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RE-EXAMINED BY MR. McGUINNESS ..... 6

THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVS, ON TUESDAY, 12TH NOVEMBER 2019:

CHA RMAN Yes, Garda Keogh. Thanks very much.

## GARDA N CHOLAS KEOGH WAS RE- EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NNESS,

 AS FOLLOVG:1 Q.
MR. MEGI NNESS: Good morning, Garda Keogh.
A. Good morning.

2 Q. Garda Keogh, I intend to re-examine you on behalf of the Tribunal and I am doing so on the basis that we have all 1istened carefully to your evidence and all of the answers that you have given. It's really just to try and tease out a few issues that may be a bit ambiguous or need to be clarified in some way. Obviously, the intention is to put before the Chairman your evidence in the fullest context, in the true context and in the hope of allowing the whole landscape to be out there insofar as it's relevant. Do you understand?
A. Yes.

3 Q. I don't want to in any way suggest that you cut short your answers but I am taking it that you are totally familiar with the evidence you have given yourself to date, in the sense that there is no need to repeat it. That is my hope.
A. Yes.

4 Q. Do you understand?
A. I understand there is one thing I will have to come back though to address, because I was looking at the weekend to try and look for the answer on a particular matter.

5 Q. Okay. We will see if that arises.
6 Q. CHA RMAR Would you like to just tell us what that is, so we don't forget?
A. Well, it's to do with the thing where I couldn't remember something, Judge.
7 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. And you asked me --

8 Q. CHA RMAN That's right, yes.
A. -- are you sure, you asked me, but you also gave me the look as well when you were asking me about it.

9 Q. CHA RMAN Tell us what it is?
A. No, well, I wasn't -- I was just assuming that this was -- I may have jumped the gun on that.
11 Q. CHA RMAN That's all right. But sorry, this occurred to you over the past time, that there was something that you wanted to come back to; is that right?
A. No. Judge, I was asked the question and I couldn't answer the question, because I couldn't remember and I went back, trying to find out --
12 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. -- the sequence of events or how something occurred, that's all, Judge.
13 Q. CHAN RMAN All right. Just let me explain, if there is something that you want to revisit, just let us know, okay.
A. I don't have a definitive answer, but I just --

CHAN RMAN If there is something you want to add or subtract or qualify, you just let me know.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Now, sorry,
Mr. McGuinness. Yes.
15 Q.
MR. MtGU NESS: Garda Keogh, Mr. Murphy directed you to a number of your diary entries which related to your drinking?
A. Yes.
A. Yes, but it was also parallel to stuff that was going on.

17 Q. No, I understand that. I think you were very frank with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy in telling him that you had in fact started drinking with Garda A.
A. Yes.

18 Q. Who had been one of the other gardaí on the drugs unit?
A. Yes.

19 Q. I think you told him you were drinking with him on
duty, off duty, on your off days?
A. Yes.

Obviously it would seem a quite close companionship, if I could put it that way, at that time?
A. Yes. But for clarification, we have to go into my drinking, because some of the evidence that became very relevant emanated from the drinking. That's why I have to go into the drinking with mulcahy.
21 Q. I understand that. But in any event, it continued and obviously it continued during the period that we're concerned with. I mean, I think you will agree, it did seem to affect your duty or your ability to do your duty and turn up at different times, which caused, in itself, points of friction.
A. On one occasion.
on one occasion.
A. That's on one occasion.

23 Q. Yes. But obviously it also contributed to absences, the absences we have heard about. We don't need to go into the detail. It must have been contributed.
A. Yes. But just for clarification.
A. Judge, if I go back to my last day at work, 21st December 2015, it is a lot easier to come in here, into this Tribunal and face any questions thrown at me, knowing the Garda propaganda office in the Phoenix Park would be feeding the media certain negative things about me, than to go back to the likes of that day, of going into work. It was just unbearable.
Q. Is this going back in on the day after you made the disclosures?
A. We11, that day was a difficult day, but it wasn't -no, no, as things got on, worse. I'm talking about my last day, my last day of duty within An Garda Síochána. 10:42
Q. In December?
A. 21st December 2015.
okay. You have told the Tribunal obviously about coming in to duty after having made the protected disclosure, obvious7y contemporaneous with your identity being disclosed?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you describe your state of mind? You said you were a sitting target, a sitting duck?
A. For the first month. That was just in that first month 10:43 period.
Q. In that period?
A. Yeah.
Q. Did it cause you to sort of view events or interaction with management with a suspicion perhaps that you mightn't ordinarily have had?
A. Em, I never had a problem ever with Garda management, Judge, ever. And they wouldn't have had a problem with me. I'd say prior to making my protected disclosure, my personne1 file was probably about -- Judge, my personnel file was possibly half an inch thick and I'd say you'd need a lorry to carry it down to the Tribunal now.
Q. Mr. Murphy, he also focused on this entry about you
being paranoid but committed, he asked you is that how you felt on that day. In fact, you said in answer to him that you felt that at around that time. But can I ask you for your own assessment at this point in time: Did that sort of feeling or attitude, did that ever recur or did you feel it to be prevalent on other occasions?
A. No, that was a constant thing. I was constantly -- to be honest, like, any documents, any documents, even evidence that I kept myself, I wouldn't have kept it in 10:44 my own house, it would have been on my mind that the house at any period of time would have been searched, just for documents or whatever. In relation to the paranoia, I believe that it was justifiable to be paranoid, in that, as I said yesterday, I knew I was going to end up in conflict with Garda management and at the end of the day, they have the largest and most active phone tapping section in the country. I know that it's not an allegation or anything like that. But I'm just saying, I was conscious of that. Yes. I mean, in answer to Mr. Carroll, who is appearing for Superintendent McBrien, you said that you thought there were people behind the scene who were ready to run with negative things about you?
A. Yes.

You made reference to a sergeant in the chief's office. There was a suggestion which was made in relation to Inspector Farre11, that he was in some way manufacturing complaints?
A. I think I clarified --
A. I think I clarified those, though.
Q. But at one stage you sought the names of the investigating team?
A. Yes.
A. Yes, that's correct.

What advice did he give about that?
A. Well, there's an issue why $I$ had to do that. I didn't go into it because it just wasn't relevant for anything I had been asked up to now.
Q. Yes.
A. But there was -- Judge, I received information that there was somebody on the investigation team that shouldn't have been on the investigation team. I brought it to Detective Superintendent Mulcahy's attention and to the judge's attention. I think the judge, Judge McMahon, I can't remember did he say just get the names of the investigation team or he'd get them or something like that. But in any case, Superintendent Mulcahy did ring me with the names of the investigation team.
Q. Yes.
A. And that person wasn't on it, but I still am not sure whether he was initially on it, but wasn't on it.

40 Q. But he assured you that this person wasn't on it?
A. Yes.

41 Q. And that, one would think, perhaps would give you some comfort that your complaint had been dealt with by him?
A. Well... Just, that question is broad.

42 Q. Al1 right.
A. Just.

43 Q. okay. In any event, you were given the names and the person who you were concerned about wasn't on the investigation team?
A. The main concern was just that person would have been good friends with Garda A and I knew that. I had a concern initially and I am happy that person, if that person was initially on the investigation, was removed or just wasn't --
44 Q. Yes.
A. There's no issue with that.

45 Q. Okay. At a point in your diaries on the 22nd Ju7y, you have an entry relating to being satisfied that the investigation team was double-crossing you?
A. Can I just refer to that.
Q. Yes. The 22nd Ju7y. 13266.
A. Yeah. I just can't remember what particular thing that is in relation to. I accept it's there, it's in my diary, $I$ just can't remember exactly what particular thing that is. Just it seems to be a very firm conclusion reached by you, which was put down on that date?
A. Yes.

48 Q. You can't recall what it relates to?
A. I can't. I can't put it -- as I have said on a number
of occasions, in relation to -- let's say my liaison person with the investigation team was Detective Superintendent mulcahy and it took time for trust to build there, so it wasn't an overnight thing. And actually, Judge, on a point of evidence yesterday evening, I forgot to clarify in relation to the person who had come forward on the 10th April, where there was the incident to do with finding where that person wouldn't make a statement and therefore didn't fully cooperate. How I knew that, Judge, that person fully cooperated, I forgot to say this, Judge, was to do with contact with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy. Superintendent Mulcahy would have discussed with me that that person wouldn't make a statement. which I wasn't surprised at, because they wouldn't make a statement for me on the 10th may '14.
49 Q. Just coming to one aspect of your evidence on Friday afternoon, in relation to the statement of Garda Gerry white, which was dealing with the issue in September.
A. Yes.

50 Q. And the checking of the Pulse.
A. Yes.

51 Q. And the audit that was then initiated by Superintendent McBrien, isn't that right?
A. It was an audit that was initiated, I would argue, on the basis of the car, of the tax issue initially, the car tax issue. That's where I believe that audit emanates from.

52 Q. But you've suggested very clearly and directly that
that was a construct, a deliberately -- a cover story started to try and mask the issue of the car tax that was behind the initial enquiry on Pulse?
A. That's what I suspect, because they couldn't just single out my car and go -- they would have had to have 10:51 some reason. And I suspect that the sub claim forms, they used that for the reason to go into the... But is this not clearly a suggestion which is necessarily directed towards Superintendent MCBrien, whom you sort of steadfastly refused to involve in the first four complaints?
A. Yes. Well in this, in this part, she may have questions to answer in this particular part.
54 Q. And just to be clear, what question do you say she has to answer?
A. Well, there's the issue in relation to -- what my argument would be, there's the check on the car, the check on the car, whenever, there's -- Superintendent mulcahy spots there's an issue with the car tax, and in order to go into the car tax there has to be sort of some reason to go into it. I suspect it was to do with those sub claims. The initial sub claims go missing and then I re-enter, if I'm right, a resubmission on the sub claims in case that they were going to try and do me for fraud.

But you must have seen Superintendent McBrien's explanation, that she had been at a sort of conference training in Templemore relating to auditing.
A. Right.

56 Q. She came back. This appears to have been her idea. Do you accept that?
A. I'm not disputing it. If Superintendent McBrien says that, $I$ 'm not in a position to comment on it.
57 Q. Okay. Can I just turn to some of your interactions with Judge McMahon. Obviously you met him on the 8th May.
A. Yes.
A. Yes.

59 Q. I am not in any way criticising you, you didn't provide him with anything beyond that. He told you what he would do with it then?
A. No. I think -- no, I provided him with the affidavit and a DVD.

60 Q. You gave him the DVD on the same date?
A. I think so.

61 Q. Al1 right. Okay.
A. I think, and I mightn't be correct on that, but I think it was on the same day.
62 Q. Okay. Did he tell you what would then happen?
A. He told me that there will be an assistant commissioner appointed to give -- sorry, more than likely there was going to be an assistant commissioner appointed to deal with this and that you're not to speak to anyone else about it other than the appointed assistant commissioner.

63 Q. Did he tell you your identity would be protected under the 2014 Act?
A. He may have. I can't remember that, because I had so much I was trying to tel1 him that I -- he may have, I just can't recall.
64 Q. You have seen that he has expressed surprise in his statement about the revelation at the same time that he 10:54 was meeting with you?
A. Yes.
A. I don't know, I don't know. I'm not sure if I did or not. I just can't remember that part. I did see it in 10:54 a statement. I don't know. I have explained already, I didn't particularly want to be named in the Dáil.

66 Q. Yes.
A. But it became -- it was explained to me, it is for your protection and in hindsight, Judge, I think probably it 10:54 was the right road to be going down.

67 Q. Your diary notes that you told the judge on the 13th May that you weren't happy with the assistant commissioner?
A. Yes.

68 Q. What was his response to that?
A. The 13th...

69 Q. 13262. I'm sorry, 13256. It's on the left-hand side of the screen there.
A. Sorry, I'm in June. Yes. Yeah, I informed the judge -- my note has:

[^0]70
A. It could have been, I presume it was, Judge, because I would have -- I say I would have met the judge.
71 Q. Yes.
A. I would have wrote in I met the judge. So I presume it 10:56 was a phone call, yeah.
Q.

But what did you expect him to do or what response did he give, as far as he you can recall?
A. Judge, as far as I can recall he said, look, he said, when you get to that level -- it was a common sense answer, he said: when you get to that level, like, the reality is that they're all going to know each other up at the top to some degree, which would be correct.
73 Q. On the 26th June you told him and Detective Superintendent Mulcahy that your notebook was missing?
A. Yes. That's -- I've made -- I found the notebook later, Judge. It just happened to be a particular notebook that may -- I can't remember, it was relevant at the time, I found that somewhere, somewhere...
74 Q. Was that your official Garda notebook?
A. Yes.
A. Judge...

76 Q. As opposed to your diaries?
A. What page number, Judge, is...

77 Q. Well, in the diary there, it's referred to on the 26th June.
A. Yes. "Not ebook missing", yeah. I reca11, I had a
number on the notebook, because I have a number on -- I would have had a number on all my notebooks from when I joined the force. So I'd say, I think off hand something like notebook number 19 or something like that. But I later found that notebook.

78 Q. Yes. The question $I$ had asked was: Does that relate to the period in question and is that something that you have discovered to us or do you still have it?
A. I'm sure I have it somewhere but I don't think there was anything -- I'd say, off the top of my head, I think it may have referred to relevant, let's say, dates and times, and when I went back to look for the notebook I couldn't find the notebook and then got slightly suspicious. But I later found the notebook, but I don't think there was anything of any evidential value. If there was, I would have given it to Mulcahy and to the Tribunal. I think I have -- if I can root out the notebook, I... There was nothing in the notebook, from recollection, Judge, other than it had gone missing.
79 Q. Okay. You told the Judge on the 30th June about your concerns over somebody being on the case, we have dealt with that.
A. Yes.

80 Q. You told the superintendent, your own superintendent, on the 8th July that you were meeting the judge on the Monday?
A. Okay.

81 Q. Which would have been the 14th July. You met the
judge, you've noted that in your diary at 13265 ?
A. Yes.

82
Q. If we go onto the next page, we will see your note of that meeting.
"July '14th 3pm Meet judge Stillorgan."

What does that say? "Gave copy of statement and i ntel."

Is that right?
A. Yeah.
"Gave hi m copy of statement."

It's July. Em, I presume, I'm presuming it's the copy of the statement that I would have made to Mulcahy and Coppinger in June, I presume, and the intel, intelligence thing that we've gone through on the intelligence incident with ms. в.
Q. You see, you told the superintendent the previous day that you were meeting the judge in relation to the Olivia O'Neill and Liam McHugh statements?
A. But I would've brought have them up. Judge, I brought them up, there's no question $I$ brought them up.

84 Q. I am just anxious to know, what result did you get from the meeting in the sense of, what did the judge said he'd do with them, or do you know what he did do with them?
A. We11, em, in relation to "gave hi ma copy of the statement" I don't even remember doing that but I see I have a note of it. The intelligence, I do recall he said, perhaps you shouldn't have done that, something along those lines. I would have then explained, I would have done my best to explain why I believed I had to do that. And in relation to Olivia O'Neill and Liam McHugh matters, Judge, it's my recollection that he said something along the lines of they can't mount an investigation -- there's an investigation team appointed by the Western Region, that Mullingar can't now start mounting their own investigations into this, that that was part of the Morris Tribunal, they can't start doing all these investigations everywhere and it should all be rolled into the one investigation. That's the way I took it, what he said.

85 Q. Was it your understanding that he was saying that the local management couldn't enquire into the Olivia O'Neill and Liam McHugh matters?
A. No. No, no, no, no. Bear in mind, whatever way I explained to Judge McMahon is one thing, whatever way he interpreted and... So I can't, like I wouldn't have -- I mean, we wouldn't have had the time to go into things in depth really, or going through them now.
86 Q. Okay. But he certain7y wasn't telling you that you couldn't or shouldn't cooperate with your authorities about those matters?
A. No, no. No, no. But just cooperate with the investigation team was the thing. And that's what I
did, I went to Superintendent Mulcahy and I said, listen -- from the start, I think, I would have said, listen, there's this stuff here with Liam McHugh and Olivia o'Neill. It came in the one week and they had been coming out on the same headed paper and sheets about interactions with both these individuals in the one week. And for clarification again, neither of those individuals were to do with anything in my main complaint.
87 Q.
Yes. We know obviously that the ó Cualáin inquiry didn't think it proper to enquire into allegations concerning you, we don't need to go there?
A. I understand their point of view on that. But my point was, if they're saying in, let's say, Mullingar, that they're implying that I'm rounding up witnesses to go in to make these complaints in relation to what you're investigating, my argument was perhaps you should look at that. But in any case, what happened?
88 Q. Okay. You have a note in your diary on the 16th July, at page 13265, that we're are looking at there.
"Superintendent calls me and asked me about above last meeting with LME --"
A. Liam McHugh and Olivia O'Neill.
"-- intelligence. Do I have informant?" Then it's: "I nf or m j udge. "
A. Yeah.
describe
Q. Just in terms of the question you have written here is, "do I have informant?" and then you say "i nform judge".
A. Yes. This is where Superintendent McBrien calls me, asking me about my meetings with Liam McHugh and Olivia 11:04 O'Neill. Then the stuff to do with the intelligence report and "do l have an informant", is what I have written in and I informed -- I just informed the judge. Because the judge at the time was the confidential recipient until GSOC took over. So I would have been in a good bit of contact with Judge McMahon at that period of time.

92 Q. You see, you do have a note then on the 17th July, you call the judge and you tell him that you weren't -- you te11 him that you informed the D/Super you weren't happy with the investigation. It's on the previous...
A. Yes.
Q. It's 13265.
A. Yes.
"Call with judge. Told hi m that I informed D/ Super that I wasn't happy with the investigation, that how can gardaí cooperate fully when they're still working with himp No suspensi on."

94 Q. Yes.
A. And I have further:
"And chi ef in Mullingar is trying to mount two i nvesti gations. One intel li gence, t wo compl ai nts. He said they can't run two investigations at the same time. It's like what they did in Donegal. Will cont act commi ssi oners."

I already just made reference to some of that stuff.
95 Q. Was it your understanding that he would raise these matters with the Commissioner?
A. That was my understanding.

96 Q. Did you get a further response from the judge about that?
A. I can't remember. But I think he -- I think he may have done. I just can't -- I can't remember.
97 Q. okay. Just going onto the first issue, and I am going to go through the issues one-by-one, I don't have questions on some of the issues at all, but just very briefly. The first issue, the Pulse entry. You've explained why you didn't think it was a CHIS matter, but I suppose from the point of view of local management and from the point of view of the Chairman
having to look at it, he has to look at both sides. From the point of the entry, nobody else knew in local management or divisional management what had caused the entry, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

98 Q. Nobody knew the source of the information that caused you to make the entry?
A. Well, Mulcahy would have been --

99 Q. I know, but I am talking about at the time in local management?
A. Local management.

They wouldn't have known how recent it was or how accurate it was, obvious7y?
A. Fair enough. But bear in mind, the allegations that they do know, there's allegations to do with criminality in the Westmeath division, I can't, I can't tell the person in charge.
Q. I understand your reasoning. It's not that I am trying to force you to see it from their point of view, but you may concede that all they had was the entry without any other knowledge of who the person was, when they got the information, how trusted they were or otherwise, what their background was?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. They were hampered to that extent in terms of evaluating it?
A. As I already said, reams of paperwork on that particular matter, it could have taken a phone call. Just one phone cal 1 from Chief Superintendent Curran to Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin or, indeed, Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and say, we have problem here,
can you just assist us with this, and it could have been all sorted there.

104 Q. I mean, your decision that it wasn't a CHIS matter was made by you being in full possession of everything you knew about it?
A. And everything I knew about CHIS.

105 Q. The contrary view is that it may not have been for you to decide that, in the sense that if the system is that it should be referred into CHIS, it may be decided within CHIS that then it's not a CHIS matter; but it wasn't for you to necessarily decide that?
A. But I couldn't take the chance.
Q. Right.
A. I couldn't take the chance. I couldn't give that name to persons within the Westmeath division.
Q. Yes.
A. I just couldn't.

108 Q. In terms of the Pulse entry, is it your view that it was of assistance to the investigating team to create the entry and have it?
A. Probably not to the investigation team. But for me, I had to do it.

109 Q. The second issue, the Pulse check. You may recall when I was examining you, you weren't perhaps entirely certain at what time it was done at, but if you look at 11:09 Volume 48, page 13449 --
A. The 18th, it's the same day.
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

111 Q. Yes. But it does show the record there, that it was created at 5:30 in the morning?
A. okay.

112 Q. I'm sure you take it as accurate?
A. Oh, yeah.

113 Q. Now, I am not going to obviously question you any more about why you did it, you have given your evidence, but would you accept that there is no reason that that couldn't have been left to the investigating team to do and that they could have done it themselves?
A. They could have done it themselves.

Yes.
A. But equally, I had to be sure exactly -- I had to check for myself.
115 Q. Yes.
A. Bear in mind, Judge, this is at a time prior, when $I$ meet the investigation team. So if there's any little extra pieces of the jigsaw puzzle that are anywhere to be found, I want to give them as much as I have to make it a coherent, as I described, jigsaw, put all the puzzles together. Because when I tell them the various stories of different incidents that occurred by way of I'm able to say, that piece fits here, that piece fits here and explain it.
116 Q. Al1 right. As it turned out, there was nothing there 11:10 to be found and it didn't assist the team?
A. Correct.

117 Q. You told them about it, though, isn't that right?
A. Yes. I'm sure, just from recollection, I'm sure I did,
because it was getting written in -- it was coming down on paper at some stage, so I'm sure I brought it up.
118 Q. Yes. Just turning to the Olivia o'Neill matter, in your diary entry for $26 / 6$, at 13262 , you have an entry there:
"Olivia O' Neill calls to station, asked to speak to me in private. Speak with D/Sergeant Curley and Hi ggins. Called to her house, then to her in another house to try and get her to make a statement about me but ref used to take her statement of assault. I nf ormed her to go to GSOC. "
A. Yes.

119 Q. Then if we go back to the 31st May, I think. There's the issue of the Olivia o'Neill statement there on the 29th May, do you see that?
A. Yes.

120 Q.
"Ol i via O' Neill statement to nake compl ai nt about ME. B. "
A. Yes.

121 Q. We know you didn't take that.
A. Yes.

122 Q. There's then an issue about what happened, we won't go back into that.
A. Just for clarification, Judge, on that date, $I$ have a side note on the 28th there as well.
Q. Yes.
A. There to do with -- I'm not sure whether it was $s$ the 28 th or the 29 th, I may have got that mixed up, the 28th or 29th. I have it in --
124 Q. What does that say?
A. On the side note, it has:
"Oi ivia Ơ Neill. I nspector Farrell statement not to be taken and starts compl ai nt."

Is a side note.
125 Q. Yes. It does appear from the papers that you actually took a statement from Ms. O'Neill's other daughter on the 29th. If we just look at Volume 52, at 14667 , just the heading seems to record you as taking a statement there?
A. Can I just read this?

126 Q. Yes.
A. Can I read just this?

127 Q. I am not going to ask you to comment on the contents. 11:14
A. Yeah. Judge, I didn't -- I don't remember actually taking this statement. But I do remember, I think, Judge, the daughter, that girl, I didn't even -- it's just coming back to me now, that girl, the daughter, would be the Athlone equivalent of Katie Taylor, she remember having a dealing with her, I didn't even recall this statement.
128 Q. There seemed to have been a sort of running number of
incidents in this area between the 26th and the 28th?
Q. okay. In the context of the investigation into this, if we look at page 14654, this is Sergeant Haran on a later date, he having been asked to take a statement from inter alia olivia o'Neill. He reports there:
"The following peopl e were intervi ewed and ref used to make statements."

And olivia O'Neill is there. I am just wondering, when you referred earlier in your evidence to the Gardaí trying to get a second statement from olivia o'veill in relation to you, I am just wondering, does this raise a doubt in your mind that, in fact, they went to her to try and get a second statement relating to her second daughter, relating to the second incident?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Presumably you took this in Athlone Garda Station yourself, obviously, on the day?
A. It has:
A. Yes, that's what's there, yes.
Q. And that may be the confusion?
A. Right.
A. I don't think so, because at some point -- no, I think
the last time I spoke to Olivia O'Neill was the time where she came into the station to say that more or less the Guards don't want to take statement from her to do with one matter but they wanted to take a statement to do with me. The only thing I could say to 11:17 her was, well, go to GSOC, because there was nothing I could do about it in my position. I see here, there's two daughters here, yeah.
Yes. All right, we will pass on from that. Just to go to the next issue, then, issue, 4, Liam McHugh. Just to go back to the report of Garda Lyons, perhaps if we look at 1898. Now, it relates to, on the face of it, an event on the 31st May and Garda Lyons is reporting that he met Mr. McHugh, and he details what the conversation was.
A. Judge, I am just trying to find out what time that e-mail is sent at.
Q. Well, it looks like 20:28.
A. 20:28.
Q. The 2nd June?
A. On the 2nd June, okay.
Q. Yes. So the last paragraph says:
"I asked himif he was referring to Garda Nick Keogh and he confirmed that he was. He went on to say' he
tol d me he was there himself when it happened and would back me up if I wanted to make a compl ai nt'."

So, I suppose you will agree with me that there's two
different days now that we're talking about; we're talking about encounter that is said to have taken place on the 31st may, and then Mr. McHugh apparently referring back to some previous encounter?
A. Yes.
A. That would have a whole list of obvious questions attached to that, yeah.
Q. Yes. The second thing, it could be a complaint about you as whistleblower, trying to draw or drum up complaints against Gardaí?
A. That appears to me is the line that they, Garda management went down.
139 Q. It could, on interpretation, be a suggestion that you were present in the sense of witnessing an incident that happened between Mr. McHugh and other gardaí?
A. Yes. And if that were the case, I would have told Detective Superintendent Mulcahy that, because I have nothing to lose, I'd be covered under the Protected Disclosures Act, in that I don't think you can be prosecuted for anything that emanates out of the occurred, you know... I would have told -- because there's other things that cropped up. There's one incident where I didn't tell Mulcahy, D/Super Mulcahy,
about because it wasn't relevant to the heroin thing, but he found out about it, that's how he knew. But I remember thinking, how does he know about that? But it didn't matter how he knew, the fact is I knew he was investigating and he was going deep into things.

