent.
A. You see, I'm not sure what happened. I don't know. Chief Superintendent Roche will you find in volume 35, 9902.

CHAI RMAN 9902. Thanks very much.

MR. KELLY: It will just make it easier for you. CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Thanks, Mr. Kelly.
229 Q. But you think you would have expected one to be appointed?
A. Yes.
Q. CHAN RMAN It's questionable why two?
A. Judge it's only to take a statement. You'd on7y appoint one chief.
CHA RMAN Whatever it is, you think it doesn't appear on the face to make sense to appoint two?
A. Yes. There appears to be some communication problems. I don't know, Judge, I can't...

232 Q. MR. MRPHY: We can see and I have to put it to you, Garda Keogh, we can see in the last paragraph of this letter that the effect of all of this conduct that $I$ have been taking you through is that the Minister looks for an urgent update report from the Gardaí, in the last paragraph. Do you see that?
A. She did, in fairness.

So, I have to suggest to you at this stage what's happening is that you are ratcheting up the pressure in relation to all matters but particularly at this time it's important to you, I have to suggest, that Superintendent Murray's promotion is what you are trying to stop and impede?
A. As I said, there's three strands, three strands now. Sorry, there's three strands and out of the third one, which is the bullying and harassment thing, one of the subjects of that complaint which I made in March 2017,
is on the promotion list. Then, of course, this is in the time period roughly where the cabinet, the government, hand over control of promotions to the newly formed policing Authority, it happened somewhere within the time period that we're talking about, Judge. So just in terms of the documentation, can I ask you to turn forward, please, to page 10149 in the same book. so, here we have another case conference, this is on 23rd October 2017?
A. Yes.

Do you see that reference?
A. Can you point me to it?
Q. Have you seen this document before?
A. I am sure I've read it in the -- I am sure I have read it. I will just familiarise myself with it. The only place like $I$ would have read it is in the volumes and I just can't -- obviously I can't recollect everything. CHA RMAN what do you want to ask him about it anyway. we can read it as we go along.
MR. MRPHY: Very good.
Garda Keogh, I put it to you that in the course of that Mr. Nugent is referred to as CAO and he will say in his evidence that he queried whether there were grounds to proceed with a bullying and harassment claim at that
stage. And that became the subject-matter of debate, were you aware of that?
A. Yes, Judge. I have read some stuff in relation to Mr. Joe Nugent, the CAO, and it would be fairly concerning. I think he was trying -- the person who was trying to do scoping exercises in relation to -- to divide all the bullying and harassment stuff up, just as it appears they may have done with the original criminal complaint in relation to the heroin, where they're dividing up all the strands of evidence, which weakens the whole case. It appears Mr. Nugent -- it appears to me Mr. Nugent was using the same tactic here in the bullying and harassment thing, the scoping thing.
CHA RMAN Let's find the particular part first of all. 11:32 As to whether it's right or wrong is another day's work. Where are you talking about, Mr. Murphy?
MR. MRPHY: Chairman, that's at the end of this page, 10149.

CHAN RMAN 10149, fact-finding piece. MR. MRPHY:
"Do we have grounds to proceed. Each segment is being dealt with. Adhere to the policy."

Mr. Nugent will say that that's a reference to him to indicating that he felt it would be wiser at that stage to follow the policies, as he had outlined. You understand that, don't you?

MR. MRPH: Yes. Are you aware of the fact -- just turning over to the next page, please.
A. I've just seen a remark:
"Assi st ant commi ssi oner Corcoran, opening remark, Gar da Ni chol as Keogh it is bi gger than..."

CHA RMAN Hold on, wait until you find out what he is asking you first of all. The document is there. We can come back to it, that's not a problem. Now, what do you want to ask about this, Mr. Murphy?
240 Q. MR. MRPHY: On the next page, can I ask you to look down to subsection D ?

CHA RMAN Right. Down to D we go and only D. okay.
241 Q. CHA RMAN This is what the words say.

MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN what he understands. I am not sure I understand. I think most people would probably think adhere to policy was probably a pretty good idea, if you knew what the policy was and what its relevance was. I think Garda Keogh says it's a bit late in the day to be decided on, but maybe all will be revealed in 11:33 due course. But that's what Mr. Nugent says, be it right or wrong, that's what he wrote or that's what he said at the time. Anything else about this one, Mr. Murphy.

Nichol. MR. MRPHY: FF, Fintan Fanning is referred to there,

Assistant Commissioner Fanning, he was raising points in relation to the number of files in play at present and that no file at present on the protected disclosures was there before them, do you see that?
CHAI RMAN Do you see point D?
A. I do.

CHA RMAN The first dash.
A. Can I read that, Judge.

CHA RMAN Yes, absolutely. okay. what is your question about this, Mr. Murphy?
243 Q. MR. MRPHY: Garda Keogh, I think it's clear, do you accept that at that meeting the various parties were there discussing different ways your complaint could be dealt with?
A. I accept that.

244 Q. Just turning over to the next page, we know from the previous page, just at the end of the previous page, Mr. Nugent will say that it's recorded that he queried whether there were grounds to have a bullying and harassment investigation done and that Assistant
Commissioner Fanning will reply that he was the one to decide given that he had been tasked with that issue up-to-date?
A. Just where in that?

245 Q. I'm sorry, in fact it should be at the bottom of the previous page.

## CHA RMAN

"J M quer ying if there is grounds."

## MR. MRPHY: Yes.

CHAL RMAN
"Quer ying if there are grounds to have the B\&H i nvesti gati on done."

To which he says that's a decision for me to make.
MR. MRPHY: Garda Keogh, were you aware that there was a disagreement as to what the correct approach was at that time, between Mr. Nugent and Assistant Commissioner Fanning?
A. I don't know if I was aware at that time. I doubt if I was aware at that time what was going on.
247 Q. I see. Then would you just turn over to the next page please, very briefly on this paragraph, can I ask you to look at the top third of the page. Do you see there's two blanked out areas, if you move to the second blanked out area you will see "FF"?
A. Sorry, page 10152?

248 Q. This is 10152. You will see there are two blanked out pieces on the top of the page. If you look at the second one?
A. Judge, I don't have that. 10152, this is what I have.

249 Q. Sorry, 10151 it should be, I beg your pardon?
A. Sorry.

CHA RMAN I don't know what page this is.
250 Q. MR. MRPHY: It's 10151, Chairman, sorry. Do you see the point, "FF" is referred to there at the end of the
second line.
A. Yes.

Mr. Nugent will say that it was noted also that Assistant Commissioner Fanning noted that the content of your statements were far wider than bullying and harassment and a discussion arose as to how that was a11 connected to bullying and harassment. Do you see that? Apart from this recording of a debate and a discussion, can $I$ just point you to one thing and ask you whether you can agree with what's said here. It 11:37 says:
"FF noting that he [Assi stant Commi ssi oner Fanni ng], had ensured that you [Garda Keogh] had been communi cated fully through the process by him"
A. Yes.

252 Q. Is that correct?
A. Yes. But there's a lot of problems with stuff here that I don't know what's going on with. And there were 11:38 a lot of problems which originally $I$ had to make but from his -- whenever he -- he did send Inspector McCarthy out to me and he was updating me. But, Judge, there's an awful lot of stuff I didn't know, they weren't updating me with absolutely everything, because 11:38 there's stuff there I only read in the documents. I have suggest to you that it's clear at this stage that Assistant Commissioner Fanning was saying to the management that Inspector McCarthy and he has kept you
communicated fully throughout the process?
A. There's no issue, Judge. I know I was updated, but for example, they weren't giving me copies of the likes of this stuff, you know, it was a general update and that was it.
Q. You see, I have to suggest to you that in fact contrary to the complaints you have made to the Chair throughout the course of the last couple of days, it's clear from this that Assistant Commissioner Fanning did keep you updated?
A. I'm not disputing that.
Q. This is a letter from chief executive administrative officer Joseph Nugent on 2nd November 2017. Now we have moved forward to the 2nd November. I think in this situation, Mr. Nugent will say that he had a discussion with Assistant Commissioner Fanning in relation to your complaints and that there was correspondence following the meeting on the 23rd
Q. Not partially, but fully?
A. Yeah. I haven't --
Q. I wanted to put your complaint in context in that sense. Could you turn forward, please, to page 10235 ?
A. 101235 .
Q. No, 10235, please.
A. Okay. there had been such a conversation or discussion?
A. Between?

259 Q. Assistant Commissioner Fanning and Mr. Nugent?
A. Mr. Nugent, I don't think so.
Q. Okay. You will see Mr. Nugent will say in his evidence, just putting to what he will say, he will say that he had proposed a particular course of action. If you look down, please, at the second half of the 1etter, just to confirm this. He will say that he proposed that Assistant Commissioner McPartlin will be tasked with a piece of work to examine the totality of matters complained of by you. That was the first point?

Commissioner, but either way...
Q. I am just putting to you at that time this is what Mr. Nugent says he was proposing. He will also say, in the second part he will say that he had asked, following a letter of 13th October 2017 to your solicitor, that he, Mr. Nugent, had asked Mr. Barrett to liaise with Mr. Cullen and you on welfare matters. Weren't you aware of that?
A. It would have been very helpful if Mr. Nugent was able to tell me who was conducting the disciplinary investigation into the heroin matter that I made back in 2014. Which he didn't do.

262 Q. Garda Keogh, that's another diversion.
A. It's not, it's related to the welfare matter, Judge. .

263
Q. Please just look at this question, if you would. He will say that he asked the director of HRPD to liaise with Assistant Commissioner Fanning to progress matters and documents and that he accepted what you raised was broad in context.

Now, Just turning over the page please, to page 10236, here he is referring to the meeting on the 23 rd October, he says:
"I do not share your vi ews on the need to informGarda Keogh of the hol ding of the af orementioned meeting, particul arly where legal issues to incl ude ongoing ci vil litigation on behal f of Garda Keogh were di scussed at such meetings and will take place in a I egally privileged context."

He will say that it was being suggested that details of the 23rd October meeting, which involved a solicitor and the litigation, should be discussed with you?
A. Basically he says keep him in the dark.
Q. No, what he says ultimately -- what he says in this letter is ultimately that the meeting dealt with issues affecting privilege and litigation?
A. Yeah, but it means the same thing, just keep him in the 11:43 dark.
Q. Did Assistant Commissioner Fanning tell you that that is what he had said?
A. what do you mean?
Q. Did he speak to you about this conversation with Mr. Nugent at any stage?
A. No.
Q. Very good. Can I ask you then please to turn forward to --
A. Judge, I have already explained the details with Assistant Commissioner Fanning. He's after -- it's like a trick question, did Mr. Fanning tell you, when I already stated I only met Assistant Commissioner Fanning twice, you know.
CHA RMAN I am understanding that when he says
Assistant Commissioner Fanning, he means either him or his agent lawfully authorised thereto.
A. My apologies.

CHA RMAN i.e. Inspector McCarthy. That is what I am 11:44 understanding Mr. Murphy to say. Maybe I'm wrong but that's what $I$ am understanding him to say.
A. I may have taken you up wrong, Mr. Murphy, on that.
Q. MR. MRPHY: would you turn forward, please, to page 10237?
A. 10 --
Q. -- 237. I put to you there is a further example of an attempt by An Garda Síochána to engage with you and Chief Superintendent Duff is effectively in Mullingar at this stage, on 10th November 2017, and he is reporting back from Superintendent Minnock and Superintendent Minnock will say that it wasn't possible to arrange for the introduction of Inspector Foalan to you as had been originally envisaged as a liaison
inspector, because you said you didn't wish to have a member of An Garda Síochána to be appointed as liaison inspector to you and you decided your contact with the welfare service and Garda Michael Quinn as well as communications from your office as being sufficient?
A. That's correct.

270 Q. So there was an attempt, you will agree, to have a liaison officer?
A. Yes.

271 Q. And you rejected that?
A. Yes. On the grounds, Judge -- just to explain. Judge, I had my -- I was in regular contact with Garda Mick Quinn, the welfare officer, and, as I said, he was brilliant and everything was working fine there. It became apparent to me at some point that this -- the inspectors calling out to the house on the basis of welfare was nothing more than a spying mission. I actually read, it cropped up yesterday on the screen, about where Inspector Minnock writes back I was using four phones. Now, why that would have to go into a welfare report, I do not know.

But, Judge, in relation to Chief Superintendent Duff, when he made -- he made contact to me via Superintendent Minnock and at that point I had told --
I was telling Inspector Minnock, I was trying to say listen, stay out of this, keep away from it. I said the same thing, can you pass this on to Chief Superintendent Duff, not to get involved in this stuff,
this is going to be messy stuff. That was the basis for it.
Q. In the second paragraph, is it correct to say that you said to Inspector Minnock at the time, Superintendent Minnock that communication outside of the areas you referred to amounted to harassment?
A. Yes, Judge. That's when I had to, more or less, excuse the term, put the foot down with Inspector minnock. Because, as I said, we had a good relationship under Superintendent McBrien's rein in Athlone, but that did change under Superintendent Murray's rein in Athlone. Inspector Minnock was -- Judge, I could sense it was no longer about my welfare or anything, it was spying issues he was up to at that stage. And that's where I ended up saying to Inspector minnock, please don't call 11:47 around again. But equally, on the other side, I had always tried to tell Inspector Minnock and the words I would have used was: Stay out of this. Do not get involved in this stuff please. Because it's going to get messy.
273 Q. And again I just have to put it to you that notwithstanding that, that Chief Superintendent Duff indicated in the middle of the letter, that he corresponded directly with your solicitor, advising him of his obligations to you under the Safety Health and welfare at Work Act, and requested a meeting with your solicitor with a view to resolve the issue, to see if it was possible to come to amicable agreement with regard to future engagement?
A. That's correct.

274 Q. Did that meeting happen?
A. No. But he did -- that part is accurate, Judge. Yes. So, at this stage these are overtures, I suggest to you, being made to you to try and help resolve issues, but you're rejecting those. One further element, please turn forward to page 10247, the 13th November. So here we have a reference to a letter addressed I think to Mr. Barrett by Assistant Commissioner Fanning. He refers to previous correspondence. Then he refers to you. And he says that he provided a summary of the allegations that you had made:
"I ncl uding corresponding with Garda Keogh as per 8.4 of the policy in rel ation to procedures, harassment, sexual har assment and bullying."

Then he says this:
"Thi s sets out the two options available in attempting to resol ve the compl ai nt through either medi ation or i nvesti gation. As you are aware, Garda Keogh i ndi cated he would not accept medi ation and requi res the matter fully investigated. Copy attached."

So, can I ask you just to indicate when you communicated to him that you did not want to go with mediation?
A. That was with -- Inspector McCarthy called out to me at, oh I don't know when, but he offered -- he made the offer, you can either have it done this way or that way, mediation or full investigation, and I told him a full investigation. I think he may have said, we're going to need that in writing. I'm not sure if that's where $I$ just wrote it out on a piece of paper there and then and it was later typed up.
A. Yes.
Q. This article refers to, $I$ have to suggest to you, a lot of details in relation to the meeting on 23rd October 2017. Can I just ask you to confirm, you weren't aware 11:50 of the details of that meeting of the 23rd October at that stage, were you?
A. I don't think -- I know -- I just know I remember reading this article in the paper. From what I
remember, I got a call or something, maybe to say there was something in the Independent.

279 Q. Yes.
A. And I would have got it, read it.
Q. So, is it the case then when you looked at this detail, you will accept I think that there is chapter and verse about what happened at the meeting, a lot of detail?
A. I would have to read it. I haven't read this article since, whenever, 2017.

282 Q. Yes.
A. I accept it's in the volumes there, Judge. But because I had read it before, I didn't read it again.
283 Q. For example, if we just take a few examples, if we look at, for example, the second paragraph, there is a reference to tense meetings in Garda Headquarters in recent days. There's no way would you have known about
that at that stage?
A. No.

284 Q. It had to be somebody who was involved in one of those meetings, would you agree?
A. Well, I mean, I presume --
$11: 52$
MR. KELLY: Judge, I wonder whether there is any point in inviting this witness to absolutely speculate to this. I know nothing about it at all
CHA RMAN I agree. I mean, Mr. Murphy, in this situation, and I don't mean this in any disrespectful way, but what difference does it make whether the witness agrees or not?
MR. MRPFH: Insofar as the article is concerned.
CHA RMAN In fairness, the witness in the situation doesn't know about the meeting, he says, oh absolutely, 11:52 I tell you, it had to be somebody at the meeting, no doubt about it, what difference does it make? It's his opinion, which technically is inadmissible because he's not an expert.
MR. MRPPH: yes.
CHA RMAN Anyway. Mr. Kelly is right, Mr. Murphy. MR. MRPHY: I simply wanted to ask the question to witness to confirm, and he has, that he wasn't responsible.
CHAl RPERSON He wasn't responsible, but he has, indeed.

