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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVS, ON VEDNESDAY, 27TH NOVEMBER 2019:

## SUPERI NTENDENT NOREEN MEBRI EN CONTI NUED TO BE

 DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY MR MARRI NAN, AS FOLLOVB:1 Q. MR. MARRINAN Good morning, superintendent.
A. Good morning.

2 Q.
We were about to move on to 8th Ju7y 2014. Before we do, do you mind if we just revisit an issue that I was asking you about yesterday, and that was the report that had come in from Garda Lyons and what there was to investigate arising out of that reported conversation with Liam McHugh. Just tell us in your own words.
A. Well, in my own words: Garda Lyons had given his report of what happened. Garda Keogh was the other member mentioned and he was required to give a report of what happened. And Liam McHugh was asked to make a statement and, depending on what Liam McHugh would have or could have said, that would have been investigated. But there was nothing from Liam McHugh, so at that stage I can't guess what may have been said, if he said it, but depending on what he said, would have been what would have been investigated.
3 Q. I am not asking you about what was done subsequent to the report coming in from Garda Lyons. I am asking about, having read Garda Lyons' report, what you think offences or investigations were first of all disclosed and then warranted?
A. We11, as I said, Garda Lyons, the issue with Garda Lyons' report had already been in process when I came back on the 5th June. And, as I said, the report from Garda Keogh, I had a report from Garda Lyons and then, depending on Liam McHugh would or could have said, that 11:03 is what would be investigated.

We11, I said to you yesterday, one of the questions I asked you was in relation to Garda Lyons' intention when he was putting together that report and submitting it to Sergeant Curley. The quote was from a statement 11:03 that he made, it's at page 11719. I think you are familiar with it. There's no need to open it. But he said:
"My understanding is that Garda Keogh was encour aging Mr. MKHugh to make a fal se compl ai nt."

Remember we discussed that yesterday?
A. Yes, and I think I said that Garda Lyons' statement was made I think to the Disclosure Tribunal.

5 Q. Yes.
A. I am not sure of the date of it. But I am going by the information that I had to hand when I looked at that when I came back on the 5th June.
6 Q. Which was the report?
A. which was the report.

7 Q. So, having read the report, did you think there was something to investigate?
A. As I said to you, the process was already ongoing and
the only thing that I would require, I had the report from Garda Lyons, I wanted a report from Garda Keogh, that had come down from the chief superintendent as we11, that was reflecting his views, and then a report from Liam McHugh, a statement from Liam McHugh. Without Liam McHugh, who was the central person in this, telling us what allegedly happened, did happen, didn't happen, I couldn't take it any further.
8 Q. But I am just trying to get a handle on what it was you were enquiring into?
A. Into whatever complaint Liam McHugh had.

9 Q. But it's clear that he had no complaint?
A. Not to me, it's not.

10 Q. Well is it not?
A. No.

11 Q. Right. I want to try and establish what was clear to you and what was your impression having read --
A. Well, as I said, this investigation, this was already in process. I took it up a number of days after. Liam McHugh had said something happened and then withdrew it 11:05 or said he didn't want to draw trouble on himself or something to that effect, $I$ don't have it in front of me.

12 Q. Yes. I am going to go through it.
A. Yes, so that would be what -- that would be a concern.

Like if someone makes an allegation like that, you'd like to get the bottom of it and give them the opportunity --

13 Q. What was the allegation?
A. Whatever was in Garda Lyons' report that was --

14 Q. But you read Garda Lyons' report?
A. Pardon?
Q. You had read Garda Lyons' report?
A. Yes.

16 Q. And you read it in 2014?
A. Yes.

17 Q. On the 9th June 2014, at page 524 of the materials, if we could have, you wrote to the detective sergeant in Athlone?
A. Yes.

18 Q. And you say:
"Wth regard to e-nail from Garda Ai dan Lyons dated 2nd June 2014, please ascertain if Mr. MkHugh is willing to 11:06 make a statement about this inci dent. Arrange to have such statement taken if forthcoming."
okay. So, what was it that you were asking?
A. That report is written as a result of a report that 11:06 came back from Chief Superintendent Curran after Inspector Farre11, who was acting for me, reported the incident up to the chief superintendent. And it's quite clear, ask him if he is willing to make a statement about this incident. So, I don't know what 11:07 Mr. McHugh was or wasn't going to say. He is the only one that appears to have the knowledge about what he is reporting and he chose not to.
19 Q. You told us yesterday that you discussed this with

Garda Keogh and that you told him about the Liam McHugh incident?
A. I told him that, yes, I would be discussing it with him, yeah.
20 Q
A. Of what was said, which would be the content of Garda Lyons' report.
Q. Can you recall what was it that you said to Garda Keogh at that time?
A. I think I just have it in my notes that we discussed Liam McHugh, so.
Q. What discussion took place?

What did you convey to Garda Keogh as being the information that had been brought by Liam McHugh to Garda Lyons?
A. Exactly what it says in Garda Lyons' report. That would be my recollection. I just have it in my notes I discussed Liam McHugh.

23 Q. In any event, you wrote that letter to the detective sergeant in Athlone, who would be Detective Sergeant Curley, is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And you subsequently sent him a reminder on the 23 rd June?
A. Yes.
Q. 2014?
A. Yes, a reminder on the 20th June.
Q. That's page 525 of the materials. We don't need to open that. And then you received a report from Inspector Aidan Minnock?
A. Yes.

27 Q. That is dated 8th July 2014?
A. Yes.

28 Q. That's at page 1305, Volume 5. And we see there:
"W th reference to the above, I bel i eve the associ ation of Garda menbers both with Li am McHugh and the menbers i nvol ved in the investi gation, Garda Lyons, Garda A and Keogh make it inappropriate for Gardaí fromAthl one to i nt ervi ew Li am McHugh when colleagues are under i nvest i gat i on. "

It seems to be fairly clear from that, that there is a knowledge that Garda A is under investigation at that time?
A. As I said to you, there was a knowledge around the station from May the 12th, the first day I came back to Athlone after being on leave, that there was something to do with Garda A. That was a knowledge around the station. And also, as I said yesterday I had welfare interviews with the central parties and Garda A was of the assumption that it was something to do with him because he did say that he would get notes to Nicholas Farrell.

29 Q. This is an official document that Inspector Minnock is sending you?
A. Yes.

30 Q. Where he officially says that there is an investigation in relation to Garda $A$ ?
A. He says "l bel ieve", so that's just... And he said "based on talk around the station".

31 Q. Thinking Garda Lyons, Garda A and Garda Keogh al1 surrounding this Liam McHugh incident?
A. Well, that is Inspector Minnock's report, so...
Q. Then he says:
"I understand Detective I nspector Coppi nger is the external appointed officer to investigate this matter. I feel he or his investi gation team are the most appropriate persons to intervi ew Mr. McHugh. "

Then he says he will obtain a mobile number from Mr. McHugh which will assist the investigation team to arrange a meeting.

Now, I think the following day, the 9th July, you get a report from Detective Sergeant Curley, is that right? That's at page 1306, if I could have that one the screen.
A. Can I just say, just to give context to this, we had a murder on the 20th June, which required the participation and assistance of most of these people as well as the whole station party in Athlone. There was a very complicated and a successful conviction. And at 11:11 that time a lot -- there was a lot of workload on other members there with regard to the murder. I just think that should be high1ighted as we11.

33 Q. We11, I understand this to be Inspector Minnock
indicating that it's inappropriate --
A. Yes, but I am just trying to give a context for you of the workload and what was going on at that time.

34 Q. But there's no suggestion, sure there's not, that it's being handed on to Detective Inspector Coppinger because you're short staffed?
A. No, no, no. it's an issue that he doesn't believe that it's appropriate in the circumstances?
A. Yes, that's Inspector Minnock's view.

37 Q. Yes. Then you received a letter from Detective Sergeant Curley, as I say, 1306. He says:
"I note recei pt of attached correspondence. Prior to same being forwarded to me, I requested that I may not be the most suitable person to pursue same as I am personally known to Li am McHugh. "

Was that a conversation that you had with him that he is referring to there?
A. Yes, I believe so. I believe that Detective Sergeant Curley knew Liam McHugh from childhood and possibly lived quite near him.

38 Q. Then he goes on to say:
"I had requested personnel withi $n$ the detective office to compl ete this task. I had tasked Gar da Tom Hi ggi ns with this role. Garda Tom Higgi ns met with Li am McHugh and invited himto make a statement in rel ation to this i nci dent."

So it would appear that despite the view of Inspector Minnock, Garda Tom Higgins had been tasked with going out and asking Liam McHugh would he make a statement?
A. I think Garda Tom Higgins was approached possibly before Inspector Minnock.

39 Q. "Li am MkHugh ref used to consent to provide a witness statement at that time but undertook to think about it and maybe nake hi nself available to provi de such a statement in the future."
A. Yes.

40 Q. Did Garda Higgins provide a statement to you or a report that you had sight of at that time?
A. Garda Higgins was dealing with Detective Sergeant Curley.

41 Q. Do you know what day that Garda Tom Higgins went out?
A. I would have to go through all the notes and documentation but...

42 Q. It doesn't appear that there is a report from Garda Tom Higgins, it doesn't appear there is a statement from Garda Tom Higgins?
A. I believe that the Tribunal are seeking a statement from Garda Higgins.
43 Q. Yes. But none was available to you at that time, is that right?
A. Detective Sergeant Curley wrote to me and I would take Detective Sergeant Curley's word on the matter.

44 Q. "Garda Hi ggi ns reported this situation to me following his meeting with Li am MkHugh. "

So, as matters stood then, Liam McHugh was not prepared 11:14 to make the statement in relation to his interactions with Garda Lyons, but was going to think about it and might do at some time in the future, is that right?
A. That's what's indicated there, that's correct.

45 Q. Then he goes on to say:
"Due to the fact that the matter under inqui ry rel at es to members within Athl one Garda Station, l feel it may be prudent for a member ot her than Athl one prime drugs office to pursue Li am McHugh further for a statement on 11:15 this matter."
A. Yes.

46 Q. Why was Liam McHugh being pursued in relation to this matter?
A. Because Liam McHugh seems to have made an allusion or an allegation to a possible crime involving Garda members.

47 Q. What crime was that?
A. I don't have it in front of me. Garda Lyons' report,
where he alleged that Liam McHugh alleged in a conversation to Garda Keogh through Garda Lyons that money had been taken from him.
48 Q. This is what I was asking about earlier on. If we can just refer to the evidence of chief Superintendent Curran, I think you were here for his evidence, were you?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is on Day 117 , please, at page 157. If we could scroll down to line 24 , please.
A. Yes.
Q.

He is asked the appropriate question, what was the allegation?
A. Yes.

51 Q. And his answer is:
"The allegation was that Guards had actually taken money."
A. Yes.

52 Q. "There's a number of possibilities here, but one of them was that there was criminality invol ved and Guards had taken money fromthis person and then went of $f$ and squandered it."
A. Yes.

53 Q. "The other possi bility is there, did Garda Keogh anticipate? Did he witness this and did he fail to report it?
A. Yes.

54 Q. "And al so, was it potentially something that he had
reported to the confidential reci pient rechani smin the first place."
A. Yes.

Do you agree with that assessment?
A. We11, Chief Superintendent Curran probably had the benefit, which I don't have at the moment, of Garda Lyons' report in front of me. I do agree that we at that time did not -- I was unaware whether this had relevance to the ó Cualáin investigation. We just didn't know whether it would be something that could be of interest.

56 Q. So do you agree with that assessment that he made, which is essentially what was disclosed?
A. That was chief Curran's view. But as I said to you, 11:18 there was a potential issue with regard to Garda members disclosed, and I also was unaware whether that was something that was of relevance to the ó Cualáin team, to the ó Cualáin investigation. I couldn't take it -- really, to take it any further, you would have to 11:18 speak to Mr. McHugh.

57 Q. Yes. The reason I am asking you these questions is you wil1 appreciate that Garda Keogh is in a very general sense making a case that Chief Superintendent Curran was pursuing these matters against him?
A. Yes.

58 Q. All right. Was giving instructions down the line to you.
A. Yes. have any sense at the time that these matters were being pursued to a degree that perhaps wasn't warranted by the information that was actually contained in Garda Lyons' report?
A. No, I didn't. They're serious allegations. And as I explained to Garda Keogh at the very outset, these were incidents that happened in my district on my watch. I 11:19 was duty bound to investigate them. That didn't mean I was investigating him or investigating a complaint against him. I was doing my job with what was in front of me.
61 Q. Was there any report requested in relation to the reliability of the informant in this instance?
A. I answered that yesterday I think. I didn't know Mr. McHugh.
Q. Yes.
A. I think the process would be to speak to the person first and see what he had to say.

63 Q. We11, was there a report sought from Garda Aidan Lyons, who had brought this information from the informant? was he requested to give an assessment on the reliability of his informant? And I use that word --
A. Well, I don't think it was being put down -- actually wasn't being put down as a criminal intelligence entry, which would seek validation of the reliability. It was put down as a record of a conversation where there may
have been a matter that involved criminality with Gardaí.

64 Q. Was there any request from Garda Lyons for an assessment of how reliable the information that he was getting was?
A. There wasn't. But I wouldn't consider it at that stage a requirement. There was something -- if that was an issue, you could always go back to it at any stage. Garda Lyons was working in the station and I could always go back to it.
65 Q. Were there any inquiries commenced in relation to the investigation, if this incident had occurred, of the three Gardaí who were mentioned by Liam McHugh?
A. There was no investigation that could be taken any further because Liam McHugh held that information. He wasn't willing to give a statement. I had no date. I had no time. I had no year. I had no idea who the guards were.
66 Q. In any event, you thought that this was a matter that needed to be pursued further and you then wrote to Detective Superintendent Mulcahy; is that right?
A. I did.

67 Q. If we can just have a look at that letter, it's at page 1304 of the material. There we can see that it's headed:
"I nvestigation regarding allegations made by Garda Ni chol as Keogh. "

In the first instance and then it's the:
"Report of Garda Ai dan Lyons regarding Mr. Li am MEHugh. "
A. Yes.
Q. Pulse ID number.
"On 2nd J une 2014, Garda Ai dan Lyons, At hl one, made a 11:22 report regarding information he recei ved from Liam MEHugh concerni ng Garda Ni chol as Keogh. An e-mail outlining this is attached."

I think that first paragraph, it's a matter concerning Garda Keogh. Can I come back to the issue that Garda Lyons has, where he says that he compiled a report, he sent it to his superiors, and he is pretty clear what he was trying to convey; namely, Garda Keogh had attempted to coach Mr. McHugh. But in any event, we will move on.
A. I think Garda Lyons' statement in relation to that was made to the disclosures Tribunal. I am dealing there with the facts I had at the time.
70 Q. Then you go on:
"I have requested that a statement regarding this al I egation be taken from Mr. MEHugh. Detective Sergeant Curley, who knows Mr. McHugh personally si nce
chil dhood, has stated that he would not be the most suitable person to take this statement."

Then you refer to the fact that the Garda Tom Higgins met with Mr. McHugh and invited him to make a statement 11:23 in relation to this incident. That he refused to make a statement but undertook to think about it and maybe make himself available to provide such a statement in the future. And then you say:
"I have consi dered and agree with Inspector Mnock and Detective Sergeant Curley's vi ew that in light of your i nvesti gation, it might be more appropriate and i mpartial if someone from outside this di strict approached Mr. McHugh to ascertain if he was willing to 11:23 make a statement. In the circumstances, would it be possi ble for Detective Inspector Coppi nger to arrange to i ntervi ew Li am McHugh in this regard? Inspector M nnock, Athl one, will arrest to arrange such meeting.

Garda Keogh is aware that l know about this allegation. He informed me last ni ght that he is meeting his confidential reci pi ent on Mbnday and he will be making hi maware of it.

I would be gratef ul for your assi stance in this regard. "

I suppose that arises out of what you perceived to be a
dilemma that you had at the time, that had been highlighted by Inspector minnock, isn't that right?
A. Yes. As I said, we were -- I was unsure whether this had any relation to anything Garda Keogh was dealing with, with the team from -- Donal Ó Cualáin's team from 11:24 the Western Region. Mr. McHugh, I believe, was resident in the western Region, which would have had certain elements of convenience. And also, with regard to this correspondence, I did tell Garda Keogh that this was my view and I was considering this and I think 11:24 he thought it was a good idea as well.
71 Q. So you got a reply on the 15th July. It's at page 1191 of the materials. Then second paragraph:
"After reading the report, I believe that the issue rai sed by Mr. Li am MEHugh regardi ng Garda Ni chol as Keogh nay requi re further investigation.

As you are aware, the current investigation pertai ning to Garda Ni chol as Keogh is investigating allegations outlined by the mentber hinself. The report of Garda Lyons concerns allegations made agai nst Garda Keogh. "

Do you see that?
A. Yes. And that gave me clarity that what had happened, or that the content of Garda Lyons' report wasn't something that was of concern to that team, which I didn't know on the 9th when I wrote.
72 Q. Well he will be here to give evidence and he can answer
what he meant by that.
"And I feel that it may be prudent for an independent i nvesti gation to be conducted to progress these matters.

Per haps this file can be forwarded to the chi ef superintendent, West meath, to determine the most appropriate and effective manner to investigate these al I egations."

Okay. So, you here was an experienced superintendent taking on advice from Inspector Minnock, decided to refer the matter to Detective Superintendent Mulcahy. That is the appropriate course, he believes, because it 11:26 concerns an allegation against Garda Keogh, that it would be inappropriate, but he is recommending an independent investigation in relation to the matter, is that right?
A. Well, the views in Athlone between D/Sergeant Curley, 11:26 Inspector Minnock and my views were that this matter may be of relevance and be appropriately investigated by this team. That was my view as well, that the content of Garda Lyons' report may of relevance to them. This, to me, gives me clarity that it's not. And that gives me some level of satisfaction in relation to it.

73 Q. Then if we move forward then to the 8th July. I think that you had a meeting with Garda Keogh, is that right?
A. The 8th July, I did, yes.

74 Q. Yes. I think the notes, the handwritten notes of that meeting are at page 1100. If we could refer to the typed copy, I think it might be easier, which is at page 6410. It's recorded there that you had a meeting with him in your office and that he was in good form. He was keeping well. You discuss an incident that's not relevant, a missing person case I think. You then went on to say:
"He said he was monitoring Li am McHugh and Oivia O Neill."