140 Q. Yes. The fourth thing it could be categorised as, on interpretation, is that it's the report of a complaint by Mr. McHugh about an incident in which you are said to have participated in the incident with the other gardaí?
A. Oh yeah, we11, that covered that in relation to the previous, the one before, where I would have told Mulcahy, you know, yeah, there was three of us and we went down and we robbed this man who sells The Big Issue.

141 Q. We have seen obvious7y how Garda Lyons characterised it in his statement at paragraph 4.31 last week, but I just want to draw your attention --
A. Is that the statement where he says no one from Garda management ever came back to him in relation to the thing?

142 Q. Perhaps we will look at that and see how he characterised it.
A. Okay.

143 Q. At 11719?
A. The fifth, there wasn't just four options. There's a fourth one.

144 Q. Okay, please.
A. Which is, this never happened at all.

145 Q. We11, I am taking it at its face, obviously, as to what it could be or is or might be.
A. I understand.
Q. Paragraph 4.31 there, he says:
"My understanding is Garda Keogh was encour aging Mr. McHugh to make a fal se compl ai nt."

So he seems to be saying that that's what his report really conveys.
A. Sorry, just, can you -- sorry.

147 Q. 4.31 there, the top of the page. It's on the screen there. It's a one-1ine paragraph.
A. Oh sorry. I see, I see what's written there. I mean, I have disputed that from day one when the allegation was put to me.
148 Q. We will come to that. But is it your interpretation of the report, is it your interpretation of the report that it was a complaint that you had participated in an event directly with Mr. McHugh rather than you being there and witnessing other Garda do something?
A. I'm not even sure. I'm not even sure.

149 Q. okay.
A. Because it veers into two angles. Initially it looks like an incident happened and I go to Mr. McHugh and
tell him to report the incident. It's later investigated as an incident happened with these three guards but that I am one of the three guards, initially, initially.
Q. When you were being cross-examined by Ms. G1eeson 1ast week, you gave an answer on Day 105. Perhaps we will look at the transcript for Day 105, pages 35-37. You are being handed the transcript there, Garda Keogh.
A. Judge, sorry, I come back to -- I apologise for this, there's something here, back to the Aidan Lyons report on 11719. Judge, at 4.33, it's on page 11719. I have --

CHA RMAN Hold on a second until we get 11719.
MR. MEGU NESS: Day 105. He wants to look at 11719. 11:25 CHA RMAN It's not a transcript, we're looking for a document, 11719.
MR. KELLY: Volume 42.
A. We just had it a minute ago.

CHA RMAN Don't worry, it's is coming back. Hold on. Now, we have it. Have you got it on in front of you there? Thank you. Yes.
A. Yes, Judge, the third, the third paragraph down.

151 Q. CHA RMAK what number?
A. 4.33.
Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. Judge, that statement was made on 17 th June 2019. cropped up. This is in Finn's stuff I think. I just had to make that point.
154 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. And what point are you making?
A. The point I'm making is: It appears no one ever went back to at any point to Aidan Lyons and asked him anything since he initially sent the e-mail on the 2 nd June 2014.

CHA RMAN That was my understanding.
MR. MEGU NESS: Now, can we look at Day 105?
CHA RMAN Just to complete it, your complaint is that that illustrates or is evidence of non-belief in the report?
A. Yes.

156 Q. CHA RMAN That's the point you make?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN okay. A11 right.
157 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: If we go to page 35 of the transcript. CHA RMAN Thank you.
158 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: It's just dealing with the issue of where you say:
"The onl y names apparently identified is that of Garda
Keogh. "

If we go down the page there. Just stop there. The last five lines, if we just look at those. You see, we wi11 start with:
"Wen I go back, when Superintendent McBrien shows me the actual report and I actually get to see what this allegation is about, l still don't know who wrote the report, so l go back into my own di ary to try find out
what was going on around the ni ght of the 30th and the early hours of the 31st, that period of time. And, of course, I have a recollection of an incident with these ot her two guards that ni ght and, as I stated, I was deal ing with a thing on the -- I have a clear recollection of that. So, it's not in the report, but that's perhaps an omission on my behal f."

And then if we just go down to the next page, you say it is trumped up there. And just stop there. In answer to question 140, you say:
"Apart from I have the incident on Pul se in rel ation -- and I'maware there's an inci dent on Pul se in rel ation to the traffic incident that l'mon about, whi ch woul d have the exact time and everything that corresponds with when that drugs patrol car was going by. Ot her than that, I have no evi dence. "
A. Yes.

159 Q. You appeared to be relating what was in the report to an incident that you knew about, the involvement of Guards in that incident, the presence of the drugs car and your knowledge of a traffic incident, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

160 Q. If we just look then at your diary, at page 13258?
A. Just the date, please?

161 Q. It's the 31st May.
A. Oh yeah. Yeah.

162 Q. It's actually the date of the report. The bottom right-hand page there:
"LMEH meet guard 9pmalleges..."
A. "Section 23". Section 23 being the Section 23 misuse of Drugs Act, a drugs search, and "€800 three cops".
Q. Now stop there, please?
A. Sorry.
Q. Stop there. You have in your diary the name of a civilian then, isn't that right?
A. That's the civilian that $I$ referred to, to the incident that I was dealing with.
Q. And then "TA" for traffic accident?
A. Yes.
Q. And then:
"Garda A and another guard in car."
A. Yes.

167 Q. They're blanked out on the screen, do you see that?

## A. That's correct, yeah.

168 Q. So if we go on then to an entry on 13260?
A. Can I just get the date?

169 Q. Yes, this is the 10th June, it's the day after you met Superintendent McBrien in her office.
A. Yes.
Q. Maybe we will just read that entry. Can you read the
entry for the 9th?
A. The 9th or the 10th?

171 Q. We11, read the entry for the 9th first.
A. The 9th, okay.
"9: 10pm meet with Super MEBrien. Conversation.
Informs me that another compl ai nt. Li am McHugh to be approached to take statement. I informed her wasn't happy with current wel fare officer i.e. associ ation with G acken."
Q. Okay. Now, Superintendent McBrien, I know she didn't show you the report on that day, but did she tell you the gist of the complaint?
A. No.

173 Q. Okay. You see the next day, you have an entry for the 10th, could you read that out for us?
A. Yes, Judge. It's:
"22: 35 call from F Greene. I nformed himabout LMEH compl ai nt. He told me LMEH (Li am MEHugh) approached hi mto say he is under pressure to make a compl ai nt agai nst a garda re theft of 4,500 . Di dn't know about my compl ai nt."

174 Q. Just stop there.
A. Yes.
Q. "Suspect Garda A" and a different person?
A. The different person is the person that I originally
objected to be on the investigation team, prior to all this.
Q. Okay. It seems on an interpretation of this, that you must have been ab1e to te11 him about something about the Liam McHugh complaint on the 10th, because you say there "informed hi mabout it"?
A. Yeah, because I obviously was getting documents down about my -- what conversation did I have with Liam McHugh in the last three months. Like I knew -- and I was obviously, Judge, trying to find out what the he11 is going on, what was this about. So, em, Garda Greene would know a fair bit of what was going on. Like, he'd know a lot of stuff. I just would have asked him, did he hear anything about it. He heard something on the lines of something to do with a left of $€ 4,500$. But that's al1 I knew, you know.

177 Q. Had you checked a Pulse incident that had been sort of triggered by...
A. I didn't even know there was a Pulse incident to check. I think the first I heard of a Pulse incident was when, 11:33 I think it was yourself put it to me at the start of the Tribuna1. I don't think I was even aware there was an incident on Pulse.

178 Q. You see, that's why I opened page 37 of the Day 105, because it's you referring to a Pulse incident in
A. No. No, no. There's no Pulse incident to do with this. whatever this is about, it's not to do with Pulse. I don't think I knew there was a Pulse incident
to do with the Liam McHugh matter at all until three weeks ago or whatever. I don't believe I knew.
179 Q. Just to clarify matters, you identified in your diary a civilian in relation to a traffic accident?
A. Yes.

180 Q. Was that a pulse incident traffic accident?
A. Yes, yes. I put that incident on Pulse, yes.

181 Q. You're relating that to the 9th --
A. Yes.
-- where the other members are at the scene somewhere in the drugs car, isn't that right?
A. Yes. Just for clarification, I will make it short because I know we went into it already, it was a traffic accident in the -- Church Street in Athlone is the equivalent to o'Connell street in Dublin, it's obviously on a much, much smaller scale, but it's the main street in Athlone. There was an incident occurred to do with a fella and a car at a pedestrian crossing, a lot of people had gathered around this incident, Judge. I suspect Liam McHugh was there somewhere in the crowd, in hindsight. But I was dealing with the person, the injured party -- alleged injured party for that incident. while I was doing that, I had to call an ambulance, the patrol -- the unmarked black vectra was going up and down with two guards. And what was interesting was, it was Garda A and another garda, not his partner Garda Lyons, it was another garda that wasn't attached to the drugs unit that was in the car that I noticed going up and down, up and down, while I
was dealing with that road traffic incident.
183 Q. Now, can I ask you this question: was the date of that road traffic incident the 31st May or was it some other date?
A. I'11 just go back. Judge, I have it in actually -- I have it in, in between the 30th and the 31st, so I'm not a hundred percent sure, because the little asterisk is pointing up to the -- this would have been -- this diary entry, at the bottom, would have been made the day -- I presume the day Superintendent McBrien shows me the full allegation without the author of the report. I then went back to see what was going on in this time period. So I wrote in just the gist of the allegation. And I was trying to find out what happened that night. I recall that incident happening that night. If there is an issue in the date, Judge, if we are talking about the early hours of the morning, I think I referred to the Garda A85, where our duty periods are covered, it's an unusual document, because it doesn't go by the 24 hour system. For example, by way of example, going back to the Aidan Lyons incident on 2nd June 2014, Judge, if that incident, 1et's say, happened at lam, you would have to look at the 1st June 2014 on the A85, if that makes sense. I know it's very complicated and it complicates me. I still find it hard to understand. It would be the early hours of the morning, if there's a mistake or a minor thing there. It's just that your answer to Ms. Gleeson relating to the incident and then the identification of persons in
your diary entry for the 31st and the 10th June, would seem to suggest that you had a strong suspicion or belief as to who might have been involved in the Liam Mchugh incident?
A. I suspect, I suspect that that was the night -- I suspect that was the night that the Liam McHugh allegation was born, that day. The concept of that allegation, I suspect was born that night with those two guards. Now, as already stated, I believe they went to Sergeant Lyons because he was a clean pair of hands --
185 Q. Well now, just bear with the questions.
A. Yes, sorry.

186 Q. The report of Garda Lyons relates to, he says, the 31st May, recounting an incident on some previous time that 11:39 Mr. McHugh was approached?
A. Yes.

187 Q. Not on the 31st?
A. Yes.

188 Q. So are you relating the approach to Mr. McHugh with the 11:39 date of the traffic incident that you were dealing with and the Pulse entry referred to?
A. No, no. No, no. Nothing -- no, two separate things completely.
189 Q. okay. So, is it correct then to say that you had no basis in connection with the traffic incident for linking the two officers with approaching Mr. McHugh?
A. No, it's a suspicion that $I$ have, it's a suspicion I have, that that is when the -- bear in mind, this is
within the few days after the olivia o'Neill thing has cropped up and I suspect that there was a conversation along the lines of, it'd be great if we could get another one of these things going and that's how we'11 put it into motion. I suspect, that's all.
190 Q. In any event, you're positively saying that it's not related to the date of the traffic incident, that you were aware of?
A. The incident where the two guards were in the unmarked car is exactly during the time I am dealing with the traffic incident. I am a hundred percent on that. okay. So it might be related to the night that Mr. Mchugh was approached, is that what you're saying?
A. No. No, because, firstly, I don't -- I would -- I don't even -- I used the word allegedly before, approached. I don't even know -- I don't think there's any evidence to say Liam McHugh was actually -- there was a conversation. There's certainly no statement from Garda Lyons to say -- well, originally there wasn't anyway.

193 Q. You obviously deny all knowledge of it, you say you know nothing about any part of it at all?
A. Yes.
Q. You didn't voice any suspicion to her then or to anyone else subsequently as to who might have been involved in
speaking to Mr. McHugh?
A. No, I didn't, because I wasn't allowed to see the author of the report. I actually suspected and did, right up until the time I read in the -- it was to do with the Finn stuff I think, Garda Aidan Lyons' name, I 11:41 never suspected him until that time. And just for clarification, I didn't say I didn't know anything about the incident, I went further, I said this is simply false. Like I can't remember what words I used, but I left Superintendent McBrien in no doubt that this 11:41 -- it wasn't just that $I$ denied knowing anything about the incident, $I$ went further than that.
195 Q. Okay. Thank you. We will pass on from that, then. Issue 6, relating to the car tax. In examination by your own counsel, you have referred to this issue of 11:42 the declaration being sought in relation to the motor tax.
A. Yes.
Q. If we look at 743 , which is part of the return from the county council. If you go up to the top of 743 .
Sorry, if we go down, I beg your pardon. The next page, the following page. If you just stop there. On the bottom right-hand corner, it seems to refer to a sale date, 12th March 2011. Do you see that, is that when you purchased the jeep?
A. It sounds right.

197 Q. A11 right.
A. I just can't see the -- oh sorry, I see what you're looking at. That would be correct. And for
clarification, the car I had before was the exact same type, mode1, two seats in it as well.
Q. Yes. Underneath that then there an RF 111 A date, 3rd May 2012. Presumably you're familiar with the forms that had to be filled in for change of ownership, any other supplementary documentation?
A. Yeah. The last time I would have dealt with it would have been whenever I bought the car that I'm driving now after this one. Yes, I'm aware there's a change of ownership form, yes.

199 Q. Yes. I mean, in any renewal year, I understand your evidence, you renewed it in the way in which it had been taxed to date and so forth, but on any later renewal date was there any necessity to make any further declaration, do you recall?
A. I can't --
Q. Okay.
A. I don't think so. I think as well, I think with motor tax, Judge, I think you can ring up the motor tax office and just pay over the phone with a laser card, 11:44 the payment is accepted. But I am just trying to think, I do know, Judge, the law has tightened up a lot now in relation to this sort of thing, where now you have to have a hard number or you have to have a goods thing, but back then the law was lax and you didn't
have to do -- you didn't have to really -- and no one -- I think very few people in the country would have.

201 Q. CHAL RMAN It looks from this, and I may be totally
wrong, but it looks as if the revenue issued a certificate on 30th June 2006?
A. I wouldn't have had that car.

202 Q. CHA RMAK No, no. Hold on. I know you didn't have the car then. Follow me for a moment. It looks as if the car was bought, at least according to this document, maybe I'm totally wrong, it looks as if the car was bought new.
A. Yes.

203 Q
CHA RMAN You didn't buy it new?
A. No.

204 Q. CHA RMAN And that the person who bought it was in possession of a revenue certificate dated 30th June '06. So the person had the certificate, now bought this car, probably had a previous one, and that's the way it worked. That's what it looks like.
A. Yeah.

205 Q. CHA RMAK And you bought it just over a year old, is that correct?
A. No.

206 Q. CHA RMAN Or is that wrong? was it older when you bought it?
A. No, it was a '06 car, so the first part is correct.

207 Q. CHA RMAN Ah!
A. I would have bought it in 2011, at some period in 2011. 11:46

208 Q. CHA RMAN Ah, so the sale date relates to you buying it.
A. Yes.

CHAL RMAN I see. Thanks very much.
Q. MR. MEGU NESS: You agreed with Mr. Murphy last week that after your meeting with Superintendent Murray on the 26th March, you went and you actually got it taxed on the next day, the 27th March?
A. I think so, yeah.
Q. But he drew attention to a portion of Superintendent Murray's statement which referred to Deputy Daly raising the car tax issue in the Dáil on the 1st April. without addressing that issue first, you appeared to readily agree with him that you had raised the issue of 11:47 the car tax with Deputy Daly?
A. Yes.

211 Q. Had you done so immediately after that period we're talking about, after the 26th March?
212 Q. CHA RMAN I think you said you did it on the 30th and you referred to your diary.
A. I'11 have to go back here.

CHA RMAN I may be wrong, but I would have the 30 th?
213 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: 13305, you appear to have met Deputies Wallace and Daly on the 30th March.
A. '15?
Q. Yes, I'm sorry, '15?
A. Yes, yes, that's correct. I met them on the 30th March '15. Just for clarification, $I$ just want to check as well, the dates on that can be confusing as well, because when the dates change, the top part -- I think it is the 30th March, yeah.

215 Q. Have you any recollection of raising the tax issue with them?
A. I don't remember it but that had to have come from me.
Q. okay. I don't want you to be misled in any way, it doesn't appear that Superintendent Murray is correct in saying that the car tax issue was raised on the 1st April.
CHAN RMAN In the Dáil.
MR. MEGU NESS: In the Dáil, yes, on the floor of the House. Could I ask you to look at just volume 54, page 15321? This is Deputy Daly [sic] speaking, he doesn't seem to mention the car tax issue, doesn't mention you by name, but he makes some comments. If we go to the bottom of that page, 15321. We're not concerned with the first few paragraphs, but --
A. Just for clarification, this is the 28th January, what year?

218 Q. No, this is the 31st March. CHA RMAN There's a reference, Deputy wallace refers back to what he said on the 28th January.
A. Yes.

219 Q
MR. MEGI NESS: Just go down to the last paragraph?
A. Sorry, "what hope is there..." that paragraph?

220 Q. Yes, that paragraph. He says:
"What hope is there for reformas long as the old hi er archy remai n in place?"

He continues on. Then if we go over the page. Then to the first full paragraph, he says:
"We have been speaki ng to new whi stlebl owers of Iate, some of whomare trying to rai se issues regarding gardaí invol ved in the drug trade. I will tell the Taoi seach what they are faci ng: Harassment, bullying, intimation, cover up, denial and del ay. In one internal investigation the garda about whom complaints had been made is being kept informed while those making the allegations are being harassed, all under the watch of the new Commissi oner. The same inter nal investigation has been going on for 11 months. It appears as if they are trying to break the man and I thi nk they might."

I'm not concerned with the rest of the interchanges. Did you interpret that as relating to you?
A. Obviously that would relate to me, I can't deny it.

221 Q. Okay. obviously there isn't a mention of car tax. Why did you go to speak to Deputies Daly and wallace at that point in time, immediately after, fairly immediately after your meeting with the superintendent?
A. I've already had the previous -- I've already had, oh, the Pulse entry, the intelligence stuff, the Liam McHugh, the olivia o'Neill, and the car tax is -- I don't think I even know that the car tax is lingering in the background. I knew there was something going on 11:51 with the subsistence claims, but I didn't -- at the time I couldn't -- I didn't have enough information to fit them all together. But, so... I mean, I would have been in contact with Deputies wallace and Daly in
relation to everything, not just those issues, there was the main --
Q.

I understand.
A. The main collusion complaint and all that.

223 Q. Yes. But I mean, on one view you had agreed to pay the 11:51 car tax, you did pay the car tax.
A. Yes.

224 Q. It was at the appropriate rate. You had no reason to complain about the car tax issue unless you knew you were going to be disciplined for it then?
A. Yeah, but the issue there -- look, in relation to the car tax, I accept there was an error on my behalf in relation to the car tax, but it's not one that I deliberately knew about because I would have had amended it. I never thought of the car tax. I knew they were going to come after me and I knew my car was one of the first things they'd be looking at. I just never thought of the bracket, tax bracket. That's the issue there.
okay. One issue in relation to the car tax is that obviously we have seen the report that Superintendent Murray sent to Chief Superintendent wheatley, in which he confirms that the car tax and the expenses issue have been dealt with and it's all now closed?
A. Yes.

226 Q. Perhaps we will look at that, on Volume 55, 15698. That's the letter of the 7th April, he refers to the different claims that were made there. In the second paragraph he says:
"The clai ms were left for me when I arrived in Athlone as district officer on 9th March 2015. It was brought to my attention that Garda Keogh may not have had his vehi cle properly taxed. I made an enquiry with the motor tax office and was provided with documentary evi dence, incl udi ng that Garda Keogh had taxed his vehi cle as goods class when it should have been taxed private. As a result a loss of revenue to the State of €377 resulted each year."

Then he goes on to report what you had done and provided proof of it. Then he says he:
"...dealt with it by way of a regulation 10 discipline 11:54 (copy attached) and approved his clain玉 for payment. The matter is now cl osed."
A. Judge, I don't see any reference -- only glancing at this, this is a new document which has come in, but I don't see any reference to discipline being mentioned.
227 Q. It's the last two lines of the document?
A. Sorry. Oh, yeah.
"I then deal t with himby way of di sci pline regul ation 10. "

Yeah, that's correct. I was never informed of the discipline, was my argument.
Q. Yes.
A. On the page before that, Judge, on page 15 -- it's related to this.
229 Q. Yes. I was just going to come to it?
A. Oh.
Q. A cover e-mail?
A. Yes.

231 Q. The superintendent appears to have sent that on, on the 8th April, to the Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin.
"Assi stant commi ssi oner, please see attached re Garda Ni chol as Keogh for your inf ormation as di scussed. Pat Murray, superintendent."
A. That's an incredible document.

232 Q. I am not going to comment on that. But why do you say that's is an incredible document?
A. If my recollection is correct, in Superintendent Murray's statement he makes reference to not discussing anything to do with me with other senior officers. Something along those lines there. I'11 find it for perhaps a better time when it comes to it, but there's something there that I am going to have to go through again and cross-reference. But, we now have Superintendent Murray in Athlone now reporting to Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin, who is appointed to investigate my heroin collusion complaint. Judge, if we go back to a part of my original thing, where I said that Superintendent Murray was put in to Ath1one to get

Well, just looking at the content of the letter that Superintendent Murray sent forward, I mean he is confirming through this that all the expenses that you incurred in meeting the team and the confidential reporter had been met, the confidential recipient, isn't that right?
A. Yes. Yes.

234 Q. These were matters that you had been complaining about. 11:57 Expenses hadn't been paid for these.
A. Yeah, but it's not -- it wasn't as simple as they weren't paid. The first batch of subsistence allowance that I submitted went missing. They've reappeared in those documents. But they went missing. I was writing 11:57 to find out what happened. So I then had to write out a new set of subsistence allowances and on the new set I wrote "resubmission" at the top, because I suspected they'd try and do me for fraud then if there was any discrepancy between the first batch which went missing 11:57 and the second, any -- if there was 5 cent in the difference, that they may come after me down the line with fraud.

235 Q. Garda Keogh, I am just concerned that the letter
relates to you being paid belatedly, obviously, I am not assigning any fault to anyone, but would it not be a matter that the assistant commissioner and/or others would want to know that you have actually had your payments made for the trips that you make to meet the superintendent and the confidential recipient?
A. No, that's -- no. That's -- I never made an issue, like I never made any official issue anywhere that I didn't get paid for anything like that. It was never in any of the things anywhere. It was never an issue. 11:58 I didn't complained to Detective Superintendent mulcahy whether I got paid or not in relation to that. It didn't really matter, I was going to meet them anyway.
236 Q. That's what I was going to ask you.
A. Yes.
A. I do, I do. It has:
"Pl ease see attached re Garda Ni chol as Keogh for your information as di scussed. "

238 Q. Is there anything else you would like to add to that?
A. Not now, but I am sure if I had a good bit of time to go through some of this stuff, perhaps. But just not now. I don't need to. I don't need to.
239 Q. Okay. I think it has gone 12, Chairman, I don't know if you want to take the customary break?

240 Q. CHA RMAN How are you doing? Are you happy to carry
on?
A. Yes, that's all right.
Q. CHA RMAN We will take one this afternoon, if that's a11 right. If you fee1 you need a break, just let me know. Is that all right?
A. Yes, Judge.

CHA RMAN A11 right, thanks very much. We might finish a bit early for lunch, you know what I mean, about quarter to, if that's all right. I'm sorry that I forgot.

WTNESS: Oh no.
Q. disciplined in relation to the reporting sick in July. Obviously, one of the complaints you made was that you were requesting the statement that you have given to Superintendent Murray?
A. Yes.
Q. You wouldn't be requesting unless you didn't have it?
A. Correct.
Q. Or unless you had it and you couldn't find it, perhaps?
A. It wasn't that I had it and I couldn't find it. Because the bunch of documents that I signed for were all together. I don't know whether it was stapled or had one of those clips in it, but they were together.
Q. On the face of it, obviously, you were mounting an appea1?
A. Yes.
Q. But had you got a clear memory of what you had said to Superintendent Murray?
A. I definitely remember the thing that I had about, that I was under stress. I know I told him exactly the truth in relation to the incident that happened and what had happened and the thing -- I do know he had stress. I recall, while he was writing, this is Superintendent Alan Murray.
A. While he was writing down the discipline, I remember trying to read what he was writing and I couldn't. But either way, $I$ think he did read it out it me. He did read it out to me and he had the word stress in. And that was... Yeah.

We will pass on from that then. Issue 9 relates to different a crime file investigations. I am just going to look at a couple of dates in relation to the trailer 12:01 theft incident. I will try and do so without opening documents and we will see if we can agree as much as possible. That happened on the night of the 7th going into the 8th August, isn't that correct?
A. I disagree with the dates.
A. But I can't remember them in my head.
Q. The crime file was submitted, we have seen that a few times, at page 213/214. On page one it makes reference to CCTV, isn't that right? And then on page 2 , if we see it there, in fact, you see:

[^1]A. Yes.
Q. Then on the second page, under "additional enquiries" it's then reported there:
"Garda CCTV vi ewed crime committed 4: 31-4: 34am Poor qual ity footage of car moving stol en trailer hitched."

There's no relevance to Gilmartin's at that point in time.
A. No, because it's not relevant, I don't have anything to add. Like there's relevance at that period in time to Gilmartin's -- Kilmartin's.
Q. Yes. You addressed the superintendent's concerns in relation to his points in a report of the 28th August, we don't need to look at that. But it appears that by the 28th, some time later on the 28th, you had obtained the CCTV?
A. Yes, I have gone into this, where on the night the incident occurred.

