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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVS, ON MDNDAY, 2ND
DECEMBER 2019:

CHAL RMAN Yes, Mr. Marrinan.

MR. MARRI NAN The witness for today, Chairman, is
10:33
Chief Superintendent Pat Murray, please.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.

## CH EF SUPERI NTENDENT PAT MURRAY MAS DI RECTLY- EXAM NED

BY MR MARRI NAN, AS FOLLOVG:

WTNESS: Chief Superintendent Pat Murray.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Good morning, chief superintendent.
WTNESS: Good morning, Chairman.
MR. MARRI NAN Chief superintendent, would you mind just giving a résumé of your time in An Garda Síochána to the Chairman, please?
A. I was attested as a member of An Garda Síochána in Ju7y of 1982 and from ' 82 until ' 89 I served here in the city at garda rank and then I was transferred to midlands, where $I$ served at garda rank in different stations until 2002, when I was promoted to sergeant, transferred back to the city again, and a year later I transferred back to the midlands again as a sergeant in Tullamore for a period before my promotion to inspector in 2006. On promotion to inspector, I was transferred to the Wicklow-Wexford division, as it was
then, and is soon to be again. I spent two years there and then I was transferred back to the midlands again, to Tullamore as an inspector. In 2010 I was promoted to superintendent, transferred to Gort in County Galway. While there, in October '13, district amalgamations occurred countrywide during that time, because of the district $I$ was in then, Superintendent Finn was being amalgamated with a neighbouring district, I was transferred to a regional position in traffic policing. I held that role until my transfer to Athlone on 9th March '15, albeit it was superimposed with a second position as superintendent in Roscommon district, from June '14 until March '15.

CHA RMAN Thank you.
2 Q. MR. MARRI NAN During your time in service in Galway, 10:35 was Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin in the Western Region at that time?
A. When I went to Galway first, I met, who was then chief superintendent, Donal ó Cualáin, for the first time, in 2010. So he was my divisional officer or my next person in the chain of manned when I was in Galway, until his promotion to assistant commissioner.
3 Q. Did you have a close working relationship with him?
A. No.

4 Q. Were you friendly with him in any way?
A. No, not at all.

5 Q. Did you socialise with him?
A. No.

6 Q. I am asking you those questions --
A. Yes, no, I appreciate that.

7 Q. -- you appreciate --
A. Yeah.

8 Q. -- there is a suggestion that there was --
A. I do.

9 Q. -- some sort of closeness between the two of you?
A. No, there wasn't.

10 Q. Were you involved in any major investigation was him?
A. No.

11 Q. You say that for a period of that time you were in the traffic corps, is that right?
A. When I was transferred into that then, Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin, as he was then, because during my time as a district officer there he was promoted to assistant commissioner, I think he went to Cork for some time, if I am correct, and he came back then to head up the Western Region as the assistant commissioner.

12 Q. Yes.
A. And it was in that period that I was transferred to the 10:37 traffic policing, a regional role in traffic policing in the Western Region.
13 Q. Now, I think you put in your statement, it's at page 2038, and we will be going through this as well as other documentation, but at the outset of your statement you said that you have over 36 and a half years of service up until the time when you made the statement?
A. That's right. That has increased a bit now, yeah.

14 Q. You wanted to point out to the Tribunal that you weren't the subject-matter of any disciplinary sanctions whatsoever, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