Do you see there?
A. "Menti oni ng".
A. "Mentioning Li am McHugh and O i via $\mathrm{O}^{\prime}$ Neill."

76 Q. You are certain that that is the correct entry, are you?
A. Oh absolutely, he said he was mentioning Liam McHugh. 11:28

77 Q. Absolutely, because it gives an entirely different meaning.
"He said that $O$ ivia had called in to the station about a week ago about her previ ous inci dents and that he had 11:28 advi sed her to go to GSOC. "

Is that right?
A. That's what I have, yeah.

78 Q. You then discuss Liam McHugh with him, that you had requested a statement from him; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that you had not, as yet, got it?
A. That's correct.

80 Q. You said you were considering asking a Galway detective superintendent to organise to have it taken?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

81 Q. And you had done that; isn't that right?
A. I think is my report dated the 9th? Yes.

MR. CARROLL: Sorry for interrupting, it appears to be the sequence, the last letter was the 9th November, which is after this.
MR. MARRI NAN Yes.
MR. CARROL: We're going backwards and forwards in the dates.

CHA RMAN Yes, that does appear to be the case.
MR. MARRI NAN That is right, yes.
CHA RMAN Is it not better to do it in chronological order?

MR. MARR NAN Well, $I$ only did it, that was the only time I've done got it.
CHA RMAN I think that's --
MR. MARN NAN I have been trying to follow the diary. $11: 29$
CHA RMAN I think that is Mr. Carroll's point.
MR. MARRI NAN But in relation to the discrete incident
-- the discrete series of letters in relation to Liam McHugh.

CHA RMAN Okay. You're doing it your way.
MR. MARRI NAN Yes.
CHA RMAN Anyway, Mr. Carroll points out that this is earlier. I hadn't noticed that, I have to confess.
MR. MARRI NAN Yes. No, he is correct.
83 Q. You point out that you were requesting to ask Detective Superintendent Mulcahy to organise to have it taken and to keep everything impartial and he thought this was a good idea?
A. Yes. I mentioned that in relation to --

84 Q. Yes, you just mentioned that a moment ago, when you were drafting the letter of the 9th July.
"He sai d that he' d trust Detective Sergeant Curley and he woul dn't mind himtaking it, if he di dn't object."

And you informed him that Detective Sergeant Curley had a personal relationship or knowledge of Liam McHugh and this was not really suitable.
A. That's correct.

85 Q. So all this is being discussed in a very open and frank way.
A. Yes.

86 Q. You're stating your position?
A. Yes.

87 Q. And Garda Keogh is stating his position?
A. Yes.

88 Q. Everybody seems quite happy with the way the matter is progressing at that stage?
A. That's my understanding of it, yes.

89 Q. Then you mention the Pulse intelligence entry.
A. Yes.

90 Q. Al1 right. Was this the first time that you raised this issue with him?
A. Sorry, I am just checking my notes. I think I may have mentioned it on the 9th June.

91 Q. It may help you if we put 1127 up on the screen. These are your handwritten notes. But remember I asked but whether or not you'd in fact prepared something for a meeting with Garda Keogh and you will see there number 1 "intel"?
A. Yes.

92 Q. And then "outline"?
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN "NF" that's Inspector Farre11, I assume, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

93 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Do you see that?
A. Yes. That is like a note to myself to...

94 Q. That was a note to yourself.
A. Yes.

95 Q. And then when I brought you through your notes -
A. Yes.
Q. - of your actual conversation, they don't refer to that?
A. They don't, yeah. That just -- maybe I just haven't got the note to say that I -- as I said, the meeting on the 9th June was 90 minutes, so it's possible.

97 Q. The note, I'm reminded, refers to the fact you asked him was he in touch with criminals, but that seems to be the only reference that you had during the course of that conversation?
A. When I asked him was he in touch with criminals at that 11:33 time, on the 9th, that was in relation to my concern that he was taking or perceived he was taking an active role in the ó Cualáin investigation.
Q. Yes.
A. Rather than a role as a witness.

99 Q. Yes.
A. I had a concern about that. I had a concern he could have been meeting criminals and I had a concern about his safety if he was doing so. I don't have a mention in my note of the 9 th June on that, even though I have it there. That's not to say it wasn't mentioned. But I just want to clarify why I mentioned meeting criminals.
100 Q. We went through your typed note at page 6401?
A. Yeah.

101 Q. If I could have that up on the screen.
A. Yes.

102 Q. That's your typed note of the meeting. It starts off at number 1 "wel fare".
A. Yes.

103 Q. It skipped what's written in your handwritten note?
A. Yes.

104 Q. Which is the first issue was to be intel?
A. Does my report to the chief of the 9 th June -- I would
have typed a report to the chief on the 9th, the chief superintendent on the 9th June.
105 Q. If we could have that, it's 1896. There doesn't appear to be any reference?
A. It doesn't mention --

11:35
A. I just can't be any clearer than what's in the notes.

107 Q. We'11 pass on.
A. Yes.
Q. Sure, you can have a look at it again yourself and then come back to us if you can find an earlier entry or if we can find an earlier entry or reference to it. But we will just proceed with it.
"I mentioned the Pul se intelligence entry. He said he bel i eved the current investigation would totally prove his assertions. He said Olivia O Neill said she was approached several times for a statement. I said l was aware that she had been approached once. I di scussed that these three inci dents may requi re separate i nvesti gation. "

The three incidents being the Olivia O'Neill, the Liam McHugh and then the intelligence entry, is that right?
A. Yes, yes.

109 Q. "But I was aware that he was, by himinforming re, goi ng to di scuss them with the confidential reci pient."
A. Yes.

110 Q. "And it might be best to see what happened there. Al though he knows and understands that may be a separate i nvesti gation inqui ry, if deemed necessary."

And then you explain that such issues being investigated would provide resolution. At that time who did you think should be investigating these matters? Obviously you had a view in relation to the Liam McHugh incident, that it shouldn't be within the division. In relation to the Olivia O'Neill incident, she had refused to make a statement?
A. Yes.

Was that not going to be the end of the matter? I mean what was there to be investigated in relation to that?
A. I think we're talking about timeframe in that again, the 8th July. I think it has been clarified, correspondence came up to me on the 9th July, which I wasn't aware of on the 8th July, so...
Q. Well, we know that Olivia o'Neill was approached in relation to -
A. To make a statement and she chose not to.

113 Q. - to make a statement to Detective Sergeant Curley, and 11:37 he a long time previous to this reported that she was declining to make a statement?
A. Yes.

114 Q. So what further was then to be investigated? was that
not the end of the matter?
A. I think the report, there's a report dated the 9th July to me that gives clarity that $I$ didn't have on the 8 th July, from Detective Sergeant Curley. I think it has been addressed. That Garda Keogh -talking about the Olivia O'Neill incident.
A. He said she was approached several times for a statement and I said I was aware she was approached once.

116 Q. No, I am asking you what was to be investigated in relation to the Olivia O'Neill incident?
A. In relation to Olivia O'Neill, the content of what she said, was it accurate? And then we had a report in from Stephanie Treacy and whatever information I required from Garda Keogh, to see if the incident had happened in the manor that it was alleged.

117 Q. Well, you see, one might think looking at this that Olivia O'Neill, from the documentation, all of which was available to you, and from Garda Treacy's report, was that she mentioned this issue in relation to her interaction with Garda Keogh. And again, Garda Treacy has made it abundantly clear that what she intended to convey in her report was that Olivia O'Neill had been told what to say, advised of the information by Garda Keogh. Okay. We dealt with this yesterday and we were talking about coaching of a witness. She had been advised at the time that she had two options: She could either go to GSOC in relation to that information
or she could go and make a statement to the superintendent?
A. Yes.
Q. She didn't do that?
A. Yes.

119 Q. She was then approached by Detective Sergeant Curley and Garda Tom Higgins, it is suggested, and she was asked would she make a statement in relation to her conversation with Garda Keogh. Yes? Now, she had declined to make a statement or make any complaint in 11:40 relation to her interaction with Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.
Q. You had spoken to Garda Keogh about his interaction with Olivia O'Neill and he had advised you that he had told Olivia O'Neill to go and make a full statement to --
A. To GSOC.

121 Q. Yes. No, not to GSOC -- well to GSOC, yes.
A. Yeah.

122 Q. Now, what was there to be investigated as far as you 11:40 were concerned at that stage?
A. I still think there is correspondence that came to me after that I didn't have at the time. I know there is correspondence as well from Chief Superintendent Curran down to me, saying that he felt he had everything in about Olivia O'Neill and he was satisfied with that.

123 Q. Then you go on in your note, at page 6411, that we were dealing with:
"Nick again reiterated that he does not want Inspector Farrell dealing with him"
A. Yes.

You said that Inspector minnock and himself and yourself would deal with him?
A. Yes.
Q.

I think you add to that, at page 834 of your statement:
"Garda Keogh had previ ously stated to me that he did not really deal with Inspectors Farrell and Mnnock. He al so expressed vi ens that he was not happy with Karena Friel, the welfare officer. He wanted a specific person to type his report and he said he trusted Detective Sergeant Curley."
A. Yes.

126 Q. "He al so expressed a desire to have input into the nomi nated menbers on the investi gation team"
A. Yes.

127 Q. That is the bigger investigation, isn't that right? 11:42
A. It is, yes, the Ó Cualáin investigation.

128 Q. "He seemed to have views on who were trustworthy."

Then if we just move forward to the 9th Ju7y. You had an interaction Garda Stephanie Treacy, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

129 Q. This is at page 1658 of the materials. Just tell us in general terms what that interaction was about and her
concerns at that time?
A. Well, the day beforehand, Stephanie had approached me in the station, she wanted to talk to me. I was meeting with Garda Keogh that night. She gave some indication as to what was concerning her. I was meeting with Garda Keogh that night, so it wasn't appropriate for me to meet her on that date. So we made an arrangement to meet the following day. She came in and she spoke to me about the Olivia O'Neill incident. She was very concerned. She was worried about being dragged into something. She said she worked well with both Garda Keogh and Garda A and she gets on well with him and she wanted it to remain so. She was worried about this. Her particular concern about this, was Garda Keogh had indicated to --
CHA RMAN I know it's difficult, but could you try to use Garda A and Ms. B, when we are referring to them. You have no doubt inadvertently mentioned -- so that will be expunged from the record.
MR. MARR NAN Yes, sorry.
WTNESS: Sorry, I didn't realise.
CHA RMAK I know. It's is impossible to think that we are going to get through the full inquiry without somebody, and you won't be the last person to do it, but do try to be alert to that. We only really have two names that we have to watch out for, so it's not as if we have a whole lot. So now.

WTNESS: Sorry.
130 Q. CHA RMAK No. She was concerned, she said she got on
well with all the gardaí, including Garda Keogh and Garda A.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAK Now, sorry I didn't mean to -- we11, I did mean to interrupt you.
A. No, I was reading from notes that were in front of me. CHA RMAN I understand.
A. She was worried because Garda Keogh indicated to her that this might be going further, that was I think in relation to a phone call, she was ringing the station one night about something. So we chatted and I outlined to her that there was no decision yet as to how this would progress. I didn't know how it was going, and she shouldn't be worrying. I advised her re welfare and she said she gets on well with Sergeant Sandra Keane and she'd prefer to deal with her. She was very -- she was worrying, she was very, very agitated. So I said to her that in any investigation she should tell the truth and stop worrying. And I explained that in such circumstances as we found ourselves in caused tension, whether intended to or not. And then I just praised some recent work she had done.
133 Q. MR. MARRINAN I think the next important entry in your diary is the 16th July.
A. Yes.

134 Q. I think that refers to a meeting that you had, it's a telephone conversation that you had with Garda Keogh, is that right?
A. Yes.

135 Q. This is at page 1102, your handwritten notes of that conversation. And the types note are at 6411?
A. You know the notes, as I said, the memo to myself.

136 Q. Yes.
A. Is it possible to see the original of that?

137 Q. CHA RMAN Yes, of course.
A. Thank you.

138 Q. MR. MARRI NAN The original of?
A. You know the notes you referred to where you said

Inspector Farre11 and I hadn't mentioned it, we thought it was 9th -- for the 9th June, is it just possible to see --

CHA RMAN Are you going back now to something you were discussing earlier?

WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN There is no problem doing that.
WTNESS: There is a note to myself, I'm not sure of the sequence of it for myself.
139 Q. MR. MARRI NAN This is the 9th June?
A. Where it just has numbers, where I said it was like a note to myself with regard to points.

140 Q. CHA RMAN Points you were going to raise?
A. Yes.

141 Q. CHA RMAN Points that you said you were intending to 11:47 raise with Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.

142 Q. CHA RMAN You would like to see the original of that?
A. Yes, please.

143 Q. MR. MARR NAN Well, the photocopy of the original is at page 1227 ?
144 Q. CHA RMAN Let's have a look first of all at the photocopy of the original, is that okay?
A. Yes, that's what I did want to look at. CHA RMAN Now, is that sufficient for you. WTNESS: Is there a date on that? MR. MARRI NAN No, there is no date.
CHA RMAN Wait now, let's get the document. If we can get the copy. orla, could you get the copy, the actual 11:47 original one. what's the number?
MR. MARRI NAN It's page 1227 of the materials.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
MR. MARRI NAN Your concern is, you think there may be a date up on the left-hand side that might help you, is 11:48 that it?
CHA RMAN Peter, stop fiddling with it. I am so sorry. Forgive me. Just have a look at it there.
147 Q. MR. MARR NAN There doesn't appear to be -- there are no redactions.
CHA RMAN Well, just give her a chance to have a look at it first of all. Find it first of all. 1227.

MR. MARRI NAN Yes.
CHA RMAN Have you got it there, superintendent?
WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN So, I know that's a photocopy.
WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN It doesn't always come out perfectly, are you happy to deal with the photocopy?

WTNESS: No, that's fine. Just let me read it for a moment. That piece of documentation, that note to myself, is actually made around the 16th, before I wrote to the chief. It's me pulling my thoughts together.

148 Q. CHA RMAN The 16th of?
A. Of July. It's not relevant to --

149 Q. MR. MARRI NAN It's not the 9th June?
A. No.

150 Q. Al1 right.
A. No, it's not.

151 Q. CHA RMAN How are you able to fix a date on it then, superintendent?
A. Because it has my concerns, it fills in to what $I$ write in the report to the chief dated the 16th. If you can look specifically as well on page 2, number 7 I have in my own writing, it filters into my final paragraph of my report to the chief on the 16th about no decisions being made in isolation and that. So that to me looks as if I am pulling my thoughts together before I write 11:49 to the chief, and it would be on the 16th and not, as we were previously taking it, the 9th.
152 Q. MR. MARR NAN Because you would have raised the issue of intelligence had you had it on the list and it doesn't appear that you did raise the issue of intelligence?
A. No. And, as I say, if you look at page 2 of it, it gives -- it filters in totally into my written report to the chief. So I would guess that I am sitting down,
pulling my thoughts together before I write a report.
153 Q. Okay. And thank you for correcting that. So can we just, so that we are clear in relation to this, for the benefit of everybody and the Chairman in particular. Page 1227 is what we have up on screen at the moment, 11:50 if we go to the introduction there. They are notes that you prepared in advance of your meeting --
A. In advance of writing to the chief.

154 Q. In advance of writing to the chief?
A. My report.

155 Q. In advance of writing to the chief?
A. Yes.

156 Q. CHA RMAR On the 16th?
A. Yes.

157 Q. MR. MARRI NAN okay.
A. Because that would kind of follow the sequence of the headings and what I was thinking of.

158 Q. The notes at 1102, are the notes of that conversation, is that right?
A. That's correct.

159 Q. At 6411, sorry, Mr. Kavanagh, 6411, they're the typed notes of 1102?
A. Yes.

160 Q. Al1 right. Is that clear?
A. Yes.

161 Q. So if we just go through this conversation that had you with him. You refer to the intelligence entry, Inspector Farre11, on 20th May 2014?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Would that be on Pulse?
A. Yes, on Pulse.

167 Q. The entry on Pulse. If we can just stop there in relation to that. Did you share the concerns that Chief Superintendent Curran had in relation to the obligations that Garda Keogh had under CHIS?
A. Yes, I did.

168 Q. You did?
A. I did.

169 Q. Had you discussed it with Chief Superintendent Curran?
A. We often spoke on the phone about it, yes.

170 Q. Pardon?
A. We would speak on the phone about it. Chief Superintendent Curran had the responsibility for the integrity of CHIS in the division. As well as having good theoretical knowledge, he had extremely good practical knowledge of where I could go wrong on that because he had been a CHIS handler in Coolock in the $R$ District for a number of years and DMMR, so he would have good practical knowledge of how it could go wrong. That level of knowledge for me was a privilege, to have someone who had that. So I totally took his lead on that and supported it.
171 Q. Did you have any concerns that it may have overlapped with the inquiry that was being conducted by Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin?
A. Sorry, in what way?

172 Q. In the sense that the content of the entry on Pulse was a matter that was being investigated by Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin?
A. With regard to this, again this is something that came up when I was on my holidays and it was well established and ongoing. The content of it, it could well have had something to do with assistant commissioner -- I don't know, I don't know what Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin was investigating. But what was important to us was the obligations, and carry the can on this one, was the obligation that the CHIS policy was fully complied with.
173 Q. Well, I can understand, well, here was a second matter
that potentially could be of interest to Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin?
A. Yes.
Q. And you decided, well it's not appropriate that we should deal with that and we will ask the ó Cualáin investigation team to look into this?
A. Yes.
Q. And here's Garda Keogh saying this isn't a matter for CHIS and Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin is investigating the intelligence that's contained in that report. Yes?
A. Garda keogh is saying it but --

177 Q. He's telling you?
A. That's what he is telling me.
Q. Yes.
A. Garda keogh has a very narrow focus on this, we have a broad one. Garda keogh couldn't -- wasn't qualified or trained or that to make that decision, as to whether it 11:55 was a CHIS matter or not.
179 Q. But that was his assertion and he was consistent throughout?
A. It was his assumption, but on the same date I was told by the ó Cualáin team that they weren't investigating 11:55 it.
180 Q. In hindsight, looking back on this, do you think there would have been any benefit in perhaps having a round table conference with the ó Cualáin investigation?
A. The Ó Cualáin investigation was under the auspices of an assistant commissioner who was well able to run his own investigation. It was separate to anything we were doing. If there was any correspondence or anything required, I would imagine --
CHA RMAN Would that have been legitimate, Mr. Marrinan? Having regard to the confidentiality of the process, would that have been legitimate?
MR. MARRI NAN I don't know, I am just exploring.
CHA RMAN Maybe everybody should sit around and discuss everything, but, I have to say, I have a query as to whether, if you go to the confidential recipient and that process proceeds, it may not be quite so simple for the local team to say, let's have a general chat, because there's a protection --
181 Q. MR. MARR NAN There was no problem in relation to Garda Keogh and confidentiality, because he was in fact encouraging local management to communicate with the ó Cualáin investigation, isn't that right?
CHA RMAN okay.
A. But Garda Keogh wasn't conducting the investigation.