253 Q. CHA RMAN They weren't able to tell you.
A. Yes.

254 Q. CHA RMAN He wasn't able to operate the machine?
A. Yes. And it is a 24-petrol station.

255 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
A. So it would have been the only place open anyway.
Q. So, if we look at page 221 , for instance, this is the statement from the person who was the manager there. It says?
"On Saturday, 8th April, Garda Ni ck Keogh contacted Gilmartin's service station, N6 Athl one, regarding CCTV for a Citroën car at about 4: 30amon 8/8. On Mbnday, 10th August, I vi ewed the CCTV and found a silver Citroën car."

It gives the car registration.
"... and downl oaded the footage onto a disk and left it ${ }_{\text {12:04 }}$ for collection for Garda Keogh. This statement has been read over to me and is correct."

So, that does obviously verify precisely what you said. You went there, you did see it, you weren't able to take it away, but a download then took place on the 10th. Do you know when you got that download then?
A. I can work it out if I go through my diaries. It's whenever I would have been back at work. There was just, I vaguely remember, an envelope left in the public office with my name on it, it contained the DVD. And just for clarification --
257 Q. It was left in the Garda station for you, is that right?
A. Yes. When I had gone to the young lad the night of the ${ }_{12: 05}$ 10th that was working there, I would have left a note of the time periods of what to go -- the time periods to look at the monitor on the CCTV, to make it simpler for him.

258 Q. Yes. If we look at the Pulse record at 8921, Volume 31, that statement you took from the young man was on the 9/9?
A. No. Sorry, that was the 8th.
Q. No, you took that statement on the 9/9. Perhaps we wil1 just go back to it. Back to 221 , sorry. Just scroll up to the top to see the date.
A. You're right. Correct, 9/9. Sorry, statement taken $9 / 9$ and the date of the incident $8 / 8$, I apologise, yes.
260 Q. Then if we go to 8921. If we can perhaps zoom in on the middle bit, the narrative there, is it possible to zoom in?

CHA RMAN which bit are you referring to, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGU NESS: It's the narrative.
CHA RMAN We will see whether we need to zoom.
MR. MEGU NNESS: We will start at the bottom of the narrative:
"IP, injured party reports trailer stol en fromdriveway 12:0 of house."

CHA RMAN "I nj ured party IP reports trailer stol en from dri veway of house."
okay.
MR. MEGU NNESS: There is an update then from someone who isn't you.
CHA RMAN So it works from the bottom up, is that
right?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Updated on the 11th May:
"Crime file submitted, no suspects."

Obviously the file doesn't contain any reference to Gilmartin's at that point in time.
A. This, of course, isn't the file, this is just a narrative of...

261
Q. This is the Pulse narrative, I know, yes.
A. Yeah.

262 Q. Then:
"Updated 28/ 8."

That's your number there?
A. Yes.

263 Q. "Added vehi cle."
A. Yes.

264 Q. So you added the registration number of the vehicle that the manager had identified?
A. Yes.

265 Q. Isn't that right? Although you hadn't obtained a statement from him, but you must have got that somehow.
A. We11, I would have had to -- when I got the DVD, the 12:08 first thing I would have done with it was put it in and look at it.

266 Q. Okay. Then there's a later update:
"Updated 11/9/15 as per Garda Keogh, occurred time updat ed. "

Then the CCTV was uploaded by somebody else then onto G Tube, isn't that right
A. Yes.

267 Q. So, I suppose I am just asking you to reflect on this. The crime file and your first report didn't refer to Kilmartin's or the CCTV and the first report of the acquisition of the CCTV is when Sergeant Monaghan reports the events of the $28 / 8$ to the superintendent?
A. Okay.

268 Q. He then writes to you asking for an account and you set out your reply on the $3 / 9$-- sorry, on the $12 / 9$, at page 220. So, if we scroll down the four points, you answer the four points there?
A. Yes.

269 Q. So you're in a position to demonstrate there then what had occurred at that point in time.
A. Yes.

270 Q. Your interpretation of the sequence of events, correct me if I am wrong, is that you didn't need to be jogged or cajoled into the proper investigation and reporting of the offences because you had gone to the station on the day in question; isn't that right?
A. Yes, that's right.

271 Q. Albeit that there's some delay perhaps in getting the CCTV and uploading it?
A. Yes.
Q. Would that be a fair assessment of your position then?
A. Yes. I couldn't have put it on $G$ Tube myself, I would have applied to do that. As I said, I'm not -- certain things with computers, $I$ wouldn't be great.
Q. okay.

12:11
A. Other things I would be all right.
Q. Just turning to issue 11 then, confinement to indoor duty. You wil1 recal1 obviously Superintendent Murray's direction in that regard. Mr. Murphy asked you about a Facebook entry in a Facebook chat, where you had said you weren't bothered by that at a11?
A. Yeah.
Q. That was a chat with Garda Greene at that point in time, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. That was at a time when your relations had ruptured slightly, was it?
A. Well, I don't think so. You see, the problem with a lot of stuff in the Guards and because different things go on for years, things are constantly shifting. Like 12:11 the tectonic plates nearly, they're constantly shifting. Oh, it's too complicated to go into. But I was in contact with Garda Greene in relation to that, and that was where -- this is where $I$ am being put on the indoor duties and I make a comment, yeah, it doesn't bother me at all, I'm under pressure. It was just bravado. But equally, Judge, I recall when that was put to me, and I turn the page, there's another incident when Garda Greene himself is under serious
pressure on a particular matter and he makes the same comment back, that he's not bothered at all and it was on something that obviously he would have been bothered on.
277 Q. okay. All right.
A. Where I am essentially saying we're both trying to -we're trying to keep the spirits up as opposed to, say -- opposed to...
278 Q.
okay, I understand. If we go on to issue 12 then. I just want to draw your attention to a couple of provisions of the Garda Code insofar as it relates to sickness management. At Volume 27, page 7962. So if we look at paragraph 11.35 there first, at the bottom of the page. This says:
"Record of si ckness: Where a menber of the station party reports sick, a record will be made in the station party or occurrence book. All absences from duty because of sickness will be recorded in the menber's form D5 by the di strict of ficer in the case of members up to and incl uding the rank of inspector and by the di visional of ficer in the case of officers."

Now, if we just go back, we're going to go back to paragraph 11. Maybe we will just go on to paragraph 11.37 next, over the page. This relates to where members suffer injuries. I don't know have you considered that before? It seems to require a full report of circumstances immediately to the member's
divisional officer.
A. Just for clarification, a district officer is a superintendent.

279 Q. Yes.
A. And a divisional officer is a chief superintendent.

12:14
280 Q. Yes. I mean, were you of the view that this applied to you at all or did you ever consider that?
A. Sorry, this is to do with the recording of sick?
Q. Yes.
A. Em, I'm just going to have to read the paragraph.

282 Q. Go ahead.
A. Sorry, if you just ask me the question.

283 Q. Yes. We11, I mean, did you consider that your work related stress at this stage had become a personal injury?
A. Em, no, no, I wouldn't have said a personal injury. I wouldn't have said a personal injury.

284 Q. Okay.
A. But it was a work related -- it was work related.

285 Q. Okay. Well, can I draw your attention then back to an earlier provision; paragraph 11.25. Sorry, that is not the right page. If we scroll down, sorry, 11.30. This relates to the form D5. It says:
"Recording of absences: All absences from duty, save those occasi oned by rest days, shall be recorded in the appropriate col umm of formD5. Separate forns should be used in respect of each menber. The di strict officer will make arrangements for the completion and
filing of the forms."

So again, that seems to have cast the duty on the superintendent, who may cause it to be done obviously. Your D5s are contained at volume 33, at page 9306. I ${ }_{\text {12:17 }}$ don't know if you can read the periods there, but there's various dates on the left-hand side, and then there's a heading "medi cal hi story record" and the days are totted up there under "ordi nary illness". Then, on the far right-hand corner "work rel ated stress" is recorded there.
A. Yes.
Q. So this is, I suppose, the other half of the recording at that point in time. while the SAMS system on the system has flu viral, this D5 record apparently maintained by or on behalf of Superintendent Murray, seems to record it as work related stress there?
A. Yes.
Q. Then if we go to the next page, we can see it there as well, if we turn that around, for those different periods that we're talking about there.
A. Yes.

288 Q. So, on the one hand, it is, of course, categorising it as an ordinary illness, but it does appear to be actually recording it contemporaneously at that time as 12:19 a work related stress?
A. Yes.

289 Q. Now, I have heard what you have said about the meeting of the 26th March with the superintendent and he seemed
sceptical, certainly to your view, of the issue of stress. We have seen the letter which he wrote, referring you off to the cmo.
A. Judge, just even on that, Judge I think, and I could be wrong, I think he's obliged. He's now aware work related stress is on my cert, there's no threats of going to send to the CMO, he actually has to I think in accordance with the Garda Code. Bear in mind, after this, when it comes to that AWOL incident, there can be absolutely no doubt in relation to work related stress, because they use the certs as part of the disciplinary thing, which says work related stress. And, of course, the statement that's not given to me is a statement that refers to work related stress.
290 Q. Well, can I just ask you to look at 3270 , which is Superintendent Murray's letter? This goes off to the chief superintendent. If we go down there to the paragraph beginning "as an additional measure" and then if we look over the page, he refers to the period of absences, we have dealt with that already. But you did 12:21 then see the doctor on the 19th May, isn't that correct?
A. I think so. I can check.

291 Q. Yes.
A. This is '15, isn't it?

292 Q. Yes. Your diary does appear to record that you discussed the stress with the doctor?
A. Yes.

293 Q. Perhaps we will just look at that entry. It's for the

19th May '15.
A. Judge, the note I have is: "RD." RD, that is rest day.

CHA RMAN Just one second, we will get it. For the 19th May.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Scroll down to the next page.
CHA RMAN Here we are.
MR. MEGU NESS: No, 2015.
WTNESS: 2015.
CHAL RMAN Do we have the number, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGI NESS: Sorry, Judge.
WTNESS: That's 2014, this is 2015.
CHA RMAN I know.
MR. MRPHY: Chairman, it could be 13312, possibly.
CHA RMAN Thank you.
294 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: So there, it's in the middle of the page, Tuesday, the 19th. Could you just read out that to help us?
A. Sorry, yeah. "19th." RD stands for rest day.
"Surgeon 1pm Dr. Oghuvbu in CMD s of fice. He pointed out I ran out of annual leave and then went sick. Although l would be under some stress, it's not stuff to keep me out of work."

Judge, bear in mind, he doesn't know at that time my sick certs say work related stress. He has been kept in the dark. Because we don't find that out until December 2015
Q. Okay. The doctor wrote a short report, a handwritten report of that at 3790. There's various comments made, but if we just go down to the end, we have the doctor there. The conclusion there seems to be:
"Agreed fit to attend at present and fit for duties as assi gned. Continued to avail of organi sational..."

And is that: "some support." So you went back on duty 12:25 after that?
A. Yeah. We11, yeah. My diary note has that he said although I'm under some stress, it's not enough to keep me out of work. I think I would have been quite happy to have jumped ship at that stage.
297 Q. You did see him, as you said, in December. Mr. Murphy seemed to suggest that you were stood down, as he put it?
A. Yes.

298 Q. Can we just look at --
A. I dispute that, now.

299 Q. I understand that, that's fine. I just want to you comment on the doctor's notes from that day, at 3792. Sort of towards the bottom of the page there, it's sort 12:26 of starred, there is:
"Di scussed how we proceed to here and agreed treat ment i nterventions as referred by GP and" something "Ii nked in, continue to engage with supports, RTW.." Return 12:26 to work. "...depending on GP certification. I mportance of compliance reiterated. Agreed temporarily unfit to attend and wrote" is that "pending reval uation by GP."

I am just wondering, did he tell you or not that you were unfit for work as a consequence of --
A. No, no, absolutely not. There's no way -- I accept this is what's written here, I accept that. But there's no way I would have gone into work on the 21st December, absolutely now way. I would have quite
gladly, you know, gone out on that date. But no way on that, because how that meeting happened, what emanated from that, I remember actually, I remember even referencing a Latin word for him and it was primum non nocere, going into that meeting, it means first do no 12:27 harm. It's a doctor's oath that they take. I had looked it up, because, as I say, I'm going to have to tell this fella exactly what's going on.

But anyway, when I went in, I brought up a big file with me, Judge, of all the stuff. And that's when, as a result of the file that $I$ had, he asked me how, why are you not going out with work related stress and I said, I am. He said, is it on your certs? And I said, 12:27 it is. That's when he just turned around the sheet of paper in front of me, which is in the volumes, and it has all the viral flu the whole way down. He then said, is it on your certs? I said, yes, it is. So he then went rooting through folders. Then he said, I'm going to talk to someone high up about this. And I remember passing a comment, like, no matter how high up you talk about this, you won't be getting anywhere, or you won't get anywhere. And he said something like, they'11 1isten to me. And I remember thinking, yeah, right! But there was no -- he didn't say you're unfit for duty on that, I don't know.
300 Q. I don't know whether he took these contemporaneously or did them afterwards or whatever, but it is correct to say that the first report he seemed to have sent to effect is on the 8th January, at 3750?
A. Yeah, I noticed that. And I have already gone out sick on 26th December 2015.

301 Q. Yes.
A. So it was of no difference to me, really, whether he marked me out sick or -- because I was at the end anyway.

302 Q. Just scrol1 down the page slightly. In the recommend there:
"1. Foll owing consultation on 18/ 12 and update now recei ved fromthe menber's doctor, the nember is deemed temporarily unfit to attend regularly at work for pol icing duties."

So, he appears perhaps to have waited to have consulted with your doctor before he actually reports this?
A. That would be accurate.

All right.
A. Because he -- I don't know whether I had to sign something or whatever, but he did -- because of the issue over the flu, and bear in mind, the Guards had a number of case conferences -- Garda management, excuse me, a number of case conferences to do with me and my sick with Dr. Oghuvbu, and it's not until 18th December --

304 Q. We have dealt with this.
A. Oh yeah, but he then becomes aware of the flu.

305 Q. I understand.
A. What ultimately happens is, he then is in consultation with my doctor and the two of them speak, I understand, by way of telephone.

306 Q. We will be hearing from the other persons at the conference as well.
A. All right, sorry.

307 Q. Not at a11. It did appear that Superintendent Murray had sent your certs up though. Could we look at 3274 and 5? The 20th May, earlier that year. I think we
saw this yesterday. There's a number of attachments which are listed. This is obviously going up through the chief superintendent, prompted by a request from Mr. Mulligan, I think, at that stage. But the last one are the medical member's certificates there. You have 12:31 seen that before I think?
A. Anything that's in the documents I have read at some point.
Q. Okay, I'm going to pass from that. Is there anything else you would like to say on that?
A. I don't think so.

Q Issue 15, the denial of commendations. You've obviously been reading the volumes that we have been producing and hopefully that we will cease to produce, but volume 54 contains your commendations. You have seen that?
A. I know I'm just after stating anything that's in the volumes I have read.
Q. Right.
A. Any new material I haven't got to read, Judge, just for 12:31 clarification.
Q. Obviously, you will have seen that Superintendent Murray referred in his statement to having recommended others for the Seiko Just in Time award. It appears that, in fact, one of those who was so recommended also 12:32 got a Garda commendation. I don't know, were you aware of that?
A. Just what page?
Q. We11, if we go to 15292. This was an incident
connected with a possible apparent suicidal attempt on a bridge.
A. Yeah. I see here now, yeah.
where Sergeant Keane had recommended this guard for his efforts in saving somebody from the bridge, while the others were not commended. I don't know if you have any knowledge of that or do you want to comment on the fact of commendation of somebody in such a circumstance?
A. No, he did not -- just my thing in relation to the commendations, I know it might sound like a small thing, but the commendation, that would be standard in anything like that; that you would get a commendation for something, an incident like that. They can give you all the -- nominate you for all the awards in the world, but at the end of the day, you would always get a Garda commendation from the Guards in relation to incidents like that, is in general is my point.
314 Q. We11, could I ask you to look at page 15707, where a query was s specifically raised as to whether the other 12:34 gardaí involved in this have been the subject of a recommendation for commendation, as opposed to Garda Teehan, who had been recommended by Sergeant Keane. It appears to confirm Superintendent Murray's position in that regard. I don't know if you have any commend to make on that?
A. I am just reading it now. It's very interesting. MR. KELLY: Is this the document we got this morning? MR. MtGU NESS: Possibly.

MR. KELLY: okay.
MR. MEGU NESS: This is in volume 56, 15706.
CHA RMAN It's dated three or four days ago.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
WTNESS: The last page.
12:35
MR. KELLY: Nobody has given it to me and I have up to 55.

CHA RMAN It's dated 8th November. So we wouldn't have had much of a chance over the weekend.

MR. KELLY: 55 I have. 56 I have never heard of.
CHA RMAN which is 56, Mr. Kelly?
MR. KELLY: That's not something mentioned in volume 56.

MR. MEGU NESS: There's several pages in it.
CHA RMAN No, hold on. Mr. Kelly has up to volume 55. 12:35 Is this Volume 56?

MR. MEGU NESS: This is, yes.
CHA RMAN A new volume.
MR. KELLY: It may be once I speak to Mr. McGuinness, we can actually sort it out, I can get a digitalised version of that.

CHA RMAN Yes, I think that's fair. Okay. Maybe you will pass on from that. It's a letter of 8th November 2019, so it's pretty well hot off the presses on any basis, so I don't see how Mr. Kelly or Garda Keogh could have had a chance to have look at it. MR. KELLY: It's okay, as long as Garda Keogh is given a chance to read it now.

CHAN RMAN Absolutely.

MR. KELLY: It doesn't look, in the stuff that I have been given, that there is that much in it. So if we just read it.
CHAL RMAN But I am understanding that this an instance, another instance where Superintendent Murray put people forward, a person or persons forward for the Seiko Just in Time award, but didn't think that there should also be a commendation. Am I understanding that correctly?
MR. MEGI NNESS: Yes. Although, a commendation was made by Sergeant Keane for one person, the person who was on the bridge.
CHAN RMAN Okay. Do you understand the point?
A. Yeah, but on this last page, 15707, Judge, it refers to
"We are instructed that Superintendent Pat Murray did not seek nor recommend commendations for the ot her gar daí ".

315 Q. CHA RMAN Yes, that's right. Now really, it really is 12:37 matter for comment or cross-examination of Chief Superintendent Murray, to be honest. But for what it's worth, there's not a whole lot that anybody can say about it at this point, if you know what I mean.
A. Yes.

316 Q. CHA RMAN It's just a fact to suggest that your circumstance was not unique, you can't comment on the other circumstances of the other case?
A. No.

317 Q. CHA RMAN Do you understand?
A. I do understand.

318 Q. CHA RMAN I don't want to be unfair to you. And really, there's not a whole lot you can say about it, I would have thought?
A. I do understand. And Judge, just I know I mentioned this before, it was just a little thing, but it might be -- it was just, when the nomination for the award to do with myself and my unit, it was two months after the incident, Judge, and I would be very curious about that 12:38 because a lot goes on in eight weeks in policing. I know I pointed it out already.
CHA RMAN Okay. I think that's right, I think I'm right in saying that, Mr. McGuinness; that really Superintendent Murray will say, presumably, the
situation that obtained here, it wasn't unique, it has happened on another occasion and people will explore that to say, we11, whatever they will say about that, I think.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes, Chairman.
CHA RMAN That seems to be the situation, Mr. Kelly. There's not a whole lot that anybody can say about it at the moment until such time -- but it's certain7y a matter to be explored, as appropriate, with Superintendent Murray.
MR. KELLY: We11, I try not to comment on stuff that I have just seen.
CHA RMAK Very good. Well I don't think you will have a lot to say about it, Mr. Kelly, at this point. But
you may have something afterwards to say about it.
MR. KELLY: who knows.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MEGI NNESS: If I can pass on to issue 17, concerning the ó Cualáin investigation.
CHA RNAN Right. This is probably going to take you a while, Mr. McGuinness, is it?
MR MEGU NESS: A little while.
CHA RMAN okay. Well, would it be convenient to take a break at that point?
MR. MEGU NESS: of course, Chairman.
CHA RMAN I think we could all do with a break at that point. Thanks very much. Lovely. Okay.

THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED FOR LUNCH AND RESUMED AS FOLLOVG:

319 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: Good afternoon, Garda Keogh. If I may just backtrack a little bit. We had dealt with the car tax issue, and I am not going back to it, but it gave rise to a different issue, which was the regulation 10 notice issue. Now obviously, Superintendent Murray dealt with you in the way that he did. Obviously in his statement he drew attention to the fact that he had issued other regulation 10 notices to other members. so he was dealing with people under the same discipline procedure, using the same mode of proceedings for a variety of other matters. Obviously we have looked at those, you have seen them in the books, I take it?
A. I have disputed that part.

320 Q. They were issued for a variety of different issues. Perhaps if we look at Volume 31, 8793, 8797. 8793. That's the heading there. If we just go down to the first one, scroll down through all four fairly quickly. 14:04 This is Garda A in fact, and there's a neglect of duty there, failing to submit an investigation file. There's issues about unexplained delay there. If we go down then.
A. Sorry, I apologise, just one -- I just see here, this is an incident that's on 20th November 2013, Judge. That should have been -- all that should have been covered and encompassed into the main ó Cualáin investigation.
321 Q. I am not opening these for that purpose but you have offered that opinion. But it's dealt with there in that way. Then if we go to the next one, it's a different guard, and that's about extending immigration registrations for students. That's dealt with in the same way; advice, caution. Advised, cautioned to adhere to the policies. The next one down then.
A. Judge, in relation to that, there was a lengthy investigation into that and that's another -- it's not under the Terms of Reference.
322 Q. This is another one, about neglect of duty, about failing to submit a file in relation a seizure. Again, that's dealt with under the same mechanism. Then there is one in handwriting here, it's about neglecting to carry out a proper investigation into a crime over
quite a period. It's an assault type of -- it's a rape case. Again, that was dealt with in April 2015, close enough to your one. So they're the other examples of the regulation 10. Is there any comment you'd like to make?
A. Yeah.

323 Q. I mean, perhaps it's invidious to ask you to comment on the members, I don't really want to you to comment on the members, but it's really the issue of Superintendent Murray in the sense of targeting you vis-à-vis them or otherwise?
A. Yeah. The only comment I have to make is, no one else -- the misdemeanour on the car, nobody else is disciplined for misdemeanour on a car. Everybody else is given a two month chance to get their --
324 Q. You would like to be considered in that light, is it?
A. I think so, that would fair, if I was given a chance like everybody else was.
Q. If we go back to the issue then I was just about to start before lunch, the ó Cualáin issue, issue 17. You noted in your diary for the 6th, 7th and 8th August, it's volume 47 --
A. I'm sorry for interrupting. Just back to that page, 8794. Judge, in relation to the McMahon report, there's a number of discipline matters in relation to Garda A. This one is not --
CHA RMAN I am not concerned with that.
WTNESS: Yes, Judge.
CHAI RMAN At least at this point I'm not concerned
with that. I am not concerned with revisiting everything. A simple point, Mr. McGuinness makes a simple point, in fairness to you, which is to say that your point was that the punishment, the use of regulation 10, even though it's not a severe sanction, the use of regulation 10 was unreasonable and disproportionate. Now that is what you say; it was unreasonable and disproportionate.
A. It's the way they did it, Judge, that everyone else was given a chance.
326 Q. CHA RMAN That's what am I trying to say? I'm trying to summarise the situation. It was unreasonable and disproportionate to do it. what's more, when you compare it with the other people who didn't get any, even though they might have had more serious, that's one point. And the second point, which is what Mr. McGuinness has just drawn up, is other people who did get regulation 10s, at least on the face of it appear to have done things far more seriously than any question of road tax. I am just trying to keep our eye 14:08 on the ball. That's the specific point he wants to make under the revisiting the car tax question. Okay.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN I am not sort of criticising you for introducing something else, I am just saying I do understand and that's the point that we're talking about. Okay. Now we are onto the ó Cualáin investigation.
327 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. If we just look at page 13268.

If we just go down the page there, we have got entries there in relation to the 6th: "12" Is that 12 midday:
"...investigation teamin Athl one. At one point I was in public office. Garda A wrote letter to D/Super saying this was unacceptable."

Then you've got a reference to:
"Sonebody [bl ank] made a statement. Sai d coul dn't remenber who was on search and what was sai d. Garda A hanging around station all day."

And then, if we go back up the page so we can see the day of the 7th: "Was aware that MR to be spoken to..." 14:10 Is that "took". No. "...told D/Super at 1:30amre Garda A and ME. B, other case."

Is it?
A. Can I just get the date?

328 Q. Well, that's the 7th August, it's across the page.
A. Yeah. "Was aware --" Judge, they're initials. " -- to be spoken to --" There's a time, it says something 30am, I can't make it out myself, re, two more initials, and Ms. B, and overdose.
329 Q. It seemed to convey, perhaps I'm misinterpreting it, that one of your colleagues was being interviewed that day in the station?
A. It appeared, yes, yes, that's -- I'm just working out
myself the initials. Yes. There's one, two, three, four that I have that would have been met and then I have: "IT investigation team" Then:
"Garda A hung around station again all day."

I think it's "wal ki ng", I think is the last word.
330 Q. obviously we have made various requests of the Commissioner and the Commissioner's team for a breakdown of who was interviewed where. The latest one 14:12 is included in Volume 55, at page 15526. I should just ask you to confirm that. The reference there to writing a letter, you wrote to Detective Superintendent mulcahy about this, you then met him the following week, the 13th, discussed this issue?
A. Yes.

331 Q. You have given your evidence already, your opinion of this. But it would appear that perhaps only six to seven statements by that time had been taken. I don't know if you see that first page there? If you go down four from Garda A. Do you see Garda A in the middle?
A. Yes.

332 Q. There's Garda Lyons there, 10/8 /14. So that's in the period we're talking about. If you go down four more below that, there's a statement there from Garda Turner, 10/8/2014.
A. Yes.