15 Q. If you would expand on that yourself.
A. Yes. In that 36 and a half years $I$ have never been the subject of a disciplinary sanction and I have never had a complaint made against me under the policy document, working together to create a positive working environment, which is in effect a bullying and harassment or sexual harassment. So I feel I have annum blemished career in An Garda Síochána until these allegations.
16 Q. How was it that you came to be transferred to Athlone? what is the process?
A. So when I -- I live around the midlands and I have done so for a number of years, and that's why, I suppose, I have always headed back there after periods on transfer on promotion. In Gort, I think, in 2011 I applied for a transfer back to Laois-Offaly or westmeath division. Nothing happened. I renewed it in 2013, before the amalgamation happened, and nothing happened again. The opportunity came then and I was notified of a transfer to Athlone on 27th February, I think, 2015. That application being in there, in Human Resources at that time in 2011 and renewed again in 2013.
17 Q. So, you note that it's the Garda Commissioner who decides --
A. Yes, I served at the pleasure of the Garda Commissioner
and you're entrusted with a role in a particular area at the behest of the Garda Commissioner. I think the time I was transferred to Athlone there were 78 officers appeared on just one bulletin itself at that time. So that had never happened before, where there'd 10:39 be so many officers transferred. And it was a time that former Commissioner O'Sullivan had taken over the role of Commissioner, and I think that she was, I suppose, laying down a marker or transferring people around to where she felt they were best fit and I think 10:40 newspapers at the time will reflect that this was a remarkable thing or an unusual thing to happen. And I was on that bulletin with 78 other officers, as was Superintendent McBrien, who I replaced.
18 Q. Had you heard of anything in relation to the problems that had then arisen in relation to Athlone Garda Station?
A. No. I didn't know anybody in Athlone. I had never worked there before or never worked with anybody there before. And I really didn't know anything about the station or the district or the division, indeed, at that time.

19 Q. Had you heard of Garda Nicholas Keogh?
A. Yes, I did, a year previously, in the media. I remember watching it on television the night that it 10:40 became public knowledge that he was embarking on this process.

20 Q. Did you know that he had made a protected disclosure?
A. Just from that time, yeah.
Q. In relation to alleged wrongdoing in Ath1one Garda Station?
A. Just what was in the media at the time. I remember particularly Deputy Flanagan asking people to clap him into the station at ten o'clock when he was coming on duty. I remember that distinctly. I think I was at home, sitting at home when I heard that.
Q. Did you know that Assistant Commissioner Donal ó Cualáin was conducting an investigation in relation to matters concerning Athlone Garda Station?
A. Not before going to Athlone, no.
Q. Were you aware of the fact that there was an investigation in relation to matters that arose out of Garda Keogh's protected disclosures?
A. Well, my experience would tell me that there would be an investigation, but until $I$ got to Athlone I didn't know the extent of it or who was doing it or what it was about.
Q. I think there were other matters pertaining to Athlone that we have heard from Superintendent MCBrien in relation to the Roma baby controversy. Were you aware of that?
A. Not until I got there again. Again, I knew broadly from the media that this had occurred and it was associated with another similar incident in Tallaght.
And outside of that, I didn't really have any understanding of its impact on Ath1one until I got there.
Q. Now, I think that in the first instance on your
transfer there was a -- you met with Noreen McBrien, is that right, on 4th March 2015?
A. I did, yes.

Can you just deal with what happened at that meeting that you had with her?
A. That was one of three handover meetings I had that day. I was relinquishing the two roles I held and I had two handover meetings with officers who were taking over from me. I met Superintendent McBrien in the middle of that process in Athlone. It was unremarkable as far as 10:43 I was concerned. We discussed the policing plan, the different areas of that. She showed me around the station, which comprised of three separate buildings unconnected to each other. I met some people who were around there. We had a discussion in her office for a short period and she was having a function that evening in the canteen while I was there to, it was her last day I think and she wouldn't have been returning, so there was a small function arranged for her in the kitchen which she asked me to go to, and I didn't. I didn't fee1 it appropriate to go there until I actually transferred. So the meeting didn't last that long. I met Inspector Farre11 and Inspector Minnock there at the time and I spoke to them. Superintendent McBrien was busy herself. She had boxes all around the office 10:44 and she was preparing to leave and that was the last time she would have been in Athlone, I think that day. I asked Superintendent McBrien whether or not there were any $H Q$ directives or circulars in relation to the
handover meeting and whether or not particular matters should be addressed at that meeting when handing over to a new superintendent coming into the district. were you aware of any directives or circulars being brought in in relation to that?
A. I am, indeed, yeah. I am. I don't have the actual, I suppose, number of it on the top of my head now, but there is a circular in relation to handover. And we would have, I suppose, followed that format in terms of discussing policing issues.
A. It outlines, I suppose, the format in relation to policing plan and the handover process that would occur. And I suppose it encourages a transfer of information in relation to that policing plan and how it's working and resources, budgets, and all the myriad of different issues associated, I suppose, with the role and responsibilities of a superintendent. And there are 40 of them outlined in chapter 3 of the Garda Code, volume 1.
29 Q. Is one of those particular welfare issues concerning any members in the district?
A. Yes. Resources is one of the issues that would be discussed, yeah.
Q. Do you recall whether Superintendent MCBrien discussed Garda Keogh at that meeting?
A. She had a file with her which she was handing over to me and it was in terms of that the discussion came up. 31 Q. Just tell us about that discussion?
A. It was about the file mostly and it was a file of claims that Garda Keogh had made sometime ago but that hadn't been paid. Superintendent --