MR MRPH: Can I ask you then please to move on to 10264?

CHAI RMAN 10264. This is Mr. Cullen's letter.

MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHAN RMAN okay.
Q.

MR. MRPHY: will you confirm that Mr. Cullen wrote this letter on your instructions, which was to effectively raise an application $I$ think under the Data 11:53 Protection Act or the Freedom of Information Act, looking for minutes of these meetings which had taken place in Garda Headquarters, do you see that?
A. Yeah, I see that. Yeah.

286 Q.
And were you aware of the fact that, for example, it says:
"It appears that two recent meetings were convened in Garda HQ by Mr. Nugent to determine the possi bility of processing Garda Keogh's bull yi ng compl ai nt by way of what is known as a scoping exerci se onl y rather than in compl iance with the standard gri evance procedure."

Where did you and Mr. Cullen find out that information?
A. I presume he would have heard it from me, I presume.

287 Q. Where would you have heard it from?
A. I don't know. I don't know.

288 Q. You don't know. So you were aware of the detailed information about the scoping exercise proposed by Mr. Nugent but you don't know where you heard it from, is that fair?
A. Judge, I have given -- as I said yesterday, Judge, I had an awful lot of guards all over the country that I was in communication with and a lot of those guards
would have been in contact with other people and whatever. But I was -- I would have -- obviously I had a lot of information coming in to me, I would have evaluated it, some of it was false, some of it was true.

CHA RMAN Mr. Murphy is asking you where the source of that is and he is seeking you to tell him how you found out that piece of information, because Mr. cullen can only get it from you?
A. Yeah.

290 Q. CHA RMAN And you're saying well, sources and things, people?
A. If I just check my diary.

291 Q. CHAL RMAN okay.
A. Is the only thing, I think.

CHAN RMAN Have you a bit more to go?
MR MRPH: I have.
CHAN RMN That's all right. We will take a little break then. Just finish this one, first of all.
WTNESS: I don't know.
CHA RMAN I will take a wild guess and find there isn't an answer in your diary to say, got this information urgently from -- I don't mean to be f1ippant.
WTNESS: You're correct, Judge, I don't have it there. 11:55 CHA RMAN I am taking a wild guess. All right.
Thanks very much. So we will take a little break then and come back 12:10. Al1 right. Thank you.

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

MR. MRPHY: Garda Keogh, just coming back 10264 for the moment. Can I ask you to look at the third paragraph of Mr. Cullen's letter, which was written on the basis of your instructions, which says:
"The commi ssi oner was sufficiently informed of the agenda of such meetings that he absented himself due to 12:11 what he described as conflicts of interest. The Commissi oner further, however, then left his office manager at the meetings (thereby def eating the express purpose of his absence). It is clear in any event ther ef ore that the Commi ssi oner concurred in the agenda 12:11 of both meetings."

I have to ask you, who told you about the Commissioner leaving his office manager at the meetings?
A. I'm not sure if this was based on a letter where he had 12:11 sent us to say Joe Nugent would be dealing with all these matters.

293 Q. What letter was that?
A. I'm not sure. That's what I said, I'm not sure if that is what it refers to.
But you told us I think that you had given this information to Mr. Cullen and someone else had given this information to you?
A. I am presuming.
Q. Yes.
A. I think it's fair to presume that that is what happened.
Q. We know that any letters written by Mr. Nugent at that time would have been written to Mr. Cullen; isn't that right?
A. I don't know.
Q. So, just leaving that to one side. Can you explain to the Chairman how you came into possession of information in relation to the agenda of both meetings, 12:12 meetings that you weren't present at, meetings that weren't detailed in the newspaper, where did you get this information, please?
A. I don't know. I don't know. Because -- I don't know. In relation to -- I'm trying to think. You see, I
don't know about these meetings.
Q. You see, Garda Keogh, I have to suggest to you that's simply not credible. This is an important piece of information, your solicitor is writing to the Commissioner and you have been given this information by somebody, it's sufficiently important for it to be put in a letter and I suggest to you it's not credible that you can't tell the Chairman today who gave you that information?
A. No, what's not credible is -- Judge, I just can't -- I 12:13 haven't a note of where $I$ got the thing and I can't -this is back, what, three years saying, I can't remember.

299 Q. Garda Keogh --
A. To explain, Judge, there's the other two big investigations going on. This is just one strand of what's happening as well. So I can't actually remember everything. Because, as I said, I would have been in contact with a lot of guards in various places throughout the country. So, I mean, it could have been from any of those I may have heard it. We11, it has to be a very small number of people. It has to be, I suggest to you, it's likely to be someone at the meeting; isn't that right?
A. I'm sure it emanated from someone that was at the meeting but, but how $I$ heard it is a different thing.
Q. Well, is it the name of somebody you're trying to protect?
A. There's no protection in this. I have been upfront as far as I can go but I can't go into it could be this person, it could be that person.
A. I would accept that.

307 Q. And yet you had this information. I have to suggest to you it seems likely that it must have been from one of the people who was at the meeting?
MR. KELLY: Again, we're in the same realms of speculating.
CHA RMAN I understand. It's a slightly difficult one.

MR. KELLY: I wonder how it actually helps you in the end.
CHA RMAN He is asking who told you? That's what he's asking.

308 Q. MR. MRPHY: I am putting it forward as a question of creditability.
CHA RPERSON He is suggesting that is hiding the name. 12:15 That's what he is suggesting. I don't know if that's correct, $I$ don't know if it's important, I don't know if it's unimportant. But for what it's worth, it looks like a very specific information.

Let me just tell you the way it works. As I say, for what it is worth, important or otherwise, I don't know. It looks like a very specific piece of information. I can't understand how guards all over the country or any 12:16 guard in the country would be aware of this specific piece of information and able to tell it to you. That's number two.

Number three, it seems like the sort of thing that a person would remember. That's the way it looks. But how far that goes, how important that is. That's what Mr. Murphy is suggesting
A. I understand.

309 Q. CHAN RMAN He is suggesting that you are able to remember but don't want to remember, that you don't want to say. That's what he's suggesting. As I say, look, how important that is, I don't know. We will worry about that in due course. But that's really what the situation is, Mr. Murphy. We can all read it, we can all draw the inferences of the situation that you suggest, a small number of people, maybe there will be other argument about that, who knows, maybe there will be arguments that it got circulated or might have got -- whatever, I don't know about any of that. But 12:17 that is the situation at the moment.
A. Yes.

310 Q. CHA RMAN You say, look, I do not know who.
A. Judge, I have no note and I can't remember this, just
exactly who told me.
311 Q. CHA RMAN okay. As I say I'm trying to stay as neutral as I can and say I don't know what the importance of the issue is going to be or may turn out to be. okay.

MR. MRPHY: Can I suggest to you that it's likely that the person who gave this information to you was somebody who was friendly to you or you considered to be an ally?
A. I presume on the second term you would probably be correct. I would presume.

313 Q. That's a term you have used in your diary?
A. Yes, yeah, yeah. And I'm not disagreeing with that. I mean that would -- but as for who exactly it was that told me, I cannot remember.
314 Q. That kind of narrows the field, Garda Keogh, doesn't it, because it has to be an ally and it has to be somebody who is in the meeting. So, perhaps you will just tell the Chairman who in your circle of trust would fit into that category?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Chairman --
CHA RMAN Is that entirely fair, Mr. Murphy, as a way -- surely -- I mean, we have to be fair to everybody here.
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAK I will go back to something that Mr. Kelly said, I am anticipating that Mr. McGuinness may have concerns about. I wouldn't want to have a situation made where an allegation was made or induced where
there is no evidence.
MR MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMN Further challenges, cross-examinations of witnesses may take place, I have no problem about that, and further light may be thrown on this matter, to the extent that it's is relevant. But Mr. Kelly's objection about a discussion with the witness as to the likely source is really something calling for him to speculate, calling for him to draw an inference, calling for him to express an opinion, it seems to me. I don't think that's appropriate. I don't say it's an improper question but I think it's not an appropriate question and it is probably not a legally legitimate question in cross-examination.

So, I am going to close down on that. We can all in due course, as I say, to the extent that it's relevant, and then Mr. Kelly, Mr. McGuinness or Mr. Marrinan may make a submission about it, anybody else may make a submission about it and we will see where we are going. 12:20 Sorry to make a speech about that, but we will leave that where it is. okay.

MR. MRPHY: Chairman, could I explain, just for the avoidance of doubt, the purpose of my question is not to achieve the desired result which you have outlined, but rather to test the credibility of the witness in what he is saying to you. So in that sense it's a question as to credit.

CHA RMAN You have made a challenge to the
credibility of Garda Keogh to say, in respect of this particular item you have suggested that he's not being candid, he is not being truthful with the Tribunal.

MR. MRPHY: Yes. And that's as far as I put it.
CHA RMAN I understand.
WTNESS: Judge, can I respond to that?
CHA RMAN Yes.
WTNESS: Judge, I have been asked here earlier on in relation to the RTÉ thing.
CHA RMAN Yes.
WTNESS: I said it was me that spoke to John Burke in relation to that thing. In relation to yesterday's matter, the question to do with the Policing Authority, I said it was me that was behind it, that came from, emanated from me. Judge, I cannot remember this part. CHA RMAK I understand. But where we stand at the moment, you say I can't remember.

WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN I don't know. Mr. Murphy says on this specific topic he is suggesting that you're not telling 12:21 the truth about that.

WTNESS: I understand.
CHA RMAN That's where we stand at the moment. He's not suggesting that in respect of everything else or, indeed, in respect of anything else you are not being
truthful. He is suggesting you are wrong or your interpretation is wrong. Do you understand me.

WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN So at least that's my understanding of the
present situation. Until somebody suggests otherwise, that's what I am thinking. If Mr. Murphy at a later stage or anybody else says, because Garda Keogh was not candid about that, he mustn't be believed about something else. That's a different story and it would be very difficult for somebody to make that case if they hadn't actually suggested to you that you were lying about some other event. So, are you with me on this?

WTNESS: Oh, I am totally with you.
CHA RMAN okay.
WTNESS: I would have -- obvious7y I would -- I could presume, you know, where $I$ heard it from, but because I can't actually remember where, I cannot.
CHA RMAR Hold on. You don't have to test that any further. We know where we stand on that. I tried to say earlier, I said earlier what the importance of such conclusion is, is quite another day's work. Do you follow me?

WTNESS: Yes, Judge.
CHA RMAN Okay. That will be in a compartment and I will be waiting for somebody to demonstrate, to show the evidence, an evidential basis and secondly, to show the consequence. Do you follow me?
WTNESS: Yes, Judge.
CHA RMAN Anyway, that's where we stand on that, Mr. Murphy. Thank you very much.

315 Q. MR. MRPHY: The last question on this letter just relates not to a question of credibility but just as a
matter of fact. The second last paragraph, I think you will agree with me, Garda Keogh, is the letter from Mr. Cullen, repeated the questions asked previously, and it says:
"। address specifically to Cormíssioner Ó Cual ái $n$ onl y. We subnit for the reasons outlined that only the Cormi ssi oner can answer such questions."

So, would you agree with me that the last paragraph suggests that this freedom of information request and the questions raised in previous letters were all targeted at acting Commissioner ó Cualáin only?
A. Sorry.

All these questions were directed towards Commissioner ó Cualáin only?
A. That's the way it's worded.

CHA RMAN That is what it says, Mr. Murphy. MR. MRPH: Thank you.
A. I didn't draft this letter but it is a letter sent on my behalf.
CHAN RMAN Okay. We11, we all agree that's what it says.
317 Q. MR. MRPHY: I think you've indicated in other questions previously that part of your world view at that stage was to bring down Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin, isn't that right? In your earlier evidence.
A. Judge, I made reference to that while I was under the influence of the alcohol.

318 Q. Can I ask you please then to turn back to Volume 8, at page 2073 -- sorry, 2074.
CHA RMAN 2071, Mr. Murphy?
MR. MRPHY: 2074.
CHA RMAN 2074?
MR. MRPHY: Yes, please.
CHA RMAN Thank you.
319 Q. MR. MRPHY: This is Chief Superintendent Murray's statement. Can I put it to you that he will say that on 28th November 2017 he high1ighted his concerns to the Garda organisation because he felt at this stage that there was an orchestrated effort to prevent his promotion. He could see from the media and from the other reports that these all appeared to be part of an orchestrated effort to prevent his promotion.
A. He has said that, yes.

CHA RMAN He has said that. Yes..
320 Q. MR. MRPHY: In terms of his position, I suggest to you that the person who is responsible for orchestrating that was you?
A. The man who couldn't hold a pen and sign his own name! okay.

321 Q. When he wasn't drinking. So, in terms of the position, I suggest to you that you were orchestrating an effort, do you accept or reject that?
A. Judge, in the context of what $I$ said, prevent the promotion while the bullying and harassment thing is -I have said this so many times, Judge. It's still the thing. If they were going to do with the promotion, do
it legitimately. Do it the proper way. Not while there is this pending case and there's a serious complaint made against the superintendent. As I have given in evidence yesterday, there were persons in Garda management that appeared to be misleading the missing authority in relation to this promotion and there was a lot of skullduggery going on behind the scenes and I was trying to highlight the fact, I have a complaint here which should be investigated first and then we can do the promotion.

322 Q. Could I ask you to turn forward to page 2076, please? This is on 22nd December 2017. Just to put it to you again, Superintendent Murray's evidence will be that he received a phone call from Ms. Helen Hall of the CAO of the Policing Authority and he was informed that the Authority were again, for the second time, passing him over in the order of merit and promoting a person further down the list at number 9 .
A. I see that.

323 Q He will say that also he was informed for the first time the issues affecting his promotion were the complaints made by you?
A. okay.

324 Q. So you do accept that the complaints being made by you, in the pattern that we have been describing over the last three years, was having an effect; it was causing the Policing Authority to pass over Superintendent Murray, do you accept that?
A. Judge. I just answered this question. Look, the
answer I gave just a moment saying, Judge, is the same answer $I$ would give to this question again.
Q. Well, the question I'm asking is: Do you accept that it had an effect on the Policing Authority, what you were doing?
A. It appears, yes, to have had an effect.

326 Q. And in the course of that discussion he will say that that was the first time he was aware of this. Because he will also say --
A. Excuse me, aware that there was a complaint against him 12:28 and that he was under investigation?

327 Q. Aware of the fact that your campaign was ultimately having an effect on the Policing Authority?
A. Judge, I had already sent my complaint to the Policing Authority.

CHA RMAN Yes. I understand. Mr. Murphy, isn't that more a matter for the Policing Authority? Just let me say, I was thinking about something that arose yesterday or the day before. The question was: was it not an unfair procedure or unfair generally or
unreasonable for Garda Keogh to write to various people but not to include Superintendent Murray? That was the question.
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN It did occur to me afterwards, and I should mention this to you, that I don't see any obligation on him. He is protesting about an event, rightly or wrongly, and all questions on that are open, he is protesting about something and he writes in to the
authority, isn't it a matter for the Authority to behaviour in a fair and reasonable manner?

MR. MRPHY: oh yes.
CHA RMAN I mean the protestor can scarcely be criticised for not notifying the person against whom he 12:29 or she is complaining. But $I$ can see the point about the Authority receiving this may well have -- 1et's face it, those would be easy enough questions for any 7awyer.

MR. MRPHY: I agree, Chairman.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MRPHY: But I think my point in relation to unfairness generally applied also to the speeches in the Dáil.

CHA RMAN I understand.
MR. MRPHY: That's a matter for submissions.
CHAN RMAN You can say, listen, was that a bit much, was a bit unfair or whatever it is.

MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN But on a sort of procedural, legal basis, it 12:30 seemed to me that it's more for the Authority dealing with it. That's only a tentative view, Mr. Murphy, anybody can suggest otherwise.
MR. MRPHY: Perhaps I will can refer to that in submissions, Judge.
CHA RMAN Of course. Anyway there it is.
328 Q. MR. MRPHY: Can you please turn forward to page 2077?
On 29th January 2017, Superintendent Murray will say
that he received a call from the Policing Authority,
who informed him that there had been a meeting on the 26th January and that following that the Authority decided to promote Superintendent Murray and backdate that promotion to 26th October 2017. When did you find out about that decision?
A. Oh, I would imagine, it was day -- I know exactly, Judge, it was the day he was promoted. That was the day in January, $I$ found out on that day. I recollect that day very we11.