333 Q. If we go over to the next page, 15527, in the middle of the page they're Garda mick Ryan on $7 / 8$. That's the
day in the diary we just looked at. Then the first statement of Inspector Farrell, which is at the bottom of the page. Again, that's in that period, isn't that right, 26/6?
A. Yes.

Then if we go to the next page, 15528, and in the middle of the page there you see the first statement of Sergeant Haran, 6/8/2014?
A. Yes.
Q.

Then the second from the bottom, Garda Neary, 6/8 as well?
A. Yes.
Q. Then if we go to the next page, there's a reference there to Ms. Hannon, clerical officer. The descriptor on the statement header is at Athlone. So we will take 14:14 that at its face, that's 16/7/2014. So that appears that they had taken seven statements before you made your complaint. I don't know whether you want to comment on that.
CHA RMAN Well, if that's what it says, that's what it 14:14 says?

MR. MEGI NESS: Obviously, subject to hearing other witnesses.
A. I am slightly confused.

337 Q. Yes.
A. Before I actually made my statement?

338 Q. CHA RMAN No, before you made the complaint about the statements being -- the relevant date here is the time you made a complaint.
A. Yes.


## A. Yes.

CHA RMAK That statements were being taken and that Garda A was hanging around?
A. Yes.

340 Q. CHA RMAN Now, Mr. McGuinness points out that on this record apparently seven statements, if I am understanding, were taken prior to that date, is that correct, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGU NESS: That's correct.
CHA RMAN Well that is a statement of fact.
A. Yes.
Q. CHAN RMAN Right.
A. My answer to that is, it's seven too many.
Q. CHAL RMAN whether it's is 107 or not, the question is: That's a number that we are taking before you did it, okay.
Q. MR. MEGU NESS: And you will have seen the other documents which will show that some later statements, which are identified in yellow here, were also taken after that?
A. Yes.
Q. Obviously that's subject to proof. Just turning to another issue. After Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin reported and sent his report to the Director of Public Prosecutions, a decision was made by the Director and you were informed of that, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

345 Q. You wrote a letter, which is at page 298. This is a letter to the Minister, copied to others I think, on
the 16th May. If we scroll down and just stop there. It says:
"Dear Mnister for Justice, Frances Fitzgeral d.

Further to my letter dated 26 th July 2015 (al so attached) on the $2 / 10 / 2015$ I made a protected di scl osure to $G S O C$ regarding a flawed Garda criminal i nvestigation into a conspiracy to supply heroin i nvol ving a menber of An Garda Sí ochána in
contravention to section 21... Wi ch I believe was no more than a deliberate and unmitigated cover up by Deputy Cormíssi oner Ó Cual ái n. I believe this investigation was similar to the internal Garda investigation into Garda misconduct in Donegal in the 1990s, which was Iater exposed by the Mbris Tri bunal."

Now, it's your solicitor's letter but obviously it is written on your behalf. Was that your view about it at that time?
A. Judge, I think I wrote this letter.

346 Q. You think you wrote that letter?
A. Yeah, I wrote this myself.

347 Q. Okay.
A. Judge, for clarification, I won't go into the details but I'm aware now there's one part in that letter that's actually, I understand, not accurate. It's the third last line from the bottom, in relation to a TD being informed. I now understand that -- at the time I
wrote the letter, that was my belief. I understand that that may not be accurate.
348 Q. I'm not sure which page you're referring to there?
A. It's 298.

349 Q. On 298 itself. If we go back to 298, please. The reference to the TD there is inaccurate?
A. Yeah. Well, at the time I had heard that and wrote the letter, but after that, Judge, I heard that that part is not accurate. So, just for clarification.
Okay, thank you. Just to go back to the first paragraph that we were looking at. My understanding of it at this stage is that Detective Superintendent Mulcahy had offered to sit down with you and go through the report?
A. Yes.
Q. So you hadn't seen the report or its contents or any material contained in the investigation report or the backup documents?
A. Yes.
Q. We11, I wonder would you consider whether the opinion you've offered here was perhaps premature in the light of that?
A. Judge, I was that annoyed with the whole investigation, 14:19 the way it was conducted and everything that I -- I mean, as I said, I had already then made a complaint to GSOC in relation to the Garda investigation.

354 Q. Yes.
A. So, in hindsight, I should have, I probably should have taken Detective Superintendent Mulcahy up on his offer in relation to looking at it. But it wasn't going to change anything. I mean I had reported, I think I had reported anyway to GSOC at the time.
Q. Yes. But I mean, as matters stand today, are you maintaining that this was a deliberate cover up by the assistant commissioner?
A. I believe so. This is the assessment of the suspension, is it?
A. I just mightn't have the right page number. I have the 14:21 wrong page number, I think, Judge. But there's something which is written by Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin, where he states if -- he's the investigating member, and it's in 2015, where he writes, it's one paragraph where he writes, if this -- something along the lines of: If these allegations were proven, it would be -- it would be reflected in an unfavourable light to An Garda Síochána. Something along those lines, Judge. I will try and get the paragraph exactly.

358 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: In any event, just turning to issue 18.

CHA RMAN what do you say to that?
A. I would argue that there is motives there. Motives. Because, like, I would -- part of my case is saying, you know, for any policeman anywhere in the world who has to be bringing an allegation like that, it has to be established, means, motive and opportunity. And I would argue that there is means and opportunity constantly through this, but for motive, to do something like that, I would -- I'd have to move that paragraph out, Judge.

359 Q.

360 Q.
A.
Q.

CHA RMAN You say he had the means, the opportunity and the motive to produce a phony report? Is that right? Sorry, you say it's a deliberate and unmitigated cover up?
A. Is essentially what I'm saying, Judge, yes. If I can get that paragraph, I'd be able to put my argument of what the motive is, Judge, that there is a motive.

361 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: In any event, Garda Keogh, your legal advisors will have ample opportunity to raise the issue. You can take some assurance from that. Just in relation to the bullying and harassment, in summary obviously, you had raised issues with Dr. Oghuvbu in February -- December '15, you had met Chief Superintendent Tony McLough1in, you had posted a large collection of documents with him at the beginning of

September I think, isn't that right, in relation to your bullying issue?
A. Yeah, this is with Dr. Oghuvbu?
Q. Yes, that was the first step, as it were.
A. Yes.
Q. You met Chief Superintendent McLoughlin in the summer of 2016?
A. Yes.
Q. He wrote to you.
A. Yes.

366 Q. You wrote a letter, which is to be seen at page 3321. 14:24 This was your position then as of 1st September:
"I wi sh to acknow edge your letter dated 19th August 2016. I posted documents to you in rel ation to the har assment on 29/8/16. I hope you recei ved same.

I am writing in rel ation to the question of a formal compl ai nt bei ng made by me regarding the harassment and the answer is no. I first reported this harassment when it started to Deputy Commi ssi oner Ó Cual ái n on 7th 14:25 J une 2014. Deputy Commi ssi oner Ó Cual ái $n$ i nf or med ree that he was only deal ing with what is in my affidavit.

The issue of harassment has been raised over 20 times
in the Dáil and l have written to the $M$ nister for Justice, Mb. Francis Fitzgerald, regarding same on a number occasi ons and she is aware of it."

We know subsequent to this you explained why you
decided not to make a complaint of bullying and then you ultimately changed your mind and you confirmed in writing to the chief superintendent that you did want to make it?
A. Yes.

367 Q. As of, by the 20th October, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. The Finn investigation commences, but it would appear you were sent a letter dated 16th September 2017, by Assistant Commissioner Finn, informing you of his appointment. Could we look at that, at 4210? I think perhaps 4140.
A. Sorry 42?
Q. If we scroll down a tiny bit further. Do you recall getting that letter?
A. I can't remember actually getting the letter. However, I'm not disputing I got the letter.
Q. Okay. It's explained, the date is explained by Assistant Commissioner Finn in his statement as being a mistake in terms of the date of his appointment. He says he explained the mistake to you when you met on the 1st November. Could we just look at his notes? 4219. This is a meeting on the 1st December. He has noted there that the date was wrongly put on the
letter. Do you recall him saying that?
A. I am looking at 4219, which is the memo of the --

371 Q. Yes.
A. Yes. Sorry, so your question, the yes is not to the answer. Sorry.
Q. I have just drawn your attention to the letter written by him, apparently dated the 16th September, referring to his appointment, which he says is a mistaken date. He has noted here that he seemed to have explained that to you at the time. Do you recollect him explaining that to you?
A. I don't recollect that. Just, the contents of the letter, where Inspector Annette Browne, what's banked out I presume is a phone number there, and I do know at some point I have phone contact with Inspector Browne in relation to the procedure for the meeting.
373 Q. I mean, all of the other documentation suggests he was appointed in the middle of November, following your resection of a mediation, isn't that correct?
A. Judge, I'm just not...

CHAN RMAN I understand. Let me tell you, for what it's worth, for what it's worth, the information we have on paper gives the 15th November as the date when Assistant Commissioner Finn was appointed. So it makes sense that if this date is wrong, it should be the 16th 14:29 November. So he's writing to you to say, look, I have been appointed blah-blah-b7ah and whatever, whether it was a long delay or not a delay. So assuming he was appointed on the 15 th November, then it would probably
make sense that this would be the 16th November. But presumably we can explore all that if anybody thinks it's important. I am not saying it's not important, it may be important.

MR. MEGU NESS: Mr. Murphy was asking you about how it 14:30 came about that you had been aware of the issue of waiving mediation, and I think Inspector McCarthy called to your house with a letter from Assistant Commissioner Fanning on the 9th November?
A. Yes.

Isn't that correct?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. If we just look at that letter, it's 10228. That is dated the 9th. If we scroll up slightly to the top, we will see the date. Come back down, perhaps it's at the 14:31 bottom. You make it clear that that was a decision you couldn't make on the spot?
A. Yes.
Q. You told Inspector McCarthy and you sent a written confirmation too, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you just look at that, 10231. Did you send that back with Inspector McCarthy or did you e-mail it or post it, do you know?
A. From recollection, I think I hand wrote it on the spot and gave it, I think. But it contained -- it was -that would look right, two lines or whatever. It was on7y a very short letter with the contents, where I stated:
"I wi sh to have this matter fully investigated. I do not wi sh to avail of mediation."

379 Q. Now, obviously you've told the Chairman of your criticisms of the investigation. One of the issues that was raised in connection with it was the description by the assistant commissioner of attaching the words "bona fide" to the Garda Lyons report, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. It was submitted bona fide?
A. Yeah. A11 the way through that report, just from my recollection of reading it, the words: "Garda Lyons recei ved this information in good faith." I think is pretty much written on all the...

381 Q. Now, in your statement to the Tribunal you described the statement as a contrivance, at the time you made your statement to the Tribunal, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

382 Q. It's just, it does appear that the issue of the authenticity/validity of the report wasn't an issue that was addressed to Assistant Commissioner Finn or Mr . de Bruir in any explicit way. Was there any reason for that?
A. Well, it... Em... Judge, I'm just trying to figure out am I getting fixed up in the McMahon and ó Cualáin -- or Finn investigation here. The Lyons report was in...

CHA RMAN Just take your time. Assistant Commissioner Finn, he's doing the bullying and harassment investigation?
A. Yes, it was in with the Finn.

383 Q. CHA RMAN So you have met him. You have had the business of the note when you meet him and Mr. Cullen wanted to have the next meeting recorded and so on. So there is, I suppose, a certain amount of unease or tension possibly. But one way or the other, anyway, he sets about investigating these matters. There isn't a second meeting, isn't that right?
A. Correct.
Q.

CHA RMAN There isn't a second meeting?
A. No.

385 Q. CHA RMAN But he does send you various statements that 14:34 have been taken from other people?
A. Yes. They weren't statements, Judge. They were on headed solicitors papers. They were reports. CHA RMAN I follow. Okay. Responses, I should have said. .
A. Responses.

387 Q. CHA RMAK I'm sorry, I should have said, thank you, responses received from the various other participants in the affair. He asked you to comment on that. So that's your opportunity to comment?
A. Yes.

388 Q. CHA RMAN Now, Mr. McGuinness is asking you then about the Lyons, Sergeant Lyons or Garda Lyons, presumably, as he was. What are you asking, Mr. McGuinness?

389 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Just in the context of what you believed about the report, it doesn't appear to have been submitted on your behalf that the report was a deliberately falsified, trumped up report that Garda Lyons was put up at that point in time?
A. When I first meet Assistant Commissioner Finn, I'm not even aware that Garda Lyons was author of that report.
Q. I know that. But the point is, he sent you documentation, from which you knew that said Garda Lyons had been the author of the report?
A. That's when I found out.
Q. I understand. You were clear in your response to Superintendent McBrien from the beginning. There is no question about that; isn't that right?
A. Yes.

Yes. You told, I think it was Mr. Murphy when he was asking but this, that it didn't matter who wrote the report. That just seems a bit inconsistent with what your evidence was to me, because you seemed to be laying great stress on the fact that it was Garda Lyons', who was Garda A's partner, who had been probably or possibly put up to it. I mean, it did seem important, did it not, who had written the report?
A. That's in relation to the Garda responses, where they have Garda Lyons received this report in good faith,
that was my point on that one.
394 Q. okay.
A. Where I dispute good faith.

395 Q. okay.
A. And that it was never -- nobody ever said in any of the $14: 36$ investigations, including the Finn investigation, by the way, Garda Lyons was Garda A's partner. Because I believe that it was a relevant thing.
396 Q. So it was then relevant who had written the report?
A. It was, it was relevant who -- yes, it was relevant. 14:37 It was relevant who wrote the report, of course, but what I'm trying to say is, it didn't matter who wrote the report because the report was totally false.
397 Q. I understand. That's the difference, is it?
A. Mm-hmm.

398 Q. Okay. Can we just move on to issue 19; Assistant Commissioner Fanning's disciplinary inquiry. Mr. Murphy was cross-examining you on Day 110 in relation to that. Perhaps we might look at page 68 of that. At the bottom of that page you draw attention there to the paragraph at the top of page 5999, and say:
"Within the body of the letter of Ni chol as Keogh, I note there his reference to Oivia O Neill and alleged interaction. "

Then if we go over the page, to page 69, the quotation is continued:
"I can state that this inf ormation was not previ ously known to me and my di sci pline investigation team and has only come to my attention as part of the documentation recei ved fromthe Chi ef State Solicitors on 8th March 2019."

Do you remember quoting that?
A. I'm not disputing it but.

399 Q. Yes. Then if we go on to page 70, you make the comment 14:39 obviously that this seemed incredible, but you say, question 170 , if we go down the page.
"And she's not aware of interactions between Garda A and ME. B until 8th March 2019."
A. Yes.

400 Q. That's the interpretation you took of it?
A. Yes.

401 Q. Then on the next page, page 71, in answer to the Judge, 14:39 he puts forward two scenarios and said:
"J udge, if you were to take either of those scenarios, Judge, I would still argue that it is incredible that - "

I just wanted to ask you to look at the context of what the assistant commissioner had said in her statement. If we go to page 5999. You were quoting there that top
paragraph, do you see that, from the second line on?
A. Yes.

402 Q. okay. Now, if we just go back to the previous page, do you see the last line on the previous page. This is how the paragraph commences:
"Cont ai ned within tab 3, I note a letter from Garda Ni chol as Keogh addressed to retired Detective Superintendent Decl an Mul cahy dated 5th December 2014 further listed as 5(n) in correspondence fromJohn
Gerard Cullen sol icitors to the Disclosures Tri bunal dated 25th Jul y 2018. Within the body of the letter of Garda Ni chol as Keogh, I note there is reference to Ol ivia ÓNeill and alleged interactions bet ween Garda A and ME. B. I can state that this information was not previ ously known to me and my di sci pline investigation teamand has onl y come to my attention as part of the documentation recei ved fromthe Chi ef State Solicitors on 8th March 2019."

So, I just wanted to take you back to the actual correspondence. The 1etter is at 273. This was your solicitor's letter in response to the Tribunal request to set out various matters. At number 5 then, if we go down the page, you are being asked to identify the protected disclosures. So it starts off 5 A, B, C, D and then if we go over the page we go to $M$, which is referenced in the statement that we have just looked at, as is this. It says:
"M Letter to Detective Superintendent Mul cahy date stamped 5th Decenber 2014."

Do you recall that letter?
14:42
A. Just off the top of my head, I can't, because I wrote a number of letters.

403 Q. Okay. That's a handwritten letter at 327, if we just look at that. It's addressed to Detective
Superintendent Mulcahy. It records that you met Olivia 14:42 O'Neill on $4 / 12 / 14 ?$
A. Yes.
Q. It gives an account, a varied hearsay account of comings and goings, sightings of Garda Keogh and/or his car near the Ms. B house?
A. Yes.

405 Q. Observed, not by her, but by a son and a neighbour and all pieced together into this report?
A. Yes.

406 Q. Okay. It relates to the dates in question, if we just go back down there to the bottom of the page. You think the date was 28/11/14 because you make reference to some other event there?
A. Yes.

407 Q. So it appears, because of what Assistant Commissioner
McMahon has said in that paragraph, she's drawing attention to this letter, identified by your solicitor at paragraph 5 m , as being the incident that she hadn't previously been made aware of. But it would seem that
she was aware of all of the other interactions alleged between Garda A and Ms. B?
A. I don't know.

408 Q. Okay, we will hear from her in due course. Can I move to issue 20 , relating to the promotion of Inspector Murray. Now, Mr. Murphy I think drew your attention to the Policing Authority promotion forms, you recall that?
A. Yes.

409 Q. He drew your attention to parts of the form and suggested that one particular part related to disciplinary charges or disciplinary events only, and was suggesting that a pending bullying case wouldn't or shouldn't necessarily be included on the form in that part. Do you recall that?
A. I'm just a bit lost.

410 Q. Okay. Perhaps we will look at the form then. If we look at volume 14, page 4021. This particular form, do you see that?
A. The date is $11 / 9 / 2017,4022$ ?

411 Q. Yes. It gives different parts there; sections 1, 2, 3, 4. Mr. Murphy was suggesting to you in relation to parts 2, 3 and 4, that the documentation required information only in those categories and that effectively it wouldn't be possible to put in reference 14:46 to bullying and harassment?
A. Yeah, I think disputed that, Judge, just from reading it, and there's two issues there.
412 Q. Yes.
A. One was at section 4 , where in the box it has:
"Records at this of fice indi cate that there are presently no outstanding di sci pline or compl ai nts/investi gations in respect of this candi date."

Judge, this is signed by Assistant Commissioner Finn on 11/9/17. But, Judge, I think there's another --
413 Q. CHA RMAN There is. Mr. McGuinness is going to draw 14:47 your attention to it.
A. Oh.

414 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: Yes. I mean, if you look at section 1 , section 1 is perhaps as important as any of the other sections:
"Decl aration of suitability."

If Mr. Murphy is right and that section 4 could only deal with outstanding criminal or disciplinary
investigations, would you expect any issue relating to the character of the candidate to be dealt with under section 1?
A. Can I just read section 1?

415 Q. Yes, please. It says:
"I decl are that there are no grounds known to the Garda Sí ochána rel ating to heal th, character or ot herwi se why this candi date is not suitable."
A. "Ot herwi se". Judge that word "otherwi se" jumps out there.

416 Q. Yes.
A. And back to section 5, the confirmation part as well. has said, at page 7335, going towards the bottom there, the question starts at 454:
"I have been asked if I had been aware of a compl ai nt made agai nst Superintendent Pat Murray under the bullying and har assment policy, Wbrking Toget her to Create a Positive Wbrking Envi ronment, would this have been noted on the clearance formreturned to the Policing Authority rel ating to Superintendent Pat Murray's application for promtion to chi ef superi nt endent."

Then the answer is over the page there, and he says:
"I was not aware of a compl ai nt made agai nst Superi ntendent Pat Murray under the bullying and har assment policy. If known, this would have been noted in the clearance formbeing returned to the Policing Authority."

Now, perhaps that's not clear where he would have noted it. But did you see this issue of bullying and harassment going to the superintendent's character?
A. We11, no, but it would just be something that the guard -- An Garda Síochána were obliged to inform the Policing Authority of this particular complaint. whether it was true, whether it was false or anything, I would argue is not really relevant. It's just they were obliged to say, yes, there actually is something here. And I understand the person who signed off on the clearance forms was investigating the said complaint and it was countersigned by the acting commissioner, Donal ó Cualáin.

418 Q. Yes. Certainly, Assistant Commissioner Finn appears to have signed it off on 17th September 2017, before he's appointed?
A. Yes, but I think there's a -- I think there's another, another -- I think there's another form in January, I think, January of '18. I could be totally wrong. I thought I saw a form of January '18 somewhere that relates to the same...
419 Q. Yes. But certainly the Policing Authority requested information relating to the issue. Perhaps we will just look at 7518. If we go down the page there on 7518, that middle paragraph, the clearance process. And it says:
"The clearance process for Superintendent Murray commenced on 6th September 2017 as a result of vacanci es arising in the chi ef superintendent rank. The three completed forms as described in section 5 above were recei ved, but additional information was
requi red from An Garda Sí ochána and requested on 12th Oct ober 2017. This was to seek clarification arising fromthe fact that the Garda Sí ochána clearance form did not mention ongoing matters in rel ation to Superintendent Murray in the context of rel evant matters then in the public domain. Full clarification was finally recei ved fromthe Garda Sí ochána on 25 th J anuary 2018."

Now, obviously Mr. Murphy asked you all about the events of early October which led to issues coming into the public domain, I am not concerned with that at the moment. But it appeared that the Policing Authority seemed to have the view that they would like to hear more on this?
A. Yes. But I didn't know, I wasn't aware of any of this until $I$ read the documents.
420 Q. Yes. But if Mr. Murphy is right and that this bullying and harassment claim doesn't or can't come under the heading of a criminal or disciplinary investigation, it's got to come in somewhere else. That's why I am asking you, did you think your bullying and harassment claim reflected on the character of the applicant for promotion?
A. Well, it had to, it had -- in that -- well, what I am
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here. And then, if they did it the proper way, investigate it and then go through the motions and do the promotion.
421 Q. Obviously that is the process. You have given evidence about your view of that. But you told Mr. Murphy that you can't deny you didn't want him promoted?
A. I'm not going to say -- I can't say I wanted him to be promoted.
422 Q. Yes. But is that because you thought he was not fit to be promoted?
A. I mean, I had a lot of evidence that we have gone through in relation to where, you know, I made a formal complaint and I had evidence to back it up. I perceived I had evidence, had evidence to back up, to make it stand, to make my complaint stand to some degree.
Can we go back to the 26th March, because that is the first time you met him. How many times thereafter did you meet him?
A. Oh, I suppose like, as in how many times was I called up to the office, I presume four or five, something like that.
424 Q. okay. But I mean, had you formed a definitive view of him after the first meeting?
A. No. Like we shook hands the first meeting going in and 14:55 I shook hands at the end of the first meeting, when I walked out. And the thing with the tax, I immediately did, because I just -- I just wanted to move on. of course, like, I didn't want -- it wasn't in my
interests to get into any more conflict with Garda management, I was already in enough.
Q. But I mean, at that meeting and then in the following fortnight say, you had a concatenation of circumstances or events, a whole sequence of different events relating to you. There was the car tax issue, which led to the disciplinary notice. You're effectively saying you were tricked into or you were disciplined without knowing that it was going to happen after you had paid the car tax?
A. Oh yeah. Like, Superintendent Murray I think states he told me he was going to discipline me on the first day, if my recollection is correct, from reading. That wasn't the case. There was no mention of discipline. There was mention of car tax, all right, but from my recollection there was no mention that I was going to be disciplined.

426 Q. Yes. But what arises out of those couple of weeks are the car tax, the skepticism about your stress, the discipline, the delaying of your travel expenses until signed off in early April, the micro supervision that came from that and sending you off to the CMO, where you think he knew you were being misreported, is that right?
A. Yes. Yeah. I would -- yes.
you not decided that Superintendent Murray had it in for you?
A. Oh at some point it became very clear that that was my belief, yeah.
428 Q. I mean, you've described some of his actions as vindictive, isn't that right?
A. I would.
Q. So, I mean, I am just wondering, you've expressed a view about the process before the Policing Authority and that all you were concerned at was the process, that they should know about this before they appointed him. But, I mean, is it not clear that you were very intent on him not getting promoted, if you could do anything about it?
A. Em, this is different now to what was previously put to $14: 58$ me in relation to taking him down. We're into a different category. I can agree, yes, in relation to, I didn't want to see him promoted, but there's a difference there with taking someone down.
Yes. No, I understand, I understand that. It's just one can see where the process of promotion kicks off and it seems that you effectively have had close to several months of complaining against him before the process kicked off. I mean, you'd agree with that, I take it?
A. Before the process kicked off?

431 Q. The process of promotion.
A. Well, the process of promotion, you have to bear in mind, I don't know when Superintendent Murray applies
for promotion.
Q. Yes.
A. I have got no idea. All $I$ know is, from my side of things, where I reported initially to Chief Superintendent McLough1in about harassment, I then went 14:59 to GSOC and was trying to get a complaint to them, for them to investigate the harassment. But they said I had to invoke the Garda policy and then come back to them. So then I went back to An Garda Síochána then, back to the Chief Superintendent McLough1in, invoked that. But then there was still a delay after that and...

433 Q. In any event, Superintendent Murray said that he first applied for promotion on the 18th January and then he is told later, in the spring, page 2062, and you're writing to the Minister by 14th June 2016. So you must have become aware of it at that stage, the promotion issue?
A. Sorry, if I have written to the Minister and mentioned it, $I$ obviously am.

434 Q. You mentioned in passing Ms. B being sighted near your house?
A. Yes.
Q. Then you mentioned on Friday, you made a remark concerning -- I understand it to relate to a report that Superintendent Murray wrote concerning the Ms. B sighting?
A. Yes.
Q. That's a report which is contained in volume 30. It
contains a report written by Superintendent Murray on the 24th February 2016, one report directed to the superintendent in Tullamore and another report then directed to the chief superintendent in Athlone.
MR. MRPFH: Chairman, before Mr. McGuinness proceeds, can I just perhaps raise one matter?