32 Q. Did she say to you this is Garda Keogh who is --
A. Yes, yes, indeed.
A. Yes.

34 Q. Who is a confidential reporter?
A. Yes.

Did she say that to you?
A. She did. She explained to me that Garda Keogh had made those claims, that was a confidential reporter and that she had been engaging with him in relation to his welfare.
Q. Did she expand on that?
A. She explained to me in relation to the file itself, that she didn't feel she could pay those claims. That she tried to discuss it with him but didn't feel that he was up to doing it. I think she mentioned that she had done that in February of '15. Look it, I didn't pass much comment on it, I didn't know much about Athlone. So I said, look, just leave it with me and I will deal with it when I arrive. I think she was happy with that.
37 Q. Did she indicate to you whether or not in her view this 10:47 was a substantial matter that ought to be addressed with Garda Keogh?
A. She didn't portray it as a substantial matter to me. It was a very normal matter in my mind, it had to be
dealt with. There were monies owed to him, but until the matter was dealt with, the monies couldn't be approved, I suppose, for payment.
Did she discuss Garda Keogh's welfare and what had been put in place to support him?
A. She explained that she had been liaising with him directly herself mostly and that he had issues with the use of alcohol. Other than that, no.
Did she say to you that he had previously had an alcohol addiction problem?
A. No, she didn't go that far, no.

40 Q. Her account of this meeting is at page 6245 of the materials, please. It's at Volume 21. If we can scroll down to 1ine 630. Have you got that there? She says:
"On the 4th March I met Superintendent Pat Murray. It was a handover meeting. I was coming back, as l hadn't been in Athl one in a while due to ill ness and there were matters to di scuss regarding the budget, wel fare i ssues, members on long-termsick leave and operational matters, to incl ude the Assi stant Commi ssi oner Ó Cual ái $n$ i nvesti gation. "

Do you recall her discussing that?
A. No.

41 Q. "Garda Keogh woul d have been di scussed under wel fare matters. I woul d have expl ai ned that Garda Keogh and I had met several times and our meeting on 4th February

2015, and I woul d have expl ai ned that the reason the car tax matter hadn't progressed was due to both my ill ness and the fact that I was very concerned regarding his presentation on 4th February 2015."
A. Yes.
A. Around the use of alcohol at the time, she didn't feel he was up to discussing it.
44 Q. I suppose there's two matters. First of all, she is indicating that is this a matter that went back sometime and that she hadn't dealt with it and one of the reasons that she hadn't dealt with it was her own personal illness and she had been away from the Garda station?
A. She did mention that, from October, I think, that she'd had recurrence of a long standing illness, which kept her away, yeah.