Judge, to point out here with all this conspiracy stuff, no one from the Policing Authority ringing me to inform me what's going on or what's happening. Like, they're in contact here with Superintendent Murray. But there's nobody from the Policing Authority, you know, informing me what's is going on. I just wanted to make that point.

CHAL RMAK Sorry, Mr. McGuinness, wants to say something.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes. Chairman, I should perhaps draw and the witnesses that the actions of the Policing Authority aren't in any way within the scope of the Tribunal. So there is no question of --
CHA RMAN There is no suggestion they behaved wrongly. 12:32 MR. MEGU NNESS: No.
CHA RMAN There is no imputation and they're not before the Tribunal.
MR. MEGU NESS: Exactly.

CHA RMAN Nobody has made a complaint that the Policing Authority didn't do its job and we're not getting into it.
MR. MGUU NESS: Indeed.
MR. MRPH: Absolutely, Chairman. My questions are
12:32 not directed towards the Authority, they are directed towards Garda Keogh.
CHAI RMAN Okay. What is your question, Mr. Murphy, how did he find out?
MR. MRPH: I asked Garda Keogh to confirm in his
answer when did he first find out and he has confirmed it was the same asked

CHA RMAN The same day. Yes, okay.
WTNESS: Judge, can I check my diary. I know it's January 2018, just exactly.
CHA RMAN By all means check your diary, yes.
WTNESS: Sorry, what was the date?
CHAI RMAN 29th January 2018.
MR MRPHY: In fact, Chairman, it's page 1337 in
volume 47. If that could be placed on the screen.
That is the entry. I think it's in the diary for the 30th.
WTNESS: So it's on the 30th, Judge, I found out that Superintendent Murray --
CHA RMAN okay.
330 Q. MR. MRPH: what you have recorded in your diary is:
"Pat Murray pronoted, backdated to October I ast."
A. Yes.

331 Q.

$$
\text { "Drank, first in } 19 \text { months." }
$$

A. First time, yeah.

332 Q. I think that follows the next few weeks as well. So, just briefly then, at this point Superintendent Murray is now Chief Superintendent Murray. Can I just make two further points by way of questioning, can I ask you to be shown 2910. Garda Keogh, I have to suggest to you that even after Superintendent Murray is promoted, Deputy Daly continues to refer to him in an adverse way. This is a reference which can be seen in the middle of the page, about five lines down, under her name, she said:
"It is a fact that the person who made the allegation is out sick and his seni or manager has been recently promoted despite being the centre of allegations of bullying and harassment."

Did you ask Deputy Daly to make that speech at that time?
A. I wouldn't have asked Deputy Daly to make the speech, but I definitely would have informed her what has happened. I see nothing wrong with --I think what she has said there appears to be very accurate.
333 Q. At 2925, please, Deputy Daly, again in the Dái1, asked a question relating to incidents which had occurred in
the Garda college and referred to the promotion of Superintendent Murray. Did you speak to her before she did that?
A. Judge, in relation to the Garda college instance, I know about that. Absolutely zero. I had nothing to do 12:35 with it, know nothing about it. I would have only spoken about my own stuff.

334 Q. So did you speak about Superintendent Murray to Deputy Daly in March of 2018?
A. I'm sure I would have. I'm sure I would have.

Were you aware that she was going to speak about Superintendent Murray in the Dáil?
A. Judge, in relation to that Templemore thing, as I said, that had nothing to do with me. I saw a newspaper article in the thing, I didn't even read it, I'm aware of something, but it has nothing to do with me and I don't know anything to do with it. And Deputy Daly never asked me.

CHA RMAN She never told you?
A. No, no, no, she never told me, I knew nothing about that. Nothing.

336 Q. CHA RMAK So that's something you knew nothing about?
A. Absolutely zero.

CHA RMAN okay.
337 Q. MR. MRPH: Just finally I think in relatio to
Superintendent Murray's statement, could I ask you please to go back to --
A. Sorry, just for clarification, $I$ don't have a note of a meeting with Deputies Wallace or Daly in March 2018. . 6 7
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CHA RMAK So the probability is that you didn't meet 12:37 them. I mean nothing is certain?
A. That's a probability, yeah.
Q. I think it's the case you make, you didn't note everything in your diary, isn't that right?
A. Well, I would have noted if I was going up to meet them.

CHA RMAK You think if he had met them, you probably would have made a diary entry?
A. I would have.
Q. CHA RMAN And you don't have a diary entry?
A. No.
Q. CHAL RMAN okay.
A. This is just surmising on what has cropped up is, some other issue has cropped up in relation to Templemore. They're already aware of my situation and what I had --
Q. CHA RMAN I understand.
A. I presume if they were bringing it up they'd roll them into together. But that's again only presumption from me.
Q. CHA RMAK I understand.
A. But, as I said, that other Templemore thing has nothing to do with me whatsoever.
Q. MR. MRPHY: Just finally on this part of Superintendent Murray's evidence, and this will relate 12:37 to evidence of Superintendent Minnock also, can I ask you please to turn to page 2079?
A. 20 --
Q. Sorry, in the first instance could I ask for volume 4,
page 708, volume 4 please.
CHA RMAN Volume 4, 708.
A. Okay. Judge, can I just ask, whose statement is this? CHA RMAN I have no idea. Is this Superintendent Murray's?

MR. MRPHY: Minnock.
CHA RMAN Superintendent Minnock's statement. Okay.
MR. MRPH: Superintendent Minnock wil1 say that on the 17th Ju7y of 2018 he received a call from Garda Greene who said he had been speaking to you and he said that you had been drunk and had been ranting on a bit. But also he said that you had been talking -- you told him that you were talking to Assistant Commissioner Fanning and that he was going to look after all of them. Is that what you said to Garda Greene?
A. I don't know what I said to Garda Greene, but that's definitely not true, that part is a hundred percent not true.

348 Q. Garda Greene, Inspector Minnock told him that -- he said that you had asked Garda Greene if he wanted to come on board and he'd look after him too. Did that conversation happen?
A. I can't speak in relation to what I may have told Garda Greene. As briefly I touched on yesterday, Judge, a lot of the stuff -- I was aware Garda Greene was spending a lot of time in the superintendent's office. So at that point I did use the word yesterday misinformation and that is a common police tactic.
A. Misinformation. Judge, the part in relation to -- I can't -- I'm not denying that $I$ would have said that to Garda Greene. But what I will say is, that part of me talking to Assistant Commissioner Fanning, I may have said that to Garda Greene but that did not happen. CHA RMAN Okay. So you may have said it to him?
A. Yes.

350 Q. CHA RMAN But if you did, it wasn't correct?
A. Yes, Judge.
A. Yeah, it could also have been -- it could have also been deliberate misinformation as we11. Because I was aware that he was running back with everything. So at that stage...
MR. MRPHY: Garda Greene told him that you said that you got a phone cal1 from the reporter John Mooney of the Sunday Times?
A. okay.

353 Q. Is that correct?
A. I would have been in contact with John. The first time 12:40 I was in contact with John Mooney was in September 2016, Judge.

354 Q. Had he phoned you and told you to stop drinking, to get your act together?
A. I think he did, Judge, on that part. Yes. I recollect 12:41 that actually.

355 Q. Yes.
A. He did actually. Judge, just for clarification, when John Mooney contacted me in September, it was in
relation to this issue of the report, which I have mentioned and won't go into, but he wrote articles based on a report that is not here. I again, obviously trying to find out from John Mooney what was going on, he knew a lot more than that I did in respect -- but over the time period, John Mooney and myself, it wasn't constantly Garda stuff we were talking about. $50 \%$ of any conversation I had with Mr. Mooney was in relation to wildife and environmental issues, because whatever way it came up, we had almost identical views on those, 12:42 so we had a kind of a rapport there. So, not every conversation -- not all of every conversation was to do with Guards. $50 \%$ would have been, Judge.
356 Q. MR. MRPH: Garda Green said that you said that all of this was going to come to a head soon. That Mr. Mooney $12: 42$ had told you all of this was going to come to a head soon and that you needed to be ready. What was that about?
A. I don't know. Well, I presume all this. I mean, I presume this. Is this it not coming to a head? You know. Just to clarify, to help, from the top of my head, can we go to page 11352, please?

Judge, these are notes from Deputy Commissioner Donal Ó Cualáin. This is a note he has made on Saturday, 1st 12:43 October 2016. Now, the relevance of that date is, it's on 2nd October 2016 John Mooney prints on front page of Sunday Times,
"I nquiry finds Garda colluded with drug deal er in the mid dl ands. "

It goes into some detail about the supply of heron in Laois, offaly, westmeath and Longford. Bear in mind, I 12:43 only made my complaint about the supplier of heroin in Athlone, Judge. The relevance of this, Judge, is "received call", this is Donal ó Cualáin's note, "Recei ved all from Cormi ssi oner", that being Nóirín
o'sullivan:
"Had tried her a few times earlier. Gave her update re Garda on Newstal $k$, as supplied Chi ef Superintendent Tony MELoughl in. Al so spoke about yesterday eveni ng's request fromJ ohn Mboney, Ti mes, re Athl one
whi stlebl owers. She said she was al ready aware of it and that AC [blanked out] had spoken with John Mboney."

Judge, firstly, it's a pity this sort of window for what was going on wasn't available for the last part, the last module of the Tribunal. But Commissioner Nóirín o'Sullivan is fully aware of what is going on in An Garda Síochána.
MR. MRPHY: Sorry, Garda Keogh -WTNESS: No, please.

I do object to this question. This is a section dealing with Superintendent Murray and for some reason the witness has decided to refer to something, which he has clearly prepared, which has nothing to do with the
issue at stake.
A. Judge, he --

CHA RMAN Hold on, are you talking about Judge Charleton's module?
A. I just said --

358 Q. CHA RMAN A question.
A. Yes, Judge.

359 Q. CHA RMAN A yes or no answer. Are you talking about Judge Charleton's module.
A. Yes, I made reference to that --

360 Q. CHA RMAN Is that what this is about?
A. No, no, he brought up the John Mooney thing. No, I am not.

361 Q. CHA RMAR It's okay. Sorry, you may say I want to refer back to it, but I am going to stop you, because we're not referring back to it. Judge Charleton did his business, he produced his report.
A. Yes.

362 Q. CHA RMAN End of.
A. Yeah.

363 Q. CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Now we're doing this one. I'm not interested, $I^{\prime \prime m}$ not permitted to get into it and I'm not going to allow anybody digging into it. So, your statement, it's a pity this wasn't available, we'11 forget that?
A. Yes, Judge. I apologise.

364 Q. CHA RMAN That's all right.
MR. MRPH: Thank you, Judge.
365 Q. CHA RMAN So we understand each other. That's is all
right. Now, what is the relevance of this to the question about -- where we were was, the conversation with Superintendent Minnock, who reported speaking to you, you said, I might have said that, I could have said that. But you say it's not correct, there could be a variety of reasons why it's not correct, one of them could be giving him false information and we can guess as to what the other might be. But however it might be, you say that information, although I may have given it to him, is not correct?
A. The part about Assistant Commissioner Fanning was not correct, Judge. That part is not correct.

366 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. The bit about Assistant Commissioner Fanning is not correct?
A. Yes.

367 Q. CHA RMAN Now, what am I to see about this one that relates to the conversation with Superintendent Minnock?
A. Yes, Judge.

368 Q. CHA RMAN In other words, how does this relate to that 12:47 question?
A. Because the Commissioner has already sent -- Mr. Murphy has brought up about my dealings with John Mooney. The Commissioner herself has already -- is already, it states here, aware from the other side what's going on in relation to Athlone whistleblowers.

[^0]It appears she had sent somebody out to speak with John Mooney.
CHAN RMAN It does appear.
MR. MRPHY: In 2016. The question I asked you related 12:47 to 2018, a completely different issue. So, for that reason, Chairman, I do object to this line of approach by the witness, who is effectively seeking to float matters which are not connected to the issue.
CHA RMAN Garda Keogh, help me on something.
A. Yes.

369 Q. CHA RMAN Mr. Murphy asks you about a conversation that is recorded as taking place on 17th July 2018?
A. Yes.

370 Q. CHA RMAN How is it relevant to what happened on 2nd October 2016?
A. We11, I was just making the point, Judge, that the number two, Donal Ó Cualáin, in the Guards, when he went to inform the Garda Commissioner, Nóirín O'Sullivan, she was already aware of it, she had
already taken preemptive action in relation to whatever was going on there, that she was fully in the know of what was going on in An Garda Síochána.
CHA RMAN Thank you very good. A11 right. Now, Mr. Murphy.
371 Q. MR. MRPHY: Chairman, that concludes my questions on this issue. There is one further issue, which is the issue which is at number 21, the complaints by Garda Keogh that the Disclosures Tribunal order was
deliberately withheld.
CHA RNAN Very good. Thank you very much.
MR. MRPHY: I think for that purpose, the primary
evidence here is in relation to --
CHA RMAN How long will you need on that, Mr. Murphy? It clearly won't finish in the next ten minutes.

MR. MRPHY: No, it won't be very long, I would prefer, if it was convenient to you, if we could break now. CHA RMAN Yes, I think that makes a lot of sense. MR. MRPH: I will try to keep it as short as I can. 12:49 CHA RMAN It takes what it takes. What can we do. we will resume at two o'clock or as close to it as we can. Thank you very much.

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

 FOLLOVG:CHAN RMAN Thank you, Mr. Murphy.
MR. MRPH: Thank you, Judge.
372 Q. Garda Keogh, good afternoon. Chairman, I am now moving 14:05 to deal with issue number 21, which is the service of the Tribunal Order, a complaint raised by Garda Keogh. For that purpose, could I ask if Garda Keogh could be given two volumes, and only two, volume 4 and volume 41, please? on the screen, Chairman, please, if we could have page 11488. Just before we begin, I wonder if you might be shown book 4, please, on page 692.

Garda Keogh, you raised a complaint in relation to this issue, and I just want to put to you what my clients' response will be. First of all, in relation to the facts of the case, will you look please at page 11488, volume 41, that is open for you. Just to run through these facts very quickly.
A. Yeah.

373 Q. First of a11, Superintendent Murray will say that he was aware that the preservation order was made by the Disclosures Tribunal on Monday, 20th February 2017. I think there is no dispute about that, is there? And then secondly, a copy of the Tribunal order, he will say, and an e-mail was received at Athlone district office on Tuesday, 28th February 2016 at 9:56am, requesting that all personnel in the district be notified of the Tribunal order. I think again there is no dispute between us about that.

He will say that on Friday, 3rd March 2017, an e-mail was sent to all members of the district advising them of the Tribunal order. I think at that stage you were off duty and had been for some time?
A. Yes.

374 Q. He will he say that on Friday, the 3rd March, correspondence was received by e-mail from the assistant commissioner of legal and compliance in Garda Headquarters, making a further request that in addition all staff who were absent from duty should be notified of the Tribunal's order. On the 6th March, he will say
that individual correspondence regarding the Tribunal's order was prepared for seven members, including yourself, who were absent from duty at the time.

If I can ask you to turn then, please, to Volume 4, at page 694. Superintendent Minnock will say in his evidence that he undertook to the PAM in the district that he would serve the order, the documentation on you, and on other gardaí who were present, who were assigned. Effectively a decision was made to allocate the responsibility to serve all of the seven guards who were off duty. He will say that he served the order at your house on Tuesday, 21st March 2017.
CHA RMAN where does he say that, Mr. Murphy?
MR. MRPHY: At the end of page 692, Chairman.
CHA RMAN 692. Hold on, wait until we get 692. Thank you very much. Now, at the bottom of this. Thanks, Peter.

MR. MRPHY: Chairman, if you see 21st March 2017. CHA RMAK I do, yes, thank you very much. "I served the order", yes, thank you.

375 Q. MR. MRPHY: And he will say, Garda Keogh, that having made a number of previous unsuccessful attempts to serve it, that he eventually successfully served it on the 21st March. He will say also, you're free to agree 14:09 or disagree with this, he will say that prior to serving it he rang you and it was agreed with you that he would leave the order in the post at your house?
A. That part is correct. Just the last, the last part you
said is the part I'd have an issue with. The previous just part.
Q. And I think thereafter following there was correspondence from your solicitor, Mr. Cullen, on 27th March 2017, he prepared a minute for the superintendent 14:10 in relation to the service of the order and that is one which is appendicised in that booklet. Would you please turn to page 759. If you would like to take a moment to read that, Garda Keogh.
A. Yes.