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MRPH: This seems to arise from something that was said yesterday, that is transcript Day 114, I just have a concern it may be outside the scope of what you, Chairman, fixed as appropriate grounds. The reason for that assessment is, it's not just based on my -- it also seems to be shared by Garda Keogh. I don't know if on screen it's possible to bring up Day 114, at page 71, please.
CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. MRPH: Page 71, please. Chairman, you will just see there, please, at line 4, where Garda Keogh makes reference to an incident and he said:
"I won't go into the inci dent because it's not covered under the terns."

## CHA RMAN Yes.

MR. MRPH: Now, as it happened on another occasion again he does mention something about this, at the end of that paragraph, line 21, he says:

[^2]the terns."

And he stopped. This fits into a series of issues where you, Chairman, have policed this very strictly and wisely in relation to keeping matters strictly within the terms of the 22. Having looked at the documentation, it doesn't appear to me that this is one of the 22. Garda Keogh appears to accept that.
WTNESS: Judge, we're not going into the incident.
CHA RMAN Yes.
WTNESS: There's no discussion about the incident. CHA RMAN Yes.

MR. MRPHY: Chairman, before Garda Keogh replies to that, perhaps I would seek a ruling from you in relation to it.

CHA RMAN I understand.
MR. MRPHY: It does appear to be common case, it's one of the rare things that Garda Keogh and I agree about, on behalf of my clients, this is not in the terms.
CHA RMAN Okay. Have you a view on this, Mr. Kelly?
MR. KELLY: I'm checking through my notes.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: I can remember it had come up.
CHA RMAN It has been mentioned. It had been mentioned in passing, so to speak.
MR. KELLY: Several times.
CHAN RMAN In passing.
MR. KELLY: Yes. Because what we were speaking about, as I -- just to refresh my memory as anything else is,

Garda Keogh is saying, wel1, Ms. B was driving around my area, past my house, off her usual turf. I reported it and they never investigated it.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: Let me just --
CHA RMAK Well I will tell you, Mr. McGuinness, it's not in the Terms of Reference, it's not in the agreed issues, isn't that right?
MR. MEGU NESS: Sorry, my microphone is not working.
CHAN RMAN We11, don't worry.
MR. MEGI NNESS: It's on now. Chairman, it's not explicitly in the issues as such. There is obvious7y an argument for the Tribunal to consider it in terms of its potential relevance to states of mind, patterns of behaviour. The reports obviously relate to Garda Keogh 15:05 himself and they're written by Superintendent Murray. So, they relate to him, I suppose, personally and as a guard, and might on an argument be considered to be evidential in nature rather than going to an outlining of an issue.

Now, all the parties were, as you know, furnished with the draft issue papers and Garda Keogh's team obvious7y received them, amongst others, and canvassed for I think Commissioner o'Brien's report to be added in.
CHA RMAN Okay. Al1 right. We11, I have to say first of a11, I think that it's fair of Garda Keogh to identify this matter as in his understanding, which is not by any means the end of the matter, but I just want
to acknowledge that he was careful when even referring to this matter, to say that he thought it was outside, but that doesn't mean it is outside. I think I can help on this. It's certainly not within the numbered issues that the Tribunal set out. It seems to me that the right way to deal with this, is to close off discussion of this at this moment. If mr. Kelly, or any other party, but if Mr. Kelly wishes to make a submission in writing as to why this matter should be dealt with or has materiality to any of the existing issues, or if he says there should be a revision of the issues, I will entertain that application. Mr. Murphy will have an opportunity to respond to that, and counsel for the Tribunal will have an opportunity of responding to that. So, Mr. Kelly and his team will look into the matter.

MR. KELLY: Yes.
CHAI RMAN Make a decision as to how they want to proceed. I am not ruling on the matter, except that I won't allow any further evidence at this point. But
here's another thought: The evidence that relates to this is Garda Keogh's -- sorry, the material that will be under consideration is not material, as I understand it, that Garda Keogh had any direct involvement with. Any commentary that can be made can legitimately be made by counse1 on his behalf. Assuming that I were to permit the issue to be raised in whatever form, either as a full matter or in some evidential fashion, and suppose, contrary to my provisional, tentative view, if
it turned out that Garda Keogh had some relevant evidence, we can always revisit that issue.

So what I propose to do is to allow the parties time to consider it. It's not urgent at this moment, it won't arise as a matter for consideration for some significant little time, and $I$ will entertain any application from the parties.
MR. MRPHY: Thank you, Chairman.
MR. KELLY: Chairman can I just say while it's fresh in my mind, and I note what you say about it, I can make submissions if I want on a specific issue. An agreement with Mr. McGuinness as to how he says it is relevant and his approach to it, I will try and put it as succinctly as I can, I suppose one of the things that could be said there is, well, look, in respect of this incident, which isn't, of course, a separate term of reference of the inquiry, it's interesting that Superintendent Murray chooses to prefer the word of Ms. B, as against me, the guard. I think at this stage 15:09 that's as far as I will take it.

CHA RMAN I understand. What I would be happy to have, I don't require something very elaborate, but I would like to do it with some formality, so that I knew under what heading it came in, in what manner it was contended it's relevant. As I say, it's not a huge issue, I'm not looking for that. Then it would give Mr. Murphy an opportunity of knowing what argument he was facing and then we will revisit the matter in the
due course. So that's what I propose to do and leave people to do that. okay.

MR. MRPHY: May it please you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Now, Mr. McGuinness.
MR. MEGI NNESS: Yes, Chairman. Just on that issue
then of the promotion, we looked at your diary before relating to the entry, where you went to the Four Courts to consult with somebody over injuncting the promotion, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

438 Q. And then at one stage your solicitor, in July of '17, was seeking to the Policing Authority and the Justice Committee to suspend the promotion, isn't that right, as well?
A. I think so.

439 Q. But I mean, to be blunt about it, it sort of conveys, perhaps you might agree, a clear view that you just thought he wasn't fit for promotion?
A. If my allegations were correct, that would be the case. If they weren't correct, just do to the normal way and make the promotion. But it wasn't done in the normal way anyway.

440 Q. I have no more questions on that issue, Chairman, and I have no more questions on issue 21 or 22.
CHAN RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. KELLY: Chairman, can I just raise one issue? CHAL RMAN Yes.

MR. KELLY: It's really by way of clarification to one of the points Mr. McGuinness was making. If I
understood it correctly, what he was saying was in relation to the report being falsified or trumped up, he was looking at the grounds of appeal, I think, which I think are volume 25.

CHA RMAN This is the Lyons report.
MR. KELLY: Yes, that's right.
CHA RMAN He was saying, why wasn't that case made to Assistant Commissioner Finn and/or Mr. de Bruir, is that the context?

MR. KELLY: Yes, I think that's absolutely right, Judge, because the report which we are looking at, it's point 4 on that.
CHA RMAN Just tell me more, specifically more, give me a better reference than that, Mr. Kelly.
MR. KELLY: It's volume 25, page 7452. It's the notice 15:12 of appeal provided by --

CHA RMAN This is Mr. Cullen's submission on behalf of Garda Keogh to Mr. de Bruir?
MR. KELLY: That's correct.
CHAN RMAN Thank you. And it's paragraph?
MR. KELLY: Internal numbering, paragraph 4. It's probably best to make a note of the page, which is 7452.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. KELLY: That's where it appears. what it reads, just for the transcript.
CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY:
"The finding here refers to "The inci dent came to light as a result of information recei ved by Garda Ai dan Lyons". Thi s proposition is unambi guous in one respect. AC Finn's and AC O Brien's determination cl ai m to establ ish the exi stence of such an incident. It i mplies not onl y that the extraordi nary i nci dent came to light but, more signi ficantly, implies that the i nci dent actually happened. It does not, however, describe it in any specific detail or display how it came to light. What is the evi dence for the exi stence of this surreal inci dent and how it came tolight?

Garda Keogh was never invol ved in any such inci dent. He is stranger to it. It is bizarre."

My point is, that could have been construed to say, well look, it never happened and it's trumped up

CHA RMAN Implicit in that is to be found.
MR. KELLY: I think it is, Judge, yes.
CHAI RMAN Thank you very much. Very good. we have now completed Garda Keogh's evidence. Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you for being as patient as you have been and thank you for being as, what shall I say, indefatigable in dealing with all the issues and answering it. So, take a well earned rest. Thank you very much.
okay, so you can step down now and you're not just having a break, you can walk in or out at any time you
please.

Right. So, that brings us to the end, I think, of today's events. I think Garda Keogh's evidence took a good deal longer than any of us anticipated. with the best will in the world, that's the way these things happen and it's proper that they should be thoroughly investigated. we will proceed to investigate all the other parts.

So now, we will adjourn there and resume then. Do we know what witnesses we have tomorrow, Mr. McGuinness? Have we been able to notify the parties?
MR. KELLY: whilst that is being done, it has just been pointed out to me, this shouldn't affect the ultimate decision.

CHAN RMAN No problem.
MR. KELLY: That Garda Keogh won't be attending tomorrow, he just wants a day off.
CHA RMAN Absolutely. May I say, Mr. Kelly, Garda Keogh's attendance or non-attendance, he is entirely free to attend or not to attend, if he does attend, he can leave at any moment. He is entirely free, no inference or conclusion will be drawn adversely to him in that respect. So that's a perfectly understandable 15:16 thing, I must say.

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Chairman.
MR. MEGI NESS: Yes, Chairman, I believe it has been confirmed that the witnesses tomorrow will commence
with Olivia O'Neill.
CHA RMAN Very good. You're in a position to let the parties know.

MR. MEGU NESS: Yes, as previously announced.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Lovely. Okay.
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|  |  |  | annual [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 11,53: 26, \\ & 92: 18,92: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $27: 26$ |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { answer [17] - } \\ & 7: 3,7: 27,8: 6 \\ & 11: 2,11: 21 \\ & 15: 13,15: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 92:27, 92:29, } \\ & \text { 104:13, 108:11 } \\ & \text { appointment }[4] \\ & -16: 9,91: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:19 } \\ & \text { ASSISTANT [5] - } \\ & 3: 5,3: 6,3: 8 \\ & 3: 18,3: 20 \end{aligned}$ |


| Assistant [17] - | 102:11 | BASTION ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ - | blah-blah-blah | 20:25, 28:2, 52:3, | card [1] - 46:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25:28, 53:9, | attitude [1] - | 3:31 | [1] - 92:27 | 71 | careful [1] - |
| 53:26, 85:23, | 11:5 | batch [2] - | blank [1] - 82:10 | Browne [2] - | 113:1 |
| 88:17, 91:15, | audit [3] - 14:23, | 54:18, 54:25 | blanked [1] - | 92:13, 92:15 | carefully [1] - |
| 91:24, 92:24, | 14:25, 14:27 | bear [9]-21:20, | 38:22 | Bruir [3]-94:24, | 6:13 |
| 93:8, 94:23, 95:1, | uditing [1] | 25:12, 27:16, | blunt [1] - | 116:8, 116:18 | CARR [1] - 3:15 |
| 96:6, 97:16, | 15:28 | 43:12, 43:29, | 115:16 | build [1] - 14:4 | Carroll [1] - |
| 100:25, 102:8, | August [7] - | 67:8, 68:26, | body [2]-97:24, | bullying [13] - | 11:21 |
| 104:11, 116:8 assistant [12] - | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 23,57: 19, \\ & 58: 15,59: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $72: 13,108: 28$ | $99: 12$ | 50:4, 88:10, | carry [3] - 10:27, |
| 16:22, 16:24, | 80:21, 82:21, | 8:19, 9:6, 17:14, | 94:12 | 95:2, 101:13, | case [18]- |
| 16:26, 17:18, | 90:18 | 108:3 | book [1] - 64:18 | 101:26, 103:12, | 12:22, 15:24, |
| 53:11, 54:6, 55:3, | authenticity/ | become [2] - | books [1] - | 103:22, 103:28, | 19:22, 22:18, |
| $88: 8,89: 12,94: 8$ | validity [1] - 94:22 | $65: 14,109: 17$ | 78:29 | $105: 18,105: 22$ | 32:21, 64:20, |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 98:28, 103:6 } \\ \text { association [1] - } \end{array}$ | author [4] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { becomes [1] - } \\ & 72: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { born [2] - 43:7, } \\ & 43: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bunch [1] - } \\ & 56: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 64:22, 72:14, |
| 39:9 ${ }^{\text {assuming [3] }}$ | $96: 10$ | $\operatorname{beg}_{[1]}-45: 21$ | bother [1] - | business [1] - | $80: 2,82: 17,89: 2$ |
| 7:21, 92:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { authorities [1] } \\ & \text { 21:26 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { beginning [3] } \\ & \text { 67:18, 89:29, } \end{aligned}$ | 63:26 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 95:6 } \\ & \text { buy [1] - 47:10 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:13, 107:14, } \\ & \text { 111:17, 115:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:26 } \\ & \text { assurance [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | Authority [9] 101:7, 103:15, | $\begin{gathered} 96: 17 \\ \text { beha } \end{gathered}$ | $63: 11,64: 2,64: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { buying [1] - } \\ & 47: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 116: 7 \\ & \text { cast }[1]-66: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:24 } \\ & \text { assured }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 103:25, 104:3, | 37:7, 51:12, | 38:2, 42:9, 45:23, | BY [5] - 3:26, | categories [1] - |
|  | 104:19, 105:13, | 66:16, 86:19, | 49:12, 60:17, | 3:30, 4:5, 5:5, 6:6 | 101:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:28 } \\ & \text { asterisk [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 105:29, 108:9, | $96: 3,111: 19$ | 60:29, 64:13, | by.. [1] - 40:18 | categorised [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 42: 7 \\ & \text { AT }[1]-119: 8 \\ & \text { ATHLONE }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | avail [3]-57:28, | behaviour [1] - | 86:28, 93:16, | C | categorising [1] |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 69:18, 94:3 } \\ \text { award [3] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:15 } \\ & \text { behind [2] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 20,100: 21, \\ & 103: 7 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -66: 23 \\ & \text { category }{ }_{[1]}- \end{aligned}$ |
| $3: 32$ <br> Athlone [12] - | 73:24, 76:7, 77:8 | 11:23, 15:3 | bought [8] - | CAGNEY [1] - | 108:17 |
|  | awards [1] | belatedly [1] - | 46:8, 47:6, 47:8, | 3:17 <br> cajoled [1] - | caused [3] - |
| $29: 25,30: 3,30: 7,$ | $74: 15$ | $55: 1$ | 47:12, 47:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cajoled [1] - } \\ & 62: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $9: 13,24: 28,25: 2$ |
| 41:14, 41:17, | aware [20] | belief [4] - 36:8, | $47: 18,47: 22$ | candidate [3] - | caution [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 52: 2,53: 25, \\ & 53: 29,59: 3,82 \end{aligned}$ | 37:14, 40:22, | $43: 3,87: 1,108: 4$ | $47: 25$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { candidate }[3] \\ \text { 102:6, 102:22, } \end{gathered}$ | 79:20 |
| $84: 15,110: 4$ | $72: 19,73: 26$ | 83:25 | ox [1] - 102: | $102: 29$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cautioned [1] - } \\ & 79: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| attached [6] - | 82:15, 82:22, | best [3]-21:6, | bracket [3] - | canvassed [1] - | CCTV [11] - |
| 32:12, 41:28, | 86:26, 91:3, 93:6, | 116:22, 118:6 | $51: 18,54: 5$ | 112:24 | $57: 25,57: 28$ |
| 52:16, 53:11, | 96:7, 98:14, | better [2] - | bravado [1] - | $\operatorname{car}[55]-14: 26,$ 14:27, 15:2, 15:5, | $58: 6,58: 18,59: 3$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 55:20, 86:7 } \\ & \text { attaching }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100:29, 101:1, } \\ & \text { 103:10, 103:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 53: 22,116: 14 \\ \text { between }[7]- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:27 } \\ & \text { break [6] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:27, 15:2, 15:5, } \\ & \text { 15:17, 15:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 5,59: 28,62: 4, \\ & 62: 9,62: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| ```94:8 attachments [1] -73:1``` | $105: 16,109: 17$ | $30: 1,32: 20,42: 6$ | 50:11, 55:28, | 15:19, 15:20, | 62:28 |
|  | AWOL [1] - 67:9 | 54:25, 98:14, 99:14. 101:2 | 56:4, 78:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 17,37: 23, \\ & 38: 19,41: 11, \end{aligned}$ | cease [1] - 73:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & -73: 1 \\ & \text { attempt [1] }- \end{aligned}$ | B | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 14,101: 2 \\ & \text { beyond [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 78:12, 117:29 } \\ & \text { breakdown [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 41:18, 41:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cent }[1]-54: 26 \\ & \text { cert }[1]-67: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $74: 1$ <br> attend [6] - |  | 16:12 | 83:10 | 44:10, 45:14, <br> $46 \cdot 1,46 \cdot 8,47 \cdot 3$ | certain [4] - |
|  |  | big [2] - 33:14, | BRIAN ${ }_{\text {[2] - }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 1,46: 8,47: 3 \\ & 47: 5,47: 6,47: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 9:27, 26:25, 63:3, |
| 69:17, 70:13, | $-25: 21,50: 25$ | $71: 1$ | $3: 15,3: 16$ | 47:15, 47:23, | $95: 8$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 72: 4,118: 22 \\ & \text { attendance }[2] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | backtrack [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { bit [11] - 6:15, } \\ \text { 23:16, 40:12, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bridge [3] - 74:2, } \\ & 74: 5,76: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $48: 8,48: 11,49: 4$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { certainly [7] - } \\ \text { 21:25, 44:18, } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:21 } \\ & \text { attending }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 78:19 | $55: 24,56: 8$ | briefly [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 10,50: 17, \\ & 50: 23,50: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 67:1, 77:23, |
|  | $87: 20$ | 60:11, 60:13, | 24:22 | $51: 6,51: 9,51: 12,$ | 104:11, 104:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:18 } \\ & \text { attention [17] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { ball }_{[1]}-81: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 19,91: 19 \\ & 96: 22,101: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { bring [1] - } \\ 110: 14 \end{gathered}$ | 51:13, 51:15, | 113:4 <br> certificate [3] - |
| 12:19, 32:10, | banked [1] - | bizarre [1] | bringing [1] - | 51:16, 51:20, $\text { 51:23. } 54: 4.58: 7 .$ | 47:2, 47:13, |
| $33: 18,48: 6,52: 4$ | 92:13 based [1] - | 117:14 | 89:4 | $59: 4,59: 6,59: 8,$ | 47:14 |
| 64:10, 65:20, | $110: 12$ | BL [5] - 3:24, | brings [1] - | $78: 19,80: 13$ | certificates [1] - |
| 78:24, 92:6, | basis [5] - | 3:25, 3:25, 3:30, | 118:3 | $80: 14,81: 22$ | 73:5 |
| 97:20, 98:4, | 14:26, 43:26, |  | broad [1] - 13:3 | 100:15, 107:6, | certification [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 99: 17,100: 27 \\ & \text { 101:6, 101:10, } \end{aligned}$ |  | black [1] - 41:24 | brought [7] - | 107:10, 107:15, | - 70:11 |
|  |  | blah [3] - 92:27 | 12:18, 20:24, |  | certs [5] - 67:11, |


| 68:27, 71:5, 71:9, | 6:17, 24:25, | chief's [1] - | 113:6 | 49:11, 69:13 | 109:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 72:28 | 55:27, 68:14, | 11:26 | closed [2] - | Commissioner | complaint' [1] - |
| CHAIRMAN ${ }_{\text {[126] }}$ | 77:20, 78:11, | CHIS [6]-24:23, | 51:24, 52:17 | [24]-24:13, | 31:27 |
| -6:4, 7:6, 7:10, | 94:5, 110:5, | 26:3, 26:6, 26:9, | CMO [3] - 67:3, | 25:28, 50:9, 53:9, | complaints [7] - |
| 7:12, 7:15, 7:19, | 110:11, 110:17, | 26:10 | 67:7, 107:22 | 53:26, 83:9, | 11:29, 15:11, |
| 7:23, 7:29, 8:3, | 111:4, 111:13, | chooses [1] - | CMO's [1] - | 85:23, 86:13, | 22:16, 24:6, |
| 8:7, 8:10, 35:9, | 112:11, 114:9, | 114:19 | 68:21 | 88:17, 90:25, | 32:15, 50:6, |
| 35:11, 35:15, | 114:10, 115:3, | Church [1] - | CO [1] - 4:1 | 90:26, 91:15, | 56:14 |
| 35:19, 35:21, | 115:5, 115:23, | 41:14 | Code [2]-64:11, | 91:24, 92:24, | complaints/ |
| 35:24, 35:29, | 115:26, 118:27, | circumstance | 67:8 | 93:9, 94:23, 95:1, | investigations [1] |
| 36:5, 36:7, 36:11, | 118:28 | [2] - 74:9, 76:27 | coherent [1] - | 96:6, 97:17, | - 102:5 |
| 36:13, 36:15, | chance [8] - | circumstances | 27:20 | 100:25, 102:8, | complete [1] - |
| 46:29, 47:4, | 26:12, 26:14, | [3]-64:29, 76:28, | colleagues [1] - | 104:11, 112:25, | 36:7 |
| 47:10, 47:12, | 75:9, 75:26, | 107:4 | 82:27 | 116:8 | completed [2] - |
| 47:18, 47:21, | 75:28, 80:15, | Citroën [2] - | collection [2] - | commissioner | 104:28, 117:21 |
| 47:24, 47:26, | 80:17, 81:10 | 59:4, 59:6 | 59:11, 89:29 | [13] - 16:22, | completely [1] - |
| 47:29, 48:15, | change [4] - | civilian [3] - | collusion [2] - | 16:24, 16:27, | 43:24 |
| 48:18, 49:6, | 46:5, 46:9, 48:26, | 38:12, 38:13, | 51:4, 53:27 | 17:19, 53:11, | completion [1] - |
| 49:17, 55:29, | $88: 4$ | $41: 4$ | column [1] - | $54: 6,55: 3,88: 8,$ | 65:29 |
| 56:3, 56:7, 58:21, | changed [1] - | claim [3] - 15:6, | $65: 27$ | 89:12, 94:8, | compliance [1] - |
| 58:23, 60:13, 60:16. 60:23. | $91: 7$ | $105: 19,105: 23$ | comfort [1] - | 98:28, 103:6, | 70:12 |
| 60:16, 60:23, 60:29, 68:4, 68:7, | $\begin{array}{r} \text { character [4] - } \\ \text { 102:22, 102:28 } \end{array}$ | claims [8] - | $13: 2$ | 104:10 COMMISSIONE | complicated [2] |
| 68:10, 68:13, | 103:29, 105:23 | 15:22, 15:24, | coming [7] | $\mathbf{R}[8]-3: 2,3: 5,$ | $-42: 25,63: 22$ |
| $68: 15,75: 3,75: 8$ | characterised | 52:2, 52:16, | $28: 1,29: 24$ | $3: 6,3: 7,3: 7,3: 8$ | $-42: 25$ |
| $75: 11,75: 15$, $75.18,75.22$ | [2] - 33:16, 33:23 | 117:5 | 35:15, 105:11 | 3:18, 3:20 | computers [1] - |
| $75: 18,75: 22$, $75: 29,76: 4$ | characterising | clarification [18] | comings [1] - | Commissioner' | 63:4 |
| $75: 29,76: 4$, $76: 13,76: 20$, | [1] - 32:6 | - 9:5, 9:21, 22:7, | 100:14 | $\mathbf{s}$ [1] - 83:9 | concatenation |
| $\begin{aligned} & 76: 13,76: 20, \\ & 76: 26,77: 1,7 \end{aligned}$ | charge [1] - | 28:28, 41:12, | commence [1] - | commissioner | [1]-107:4 |
| $77: 13,77: 21$ | 25:15 | 45:7, 46:1, 48:24, | 118:29 | S [1] - 24:9 | concede [1] - |
| $77: 28,78: 3,78: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { charges }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \\ & \text { 101:12 } \end{aligned}$ | 49:14, 59:22, | commenced [1] | committed [2] | 25:18 |
| 78:9, 78:12, | CHARLTON [1] - | 86:25, 87:9, | commences | Committee [1] - | $43: 7$ |
| 80:27, 80:29, |  | 96:14, 105:2, | - 91:13, 99:5 | 115:13 | concern [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 81: 11,81: 24, \\ & 84: 20,84: 27, \end{aligned}$ | chat [2] - 63:10, | $105: 6,115: 28$ | commend [1] - | common [2] - | 13:9, 13:11, |
| 84:20, 84:27, 85:2, 85:5, 85:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:13 } \\ & \text { check } \end{aligned}$ | clarified [3] 6:16, 12:1, 12:3 | $74: 25$ | $18: 10,111: 17$ companions | $110: 10$ |
| 85:12, 85:14, | 15:17, 15:18, | clarify [3]-8:17, | commendation <br> [8]-73:26, 74:8, | $\mathbf{p}[1]-9: 3$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { concerned [10] - } \\ 9: 11,13: 7,49: 12 \end{gathered}$ |
| 88:26, 88:29, | 26:23, 27:13, | 14:6, 41:3 | 74:12, 74:13, | compare [1] - | 50:14, 54:29, |
| $89: 10,89: 15$, $92.21,95: 1$ | 40:19, 48:24, | class [1] - 52:8 | 74:17, 74:22, | 81:14 | 80:27, 80:29, |
| 95:13, 95:15, | 67:23 | $\text { clean [1] }-43: 10$ | 76:8, 76:10 | complain [1] - | 81:1, 105:12, |
| 95:19, 95:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { checked [1] - } \\ & 40: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { clear [10] - 8:18, } \\ & 15: 14,37: 5, \end{aligned}$ | commendation | ```51:9 complained [1] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:10 } \\ & \text { concernin } \end{aligned}$ |
| 95:27, 102:10, | checking [2] - | 56:28, 93:16, | $73: 15,74: 11$ | $55: 11$ | $22: 12,78: 5,$ |
| 110:7, 110:16, | 14:21, 111:21 | 96:16, 103:27, | 76:17 | complaining [2] | $109: 25,109: 26$ |
|  | Chief [8]-25:27, | 108:3, 108:12, | commended [1] | - 54:15, 108:23 | concerns [2] - |
| 111:20, 111:22, | 51:22, 89:27, <br> 90:6, $98 \cdot 5,99 \cdot 18$ | $115: 17$ | - 74:6 | complaint [31] - | $19: 22,58: 14$ |
| 111:24, 111:27, | $109: 4,109: 10$ | 103:14, 103:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { comment [19] - } \\ & 16: 4,29: 20, \end{aligned}$ | 29:9, 32:13, 33:7, | conclusion [3] - 13:25, 69:15, |
| $112: 4,112: 6$, $112 \cdot 10,112: 26$ | CHIEF [14] - 3:3, | 104:8, 104:22, | 53:16, 63:25 | $34: 7,34: 19,36: 7 \text {, }$ | 118:24 |
| 112:10, 112:26, | 3:3, 3:4, 3:6, 3:8, | 104:25, 105:3 | 64:2, 70:4, 71:12, | 39:7, 39:14, | conducted [1] - |
| 115:4, 115:25, | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 11,3: 13,3: 14, \\ & 3: 14,3: 17,3: 19 \end{aligned}$ | clearly [2] - | 74:7, 76:21, | 39:21, 39:22, | 87:26 |
| 115:27, 116:5, | $3: 19,3: 21,3: 27$ | 14:29, 15:8 clerical [1] - | 76:27, 77:26, 80:4. 80:7. 80:8. | 39:24, 40:5, 51:4, 53:27, 84:18, | conference [2] - |
| 116:7, 116:13, | chief [10] - | $84: 14$ | 80:4, 80:7, 80:8, <br> 80:12, 84:19, | 84:27, 84:29, | 15:27, 72:25 <br> conferences [2] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:17, 116:20, } \\ & \text { 116:24, 116:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $17: 29,24: 5,65: 5,$ | clients [1] - | 95:24, 95:25, | 87:27, 90:23, | $-72: 14,72: 15$ |
| 117:18, 117:20, | 67:17, 73:3, | 111:19 | 98:10 | 91:6, 103:10, | confidential [4] |
| 118:17, 118:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 21,91: 8 \\ & \text { 103:16, 104:27, } \end{aligned}$ | clips [1] - 56:24 | commentary [1] | 103:21, 104:3, 104:9, 105:29, | $-23: 14,54: 11$ |
| 119:2, 119:5 <br> Chairman [21] - | 110:4 | 80:2, 108:22, | - 113:25 comments [2] - | 106:13, 106:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 54:12, 55:6 } \\ & \text { confinement }{ }_{[1]} \end{aligned}$ |