45 Q. And then the second limb then is that she had met with Garda Keogh on 4th February 2015 and that because of his presentation at that meeting -- what did you take her to mean by that?
A. I didn't -- I wasn't really sure. She said she had been dealing with him personally, that alcohol was an issue and she didn't feel he was up to discussing it at that time. I didn't, I suppose, press her on it. I
took her at her word. I said, look it, I'11 deal with the file when I arrive, don't worry about it. We discussed other people who had welfare issues as well. There were a couple of people out on long-term sick and they came into the conversation, in the same way as

Garda Keogh did, there wasn't a special emphasis on Garda Keogh. we11, if we can just deal with this aspect of it and the conversation that you had surrounding Garda Keogh. was there a sense or did you get a sense from Superintendent McBrien that this was a matter that she was dealing with personally with Garda Keogh?
A. Yes, I did, that no one else knew about it.

47 Q. Now, not just in relation to the car tax but generally in relation to aspects of his welfare?
A. I wasn't sure. She said she had dealt with him herself, but I didn't press her in terms of what the arrangements were in the district.hadn't confronted him with the car tax issue on the 4th February may have been as a result of his particular vulnerability?
A. No.

49 Q. Because of his drinking and other issues?
A. No.

50 Q. On 4th February 2015?
A. No, I didn't get a sense of that.

51 Q. You didn't get that sense from her?
A. No.

52
Q. Did you discuss the issue of whether or not this might be something over which he ought to be disciplined?
A. No, absolutely not.
Q. Now, I think that at various stages of your statement you've described what you describe as a "pal pable air of fear" when you arrived in Athlone Garda Station. Would you like to expand on that and just tell us what you mean by that?
A. I suppose, I set about trying to meet people early on and I felt that a range of controversies that were explained to me, that had attracted national media attention, had an impact on confidence, I suppose, in particularly the supervisory roles. Superintendent McBrien listed some of those and the Roma baby situation, and there were a number of other issues that ${ }_{10: 53}$ attracted national media attention to Athlone in terms of perhaps more practices and issues like that. And I'm conscious that I'm in a public forum, those issues were significant for people who were there.
54 Q. Now, I think that you took up your role as superintendent, was it the 9th March?
A. The 9th March.

At that time did you contact Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin?
A. No.

57 Q. Had you been advised what welfare supports had been put in place for Garda Keogh?
A. No.

58 Q. Did you make any enquiry in relation to what welfare supports were being put in place in respect of Garda Keogh?
A. No.

59 Q. Why not?
A. I didn't see it as something that I needed to deal with in that way until sometime arrived that $I$ had to deal with. I suppose in my early analysis, I looked at quite a lot of things. As I said to you, there were a couple of people who were out on long-term sick leave with serious welfare issues. I asked him about them. I asked about Garda Keogh. I suppose I didn't make any major enquiries. I was doing a general analysis across a whole number of areas and I suppose the controversy or, I suppose, the whistleblower investigation wasn't something that I had any knowledge of or wasn't high on my agenda, my emphasis was on what kind of a policing service was being delivered and the analysis that was involved around determining that.
60 Q. We11, you knew that Garda Keogh was a whistleblower?
A. Yes.

61 Q. You found out that Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin was conducting an investigation in Athlone Garda Station?
A. Yes.
A. Yes.

63 Q. You knew that Garda Keogh had issues in relation to an alcohol problem?
A. Yes.

64 Q. And at that stage were you aware of the fact that he had been out sick on a large number of occasions?
A. That became apparent to me when I started to conduct the analysis around resources and that, yeah.

65 Q. Did it become apparent to you that he was out sick because of work related stress?
A. I didn't know, other than what was on the certificates that were coming in.

66 Q. The certificates from?
A. Medical certificates from his GP.

67 Q. Yes. Which stated work related stress?
A. Yes.

68 Q. So you were aware of the fact that he was out, having been certified by his doctor certainly as suffering from work related stress?
A. So the absences from my analysis were intermittent and there were some short-term, some a bit longer and then they would be encapsulated with periods of working and then missing again.
69 Q. And all certified as being absent because of work related stress?
A. That's what the -- the certificates that were submitted by Garda Keogh indicated that, yeah.
70 Q. And you had also been advised that he had a drink problem?
A. Yes.