379 Q. So he will say that that minute reflects what he did and that effectively there was a service of the document on you at that time. He will also say that there was no intentional delay on his part or on the part of An Garda Síochána in serving the order and the documentation on you.
A. We probably be disagreeing on the last part there.

380 Q. But just to summarise it, you do agree that you received it?
A. Yes.

381 Q. You do agree that you were in touch with him beforehand?
A. Yes. Yeah, certain parts of this we're in agreement.

382 Q. And do you agree that you were familiar with the order at that time?
A. I knew there was -- all I knew was the statement or whatever had to be in by the 13th March, that was all I knew.

383 Q. Thank you.
A. And again, I don't even know how I knew that, I had become aware of that.

384 Q. Yes.
MR. MRPHY: Chairman, that concludes my cross-examination into that issue.

CHAN RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. MRPHY: Chairman, I had spoken to Mr. McGuinness, but with your permission, there are just a number of extra questions which $I$ have been asked to put by various clients we represent, they are very few in
number but they have just arisen from the evidence, in one case a witness who is not present, has not been present.
CHA RMAN So what are you asking for?
MR. MRPHY: With your permission I would like to just ask a number of questions of Garda Keogh on behalf of a number of my clients.

CHA RMAN Yes, I understand.
MR. MRPH: They are very short questions.

WTNESS: Is this in relation to the Tribunal order? Because I haven't got an opportunity --

CHA RMAN We11, sure we will see what happens.
WTNESS: A11 right.
CHA RMAN If you are embarrassed, if you know what I mean, if you are not ready to deal with them or you have any difficulty dealing with them, just mention them, we will come back to them again. All you knew was that your statement had to be in by?
A. The 13th March.

385 Q. CHA RMAN Right.
A. But the issue, the main issue is the service, the service of the order is where I's going, where I dispute, Judge.
386 Q. CHA RMAN Te11 me more about that.
A. Yes, Judge. I am in agreement, firstly, on the 20th March I received a text from Superintendent Minnock regarding post for me. That was at 8:43am. On the same date, at 17:04, I returned a call to Inspector Minnock. There was no answer. He had no voicemail set 14:13 up, I couldn't leave a message. But that part, I got the document on the 21st. Judge, Superintendent Minnock rang me on the 1st March.
387 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. He was asking me how are things or whatever.
A. Superintendent Minnock had my phone number.

389 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. He could have rang me at any stage in the interim,
between the 1st and the 20th, to say, by the way, I have an order to serve on you. This thing of calling up to the house and I'm not there and all the rest and they couldn't find me to serve the order, that's the part I'm in dispute with. They can find me, contact me 14:14 any time they want to relation to service.
390 Q. CHAI RMAN This is the order for the preservation of documents?
A. I think so.

391 Q. CHA RMAN what had that got to do with getting your statement in? Because the statement, you understood, had to be in by the 13th March?
A. Yes.

392 Q. CHA RMAN So this is do with the preservation of any materials, is that correct?
MR MRPH: Chairman, would it help if I give a reference to that document.
CHAN RMN: Thanks very much.
MR. MRPH: volume 41, at page 11468.
CHA RNAN 11468. We might as well just clear this up, 14:15 because I am confused about this and then we can go back. 11468. Okay. Now, here's an order. The order is dated -- just scroll down there, Peter, thank you very much.
MR. MRPH: It's 20th February 2017.
CHA RMAN 20th February '17. Happy about that?
A. Yes.

393 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. So this is the order that had to be served on every garda in Athlone?
A. I think in the country.

CHA RMAN okay. So that was served on you, do you agree, on the 21st March?
A. Yes. Maybe I have misread this whole argument here.
A. Yes.
Q. CHAN RMAN okay. It is served on you on the 21st March.
A. Yes, Judge.

399 Q. CHA RMAN Now, that's to te11 you to preserve any documents and materials you have?
A. Yes, Judge.
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN How does that fit in -- you see, I am understanding that you say, look, this happened in a way that made it difficult for me to get my statement in on time?
A. Yes, Judge.

402 Q. CHA RMAN Because you say, the time limit was 13th March 2017?
A. Yes, Judge.

CHA RMAN Doesn't matter whether you are right or wrong, just tell me your understanding of it?
A. My understanding was that the documentation had to be for the Tribunal for the 13th March. Judge, it wasn't served on me until -- I accept the initial contact was on the 20th March, it was served on the 21st. No issue with that part. My point is, Judge, Superintendent Minnock had my phone number, even if I wasn't there, he could have rang me..
Q. CHA RMAK He could have easily contacted you?
A. Yes, Judge.

406 Q. CHA RMAN Between?
A. The 1st and the 13th.

407 Q. CHA RMAN The 1st and the 13th. The first two weeks of March?
A. Yes, Judge.

408 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. Also Judge, even if there was a difficulty there, they would have known I was in contact with Garda Mick Quinn of the welfare service.

409 Q. CHA RMAN So they could have contacted him and got him to alert you?
A. Yes, Judge.

410 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. But here is what I am not understanding: How did this preservation document relate to putting in a statement? Did you understand
this document to be saying you have to get something in by the 13th March?
A. Yes, that's what I thought.

411 Q. CHA RMAN okay. So that was your understanding?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN We're not absolutely concerned at this moment whether that was right or wrong. But the fact is, whether it was the 20th March or the 23rd March, he had to get to you in sufficient time before the 13th March, not alone just to get there, but to make sure you had enough time to write out a statement; is that right?
A. Yes, Judge.

413 Q. CHAl RMAN That's your understanding?
A. Yes.

414 Q. CHAD RMAN It seems like a very short window of opportunity?
A. we11, Judge --

415 Q. CHAI RMAN Do you understand me? If you had a big complaint or I or anybody had a big complaint, only -that seems unlikely?
A. Judge, my point is: If they had this on, is it the 3rd March 2017 for service.
416 Q. CHA RPERSON Yes.
A. That still gives me ten days to get the notification in 14:18 to the Tribunal.
417 Q. CHA RMAN All right. Look, that was your understanding, be it right or wrong, that was your understanding of the situation?
A. That's the only part I'm disputing, is that basically they could have got to me, served that.

418 Q. CHA RMAN They could have got to you between the 1st and -- sorry between the 3 rd and -- we11, they'd have to give you a bit of time, between the 3rd and the 10th, let's say, that week?
A. Yeah.

## 419 Q. CHAI RMAN okay.

A. Yes, Judge.

MR. KELLY: Chairman, can I just say at this stage, that this was something that Mr. McGuinness had dealt with on day one and day two.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: If I may say so, dealt with it very
clearly. Because I think that there was up until that time a misunderstanding, from what $I$ can see in the documents everybody appeared to think it -- perhaps it's a reflection of the order, perhaps it may not have been read as carefully as it should have been. CHA RMAN Well, we couldn't possibly say that, Mr. Kelly.
MR. KELLY: By all concerned.
CHA RMAN We couldn't possibly say that. Anyway. It may have been less than crystal clear.
MR. KELLY: No, it's not the fault of the order. All
I'm saying is, that I think it was a misunderstanding. It probably added to the aggravation experienced by Garda Keogh at the time. I am quite clear having looked at it, what the order says. Mr. McGuinness, I
think as I said at the time, on the first or second day, whenever it was, that clearly he was right in the way in which he is interpreting, it related to preservation of documents.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: And not --
CHA RMAN It's perhaps understandable that somebody who was uneasy about what had transpired up to then might look on this with a somewhat suspicious mind.
MR KELLY: Yes. It's quite clear that the
misunderstanding went a little wider, because there's other correspondence that it was accepted that there was a delay in, and so on. But my point is, I wonder really whether we have to go there. Because on the face of it, to me the order is clear.

CHA RMAN Yes, I understand.
MR. KELLY: It was misunderstood in another way.
CHA RMAN So you're happy to leave that one. I think Garda Keogh is happy to leave that one and say, look, whatever it means, it means. If we have to decide whether there was anything, so to speak, negligent, reckless or malicious, we can revisit that in due course, but we don't need to worry ourselves with it at the moment.

MR. KELLY: That's my personal view.
CHA RMAN If I may say so, Mr. Ke11y, I certainly endorse that view.

MR. MRPHY: Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN And you are happy with that, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MRPHY: Yes. Mr. Kelly's intervention is most helpful. In the light of that intervention, I don't think I need to ask any questions arising from your questions.
CHA RMAN The other questions that you wanted to ask, that Garda Keogh may or may not be comprehensively ready to answer, is that right, you have a few other questions.
MR. MRPHY: I have, Chairman.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MRPHY: I will try and make them as clear as possible, I think the witness should be able to deal with them and if he's not --

CHAN RMAN Absolutely. If you're not -- now, we're going back, that is the end of that part.
WTNESS: Yes, Judge.
CHA RMAN We're now going back over a few items, because particular witnesses are going to say $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}, \mathrm{Z}$ and it's on7y proper, as I am understanding, for Mr. Murphy to say, look, I better alert you to this. But if you have any difficulty, you just let me know. A11 right? okay.
MR. MRPHY: Thank you, Chairman. Garda Keogh, the first series of questions I'm going to ask are just on behalf of Chief Superintendent Mark Curran, they relate 14:22 to evidence which was given by you in relation to the question of Pulse. If you could be given Volume 3, page 486, please? This raises the issue concerning the check on Pulse of your private motor vehicle on the

13/9/2014. This is a statement of Sergeant white, Garda white, I should say, dated 25th March 2019. Do you see this?
A. Yes.

421 Q. I just want to put it to you that what he will say on the basis of the statement is that he was the person who made access to Pulse, do you see in the course of the statement, he said:
"It would appear fromthe redacted exhi bits that I
recei ved that I have been requested to clarify my checking of Garda Ni ck Keogh's private vehi cle on the Garda Pul se system on the 13th September and 1st Oct ober 2016. "

He will say he doesn't recall specifically checking your vehicle on an occasion, that it would not be normal to check vehicles. But going through the process of the materials, he says:
"I don't recall if Nick Keogh's vehi cles was one of those checks but the Pul se entries would indi cate that it may have been."

He goes on to say:
"I amat a loss to expl ai n why I checked Garda Nick Keogh's vehicle a few times in a short period of time."

So that will be his evidence.
A. Yes.
Q. Just on behalf of Chief Superintendent Mark Curran, I have to suggest to you that it is clear from Garda White's evidence that it was Garda white who carried out that action, not Chief Superintendent Curran?
A. Just on that, Judge, there's no real issue with the checking of the car, the problem is, the reason on Pulse as to why the car was checked states caller to super's office. That was the -- Judge, even as part of 14:24 the Finn investigation, that was part of the thing, $I$ wanted to out who was the caller.

CHA RMAN That is correct. It said "caller to superintendent's office" didn't it?
423 Q. MR. MRPH: The position is that Chief Superintendent 14:24 Curran says that as the chief superintendent he was not involved in that?

CHA RMAN He was not involved in that?
MR. MRPHY: Not involved.
CHAN RPERSON Okay. That's what he's going to say.
A. I have no issue with that. But, Judge, somebody called to the superintendent's office and we still don't know who it was.

CHA RMAN So it would so appear.
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN No doubt somebody can ask Garda white if he knows anything about it or whoever knows anything about it.
A. I think he says he can't recollect.

MR. MRPHY: Now, also I think if you can be shown Volume 1, page 42, 1ine 604. Do you see at line 604, this is your statement to the Tribunal investigators and you said:
"I bel ieve that Superintendent Pat Murray targeted me in this regard with the acqui escence of Chi ef Superintendent Mark Curran."

Can I just put it to you on behalf of both of those witnesses, they will say that that is incorrect and, in particular, they will say that in their statements they both indicated by the time --
A. I agree that part can't be correct. that is incorrect and that both of them said in their statements to the Tribunal that up to that particular date, which is I think the third quarter of -- sorry, up to that particular date that's relevant to that issue, that they had not met and they had not spoken? CHAN RMAN He agrees it's wrong.
MR. MRPHY: Yes.

427 Q. MR. MRPHY: You agree that's wrong?

## A. Sorry?

428 Q. I am putting it to you that any suggestion that they
acquiesced --
CHA RMAN He said he agreed that part can't be correct.

MR. MRPHY: Can't be correct, very good.
CHA RMAN That's what you said.
A. Yes, it is.

429 Q. CHA RMAN You're happy with that?
A. It can't be.

CHA RMAN We will move on to the next one I think, Mr. Murphy.
MR. MRPHY: That's very helpful.
430 Q. The next question relates to Assistant Commissioner Anne Marie McMahon. They relate to evidence which you gave at Day 100, beginning at pages 68, 1ine 23.
CHA RMAN Line 23, okay: And the question,
Mr. Murphy?
431 Q. MR. MRPHY: Now, in relation to the evidence which you gave throughout the course of that element of the Tribunal, an issue arose as to whether Assistant Commissioner McMahon was aware that Olivia O'Neill had made allegations in respect of Garda A and Ms. B. And the point that she wishes to make clear is that she was unaware that olivia o'Neill had made allegations in respect of Garda A and Ms. B. Do you agree with that? CHA RMAN I am bafffed, Mr. Murphy, I confess.
MR. MRPHY: The witness has expressed surprise that Assistant Commissioner McMahon appears to be unaware that Olivia O'Neill had made allegations in respect of Garda A and Ms. B.

CHA RMAN But I am at a loss to know the context. I mean, you can put to him, there is no problem putting to Garda Keogh that he has got it wrong about Assistant Commissioner McMahon.

MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN If only we knew what was it was about, if you know what I mean. Okay, the question is whether Assistant Commissioner McMahon knew or didn't know, was aware or wasn't aware that Olivia O'Neill had made references, aspersions on Garda A, is that correct?

432 Q. MR. MRPHY: I think position is, Garda Keogh, can deal with this, in your evidence $I$ think you said that you found it incredible any suggestion that Assistant Commissioner McMahon was unaware of any allegations you made in respect of Garda A and Ms. B.
A. Yes.

433 Q. What she will say is that she was clearly aware of your allegations in respect of Garda $A$ and Ms. B and those allegations were part of the backdrop to the investigation which she conducted?
CHA RMAN Okay.
434 Q. MR. MRPHY: what she was not aware of was that 0livia O'Neill had made allegations in respect of Garda A and Ms. B?
A. Okay.

435 Q. So, just to clarify the position: She was aware in relation to the question --

CHA RMAN was the bit where we looked at a statement? MR. MRPHY: Yes.

CHA RMAN We agreed that it could have meant one thing and it could have meant and another. Do you remember that bit? As far as I'm concerned you were, in fairness to you, I think to you Garda Keogh you were saying look at the way this is written, that doesn't make sense and I find that impossible to believe. I think we discussed that and I said there was another way I thought of reading that, by separating the two phrases so to speak. We will leave that to be clarified in due course. Are we happy to leave that to 14:31 be clarified in due course?
A. Yes.

436 Q. CHA RMAN which is really a question as to what that statement made by Assistant Commissioner McMahon actually meant. okay.
A. Yes, Judge.

CHA RMAN A11 right.
437 Q. MR. MRPHY: And just as part of that clarification, she will also say that none of the material, the evidence that was made available to or obtained by her at discipline investigation made reference to Olivia O'Neill making allegations.

CHA RMAN So by way of confirmation of her proposition as to what she meant, she says it was referred to in another report.
A. Judge, yeah, in relation to this part, because this all emanates back to the criminal complaint, Judge, I know there's a confidential system and all that part but there were high level meetings in Garda management in
relation to this. There was the appointment of Assistant Commissioner Jack Nolan, again the assistant commissioner closest to retirement that was firstly appointed to that. Judge, there appears to be some sort of a breakdown in communications, whether it's I can't -- I couldn't say by accident. But there's some -- I don't know what went on there, but certainly if -CHA RMAN We're dealing with something simple at this point?
A. Right, Judge.

439 Q. CHA RMAN All the evidence has to be given and we can worry about all that. But as far as I am concerned, I am listening to Mr. Murphy and he is confirming on his instructions from Commissioner McMahon that she meant one of the meanings that we were considering in that single line of the statement and she says something else. She says, I am clear that that's correct. Now I don't know whether this is right or not, but she says, I am clear that that's correct because I said it somewhere else. Do you understand?
A. Yes, I do understand, yeah.

440 Q. CHA RMAN That's what she says. He just wants to alert to you that?
A. Yes.

441 Q. CHA RMAN There's not really much to comment on?
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
442 Q. MR. MRPHY: The second point I would like to clarify
with you as well, on behalf of Assistant Commissioner McMahon, the second point, please, I would like to clarify, you may recall in the course of your evidence where you suggested that she should have arrested people, do you remember that?