| -63:7 | consulted [1] - | 14:10, 21:26, | 3:31 | $90: 26,94: 28$ | $93: 14,99: 9$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| confirm [2] - | 72:7 | 21:28, 23:28 | Courts [1] - | 104:10 | 99:12 |
| $74: 24,83: 12$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { contact }[6] \\ 14 \cdot 12 \quad 23 \cdot 16 \end{gathered}$ | cooperated [1] - | 115:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cullen [2]-95:6, } \\ & 99: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { dates }[7] \text { - } \\ \text { 19:12. 48:25. } \end{gathered}$ |
| - 93:20, 103:5 | 24:9, 50:29 | copied [1] | 50:5, 53:6, 86:12, | Cullen's [1] - | 48:26, 57:15, |
| confirmed [3] - | 63:23, 92:15 | 85:29 | 88:7, 89:18 | 116:17 | 57:20, 66:7, |
| 31:25, 91:7, | ontacted [1] | oppinger [1] | covered [5] | curious [1] | 100:20 |
| 118:29 | 59:2 | 20:18 | 32:23, 33:11 | 77:10 | daughter [4] - |
| confirming [1] - | contain [1] - | COPPINGER [1] | 42:19, 79:13, | CURLEY [1] - | 29:13, 29:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 54: 10 \\ & \text { confirms }[1] . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:6 } \\ & \text { contained }[6] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -3: 4 \\ & \text { cops" [1] - 38:8 } \end{aligned}$ | 110:21 <br> Create [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 10 \\ & \text { Curley [1] - 28:8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:24, 30:26 } \\ & \text { daughters [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| ```51:23 conflict [2] - 11:16, 107:1 confronted [1] -``` | 59:21, 66:5 | copy [5] - 20:8, | 103:13 | CURRAN ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 31:8 } \\ & \text { DAVID }_{[1]}-3: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 87:19, 93:26 | 20:14, 20:16 | reate [1] | 3:3 |  |
|  | 99:7, 109:29 contains [2] | $21: 1,52: 16$ corner [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:19 } \\ & \text { created [1] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Curran [1] - } \\ & \text { 25:27 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { days }[6]-9: 1, \\ 32: 1,44: 1,65: 26 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 44:22 } \\ & \text { confused }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | $73: 15,110: 1$ <br> contemporane | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 45:23, 66:10 } \\ \text { correct }[31] \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:2 } \\ & \text { Crime }[1]-61: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { current [1] - } \\ & 39: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 8,75: 3 \\ & \text { de }[3]-94: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 84: 24 \\ & \text { confusing }[1] \text { - } \\ & 48: 25 \end{aligned}$ | ous [1] - 10:10 contemporane | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:9, 16:19, } \\ & \text { 18:13, 27:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { crime }[5] \text { - } \\ 57: 14,57: 23, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { customary [1] - } \\ & 55: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 116:8, 116:18 } \\ \text { deal }[7]-16: 24, \end{gathered}$ |
| $48: 25$ <br> confusion [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ously [2] - 66:25, } \\ & 71: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 23,43: 25, \\ & 45: 29,47: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 58: 6,62: 8,79: 29 \\ \text { criminal }[3] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | cut [1] - 6:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:22, 44:21, } \\ & 54: 1,102: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 30:28 <br> CONNAUGHT | contended [1] - | 47:23, 48:23, | 86:8, 102:20 | D | $\begin{gathered} \text { 113:6, 118:5 } \\ \text { dealing [12] - } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-3: 32} \\ & \text { connected }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:26 } \\ & \text { content }[1] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 3,52: 28 \\ & 53: 18,56: 19 \end{aligned}$ 57:19, 59:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:20 } \\ & \text { criminality }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | D/Sergean | 14:19, 29:27, |
| 74:1 | 54:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 19,59: 12 \\ & 60: 8,62: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 25:1 | 28:8 | 38:14, 41:21, |
|  | 29:20, 87:18 | 63:14, 67:22 | 16:11, 81:24 | D/Super [5] - | $42: 1,43: 21$ |
| 43:26, 94:7 | 92:12, 93:28, | 71:19, 85:8, 85:9, | criticisms [1] - | 23:20, 23:26, |  |
| CONNELLAN <br> [21-3.30, 3.30 | 96:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87:17, } 92: 19 \\ & 93: 11.95: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 94:6 | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 29,82: 5, \\ & 82: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $90: 27,117: 24$ |
| [2] - 3:30, 3:30 CONOR [1] - | Context [9] - $6: 18,6: 19,8: 16$, | 107:13, 115:19, | $\begin{array}{r} \text { cropped [3] } \\ 32: 28,35: 27 \end{array}$ | D5 [4] - 64:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:22, 35:23, } \\ & 46: 7,51: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| 3:24 | 30:12, 96:1 | 115:20, 116:19 | 44:2 | 65:23, 65:27, |  |
|  | 98:27, 105:5, | correctly [2] | cross [4]-35:1, | 66:15 | 46:7, 51:24, |
| 11:20 consequence | continue [1] - | correspondenc | $53: 24,76: 21,$ $97: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { D5s [1] - } 66: 5 \\ & \text { Daly [7] - } 48: 7 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | 48:11, 48:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 19,78: 23, \\ & 79: 16,79: 19, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-70: 16} \\ & \text { consider [5] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 70:10 } \\ & \text { continued }[5] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 99:22 } \\ & \text { corresponds [1] } \end{aligned}$ | examination [1] - | 49:9, 50:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 16,79: 19, \\ & 79: 27,80: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| 65:7, 65:13, | 9:9, 9:10, 69:18, |  | 76:21 | 50:29, 107:27 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ly:LI, } \quad \text { (U:L, } \\ & \text { 102:22, 113:10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 87:22, 112:13, | $97: 29,107: 28$ | - 37:17 | cross- | dark [1] - 68:28 <br> date [35]-6:26, | dear [1] - 86:4 December [13] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:5 } \\ & \text { consid } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { continues [1] - } \\ & \text { 49:27 } \end{aligned}$ | 45:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { examined }[1]- \\ & 35: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 13:26, 16:16 | December [13] - |
| [2]-113:23, 114:6 | $49: 27$ <br> contrary [2] - |  |  | 28:28, 30:14, | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 24,10: 6,10: 7 \\ & 68: 29,69: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| considered [3] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { contrary [2] - } \\ 26: 7,113: 29 \end{gathered}$ | 45:15, 113:14 | examining [1] - | 37:28, 38:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 68: 29,69: 10, \\ & 69: 26,70: 20, \end{aligned}$ |
| 64:28, 80:16, | contravention | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:26 } \\ & \text { countersigned } \end{aligned}$ | $97: 18$ | 38:25, 42:2, 42:4, 42:16, 43:21, | 71:23, 72:17, |
| 112:18 conspiracy [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-86: 11} \\ & \quad \text { contributed [2] }- \end{aligned}$ |  | cross- | $44: 7,45: 24,46: 3$ | 89:27, 91:28, |
| 86:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 18,9: 20 \\ & \text { contrivance }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { country [2] } \\ 11: 18,46: 27 \end{array}$ | $53: 24$ | 46:13, 46:14, | 99:9, 100:3 decide [2] - |
|  |  |  | 53:24 crossing [2] | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 26,54: 3,60: 7, \\ & 60: 9,70: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:8, 26:11 } \\ & \text { decided }[3]- \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { county [1] - } \\ & 45: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 13:18, 41:18 | 82:20, 84:28, | $26: 9,91: 6,108: 1$ |
| 11:8, 63:20, | $78$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 20 \\ & \text { couple [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | crowd [1] - 41:21 | 85:7, 91:23, | decision [5] - |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 63:21, 89:7 } \\ \text { construct }[1] \text { - } \end{array}$ | conversation [6] | $8: 16,57: 15$ | CUALÁIN ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & 91: 25,91: 29, \\ & 92: 8,92: 23 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:3, 85:25, } \\ & 93: 16 . ~ 113: 18 . \end{aligned}$ |
|  | - 31:15, 32:9, | $64: 10,107: 18$ | 3:7 | 92:25. 93:15. | $118: 16$ |
|  | 39:6, 40:8, 44:2, 44:18 | course [10] - $37: 3,61: 8,66: 2$ | Cualáin [16] | 100:2, 100:22, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 117: 16 \\ & \text { consult }[1]- \\ & 115: 8 \\ & \text { consultation }[2] \\ & -72: 2,72: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { convey [1] - } \\ & \text { 82:26 } \\ & \text { conveys [2] - } \\ & 34: 10,115: 16 \\ & \text { cooperate }[4]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:12, 78:11, } \\ & \text { 97:11, 101:4, } \\ & \text { 106:29, 114:17, } \\ & \text { 115:1 } \\ & \text { COURT }_{[1]}- \end{aligned}$ | 53:9, 53:26, 54:1, | 101:20 | 3:5 |
|  |  |  | $78: 5,79: 13$ | dated [10]- $47.13,75 \cdot 3,75.8$ |  |
|  |  |  | $80: 20,81: 27,$ | $47: 13,75: 3,75: 8$, $86.6,90 \cdot 18$ | declaration [3] - |
|  |  |  | 85:23, 86:13, | 86:6, 90:18, | 45:16, 46:15, |
|  |  |  | 88:18, 90:25, | 91:14, 92 : | 102:17 |


| declare |  | 57:20 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 102:27 |  | ry |  |  |  |
| declined [1] - | 55:11, 83:13, | 67:11, 97:17, | DOCKERY ${ }_{\text {[1] - }}$ | $68: 6,69: 14$ | duty [15]-9:1, |
| 87:16 | 87:12, 88:2, 99:8, | 101:12, 102:20, | 4:3 | 69:27, 71:8, | 9:12, 9:13, 10:5, |
| deemed [1] - | 100:2, 100:9 | 105:20, 107:7 | doctor [7] - | 71:28, 79:4, 79:5, | 10:9, 42:18, 63:8, |
| 72:3 | DETECTIVE [5] - | discipline [13] - | 67:21, 67:27, | 79:9, 79:21, 82:1, | 64:19, 65:25, |
| eep [1] - 33:5 | 3:4, 3:5, 3:12, | 52:15, 52:21, | 69:12, 69:14 | 83:20, 83:24, | 66:3, 69:20, |
| definitely [1] - | 3:13, 3:17 | 52:25, 52:29, | 72:3, 72:8, 72:22 | 86:1, 87:13, | 71:17, 79:6, |
| 57:1 | determination | 57:8, 78:26, | doctor's [2] - | 91:19, 93:15, | 79:25 |
| definitive [2] - | [1]-117:4 | 80:25, 98:3, | 70:4, 70:26 | 98:12, 99:25, | DVD [4] - 16:15, |
| 8:6, 106:23 | DEVELOPMEN | 99:16, 102:4, | document [9] - | 100:21, 104:21, | 16:16, 59:21, |
| degree [2] - | T [1]-3:16 | 107:12, 107:14, | 35:12, 42:19, | 108:16, 108:19, | 61:25 |
| 18:13, 106:16 | diaries [3] - | 107:20 | 47:7, 52:20, | 117:28 | Dáil [6] - 17:8, |
| delay [6] - 50:5, | 13:16, 18:25, | disciplined [5] - | 52:22, 53:15 | DOWNEY [2] - | 17:12, 48:8, 49:6, |
| $62: 27,79: 8,$ 92:28. 109:11 | $59: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 10,56: 13 \\ & 80: 14,107: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 17,54: 2, \\ & 74: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3:15, 3:20 } \\ & \text { download [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | 49:7, 91:1 |
| delaying [1] - | 13:23, 17:17, | 107:17 | documentary | $59: 16,59: 17$ | $E$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:20 } \\ & \text { deliberate }[3] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 27,20: 1 \\ & 22: 19,28: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { disclosed [1] - } \\ & \text { 10:11 } \end{aligned}$ | [1] - 52:6 <br> documentation | $\begin{aligned} & \text { downloaded }[1] \\ & -59: 10 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 86:12, 88:7, | 36:29, 37:27, | disclosure [4] - | [7]-46:6, 92:17, | DR [1] - 3:11 | e-mail [4] - 31:17, 36:3, 53:6, |
| 89:17 | $38: 11,41: 3,42: 9$ | $10: 10,10: 24 \text {, }$ | 96:9, 98:5, 99:18, | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{Dr}[4]-68: 21, \\ 72 \cdot 16-89 \cdot 26 \end{gathered}$ | 31:17, 36:3, 53:6, 93:23 |
| deliberately [3] - | 43:1, 48:16, 67:26, 69:22, | 32:26, 86:8 disclosures [3] - | 101:23, 111:7 documents [13] | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 16,89: 26, \\ & 90: 3 \end{aligned}$ | EAMON [1] - |
| 15:1, 51:14, $96: 4$ demonstrate [1] | 80:21, 84:1, | $8: 20,10: 2,99: 26$ | $-11: 9,11: 13$ | draft [1] - 112:23 | 3:10 |
| -62:18 | 115:6 | Disclosures [2] | 40:7, 54:20, | draw [6]-32:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { early [6] - 37:2, } \\ & \text { 42:17, 42:26, } \end{aligned}$ |
| denial [2] - 50:5, | $\begin{gathered} \text { difference [4] - } \\ 54: 27,71: 25, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -32: 24,99: 11 \\ & \text { discovered }[3]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 56:22, 57:17, } \\ & 73: 7,85: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 18,64: 10, \\ & 65: 20,97: 20, \end{aligned}$ | 56:8, 105:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 73: 12 \\ & \text { denied }{ }_{[1]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 27,71: 25 \\ & 97: 14,108: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { discovered [3] - } \\ & 18: 23,19: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 7,85: 18, \\ & 87: 20,89: 29, \end{aligned}$ | 65:20, 97:20, 102:10 | 107:21 |
| $45: 11$ | different [18] - | $96: 12$ | $90: 19,105: 17$ | drawing [1] - | earned [1] - |
| deny [3]-44:25, | $9: 13,27: 22,32: 1$, $39 \cdot 28,39 \cdot 29$ | discrepancy [1] | domain [2] - | 100:26 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:25 } \\ & \text { easier [1] - 9:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $50: 16,106: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 28,39: 29 \\ & 51: 28,55: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -54: 25 \\ & \text { discuss [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:6, 105:12 } \\ & \text { DONAL [2] - 3:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { drawn [3] - } \\ 81: 17.92: 6 . \end{gathered}$ | effect [1] - 71:21 |
| ```department [1] - 90:10``` | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 28,55: 16, \\ & 57: 14,63: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { discuss [1] - } \\ & \text { 69:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DONAL [2] - 3:7, } \\ & 3: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 81:17, 92:6, } \\ & 118: 24 \end{aligned}$ | effectively [3] - |
| depth [1] - 21:24 | 66:20, 78:21, | discussed [6] | Donal [1] - | drew [4] - 48:6, | 101:25, 107:7, |
| Deputies [4] - | 79:2, 79:18, | 14:13, 53:12, | 104:10 | 78:24, 101:6, | 108:22 |
| $48: 19,50: 18$ | 101:21, 107:5, | 55:21, 67:27, | done [13]-21:4, | 101:10 | efforts [1] - 74:5 |
| 50:29, 107:27 | 107:29, 108:15, | 70:8, 83:15 | 21:6, 24:18, | drinking ${ }_{[7]}$ | [1] - |
| Deputy [7] - | 108:17 | discussing [2] - | 26:25, 27:10, | 8:14, 8:18, 8:25, | eight [1] - 77:11 either [3] - |
| 48:7, 48:11, 49:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { difficult [1] - } \\ & \text { 10:3 } \end{aligned}$ | $18: 23,53: 19$ | 27:11, 48:13, | 8:29, 9:6, 9:7, 9:8 <br> driveway [2] - | 57:10, 98:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:17, 86:13, } \\ & 90: 25,90: 26 \end{aligned}$ | digitalised [1] - | $111: 11,113: 7$ | 66:4, 81:19, | $60: 20,60: 24$ | 113:27 |
| describe [2] - | $75: 20$ | disk [1] - 59:10 | 115:21, 118:14 <br> Donegal [2] - | driving [2] - <br> 46.8, 112-1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { elaborate [1] - } \\ & \text { 114:23 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:13, 117:9 } \\ & \text { describe.. [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DIGNAM [1] } \\ & 3: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { display [1] - } \\ & 117: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Donegal [2] - } \\ 24: 8,86: 15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:8, 112:1 } \\ & \text { drug }[1]-50: 3 \end{aligned}$ | em [7] - 10:22, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { describe.. [1] - } \\ & 23: 5 \end{aligned}$ | direct [1] - | disproportiona | double [1] - | Drugs [1] - 38:8 | 20:16, 21:1, |
| described [4] - | 113:24 | te [3]-81:7, 81:8, | 13:18 | drugs [6]-8:27, | 40:11, 65:10, |
| 27:20, 94:17, | $\begin{gathered} \text { directed }[4]- \\ 8: 12.15: 9.110: 2 . \end{gathered}$ | 81:13 | double- | 37:17, 37:23, | em.. [1] - 94:26 |
| $104: 28,108: 5$ | 8:12, 15:9, 110:2, 110:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dispute [2] - } \\ & 70: 2,97: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { crossing [1] - } \\ & 13: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 8,41: 11, \\ & 41: 28 \end{aligned}$ | emanated [2] - |
| 94:8 | direction [1] - | disputed [3] - | doubt [3] | drum [1] - 32:14 | $9: 7,70: 22$ |
| descriptor [1] - | 63:9 | $34: 15,79: 1$ | $30: 24,45: 10$ | DUBLIN [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { emanates [2] - } \\ & \text { 14:28, } 32: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 84:14 } \\ & \text { DESMOND }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { directly [2] - } \\ 14: 29,34: 20 \end{gathered}$ | 101:27 <br> disputing [3]- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:10 } \\ & \text { down [43] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 28,4: 6 \\ & \text { Dublin [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 14:28, 32:25 EMMA [1] - 3:26 |
| $4: 3$ | Director [2] 85.24, 85.25 | 16:3, 91:22, 98:9 | 10:27, 13:26, | $41: 15$ | enable [1]-8:17 encompassed |
| detail [2]-9:20, | 85:24, 85:25 <br> DIRECTOR | district [4] - | 17:16, 28:1, 32:17, 33:14, | duck [1] - 10:14 <br> due [3]-17.28 | [1] - 79:13 |
| 117:9 details [2] - | $3: 13$ | 52:3, 64:20, 65:2, 65:28 | $35: 18,36: 22$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { due }[3]-17: 28, \\ 101: 4,115: 1 \end{gathered}$ | encounter [2] - |
| 31:14, 86:25 | DIRECTORATE | division [2]- | 37:9, 40:7, 41:25, | during [2] - | 32:2, 32:4 |
| Detective [14] - | $[1]-3: 15$ | $25: 14,26: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 29,45: 21, \\ & 49: 20.54: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $9: 10,44: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { encouraging } \\ & -34: 6 \end{aligned}$ |