71 Q. Did you get any sense that the work related stress might be feeding into the drink problem?
A. I suppose the sense I got was it might be the opposite, that the drink problem might be feeding into the work related stress.

72 Q. Would you just expand on that, please, and tell us what you mean by that?
A. I suppose, I learned that drink had been a major factor in his life for quite some time.
Q. Who did you learn that from?
A. From -- in the first couple of days from Sergeant Haran, when I met him.
Q. Yes.
A. And drinking was a factor in his life.
Q. Did he say that he suffered from work related stress arising from that?
A. He didn't mention work related stress to me, Sergeant Haran.

78 Q. Just go on, would you just tell us what you mean by the drink feeding into the work related stress?
A. Well, the drinking was dominating his life, as it was explained to me, at that time.

79 Q. I am just wondering about that. We'11 come to deal with your first meeting with Garda Keogh, which was on the 26th March, in due course. what sort of picture had you formed in your mind of Garda Keogh before you came to meet him on the 26th March?
A. I didn't form any picture of him whatsoever. I was totally neutral in the situation. I was meeting him for the first time and so I had no picture formed whatsoever, other than to try and offer him any support that I could to help him to deal with any issues he was 10:59 having.
80 Q. We11, you have indicated to us that having discussed the matter with Sergeant Haran and then having viewed the medical certificates, where it stated work related stress, that you thought that maybe his alcohol problem 10:59 was to the fore and that fed in some way in relation to the work related stress?
A. Yeah, and that became apparent to me as the months passed on, yeah.
81 Q. No, but what I am dealing with is before you even meet 11:00 Garda Keogh?
A. Oh well, that's not how I took your question there.

82 Q. Yes.
A. You know, $I$ took it in the over all context.

83 Q. In the over all?
A. Yes.

84 Q. Al1 right, that's fine. From experience, you're saying?
A. Yes.

85
A. No, I hadn't formed no -- I had no view formed, other than I didn't get an opportunity to meet him until the 26th March. I couldn't form a view because I never met the man before.
87 Q. Now, I think you point out in your statement that you decided to introduce a number of initiatives with a view to improving standards, accountability and governance, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

88 Q. I think that that is set out at page 2039 of the materials?
A. Yes.

89 Q. Whilst we don't need to go through them all, and you have listed them there from $A$ to $v$, if we just deal with the first one there:
"The performance and account ability framework in Athl one di strict."

That is a document that is at page 2085 of the material, if we could just have that up on the screen? If we just look at this in a little bit of detail.
A. Sure.

90 Q. You may want a hard copy, do you?
A. Yes.

91 Q. Yes, okay. It's page 2085 of the material and it's Volume 8. This is addressed to the sergeants in charge, it is dated 21st Apri1 2015. You set out there:
"Having spoken to each of you in the short period l have been in Athl one, I understand and share your appreciation of the need for a robust di strict account ability process."

And then you point out the objectives of the framework, of the performance and accountability framework. And then you say:
"With your assistance I intend to make some slight changes to the excellent systemthat is al ready in pl ace, which is as follows:

Phase 1..."

You go to deal with the streamlining of the daily PAF meetings, is that right?
A. Yes.

92 Q. You say:
"It will be hel d each Mbnday to Friday at 10: 30 in the superintendent's office. The superintendent,
inspector, sergeant in charge, duty sergeant, detective sergeant and PAF admini strator will attend. Any
sergeant on duty in Mbte or Kilbeggan will continue via phone direct to the reeting. The reeting shall take no longer than 15 to 20 minutes."

Then you set out what the agenda will be. Are notes taken at that PAF meeting?
A. The format of it was that the sergeant in charge would, I suppose, present the incidents for the previous 24 hours to the meeting, using what's called the 003 report and incident summary sheets. And they would really form the minutes.
93 Q. Are notes taken by anybody?
A. The sergeant in charge may take some notes, depending on what it is, but I didn't take notes. I chaired the meeting.
94 Q. So it's a meeting that's not minuted, is that right?
A. Not minuted to any great extent, no. It's a review type meeting. There would be some actions and decisions taken from it.
Q. I think the first bullet-point is:
"The revi ew of Pul se incidents created in the preceding 24 hours from 7amto 7pm
A. Yes.