182 Q. MR. MARRI NAN No, but he was --
A. Garda Keogh -- this goes back to what I am saying. Garda Keogh was a witness in Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin's investigation. Garda Keogh had a narrow focus on his role in it. The broader focus is, as the Chairman said, we couldn't approach them. what they were doing, they could have been investigating me, I don't know. I didn't know what it was. The chief
superintendent didn't, and nor were we entitled to. we were there to facilitate the investigation. So I think such an approach would be completely out of order. well, you did make an approach in the sense that you were suggesting to the ó Cualáin investigation that they would take up the running in relation to Liam McHugh?
A. It was a request in relation to a matter because at that stage I wasn't sure whether it was of concern to them or not and they got back to me fairly quickly and told me it wasn't, and that was the end of that. So that was written, that was a total, you know, above the table request to them.
184 Q. I am not in any sense attempting to criticise you for it. I am saying, looking back in hindsight on this. Because on the one hand you had concerns locally that weren't being addressed, you had concerns in relation to Liam McHugh, apparently there were concerns in relation to olivia o'Neill. Garda Keogh was quite happy that you would go to the ó Cualáin investigation with the Liam McHugh incident. In fact, he said it was a good idea; isn't that right?
A. When I said to him the day before, or the 8th, that it's something I was considering.
And he was encouraging you to go to the ó Cualáin and the CHIS issue, isn't that right?
A. But it wasn't up to Garda Keogh to involve me in that other investigation. That was Assistant Commissioner, as he then was, ó Cualáin's investigation.
186 Q. Okay. All right. So in any event, if we could just move on then in relation to the notes that you have?
A. Yes.

187 Q. You gave him then advice in relation to HQ Directive $11: 59$ $126 / 10$ and the management of CHIS?
A. Yes.

188 Q. The revised code under HQ 29/13?
A. Yes.

189 Q. Do you recall, did you give him a copy of those?
A. No, it was on telephone.

190 Q. Or did you advise him to go to the Garda portal?
A. No, I was on the phone him to. The Garda portal is very comprehensive, the page is available to all members. Garda Keogh, being an experienced member of An Garda Síochána, would be able to, as I say, just get access, as anybody else is. Each guard has an obligation to keep themselves in accordance with Garda code, to keep themselves updated on policy procedures and the law. So I outlined to him about that circular. 12:00 нe said this is in exceptional circumstances and he wasn't sure it would come under CHIS, it was being investigated by a D/superintendent, as in Mulcahy.
"The intelligence is being investigated. D/super may iz:00 have a different opinion. In my opinion it will be backed up."
191 Q. Then you asked him on what basis he entered the additional information relating to Garda colleagues?
A. Yes.

192 Q. There:
"Hi s coll usi on bet ween members of An Garda Sí ochána and an i ndi vi dual.
A. Yes.
A. No. I didn't know what investigation Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin -- what allegations he was investigating, but $I$ think that question is on what basis has he entered it. You know, that's fairly -- I don't think that is referring to the ó Cualáin investigation, on what basis has he entered the additional information in relation to Garda colleagues and assertion there was collusion. And he said he wasn't placed to answer them, refer to D/Super Mulcahy.
194 Q. Yes. And again referred to Detective Superintendent Mulcahy on the issue, is that right?
A. That's what he said.
Q. He indicated to you that he was getting fair play?
A. That's correct.

196 Q. Then there was the issue in relation to olivia o'Neill?
A. Yes.
A. Yes.

198 Q. He indicated that she called to the Garda station when he was on shift?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was a public officer?
A. Yes.
Q. You gave him advice in relation to letting
investigations take their course.
A. Yes. Because that's -- I had had -- Stephanie Treacy had been in to me and as well as that, I had told -- I think Garda Keogh has actually referred to this in his own evidence, where he said I was firm but fair. But I told him that, you know, I said to people that they weren't to be asking the investigation team questions or anything like that, and I said the same applies to you. I wanted to be fair to everyone in the station. And he said he hadn't approached anyone. Then I discussed claims with him.
Q. Just before that, if I could just deal with the asking people what they will say?
A. Yes.

202 Q. Then, applies to you to you as well?
A. Yes.

203 Q. Was this a reference to Garda A?
A. Yes.

204 Q. And his concerns in relation to that?
A. Yes.

205 Q. What were his concerns that he was expressing at that 12:03 time?
A. What were Garda Keogh's concerns?

206 Q. Yes, in relation to Garda A?
A. He didn't express concerns. Garda Greene expressed
concerns. I think that's around the 9th or 10th June, Garda Fergal Greene expressed concerns.
207 Q. It's mentioned here on the 16th July.
A. To Garda Keogh.

208 Q. "Asking people what they will say." You haven't got who it was alleged was doing that but you said "applies to you as well"?
A. Yes, it applied to everyone in the station.
Q. Okay. Then you discussed claims, is that right?
A. That's correct, because the correspondence had come back from the finance section about the claims. So I told him they were being approved. He said he hadn't -- there were very strict -- how would you say, budgets were extremely tight then. They're always tight but they were extremely tight then. With regard to claims, for me, for the ongoing annual management of my budget, I needed to have the claims in on a monthly basis in accordance with the code, so as I would know how much my money was as such. So I had asked him about his claims and he said he hadn't got them all in. 12:04 So I took from that, that the two, or whatever the ones were that I'd approve on that date, was the end ones, he hadn't any other claims in and I told him to notify me in advance if he was going to be claiming in accordance with the Code.
210 Q. We dealt with correspondence in relation to that yesterday?
A. We did. That's on the 16th.

211 Q. Then you have a note:
"Checked with D Mul cahy. Ni chol as Keogh cont acted him today re my questions this morning, 18th July 2014."
A. Yes.

212 Q. Was that a contact that you had subsequent to the conversation that we have just gone through with Garda Keogh?
A. I think from my notes that Detective Mulcahy called by that day and said that they weren't dealing with -that's reflected in my report of the 16th.

213 Q. Yes, we will come to that.
A. Yeah.

214 Q. Then there's an issue in relation to the Data Protection Act, is that a note to yourself?
A. That's a note to myself.

215 Q. And then the obligation to te11 the chief. Is that again a note to yourself?
A. That's a note to myself, yeah.

216 Q. And then you refer to a text from Garda Keogh.
A. Yes.

217 Q. Where he says that he had been talking to the detective superintendent.
"Can you gi ve me a buzz if you get a chance?"
A. Yes.

218 Q. Then have you a note of the intelligence.
A. I think that "obl iged to tell chi ef and intelligence" are linked into each other. That he is obliged to tell the chief -- obliged to answer the chief's
correspondence, is what I am saying there. The little box with the text, it's a box on my notes, on my handwritten notes, looks like I got a text from Garda Keogh at some time, it's 21:05 that evening. And then I'd say the notes after it refer to the content of maybe me ringing him back as he asked me could I ring him.
219 Q. Okay. If we could have 1104 up on the screen. This is what you are referring to?
A. Yeah.

220 Q. 21:05, and the text from Nicholas Keogh, talking to D super?
A. Yeah.

221 Q. That would be Mulcahy.
"Can you gi ve me a buzz if you get a chance?"

Then we might just stick with your handwritten notes, because I think maybe they're more comprehensive.
A. Yeah.

222 Q. The typed notes on this issue. Then you have the notes of your conversation with him?
A. Yes.

223 Q. That is at 9:05 in the evening?
A. Yes.

224 Q. or after that?
A. Yes.

225 Q. Will you just tell us?
A. Yeah. He seems -- they're just bullet points.

1
A. I don't know where I was when I took these notes.
"Conf usi on over today."

So I presume that meant my phone call.
"He spoke to the D super. He will look at it again tomorrow. Consent is to do with it. Told themfirst day. May have got middl ed up. He will look at it and 12:07 deci de tonorrow how he will deal with it."

And then:
"I don't think it is rel evant to CHIS."

I have a little NK note beside that:
"Bombard himwith so much stuff at the start."

That's to do with his meeting with the AC. I can't specifically recall. 22:46 then I get a text from Nick Keogh again:
"Can you let me know whet her there is a compl ai nt agai nst me, please?"

Now, he has been told numerous times by me that there wasn't a complaint against him. I said:
"St op worrying. I have recommended they be investigated. You will be kept in the loop."
"He said he has no probl em with this. I will let you know. I tol d hi mabout wel fare. Advi sed himto contact them He told me l have been $100 \%$ with him He has told the Judge this. Thi ngs have been okay with him He is feeling okay. He asked if he could have the name of the person who be would investigating."

I don't know what he's talking about there.
"I said if there was an investigation he would be i nf or med. "

227 Q. Yes.
A. Then I got a text on the 17 th, I was actually in hospital.

228 Q. That was the end of your --
A. That was the end of that one, apart from I got a text on the 17th. The 17th, $I$ believe I was on leave that day in Dublin. At 15:43 I got a text to say: "J ust to let you know..."

229 Q. Just before you move on.
A. Yes.

230 Q. We won't move on to the next day just yet.
A. Yes.
A. 9th June.
Q. "I nspector Farrell, acting superintendent, spoke with Garda Keogh regarding this intelligence entry. His report dated 20th May 2014 refers to this. On this date, I had a tel ephone conversation with Garda Keogh, 12:10 as he was unable to meet with me. I again addressed the concerns as outlined in your report of the 19th May and questioned himaccordingly. Garda Keogh sai d he has di scussed this matter with the confidential reci pi ent and that Detective Superintendent Mul cahy was 12:10 i nvesti gating the matter."

You then go on and deal with the report in relation to Garda Aidan Lyons and you set out the position there. I don't intend to open all that, we have it there. You 12:10 say:

[^0]At the beginning of that paragraph, the first three lines there:
"This is as a result of a visit to Athl one Garda Station on the 28th May. It is alleged that Garda Ni chol as Keogh gave advi ce to Olivia O' Neill regarding a compl ai nt she was making requesting her to make certain assertions."

Is how you deal with it. And then you point out that there is conflict regarding the specific content of this advice outlined in Garda Treacy and Garda Keogh's statements. And then you point out that she was approached by Sergeant Curley.

You then go on to deal with Garda Keogh's engagement with the confidential recipient regarding the above incidents. You say:
"Garda Keogh told me that he informed me the confidential reci pi ent of the matters outlined above and that Detective Superintendent Mul cahy is i nvesti gating them I informed Garda Keogh that the content of detail bet ween himand the confidential reci pient is confidential to them However, he was happy that I know he has reported them He advi sed me to contact Detective Superintendent Mulcahy to verify that these inci dents were being investi gated by him

On this date l met with Detective Superintendent
Mul cahy and Detective I nspector Coppi nger, I asked them
if they were investigating these inci dents. They advi sed me that they were not."

12:12

Do you have a recollection now of having that meeting with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and Detective Inspector Coppinger?
A. I don't really, to be honest. As I say, when I was going through all my stuff that --

235 Q. Sorry.
"Meetings with Garda Keogh:
I meet with himregul arly. I am aware that he is not currently engaging with the Garda wel fare service. He said that he doesn't trust Inspector Farrell and Inspector Farrell is aware of this and I have made arrangements made that in my absence he will liaise with Inspector Mnnock."

Then you deal generally with welfare of members in Athlone.
A. Yes.
Q. You say:
"I amaware that this situation may be difficult for members in Athl one. The contact details for empl oyee assi stance personnel and the welfare officer are
di spl ayed in the station. Each menber has been e-mailed regarding their obligations with regard to harassment and bullying in the workplace. I engage regularly with menbers. I meet with menbers at the core of this investigation. Inspectors and sergeants are available and supportive of menbers. During my conversation on this date with Garda Keogh, I outlined to himthat he was al so obliged to be mindful of other nembers, that l have a responsibility for all menbers of the district. He said he was aware of this."

Then you have:
" Recommendat i ons:
I am of the upon that the above inci dents warrant further investi gation."

That's all three incidents, is that right?
A. Yes.

237 Q. "However, I am mindful that Iegi slation, I abour I aw and 12:14 Garda policies could impact on any decision made in thi s regard."

What did you mean by that?
A. Well, I meant that I was very much in the dark with regard to a lot of what was going on. I didn't know what was going on. I just want to refer back to Declan Mulcahy and Nick Coppinger coming over, I'd say that's on a follow on, I'd say that's just a follow on on the
conversation they wrote.

Garda Keogh was a confidential recipient and there was a lot of things going on. They were all, as I say, coming, you know, not so much to a head but they were running consecutively, as well as the Ó Cualáin investigation. And from my point of view, I was totally in the dark about the ó Cualáin investigation. And I just felt that a broader perspective, a broader look at these things may be beneficial at the time, so as they wouldn't be taken in isolation because $I$ wasn't sure or comfortable that my view was broad enough at that stage.
238 Q. You then go on to point out:
"Garda Keogh is engaging with a confidential reci pient and is subj ect to benefits under the Protected Di scl osure Act 2014."

Then you say:
"I believe that the view of Legal Affairs and Human Resource Management should be sought to ensure that a decision is not made in isolation."
A. That's correct. I just felt maybe a broader
perspective would be helpful. Maybe there was something that from my perspective I wasn't aware of or I wasn't seeing or that. So...

239 Q. We11, I suppose when you throw into the mix the issue
of CHIS, Olivia O'Neill, Liam McHugh, this had become a little bit complex. Would it be fair to say that your view at the time was that you should seek the advice, as you have suggested there, of Legal Affairs and also the Human Resource Management?
A. Well, that was it, yes. I felt from a broader perspective an examination of the issues might be warranted.

Then if we move on to the 23rd of July, you had a brief phone conversation on the phone. That's at page 1106 in your handwritten notes.
A. Yes. There's also -- there's the 17th July and the 19th July, a conversation with nick Keogh. I had text on the 17th July from Garda Keogh.
241 Q. Oh, yes, sorry. Yes, you have a number of texts - ${ }^{12: 17}$
A. Yes.

242 Q. - on the 17th July?
A. Yes.

243 Q. They're in volume 5, at page 1183. 1183, this is one from Garda Keogh to you:
"Just to let you know, was tal king to the judge and he os contacting Cormi ssioner re separate investigation. "

That's sent at 15:43. Then if we just scroll down. We 12:17 have lost it there. 1184. Yes, this is another one.
"J udge. "

He's contacting the Commissioner.
A. Yes.
Q. He is contacting the Commissioner re a separate investigation.

Sorry, that's the same one. 1185. Sorry, if you just scrol1 up there, if you don't mind, Mr. Kavanagh. We have lost it again. 1185. You reply:
"Grand Nick. We'll catch up next week."

And we continue on. And then:
"Was on the beat and McHugh came over."

This is on the 19th July, isn't that right?
A. 11:30 at night on the 19th Ju7y, yes.

245 Q. Then just scroll down "okay talk next week."

Sent on the 20th July. I think those are the messages that you had.
A. That's correct.

246 Q. Then, sorry, the 21st July. You received a letter from the chief superintendent. This is at page 1886.
A. Yeah.

247 Q. Chief Superintendent Curran gave evidence in relation to your recommendations. They weren't recommendations that he followed?
A. That's correct.
Q. I am not entirely sure, because I haven't an exact recollection of his evidence, but I thought that indicated that he may not have received that letter. But in any event, it's clear that he did. Because at 1886, he is writing to you, referring to your correspondence on the 16th July, which I've just opened?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
"This matter has been ongoing for some time and while le 12:20 amsatisfied that all of the required information has now been forwarded in respect of the information di vul ged by ME. O Neill, I am now requesting that the following matters be attended to in advance for forwarding these matters for a revi ew by an independent 12:20 chi ef superintendent."

It would appear that that's the view that he settled on at that time.
A. It is.
Q. Rather than going to Legal Affairs, is that right?
A. Yes.

251 Q. Then two bullet points:
"The initial report of Inspector Farrell dated 20th May 12:20 2014, Garda Keogh nodded when he was advi sed that any informant he had should be registered with CHIS. Has thi s informant been regi stered with CHIS in accordance with HQ Directive 126/ 10 in the interim as
consi derable time has now passed to allow for the referral of this informant to the Eastern Regi on management."

It would be fairly clear from your letter to him and all your dealings with Garda Keogh that he had taken a consistent view in relation to this matter and he wasn't, in fact, going to provide any more information and he was referring to you the ó cualáin investigation team.
A. Yeah, but I think Garda Keogh's view -- and Chief Superintendent Curran outlined that with regard to CHIS, there's very strict policy there to be followed.
252 Q. Yes.
A. He was entitled to ask such questions. He would have been negligent if he didn't ask such questions and get answers.
253 Q. And then, the second bullet point:
"Has it been established with Garda Keogh whether or not he had a conversation with Liam MEHugh in rel ation to the matters outlined in the report of Garda Ai dan Lyons. Has Garda Keogh been asked to corment on the veracity of the information contai ned within the report of Garda Lyons.

These matters should be addressed i mmedi ately and a report forwarded to this office at the concl usion of your next meeting with Garda Keogh. "

Then we move on to the 23 rd July. At page 1106 you have a note saying:
"Rang Garda Keogh. Of fered to meet him"
A. I did.

254 Q. It didn't suit him. Sorry, the typed version of that is at 1256, which might be easier to read.
A. Yeah. "Tol d himl was sending down two reports. One re intelligence entry and Li am McHugh. He is resting today and starting ni ghts tonorrow. He will answer then. I asked how he was and he is fine."
255 Q. Yes. Then the same date we have, at page 1182, the letter in relation to Liam McHugh dated the 23 rd July:
"Further to our tel ephone conversation on this date, can you provi de me with a report outlining your contact with Mr. Li am MEHugh over the past three months and the nat ure of such interaction."