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MRPH: Yes. what she will say in her evidence is, and she would just like to bring this clearly to your attention, to make you aware of the fact that there is no power of arrest contained in the Garda Síochána discipline regulation.

CHA RMAN That's what you made clear. I think you put that to him.

MR. MRPHY: I ask him to just to clarify that point.
In those circumstances that such a mechanism wasn't available to her in that type of investigation.

CHA RMAN I think you put that.
A. Yes, Judge.

CHA RMAN I thought you put that to him. Was that not discussed?
A. It was, Judge, and I made the issue that that relates to the Ms. B statement of admission. That was sat on, appears to have been sat on for five months and then handed over then to Detective Inspector Coppinger in Galway.

443 Q. CHA RMAN I know you fee1 you have to bat it out of the field. Hold on. I didn't miss that point either. But on this one, rightly or wrongly, I think unnecessarily, but I don't mean to be rude either to

Assistant Commissioner McMahon or Mr. Murphy, I thought we were over that ground, that it was a disciplinary investigation, not a criminal investigation and thus and I have one or two questions about that, which I will ask in due course.

MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN But we don't have to get into them at the moment.
MR. MRPHY: Chairman, what I had not put was that there was no specific power of arrest under the discipline regulations.

CHA RMAN That's what I understood, that is what I thought was the situation.
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN Maybe it was explicitly put but I was certainly understanding that. okay.

MR. MRPHY: The third point --
444 Q. CHA RMAN Hold on a second. You want to come back on that.
A. One thing, just for clarification, with the Guards often the lowest hanging fruit is the one that hangs for something. Again, Judge, this is a high level thing, where it's assistant commissioners and deputy commissioners and commissioners involved, and it's passed back to Detective Inspector Coppinger.
Therefore, I think it's is unfair that any blame or anything should rest on his shoulders.

CHA RMAK Very good. Thank you very much. Now next point, Mr. Murphy.

445 Q. MR. MRPHY: The next one just relates to the statement made by Ms. B. Again, there seemed to be some suggestion in your evidence that that might not have been available to the criminal investigation team or to the team involved in the disciplinary investigation but 14:36 Assistant Commissioner McMahon will say that the contents of the statement of Ms. B were put to Garda A when he was interviewed by the discipline investigation in December of 2018. That will be her evidence.
CHA RMAN okay, very good.
MR. MRPH: Fourth point, I have just been asked to put it to you, were you aware of the fact that Superintendent Michael Lacey had made contact with your solicitor, Cullen \& Co., with a few to organising a meeting for the dual part of informing you of the current status of the disciplinary investigation and to clarify a number of matters, in the middle of 2018.
A. Can you give me a date, please?

447 Q. I don't have the specific date, I am just told it's the middle of 2018.
CHA RMAN Well, the bits we do know from this is Superintendent Lacey, is that right?
MR. MRPH: Yes, made contact with cullen \& Co., with a view to organising a meeting.
CHA RMAN And did a meeting take place?
MR. MRPHY: No, no, it didn't, no, to inform you of the current status of the discipline investigation and to clarify a number of points in the inquiry.
CHA RMAN Sorry, he made contact with Mr. Cullen's
office with a view, it was his intention that there would be a meeting when he would Garda Keogh/his solicitor to what was happening in the disciplinary investigation.
A. Judge, I'm not sure -- I don't think -- when I say I don't think I'm aware, just there's nothing springing to mind on this particular matter, Judge.

CHA RMAN Well, we will wait until that arises I think and then we' 11 maybe have to revisit, but at this moment, that all sounds very vague for Garda Keogh to try to deal with.

448 Q. MR. MRPHY: Very we11. Then the next question I have been asked to put is just to confirm that in relation to the meeting you had with Inspector Maher, that we referred to at an earlier stage, you were aware of the fact that he had worked previously for Assistant Commissioner Nolan.
A. I met Inspector Maher with Superintendent Lacey in Portlaoise. I can't even think of the year, Judge, but $I$ made a statement to them in relation to it.

449 Q. You're aware of the fact, are you not, that he continued to work under Assistant Commissioner McMahon?
A. I'm aware now of that.

450 Q. Yes.
A. I wasn't aware.

CHA RMAN Yes. You said you didn't know who had taken over.

MR. MRPHY: Thank you.
CHA RMAN okay. That's it?

MR. MRPHY: Just one more, Chair. In fact, this is more a clarification, chairman, rather than a question for the witness. But just in terms of the issue that arose, Chairman, concerning the understanding that there had been a second regulation 30 , concerning motor tax issues, in the district.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MRPHY: You may recal1 there was a reference to a Garda Madden.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MRPHY: We tried to check out the background to that information and on my instructions it would appear that Sergeant Moylan's evidence will be that he didn't apply regulation 30 in fact in that case -- sorry, regulation 10 at that time, because of the facts of that case, it's my understanding that the evidence will indicate that --

CHA RMAN The facts were different, he's going to say. MR. MRPHY: The facts are that Garda Maher had two cars, one which he used in his farm. I am accepting for the purposes of this --

CHA RMAN Garda Keogh can't start dealing with that. The essential point is, it looked as if -- and I think the case was made, and the parties will make of this what they choose to make of it, it was suggested that Garda Keogh was not the only one who was the subject of a regulation 10 , caution, admonition, whatever one wants to call it. There was, in fact, another one and there was a specific one cited. And it now turns out
that there wasn't another one. That there was another case, but that it is said, and I am not suggesting otherwise, it is said that the facts were different and obviously a more lenient approach was justified.

MR MRPHY: yes.
CHA RMAN Parties can investigate that and explore it as they choose to do so. Okay. But we still have Garda Keogh -- hold on, you don't need to get into this. Thank you. I'm doing your work for you. The position is, he remains then, so to speak, the only person who had a regulation 10 because he didn't have the right tax.
MR MRPHY: That's right.
CHAD RMAN okay. Thank you very much. Now. WTNESS: Judge, I was just going to say that from recollection, that incident, the incident which is referred to with that other garda, I think from recollection that was about seven months later anyway, roughly. Like it was months and months after.
CHAN RMAN Yes. But the suggestion was it also was a regulation 10 case, it looked as if it said what it said. Instead of which we now know it wasn't a regulation 10 case. Okay. Thank you very much.
MR. MRPH: Chairman, those are my questions.
CHA RMAN Now, Mr. McGuinness.

MR. MEGU NESS: Just to confirm, Chairman, that we obviously tried to trace that issue within the Athlone district, as to whether there was a copy of any such regulation 10 notice and it was confirmed that there
was none within the district, but our solicitor, diligently of course, he pursued the issue and retained a statement from Garda Madden, which is in volume 54.
CHAI RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. MEGU NESS: which outlines his position.
CHA RMAN Just in case anybody thought that Mr. Murphy or his clients were doing this out of the goodness of their heart, they're not, because the Tribunal's investigations have established that. which is not to make any aspersion on anybody but that is the situation. So credit where it's due. It doesn't go to Mr. Murphy's team, it goes to our team.
MR. MRPH: Yes. Although I should say on behalf of my clients, they did ultimately check the matter with Sergeant Moylan.
CHAI RMAN Thank you very much. Thanks,
Mr. McGuinness, for making that clear and giving us the opportunity to take a bit of credit. Where are we going next.
MR. MRPHY: Thank you, Chairman.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

MR. CARRQL: Sorry, Chairman.
CHA RNAN Mr. Carrol1, thank you very much. Sorry, I 14:42 was forgetting about this side of the house.
MR. CARROL: There was a matter that arose on
Wednesday, it's at Day 106, page 59, where Mr. Murphy was cross-examining Garda Keogh on an issue and he left
it rest as maybe an issue that would be better for me to deal with, representing Superintendent MCBrien.
CHAI RMAN yes.
MR. CARROL: Chairman, you said we could revisit it and said maybe it is appropriate for me to -CHA RMAN Well, revisit it, Mr. Carroll.
MR. CARRQL: It's really by way of clarification. CHA RMAN Could you move a tiny bit further, Mr. Carroll. You speak extremely clearly, which is very pleasant, and I think we can all hear. Just a tad away. Mostly I spend my time telling people to go closer to the microphone. Thank you.

GARDA N CHOLAS KEOGH WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. CARROLL, AS FOLLOWS:

451 Q. MR. CARROL: Once Garda Keogh can hear me as well. Garda Keogh, you recollect you were being cross-examined by Mr. Murphy, I think it was the wednesday of the last week we were here, in relation to 14:44 the issue of further statements being taken from Liam McHugh and further statements being taken from Ms. O'Neill. I just want to revisit that briefly with you, in order to put effectively what Superintendent MCBrien will say and to give you a chance to respond to 14:44 that.

You will recollect when I asked you questions there wasn't much at issue in terms of the notes. You had
looked at Superintendent MCBrien's notes, I think you had said they were very accurate. There wasn't much, I think I picked up one thing about being under pressure and we talked about that, but there is this other issue as well and there seems to be a difference between your note and her note of a particular meeting and it's just that, in this area. So I will put it in context, this area has been gone into by both Mr. McGuinness and Mr. Murphy, but just so you know where the sequence is, if I put it in context and I can be corrected if I am wrong.

If I deal first with Mr. McHugh. The position there was, just to summarise it, Garda Lyons had sent an e-mail to Sergeant Curley on 2nd June 2014, outlining events on 31st May 2014. That e-mail then was sent to Inspector Farre11, who was acting superintendent. The position was Superintendent McBrien was out of the jurisdiction on leave from the 18th May to the 5th June. She was away at that point. I don't think there 14:45 is any controversy about this, I am just putting the sequence of events.

I think then on the 3rd June we have an e-mail from Inspector Farre11, who we say was acting superintendent, to Chief Superintendent Curran. Then Superintendent McBrien, my client, returns to the station and starts to deal with matters. I think again, this is at 1197, we can jog our memory with it,
at that point Superintendent MCBrien sends a report to Sergeant Curley looking for a statement on Liam McHugh. we have seen that already. okay?
A. Yeah.

452 Q. Then it followed, if we just go on to 1205 , that was on $14: 46$ the 9th June. Then at 1205, we had this again I think earlier, this was a reminder from Superintendent MCBrien to Sergeant Curley:
"Has a statement been taken from Mr. Li am McHugh?"

Do you see that? It will jog your memory.
A. Yes.

453 Q. You no doubt have seen this before?
A. Yes.

454 Q. So she refers earlier, the 9th June.
"Has a statement been taken from Liam MEHugh? If a statement has not been taken, please outline attempts."

That was on the 23 rd June. Now, the issue where there is a difference, which you might be able to explain to the Tribunal, is you then meet Superintendent McBrien on the 8th July. You have already given evidence about this and we have a note, I think it's on 13264, your diary, you probably have the original in front of you
A. Yes.

455 Q. You have your note from that meeting of the 8th Ju7y, and you have:
"Met with superintendent, who informed me she is sending people out again to try get statements from O O Neill and L MH. "
A. Yes.

456 Q. That's Liam Mchugh. We'11 come back to Olivia o'Neill, I am just trying to deal with Mr. McHugh first. The position in relation to that then is, and she will say in evidence, and this is just to put it to you so you have an opportunity, that she didn't say she was going to send people out to get another statement from Liam McHugh. What happened actually is in her note, which is at 1100 , if we can get that up. I don't know, have you seen her notes, you may remember this or not. Unfortunately, I can't find a typed version of this? CHA RMAN It doesn't matter, don't mind that.
MR. CARROL: I don't think there is much at stake in it in terms of other information in it. I might just deal with it in this way and give you a chance to have a look at it. Initially she says she met with you, you were in good form. She then talks about stuff that has got nothing to do with this, it's something to do with a young saudi student and something to do with a murder, then she tells you about some colleagues from Bray, that she was at a do with one of the colleagues and somebody was asking you for you. Do you see that.
A. I'm listening.

457 Q. Okay.
A. When I read Superintendent McBrien's notes, Judge, they were very accurate.
458 Q. Yes. I will come to the -- she then mentions that you said you're going to the confidential recipient on the Monday, the Judge, and that you were going to mention Liam McHugh and Olivia O'Neill. Just bear with me. There may be a typed version of it, I will just check that. In any event, you had mentioned you were going to the confidential recipient, you were going to mention Liam McHugh and Olivia O'Neill to them. Then you go on to talk about Olivia O'Neill, I will come back to that in a minute. But just halfway through the notes, she writes:
"I di scussed Li am McHugh. I had requested a statement. 14:49 I had not got it yet."

So, if we just deal with that for a minute. If you turn to -- if document 1203 is got up on the screen, and we will come to the notes in a minute. 1203.
Because what happened was, and you wouldn't have known this at this time, you didn't have access to this, what happened was actually Sergeant Curley, this is Sergeant Curley's report, he actually only sent it the following day, after this meeting, on the 9th July. So you can see that there. If we go to the bottom of it, it should be signed by, yes, Detective Sergeant Curley.

So, the point $I$ am making is, at the point of the 8 th

July meeting, she hadn't got the report back from Sergeant Curley. The first attempt to get the statement from Mr. Liam McHugh, which she believes was the only attempt as far as she was aware, if you go back to the top of the page, sorry, was Garda Higgins had been tasked with going to get the statement and Mr. McHugh didn't make a statement. So the point is: On the 8th July meeting, she didn't know that attempt had failed, which was the first attempt. So it wouldn't make sense, I would suggest to you, that she would say I'm going to go out and send somebody out again, because she hadn't heard back that there was no statement. Do you understand?
A. I understand. And just by way of clarification, I think in some of those correspondence, when they came down, they had Olivia O'Neill and Liam McHugh in the same correspondence sheets.

459 Q. CHAL RMAN Yes.
A. It may well have been that it was sending out to olivia O'Neill the second attempt and I wrote down --

460 Q. MR. CARROLL: For both?
A. For both. It's possible.

461 Q. That may explain it. Also, there may be something else that explains it as well, which has come out in evidence and which may be relevant on this issue as wel1. Because if you go down to the next few lines, back in the notes, at 1100, when Superintendent McBrien, as I said, she discussed the Liam McHugh, I requested a statement, $I$ have not got it yet. She then
goes on to say she was considering asking Detective Sergeant MULCAHY and the Galway team to organise to take the thing on effectively, to keep everything impartial. And she says:
"He thought..."

That's you:
"....this was a good idea."

Then you go on to talk about trusting Detective Sergeant Curley.
"Wbul dn't mind if he took it."

Superintendent McBrien said:
"He has a connection with M. MEHugh, so it might be better to get somebody el se."

So the point was, and we know this was followed up by Superintendent McBrien because she then wrote on the 9th July, we don't need to go to that, it's in there, she wrote to Detective Super Mulcahy, asking, raising better for somebody else, maybe Detective Inspector Coppinger to interview him.

So the point was, two fronts: One, she hadn't heard back Sergeant Curley about Garda Higgins' attempt until the following day, and also, she was suggesting, and followed it up, to send this to the Galway team to look at. So it wouldn't make sense that she was saying to you, $I^{\prime m}$ sending people out again to get a statement. Do you understand?
A. I never ever accused Superintendent McBrien of being behind --

I'm not saying that. You see, in your note you said "she told me --" if we go back to the note, your own note. You said:
"She informed she is sending people out again to try and get statements fromO O N and L Mch."

CHAN RMAN Are you happy with that?
A. I am.

463 Q. CHA RMAN Does that explain what might have appeared to be a second attempt but what in fact was still only the first attempt?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Okay, very good. Thank you.
464 Q. MR. CARROLL Then to turn to Ms. O'Neill then. I
think again we don't need to go through the whole sequence of events, they have been gone through by both Mr. McGuinness and Mr. Murphy. We have seen a lot of the documents that led up to the issue, but we know that Garda Treacy had done a report. That had gone to

Inspector Farre11. It had then gone to Chief Superintendent Curran. This was in a period again in the May period, where Superintendent McBrien was on annual leave and out of the country. I think as matters progressed there, you became aware of the matter. I am just summarising the important parts. I think ultimately you did a report on the 15th June, isn't that right, about -- we can get that up, I think that was 1174 , to jog your memory. I think you had done -- at the bottom of that. I think Sergeant Haran had helped you. I think Superintendent McBrien had asked Sergeant Haran to get a report from you and then you sent it back to him?
A. Just for clarification, I absolutely also myself had brought to Detective Mulcahy's attention that -Detective superintendent, that, you know, look, this is going on and they're trying to say I'm rounding up these people to make the allegations, because they're linked maybe ye should look at it as well. I understand his point, it was valid also; we're investigating your stuff, not investigating you. I understand all that, Judge, yes.