| end [9]-11:16, | 118:4 | 21:5, 21:21, | 45:9, 97:13, | 30:10, 39:3, | 65:23, 65:27, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11:17, 69:14, | everywhere [1] - | 24:23, 91:5, | 104:4, 105:27 | 40:20, 47:23, | 101:10, 101:14, |
| 71:26, 74:16, | 21:14 | 91:23, 91:26, | falsified [2] - | 48:9, 49:13, | 101:17, 101:18, |
| 106:26, 110:26, | evidence [28] - | 92:9 | 96:4, 116:2 | 49:28, 51:17, | 103:14, 103:24, |
| 112:29, 118:3 | 6:13, 6:18, 6:25, | explaining [1] - | familiar [2] - | 54:18, 54:25, | 104:15, 104:17, |
| engage [1] - | 8:18, 9:6, 11:10, | 92:10 | 6:25, 46:4 | 61:26, 62:8, 62:9, | 107:26, 113:27 |
| 70:10 | $14: 5,14: 17,27: 7$ | explanation [1] - | Fanning [1] - | $64: 13,70: 25,$ $71: 20.79: 5$ | formal [2] 90.22 106.12 |
| enquire [2] - | 30:21, 36:8, | $15: 27$ | 93:9 | 71:20, 79:5, | $90: 22,106: 12$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:18, 22:11 } \\ & \text { enquiries [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 18,44: 17, \\ & 46: 12,52: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { explicit [1] - } \\ & 94: 24 \end{aligned}$ | Fanning's [1] - \|97:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 20,84: 1,84: 7, \\ & 87: 10,90: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { formality [1] - } \\ & \text { 114:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 58:3 | 83:17, 96:23, | explicitly [1] - | far [5]-18:8, | $90: 24,96: 6,$ | formed [1] - |
| enquiry [2] - | 106:4, 106:11 | 112:12 | 18:9, 66:10, | 106:18, 106:24, | 106:23 |
| $15: 3,52: 5$ | 106:13, 106:14, | explore [2] - | $81: 19,114: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:25, 106:26, } \\ & \text { 107:12, 109:13, } \end{aligned}$ | forms [8] - 15:6, |
| enter [1] - 15:23 <br> entertain [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:20, 113:21, } \\ & \text { 114:2, 117:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 77:17, 93:2 } \\ & \text { explored }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | FARRELL [1] - 4:2 | 107:12, 109:13, 112:26 | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 4,65: 27,66: 1 \\ & \text { 101:7, 104:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 113:12, 114:7 } \\ \text { entirely }[3] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 117:21, } 118: 4 \\ \text { evidential }[3] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 77:24 } \\ & \text { exposed } 1 \text { ] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Farrell [3] - } \\ & \text { 11:28, 29:8, 84:2 } \end{aligned}$ | firstly [1] - 44:14 <br> fit [5] - 50:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:28, } 105: 3 \\ & \text { forth [1] }-46: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 26:24, 118:21, | 19:15, 112:19, | 86:16 | fashion [1] - | 69:17, 106:9, | fortnight [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:23 } \\ & \text { entries [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:28 } \\ & \text { exact }[2]-37: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { expressed [2] - } \\ & 17: 4,108: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:28 } \\ & \text { fault }[1]-55: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:18 } \\ & \text { fits }[3]-27: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:4 } \\ & \text { forward [5] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 8: 13,82: 1 \\ \text { entry }[23] \end{gathered}$ | 46:1 exactly [6] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { extending }[1] \text { - } \\ & 79: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { February }{ }^{[2]} \text { - } \\ & \text { 89:27, } 110: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:3 } \\ & \text { Fitzgerald }[2] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 7,54: 9,76: 6, \\ & 98: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| 10:29, 13:17, | 13:23, 27:13 | extent [1] | feeding [1] - | 86:4, 91:2 | four [11] - 15:11, |
| 24:22, 24:27, | 44:10, 57:2, | 25:23 | 9:27 | FITZWILLIAM | 32:8, 33:26, |
| $24: 29,25: 3$ | $70: 28,88: 25$ | extra [1] - 27:18 | fella [2] - 41:18, | [1] - 4:5 | 62:15, 62:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:18, 26:18, } \\ & \text { 26:20, 28:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { examination } \\ -45: 14,76: 21 \end{array}$ | extraordinary <br> [1]-117:6 | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 28 \\ & \text { felt }[2]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { five [2]-36:23, } \\ & \text { 106:21 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 3,79: 5,83: 2, \\ & 83: 21,83: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| 38:24, 38:29, | examine [1] - | eye[1]-81:20 | 11:3 | fixed [2] - 94:27, | 106:21 |
| 39:1, 39:3, 39:16, | 6:11 |  | few [5] - 6:15, | $110: 11$ | Four [1] - 115:7 |
| 42:9, 43:1, 43:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { examined [1] - } \\ & 35: 1 \end{aligned}$ | F | $44: 1,46: 27$ | flawed [1] - 86:8 <br> floor [1] - 49:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fourth [2]-33:6, } \\ & 33: 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:29, 115:7 } \\ & \text { envelope }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | EXAMINED ${ }_{[2]}$ - $5: 5,6: 6$ | face [6]-9:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fide [2]-94:9, } \\ & 94: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { flu }[5]-66: 15, \\ 69: 7,71: 8,72: 13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Frances [1] - } \\ & 86: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 59:20 | examining [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 12,34: 1 \\ & 56: 25,81: 18 \end{aligned}$ | fifth [1] - 33:26 | $72: 19$ | Francis [1] - |
| Environment [1] | 26:24, 97:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 25,81: 18, \\ & 84: 16 \end{aligned}$ | figure [1] - 94:26 | $\text { FLYNN }_{[1]}-3: 19$ | 91:2 |
| $\begin{gathered} -103: 13 \\ \text { equally } \end{gathered}$ | example [2] $42: 20,42: 21$ | Facebook [2] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { file }[12]-10: 25, \\ 10: 26,57: 14, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { focused [1] - } \\ & \text { 10:29 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { frank }[1]-8: 23 \\ & \text { fraud }[3]-15: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| $27: 13,63: 27$ | examples [1] - | 63:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:26, 57:14, } \\ & 57: 23,61: 4,6 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { FOI }_{[1]}-96: 12$ | $54: 24,54: 28$ |
| equivalent [2] - | 80:3 | facing [2]-50:4, | $61: 8,62: 8,71: 1$ | folders [1] - | free [2]-118:22, |
| $29: 25,41: 15$ | except [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:29 } \\ & \text { fact }[13]-8: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $71: 3,79: 7,79: 26$ | 71:10 | 118:23 |
| error [1]-51:12 <br> essentially [2] - | $113: 19$ <br> exchange | $\begin{gathered} \text { fact }[13]-8: 25, \\ 11: 2,30: 24,33: 4, \end{gathered}$ | $\text { filing }[1]-66: 1$ <br> filled [1] - 46:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { follow [2]-47:5, } \\ & 95: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { fresh [1] - } \\ 114: 10 \end{gathered}$ |
| $64: 6,89: 19$ | 90:9 | 57:26, 73:25, | filled [1] - 46:5 finally [1] - | following [7] - | friction [1]-9:14 |
| establish [1] - | excuse [1] - | 74:8, 76:26 | 105:7 | 30:17, 44:21, | Friday [2] - |
| 117:5 | 72:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 24,79: 6, \\ & 85: 10,96: 24, \end{aligned}$ | fine [1] - 70:3 | $45: 22,72: 2$ | 14:17, 109:24 |
| established [4] - | EXECUTIVE [1] | 85:10, 96:24, | finish [1] - 56:8 | 83:14, 92:18, | friends [1] - |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 69:6, 69:9, 89:5 } \\ \text { evaluating }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $-3: 13$ <br> existence [2] - | 105:3 <br> failing [2] - 79:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Finn [15]- 35:26, } \\ & \text { 45:5, 91:13, } \end{aligned}$ | 107:3 <br> FOLLOWS [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:10 } \\ & \text { friendship [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 25:24 <br> evening [1] - | 117:5, 117:10 existing [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 26 \\ & \text { fair }[6]-25: 12, \\ & 40: 12,63: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 91: 15,91: 24, \\ & 92: 24,94: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 6:1, 6:7, 78:16 } \\ \text { footage [2] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:29 } \\ & \text { front }[2]-35: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:6 } \\ & \text { event }[9]-9: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 113: 10 \\ & \text { expect }[2] \end{aligned}$ | 75:22, 80:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 28,95: 2,95: 4, \\ & 96: 6,97: 6,102: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 7,59: 10 \\ & \text { FOR }[4]-3: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 7 \\ & \text { full }[6]-26: 4, \end{aligned}$ |
| 13:6, 31:13, | 18:7, 102:21 | 112:27 <br> fairly | $\text { 104:11, } 116: 8$ | $3: 30,4: 1,78: 15$ | $42: 11,49: 28$ |
| $34: 20,44: 6,$ | expenses [4] | $79: 5$ | $\operatorname{FINN}_{[1]}-3: 5$ | force [2] - 19:3, | 64:28, 105:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 88: 27,89: 22, \\ & 100: 23,109: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 23,54: 10 \\ & 54: 16,107: 20 \end{aligned}$ | fairness [2] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { Finn's [2] - } \\ 35: 27.117: 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:17 } \\ & \text { forget }[1]-7: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:28 } \\ & \text { fullest }[1]-6: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { events [9]-8:1, } \\ & 10: 19,62: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { explain [3] - 8:3, } \\ & 21: 6,27: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:17, 81:3 } \\ & \text { faith }[3]-94: 15, \end{aligned}$ | firm [1] - 13:25 | forgot [3] - 14:6, 14:11, 56:10 | $\text { fully }[4]-14: 9,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 62: 21,101: 12, \\ & 105: 11,107: 5 \end{aligned}$ | explained [10] 17:11, 17:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 96:29, } 97: 3 \\ & \text { false }[5]-34: 7, \end{aligned}$ | 12:7, 15:11, | form [14] - $46: 10,64: 20$ | 94:2 |


| 112:22 | 117:13, 117:21, | 63:4, 96:24 | harassed [1] - | hold [4]-35:9, | 106:27 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 118:4, 118:18, $118: 20$ | Greene [5] - $39 \cdot 20,40 \cdot 11$ | $50: 8$ | 35:15, 47:4, | immigration [1] |
| G | $\text { GARDA }[7]-3:$ | $63: 13,63: 23,$ | harassment [16] - 50:4, 88:11, | 75:15 <br> hone | implicit [1] - |
| garda [4] - | 3:10, 3:11, 3:12, | 63:29 | 89:25, 90:20 | 11:9, 76:22 | 117:18 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 21,5: 3,6: 6 \\ & \text { gardaí }[6]-8: 27, \end{aligned}$ | GRIFFIN [1] - | 90:23, 90:24, | hope [5]-6:19, | implies [2] - |
| 39:23, 41:26, |  | 3:26 | 90:29, 95:2, | 6:27, 49:21, | 117:6, 117:7 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 41:27, 50:6 } \\ \text { Garda [121] - } \end{gathered}$ | 23:28, 32:20, | 102.27 110:11 | 101:26, 103:12, | 49:24, 90:20 | implying [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6: 4,6: 9,6: 11, \\ & 8: 12,8: 25,9: 26, \end{aligned}$ | $74: 21$ | 116:3 | 105:19, 105:22, | $73: 14$ |  |
|  | Gardaí [2] - | GSOC [7] | 109:5, 109:7 | HORAN [1] - | 70:11 |
| 10:5, 10:22, | $\begin{array}{r} 30: 21,32: 15 \\ \text { gardaí" [1] - } \end{array}$ | 23:15, 28:12, | hard [2]-42:26, | 3:25 | important [5] - |
| 11:16, 13:10, |  | 31:6, 86:8, 87:28, | 46:24 | hot [1] - 75:24 | 93:3, 93:4, 96:27, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14: 18,18: 20, \\ & 30: 3,30: 7,31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 76:18 } \\ & \text { gathered }{ }_{[1]} \end{aligned}$ | 88:5, 109:6 | harm [1] - 70:26 | hour [1] - 42:20 | 102:14 |
| 31:13, 31:24, |  | guard [7]-38:5, | HEAD [1] - 3:15 | hours [3] - 37:2, | in.. [1] - 94:29 |
| 32:9, 32:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:19 } \\ & \text { general [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 38:19, 74:4, | head [3]-19:10, | 42:17, 42:26 | inaccurate [1] - |
| 33:16, 33:19, |  | 79:18, 104:2, $112: 18,114: 20$ | 57:22, 100:6 | HOUSE [1] - | 87:6 |
| 34:6, 34:21, 35:4, | 74:18 Gerard [1] - | Guards [6] - | $22: 5,95: 18$ | 3:27 <br> house [11] - | inch [1] - 10:26 incident [71] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 36: 19,38: 19, \\ & 39: 28,40: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 99:11 } \\ & \text { Gerry [1] - 14:18 } \end{aligned}$ | 31:3, 37:23, | header [1] - | 11:11, 11:12, | 14:8, 20:20, |
| 41:26, 41:27, |  | 63:19, 72:13, | 84:15 | 28:9, 49:8, 60:21, | 30:26, 32:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 42: 18,43: 14 \\ & 44: 19,45: 5,52: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GERRY }_{[1]}- \\ & 3: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 74:17, 105:28 | heading [5] - | 60:24, 93:8, | 32:26, 32:29, |
|  | $3: 11$ <br> Gilmartin's [3] - | ards [6] | 29:15, 66:8, 79:4, | 100:15, 109:22, | 33:8, 33:9, 34:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 52: 7,53: 11 \\ & 54: 29,55: 20 \end{aligned}$ |  | 34:28, 37:4, | 105:20, 114:25 | 112:2 | 34:26, 34:27, |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 58:9, 59:3, 61:7 } \\ \text { gilmartin's }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $41: 25,43: 9,44: 9$ | health [1] - | HR [1] - 90:10 | 37:3, 37:13, |
|  |  | gun [1]-7:22 | 102:28 | huge [1] - | 37:14, 37:15, |
| 59:23, 62:1, | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 13 \\ & \text { girl }[2]-29: 23, \end{aligned}$ |  | hear [3]-40:14, | 114:26 | 37:22, 37:23, |
|  |  |  | 101:4, 105:1 | HUMAN [1] - | 37:24, 38:13, |
| $63: 29,64: 11$ $67: 8,72: 14$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:24 } \\ & \text { gist [2] - 39:14 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 40:14, 40:20, | hundred [2] - | 40:20, 40:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 73: 26,74: 17 \\ & 74: 22,75: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 42:13 | half [2] - 10:26, | 66:28, 75:10, | 42:7, 44:11 | 40:25, 40:26, |
|  | given [16] - 6:14, 6.25, 13:6, 19:16, |  | 87:7, 87:8 | hung [1] - 83:5 | 40:27, 40:29, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 75: 27,78: 18, \\ & 79: 6,80: 26,82: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 23:2, 27:7, 56:15, | hand [8]-17:23, | $6: 1,78: 15,119: 7$ |  | 41:6, 41:7, 41:17, 41:19, 41:23, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 2,2: 1,5 \\ & 67: 13,75: 6, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | 42:1, 42:3, 42:15, |
| $82: 11,82: 17$ $83: 5,83: 21$, | $75: 27,76: 2$ | 19:3, 38:3, 45:23, | hearing [2] - |  | 42:21, 42:22, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 83: 5,83: 21, \\ & 83: 23,83: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 80:15, 80:17, | 66:7, 66:10, | hearsay [1] - |  | 42:29, 43:4 |
| 83:29, 84:10, | 81:10, 83:17, | 66.7, 66.10, | $100: 13$ | [1] - | 43:15, 43:21, |
| 85:3, 86:8, 86:10, | Glacken [1] - | $35: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hell [1] - 40:10 } \\ & \text { help [2] - 68:18, } \end{aligned}$ | ID [1] - 57:28 | 43:26, 44:7, 44:9, |
| 86:14, 86:15, |  |  |  | idea [2]-16:1, | 44:11, 45:8, |
| 87:28, 88:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 10 \\ & \text { gladly }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $43: 11,106: 25$ | 113:4 |  | 45:12, 54:4, 57:3, |
| 89:22, 94:9, |  | 106:26 | heroin [3]-33:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { identificatio } \\ & {[1]-42: 29} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 16,58: 20, \\ & 60: 9,63: 29,67: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 94:14, 95:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 70:21 } \\ & \text { glancing [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | handwriting [1] | $53: 27,86: 9$ <br> hierarchy [1] - | identified [5] - | 60:9, 63:29, 67:9, 73:29, 74:14, |
| 96:4, 96:7, 96:9, $96.24,96 \cdot 25$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 52:19 } \\ & \text { GLEESON }_{[1]}- \end{aligned}$ | - 79:28 | 49:25 | $36: 19,41: 3$ | 77:10, 79:11, |
| $96: 24,96: 25$, $96: 28,96: 29$, |  |  | Higgins [1] - | 61:21, 85:19, | 100:28, 110:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 96: 28,96: 29, \\ & 97: 7,98: 14,9 \end{aligned}$ | $4: 4$ | hanging [2] - | $28$ | 100:27 | 110:21, 110:29, |
| 99:13, 99:14, |  |  |  | identify [2] - | 111:9, 111:11, |
| 100:14, 101:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gleeson [2] } \\ & 35: 1,42: 28 \end{aligned}$ | 82:12, 85:3 | 71 | 99:25, 112:28 | 114:17, 117:1, |
| 102:27, 104:2, | goings [1] - | annon [1] - | himself [3] | identity [2] - | 117:5, 117:6, |
| 105:1, 105:3, | 100:14 | 84:14 | $31: 26,63: 29$$112 \cdot 16$ | 10:11, 16:28 | 117:8, 117:11, |
| 105:7, 107:1, |  |  |  | illness [1] - | 117:13 |
| 109:8, 109:9, | $3: 22$ <br> goods [2] - | 13:11, 17:18 | hindsight [3]- | 66:24 | incidents [3] - |
| 110:13, 110:18, |  | 17:28, 23:21 | 17:15, 41:21, | illness" [1] - | 27:22, 30:1, |
| 111:8, 111:13, | 46:24, 52:8 | 23:27, 39:9, | $88: 1$ <br> history [1] - 66:8 | 66:9 | 74:18 |
| 111:18, 112:1, |  | $55: 29,69: 24$ |  | illustrates [1] - | included [2] - |
| 112:15, 112:23, | $70: 11,70: 13$ <br> GRALTON ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:22 } \\ & \text { Haran [2] - } \\ & \text { 30:13, 84:8 } \\ & \text { HARAN }[1]-4: 2 \end{aligned}$ | hitched [1] - | 36:8 | 83:11, 101:14 |
| 112:27, 113:22, |  |  | 58:7 | immediately [5] | including [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 113: 24,114: 1, \\ & 116: 18,117: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3:14 } \\ & \text { great }[3]-44: 3, \end{aligned}$ |  | hmm [2]-25:22, | - 48:13, 50:19, | 52:7, 64:21, 97:6 |
|  |  |  | 97:15 | 50:20, 64:29, | inconsistent [1] |



| keep [4] - 64:7, | 3:20 | legal [1] - 89:22 | linked [1] - 70:9 | LORRAINE [1] - | 45:24, 48:3, 48:4, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 68:24, 69:23, | Kilmartin's [2] - | legitimately [1] - | linking [1] - | 3:4 | 48:14, 48:20 |
| 81:20 | 58:13, 62:9 | 113:25 | 43:27 | lorry [1] - 10:27 | 48:23, 48:27 |
| keeping [1] - | KIRWAN [1] - | lengthy [1] - | list [1] - 32:11 | lose [1] - 32:23 | 49:16, 52:3, |
| 111:5 | 3:13 | 79:22 | listed [2]-73:2, | loss [1] - 52:9 | 66:29, 98:6, |
| Kelly [11] - | know.. [1] - | less [1] - 31:3 | 99:10 | lost [1] - 101:16 | 98:15, 99:19, |
| 75:11, 75:15, | 32:27 | letter [39]- | listen [4]-22:2, | lovely [2] - | 106:17, 107:28 |
| 75:25, 77:21, | knowing [4] - | 51:27, 54:8, | 22:3, 32:7, 71:15 | 78:13, 119:5 | MARGARET ${ }_{[1]}$ |
| 77:29, 111:20, | 9:26, 45:11, | 54:29, 55:16, | listened [1] - | lunch [2]-56:8, | - 3:21 |
| 113:7, 113:8, | 107:9, 114:28 | 67:2, 67:16, | 6:13 | 80:20 | MARIE [2] - 3:8, |
| 113:15, 116:14, | knowledge [5] - | 75:23, 82:5, | LITTLE [1] - 3:28 | LUNCH [1] - | 3:17 |
| 118:20 | 25:19, 35:22, | 83:13, 85:28, | LMc [1]-22:23 | 78:15 | MARK [1] - 3:3 |
| KELLY [32] - | 37:24, 44:25, | 85:29, 86:6, | LMcH [3] - 38:5, | LYONS [1] - 4:3 | marked [2] - |
| 3:12, 35:13, | 74:7 | 86:18, 86:21, | 39:20, 39:21 | Lyons [24] - | 69:7, 71:26 |
| 74:28, 75:1, 75:6, | known [5] - | 86:22, 86:26, | local [5] - 21:18, | 31:11, 31:13, | mask [1] - 15:2 |
| 75:10, 75:12, | 25:10, 98:3, | 87:1, 87:8, 90:15, | 24:24, 24:27, | 32:9, 33:16, 35:6, | material [4]- |
| 75:19, 75:27, | $99: 16,102: 27,$ | 90:18, 91:14, | $25: 5,25: 7$ | 36:2, 41:27, | $73: 20,87: 19$ |
| 76:1, 77:26, 78:2, | $103: 23$ | 91:20, 91:21, | look [55] - 7:3, | 42:21, 43:10, | 113:22, 113:23 |
| 111:21, 111:23, | knows [1] - 78:2 | 91:22, 92:1, 92:6, | 7:14, 18:9, 19:12, | 43:14, 44:19, | materiality [1] - |
| 111:26, 111:28, |  | 92:13, 93:8, | 22:17, 24:26, | 83:23, 94:9, | 113:10 |
| 112:5, 113:17, | L | $93: 13,93: 28$ | 26:25, 29:14, | $94: 14,94: 28$ | $\text { MATT }_{[1]}-3: 19$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:10, 115:26, } \\ & \text { 115:28, 116:6, } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 24,99: 7, \\ & 99: 12 \quad 99: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $30: 13,31: 12$ | $95: 28,96: 5,96: 7,$ | matter [29]-7:4, |
| 116:10, 116:15, | lad [1] - 59:25 | 99:23, 100:2, | $35: 10,36: 6$ | $97: 7,116: 5$ | $26: 3,26: 10,28: 3$ |
| 116:19, 116:21, | landscape [1] - | 100:5, 100:8, | 36:23, 37:27, | Lyons" [1] - | $31: 4,33: 4,41: 1$ |
| 116:25, 116:28, | $6: 19$ | 100:27 | 42:23, 45:19, | 117:3 | $52: 17,55: 3$ |
| 117:19, 118:14, | large [1] - 89:28 | letters [1] - | 49:8, 51:11, | Lyons' [2] - | 55:13, 64:1, |
| 118:18, 118:27 KEOGH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { largest [1] - } \\ & \text { 11:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100:7 } \\ & \text { level }[2]-18: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 26,57: 15, \\ & 58: 16,58: 27, \end{aligned}$ | 45:5, 96:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 12,76: 21, \\ & 77: 24,94: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| $5: 3,6: 6$ <br> Keogh [37] - 6:4, | laser [1] - 46:20 last [20]-9:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:11 } \\ & \text { liaison [1] - 14:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 28,60: 1 \\ & 61: 27,64: 13 \end{aligned}$ | M | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 21,97: 12, \\ & 110: 6,112: 28, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:9, 6:11, 8:12, } \\ & 31: 24.34: 6.35: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 5,22: 22,31: 1, \\ & 31: 22,33: 17, \end{aligned}$ | Liam [17] - | 67:15, 67:19, |  | 112:29, 113:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 31: 24,34: 6,35: 4 \\ & 36: 20,52: 4,52: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $35: 1,36: 23,40: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 23,21: 7, \\ & 21: 19,22: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:29, 70:1, } \\ & 72: 28,74: 19, \end{aligned}$ | 58:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:9, 113:16, } \\ & \text { 113:19, 113:28, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 53:12, 54:29, | 46:7, 48:1, 49:20, | 22:25, 23:10 | 75:26, 76:1, 79:3, | mail [4]-31:17, | $114: 6,114: 29$ |
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| 60:16, 62:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:21 } \\ & \text { non-belief [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 61:20, 68:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 18,10: 8,10: 10 \\ & 16: 6,22: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 11,3: 14 \\ & \text { officers [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $110: 2,110: 6$ |
| negative [2] |  | 72:14, 72:15, |  |  |  |
| 9:27, 11:24 |  | $73: 1,80: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 11,27: 6,30: 4, \\ & 33: 16,34: 1,40: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 43:27, 53:20, | 114:15, 115:11, |
| neglect [2] - | normal [2] | $85: 15,88: 15$ |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 79:6, 79:25 } \\ & \text { neglecting }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $115: 20,115: 21$ | 88:16, 91:3, | $40: 10,41: 16$ | official | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:26, 115:28, } \\ & \text { 117:3 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | not.. [1] - 92:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 14,99: 24, \\ & 100: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 44:25, 50:16, | $18: 20,55: 8$ <br> OGHUVBU [1] - |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 79:28 } \\ & \text { neighbour [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | note [18] - 17:26, |  | 50:17, 51:21 |  | one-by-one [1] - |
|  | 20:3, 21:3, 22:19, | numbered [1] - | 55:1, 56:14,$56: 25,59: 14$ | 3:11Oghuvbu [4] - | 24:20 <br> one-line [1] - |
| 100:17 | $23: 18,28: 29$ | 113:4 |  |  |  |
| never 15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:6, 29:11, } \\ & \text { 59:26, 68:2, } \\ & \text { 69:22, 89:10, } \\ & 95: 6,97: 25,99: 7, \end{aligned}$ | numbering [1] - |  | $\begin{aligned} & 68: 21,72: 16, \\ & 89: 26,90: 3 \\ & \text { old [2] - 47:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $34: 13$ |
| 10:22, 33:29 |  | 116:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 6,63: 8,64: 3 \\ & 66: 4,69: 3,73: 2, \end{aligned}$ |  | ongoing [1] - |
|  |  |  | 73:13, 73:22, |  | 105:4 |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 22,78: 23, \\ & 78: 28,83: 8, \\ & 84: 22,85: 22, \\ & 86: 18,89: 26, \\ & 94: 5,98: 11, \\ & \text { 105:10, 106:4, } \\ & \text { 107:27, 109:20, } \\ & \text { 112:12, 112:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 24 \\ & \text { older [1] - 47:21 } \\ & \text { Olivia [21] - } \\ & \text { 20:23, 21:7, } \\ & 21: 18,22: 4 \\ & 22: 25,23: 10 \\ & \text { 28:3, 28:7, 28:16, } \\ & 28: 20,29: 8 \end{aligned}$ | opened [1] - <br> 40:24 <br> opening [2] - <br> 57:16, 79:15 <br> operate [1] - <br> 58:23 <br> opinion [4] - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 32:7, 79:16, | 40:24, 45:22, | 116:20, 116:21 | patient [1] - | periods [5] - | 80:29, 81:2, 81:3, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 83:17, 87:22 | 49:8, 49:12, | paragraphs [1] - | 117:22 | 42:19, 59:27, | 81:4, 81:16, |
| opportunity [9] - | 49:27, 53:2, | 49:13 | PATRICK ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 66:6, 66:21 | 81:21, 81:26, |
| 89:5, 89:6, 89:13, | 57:24, 57:25, | parallel [1] - | 3:3 | permit [1] - | 82:4, 92:15, 96:5, |
| 89:15, 89:23, | 58:3, 58:27, | 8:21 | patrol [2] - | 113:27 | 96:8, 97:1, 108:3, |
| 95:25, 113:13, | 62:15, 63:28, | paranoia [1] - | 37:17, 41:24 | person [24] - | 113:20, 116:12, |
| 113:14, 114:28 | $64: 12,64: 14$ | 11:14 | patterns [1] - | 12:26, 12:28, | 117:16 |
| opposed [4] - | 64:26, 65:22, | paranoid [2] - | 112:14 | 13:7, 13:9, 13:11, | pointed [3] - |
| 18:25, 64:7, 64:8, | 66:5, 66:19, | 11:1, 11:15 | PAUL [1] - 3:30 | 13:12, 14:2, 14:6, | 68:21, 77:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 74:22 } \\ & \text { optior } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:19, 68:6, } \\ & 68: 17.70: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pardon [1] - } \\ & 45: 21 \end{aligned}$ | pay [3]-46:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 8,14: 10 \\ & 14: 14,25: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:15 } \\ & \text { pointing [1] } \end{aligned}$ |
| $32: 8,33: 26$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 28,73: 28, \\ & 74: 19,75: 5, \end{aligned}$ | Park [1] - 9:26 | payment [2] - | $25: 19,39: 28$ | $42: 8$ |
| ordinarily [1] - | 76:14, 80:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { part [19]-15:12, } \\ & 15: 13,17: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 46:21, } 52: 16 \\ \text { payments [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $47: 12,47: 14$ | $58: 15,62: 15$ |
| 10:21 | 81:29, 82:1, | 21:13, 44:26, | 55:5 | 58:28, 76:6, | $62: 16,85: 5$ |
| ordinary [2] - | 82:14, 82:21, | 45:19, 47:23, | pedestrian [1] - | 76:11, 104:7 | 115:29 |
| 66:9, 66:24 | 83:11, 83:20, | 48:26, 53:28, | 41:18 | personal [3] - | policed [1] - |
| organisational. | 83:28, 83:29, | $67: 11,79: 1$ | PEGGY [1] - 4:4 | $65: 14,65: 16$ | 111:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \cdot[1]-69: 18 \\ & \text { original }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | 84:3, 84:6, 84:7, <br> 84:13, 85:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 86:26, 87:8, 89:2, } \\ & 98: 4,99: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { pending }[2]- \\ 70: 13,101: 13 \end{array}$ | 65:17 <br> personally [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { policeman [1] - } \\ & \text { 89:3 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $53: 28$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87: 3,88: 13 \\ & 88: 15,88: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 101:11, 101:15 | PEOPLE [1] | $112: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { policies [1] - } \\ & 70.71 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { originally [2] - } \\ 39: 29,44: 19 \end{gathered}$ | 90:15, 97:19, | 103:5 <br> participants | 3:16 | $\begin{gathered} \text { personnel [2] } \\ \text { 10:25, 10:26 } \end{gathered}$ | 79:21 |
| ORLA [1] - 3:20 | $97: 20,97: 21$ | $-95: 23$ | 11:23, 30:17, | persons [4] - | 101:7, 103:15, |
| OSMOND [1] - | 97:28, 98:10, | participated [2] | 41:19, 46:27, | 26:15, 42:29, | 103:25, 104:3, |
| 3:27 | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 12,98: 20, \\ & 98: 29,99: 3,99: 4, \end{aligned}$ | - 33:9, 34:19 | 76:6, 77:17, | 72:24, 76:6 | 104:19, 105:13, |
| otherwise [4] - | 98:29, 99:3, 99:4, 99:25, 99:27, | particular [10] - | 78:26, 81:14, | PETER [1] - 3:13 | 105:29, 108:9, |
| 25:21, 80:11, | 100:21, 101:18, | $7: 3,13: 21,13: 23$ | 81:17, 95:16, | Phoenix [1] - | $115: 12$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:28, 103:2 } \\ & \text { otherwise" [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 103:7, 103:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:13, 18:17, } \\ & \text { 25:26, 64:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 115: 2 \\ & \operatorname{per}_{[1]}-62: \end{aligned}$ | 9:26 <br> phone [7] | $\begin{gathered} \text { policing [2] - } \\ 72: 5,77: 11 \end{gathered}$ |
| 103:2 | 104:21, 109:15, | 101:11, 101:18, | perceived [1] - | 11:18, 18:6, | policy [4] - |
| outlining [1] - | $116: 15,116: 22$ | 104:3 | 106:14 | 25:26, 25:27, | $90: 10,103: 12$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:19 } \\ & \text { outside [3] } \end{aligned}$ | pages [2]-35:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { particularly [1] - } \\ & \text { 17:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { percent [2] - } \\ 42: 7,44: 11 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 20,92: 14, \\ & 92: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:23, 109:8 } \\ & \text { poor [2] - } 57: 28 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 110:10, 113:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 14 \\ & \text { paid }[6]-54: 16, \end{aligned}$ | parties [5] - 112:22. 114:4. | perfectly [1] - | phony [2] 89•13, $89 \cdot 16$ | $58: 6$ |
| 113:3 outstanding [2] | $54: 18,55: 1,55: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:22, 114:4, } \\ & \text { 114:8, 118:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:25 } \\ & \text { perhaps }[33] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:13, 89:16 } \\ & \text { piece }[2]-27: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { portion [1] - } \\ & \text { 48:6 } \end{aligned}$ |
| - 102:4, 102:20 | 55:12, 107:10 | 119:3 | 10:20, 13:1, 21:4, | pieced [1] - | position [7] - |
| overdose [1] - | ir [1] - 43:1 | partner [3] | 22:17, 26:24, | 100:18 | 16:4, 31:7, 62:18, |
| 82:25 | paper [4]-22:5, | 41:27, 96:25, | 31:11, 33:22, | pieces [1] - | 63:1, 74:24, |
| overnight [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { 28:2, 71:7, 92:23 } \\ \text { papers [3] - } \end{gathered}$ | $97: 7$ | 35:2, 37:7, 51:26, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:18 } \\ & \text { PLACE } \\ & {[1]-4:} \end{aligned}$ | $90: 16,119: 2$ Positive [1] - |
| $14: 4$ | 29:12, 95:18, | 101:10, 101:21 | 53:22, 55:25, <br> 56:20, 60:5, | place [4]-32:3, | $103: 13$ |
| 11:11, 19:25, | 112:23 | $101: 23,118: 9$ | $60: 10,62: 27,$ | 49:25, 58:26, | positively [1] - |
| $21: 12,36: 29$ | paperwork [1] - | party [7]-41:22, | 67:29, 72:7, 79:3, | 59:16 | 44:6 |
| 45:15 | 25:25 | 60:20, 60:23, | 80:7, 82:26, | plates [1] - | possession [2] - |
| ownership [2] - | paragraph [30] - | 64:17, 64:18, | 83:18, 87:23, | 63:21 | 26:4, 47:13 |
| 46:5, 46:10 | 31:22, 33:17, | 113:8 | 91:17, 93:15, | point [47]-7:20, | possible [5] - |
|  | 34:4, 34:13, | pass [7]-31:9, | 97:19, 101:17, | 11:4, 13:16, 14:5, | 57:18, 60:11, |
| P | 35:18, 49:20, | $45: 13,57: 13$ | 102:14, 103:27, | 22:13, 24:24, | 74:1, 101:25 |
|  | $49: 28,51: 29$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 9,75: 23,78: 4 \\ & 88: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 104:20, 110:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 25,24: 27, \\ & 25: 17,30: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $110: 14$ |
| PAGE [1] - 5:2 | 64:13, 64:25, | passing [4] | period [15] | $35: 28,35: 29$ | 10:26, 68:14, |
| page [85] - | 65:10, 65:21, | $71: 12,109: 21$ | $9: 10,10: 16$ | 36:1, 36:2, 36:11, | 74:29, 95:9, |
| 18:26, 20:3, | 67:18, 87:11, | 111:25, 111:27 | 10:17, 11:12, | $50: 19,58: 9,61: 7$ | 96:26 |
| 22:20, 26:26, | 88:20, 88:24, | past [2]-7:24, | 19:7, 23:17, 37:2, | $62: 19,63: 13$ | post [1] - 93:24 |
| 30:13, 34:12, | 89:9, 89:20, | 112:2 | $42: 13,47: 25$ | 66:14, 69:3, 73:8, | posted [2] - |
| 35:7, 36:14, | $97: 21,99: 1,99: 5,$ | Pat [5] - 53:13, | $48: 13,58: 12$ | 74:18, 76:13, | 89:28, 90:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 36: 22,37: 9, \\ & 37 \cdot 27 \end{aligned}$ | 100:26, 100:28, 104:22, 110:27, | $76: 16,103: 11$ | $67: 19,80: 1$ | 76:24, 77:29, | potential [1] - |
| 37:27, 38:3, | 104.22, 110.27, | 103:15, 103:22 | 83:24, 84:3 | 78:10, 78:13, | 112:14 |