Then, at 1155, this is headed "intelligence report", dated 23rd July 2014:
"With regard to intelligence report made on 18th May 2014, I requi re a report fromyou indi cating whet her the informant has been regi stered with CHIS in accordance with HQ Di rective 126/ 10."

Now, that is in fact responded to there in the body of
the report on the 27th July by Garda Keogh, where he says:
"Superintendent MEBrien, Athl one.
This is not a CHIS matter. The information is in the $12: 24$ care of Assistant Commissioner Donal Ó Cual ái n.

Forwarded for your information."

If you could just come back to the issue of whether or not and what discussions you actually had with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy in relation to the intelligence entry? Can you help us in relation to that and what your recollection is of the discussions you may have had with him?
A. I think they're just what was outlined in my report of the 16th to the chief, that they said they weren't investigating those issues. Whatever page that's on, that reflects what was -- I don't recall there being anything -- I think it would be more of kind of basically sticking their head in the door for a minute, I don't think I was expecting them.
256 Q. If we can scroll to page 8366. This is a report from Detective Superintendent mulcahy to the assistant commissioner, western Region. If we scroll down to the 12:25 third paragraph there:

[^1]the investigation teamis that the matters are still under investigation. Furthermore, to di scuss with any third party the contents of that statement would be in breach of confidentiality, which is the whole basis for the confidential reporting legislation."

Do you see there?
A. Yes.
Q. That was the matter that in fact had been raised by the judge.
"The allegations contained in the intelligence report have been agai $n$ alluded to in his statement to the i nvestigation team but to date they have been unsubstantiated. The creation of the intelligence report is not a matter I believe that the investigation team can directly investigate. I feel that this is a matter perhaps for both the di visional officer and the di strict officer to deal with in whose division Garda Keogh is currently serving. I have spoken to both the divisional and district officers in respect of this matter."
A. Yes. On the 24th october, around that time I was out sick, I had a very serious medical condition and I was out sick from the 2nd october.
258 Q. This is his letter of the 28th October.
A. Yes.

259 Q. But it's with his dealings in relation to this matter over the previous months?
A. Yes.

260 Q. But do you have a recollection of --
A. I met with him on the 23 rd September in Headquarters with Chief Curran, that wasn't in relation to this, and my only previous one was the 16th July. As I said, on 12:27 the 16th July, I think my recollection is very informal, I don't think I was expecting them and I think the comments are reflected in my correspondence to the chief of that date.
Yes. I'm sorry, if we could just go back to your notes 12:28 on the 16th July 2014, at 1102. Do you see there, number 1, the intel entry?
A. Yes.
Q. Are we to understand from that:
"My concern re putting it on --" then
A. Separate than content it looks like. It's hard to writing. It looks like "sep than content".

265 Q. It might suggest that you weren't concerned about the content of what was placed on Pulse, but it was the
fact that it was placed on Pulse?
A. Yeah, as I say, I was probably separating the two issues to Garda Keogh.
CHA RMAN I am not understanding that. How could one be concerned about putting it on Pulse without being concerned about what he put on it? I am just trying to understand. He makes this entry on Pulse, surely the concern reflects what's in it?
A. Yeah, I'm referring back to Chief Superintendent Curran's evidence as well.
267 Q. CHAN RMN Yes.
A. It's the content -- there was a conundrum with the content of what was put on Pulse, was that being investigated?
268 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes.
A. That type of thing. But also, the putting of it on Pulse and where his source was coming from.
269 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes.
A. Was the source registered and that. That was an issue as well.

270 Q. CHAI RMAN Oh, I see what you mean, I think. So the question of the sources, the source or sources, apart from the content, that's what you're inferring, looking at it now.
A. It's a long time ago but --.

271 Q. CHA RMAN Looking at it now, it's not clear but that's what you are thinking it might mean?
A. That's what I think it might mean.

272
Q. CHA RMAN I understand. Obvious7y I don't know
whether I agree with that, but I am understanding that. I understand.
A. Yes.

273 Q.
CHA RMAN You're drawing a distinction between the content?
A. Because, you see, previous to this he says he has told the D/super.
Q. CHA RMAN I understand.
A. Where $I$ am saying my concerns is, putting it on.
Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. So I would imagine my concern is in relation to, like where did you get this information from? Is this person who is making the -- you know, giving you this information, it's that aspect of it.
CHA RMAN I understand. Thank you?
MR. MARR NAN If we move onto the 30th July, at 1106, we have your handwritten notes and your typed notes. We don't need them up on the screen, Mr. Kavanagh. 6412. It indicates that you rang Garda Keogh to meet him on the 5th August. He had no problem with that, and that he would call up to you. Then you said you wanted to put certain allegations to him about Liam McHugh?
A. Yes.

277 Q. He said that he would call up.
A. Yes.

278 Q. And that had you a chat about his duty the night before.
A. Yes.

279 Q. And how busy it was. He said it was like the old days in Bray and he enjoyed it.
A. Yes.

280 Q. "Everyone was there for each ot her."

And to you he sounded well, is that right?
A. Yes.

281 Q. Then you had the meeting that you had arranged on the 5th August?
A. Yes.

282 Q. Your handwritten notes are at page 1107.
A. Yes.

283 Q. Your typed notes are at page 6412. We can deal with it on the basis of your handwritten notes, if you don't mind?
A. Yes.

284 Q. Because they're a bit more comprehensive and you have noted something in the margin. So where did this meeting take place?
A. In my office.

285 Q. In your office. You have a note here saying that you read out the allegation to Garda Keogh?
A. I did. I wanted to -- as I say, that had been -- with regard to the Liam McHugh incident, there was the report sought on that. So I read out what was on Garda 12:33 Keogh's -- Garda Lyons' e-mail.

[^2]information he would have put it in with his complaint to the confidential reci pient. And Liam MEHugh's name isn't on it."

So that would be nothing I would be aware of, you know, 12:34 what he said to the confidential recipient was between them.
"He said he di dn't know anything about this alleged meeting with Liam McHugh and if he had that information 12:34 he would have put it in his complaint"
286 Q. Did you have a copy of the report there with you?
A. which report?

287 Q. Garda Lyons' report?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Yes. Did you show it to him?
A. I did.

289 Q. You did. You didn't show him that it was from Garda Lyons?
A. I didn't show him the name, I just said -- with regard to the context of this meeting, he was telling me that apart from what we had discussed on the 19th, which wasn't an arranged meeting, he hadn't spoken to Mr. McHugh for a long time. Garda Keogh was --
290 Q. Sorry, just before you on to that.
A. Yes.

291 Q. I was asking you there about Garda Lyons' report?
A. Garda Lyons' report.

292 Q. You showed him a copy of it?
A. Yes, I did.

293 Q. You removed the fact that it had been reported by Garda Lyons. Why did you do that?
A. Because I didn't think it was appropriate at the time. Because I was trying to keep the -- I had -- I was trying to keep harmony in the station and I was trying to just keep -- just keep harmony and keep everyone on an even keel in the station. And I didn't feel -- I felt that he had -- I told him it was a member in Athlone. I showed him the full content except the member's name, to satisfy him and to allay any fears he had that it was any more than what was being said.
Q. But was it because Garda Lyons was Garda A's partner?
A. Absolutely nothing to do with it.

295 Q. Nothing to do with it?
A. No.

296 Q. Okay. So if we just proceed then on with the rest of your note.
A. "Apart from Garda Keogh's meeting on the $19 t h \mathrm{Jul} \mathrm{y}^{\text {' }} 14$ on the beat with Liam McHugh, he hasn't ret or spoken to himfor a long time."

Then I have a little side note:
"This was not an arranged meeting."
297 Q. Yes.
A. "I all owed Garda Keogh to have si ght of the allegation and read it. I have read this back through Gar da Keogh. "

We went through the whole interview. I read him all my notes. I asked him did he want to sign it, did he want to change it, did he want to do anything with it, and he didn't
Q. Why did you do that?
A. Because I just felt that to let him know that this was exactly it, this was the record of our conversation this, was all that was to it. So...
But it's not something that you had done previously?
A. No, but he -- you know, he was just concerned and probably I suppose somewhat persistent to know the actual -- I think he was making out to me that there was probably more in the allegation, you know, when I say there was more description to the allegation it there was, $I$ said, no, this is it, that's all I am asking you for and don't be imagining anything else, this is all it is. So, just for clarity, if he wanted to, just to pacify him. He was -- I read the stuff, I said, would you like to sign it. He didn't sign it. I said, do you want to change it? He didn't want to do that. If he did, there would have been no problem.
300 Q. Yes. But it's just you'd had many conversations with him.
A. Yeah.

301 Q. You had discussed incidents with him.
A. Mm-hmm.

302 Q. Olivia O'Neill previously, you had discussed Liam McHugh?
A. Yes.
Q. You discussed the Pulse entry?
A. Yes.

304 Q. And you have been happy to part with your notes?
A. Yes.
Q. And your understanding of what took place?
A. Yes.

306 Q. And here, on the 5th August, you're reading it over to him?
A. Yes.

307 Q. You're asking him does he want to make any changes to it?
A. Yes.
Q. Or any alterations. It seems just a little bit of a step up in terms of Garda Keogh and your interactions with him?
A. Garda Keogh is sitting in front of me. I was viewing Garda Keogh. The decision and the -- Garda Keogh has no issue with my notes, he has accepted them. And there was nothing -- that was what I would describe as a harmonious meeting. It was an informative meeting. We both had a good chat with each other. He was being allowed to see, this is it, there is nothing more to it. He kept saying there was more to -- he kept thinking there was more to the allegation or to the showed him my notes, read them back to him, to allay his fears. There was no problem. I didn't see any problem with that and I don't think Garda Keogh did.
Q. Then I think that you were -- sorry, yes, I neglected -- there was a response to the letter of 23 rd July 2014 that I opened and the response is at page 8712. That's in relation to Garda Keogh's interaction with Liam McHugh.
"Can you provi de me with a report?"

And his response is there.
"I wi sh to report I met Liam McHugh at 21:50 on 19th July 2014, Church Street, Athl one, while on the beat. Prior to that, I had no contact or deal ings with Liam MzHugh over the past three mont hs."

Then, on the 5th August, the same day you wrote a report then to Chief Superintendent Curran, isn't that right?
A. I did.

This is at page 1156. 1157, I beg your pardon. It's further -- well, it's headed "Intelligence created" and then "Conversation with Li am McHugh":
"Further to your correspondence of the 21st July, I
wi sh to report as follows."

And then in relation to the intelligence created:
"Attached for your inf ormation correspondence recei ved
from Garda Ni chol as Keogh dated the 27th July."

We opened that just a few minutes ago.


#### Abstract

"In response to my query as to whet her the informant has been registered with CHIS in accordance with HQ Di rective 126/10, he states that this is not a CHIS matter, the information is in the care of Assistant Commi ssi oner Donal Ó Cual ái n.


I n addition, I attach correspondence recei ved from Garda A, At hl one, regarding the same intel ligence entry. I recei ved this correspondence on the 30th July. I met with Garda A on that date. He acknow edged that this is the first time he informed me 12:42 of his upset regarding this matter."

I think that was an interaction that you had on the 30th July with Garda A.
"I informed himthat I would be meeting with Garda Keogh thi s week and would incl ude hi s concerns in my correspondence following this meeting. I regul arly meet with Garda A to di scuss his wel fare."
A. That's correct.

311 Q. And then:

[^3]Keogh dated the 27th Jul y regarding Li am McHugh. He states that apart from meeting Li am McHugh on the 19th July 2014 while on the beat, he had not met himwithin the past three months. On the 19th July, Garda Keogh sent me a text stating 'was on the beat and MzHugh came 12:42 over to me'. In addition, I met with Garda Keogh by arrangement on this date. This was the earliest opportunity we could meet. I read ow the allegation as outlined in the report of Garda Lyons dated 2nd June 2014. He requested to vi ew the allegation. I allowed himto do so without disclosing the identity of the member making the compl ai nt. He was informed it was a nember in Athl one Station.

Garda Keogh says he knows nothing about this or any part of it, even the content of the story. He said if he had the information alleged, he would have put it with his compl ai nt..."

That should be,
"...to the confidential reci pient. He said Li am M.Hugh's name is not on the compl ai nt he made to the confidential reci pient. Garda Keogh said he does not know anything about this alleged meeting with Li am
MEHugh and if he had such information he woul d have used it when making his compl ai nt. Garda Keogh sai d that apart fromhis meeting with Li am McHugh on the 19th July while he was on the beat, he had not spoken
to Li am MkHugh for a long time. He said that this meeting was not arranged. I read my notes of my meeting with Garda Keogh back to him He was invited to make any changes or alterations he considered necessary. He did not wi sh to do so. He was al so i nvited to sign my notes. He declined to do this.

His assertion that he had not been in contact with Liam MkHugh is consistent with his conversation with me on the 9th June, whi ch is covered in my correspondence to 12:44 you on the same date."

Is there anything else that you wish to add -
A. No.

312 Q. - in relation to your thinking at the time, I think 12:44 that that clearly indicates that.
A. That's it.

313 Q. Now, on the 22nd September you had a meeting with Garda Keogh in your office. It was a short meeting and we can see it at page 1108.
A. I was on leave from the 13th August until the 18th September.
314 Q. Yes. I think if you just read your note there.
A. Yes.

315 Q. "Spoke to Garda Keogh in my of fice."
A. Yes.
"Spoke to Garda Keogh in my office. Asked himhow he was. I hadn't met himfor a few weeks because of
annual leave. He is fine. He is in good form The dogs are well. He is taking a few earlies of fover the next few weeks. I told himl had sent correspondence to himfromthe chi ef superintendent. It is with Sergeant Haran."

316 Q. Now, in the meantime, I think at page 6275, if we could have it on the screen, this is a letter from Chief Superintendent Curran to you. It's dated the 11th July, but that's in error?
A. Yeah.

317 Q. It should be the 22nd August. It refers to previous correspondence from this office above and your reply dated 5th August.
"I have noted Garda Keogh's suggesti on that the matter
is not a CHIS matter as it has been referred to
Assi stant Commi ssi oner Ó Cual ái n. I amnot satisfied that this negates our responsibilities as outlined in HQ directive 126/ 10 and have to request that the source be referred in line with Garda policy."

And then that's by return. I think in response to that, on the 18th September, you wrote to Sergeant Haran. That's at page 1154.
A. Yes, 18th September.

318 Q. In the second paragraph you say:

> "Chi ef Superintendent Curran is not satisfied that this negates our responsibilities as outlined in the HQ

Di rective and has requested that the source be referred in line with Garda policy.

Garda Keogh shoul d comply with this request and report by return."

And then we have the handwritten report from Garda Keogh, which is at page 1251. We have already had all this opened previously but if I can just go four lines down, he asserts that in his view:
"...l bel ieve that it is inappropriate while the i nvesti gation is ongoing for the chi ef superintendent to seek the source rel ated to intelligence report which is directly linked to this investigation at this stage, 12:48 at least as it could jeopar di se the said i nvesti gation. "

And then, seven lines from the bottom, he says:
"I wi sh to add that I have been advi sed by Judge Patrick McMahon not to speak with any member of An Garda Sí ochána about any part of this investigation, with the exception of the investigation team under Assi stant Commi ssi oner Ó Cual ái n. And ther ef ore, I request that any deal ings between myself and Chi ef Superintendent Curran, di visional officer at Westmeath, should not be informal. I intend to be compliant once the investigations have been concl uded. "

I think then at page 1250, on 19th September 2014, you forwarded that to Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin, isn't that right?
A. No, the chief superintendent, Westmeath.

319 Q. Sorry, it was chief superintendent, I promoted him. If we can just move forward then to the 30th September, it's just an e-mail, for the sake of completeness, at 1293. This is an e-mail from you to Inspector Minnock?
A. Yes.

320 Q. "I wi sh to advi se that Sergeant Mbyl an informed me that on Sat urday, 27th September 2014, Garda Keogh enqui red if he was in the station when he returned.

Ser geant Mbyl an sai d Garda Keogh di dn't state why but there was an overlap with Garda A."

I think that was an occasion on which this matter was drawn to your attention, is that right?
A. Yes, so that was sent to the two inspectors.

Inspectors Farre11 and Minnock would be the senior management team with me in the district, so as that we would be aware of it.

321 Q. Then if we could just move forward to the 1st October. There's a letter at page 8619. This is a letter which is dated the 24th September and it's to the detective sergeant in charge of Ath1one and it concerns Garda Keogh and another garda performing a check on the Pulse system in relation to Garda A. It reads:
"On 20th Septenber 2014, I noticed that the above named t wo Gar daí - - "

CHA RMAN We have had this before, Mr. Marrinan. We have been well over this.

MR. MARRI NAN Very well.
CHA RMAN Then there was a query about it and Garda Keogh says that was fair enough, because he got a complaint, there was complaint from Garda A, and he doesn't blame Superintendent McBrien for following it up.

MR. MARRI NAN Yes, indeed.
CHA RMAN But he suspected that the thing had emanated from Chief Superintendent Curran and if and insofar as
it had emanated from Chief Superintendent Curran, he
didn't think that was good, because he thought that was targeting. But he didn't blame this witness. A11 I am saying that we really have been over that.
322 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Yes. I think that your sole role in relation to it was to ask for a report from Garda Keogh -
A. That's correct.

323 Q. - as to why he had conducted the search, is that right?
A. Yes.

324 Q. Now, I think that we then move into another issue in 12:52 relation to the concerns, the car tax issue?
A. Yes.

325 Q. That's been left over to another module. And then subsequently, your transfer over to or hand over on the

4th March to now Chief Superintendent Murray. We will be dealing with that later on. Is there anything further you wish to add in relation to the matters that I have opened to you in your notes?
A. No.

MR. MARRI NAN Yes.
CHAI RMAN Superintendent, where you have an involvement in any other matter, we are leaving that over. You're happy with that?
WTNESS: That's absolutely fine. Perfect, thank you.
CHA RMAN Okay. Mr. Kelly, I suppose you are the first person to ask any questions. Do you want to start now or would you refer to leave it until after lunch. I am completely happy either way.
MR. KELLY: I will start just after lunch, given the
time.
CHA RMAN I think that makes sense. Ms. McGrath, are you pointing out something that you think we should raise, that Mr. Marrinan should raise? Is there something else.