CHA RMAN That was the point. MR. CARROL: To ask you questions completely out of context, just to confuse everybody, just to try put things into sequence, what was happening at that point. So we are leading up to the 8th July. I think in terms of -- if we go back to Superintendent McBrien's note on that. It's further down, it's actually page 1101.

It's the second page, the page we were just looking at and then -- actually, if we go back to the previous page, sorry, there was mention first of it? CHA RMAN At page 1100, that's right.
MR. CARROL: We will go back to what I skipped over. On the first page you said to her, you're meeting the Judge, the confidential recipient on Monday. You said, having begun to mention Liam McHugh and olivia o'Neill.
"He said that Oivia O Neill had called in to the station about a week ago."
okay, so that's a week, about a week before the 8th July.
"About her previ ous inci dent and that he had advi sed. .."

That's you.
"... himto go to GSOC. "
okay.
A. Yes.

467 Q. Then it goes on to talk about the Liam McHugh thing.
If we go to the next page, it returns to Olivia O'Neill.
"He sai d. .."

That's you:
"... Oi ivia O'Neill said she was approached several
times for a statement. I said l was aware she had been 14:57 approached once."

Okay? Then she goes on, Superintendent McBrien, to say you discussed these things and that they might require separate investigations. You said again that you were going to discuss them with the confidential recipient and she makes the note, it might be best to see what happens there. She goes on to say there might be a need for an investigation or whatever. And then she says:
"I will see how he gets on with the confidential reci pi ent on Mbnday, we will chat agai $n$ next week."

I think there was reference to Inspector Farre11.

So, you see again, I am just putting it to you so you have a chance, because Superintendent McBrien will give that evidence when she gives her evidence, that her recollection and her notes in relation to it, so you were telling her that Olivia o'Neill had come back in about a week before, that Olivia O'Neill had said she had been approached several times about her statements. In fact, if we go back to the your diary note on the

26th June, you have to your diary there, and this again may clarify things for the Tribunal. I think that's at 13262. This is the 26th June, if I'm correct. Do you have that there in front of you?
A. I am reading -- sorry I'm reading --

468 Q. Your note?
A. 26th June 2014.

469 Q. 26th June 2014, yes. It's at 13262. 13262.
A. Yes.

470 Q. You said:
" 5 : 30 Oivia $\mathbf{O}$ Neill calls to the station, asks to speak to me in private, stated Detective Sergeant Curley and T Hi ggi ns called to her house, then to her in another house to try to get her to make a statement about me, but ref used to make a statement on assault, i nformed her to go to GSOC. "

Okay. I'm not asking you to redeal with the contents of that. But it would appear when you spoke on the 8th July with my client, Superintendent McBrien, you said, and I will repeat again, on the first page of those notes:
"He said that $\mathrm{Ol}_{\mathrm{i}}$ via O Neill had called to the station about a week ago about a previ ous incident and that he had advi sed her to go to GSOC. "

That would seem to tally with the 26 th June that you
were talking about. Do you understand?
A. Yes.

We know that that event with Inspector Curley and Garda Higgins, that was the first time they went to get a statement and according to them it would appear, they say, the only time, where they went and she wasn't at home and they went to her brother's house. Do you understand?
A. I understand. The only thing I can say to that is, I just made a note of what Ms. O'Neill told me.

472 Q. CHAN RMAN As you best recollect, that's --
A. Yes.

473 Q. MR. CARROL: I suppose point, to get to the point, Superintendent McBrien will say that her notes or her recollection is that it wasn't that she had said I'm going to send somebody out to Olivia O'Neill, you had said that Olivia O'Neill had told you she had been approached several times. She didn't send anybody else out to Olivia O'Neill and as far as she was aware, as she said in her notes, she recollects and her notes say:
"I said l was aware she had onl y been approached once."

So that the Curley/Higgins approach, if you like, and that was the only time she was approached. I suppose that's what her evidence will be and it's to give you a chance to --

474 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. So Superintendent McBrien is going to
say whatever happened or didn't happen, I didn't send the two out is second time.
A. Yes.

475 Q. CHA RMAN If I am understanding, you say, I don't know how many times anybody went to anybody, I took a note of what I understood olivia O'Neill said?
A. Yes.
Q. CHAl RMAN Maybe she misspoke, maybe she was correct, who knows. That's what you say.
A. Maybe reading the note, maybe there's -- I see called to one house and then to another house, maybe she meant that as the second. I don't know, I just took the note, Judge. It's again back 2014.
CHA RMAN That's what you say, look, here's the best note I took. He's not contradicting that, he's simply saying that's what it says. Okay.
477 Q. MR. CARROL: But in terms of the accuracy of Superintendent McBrien then, you'd accept that then in terms of this part, that it was olivia o'Neill that had told you several times or you picked it up that way and 15:02 you had given that information to Superintendent McBrien?
A. Sorry, just can you repeat just that last part there now?

478 Q Just in terms of what we are dealing with, where Superintendent McBrien records that you had told her Olivia o'Neill had said she was approached several times, that was your -- that's an accurate recollection now when I put matters to you, or can you say?
A. Several times --

CHA RMAN You thought Olivia O'Neill meant that she was approached more than once by the two officers looking for a statement about you?
A. As a result of the conversation with Ms. O'Neill, that was my perception.

CHA RMAR You understood from Ms. O'Neill that that's what she meant?
A. Yes.

480 Q. MR. CARROL: So again, can I --
CHA RMAN And that's what you said to Superintendent McBrien?
A. To Superintendent McBrien, yes.

481 Q. CHAN RMAN So what she says is correct?
A. I don't disagree with it, Judge, so far, I don't think.

482 Q. MR. CARROL: In terms then, what I am saying in terms, I am just trying to clarify, she will say she didn't say I'm sending -- Superintendent McBrien didn't say to you, I'm now sending out more people to get a statement from Olivia O'Neill, she says she didn't say that. Do you accept that now?
A. Judge, can I go back to my note for a second on this?

483 Q. Yes, of course.
A. Is this the 26th June?

484 Q. Yes. No, the 8th July?
A. Okay. Again, Judge, I think here is something similar to the Olivia O'Neill, Garda Stephanie Treacy and myself interaction, where it's just worded -- I mean, I don't --
Q. CHA RMAR Tell me what you say in your 8th July note.
A. What I have said on the 8th July is:
"Thursday 9pm met with superintendent, who informed me she is sending people out again to try to get st at ements from Oi via O' Neill and Li am McHugh. "

So it's a perception.
Q. CHA RMAK I understand.
A. Like, whatever they --

487 Q. CHA RMAN If she says she didn't send anybody out and didn't intend to send anybody out for a second time?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN Do you accept that?
A. I would, Judge. Then, because there's both olivia

O'Neill and Liam McHugh and because there was interviewing about --
489 Q. CHA RMAN I can see the room for confusion.
A. Yes, both together, and the correspondence was coming down with both their names together as well.

490 Q. CHA RMAN which wasn't helpful. Okay. okay Mr. Carroll.

MR. CARROL: I think that clarifies the matter. CHA RMAN Thank you very much. That's most helpful.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RPERSON Now I have Mr. Kane. Mr. Kane, who are you for?

MR. KANE: Thank you, Chairperson. I am for a number of guards. Insofar as it's relevant to the questions I want to ask, I want to ask the witness about Garda Fergal Greene, please.
CHA RMAN Right. Will we take a break at this point, Mr. Kane?

MR. KANE: I need three minutes at most, Judge. CHA RMAN Three minutes and then we will take a break, all right. We will give you three minutes, we might give you three and a half, Mr. Kane.

MR. KANE: Thank you, Chairman.

GARDA N CHOLAS KEOGH WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. KANE, AS FOLLOVG:

491 Q. MR. KANE: Good afternoon, Garda Keogh. I want to take you back to your first day of cross-examination with Mr. Murphy, it was Day 105. I ask please that the Tribunal opens that for you and goes to page 99, please. I want to refer you please to line 352 , do you see that, Garda Keogh.
A. 352 , yes.

492 Q. Here you give evidence as to the circumstances in which you obtained a DVD, do you recal1 that and see it, Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.

493 Q. In relation to that, Garda Greene will see that he was not assisting you with your complaints but rather, you asked him for this DVD through the storage procedure
and he released it to you in full compliance with the storage procedure?
A. That's correct, yes.

494 Q. Thank you. I ask, Judge, that page 101 of the same document or the same transcript is opened please. Can 15:07 I bring you please to line 357? Here you were asked was Garda Greene a friend of yours?"

You go on to say:
"Yes."

Then you are asked:
"In rel ation to what you were seeking to do?"

And you said:
"Yes, seeking to expose criminality. I mean, yes."

Garda Greene will say that he was not assisting you in your efforts to expose criminality.
A. If Garda Greene wishes to say that, I can't dispute -I'm not -- like...
495 Q. Very good. Finally, Garda Keogh, can I ask you to move 15:07 down to the next line, please, line 359 , you were asked:
"Di d he..."

That's Garda Greene:
"... meet with Deputy hallace and Deputy Daly."

And you say:
"No, I don't thi nk so."

For the avoidance of doubt, Garda Greene will say he never met with those deputies?
A. I have said no.

496 Q. You have, in fairness to you. To the extent that there was any possible doubt about that, I wanted to just put that to you?
A. That reminds me of an incident, a thing that cropped up, I can't remember which day, Judge, to do with Deputy John McGuinness.
497 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. I was asked about that. That was -- yeah, like, just for clarification again, $I$ had never spoken, have never spoken to John McGuinness. I'm aware now what that was about. Garda wilson, he was speaking to Deputy McGuinness in relation to other matters. It was I think -- that was how he cropped up into it. some enquiry or query or something like that but nothing came of it.
A. Nothing came of it.

499 Q. CHA RMAN Is that right? You didn't actually respond or meet him or whatever it was?
A. No, no, no.

500 Q. CHA RMAN Nobody is suggesting that he did anything wrong or anything?
A. No, no, no.

501 Q. CHA RMAN But he made some query, is that correct?
A. That was it, yeah.

502 Q. CHAL RMAN He doesn't feature in our investigation?
A. No, no.

503 Q. CHA RMAN You just wanted to make that clear?
A. That's all, yes.

504 Q. CHA RMAN That's what I understood to be the situation. As I say, nobody was saying that Deputy McGuinness did anything wrong, but that whatever it was, there was a query but nothing came of it?
A. That's correct, Judge.

505 Q. CHA RMAN Happy with that?
A. Yes.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Very good. So now --
MR. CARROLL: Sorry, Chairman.
CHAN RMAN Yes, Mr. Kane. Who is speaking?
MR. CARROL: Can I give a page reference.
CHA RMAN Mr. Carrol1, sorry, you're are back.
MR. CARROLL: Just to give a page reference.
Superintendent McBrien's notes are typed on 1770.

CHA RMAN That's most helpfu1. Thank you very much. 1770.

MR. CARROL: 1770 are the typed version for the note of the 8th July. Sorry, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Thank you. No, no, don't apologise at a11, Mr. Carrol1, that is most helpful. 1770. Thank you very much. So, right, that completes your cross-examination. Next -- wel1, we will be taking a break anyway. I'm in your hands, Mr. Kelly, as to whether you would prefer to get started now. I have no 15:10 idea whether you want to give an estimate as to how long you will take or what is the most convenient. Clearly in everybody's interest, $I$ want to do the fairest and most reasonable thing. I don't expect you to jump into the frame at 3:15 and I think in fairness to Garda Keogh, he has been really on stage, you know, intensively for quite sometime now.

So, what do you think, Mr. Kelly? I will do whatever you want.

MR. KELLY: Thank you very much, Chairman. I am acutely aware of the fact that Garda Keogh has been in now for what, three weeks. I don't want to keep him there as long as --
CHA RMAN We11, you have to do your job.
MR. KELLY: I have to do my job. I know there's practical stuff, $I$ will just get straight to the point. I certain7y be the whole of tomorrow, I may well be the whole of Monday.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: That's doing the best.
CHA RMAN So what would you prefer to do? Do you think it's fair and reasonable -- Garda Keogh, would you prefer to start up with Mr. Kelly tomorrow or would 15:11 you prefer to get cracking at it this afternoon? I am completely indifferent. I will do what Mr. Kelly asks. MR. KELLY: I think it would be better to go home and get a nights sleep and we will start in the morning.

CHA RMAN Very good. Thanks very much. That's what 15:11 we will do. Okay. We will make more progress that way than we will any other way.

MR. KELLY: Absolutely. I will probably be about two days. Look, it's almost impossible to say, it depends how it goes. I will react to what is happening. CHA RMAN Don't feel under pressure, Mr. Kelly. MR. KELLY: Yes.

CHA RMAK The last thing we want is anybody to be under pressure. It's better to be thorough. We always knew that Garda Keogh was going to be a very long witness, we always knew, there is a lot of material to cover and so on. We want to be as fair as possible to everybody. okay.

MR. KELLY: Thanks very much, Chairman.
CHAN RMAN Thank you.