96 Q. So is that all entries on Pulse during that period of time?
A. All entries on Pulse, and in 2015 there were some 9,000
of those.
97 Q. On a daily basis how many would you expect there to be?
A. Somewhere around 30 plus.
98 Q. And ones reporting criminality, how many would there be?
A. That would depend on the level of criminal activity.

99 Q. Yes, I know.
A. But there could be are somewhere between 10 to 15 .

100
Q. A day?
A. Yes.

101 Q. Then it says:
"The sergeant in charge, using of the Pul se report 003, which will become the meeting minutes --"

That's what was accepted?
A. Yes.

102 Q. " -- will outline the incidents which occurred."
A. Yes.

103 Q. So that's is the sergeant in charge, we'11 say, in 11:05 relation to Athlone Garda Station?
A. Athlone Garda Station, yeah.

104 Q. Will go through each of the incidents, is that right?
A. Right across the district, yeah.

105 Q. Then there will be a review of all intelligence entries 11:06 created on Pulse in the preceding 24 -hour period. And again, the sergeant in charge will outline the entries. Then you go on to deal with issues of number of prisoners, resource allocation for the period, sickness absence and any other business?
A. Yes.
Q. So, if members were out sick, that would be highlighted at that meeting?
A. Yes.
Q. Phase 2 then is:
"The creation of one Excel list which will capture each 11:06 inci dent di scussed at the daily PAF meeting requi ring follow up action of any kind."

Can you tell us what that was designed to do?
A. So, at that time there was no IT system of an any kind to capture the monitoring of those crimes, volume crime or any kind of crime. And so, after speaking with the key people in the management positions in Athlone, we designed the system as a foundation or a bedrock through which we would do our business. That Excel sheet would capture incidents from the morning meeting that needed follow up action and monitoring until close off.

109 Q. Give us an example, perhaps, of what follow up action might be needed in any particular case?
A. So, if a criminal damage incident were reported. So it would be important that the file would be seen through to conclusion in that, that statements would be taken, any enquiries or lead developed and made and if there
were arrests to follow, that that would happen. That the court prosecution would happen. That the victim would be kept informed fully throughout the process. And that the, I suppose, incident would be taken through using that system from its inception until it was closed off in some way, by either being marked inactive because of unavailability of avenues of inquiry, or that would lead to a prosecution and the court process and all that entails.
110 Q. So in the first instance this Excel list is created at the first PAF meeting, is that right?
A. Yes, at the initiation. When we would review the incident in the morning, if follow up action was required we would put it on that list and the investigating guard and their sergeant will get an
e-mail directing them to the list, to indicate what was required. And those lists then would be reviewed every Monday with sergeants of a particular unit as is referred to them, if that Monday or that date coincided with a review of that incident. It wouldn't be always crime incidents, there would be many types of incidents on Pulse that required follow up action.

111 Q. And that's at a separate meeting on Mondays at 2:30pm; is that right?
A. Correct, yeah.

112 Q. You say:

[^0]rel ating to certain inci dents will al so be examined to ensure the actions requi red are actually carried out."
A. That's right.

113 Q. Is that right?
A. Inspector Minnock undertook that role.

114 Q. You have a daily review of the Pulse entries and any crimes that have been committed?
A. Yes.

115
Q. Is that right?
A. Yes.

116 Q. It is anticipated an e-mail would be sent to the sergeants and to the members who were investigating?
A. Yes.

117 Q. Is that right?
A. Yes.

118 Q. And then on a weekly basis the file is reviewed at 2:30pm on a Monday?
A. Not every file. So there would be a date selected on the first day as to when the file would be reviewed.
119 Q. Yes.
A. That would coincide with a period of time that would be allowed to make that happen and it would also have to coincide with when that particular unit were working on Monday afternoon, that the sergeant would be available. so it was associated with the roster that people were 1:10 working, the reviews.