MR. MARRI NAN I can do it in re-examination.
CHA RMAN Okay. Very good. Thanks very much. Then we will assemble again at two o'clock, thanks very much, and proceed then. Mr. Kelly will be first and we
wil1 come around and Mr. Carrol1, I imagine you will be last but one and then we will come back. Is that the way we will do it? Okay. Thank you very much.

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

MR. MARRI NAN Chairman, before the parties start CHA RMAN Yes, thank you, Mr. Marrinan.
MR. MARR NAN - to cross-examine the superintendent, 14:00 if I could just have liberty to mention the one document that I didn't open.
CHAL RMAN Certain7y.
MR. MARR NAN It has been brought to my attention. It concerns the possible breach of the Data Protection Act 14:01 in relation to Garda A. We just skirted over it before lunch. There was one document that was put to Chief Superintendent Curran, and that's a letter that you wrote to him on the 24 th September and it's at 8617.
"Attached find correspondence recei ved on this date from Garda A. "

Then you point out the concerns that had been raised by Garda A, that two members, namely Garda Keogh and another garda recently accessed personal details on Pulse.

In the third paragraph you say:
"It is known that in or around the time of these Pul se checks, both Garda Keogh and ot her guards supplied information to the then Garda confidential recipient whi ch it is suspected rel ated to Garda A and said checks may be rel at ed to same. However, in the light of Garda A's concerns, I amseeking views in rel ation to same. "

Did Chief Superintendent Curran ever reply to that letter or state his views in relation to the issue?
A. I think he responded by a phone call.
Q. By phone call?
A. Yes, I think so.

328 Q. Do you recall what he said to you?
A. He advised me to contact the superintendent in IT, in Garda Headquarters.
329 Q. Right. And did you do that?
A. I did.

330 Q. Yes. Now you went out on sick leave in October, isn't that right?
A. Yes. I took $i 11$ in work on the 2nd October. I had a long standing medical condition that was worsening throughout the year, so $I$ had taken a lot of leave to receive treatment and that, where I actually took $i 11$ in work on the morning of the 2nd October and I was out for a long time.

331 Q. Okay.
A. Thank you.
Q. CHA RMAR And you were out for approximately?
A. Oh, I was out, I came back for two days in December and then I took -- I came back in December to go --
Q. CHAN RMAN I don't want to pry.
A. No. I came in December for two days and then I went on annual leave until mid January. I came back in January for about two, two and a half, three weeks and I took i11 again and I was out until the transfer.
Q. CHAN RMAN So you were out a good bit between then and the take over by Superintendent Murray in early March?
A. I was, yes.

CHA RMAN Okay, thanks very much.

END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Now, Mr. Ke1ly.

## SUPERI NTENDENT NOREEN MEBRI EN MAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR KELLY, AS FOLLOVB:

MR. KELLY: Good afternoon, Superintendent McBrien.
A. Good afternoon.

336 Q. If I understood the thrust of your evidence correctly, you viewed your role as being quite supportive towards members under your command in difficulties, is that right?
A. That's correct.

337 Q. Yes. In fact, you in a statement that was made to the Tribunal's investigators, the reference can be brought
up if you like, volume 21, page 6211. Do you recognise this statement?
A. Yes.
Q. It's down towards line 106:
"A. I amaffair of and familiar with the policy of HQ di rectives regarding confidential reporters and protected disclosures, which set out the duties of the various parties when a confidential report is made. As far as my role was concerned, where the confidential reporter was under supervision, my role was to ensure confidentiality, ensure menber's welfare was looked after and to ensure that the confidential reporter was not adversely affected or treated as a result of making a confidential report or protected disclosure and that the di gnity at work policy was adhered to by all menbers. This al so applied to the member agai nst whom the complaint was made, who is al so under my supervi si on. "

Is that right?
A. That's correct.

339 Q. So there was an awareness there by you that anything which would adversely affect or impact upon the reporter should be avoided, in fact it shouldn't happen. That's right, isn't it?
A. Yes.

340 Q. I see. Now, insofar as Nick Keogh was concerned, there had been no previous difficulties or complaints in
respect of him, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

Yes. You also say that after this, after he had made his protected disclosure that there was an awareness in Athlone that Nick Keogh had made allegations against Garda A, is that right?
A. There was an awareness in Athlone that Garda Keogh had made allegations or was a confidential recipient by his own self disclosure, that was fact because that had happened in the Dáil and it was a matter of record. But with regard to Garda A and the awareness, that was just a feeling that was in the station, an understanding in the station at the time.
342 Q. Yes. If you just scroll further down the page, 6219, in your statement, where it says, the question is:
"I have been asked when I first became aware either of ficially or unofficially that Garda Ni chol as Keogh had made allegations concerning Garda A whi ch were bei ng investi gated by former Assi stant Commi ssi oner Ó Cual ái $n$ and his investi gation team
A. There was an awareness of the allegations made by Garda Keogh i nvol ved Garda A and thi s awareness was around the station bef ore the assi stant commi ssi oner was appoi nted to investi gate Garda Keogh' s confidential report."

So, there was an awareness in Athlone that he had made allegations concerning Garda A, that's right, isn't it?
A. That's all, that $I$ would be aware that there was an understanding or an awareness that Garda A was the other member. That would be all I would know.
Q. What I am trying to get at is, what did you understand the awareness to be?
A. My understanding was that the awareness was a recognition or an understanding or a supposition that Garda A was the member that Garda Keogh had made an allegation about. That's it. That's as far as I'd put my knowledge.
Q. Was there any awareness as to what the nature of the allegation might be?
A. Not by me.
Q. Just reflect on that. He had been named in the Dáil?
A. Yes.
at his dogs badly or something. You must have had some idea as to what the nature of the allegation was?
A. I didn't.

351 Q. None whatsoever?
A. Whatever the allegations were, they were confidential. They were part of a confidential report or investigation. Apart from the fact that there was an awareness, I wasn't informed or I wasn't -- nor would I ask, nor did I think I should have been if there is an investigation by an external assistant commissioner. 352 Q. And what was that atmosphere in the station?
A. Throughout summer 2014?
Q. Yes, after these allegations had been made.
A. It was tense. Probably, I suppose, deflated. There had been a lot, as I alluded to earlier, an awful lot of events since September 2013. In October 2013 a family of two 1ittle girls had actually released a press statement saying how good the Guards were with their compassion and what they had done for a family. In March 2015 -- sorry, that was -- in March 2015, families of a fisherman that was killed in Loughrea, they actually extended an invitation to my members to go up to Portadown and they were welcomed into the community and spoken positively about from the alter. So, this deflated all that and there was a sense of, I suppose, suspicion and just -- it was just as if a balloon had burst; it just brought everyone down. That was across the board in the station. It was difficult.
354 Q. Suspicion about what and of whom?
A. I think people just felt they didn't know what was going on.

355 Q. Were people feeling that somebody had broken ranks and it wasn't good for the Gardaí?
A. No. No.

356 Q. So what was the suspicion about?
A. I think, from recollection, it would be people just didn't know at that stage what was happening. There was an investigation team in the station. Just that would cause, I think, a level of probably unsettlement in any working environment and I think Athlone Garda Station at that time was no different. And as well as that, because of the confidential reporter going public, it was also out in the public and it was out in 14:12 the -- the people in the town of Athlone knew all about it as well. So I think that had to be all difficult for the members.
357 Q. You were aware, weren't you, that it was being talked about in Athlone that one guard was consorting, put it that way, with a known drugs dealer in the town?
A. Are you asking me when I was aware?

358 Q. No, you were -- I am asking you: At that time were you aware of that?
A. I don't think so. No. Initially. No.

359 Q. When did you become aware of that?
A. I think I read it in the papers.

360 Q. What about the Pulse entry?
A. The Pulse entry?

361 Q. Mm.
A. That --

362 Q. A senior members of the drugs squad.
A. -- was providing -- can you read the Pulse entry for me?
Q. We can get it somewhere. Page 1802. It's 18th May 2014. You see it there.
A. Yeah.
Q. "Observed Ms. B in her [bl ank] at the [blank] On seei ng, she smiled and stuck out her tongue. Ms. B is seriously invol ved in the heroin trade in Athl one with a turnover of approximalely $€ 2,500$ per week. She has no previ ous convi ctions for drugs due to the fact that she has been ai ded and abetted for years by a seni or nember of the drugs unit, who himelf is a close associ ate of a hi gh ranking Garda officer. Fact."

You must have known by then.
A. I saw that when I came back in June. That says "ai ded and abetted". You'd have to repeat your question to me.
Q. When did you become aware, just to put it directly, that there was a member of the drugs squad who was working hand in glove with a drugs dealer in Athlone?
A. I'm not aware that during my service in Athlone it was ever said to me definitively that it was proven that a member in the drugs squad was behaving this way.
Q. I am not asking you whether it was proven or not, I am asking you when you became aware of it?
A. Well, I would have seen this on the 5 th June, but this is "ai ded and abetted", I think there was more specific information in the newspaper.

Q Okay, let's move on. I want to come to the McHugh and O'Neil1 scenario briefly again?
A. Yes.

370 Q.
A. It's a --

372 Q. "...requesting her to make certai n assertions."
A. It's a reflection of what was in Garda Treacy's statement, who was there at the time. I wasn't there

We11, if we look at your statement, $I$ think it's 21, 6278. This is an exhibit to your statement. It's a report from you to the chief superintendent. 6278. It's dated 16th July 2014. If you look down at the section on Olivia O'Neill, which is "As a result of a visit" do you see that bit, "information di vul ged by Olivia O Neill". Do you see at the top of the page?
A. Yes, I see that.
"This is as a result of a visit to Athl one Garda Station on the 28th May. It is alleged that Garda Ni chol as Keogh gave advi ce to Olivia O'Neill regarding a compl ai nt she was making, requesting her to make certai $n$ assertions."
A. Yes.

371 Q. Is that not an allegation of coaching?
A. My view on both of those were they were open to investigation and that was what I followed through with. As I say, both these matters had been started and in a process before $I$ returned on the 5th June.
at the time. I wasn't in the country at the time. This had started when I came back. So I would consider I was open minded on this and had aspects of it investigated.
When you saw this and then both of these words "was requesting her to make certain assertions" did it not run through your mind, they're saying here he's coaching her?
A. I can't recall exactly the 5 th June and what went through my mind when I read it, but I do recall that
a11 the documentation that was there and every other bit of information, and to me it was something that had to be taken into account and had to be investigated.
And I followed on the track of what had already started. I had no issue with the way that had gone. I 14:18 thought it was progressing appropriately.

374 Q. Let's look again at the statement of Garda Stephanie Treacy, which is to be found at volume 3, page 472. This is a statement you have read and seen, yes?
A. Yes.

375 Q. I want to draw your attention to line 48. well, we will start just before that, 46:
"I was just getting the background to the inci dent when Oi via said to me she had been told to put in her statement that $M$. B was friendly with certain mentors of the Guards in Athl one and that she is protected by these members. Oivia said that she was told to put in her statement that M . B was told when any search or
i nvesti gation was going on so that she could get rid of any weapons and drugs she had. ME. B will be told of any statement of complaint."

And so on.
"Oivia kept saying she was told to make sure this information went in her statement. I asked her who tol d her this and she said 'Garda Nick at the counter downstai rs'."

Stephanie Treacy there doesn't appear to be in any doubt that this was coaching.
A. That's Stephanie Treacy's view in her statement to the Tribuna1. I had Stephanie Treacy's report that was dated the end of May, which, as I said, was made when I was abroad. As I say, I was interested in the allegation, the allegation of what -- the content of Olivia O'Neill was saying was of concern to me. well, I am suggesting to you that given the information you had at that time, it was blindingly obvious that the allegation was being made that Nick Keogh was coaching her. Do you accept or reject that?
A. I wouldn't agree that that's what I considered immediately. I was considering the content of what was 14:20 being alleged by -- to have been said to olivia o'neill. That to me was very, very serious.
377 Q. If we turn now to the Liam McHugh stuff. That's something you have been over already. It's been said
here, I am suggesting to you, that this again was being viewed and could only be viewed as an allegation against Nick Keogh that he was coaching witnesses and making up stuff. Do you accept that?
A. No.
Q. Liam McHugh supposedly making this allegation, Lyons reporting it. That the purpose of that report was to suggest that Nick Keogh was coaching witnesses, making up evidence?
A. To me, the purpose of that report was a Guard that's on duty reporting something that he thinks may be of certain and reporting it up the ranks.
Q. I am looking at the statement of sergeant Aidan Lyons, it can be found at volume 2. It begins at page 11714. Have you got that?
A. Yes, it's on the screen.

380 Q. If we look at paragraph 4.31. Do you see that, which is on page 11719, the very top paragraph. I think it may have gone through far too far, Mr. Kavanagh?
A. Yes, it's gone past.
Q. Yes, stop there.
A. Yes, I see that.

382 Q. "My understanding is that Garda Keogh was encouraging Mr. MEHugh to make a fal se complaint."
A. Yes. That's Garda Lyons' view.

383 Q. It's not your view?
A. This is a statement Garda Lyons has recently made, I believe, to the disclosures Tribunal. I was operating on a report that was there at the time that had already
been enacted upon by the acting superintendent in my absence.
384 Q. We have heard evidence from Chief superintendent Curran, who says that in respect of this he now believes Nick Keogh's version of this; that is, it was all made up to discredit him?
A. Yes.

385 Q. You were in the Tribunal when he said that?
A. I was, yes.
Q. Do you agree with that?
A. Well, there was nothing -- there was nothing -M. O RORKE: I don't believe that that is what chief Superintendent Curran said.
MR. KELLY: we will call it up. Day 117, page 184/5.
If we go to the bottom of it.
CHAL RMAN Where, Mr. Kelly?
MR. KELLY: At the bottom of it. Hold on, I have got it now. Do you see it, page 184.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KELLY: It's at is line 22, question 652.
"It comes up to you and she says, the last paragraph there. I just want, Mr. Kavanagh, to go down to the I ast paragraph:
"His assertion that he has not been in contact with Li am Mchugh is consistent with his conversation with me on the 9 th J une, whi ch is covered in my correspondence to you on the same date."
A. Yes.
Q. Now, do you see that as the end of the matter?
A. Yes. I bel i eve Garda Keogh on this. If you ask me, I don't bel ieve there was an interaction with Li am McHugh. "

Do you agree with that?
A. I agree with my comments that his assertion hadn't changed. Chief Superintendent Curran's view, it was my understanding that he felt that the conversation as it happened --
387 Q. CHA RMAN He didn't believe there was an interaction between Liam McHugh and Garda Keogh.
A. Yes, that's my understanding.

388 Q. CHA RMAN That does not mean, Mr. Ke11y, what you suggested.
A. Yes, that there was an interaction with Garda Lyons-CHA RMAN In other words, what you are suggesting is that Chief Superintendent Curran said, I accept that this was a phony report. He didn't say that, and that's what you have just put.

MR. KELLY: okay.
CHA RMAN what he said was, I don't believe there was an interaction between Garda Keogh and Liam McHugh. In other words, I accept what Garda Keogh said. That was his evidence. At least as I recall, that was his evidence.

MS. O ROURKE: Yes. That was made abundantly clear on Day 118, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Say that again, Ms. O'Rourke.
MS. O ROURKE: That was made clear on Day 118, yes,
Chairman.
CHA RMAK Okay, thank you very much. So maybe he made it clearer on some other occasion, but certainly that was my impression.
MR. KELLY: I see.
CHA RMAN I may be wrong, Mr. Kelly. Don't think just 14:27 because that's my impression, that that's my thing. But I'm not reading that statement as an indication of Chief Superintendent Curran saying, yes, I believe this was a phony, fabrication of a report. That's my understanding of it, rightly or wrongly, but please show me where I am wrong, if I'm wrong.

389 Q. MR. KELLY: From what you have seen, do you think there was an interaction between Garda Keogh and Liam McHugh?
A. My understanding of what has been said is the same as what the Chairman has said. And there was nothing presented to me that would show there was an interaction between Liam McHugh and Garda Keogh.
390 Q. So, I put to you again, do you read those two examples I have given to you, McHugh and O'Neill, as allegations that Garda Nick Keogh was coaching witnesses? This is only the third time I have put it to you, I think.
A. Yeah, my understanding -- as I say, these allegations were something that happened in my absence. when you're not there and you're reading it on paper -- I
was reading it on paper. They were incidents, they were separate incidents of issues that had happened. The investigation was progressed. And it was to get to the bottom of these allegations, to come to a conclusion. That's where I stand on it.
well, perhaps I am just being thick, but are you saying that you don't read it as being allegations that Garda Nick Keogh was coaching witnesses?
A. At that stage, when I come back, as I say, on the 5th June, it's very hard to remember exactly and I can only go from my notes, but my recollection is, for me, at that stage, they were isolated incidents that just warranted a separate investigation. I had lots of conversations with Garda Keogh afterwards in relation to these and I don't recall ever using the term coaching.

392 Q. Did you ever meet with Garda Lyons or Garda Treacy to ask them about this?
A. Garda Treacy came in to me in July because she was very anxious and concerned about a conversation she had on the phone with Garda Keogh. That was welfare related. And she was upset about that, because she worked with both members and she wanted to keep that situation going well. I didn't -- I don't recall, I have nothing, no notes to indicate that I met with Garda
Lyons, but I believe Sergeant Curley may have and I have faith in Sergeant Curley's decisionmaking, as had Garda Keogh, as he indicated, he trusted Detective Sergeant Curley.

393 Q. Was there any reason why you yourself didn't meet with Garda Lyons?
A. No.

394 Q. Had you have met with him, you could just easily have said, look, are you saying that Keogh was coaching
A. I was satisfied with the report of Garda Lyons and the report of Garda Lyons was a reflection or a recollection of a conversation that he had, and he reported it accordingly.
395 Q. Do you think these two incidents could fairly be described as getting at Nick Keogh because he had made protected disclosures?
A. I don't think -- I think if an incident happens in a district -- like both these incidents were reported by members of An Garda Síochána and from what I can reca11, I think Garda Keogh may have had some input, in the office, in the public office that day, with Garda Treacy being nominated to take the statement. Both of these were incidents that happened. I don't -- I think 14:31 to tie them in as a consequence of Garda Keogh making a protected disclosure, I wouldn't see how two separate members, and especially something that Garda Treacy said actually happened in the office that Garda Keogh had some input into, I don't know how you could see that as targeting. And as a district officer, when something is brought to my attention or the person who is acting on behalf, you are duty bound to deal with it.