THE HEARI NG THEN ADI OURNED UNTI L FRI DAY, 8TH NOVEMBER 2019 AT 10: 30AM


| TH [1] - 143:27 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:17 } \\ & \text { accurate [6] - 49:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:17 } \\ & \text { advising [2] - 62:24, } \\ & 96: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { allegations [13] - } \\ & 45: 21,46: 14,63: 12, \\ & 85: 19,111: 21 . \end{aligned}$ | application [1] - 67:5 <br> applied ${ }_{[1]}-82: 13$ <br> apply ${ }_{[1]}$ - 119:14 <br> appoint [4]-10:12, <br> 18:28, 50:8, 50:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:2, 135:28 } \\ & \text { accused [1] - 129:8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Affairs [1] - 11:14 } \\ & \text { affecting [2] - 59:24, } \\ & 80: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 111:23, 111:28 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 9[3]-3: 6,23: 23, \\ & 80: 18 \end{aligned}$ | accused [1] - 129:8 <br> achieve [1] - 75:25 |  | 112:14, 112:1 |  |
|  |  |  | 112:19, 112:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:28, 50:8, 50:10 } \\ & \text { appointed }[11]-7: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { acquiesced [1] - } \\ & \text { 111:1 } \end{aligned}$ | 80:21 | 113:22, 130:18 <br> allocate [1] - 97:10 | 16:12, 18:22, 22:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80:18 } \\ & 9 / 7 / 2017[1]-37: 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | aforementioned [1] - |  | $43: 19,47: 9,47: 16$ |
| 99 [1] - 138:19 | 111:1 <br> acquiescence [1] - | 59:12 | allow [1] - 92:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 14,50: 4,61: 2 \\ & 114: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 9902 [2]-49:28, | 110:10 | afternoon | ally [2] - 74:9, 74:17 <br> almost [2] - 90:10 |  |
| 49:29 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Act }[6]-27: 26,28: 6, \\ 32: 29,62: 26,67: 6 \end{gathered}$ | $95: 20,138: 16,143: 6$ |  | appointment [2] - |
| 9:56am [1] - 96:14 <br> 9pm [2]-25:5, 137:4 |  |  | $143: 14$ | $14: 20,114: 1$ <br> appraised [1] - 22:27 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 32: 29,62: 26,67: 6 \\ \text { act }[1]-89: 24 \end{gathered}$ | 81:25 |  |  |
| 9pm.. [1] - 25:27 | ACT [2] - 1:3, 1:8 acting $[7]-7: 20,8: 7$, |  | $\text { AMENDED }_{[1]}-1: 9$ | appreciated [1] - |
| 9th [8]-45:3, 45:17 |  | 69:10, 69:15, 70:10 | amicable [1] - 62:28 |  |
| 46:6, 46:9, 124:6, | $27: 26,44: 11,78: 13$ | agent [1] - 60:13 | amounted [1] - 62:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40:12 } \\ & \text { appreciates [3] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $124: 16,126: 25$,$128: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:17, 123:25 } \\ & \text { ACTING [2]-3:7, } \\ & 3: 13 \\ & \text { action [9]-1:27, } \\ & \text { 17:26, 19:13, 19:18, } \end{aligned}$ | aggravated | AN [1] - 3:2analysing [1] - 18:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:10, 33:21, 33:29 } \\ & \text { approach [5] - } 34: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 17,32: 23 \\ & \text { aggravation [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  | analysis [1] - 51:14 | $55: 10,94: 7,120: 4$ |
|  |  | 105:27 | $\begin{gathered} \text { AND [6] - 1:3, 1:4, } \\ 1: 8,3: 15,69: 1,95: 15 \end{gathered}$ | approached [8] - |
|  |  | ago [5] |  |  |
| able [11] - 26:9, 27:8, | $39: 7,49: 2,58: 4$$94: 21,109: 6$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 58:11, 131:11, 133:26 } \\ \text { agree [39]-9:17, } \end{gathered}$ | ANDREW [2] - 2:22,$4: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:4, 132:6, 132:28, } \\ & 134: 18,134: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| 27:9, 29:23, 47:24, |  |  |  |  |
| 47:25, 58:24, 73:7, <br> 73:15, 107:12, 124:22 | 94:21, 109:6 | 18:7, 18:14, 18:1 | Anne [1] - 111:13 | 134:26, 135:27, 136:3 appropriate [3] - |
|  | 10:7, 10:8, 38:22, | 19:18, 19:21, 19:2 |  |  |
| above-named [1] - | 83:22 | 20:26, 22:25, 37:15 | annual [1] - 130:4 | $\begin{gathered} 75: 11,75: 12,122: 5 \\ \text { area }[3]-55: 19, \end{gathered}$ |
| 1:26 absence [2] - 36.4 | acutely [1] - 142:22added [1] - 105:27 | 37:20, 39:8, 41: |  |  |
|  |  | 41:13, 41:18, 43:7 | answer [10] - 31:3, | $123: 7,123: 8$ |
| absence [2]-36:4, 48:4 | added [1] - 105:27 <br> addition [1] - 96:27 | 44:9, 45:25, 46: | 33:5, 68:22, 78:8, | areas [3]-7:7, |
| 48:4 absence) [1] - 69:14 | addition [1] - 96:27 <br> address [3] - 6:14, | 48:7, 56:10, 61:7 | 81:1, 81:2, 84:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 18,62: 5 \\ & \text { arena }[1]-34: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| absence) [1]-69:14 <br> absent [2]-96:28, | $39: 12,78: 6$ <br> addressed [4] - | 64:9, 66:4, 66:9, 72:8, |  |  |
| 97:3 |  | $78: 2,78: 10,78: 22$ | 92:8, 100:20, 107:7 | arena [1]-34:13 argument [2] - |
| absented [1] - 69:10 absolutely [13] - | $21: 25,36: 23,39: 27,$ | 82:10, 97:25, 98:2 | 39:18, 80:29 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 73:23, 102:8 } \\ & \text { arguments [1] } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $63: 9$ <br> addressees [1] - | 99:2, 99:5, 102: | answering [1] - 20:8 |  |
| 34:7, 34:8, 54:9, |  | 110:17, 110:27 | ANTHONY [1] - 3:6 | 73:24 ${ }^{\text {arise [1]-8.24 }}$ |
| 56:25, 66:7, 66:15 | $9: 17$ | agreed [13] - 10:12, | anticipating [1] - | arise [1] - 8:24 |
| 84:5, 86:5, 86:23, |  |  | 74:27 | arisen [1] - 99:21 |
| 104:6, 107:14 | 40:26 | 10:25, 10:29, 11:19 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { anyway [10]-33:2, } \\ 33: 28,49: 19,51: 23, \end{array}$ | arising [2] - 10:7, |
| 130:14, 143:13 | addressing [1] | 16:29, 17:24, 18:21 |  |  |
| AC [4]-22:23, 25:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:16 } \\ & \text { adhere [2]-52:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 41:26, 42:25, 43:4 | 33:28, 49:19, 51:23, 66:21, 77:26, 82:26, | 107:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91:17, 93:29 } \\ & \text { accept }[18]-11: 23, \end{aligned}$ |  | 97:27, 111:2, 113:1 | $105: 23,120: 18,142: 9$ | 56:6, 81:18, 111:19, |
|  | 53:7 | agreeing [1] - 43:5 | apart [1] - 56:8 |  |
| $19: 4,19: 27,54: 12$ | ADJOURNED [3] - |  | apologies [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ARRAN }_{[1]}-2: 24 \\ & \text { arrange }[1]-60: 28 \\ & \text { arrest [2] }-115: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| $54: 15,63: 24,65: 19$ | 69:1, 95:15, 143:27 <br> administration [2] - | $100: 16$agrees [2] - 66:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 28,60: 14 \\ & \text { apologise }[2]- \\ & \text { 92:26, 142:5 } \\ & \text { apparent }[1]-61: 15 \\ & \text { APPEAL }[2]-1: 13, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 65: 24,72: 11,79: 25 \\ & 80: 24,80: 28, ~ 81: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $6: 27,7: 7$ <br> ADMINISTRATIVE |  |  |  |
| 103:8, 110:2, 135:18, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AGSI }_{[1]}-4: 1 \\ & \text { AIDAN }_{[2]}-3: 9,4: 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:10 } \\ & \text { arrested [1] - 115:4 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:21, 137:14 } \\ & \text { accepted }[2]-59: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\text { [1] }-3: 14$ |  |  |  |
|  | administrative [2] - |  | 2:3 article [6]-64:21, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:12 } \\ & \text { accepting }[2]-21: 7, \end{aligned}$ | 6:29, $57: 19$admission [1] - | AISLING [2]-2:11, |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 21 \\ & \text { Alan }[1]-9: 18 \\ & \text { ALAN }[2]-3: 9,3: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 50:9, 94:4 | 66:13, 86:15 <br> articles [1] - 90:2 |
| $119: 20$ | 11 |  | 109:24, 119:1 |  |
| access [2] - 108:7 | a |  | $\text { 133:20, } 134$ | AS [8]-1:9, 6:1, 6:2, |
| 126:22 | 119:2 | ALAN [2] - 3:9, 3:13 | APPEARANCES ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 6:5, 69:1, 95:15, |
| accident [1] - 114:6 | adverse [1] - 85:12 | alert [3]-103:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2:1 } \\ & \quad \text { appeared }[6]-9: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 122: 15,138: 13 \\ & \text { aspect [2] - 12:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | advise [2] - 28:7 | ALISON [1] - 3:26 |  |  |
| $35: 28,134: 5$accordingl | 28:11 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:9, 79:14, 80:5, } \\ & \text { 105:17, 129:19 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:15 } \\ & \text { aspects [2] - } 8: 19, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | advis | $\begin{gathered} \text { allegation [4]- } \\ \text { 12:26, 48:26. 74:29. } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| 22:13 | 47:15, 133:27advised.. [1] - | 12:26, 48:26, 74:29, | appendicised [1] -98:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:27 } \\ & \text { aspersion [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 85:1 |  |  |




| 39:3, 40:25, 54:11, | 24:8, 25:7, 27:1, | comprehensively [1] | CONNAUGHT ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 93:17, 94:12, 136:5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56:27, 57:8, 69:14, | 33:14, 34:22, 44:11, | - 107:6 | 3:32 | coordinate [1] - |
| 101:20, 105:24, | 54:1, 54:21, 55:12, | computer [1] - 26:11 | connected [2] - 56:7, | 18:13 |
| 105:28, 106:10, | 56:4, 56:13, 56:28, | computers [2] - | 94:9 | coordinative [1] - |
| 106:15, 107:11, | 57:9, 57:23, 57:29, | 26:10, 27:3 | connection [2] - | 42:10 |
| 109:4, 111:2 | 58:7, 58:16, 59:3, | concern [3] - 13:6, | 34:4, 128:19 | copied [2]-25:16, |
| 114:18, 114:20, | 59:27, 60:7, 60:9, | 14:19, 17:3 | CONNELLAN ${ }^{2}$ ] - | 26:2 |
| 115:12, 121:17, | 60:12, 63:10, 69:12, | concerned [7] - | 3:30, 3:30 | copies [1] - 57:3 |
| 141:11 | 69:15, 69:18, 70:20, | 20:23, 66:13, 102:4, | CONOR [1] - 3:24 | COPPINGER [1] - |
| clearly [10] - 17:25, | 78:6, 78:8, 78:13, | 104:6, 105:22, 113:3, | conscious [1] - 8:27 |  |
| 32:16, 91:29, 95:6, | 78:15, 78:26, 88:13, | 114:13 | consequence [1] - | Coppinger [3] - |
| 105:15, 106:2, | 89:4, 90:24, 91:9, | concerning [5] - | 77:24 | 115:24, 116:25, |
| 112:17, 115:8, 122:9, | 91:21, 93:11, 93:13, | 22:12, 52:5, 107:28, | consideration [1] - | 128:28 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:13 } \\ & \text { click [2] - 30:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 93:22, 93:24, 94:19, } \\ & \text { 111:12, 111:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:4, 119:5 } \\ & \text { concerns }[2]-74: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 25 \\ & \text { considered }[3]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { copy [11]-27:6, } \\ \text { 27:11, 27:13, 37:23, } \end{gathered}$ |
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| pity [2]-91:19, | 118:19 | prevent[3]-79:12, | 79:15, 79:27, 79:29, | 115:12, 115:17, |
| 92:24 | portrayed [1] - 13:20 | 79:15, 79:26 | 80:6, 80:10, 80:21, | 115:19, 116:9, |
| PLACE ${ }_{[1]}-4: 5$ | position [16]-6:16, | previous [14]-8:19, | 83:4, 86:1 | 116:15, 117:7, |
| place [12] - 6:13, | 7:2, 9:6, 9:12, 34:9, | 8:27, 13:14, 44:22 | promotions [1] - | 117:12, 118:13, |
| 7:14, 10:26, 27:12, | 34:11, 79:18, 79:23, | 54:17, 54:26, 63:10, | 51:3 | 122:24, 123:7, |
| 42:1, 48:22, 51:21, | 109:15, 112:11, | 78:12, 97:23, 98:1, | promptly [1] - 22:26 | 123:10, 125:10, |
| 59:15, 67:8, 75:4, | 112:26, 120:10, | 131:2, 131:16, 133:26 | proper [2]-80:1, | 130:25, 135:29, |
| $94: 13,117: 25$ | 121:5, 123:13, | previously [4] - | $107: 19$ | $140: 14$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { placed [2] - 36:2 } \\ & 84: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 123: pos | $26: 25,78: 3,78: 25$ 118:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { propose [2] - 6:1 } \\ & 41: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $20: 10,39: 6,39: 15$ |
| places [2]-36:2 | 70:9 | primary [1] - 95:3 | proposed [5] - | 58:3, 58:17, 72:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 71:27 } \\ & \text { plan [2]-28:11, } \end{aligned}$ | possibility [1] | print [1]-26:28 | 10:17, 10:27, 58:4 | 103:29, 110:29, |
|  | 67:14 | printed [6]-25:16, | 58:7, 67:24 | 112:2, 123:21, 132:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:13 } \\ & \text { plannina [1]-28:12 } \end{aligned}$ | possible [9]-31:3, $36 \cdot 20,36 \cdot 21,60: 27$ | 26:2, 26:8, 26:12, | proposing [1] - $58: 18$ | Q |
| nning [1] - 28:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 36 \\ & 62 \end{aligned}$ | $26: 13,27:!$ | 58:18 | Q |
| pleasant [1] - 122:10 | 127:22, 140:14 | prints [1] - 90:27 | 113:23 | quarter [1] - 110:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PO [1] - } 24: 24 \\ & \text { pocket }[5]-25 \text { : } \end{aligned}$ | 143:22 possibly [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { private [3]-107:29, } \\ & 108: 12,133: 13 \end{aligned}$ | protect [1]-71:17 <br> protected [2] - | QUAY [2] - 2:24, |
| 26:3, 26:16, 26:18, | $105: 20,105: 23$ | privilege [1] - 59:24 | $14: 19,54: 3$ | queried [2] - 51:28, |
| $27: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { post [2] - 97:28, } \\ & \text { 100:18 } \end{aligned}$ | privileged [1] - 59:16 | PROTECTED [2] - | 54:18 |
| $11: 26,23: 20,40: 4$ | power [2] - 115:10, | $87: 10,87: 12$ | protection [1] - | queries [2]-8:24, |
| 41:21, 42:20, 42:21, | 116:10 | problem [5] - 18:26, | 71:18 | query [3] - 140:27, |
| 42:26, 43:6, 51:17, | practical [1] - 142:27 | $53: 24,75: 4,109: 8$ | Protection [1] - 67:6 | 141:7, 141:16 |
| 54:5, 55:29, 56:9, | practice [1] - 37:22 <br> preclude [1] - 18:20 | 112:2 | protesting [2] - <br> 81.27 81.29 | querying [1] - 54:29 |
| $65: 11,66: 6,71: 15$ | preemptive [1] | $49: 18,49: 20,50: 1$ | protestor [1] - 82: | Querying [1] - 55:5 |
| 82:6, 82:12, 83:11, | 94:21 | 56:19, 56:21 | provide [1] - 43:11 | $50: 6$ |
| 83:17, 85:7, 88:27, | prefer [5] - 95:7, | procedural [1] | provided [7] - 36:13, | questioning [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 94:17, 103:10, } \\ & \text { 104:22, 106:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:10, 143:3, 143:5, } \\ & 143: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 82:20 } \\ \text { proc } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 15,36: 19,37: 10 \\ & 45: 20,46: 13,63: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 85:9 |
| 111:22, 114:10, | 143:6 prepared [3] - 91:29, | 67:17, 81:20, 138:29, | 45:20, 46:13, 63:12 provoke [1] - 43:27 | questions [26] - |
| 114:29, 115:2, | $97: 2,98: 15$ | 139:2 | public [5]-24:27, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:10, 20:10, 35:6, } \\ & 36: 24,78: 3,78: 8, \end{aligned}$ |
| 115:14, 115:27, | present [7] - 54:2, | procedures [1] - | $24: 28,33: 24,34: 13$ | $78: 12,78: 15,78: 25,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:17, 116:29, } \\ & \text { 117:11, 119:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 3,70: 11,77: 1 \\ & 97: 9,99: 22,99: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 63:16 | $65: 12$ | 81:28, 82:8, 84:5, |
| 123:20, 124:1, | 97:9, 99:22, 99:23 preservation [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { proceed [3] - 10:17, } \\ & 51: 29,52: 23 \end{aligned}$ | publicly [1] - 34:14 | 94:26, 99:19, 99:26, |
| 126:29, 127:7, | 96:9, 101:7, 101:14, | process [5] - 16:14, | Pulse [16]-26:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 29,107: 3,107: 4 \\ & 107: 5,107: 8,107: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| 128:22, 129:1, | 103:28, 106:4 | 16:20, 56:15, 57:1, | $26: 8,26: 10,27: 3,$ | $116: 4,120: 24$ |
| 130:20, 130:23, | preserve [1] - 102:17 | 108:19 | 27:9, 27:20, 28:8, | $122: 28,130: 24,138: 2$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 130: 26,134: 13 \\ & 138: 5,142: 27 \end{aligned}$ | PRESIDENT [2] - | processing [1] - | 28:26, 29:21, 34:6, | quickly [1] - 96:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 138:5, 142:27 } \\ & \text { points [9] }-6: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1:13, } 2: 3 \\ & \text { press }[4]-26: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:15 } \\ & \text { produced }[1]-92: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:27, 107:29, } \\ & \text { 108:7, 108:13, } \end{aligned}$ | QUINN [1] - 3:10 |
| 7:13, 12:24, 17:26, | 37:24, 38:16, 43:11 | programme | $108: 22,109: 9$ | $61: 13,103: 22$ |
| 41:10, 43:26, 54:1, | Press [1] - 36:23 | 35:29 | purpose [4]-69:14, | quite [4] - 77:18, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 85:9, 117:28 } \\ & \text { police }[1]-88: 28 \\ & \text { policies }[2]-16: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pressure }[5]-39: 16, \\ & 50: 21,123: 3,143: 16, \\ & 143: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { progress [5] - 11:16, } \\ & 42: 11,48: 4,59: 3 \\ & 143: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 24,95: 3,95: 23 \\ & \text { purposes [1] - } \\ & 119: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:28, 106:10, } \\ & 142: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
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| Policing [14]-7:23, | $13: 17,13: 28,16: 8$ | $130: 5$ | put [41] - 11:19, |  |
| 51:4, 76:13, 80:15, | 25:22, 37:11, 66:5, | promote [1] - 83:3 | 17:24, 21:8, 26:17, |  |