| precisely [1] - | 104:22, 104:25, | 65:21 | 115:24 | 48:10 | recorded [4] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $59: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 106: 4,108: 9 \\ & 108: 10.108: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { provisional [1] - } \\ & 113.29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { quickly [1] - } \\ & 79: 5 \end{aligned}$ | reading [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:19, 65:26 } \\ & \text { 66:11, 95:7 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 114:19 | 108:24, 108:26 | ovisions [1] | NN [1] - 3:10 | 4:14, 101:27, | reco |
| remature [1] - | 108:27, 108:28 | 64:11 | quite [5] - 8:19, | 107:13 | 65:8, 65:25, |
| 87:23 | produce [3] | public | 9:3, 69:24, 70:20, | reads [1] | 66:13, 66:25 |
| presen | 73:14, 89:13 | 59:21, 82:5 | 80: | 116:25 | records [2] |
| $\begin{gathered} 30: 9,37: 23 \\ \text { present [2] } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:16 } \\ & \text { producing }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $105: 6,105: 12$ <br> Public [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { quotation [1] - } \\ & 97: 28 \end{aligned}$ | ```ready [1] - 11:24 reality [1] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100:10, 102:3 } \\ & \text { recounting }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 32: 19,69: 17 \\ \text { presently } \end{gathered}$ | $73: 14$ <br> promoted [5] | $85: 24$ <br> Pulse [21] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { quoting [2] - } \\ 98: 8,98: 29 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:12 } \\ & \text { really }[14]-6: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:15 } \\ & \text { recur [1] - 11:6 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 102:4 <br> presses [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:6, 106:8, } \\ & \text { 106:10, 108:13 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:21, 15:3, } \\ & \text { 24:22, 26:18, } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 24,34: 10, \\ & 46: 26,55: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\text { REDDY }_{[1]}-4: 5$ |
| $75: 24$ <br> pressure [3] - | 108:18 <br> promotion [16] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:23, 37:13, } \\ & 37: 14,40: 17 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 25,76: 20, \\ & 77: 4,77: 14,80: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45:23, 62:8 } \\ & \text { Reference [2] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 39:22, 63:26, | 101:5, 101:7, | $40: 19,40: 20$ | raise [6]-24:12, | 80:9, 104:5, | $79: 24,112: 7$ |
| 64:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:16, 105:24 } \\ & 106: 3,108: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 40:23, 40:25, 40:27, 40:29, | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 23,50: 2, \\ & 89: 23,110: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 115:28 | reference [21] - |
| presumably [5] - $30: 3,46: 4,77: 15$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:3, 108:21, } \\ & \text { 108:27, 108:28, } \end{aligned}$ | 41:6, 41:7, 43:22, | $115: 26$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { rean } \\ 25: 25 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 26,24: 11, \\ & 49: 17,52: 19, \end{aligned}$ |
| $93: 2,95: 28$ | 109:1, 109:14, | $50: 22,60: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { raised [8] - 12:7, } \\ & 48: 10,49: 4 \end{aligned}$ | reappeared [1] - | $52: 21,53: 1$ |
| presume [7] | 109:17, 115:6, | $61: 10$ | $74: 20,89: 26$ | 54:19 | 53:24, 57:24, |
| $18: 2,18: 5,20: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:9, 115:13, } \\ & 115: 18,115: 21 \end{aligned}$ | punishment [1] | 90:29, 94:7, | reason [7] - | 61:6, 82:8, 83:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20: 18,42: 10 \\ & 92: 14,106: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 115:18, 115:21 prompted [1] | - 81:4 purchas | 113:27 | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 6,15: 7,15: 21, \\ & 27: 8,51: 8,94: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 84: 13,87: 6, \\ & 89: 10,97: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| presuming [1] - <br> 20:16 | $73: 3$ | 45:25 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { raising [2] } \\ 48: 8,48: 28 \end{array}$ | $110: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 13,100: 22 \\ & 101: 25,110: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| $20: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 85:22 } \\ & \text { propaganda }{ }_{[1]} \end{aligned}$ | 79:15 | ran [1] - 68:22 rank [2] - 64:2 | $25: 16$ | 114:18, 116:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 75:24, 94:16 } \\ & \text { prevalent }[1] \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { put }[24]-6: 17 \\ 8: 16,9: 4,13: 2 \end{array}$ | 104:27 | received [12] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { referenced }[1] \text { - } \\ & 99: 28 \end{aligned}$ |
| 11:6previous [8] - | proper [5] | $13: 29,27: 20$ | rape [1] - 80: | $90: 20,94: 15,$ | referencing [1] - |
|  | 22:11, 62:23 | 34:16, 40:21 | [1] - 111:18 | 95:23, 96:29, | 70:24 |
| previous [8] - 20:21, 32:4, | 79:29, 106:1, | 41:7, 44:5, 53:29, | rate [1]-51:8 | 98:5, 99:18 | referred [12] |
| $33: 12,43: 15$ | $118: 7$ <br> properly [1] | 61:26, 63:2, | rather [2] - $34 \cdot 20,112.19$ | 104:29, 105:7 | 18:27, 19:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 47: 15,50: 21, \\ & 99: 3,99: 4 \end{aligned}$ |  | 63:24, 63:28 | 34:20, 112:19 | 112:24, 117:2 | 26:9, 30:21 |
| $99: 3,99: 4$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 52:5 } \\ \text { pro } \end{gathered}$ | $69: 27,76: 6,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RD [3] - 68:2 } \\ & 68: 19 \end{aligned}$ | recent [1] - | $38: 13,42: 18$ |
| previous.. [1] - |  | 89:20, 91:29 |  | 25:10 | 43:22, 45:15, |
| 23:21 <br> previously [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:4, } 115: 1 \\ & \text { proposition [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 5,96: 26, \\ & \text { 101:25, 108:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RE }[2]-5: 5,6: 6 \\ & \text { re }[7]-6: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recipient [3] - } \\ & 23: 15,54: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48:7, 48:16, } 70: 9 \text {, } \\ & 73: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 98: 2,99: 16 \\ & 100: 29,108: 15 \\ & 119: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:3 } \\ & \text { prosecuted [1] - } \\ & 32: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 114:14 | $15: 23,39: 23,$ | 55:6 | referring [8] |
|  |  | puts [1]-98:21 <br> puzzle [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 11,55: 20, \\ & 82: 16,82: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recollect }[2] \text { - } \\ & 92: 10.92: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 24,32: 4 \\ & 40: 25,60: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 119:4 <br> primum [1] - | 32:25 <br> Prosecutions | $\begin{aligned} & \text { puzzle [1] - } \\ & 27: 18 \end{aligned}$ | re-enter [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 92:10, 92:12 } \\ & \text { recollection [11] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 25,60: 13 \\ & 67: 3,87: 3,92: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 70:24 } \\ & \text { private [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-85: 25} \\ & \text { protected }[6]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { puzzles [1] } \\ & \text { 27:21 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:23 } \\ & \text { re-examine [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -19: 19,21: 8 \\ & 27: 29,37: 3,37: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:1 } \\ & \text { refers [6] } \end{aligned}$ |
| $28: 8,52: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 20,10: 9,10: 24, \\ & 16: 28,86: 7 \end{aligned}$ | Q | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:11 } \\ & \text { RE-EXAMINED } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 28,53: 18 \\ & 93: 25,94: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 17,51: 2 \\ & 67: 14,67: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 99:26 } \\ & \text { Protected [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |  | [2] - 5:5, 6: | 107:13, 107:1 | 76:14, 117:1 |
| $8: 19,10: 22$, $10: 23,25: 29$, |  |  | reached [1] | recommend [2] | reflect [1] - 62:7 |
| 63:18, 69:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 32:23 } \\ & \text { protection [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | qualify [1]-8:8 quality [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:25 } \\ & \text { read [21] - 29: } \end{aligned}$ | $-71: 28,76: 17$ | reflected [2] - |
| $118: 17$ <br> procedure [2] - | $17: 15$ <br> proven [1] - | $57: 28,58: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { read [21]-29:17, } \\ & \text { 29:19, 38:29, } \end{aligned}$ | recommendati on [1]-74:22 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 88:22, 105:23 } \\ \text { reform [1] - } \end{gathered}$ |
| 78:27, 92:16 |  | quarter [1] - | $39: 3,39: 17,45: 4$ | recommended | 49:24 |
| proceed [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88:21 } \\ & \text { provide [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $56: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 9,57: 10 \\ & 57: 11,59: 12 \end{aligned}$ | [4] - 73:23, 73:25, | refresh [1] - |
| 70:8, 113:19, |  | $90: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 57:11, 59:12, } \\ & \text { 65:10, 66:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $74: 4,74: 23$ | 111:29 |
| 118:8 <br> proceedings [1] | $16: 11$ <br> provided [6] | query [1] - 74:20 | $68: 17,73: 7$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { record [10] - } \\ \text { 27:1, 29:15, 60:1, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { refused }[3] \text { - } \\ \text { 15:10, 28:11, } \end{array}$ |
|  | 16:9, 16:14 | questions [7] - | 73:18, 73:20 | 64:16, 64:17, | 30:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & -78: 27 \\ & \text { proceeds [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |  | 9:25, 15:13 | 75:28, 76:3, | 6:8, 66:15, | regard [2]-63:9, |
| 110:5 <br> process [10] - | $\begin{gathered} 35: 23,52: 6 \\ 52: 13,116: 16 \\ \text { provision }[1]- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 21,32: 11 \\ & 43: 12,115: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 102:24, 105:17 | 66:17, 67:26, | $74: 25$ |
|  |  |  | readily [1] - | 85:6 | regarded [1] - |



| seeking [1] - | 83:19, 84:17, | significant [1] - | 17:23, 17:25, | 74:12 | 59:3, 59:23, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $115: 12$ | 85:6, 85:13 | 114:7 | $34: 11,34: 14$ | stands [1] - | 62:24, 64:16, |
| seem [6] - 9:3, | several [3] - | significantly [1] | 35:5, 38:10, | 68:19 | 64:18, 82:12, |
| 9:12, 43:2, 49:10, | 75:14, 108:23, | - 117:7 | 43:13, 45:21, | stapled [1] - | 82:28, 83:5 |
| 96:26, 100:29 | 111:26 | silver [1] - 59:5 | 45:28, 48:22, | 56:23 | Station" [1] - |
| Seiko [2] - | severe [1] - 81:5 | similar [1] - | 49:21, 52:23, | starred [1] - 70:6 | 30:7 |
| 73:24, 76:7 | shall [2]-65:26, | 86:14 | 56:9, 60:4, 60:6, | start [7]-21:12, | steadfastly [1] - |
| seizure [1] - | 117:23 | simple [3] - | 60:8, 62:14, 65:8, | 21:14, 22:2, | 15:10 |
| 79:26 | SHANE [1] - | 54:17, 81:2, 81:3 | 65:12, 65:21, | 36:24, 40:21, | step [2]-90:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { sells }[1]-33: 14 \\ & \text { send }[3]-67: 7, \end{aligned}$ | 3:23 <br> SHANKEY [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { simpler [1] - } \\ 59.78 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:22, 68:11, } \\ & 68: 19,72: 26, \end{aligned}$ | $60: 17,80: 20$ started [4] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:28 } \\ & \text { still [7]-12:26, } \end{aligned}$ |
| send [3]-67:7, 93.22 $95 \cdot 15$ | SHANKEY ${ }^{[1]}$ - 3.21 | $59: 28$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:19, 72:26, } \\ & 79: 10,80: 23, \end{aligned}$ | started [4] - <br> 8:19, 8.25, 15.2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { still [7]-12:26, } \\ & \text { 19:8. 23:28. } \end{aligned}$ |
| 93:22, 95:15 sending [1] - | 3:21 <br> SHANKEY- | $\begin{gathered} \text { simply [2] - } \\ 32: 9,45: 9 \end{gathered}$ | 88:12, 89:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 19,8: 25,15: 2, \\ & 90: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:8, 23:28, } \\ & 36: 28,42: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:22 } \\ & \text { senior }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SMITH }_{[1]}-3: 21 \\ & \text { shared }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | ```single [1] - 15:5 sinister [1] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:14, 89:17, } \\ & 91: 18,92: 4,92: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { starts [3]-29:9, } \\ & 99: 26,103: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 98: 24,109: 11 \\ \text { Stillorgan [1] - } \end{gathered}$ |
| 53:20 | $110: 13$ <br> SHEA | $55: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 22,109: 19 \\ & \text { 112:9, 113:22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { state }[3]-10: 13, \\ & 98: 2.99: 15 \end{aligned}$ | ```20:6 stolen [3] - 58:7``` |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { sense [9]-6:26, } \\ & \text { 18:10, 20:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SHEAF } \\ & 3: 18 \end{aligned}$ | SINEAD [1]-4:4 <br> sit [1] - 87:13 | sort [13] - 10:19, | State [3] - 52:9, | $60: 20,60: 23$ |
| 26:8, 32:19, | sheet [1] - 71:6 | sitting [2] - | 11:5, 15:10, | 98:5, 99:18 | stood [1]-69:27 |
| 42:24, 80:10, | sheets [1] - 22:5 | 10:14 | 15:20, 15:27, | STATE [1] - 3:27 | stop [7]-36:22, |
| 92:25, 93:1 | SHELLEY ${ }_{[1]}$ - | situation [3] - | 29:29, 40:17, | statement [55] - | 37:10, 38:9, |
| sent [11]-31:17, | 3:25 | 77:16, 77:21, | 46:23, 70:5, | 14:9, 14:14, | 38:11, 39:26, |
| 36:3, 51:22, 53:8, | shifting [2] - | 81:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 20,81: 24, \\ & 115: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 14:16, 14:18, | $45: 22,86: 1$ |
| 54:9, 71:20, $72: 28,85: 24$, | 63:20, 63:22 | $\text { six [1] }-83: 18$ | 115:16 sorted [1] - 26:2 | $17: 5,17: 11,20: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stopped [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 72: 28,85: 24, \\ & 91: 14,93: 19, \end{aligned}$ | ship [1] - 69:25 | skepticism [1] $107 \cdot 19$ | sought [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 14,20: 17, \\ & 21 \cdot 2 \cdot 10, \end{aligned}$ | 111:3 stories [1] - |
| 96:8 | shook [2] | slightly [5] - | 12:4, 45:16 | 28:11, 28:16, | 27:22 |
| separate [3] - | 106:25, 106:26 | 19:14, 63:17, | Sound [1] - | 28:20, 29:8, | story [1] - 15:1 |
| 43:23, 65:27, | short [4]-6:23, | 71:28, 84:24, | 74:11 | 29:13, 29:15, | stranger [1] - |
| 114:17 | 41:12, 69:12, | $93: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sounds [1] - } \\ & 45: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 22,29: 28, \\ & 30: 14.30: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $117: 14$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { September [7] - } \\ & 14: 19,90: 1 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 93:28 } \\ & \text { show } \end{aligned}$ | small [1] - 74:11 | 45:26 <br> source [1] - 25:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 14,30: 22 \\ & 30: 25,31: 3,31: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { STREET [2] - }^{\text {STR }} \end{aligned}$ |
| 90:16, 91:14, | 39:13, 85:18 | $41: 16$ | speaking [4] - | 33:17, 33:19, | Street [2] - |
| 92:7, 104:12, | shows [2] - | SMITH [1] - 3:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 1,49: 9,50: 1, \\ & 111: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 25,39: 8, \\ & 44: 18.48: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $41: 14,41: 15$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:26 } \\ & \text { sequence }[3] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 36: 26,42: 10 \\ \text { sic [1] - } 49: 9 \end{array}$ | so.. [1] - 50:28 solicitor [2] - | 111:28 specific [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 44:18, 48:7, } \\ & 53: 19,56: 15, \end{aligned}$ | ```street [1] - 41:17 stress [22] -``` |
| 8:1, 62:21, 107:5 | sick [8] - 56:13, | 100:27, 115:11 | 81:21, 114:12, | 58:28, 59:11, | 57:2, 57:5, 57:11, |
| sergeant [2] - | 64:17, 65:8, | SOLICITOR'S | 117:9 | 60:2, 60:5, 60:8, | 65:14, 66:10, |
| 11:26, 32:10 | $68: 22,68: 27,$ | [1] - 3:27 | specifically [2] - | 61:24, 67:13, | 66:17, 66:26, |
| SERGEANT [5] - | 71:22, 71:26, | solicitor's [2] | $74: 20,116: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 23,78: 24, \\ & 82: 10.83: 25 . \end{aligned}$ | 67:2, 67:6, 67:10, |
| $3: 12,3: 20,4: 2,$ | 72:16 | 86:18, 99:23 | spirits [1] - 64:7 spoken [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 10,83: 25, \\ & 84: 2,84: 7,84: 15, \end{aligned}$ | 67:12, 67:14, |
| 4.3, 4.3 Sergea | sickness [3] - | Solicitors [2] 98.5, 99:18 | $82: 15,82: 23$ | 84:26, 85:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 67: 27,68: 23 \\ & 68: 27,69: 2,69: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| 30:13, 43:10, | 64:19 |  | spot [2]-93:17, | 91:24, 94:17, | $69: 8,69: 23,71: 4$ |
| 62:10, 74:4, | side [6] - 17:23, | $-4: 5$ | 93:25 | 94:18, 94:19, | 96:24, 107:19 |
| 74:23, 76:11, | 28:29, 29:6, | solicitors [2] - | spots [1] - 15:19 | $98: 28,99: 28$ | strictly [2] - |
| 84:8, 95:28 | 29:11, 66:7, | 95:18, 99:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { spring [1] - } \\ & \text { 109:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { statements [10] } \\ & -20: 23,30: 18, \end{aligned}$ | 111:4, 111:5 strona [1] - 43:2 |
| series [1] - 111.3 | 109:3 | someone [3] - | stage [9]-12:4, | 83:19, 84:17, | strong [1] - 43:2 <br> students [1] - |
| 111:3 serious [2] - | sides [1] - 24:26 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60:27, 71:11, } \\ & 108: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stage [9]-12:4, } \\ & \text { 28:2, 65:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $84: 28,85: 2,85: 6,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { students [1] - } \\ & \text { 79:19 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 63:29, 81:15 | 109:21 | somewher | 69:25, 73:4, | 85:18, 95:15, | stuff [15] - 8:21, |
| seriously [1] - | sighting [1] - | 18:19, 19:9, | 87:12, 109:17, | 95:17 | $22: 3,23: 11$ |
| 81:19 | 109:27 | 41:10, 41:20, | $114: 20,115: 11$ | states [3] 88:18, 107:11 | 24:11, 35:26, |
| service [1] - $59 \cdot 3$ | sightings [1] - | 89:11, 104:17, | stages [1] - $107 \cdot 29$ | $112: 14$ | 35:27, 40:13, |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 59: 3 \\ \text { set }[5]-54: 22, \end{array}$ | $100: 14$ | $105: 21$ <br> somewhere | stamped [1] - | stating [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 5,50: 22 \\ & 55: 25,63: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 62:13, 99:24, | signed [5] - | $-18: 19$ | 100:3 | 73:17 | $68: 23,71: 2,76: 1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 113: 5 \\ & \text { sets }[1]-95: 10 \\ & \text { seven }[4]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 56:22, 102:8, } \\ & \text { 104:7, 104:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { son [1] - 100:17 } \\ & \text { sorry [41] - 7:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stand }[3]-88: 6, \\ & 106: 15 \\ & \text { standard }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Station }[1]-30: 3 \\ \text { station }[11]- \\ \text { 28:7, } 31: 2,58: 24, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 26 \\ & \text { sub }[4]-15: 6, \\ & 15: 22,15: 24 \end{aligned}$ |




| Ó |
| :--- |
| Ó $[17]-3: 7$, |
| $22: 10,25: 28$, |
| $53: 9,53: 26,54: 1$, |
| $78: 5,79: 13$, |
| 80:20, 81:27, |
| 85:23, 86:13, |
| 88:17, 90:25, |
| $90: 26,94: 28$, |
| 104:10 |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |


[^0]:    "I informed judge I'm not happy with AC appoi nted due to friendshi p with chief."

[^1]:    "CCTV vi ewed to no avail as poor qual ity. No ID for suspects."

[^2]:    "It was to with that incident. But l knowit's not in