CHA RMAN Certainly. Mr. Carrol1, are you going to have any questions.
MR. CARROL: Mr. O'Higgins -- I would be second last, I probably don't have any questions.
MR. MCHEÁL O HGG NS: I will have some short questions as well on behalf of An Garda Síochána.

CHA RMAN Sorry, of course. I am trying to get where everybody is. Ms. O'Rourke, if you ask your questions. Mr. O'Higgins, are you happy that you go after Ms. O'Rourke, followed by Mr. Carroll.
MR. MCHEÁL O H GG NS: No difficulty at all with that. CHA RMAN Very good. Thanks very much.

## SUPERI NTENDENT NOREEN MEBRI EN MAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED

 BY MS. O ROURKE, AS FOLLOVG:398 Q. MG. O RORKE: I just have a very brief question for Superintendent McBrien. I think yesterday in your evidence, at page 107, and I don't think we need it up, you said that Garda Keogh had mentioned that he didn't trust I think Inspector Farrel1. If I could just ask Mr. Kavanagh to bring up at Volume 5, your handwritten notes, at 1227. They're notes, something we have seen this morning. It's at 1227. I think it's the notes that predated your letter of 16th July 2014. I know Mr. Marrinan brought you through some of these yesterday, but maybe if you can scroll to the end of the page.
A. It's the 8th July. My handwritten notes of the 8th

Ju7y.
399 Q. If you see number 6, it's "interaction with garda management", and you indicate:
"He will not deal with NF, doesn't trust him"

I think it is:
"He nay a fine person but doesn't trust association with persons he has compl ai ned of."
A. That's actually Nick Keogh's words.

400 Q. Yes. So, what was it your understanding that Garda Keogh's views of Inspector Farrell weren't based on his interaction was Inspector Farrell or Inspector Farrell's actions but rather it was a perception that Garda Keogh held?
A. I think it was a perception of people he may be friendly with.
401 Q. Yes.
A. That was my understanding.

402 Q. I think on the 16th July you wrote to Chief Superintendent Curran. I don't know if it's necessary to bring up the 1etter, but it is at 6279, which is Volume 21. We have looked at this earlier today. In the course of that letter you indicated that the of members. I think that was all members in the station. But you would understand that Inspector Farrell was someone who was both available and
supportive to all members, including Garda Keogh, is that correct?
A. Inspector Farrell was extremely supportive of all members. He had a very good understanding of them and he was always available to Garda Keogh, even if Garda Keogh didn't accept his support.

MS. O ROURKE: Thank you very much, superintendent.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Now, Mr. O'Higgins.

## SUPERI NTENDENT NOREEN MEBRI EN MAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS, AS FOLLOVG:

403 Q. MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Superintendent McBrien, Micheá O'Higgins is my name, I am going to be asking some questions on behalf of An Garda Síochána and the Commissioner. Now, just as a road map for you and the Tribunal, $I$ am going to principally being working from, 14:36 and try to do this with some dispatch, from your initial statement to the Tribunal, commencing at page 85 of the materials in Volume 4. From time to time $I$ am going to bring you to documents, most of which, perhaps all of which you may have seen already but I am 14:36 going to ask you very briefly some questions pertaining to them.

So, if I can start then with what you say there on page
825. It's the case, isn't it, that you were on annual leave on the 8th and 9th May 2014.
A. That's correct.

404 Q. You appreciate I am going to be dealing with items 1 to 4 in the list of pleadings?
A. Yes.

405 Q. But I think whilst you were on annual leave, Mark Curran, chief superintendent, contacted you and relayed the fact that Garda keogh had been mentioned in the Dáil by Deputy Flanagan?
A. That's correct.

406 Q. Now, I think the position is that -- well, can I ask you: At this point in time you had a conversation obviously with Mark Curran at this time and then subsequently, isn't that right?
A. I had a conversation on the phone with him that day, yes.
407 Q. Yes. Am I correct that your concern and Chief Superintendent Curran's concern principally at this point in time was for Garda Keogh's welfare?
A. Absolutely. Absolutely. And specifically because he had been mentioned publicly.
408 Q. Right. Did you and Mark Curran discuss what steps you proposed to take regarding his welfare? what I am getting at there is: on the same page, page 825 , you make reference to a conversation you had with chief Superintendent Curran on the 12th May, relating to a particular welfare concern.
A. My understanding of that conversation, you know, his
welfare was discussed. I don't know whether I said I'11 contact him or he said you contact him. But on the day his welfare was discussed and there was an agreement to contact him. Garda Keogh was also -- or sorry, the chief was also concerned that Garda Keogh would know he was available to him and he would meet him. But the conversation, it's very difficult to say who said what first, but the general conversation was: Check in on him, make sure he's okay, I'm available to talk to him. That's with regard to my recollection of Chief Superintendent Curran. Then, I was in Dublin for that weekend and I was on annual leave, so I contacted Sergeant Haran to make contact with Garda Keogh for me, to see would Garda Keogh speak to me. I spoke to Garda Keogh on the Sunday on the phone. On Monday Chief Superintendent Curran rang me, that was my first day back in Athlone after that break, to see how I got on with Garda Keogh and to ensure I met with him as soon as possible.
409 Q. Right. Elsewhere in your statement you made reference to Sergeant Haran.
A. Yes.

410 Q. In particular, in a welfare regard from Garda Keogh's perspective. I think Sergeant Haran was the community policing sergeant?
A. Sergeant Haran was the community policing sergeant, but he also used to look after unit $C$ as well and he had a very good rapport with Garda Keogh.

411 Q. I see on page 826 you make reference again to a
conversation you had with Sergeant Haran on 15th May of 2014, where the subject of Garda Keogh's welfare came up?
A. Yes. I thanked Sergeant Haran for the assistance he had given me over the weekend, because he gone to a lot 14:40 of effort. I think Garda Keogh wasn't answering his phone to everyone and Garda Haran had made arrangements for us to have a conversation, for Garda keogh to -you know, to know I was ringing him and to engage with him.

412 Q. Right. The first of the themes the Chairman is concerned with in this aspect of the module is the Pulse entry of 18th May 2014?
A. Yes.

413 Q. Mindful that you were on leave when it initially arose. 14:40
A. That's correct.

414 Q. -- could I ask you to turn to page 1303 of the materials for a moment, which I think we will see, when it comes up, is communication and administrator in Inspector Farrell's office sent, drawing to the
attention of the Chief Superintendent Curran, the fact -- we have it there on screen, the fact of the Pulse entry made by Garda Keogh. Do you see that there?
A. I have that here, yes.

415 Q. That is dated 19th May 2014.
A. Yes.

416 Q. which is the day after the date mentioned on the Pulse entry itself?
A. Yes.

417 Q. Do you see there, it just captures essentially the gist of it.
A. It does.

418 Q. "I wi sh to draw your attention to an intelligence
report created by Garda Ni chol as Keogh on 18th May 2014."

Then there is a quote from it.
"Observed ME. B in her white Vol vo..."

I needn't read it out. Those words there "seriously i nvol ved in the her oi $n$ trade... turnover of approxi matel y $€ 2,500$. . . ai ded and abetted by a seni or member of drugs unit."

I think everyone would agree, these were matters that warranted needed looking into at the very least?
A. They are, yes.

419 Q. We know that Inspector Nicholas Farrell sent a report, that's at page 1301, it needn't delay us unduly.
A. Yes, I have that.
Q. Can I ask you though, you made reference to the fact that at some point in time Garda A, who stated that he was the person against whom the allegation was being made in the Pulse entry, made a complaint about the fact of the Pulse entry, isn't that so?
A. He made it around the end of July. He made it in
writing to me about the end of July.
421 Q. Can I ask you just to about that?
A. Yes.

422 Q. We might look at it, it's page 1163?
A. Yes.

423 Q. If we pause there for a moment. This is Garda A's memorandum complaining about the existence of the Pulse entry. It says:
"I wi sh to report on the above intelligence record whi ch was created by Garda Ni chol as Keogh on the 18th May. I am obvi ousl $y$ the seni or menbers of the drugs squad referred to, as Garda Keogh has recently made a number of compl ai nts agai nst me which I bel ieve are the result of a personal grievance whi ch Garda Keogh hol ds agai nst me."

I am not inviting you to get involved in that. But he says in the next paragraph:
"I previ ously verbally reported my di ssatisfaction with thi s intelligence record to my superiors in Athl one and was informed that the matter would be deal t with. The matter has not been dealt with. The intelligence record is still in exi stence and the matter has not been revi ewed. "

Perhaps if Mr. Kavanagh can scroll down. I think at the bottom of this memorandum of complaint, if that's
the right expression, he states that he is expressing his severe disappointment that the matter has not been dealt with and if it is not resolved he will be forced to take legal advice.

As far as you're concerned, did Garda management, including yourself, have any duty towards Garda A, who was seemingly the subject of this Pulse entry?
A. Well, Garda A is a member of an staff, the same as every other member of my staff is. So, there are obligations under data protection with regard to data and which way it's being generated and accuracy and distribution and all of that. There would be responsibilities under that, but with regard to Garda A, I have a duty to his health, safety and welfare, as I do any other member. And he received that from me. I met with him as well regularly.
424 Q. Yes. But could I ask you in that connection if we could briefly look at page 1186, which is your report to Chief Superintendent Curran of the 16th July. We're 14:45 skipping forward for a moment, just to develop the point you just mentioned.
A. Yes.
Q. On page 1188 , a couple of pages on within that same document, you refer to a conversation you had with Garda Keogh on the 16th July?
A. Yes. Is it the front page? The first? Intelligence report. 1186, is it?

426 Q. It's page 1188 and you indicated to the report, that
you outlined to him, to Garda Keogh that is, he is also obliged to be mindful of other members?
A. Yes.

427 Q. Do you recall that?
A. Em...

428 Q. Perhaps if we just scroll down a small bit, you will see the reference.
A. Yes.

429 Q. And then on to the next page. Towards the last page, 1186. If we go down a little bit further, please, Mr. Kavanagh.
A. "Meeti ngs with Garda Keogh" is it?

430 Q. A little bit further on, I think is the reference to it. It's under the heading of "Wel fare of menbers in At hl one"?
A. Okay.

431 Q. You say you aware the situation may be difficult for members in Athlone. You refer to the contact details for employee assistance and the welfare officer.
"Each nember has been e-mailed regar ding thei $r$ obl i gations with regard to harassment and bullying in the workpl ace. I engage regul arly with menbers, I meet with members at the core of this investigation. Inspectors and sergeants, who are available and supportive of members."

This is what I want to ask you about:
"During my conversation on this date with Garda Keogh, I outlined to himthat he is al so obl iged to be mindful of other members, that l have a responsibility for all members of the district. He said he was aware of this."
A. Yes.

432 Q. What point were you making to Garda Keogh and what did he say to indicate that he was aware of this?
A. I have to refer back to my notes of the telephone conversation on the 16th June -- July, and I believe Stephanie Treacy and that had been in with me beforehand. I had already indicated to Garda A, you know, around the station, leave the investigation team to do their job. And I believe I reaffirmed that with Garda Keogh, that he wasn't an exception to this rule, that he had to --
"Advi sed himlet the i nvestigations take thei $r$ course, et cet era. "

And I told him that it applies to him as well, asking people -- because it had come to my attention that some people were asking others what they would say and he said he hadn't approached anyone. But that was -- he had spoken to Garda Treacy on the phone when she rang in, about saying this would go further. But it applied to him as everyone else.

433 Q. If I can return then to the issue that we were dealing with, the Pulse entry. Could we have page 1164 ,
please? We've looked at this document before. It's a document of 23rd July 2014. It's from yourself to Garda Keogh himself, simply indicating that you require the report, indicating whether the informant has been registered with CHIS in accordance with HQ Directive 126/10?
A. Yes.

It has been suggested to you by Mr. Marrinan a little while ago that perhaps in hindsight, and I hope I am not mischaracterising the gist of his question, but as I look it up, it was suggesting that maybe in hindsight it would have been better, rather than raising the matter of the Pulse entry with Garda Keogh, that it would have been better, for instance, if management had had a round table conference with the ó Cualáin investigation team. Do you recall being asked about that?
A. I do.
Q. Well, could I ask you, what would you say to my suggestion, a different suggestion, that it was Garda Keogh perhaps who had pursued a dua1 channe1, not Garda management?
A. That's absolutely correct.

436 Q. You agree with that?
A. I do. I agree with that, because apart from my correspondence of the 9th July, the correspondence, anything that was coming in relation to the ó Cualáin team was just -- the initial meeting on the 10th July, or the 10th June with D/Super Mulcahy and that, the
chief and I were both very strict on the fact that the investigation takes its course, it's separate to us and that's it. So, we didn't -- we didn't engage with them. If they wanted anything, they contacted us.
437 Q. Garda keogh had taken the decision to publish the intelligence reports?
A. Yes.

438 Q. As far as you were concerned, was it reasonable for management to look into the pulse entry and take the steps that were taken to do that?
A. Absolutely. Specifically in relation to the CHIS aspects of it. Chief Superintendent Curran was the owner of the -- to ensure CHIS was run appropriately in his division. He carried, as I say, that can, I said that this morning. And if anything went wrong, it was his baby, so to speak. It's a very serious and a very burdensome load to carry and I think he was quite entitled and I would support his line of analysis with regard to how the separation and the recording and proper treatment of the CHIS in this, the possible CHIS as well in this instance.
439 Q. You made reference to it being his baby, so to speak. I think that's a reference to his own evidence?
A. Certainly. The integrity -- it's in the policy document, the integrity of CHIS in a division is the responsibility of the divisional officer.
440 Q. But insofar as Garda Keogh, I think you accurately quote his words, regarded the disclosure of corruption as being his baby. Can you assist the Tribunal, from
your knowledge of Garda Keogh and without being unduly unfair to him now, did he have a tendency to immerse himself in investigate matters?
A. I believe in relation to the ó Cualáin investigation, and I had to address it from the very outset, I thought 14:52 Garda Keogh felt he was taking on an investigative role rather than a role as a witness and I had concerns and I outlined that to him at the very outset. Yes. Returning to your statement then, you have told us that between the 19th May and the 4th June you were on annual leave?
A. That's correct.

442 Q. You telephoned Garda Keogh to arrange a meeting with him, isn't that so?
A. Yes. Before I went on leave or when I came back from 1eave?

443 Q. Page 827 of the materials, you made reference to being on annual leave from the 19th May until the 4th June?
A. Yes.

444 Q. And the 5th June, on return from leave, you contacted Garda Keogh by telephone with a view to meeting him?
A. That's correct.

445 Q. What was your focus in relation to this and the other meetings that you were having with him at this time?
A. Welfare. To see how he was. To see that he was doing wel1. To see if he felt supported. I knew he wasn't engaging with the welfare officer. Just to make sure he was good. I knew of his historical medical issues and I just wanted to make sure that he was doing okay.

446 Q. Right. Over the page, at page 828, you make reference to what you learned on returning from annual leave regarding Garda Stephanie Treacy's report?
A. Yes.

447 Q. And acting Inspector Farre11's report of the 29th May?
A. Yes.

448 Q. That's in relation to the Olivia O'Neill matter, which we can move to presently. But I think it's the case that on 9th June '14 you met with Garda Keogh and raised with him both the olivia o'Neill matter and the Liam McHugh matter?
A. That's correct.

449 Q. That's at page 829 of the materials?
A. That's correct.

450 Q. Your report, and we will do this quickly, is at page
1217. Would you mind moving to that for a moment please? Now, the Chairman has seen this repeatedly, so we will do this with dispatch. I just want to ask you about the second last paragraph, where it says Garda Keogh said that with regard to Olivia O'Neill -- this is on the last page.
A. I see it, yes.

451 Q. That's it there. So the second last paragraph:
"Garda Keogh said that with regard to Oivia O Neill he 14:55 had heard that menbers had contacted her to see if she would make a compl ai nt against him l clarified to him that in certain situations a statement is sought, that's not to be conf used with seeking to have someone
make a compl ai nt. Such statement can provi de cl arification and even exoneration. He understood this."

That's my question: what did he say to indicate or that caused you to conclude he agreed or understood that point?
A. He said he totally understood, I have in my notes, which are contemporaneous. I will read a paragraph in my notes:
"I said he has to understand that an issue was to brought to my attention, I have to address it and he should not misunderstand this. He said he totally understood it."

It would be my recollection of that night that I was possibly quite firm with him with regard to specifically taking on what he may perceive to be a role in the investigation team, and he was on about kind of complaints or investigations into him. And I made it quite clear to him that there wasn't investigations into him, there wasn't complaints, but I was investigating and clarifying and trying to get clarity on issues that had happened within my district. 14:56 As district officer, that was my role.

452 Q. Yes.
A. He understood this. And it was the same in relation to other matters that we discussed then, he said that he
could see my point on it.
453 Q Do you see the next paragraph in the same memorandum of 9th June '14, you say:
"Garda Keogh said with regard to Oivia O' Neill he had heard that members had cont acted her to see if she would make a compl ai nt agai nst him"
A. Yes.

454 Q. Just pause there for a moment?
A. Yes.

455 Q. You may recall that Mr. McGuinness yesterday, from An Garda Síochána legal team, was asking questions of Olivia O'Neill with a view to eliciting with some degree of certainty what level of contact she had with Garda Keogh -
A. Yes.

456 Q. - before and after her visit to the Garda station?
A. Yes.

457 Q. Can I ask you, mindful that this is a report of the 9th June?
A. Yes.
Q. And at this point in time Garda Keogh appears to be armed with the information that members had contacted her, presumably that's a reference to Sergeant Curley and his colleague calling up to her home?
A. Yes.

459 Q. Are you in a position to shed light -- well sorry, did you ask Garda Keogh, for instance, of his source for that statement?
A. No.

460 Q. His awareness that Olivia O'Neill had members calling up to see her?
A. No, I didn't.

461 Q. Al1 right. In terms of the timeline, it would follow, wouldn't it, that Garda Keogh became aware of that from somebody, very possibly Olivia O'Neill, at some stage between the 28th May and the 9th Judge, that would follow?
A. Yes, I would say so.