| ```42:10, 97:11 responsible [4] - 38:21, 66:24, 66:25, 79:19 rest [5] - 17:23, 38:27, 101:3, 116:27, 122:1 result [3] - 13:21,``` | S | 14:13, 17:16, 17:20, | sentence [2]-15:10, | SHANKEY-SMITH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 19:13, 21:27, 22 | [1] - 132 | SHANNON ${ }_{[1]}-2: 13$ |
|  | safe [1] - 33:27 | 23:14, 24:6, 27:7 | , | share ${ }_{[1]}$ - 59:11 |
|  | ety $[1]-62: 25$ | 27:8, 28:3, 28:20 | 113:8 | EAHAN ${ }_{[1]}-3$ |
|  | id.. [1] - 131:29 | 28:23, 29:25, 30:1 | September [10] |  |
|  | ${ }_{[1]}-4$ | 31:6, 31:19, 31:23 | 40:28, 41:13, 41:14, | ELLEY ${ }_{[1]}-3:$ |
|  | [ [2] - 115:22 | 35:26, 36:14, 36:2 | 4, 45:17, 46: | - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 75: 25,136: 5 \\ & \text { resume }_{[1]}-95: 12 \\ & \text { RESUMED }_{[3]}-6: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 115 | 38:18, 39:1, 40:2 | 46:9, 89:21, 89:2 | ort [4] - 95:10 |
|  | turday [1] - 90:25 | 41:5, 42:14, 44:2 | 108:13 | 99:29, 104:16, 108:28 |
|  | audi [1] - 125:24 | 44:23, 45:16, 45:28 | quence [7] - 6 : | shortly [1] - 42 |
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|  | 11] | 51:16, 54:4, 54:5, | rgeant ${ }_{[1]}-9: 2$ | 33:26, 77:22, 77:23 |
| 3:6, 3:7, 3:7, 3:11, | 2:10, 2:16, 2:21, 2:28, | 55:15, 55:17, 55:1 | rgeant ${ }_{[18]}$ | showing [2] - 38:5 |
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|  | 4:4 | 57:6, 58:2, 62:27 | :13, 121:1 | shown [7] - 6:8, 9:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:3 } \\ & \text { returned }{ }_{[1]}-100: 19 \\ & \text { returns }[2]-123: 27, \end{aligned}$ | Scanlan [1] - 13:5 | 67:8, 67:9, 70:15 | 123:15, 124:2, 124:8, | 21:22, 35:20, 85:10, |
|  | SCANLAN ${ }_{[1]}-3: 8$ | 70:17, 71:12, 75:20 | 6:23, 126:27, | $95: 27,110: 4$ |
|  | nlon [1] - 49:15 | 79:13, 80:19, 81:2 | 7:2, 128:2, 128:13, | shows [2]-18:1 |
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|  | pe [1] - 83:23 | 110:5, 124:12, | 3:12, 3:20, 4:2, 4:3, | side [5] - 10:4, 62:16, |
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| right-hand [1] - 10:4 rightly [2]-81:27, | 52:13, 58:12, 67:16, | 129:10, 132:1 | series [2] - 36:23, | sign [1]-79:21 |
|  | 67:24 | 135:10, 137:1 | 107:24 | signed ${ }_{[1]}$ - 126:27 |
| 115:28 | reen [4] - 61:18 | 138:21, 138:24 | \| 80:2 | significant $[1]$ - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ringing }[1]-83: 12 \\ & \text { rise }[1]-44: 20 \end{aligned}$ | scroll [2] - 23:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 138:27 } \\ & \text { seek }[2]-39: 7,42: 11 \end{aligned}$ | seriously [1] - 72:4 | similar [3] - 27:1, |
| ROAD ${ }_{[1]}-2: 18$ <br> robberies [1]-32:10 <br> robbery $[11]-28: 18$, | 101:23 |  | serve [6] - 97:8, | $47: 21,136: 26$ |
|  | SEAN $[4]-1: 12, ~ 2: 2, ~$ $2.22,3: 17$ | $\text { 39:11, 68:7, } 94$ | 97:11, 97:24, 98:3 | simple [5] - 26:28, |
|  | 2:22, 3:17 | $139: 15,139: 19$ | served [9] - 97:12, | $30: 7,30: 22,43: 2,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 32: 8,32: 9,32: 12, \\ & 32: 15,32: 19,32: 21, \\ & 32: 23,33: 4,33: 5 \end{aligned}$ | arch [1] - $28: 22$ | eem [1] - 133:29 | $97: 20,97: 24,101: 29$ | simply [3] - 66:? |
|  | cond [39] - 10:15, | gment $[1]$ - 52:2 | 102:6, 102:14, 103:8, | 70:18, 135: |
| Roche [2]-49:16,49:27 | 15:6, 15:8, 18:2, 22:6, | send $[10]$ - 39:13 | 103:9, 105:2 | 114: |
|  | 31:17, 35:14, 35:16, | 56:22, 125:12 | service [10]-41:27, | EEAD [1] - 4:4 |
| role [1] - 7:27 | 36:25, 44:22, 44:24 | 127:11, 129:4, | 61:4, 95:21, 98:16 | NéAD [1] - 2 |
| roll [1] - 87:18 | 45:6, 45:13, 45:28, | 134:16, 134:18 | 98:22, 100:12 | situation [15] - 14:8, |
|  | 46:3, 55:19, 55:23, | 135:1, 137:11, 137:12 | 100:13, 101: | 39:8, 57:22, 66:1 |
| room [2]-33:25, | 56:1, 58:5, 58:19 | sending $[7]$ - 125:3 | 103:23, 104:23 | 66:14, $73: 20,73: 21$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:18 } \\ & \text { roughly }[4]-11: 9, \end{aligned}$ | 62:3, 65:27, 74:10 | 127:19, 129:6 | Services [1]-1:24 | $3: 26,74: 28,77:$ |
|  | 78:1, 80:16, 102:9 |  | ervices [2]-10:21 | $87: 16,104: 29,$ |
| $23: 8,51: 2,120: 19$$\text { rounding }{ }_{[1]} \text { - }$ | 102:10, 106:1 |  | 29 | $116: 13,121: 1$ |
|  | 114:29, 115:2 |  | ERVICES ${ }_{[1]}-1: 29$ | 141:14 |
| 130:17 | 116:18, 119:5, |  | serving [2]-97:27, | $\operatorname{sixth}_{[1]}-12: 2$ |
| RTÉ [6] - 35:21, | 127:20, 129:20, | 33:17, 41:17, 85:18 | 98:25 | skipped ${ }_{[1]}$ - 131:5 |
| 36:13, 37:10, 37:20 | 131:1, 135:2, 135:12, |  | [1] - 100:20 | skullduggery [1] - |
| 76:9 | 136:22, 137:12 |  | ts [1] - 63:21 | 80:7 |
| RTÉ's [1] - 35:28 | secondly [2] - 77:23, | 62:12, 75:27, 95:9, | seven [4]-41:9, | sleep [1] - 143:9 |
| Ruane [2] - 9:19,10:22 | 96: | 113:6, 127:10, 129:5 | 97:2, 97:11, 120:1 | light ${ }_{[1]}$ - 38:18 |
|  | section [1] - 91:26 |  | several [7] - 98:3 | $\text { ightly [1] - } 7$ |
| rude ${ }_{[1]}-115: 29$run $_{[1]}-96.5$ | Section [5]-27:25, | 15.3, 16.25, 18:2 | 132:4, 132:28, | small [3]-71:21, |
|  | 28:5, 44:14, 44:17, |  | 134:18, 135 | $72: 9,73: 22$ |
| running ${ }_{[1]}-89: 13$ | 44: | $21,78: 20,81: 14$, | 135:27, 136:1 | $\text { SMITH }_{[1]}-3: 21$ |
| RYAN [2] - 1:12, $2: 2$ | see [94]-9:15, 9:23, |  | ual $[1]$ - 63:17 | HFIELD ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
|  | 9:28, 10:6, 10:13, |  | HANE [1] - 3:23 |  |
|  | 10:20, 11:27, 14:2, | 126:24, 130:13 | SHANKEY ${ }_{[1]}$ - 3:21 | smuggled [2] - |


| 25:17, 26:3 <br> sneaked [1]-26:17 <br> SOLE [1] - 2:2 <br> solicitor [29]-8:5, <br> 10:16, 10:22, 12:29, <br> 14:9, 15:4, 15:20, <br> 15:28, 16:3, 37:17, <br> 39:10, 39:27, 40:4, <br> 40:16, 41:15, 42:16, <br> 47:20, 48:2, 48:12, <br> 48:20, 58:21, 59:19, <br> 62:24, 62:27, 70:19, <br> 98:14, 117:14, 118:3, <br> 121:1 <br> SOLICITOR ${ }_{[1]}-2: 8$ <br> SOLICITOR'S [1] - <br> 3:27 <br> SOLICITORS [5] - <br> 2:11, 2:18, 2:23, 2:30, 4:5 <br> solicitors [1] - 14:4 <br> someone [7]-16:20, <br> 18:28, 26:19, 69:27, <br> 71:9, 71:22, 71:24 <br> sometime [1] - <br> 142:17 <br> somewhat [1] - <br> 106:9 <br> somewhere [5] - <br> 24:9, 43:16, 51:4, <br> 58:12, 114:21 <br> soon [2] - 90:15, <br> 90:17 <br> Sorry [1] - 45:6 <br> sorry [57]-9:4, 9:5, <br> 9:8, 9:22, 13:25, 15:6, <br> 15:23, 15:24, 19:14, <br> 23:16, 24:18, 27:19, <br> 27:29, 30:3, 30:26, <br> 36:18, 36:28, 37:4, <br> 40:9, 45:6, 45:12, <br> 45:28, 48:10, 49:4, <br> 49:11, 50:27, 53:1, <br> 54:25, 55:20, 55:25, <br> 55:26, 55:28, 75:21, <br> 78:14, 79:2, 83:18, <br> 84:17, 86:28, 87:29, <br> 88:29, 91:24, 92:14, <br> 102:10, 105:4, <br> 110:21, 110:28, <br> 117:29, 119:14, <br> 121:24, 121:25, <br> 127:5, 131:3, 133:5, <br> 135:23, 141:24, <br> 141:27, 142:4 <br> sort [5] - 13:20, <br> 73:10, 82:20, 91:19, <br> 114:5 <br> sought [1] - 42:22 <br> sound [1] - 26:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sounds }[2]-26: 5, \\ & \text { 118:10 } \\ & \text { source }[2]-68: 6, \\ & 75: 8 \\ & \text { sources }[1]-68: 11 \\ & \text { speaking }[5]-39: 11, \\ & \text { 88:10, } 93: 3,140: 23, \\ & 141: 25 \\ & \text { specific }[8]-21: 20, \\ & 72: 29,73: 4,73: 6, \\ & 76: 20,116: 10, \\ & 117: 19,119: 29 \\ & \text { specifically }[4] \text { - } \\ & \text { 29:24, } 40: 26,78: 6, \\ & 108: 16 \\ & \text { speculate }[2]-66: 7, \\ & 75: 9 \\ & \text { speculating }[1]- \\ & 72: 16 \\ & \text { speech }[3]-75: 21, \\ & 85: 22,85: 24 \\ & \text { speeches }[1]-82: 13 \\ & \text { spend }[1]-122: 11 \\ & \text { spending }[1]-88: 26 \\ & \text { spoken }[11]-14: 4, \\ & 15: 20,15: 28,28: 4, \\ & 86: 7,91: 17,93: 29, \\ & 99: 17,110: 23, \\ & 140: 21,140: 22 \\ & \text { springing }[1]-118: 6 \\ & \text { spying }[2]-61: 17, \\ & 62: 13 \\ & \text { staff }[1]-96: 28 \\ & \text { stage }[26]-14: 27, \\ & 20: 11,33: 24,37: 22, \\ & 37: 28,39: 5,39: 22, \\ & 50: 20,52: 1,52: 27, \\ & 56: 27,60: 2,60: 25, \\ & 62: 14,63: 4,64: 27, \\ & 65: 13,66: 1,77: 3, \\ & 78: 26,79: 11,96: 21, \\ & 100: 29,105: 10, \\ & 118: 15,142: 16 \\ & \text { stage.. } \\ & \text { spe } \end{aligned}$ |  | ```strand [1]-71:2 strands [5] - 50:26, 50:27, 51:14, 52:10 strategy \({ }^{11}\) - 22:22 STREET [3]-2:12, 3:28, 3:32 stress [1] - 38:10 student \({ }_{[1]}\) - 125:24 stuff [19]-26:24,``` 34:14, 49:16, 52:3, 52:7, 56:19, 56:24, 56:26, 57:4, 61:29, 62:1, 62:19, 83:12, 86:7, 88:25, 90:7, 125:22, 130:21, 142:27 sub [2]-29:20, 32:14 sub-district [1] - 29:20 subject [2]-52:1, 119:26 subject-matter ${ }_{[1]}$ - 52:1 subjects [1] - 50:29 submission [2]- 75:19, 75:20 submissions [2] - 82:16, 82:25 submit ${ }^{[1]}$ - 78:7 submitted $[5]$ - 16:26, 45:3, 45:17, 46:6, 48:2 subsection [1] - 53:27 successfully ${ }_{[1]}$ - 97:24 sufficient [2]-61:5, 104:9 sufficiently [2] - 69:9, 70:21 suggest [29] - 12:13, 17:16, 20:23, 38:1, 39:1, 40:25, 42:21, 46:22, 50:20, 50:23, 56:27, 57:6, 63:4, 64:23, 70:17, 70:22, 71:5, 71:7, 71:12, 71:22, 72:12, 73:22, 74:6, 79:18, 79:24, 82:23, 85:10, 109:4, 127:10 suggested [6] - 16:25, 59:18, 76:2, 77:7, 115:4, 119:25 suggesting [13]- 53:2, 72:5, 72:25, 72:26, 73:13, 73:15, 73:17, 76:20, 76:24, 76:26, 120:2, 129:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:4 } \\ & \text { suggestion [6] - } \\ & \text { 49:7, 83:25, 110:29, } \\ & \text { 112:13, 117:3, 120:20 } \\ & \text { suggests [3] - 46:1, } \\ & \text { 77:1, 78:11 } \\ & \text { summarise [3] - } \\ & 44: 7,98: 28,123: 14 \\ & \text { summarising [1] - } \\ & \text { 130:6 } \\ & \text { summary [1] - 63:12 } \\ & \text { Sunday [2] - 89:17, } \\ & 90: 28 \\ & \text { Super [1] - 128:25 } \\ & \text { super's [1] - 109:10 } \\ & \text { SUPERINTENDENT } \\ & \text { [15] - 2:15, 3:3, 3:3, } \\ & 3: 4,3: 5,3: 6,3: 8,3: 9, \\ & 3: 9,3: 13,3: 14,3: 17, \\ & 3: 19,3: 19,3: 21 \\ & \text { Superintendent [113] } \\ & -7: 25,8: 25,11: 16, \\ & 12: 4,13: 5,14: 3, \\ & 17: 11,18: 19,19: 10, \\ & 28: 17,29: 6,29: 29, \\ & 38: 2,38: 16,38: 20, \\ & 38: 22,38: 23,38: 27, \\ & 39: 4,39: 7,39: 17, \\ & 40: 7,40: 12,40: 22, \\ & 41: 18,43: 13,43: 28, \\ & 46: 27,47: 5,47: 13, \\ & 49: 15,49: 16,49: 27, \\ & 50: 24,60: 24,60: 26, \\ & 60: 27,61: 23,61: 25, \\ & 61: 29,62: 4,62: 10, \\ & 62: 11,62: 22,65: 15, \\ & 79: 8,80: 13,80: 27, \\ & 81: 22,82: 28,83: 3, \\ & 83: 14,84: 24,85: 7, \\ & 85: 8,85: 11,86: 2, \\ & 86: 8,86: 12,86: 26, \\ & 87: 25,87: 26,88: 4, \\ & 88: 8,91: 13,91: 27, \\ & 93: 3,93: 17,96: 8, \\ & 97: 6,100: 17,100: 22, \\ & 100: 27,103: 10, \\ & 107: 25,109: 3,109: 6, \\ & 109: 15,110: 9, \\ & 110: 11,117: 13, \\ & 117: 22,118: 18, \\ & 122: 2,122: 24,123: 1, \\ & 123: 18,123: 26, \\ & 123: 27,124: 1,124: 7, \\ & 124: 23,126: 1, \\ & 127: 27,128: 17, \\ & 128: 23,129: 8,130: 2, \\ & 130: 3,130: 11, \\ & 130: 28,132: 8, \\ & 132: 23,133: 21, \\ & 134: 14,134: 29, \\ & \text { 13, } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |





[^0]:    "She sai d that she was al ready aware of it and that she, AC, had spoken with John Mboney."