462 Q. Would you mind then for a moment going to page 434 and the entry for the Thursday. This is Garda Keogh's diary. Do you see it on screen there, the entry for Thursday, the 26th June?
A. Yes.

463 Q. It reads:
"I nf or med Judge and D/ Superintendent my not ebook missing 5: 30 Ol ivia O Neill calls to the station asked to speak to me in private, stated D/Sergeant Curley and

T Hi ggi ns called to her house, then to her in another house to try to get her to make a statement about me but refused to take her statement of assault. Informed her to go to GSOC."

Do you see the reference there, the second line:

> "Ol ivia O' Neill called to station, asked to speak to me in private" ?
A. Yes.

Did Garda Keogh mention any of these conversations or visits he had to you with Olivia O'Neill in your inquiries with him?
A. I think in my notes of the 8th July, he refers back to saying that she called in to the station the previous week and he told her to go to GSOC, I think. Sorry, I wil1 get my notebook now.
Q. Maybe I might assist with you that. If you wouldn't mind turning to page 1187.
A. Yes.

466 Q. You see it on screen, first paragraph, about four lines down?
A. Yes.

467 Q. Five lines down, halfway along:
"Garda Keogh informed me --"

This is your own report:
"Garda Keogh inf ormed me during the conversation on 8th July 2014 that Oivia O Neill had called in to the station about a week previ ously about her previ ous i nci dent and he had advi sed her to go to GSOC. I again asked hi mabout this today and he stated this happened when she called into the station at the start of his shift. He was in the public office doing PO. He does not know if she has contacted GSOC "
A. Yes.


Q. Yes.

MR. CARROLL: 1100.
CHA RMAN Thanks, Mr. Carroll.
A. It says in this, in my exact note:
"He said that Oivia O'Neill had called in to the station about a week ago about her previous incidents and that had he advi sed her to go to GSOC."

So I would imagine that's a week before the 8th July.
471 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: I sorry, I may be succeeding only in shedding darkness rather than light on this of clarity on is this: Insofar as I can read the materials, neither Olivia O'Neill or Garda Keogh have referred to a meeting between the 30th May '14 and the

26th June '14. The various conversations that are referred to would appear to indicate that there may have been some engagement between Garda keogh and Olivia o'Neill on this issue on other occasions. Does that accord with your understanding.
A. Well --

CHA RMAN May I suggest, Mr. O'Higgins, with respect, that really what we are looking at is what the superintendent wrote and the meaning of what she wrote. what meetings took place or didn't take place -- and I thought you asked a question that I was happy to have clarified. In other words, it seems to me, I was assuming that when this -- it records, rightly or wrongly, I'm not saying anything about that, but it says Garda Keogh that about a week ago Olivia O'Neill called in. I am assuming that's a week before I am writing this. That's what $I$ am assuming. In other words, a week before your conversation with him.
A. A week before the 8th.

CHA RMAN He says a week ago, that's what it looks
like to me. Maybe it means something different, I don't know. If it follows, if that is correct -- I am sorry to be tedious about this. If that is correct, it may mean that there were more meetings than we previously knew about. But that's not something that the superintendent really knows about because that's a conclusion that will follow from -- do you follow me? MR. M CLEÁL O H GG NS: I take your point, Chairman.

472 Q. CHA RMAN okay. So as far as you're concerned, you
think this means, when he says she called in about a week ago and so on, you think that's about a week before your conversation that you're referring to?
A. Yes, on the 8th July.

CHA RMAN okay.
MR. ḾCHÉL O H GG NS: Yes.
CHAN RMAN All right.
473 Q. MR. MCHEAL OHGGN: In your later report then of the 5th August, which we have seen on the screen a number of times already, for your assistance, at page 1157, you give what I think is your conclusion on the Liam McHugh matter.
A. Yes.

474 Q. Do you see in the last three lines of this document --
A. Yes.

475 Q. -- and again, we have been over this, so I will do it with dispatch. You say:
"His assertion that he had not been in contact with Li am Mchugh is consistent with his conversation with me $15: 05$ on the 9 th June 2014, which is covered in my correspondence to you on the same date."

And this is your report to Chief Superintendent Curran, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can we take it from that, that as far as you were concerned at this point the matter was finished and you and Garda management accepted Garda Keogh's position on
the Liam McHugh matter?
A. Yes. There was nothing further to add.

477 Q. Regarding the Olivia o'neill matter, which is another theme the Chairman is looking into through the lens of whether there was targeting or discrediting?
A. Yes.

478 Q. Mindful of what was in Garda Treacy's report -
A. Yes.

479 Q. - as to what they says Olivia O'Neill said to her on the occasion of the visit to the station. In your view 15:06 and from your perspective, was it reasonable for Garda management and for yourself to take the steps you took to enquire into the matters arising from Garda Treacy's report?
A. I think it was reasonable and necessary. We were duty bound to.

480 Q. Can I conclude by asking you to deal with matter that was raised by Mr. Marrinan yesterday in your own evidence, and it is a more general matter concerning Garda Keogh's alcohol sickness.
A. Yes.

481 Q. And his work attendance record.
A. Yes.

482 Q. You knew a sergeant Pat Tully, isn't that right?
A. I did, yes.

483 Q. He was somebody who you had regard for, I think also it was also indicated by Garda Keogh he had regard for in the station?
A. That's correct, that's correct. . 3


484
Q. Could I ask you to look briefly at page 9267, it's either volume 32 or volume 33, at page 9267. If we just scroll up a small bit we will get the -- sorry, the other way, Mr. Kavanagh, please, just at the top of the document. This is Sergeant Patrick Tully's minute to superintendent, Ath1one. It's date stamped 4th October 2012. Am I correct that you took up duty in July 2012, taking over from Superintendent Aidan G1acken?
A. That's correct.
A. I am.
Q. If we look to see, there's numbered paragraphs set out in the body of the document, if we can skip down to -if we stop there. So paragraph 3, Sergeant Tully reports:
"His coping skills are being tested due to his al cohol problems. Even though he is currently off the drink, it is certainly taking its toll on himbut he is making a huge effort to overcome his probl em"

Then paragraph 4 says positive things about his relationship with his peers and supervisors. Then paragraph 5, he says the following:
"This member is not the most robust indi vi dual and is easily upset by the rough and tumble of life. He
bel ieves he needs a transfer fromAthl one although he is not sure where he wants to go. He clains he is happy with his work colleagues and has no issue in that regard. Over all, he is a bit mixed up but hopefully will make a recovery and becone more self reliant and settled. "

Now, you may have been here for his evidence or you may not have been, Garda Keogh was asked about this by Mr. Murphy, my colleague, earlier in evidence. If we 15:09 can just very briefly have the transcript interest Day 105 , which is the 22nd October. Day 105, page 67. And halfway down line 6 on page 67
A. Yes.

487 Q. Mr. Murphy requests if a document we've just looked at 15:10 could be called up on screen. Then in line 17 there's a quotation from the document, which we can pass from. If you could turn over to page 68, line 7, Mr. Murphy asks:
"So, can I just suggest to you, that was Sergeant Tully's assessment of your position; that you had gone through a difficult time in the middle of 2012, you had gone through rehab and you returned to work?
A. I never informed Sergeant Tully of what the difficult time was.
Q. Yes."

If you turn over the page then to page 69, halfway
down, line 12, there is a further exchange on this issue, line 12:
"Q. But would you agree, Garda Keogh, in 2012 you weren't well for a long period of time during that year, with your al cohol probl em
A. I'mnot di sputing that."

Is the recorded answer. And then at in line 16:
"Could I ask you, please, to be shown document 9448."
we needn't go to that
"Garda Keogh, this is an absence report in rel ation to you. It details materials in rel ation to a number of years. I just want to look, if l could please, at 2012. Will you see that towards the last part of the page. I think again there will be no di spute between us, that that shows that in the year 1st January 2012 to 6th January 2012..."

I think that should be -- it's down as '12 but I think it should be 2013.
"... you were of $f$ sick for 106 days.
A. That's correct."

So, mindful that that was Garda Keogh's position in
relation to (a) his sick record and (b) his alcohol addiction, broadly speaking were you aware of those matters as his superintendent during 2012, that his ability to scope as a guard was under challenge?
A. He -- I was made aware of his condition by Chief Superintendent Glacken when I was taking over and I was aware he was -- had the alcohol addiction and I think this ties in with my meeting with him in February 2013, when we had a long conversation, where did we all go wrong, or where did it all go wrong, and he went back to his movement to Ballynacargy. So I would have been aware and that's part of the reason why I met him that night in February 2013.
488 Q. Yes. Lastly, superintendent, can I ask you this, and tying matters back to the core matter the Chairman is investigating: what do you say to the suggestion that you and Garda management participated in a pattern of discrediting and targeting Garda Keogh because he made a protected disclosure --
MR. CARROL: Sorry, Chairman, I don't think there was a suggestion that my client participated in that activity.
CHA RMAN I think that's right.
MR. CARROLL: So I would ask for that be rephrased.
CHA RMAN Mr. O'Higgins, I think, in fact, of all the officers in question, I think Garda Keogh was explicit in saying the one person he didn't lay a finger on, so to speak, was Superintendent McBrien. Not alone that, her notes, her statements, he agreed with everything in

15:12
them, I think.
MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes.
CHA RMAN That's my recollection. Mr. Kelly or somebody wil1 correct me if I am wrong, but I thought that was what he made absolutely clear.
MR. KELLY: Chairman, what you say about Garda Keogh is absolutely right. But I think Mr. O'Higgins probably is entitled to ask the question on the basis that it's not actually Garda Keogh's view which is the definitive one, it will be the evidence as a whole. And on that

15:13 basis, it seems to me he's entitled to ask it.

CHAN RMAN Very good. Mr. Kelly says that independently of what Garda Keogh thinks or of his complaints, that it would be possible for the Tribunal to say, well, while Garda Keogh thinks that
Superintendent McBrien did absolutely nothing wrong, the Tribunal, nevertheless, is going to find that she was involved in targeting and discrediting. So, against the possibility of that finding, Mr. O'Higgins, which strikes me as being just a tad remote, but against the possibility, given that all things are open to the Tribunal, you better ask the question.

MR. CARROL: Just on that point, Chairman, without being difficult. Not alone would the situation arise as the Chairman has said, but would it not be reverse in relation to the evidence we have heard in this module, and this is the module we are dealing with. CHA RMAN I think, Mr. Carrol1, I think every lawyer in the room would understand that before I signed off
on a document I think I might have voices saying, are you really sure this might be a sound finding. So I might have find myself putting another correction in a few years time on the website. Anyway. Ask away, Mr. O'Higgins, but Mr. Carroll understands and everybody understands.

MR. ḾCHEÁL O HGG NS: Chairman, could I say, I didn't intend, excuse me, I didn't intend to trigger an inquiry.
CHA RMAN It's all right.
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: It was a loose question, full stop. Could I ask you this question, superintendent: Were you aware of any targeting or discrediting being engaged in by senior management against Garda Keogh?
A. No, I wasn't.

MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Thanks very much.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Now, Mr. Kane, you're not involved in this, are you?

MR. KANE: No, thank you, Judge.
CHA RMAK You don't have any questions. Thanks very much. So, Mr. Carroll, any questions?
MR. CARROLL: Yes, Chairman, just one matter.
CHA RMAK sure.

490 Q. MR. CARROL: I suppose primarily, Mr. Marrinan has brought you through an extensive examination, so I don't really have any questions. There's just one matter that arises that may be of note on one aspect, and that was to do with the general awareness at the time in Athlone Garda Station as to the disclosures, as to what was going on. I think you've already indicated 15:16 and it's part of the evidence before the Tribunal, Mr. Murphy dealt with it in some detail earlier on, about media reports, Dáil reports and whatnot. I think you were absent actually on the 8 th and 9 th May, isn't that right?
A. I was.

491 Q. But you were back into the station then after that. There is just one aspect, it was touched on maybe previously and we will hear from I think Sergeant Haran in relation to it, but it would appear that Garda Keogh actually had some sort of meeting, at Sergeant Haran's suggestion it would appear, on the evening of the protected disclosure with some of the members. And it may be relevant to what was known in the station and the knowledge of others in the station as to what was going on. Were you aware of that at the time or when did you become aware of that?
A. I think I was aware of it afterwards, when I came back, when I had been talking to Sergeant Haran, he may have Again, that would be a matter for Sergeant Haran's evidence. There is nothing else.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHAI RMAN Thank you very much, Mr. Carroll. Now, Mr. Marrinan.

## SUPERI NTENDENT NOREEN MEBRI EN WAS THEN RE- EXAM NED BY

MR. MARRI NAN AS FOLLOVS:

494 Q.
MR. MARRI NAN Yes, there is just one matter that arises out of the questions that you were asked by Mr. O'Higgins there and a reference to Sergeant pat Tully's report in 2012.
A. Yes.

495 Q. Was Garda Keogh always open in relation to his alcohol
A. He was -- I can on7y account from July 2012.
Q. Yes.
A. When I went there.

497

98 Q. We11, you see, this arises out of the question that $I$ asked you in relation to Garda Keogh's performance as a 15:18 member of An Garda Síochána.
A. Yes.
Q. Under your watch in Athlone Garda Station?
A. Yes.

500 Q. I don't think it would be particularly fair if it was watered down in some way. Because I asked you the question whether or not Garda Keogh at any time had been disciplined during your period on watch?
A. He hadn't been.

501 Q. I asked you had there ever been a complaint made by a member of the public in relation to Garda Keogh?
A. I wasn't aware of one, no.

502 Q. And had any sergeant or inspector called into question the quality of his work?
A. And I mentioned Sergeant Haran with regard --

503 Q. Sergeant Haran, had difficulty with paperwork?
A. Yes.

504 Q. Yes. But other than that?
A. If you're referring to Sergeant Tully's report, it's a medical report for the CMO, it's to do with a condition.
Q. This is back in 2012, I am talking about?
A. Yes.
Q. Under your watch.
A. Yes.

507 Q. And your period of time. You received in complaints in relation to the quality of the work that Garda Keogh was undertaking, is that right?
A. The only comment that $I$ had was that in relation to Sergeant Haran saying Garda Keogh was slow on paperwork.
MR. MARRI NAN Thank you very much.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Thanks very much, superintendent.
WTNESS: Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Just give me a moment.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

CHA RMAN Where do we stand now, Mr. McGuinness, Mr. Marrinan?
MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, could I suggest a short recess for five minutes.
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| 42:19, 44:16, 52:22,$58: 19,58: 26,59: 6$, | owner [1] - 113:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { participated [2] - } \\ & \text { 127:17, 127:21 } \\ & \text { participation [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:21, 16:22, 18:20, } \\ & 21: 2,24: 8,33: 13 \end{aligned}$ | Portadown [1] -88:19 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 58: 19,58: 26,59: 6, \\ & 62: 9,65: 5,66: 4,82: 2, \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $4: 24,52: 10,67: 1$ | portal [2] - 45:12, |
| 127:27, 128:10, | pacify [1] - 71:19 |  | 107:26, 127:27 | position [9]-26:24, |
| 129:25, 130:6, 130:7, |  |  | personal [3] - 26:18, | 26:26, 53:24, 81:9 |
| $130: 18,131: 20$, $132: 17$ | page [83]-7:11, 9:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 14,39: 4,104: 28, \\ & 105: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 82:26, 108:15 | 104:12, 117:27, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:17 } \\ & \text { ones [2]-48:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 27,11: 4,12: 19, \\ & 16: 9,19: 23,22: 12, \end{aligned}$ |  | personally [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 122: 29,125: 22, \\ & 126.29 \end{aligned}$ |
| ```48:22 ongoing [5] - 7:29, 41:21, 48:16, 60:10, 78:13 open [9]-7:12, 10:28, 26:21, 53:25,``` | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 3,24: 5,28: 19 \\ & 29: 6,32: 27,33: 7 \\ & 33: 28,36: 2,37: 2 \\ & 37: 12,38: 16,38: 27, \\ & 39: 5,45: 14,53: 3 \\ & 58: 10,58: 19,59: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:10 } \\ & \text { parties [3] - 11:21, } \\ & \text { 82:8, } 85: 9 \\ & \text { partner [1] - 70:13 } \\ & \text { party [2]-12:24, } \\ & 64: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:22, 20:29 } \\ & \text { personnel [2]-14:2, } \\ & 55: 29 \\ & \text { persons }[3]-12: 11, \\ & \text { 102:10, 131:5 } \\ & \text { perspective }[6]- \\ & 57: 9,57: 26,57: 27, \end{aligned}$ | ```positive [1] - 124:24 positively [1] - 88:20 possibilities [1] - 16:20 possibility [3] - 16:25, 128:19, 128:21``` |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |



| reflection [2]-91:28, | 44:19, 44:26, 45:3, | 31:2, 31:14, 31:20, | resident [1]-22:7 | 116:26 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 99:8 | 45:5, 46:16, 46:24, | 31:24, 33:13, 38:15, | resolution [1] - 30:9 | room [1] - 128:29 |
| reflects [2]-63:19, | 47:4, 47:23, 47:28, | 38:18, 38:28, 39:1, | RESOLUTIONS [1] - | rough [1] - 124:29 |
| ```66:8 refused [4] - 14:14,``` | 48:26, 49:13, 53:23, | 39:10, 42:13, 49:10, | 1:4 | round [2] - 42:28, |
|  | 59:26, 61:7, 61:21, | 53:8, 53:14, 53:17, | resolved [1] - 109:3 | 112:15 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 21:6, 30:14, 118:23 } \\ \text { regard }[32]-9: 14, \end{gathered}$ | $62: 14,63: 12,63: 13$ | 53:23, 60:25, 61:22, | Resource [2] - | rule [1] - 111:15 |
|  | 64:28, 65:4, 67:11, | 61:24, 61:28, 62:17, | 57:23, 58:5 | run [3] - 43:2, 92:7, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:27, 17:16, 21:18, } \\ & \text { 21:27, 22:8, 36:22, } \end{aligned}$ | 73:4, 73:27, 76:15, <br> 79:29, 80:20, 80:26 | 62:21, 62:24, 62:25, $63: 1,63: 16,63: 23$ | RESOURCES ${ }_{\text {[1] - }}$ | 113:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 41: 19,43: 7,48: 15 \\ & 56: 2,56: 22,56: 26 \end{aligned}$ | 81:3, 81:10, 82:16, | 63:1, 63:16, 63:23, $63: 28,64: 12,64: 1$ | 3:15 | running [2]-44:6, |
|  | 83:7, 83:11, 98:14 | 68:25, 69:12, 69:13, | 64:21, 86:1, 91:4, | RYAN ${ }_{[2]}$ - 1:12, 2:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 61: 12,62: 24,68: 24 \\ & 69: 20,86: 11,105: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 112:27, 113:11, | 69:14, 69:27, 69:28, | 95:4, 121:7 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:4, 114:23, 115:7, } \\ & \text { 116:28, 126:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 26,73: 7,73: 11, \\ & 73: 17,73: 25,75: 9, \end{aligned}$ | responded [2] - | S |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:23, 109:11, } \\ & \text { 109:14, 110:22, } \end{aligned}$ | 126:16, 127:1, | $78: 4,78: 7,78: 14$ | response [5] - 73:2, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:19, 115:20, } \\ & \text { 115:25, 116:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:26, 130:20, } \\ & \text { 131:25. 132:5. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80:20, 85:9, 85:15, } \\ & \text { 86:26. 88:2. 91:12. } \end{aligned}$ | $73: 3,73: 9,74: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { safety [2]-28:14, } \\ & \text { 109:15 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:25, 116:18, } \\ & \text { 117:5, 123:26, } \end{aligned}$ | $132: 16,133: 3,133: 5$ | 93:15, 94:7, 94:10, | 77:22 | sake [1] - 79:8 |
| $123: 27,125: 4,132: 20$ <br> regarded [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { relationship [2] - } \\ & 26: 18,124: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 29,96: 22,97: 14, \\ & 99: 7,99: 8,107: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $77: 18,77: 29,109: 14$ | SANDRA [1] - 4:3 <br> Sandra [1] - 35:16 |
| $113: 28$ <br> regarding [19] | relayed [1] - 104:8 | 107:21, 108:10, | responsibility [4] - | satisfaction [1] - |
|  | released [1] - 88:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:19, 109:28, } \\ & \text { 109:29, 112:4, 115:3 } \end{aligned}$ | 113:26 | 23:26 |
| $19: 27,20: 3,20: 11$, $20: 27,22: 16,53: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { relevance }[4] \text { - } \\ & 17: 10,17: 18,23: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:29, 112:4, 115:3, } \\ & 115: 5,115: 15, \end{aligned}$ | rest [1] - 70:17 | $\begin{gathered} \text { satisfied [5] - 32:26, } \\ 60: 11,77: 17,77: 28, \end{gathered}$ |
| 54:7, 54:12, 54:18, | 23:24 | 117:19, 119:19, | result [6] - 9:20, | 99:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 56: 2,74: 12,74: 16 \\ & 75: 1,85: 7,91: 21 \end{aligned}$ | relevant [5] - 24:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:8, 122:24, 123:7, } \\ & 123: 14,124: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $54: 5,85: 14,91: 14$ | satisfy [1] - 70:11 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 7,51: 15,81: 6, \\ & 130 \cdot 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:14, 124:12, } \\ & \text { 126:15, 131:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $91: 19,108: 15$ | Saturday [1] - 79:12 <br> SAVAGE ${ }_{[1]}-3: 16$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 104: 24,110: 2 \\ & 115: 3,123: 3 \end{aligned}$ | reliability [3] - 18:16, | $132: 24,132: 25$ | resume [1] - 134:5 | $\text { saw [2] }-90: 14,92: 5$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Region [4]-22:6, } \\ 22: 7,61: 2,63: 25 \end{gathered}$ | 18:25, 18:28 | reported [10]-6:13, | $82: 5,134: 1$ | SC [11] - 2:6, 2:7, |
| registered [6] - | reliable [1] - 19:4 <br> reliant [1] - 125:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 22,15: 7,17: 1, \\ & 30: 26,54: 27,70: 2 \end{aligned}$ | RETIRED ${ }_{[7]}-3: 5$, | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 10,2: 16,2: 21,2: 28, \\ & 3: 23,3: 23,3: 24,4: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60:27, 60:28, 62:26, } \\ & 66: 19,74: 6,112: 5 \end{aligned}$ | main [1] - 34:13 | $99: 10,99: 15,108: 21$ | 3:6, 3:7, 3:7, 3:11, | $4: 4$ |
|  | remember [3] -7:18, | reporter [4]-85:11, | return [4] - 77:22, | SCANLAN [1] - 3:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { REGISTRAR [2] - } \\ & 2: 5,134: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 27:9, 98:10 | 85:13, 85:25, 89:9 <br> reporters [1]-85 | $78: 5,111: 28,114: 20$ | scenario [1] - 90:29 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { regularly [5] - 55:15, } \\ 56: 4,74: 23,109: 17, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reminded }{ }_{[1]}-28: 1 \\ & \text { reminder }[2]-10: 22, \end{aligned}$ | reporting [5] - 9:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { returned }[3]-79: 13, \\ & 91: 9,125: 24 \end{aligned}$ | scope [1] - 127:4 <br> screen [13] - 12:20, |
|  | 10:26 | 64:5, 94:7, 94:11, | returning [2] - 114:9, | 27:8, 28:21, 39:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:23 } \\ & \text { rehab [1] - 125:24 } \end{aligned}$ | remote [1] - 128:20 | 94:12 reports [5] - 62:9 | 115:2 | $50: 8,67: 18,77: 7$ |
|  | removed [1] - 70:2 | $113: 6,124: 17,130: 13$ | reverse [1] - 128:25 | 94:16, 106:22, |
| reiterated [1] - 33:1 | repeat [1]-90:15 repeatedly [1] - | request [6] - 19:3, | review [1]-60:15 | $122: 9,125: 16$ |
| reject [1] - 93:23 | 115:17 | 44:8, 44:13, 77:19, | 108:2 | scroll [11] - 16:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 83: 5,83: 6,98: 21 \\ & \text { relates [1] - 15:17 } \\ & \text { relating [2] - 45:29, } \\ & \text { 104:27 } \end{aligned}$ | rephrased [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 78:4, 78:26 } \\ & \text { requested }[8] \end{aligned}$ | revised [1] - 45:8 | $58: 25,59: 7,59: 18$ $63: 23,63: 25,86: 14$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 127:24 } \\ & \text { reply [4] - 22:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $13: 20,14: 2,18: 15$ | revisit [1] - 6:10 | 101:27, 108:28, |
|  | $59: 8,77: 12,83: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 24,20: 27,25: 2, \\ & 75: 10,78: 1 \end{aligned}$ | rid [1] - 93:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:6, } 124: 3 \\ & \text { SEAN }[4]-1: 12,2: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11: 29,14: 5,15: 11 \\ & \text { 15:23, 18:15, 19:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $6: 16,6: 17,6: 26,6: 27$ | requesting [6] | ghtly [2] - 97:15 | 2:22, 3:17 |
|  | $7: 2,7: 3,7: 4,7: 9$ | $26: 6,54: 8,60: 13$ <br> 91.22, 91.27, 92.6 | $\text { ring }[1]-50: 6$ | $\operatorname{SEANAD}_{[1]}-1: 5$ |
| 20:22, 21:6, 22:4, | $7: 25,7: 26,7: 27,8: 1$ | 91:22, 91:27, 92:6 requests [1] - 125 | ringing [3]-35:10, | search [2]-80:23, |
| 23:18, 23:27, 25:27, | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 2,8: 4,9: 1,9: 2,9: 4, \\ & 9: 20,10: 7,10: 15 \end{aligned}$ | require [5] - 8:1, | $50: 6,106: 9$ | 92:29 <br> second $[8]-22: 13$, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 29: 10,30: 11,30: 13 \\ & 30: 17,30: 23,31: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 10:28, 12:5, 12:18, | $22: 17,29: 24,62: 25$ | $\operatorname{ROAD}_{[1]}-2: 18$ | 41:29, 61:18, 77:26, |
|  | 14:21, 14:27, 15:29, | 112:3 <br> required $[5]-6: 1$ | road [1] - 103:19 | 101:3, 115:19, |
| 31:29, 32:8, 32:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:27, 17:8, 18:7, } \\ & \text { 18:15, 18:22, 20:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $12: 22,31: 16,43: 5$ | robust [1] - 124:28 | section [2]-48:11, |
| 35:10, 39:3, 40:9, | $20: 11,20: 17,22: 15,$ | 60:11 | role [12]-14:4, 28:8, | 91:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 40: 21,40: 22,43: 16 \\ & 44: 6,44: 8,44: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 22:21, 22:26, 23:24, | requirement [1] - | :10, 43:26, 80:19, | see [58]-11:4, |
|  | 25:10, 28:29, 29:1, | 19:7 | 114:6, 114:7, 116:20, | 18:21, 19:24, 22:24, |



| Stephanie [11] - <br> 31:15, 33:25, 34:2, <br> 47:6, 53:29, 92:17, <br> 93:12, 93:14, 93:15, <br> 111:11, 115:3 <br> STEPHEN ${ }_{[1]}$ - 2:21 <br> steps [3] - 104:23, <br> 113:10, 123:12 <br> stick [1] - 50:18 <br> sticking [1] - 63:21 <br> still [4]-32:22, 64:1, <br> 100:3, 108:25 <br> stood [1] - 15:10 <br> stop $[7]-35: 19$, <br> 37:17, 40:20, 52:2, <br> 94:21, 124:16, 129:12 <br> stopping [1] - 81:9 <br> story [2]-68:29, <br> 75:16 <br> STREET [3]-2:12, <br> 3:28, 3:32 <br> Street [1]-73:12 <br> strict [3]-48:13, <br> 61:13, 113:1 <br> strikes [1] - 128:20 <br> stuck [1] - 90:5 <br> stuff [5] - 51:19, <br> 55:11, 71:19, 93:28, <br> 94:4 <br> subject [3] - 57:17, <br> 106:2, 109:8 <br> submitting [1] - 7:9 <br> subparagraph [1] - <br> 65:14 <br> subsequent [2] - <br> 6:25, 49:5 <br> subsequently [3] - <br> 10:22, 80:29, 104:15 <br> succeeding [1] - <br> 120:24 <br> successful [1] - <br> 12:25 <br> sufficient [1]-37:6 <br> suggest [5] - 65:28, <br> 94:8, 121:7, 125:21, <br> 133:21 <br> suggested [4]-32:7, <br> 58:4, 96:18, 112:8 <br> suggesting [5] - <br> 44:5, 93:20, 94:1, <br> 96:20, 112:11 <br> suggestion [7] - <br> 13:4, 77:15, 112:20, <br> 127:16, 127:21, <br> 130:22 <br> suit [2] - 40:6, 62:7 <br> suitable [3]-13:21, <br> 21:2, 26:19 <br> summer [1]-88:8 <br> Sunday [1] - 105:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { super }[2]-50: 12, \\ & 51: 8 \\ & \text { superintendent }[35] \\ & -6: 7,8: 3,9: 23,23: 8, \\ & 23: 12,25: 7,29: 2, \\ & 32: 2,37: 24,38: 13, \\ & 41: 26,44: 1,49: 22, \\ & 53: 5,53: 12,59: 24, \\ & 60: 16,77: 4,78: 13, \\ & 79: 5,79: 6,81: 12, \\ & 82: 10,83: 16,91: 12, \\ & 95: 1,103: 7,104: 8, \\ & 121: 9,121: 26,124: 6, \\ & 127: 3,127: 14, \\ & 129: 12,133: 13 \end{aligned}$ <br> SUPERINTENDENT <br> [22]-2:15, 3:3, 3:3, <br> 3:4, 3:5, 3:6, 3:8, 3:9, <br> 3:9, 3:13, 3:14, 3:17, <br> 3:19, 3:19, 3:21, 5:3, <br> 6:4, 84:18, 101:14, <br> 103:13, 130:1, 131:17 <br> Superintendent [56] <br> - 9:21, 16:5, 17:6, <br> 17:24, 19:21, 23:14, <br> 26:7, 32:24, 40:22, <br> 40:27, 41:2, 46:19, <br> 53:20, 54:23, 54:28, <br> 55:2, 55:8, 59:26, <br> 61:12, 63:4, 63:12, <br> 63:24, 66:9, 73:17, <br> 77:8, 77:28, 78:27, <br> 80:10, 80:14, 80:15, <br> 81:1, 82:18, 83:10, <br> 84:10, 84:21, 95:3, <br> 95:13, 96:11, 96:21, <br> 97:13, 100:16, <br> 101:18, 102:22, <br> 103:16, 104:19, <br> 104:27, 105:11, <br> 105:16, 106:21, <br> 109:20, 113:12, <br> 122:24, 124:8, 127:6, <br> 127:28, 128:16 <br> superiors [2] - <br> 20:18, 108:22 <br> supervision [2] - <br> 85:11, 85:19 <br> supervisors [1] - <br> 124:25 <br> supplied [1] - 83:3 <br> support [2]-103:6, <br> 113:18 <br> supported [2] - <br> 41:11, 114:26 <br> supportive [6] - <br> 56:6, 84:24, 102:26, <br> 103:1, 103:3, 110:26 <br> suppose $[7]-21: 29$, <br> 57:29, 71:12, 81:16, | $\qquad$ <br> 88:10, 88:22, 130:4 <br> supposedly [1] 94:6 <br> supposition [1] 87:12 <br> surely ${ }_{[1]}$ - 66:7 <br> surrounding ${ }_{[1]}$ - <br> 12:4 <br> suspected [2] - <br> 80:13, 83:5 <br> suspicion [3] - <br> 88:22, 88:25, 89:2 <br> system [1] - 79:29 <br> SÍOCHÁNA [1] - 3:2 <br> Síochána [8] - 45:16, <br> 46:4, 78:23, 99:16, <br> 101:6, 103:18, <br> 117:12, 132:6 | ```tested [1] - 124:19 text [10]-49:19, 50:2, 50:3, 50:11, 51:22, 52:19, 52:22, 52:24, 58:13, 75:5 texts [1] - 58:15 thanked [1] - 106:4 THE [11] - 1:3, 1:7, 1:8, 1:13, 2:3, 2:6, 6:1, 82:5, 133:17, 134:1, 134:8 theme [1] - 123:4 themes [1]-106:11 themselves [2] - 45:18, 45:19 THEN [9] - 82:5, 84:18, 101:14, 103:13, 130:1, 131:17, 133:17, 134:1, 134:8 theoretical [1] - 41:4 therefore [1]-78:25 thick [1] - 98:6 thinking [5] - 12:3, 39:17, 66:27, 72:25, 76:15 thinks [3] - 94:11, 128:13, 128:15 third [4]-63:26, 64:3, 82:29, 97:26 thoughts [3] - 38:4, 38:20, 39:1 three [10] - 19:13, 29:24, 29:27, 54:2, 56:18, 62:18, 73:14, 75:4, 84:7, 122:14 throughout [3] - 42:23, 83:24, 88:8 throw [1]-57:29 thrust [1]-84:23 THURSDAY[1] - 134:8 Thursday [2] - 118:12, 118:14 tie [1] - 99:21 ties [1] - 127:8 tight [3] - 48:14, 48:15 timeframe [1] - 30:18 timeline [1] - 118:5 TO[1] - 6:4 to.. [1]-27:20 today [5] -49:3, 51:4, 62:11, 102:24, 119:25 together [5] - 7:9, 38:5, 38:20, 39:1, 100:3 toll[1]-124:21 Tom [9] - 14:3, 14:4,``` | 14:9, 14:11, 14:24, 14:27, 14:29, 21:4, 32:7 <br> TOM ${ }_{[1]}-3: 12$ <br> tomorrow [4]-51:9, <br> 51:11, 62:11, 134:5 <br> tongue [1] -90:5 <br> took [14]-8:19, <br> 10:12, 41:10, 48:21, <br> 51:2, 72:6, 83:22, <br> 83:25, 84:3, 84:7, <br> 91:3, 121:10, 123:12, <br> 124:7 <br> top [3]-91:16, <br> 94:18, 124:4 <br> total [1] - 44:12 <br> totally [6] - 29:20, <br> 38:28, 41:10, 57:8, <br> 116:8, 116:14 <br> touch [2]-28:2, 28:5 <br> touched [1] - 130:18 <br> towards [5] - 84:24, <br> 85:4, 109:7, 110:9, <br> 126:18 <br> town [2]-89:11, <br> 89:16 <br> TOWNPARKS ${ }_{[1]}$ - <br> 2:12 <br> track [1] - 92:14 <br> trade [1] - 90:6 <br> trade.. [1] - 107:14 <br> trained [1] - 42:20 <br> transcript [2]-1:25, <br> 125:11 <br> transfer [3] - 80:29, <br> 84:8, 125:1 <br> TREACY ${ }_{[1]}-2: 27$ <br> Treacy [14]-31:15, <br> 31:22, 33:25, 47:6, <br> 53:29, 54:13, 92:18, <br> 93:12, 98:17, 98:19, <br> 99:19, 99:23, 111:11, <br> 111:25 <br> Treacy's [7]-31:20, <br> 91:28, 93:14, 93:15, <br> 115:3, 123:7, 123:13 <br> treated ${ }_{[1]}-85: 14$ <br> treatment [2] - <br> 83:25, 113:20 <br> TRIBUNAL [2] - 1:2, 2:6 <br> Tribunal [14]-7:20, <br> 15:1, 20:23, 93:15, <br> 94:28, 95:8, 103:20, <br> 103:22, 113:29, <br> 128:14, 128:17, <br> 128:22, 130:11, 134:4 <br> Tribunal's [1] - 84:29 <br> TRIBUNALS ${ }_{[1]}-1: 8$ <br> trigger [1]-129:8 |
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[^0]:    "The inf ormation di vul ged by Olivia O' Neill to Garda Stephani e Treacy on the 28th May..."

[^1]:    "The matters outlined in his intelligence report are of a very serious nature. The difficulty that arises for

[^2]:    "Garda Keogh sai d he knew nothing about it or any part of it, even the content of the story, and if he had the

[^3]:    "Conversation with Li am McHugh: I attach for your i nf ormati on correspondence recei ved from Garda Ni chol as