120 Q. Would you just help us in relation to the role of a supervising sergeant? what do you understand the role to be of a supervising sergeant?
A. I suppose their primary role is to manage the Garda resources under their command. They also would have, I suppose, a list of -- or roles in areas of district policing and district portfolios that are created for the sergeants across, I think, off the top of my head, 109 different areas of policing that were divided between the 13 sergeants to, I suppose, monitor and assist me in ensuring that a professional service was being delivered across a myriad of policing demands that would be relevant to the district. And what about the supervision of individual gardaí in relation to their work?
A. Yeah, absolutely. Absolutely. And that's why those lists and the sergeant -- the review of the sergeant -with the sergeant was important in terms of ensuring that they would ensure that that work was done through the members that they were supervising.
122 Q. This is something that is going to arise obviously in relation to some of the issues and the investigations that were scrutinised in relation to Garda Keogh and issues that arose. Would one expect that the sergeant, the supervising sergeant who receives a report from onwards transmission to the superintendent, would have a role and function in relation to ensuring that the member has in fact sent in a report that would stand up 11:12 to scrutiny?
A. In the ideal world, that would be nice.

123 Q. But would that be your expectation?
A. Yes, absolutely. Yeah, if possible, yeah.
Q. And if he didn't do so, that would in part be his failing as well as the member's failing, isn't that right?
A. We11, I suppose that depends on the individual sergeant and what issues they might be having with individual members. You know, it's a difficult one to generally comment on.
Q. Yes.
A. Would be introduced on 1st May '15.

127 Q. Yes.
A. And 4 and 5 were introduced shortly after then. I think my -- I have included it in my statement.

128 Q. You then, in the second last paragraph, say:
"As the framework is desi gned to ensure the adequate accountability and information exchange exists in the Athl one di strict, l ask each member to engage with and embrace the framework in order to further devel op the excellent pol icing service that al ready exists.

Please bring to the attention of each member."

Insofar as you can assist in relation to this, how did this change and alter the position that previously
existed in Athlone?
A. Em, I suppose in my time there early on, there were some issues that hadn't been brought to conclusion, that had, as it were, maybe slipped through the cracks of the existing system that had been there. And I felt 11:14 that, I suppose, we could look at that again to create a more effective and efficient system. And the key people in Athlone sat around the table with me in designing that. It wasn't just me alone, I was assisted by the key people on my team in Athlone, who also saw a need to create efficiency and effectiveness, if possible, and improve things.
129 Q. If we could go back to your list then at 2039. There's the PAF issue at $A$ and then $B$ is a district policing and accountability process; $C$ is a process to identify staff kills,; D an expenditure audit governance measure; and then E high visibility patrolling initiative?
A. Yes.

130 Q. And then $F$ :

## "A systemto ensure account ability around the

 investi gative process for vol ume crime on 19th June 2015. "We will have a quick look at that, if we could. This is page 2099.
A. Yes.

131 Q. Again, you might want a hard copy, chief
superintendent.
A. I have it, yes. Thank you.
Q. Now, this is dated the 19th June, it's addressed to each sergeant and each member in Athlone and it's headed "the investigation and vol ume of crime and the accountability process".
"The new process will operate as follows: Crime reported or di scovered will be entered on Pul se as soon as possible."

Was that not previously being done?
A. We11, I was re-emphasising what should be done always.
Q. "The inci dent revi ew process at the daily PAF meeting --" that's what we just previous7y discussed? 11:16
A. Yes.
Q. " -- will examine each crime."
A. Yes.
Q. "A request for a he crime file will be displayed on the tasking list col umm on the PAF admini stration system and e-mailed to the to the investi gating member and nomi nated supervi sor imedi at el y after the daily meetings."

Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. "The i nvesti gating nember will compl ete each section of the attached crime file fol der and insert all original statements and correspondence rel ating to the crime
into the fol der. When all avenues of enquiry are exhausted, the investigating nember will submit the crime file to their nominated supervisors, usually by the due date on the PAF list, who will revi ew the file, compl eting the last page of the manila fol der and submit it to the district office."
A. Yes.

137 Q. Just explain to us, how was that to work in practice? The file is reviewed at the daily PAF meeting -- not the file, the crime is reviewed?
A. Yes, and a request would be made for a crime file, if that was the decision of the meeting, and that would be communicated on the tasking list, as indicated in the document.

138 Q. Then it says:
"The di strict officer or acting district officer will then revi ew and close of $f$ the file or return it for further action."
A. Yes.

139 Q. "If all avenues of enqui ry have been exhausted and no leads exists, the district officer or acting district officer will mark the investigation of the crime inactive and send the crime file to the PAF admini stration office at the victins office for

And then you deal with the victims over the page, at 2100. The victims office staff, we needn't go into
that. Then:
"This process is bei ng introduced to ensure An Garda Sí ochána in Athl one di strict are provi ding an accountable transparent response to the investigation of vol une crime.

Please bring to the attention of each member for strict compl i ance. "

And that was the view that you took in relation to that?
A. Yes.

140 Q. And that you expected that there would be strict compliance with that, is that right?
A. I had hoped that there would, yeah. I was trying to set a standard which we could all aspire to.
141 Q. Then if we go back to your list at 2039 of the various initiatives that you introduced. We were at $F$ and then G: "A di strict policing and performance reporting structure to the chi ef superintendent."

And then H :
"A governance accountability and transparency policy in 11:19 rel ation to the detection and prosecution of crimes."
which was to be introduced on 14th August 2015. And then I:
"An instruction rel ating to the reporting of critical or serious inci dents, including excellent police work, on 18th August 2015."

If we could just look at that briefly, it's at page 2021 of the materials. And this was introduced by you -- sorry, it's 2121, I beg your pardon, Mr. Kavanagh. The first paragraph there is:
"All incidents of a critical or serious nature must be the subject of a short, concise report in addition to any entry made on Pul se."

What do you mean by "inci dents of a critical nature"?
A. So, I suppose, anything that would involve injury to people would be notorious in that way, attract public attention and, you know, something that would be, I suppose, critical in terms of its importance as outside the norm.

142 Q. Right. And then "serious nat ure", give us an idea of what that might...
A. Same, you know. The same, you know, same idea again. something that was serious, critical.
143 Q. Significant crimes that have been committed in the district, is that right?
A. Yeah, yeah. Ones involving injury to people, you know, yeah.

144 Q. Then you go on to say:
"Must be the subject of a short, conci se report--"
A. Yes.

145 Q. " -- in addition to any entry made on Pul se."
A. Yes.
Q. How would you define "short, concise report"?
A. We11, I suppose the idea there was that the team would move into gear, as it were, immediately that something like that would happen. And that whoever had been dealing with the incident initially had to leave or finish duty, that people taking up would have a good knowledge of the key areas that had been dealt with, so as that the information would be available to those taking over. So that, I suppose, an incident response would take place in order that we could use that golden 11:22 period as soon as possible after a crime or incident is committed, to gather as much evidence as possible.
147 Q. You go on to say:
"A report in addition to the Pul se entry is necessary 11:22 in order that local and di visional management are aware of the background surrounding all critical or serious i nci dents either reported or di scovered by menbers."

That would indicate that this was a matter that really 11:22 was for management?
A. It's also important that management would be aware. And at that time, management, when they were away from the station, had access to emails on their phones but
not Pulse.
148 Q. We11, I am just wondering what is required and when it's required. It's obviously required in
circumstances where the incident is critical or serious?
A. Yes.

149 Q. That's is the first thing?
A. Yes.

150 Q. The second thing is, this is in addition to what would go on Pulse?
A. Absolutely.

151 Q. So there's an obligation to put the relevant details on Pulse of the crime, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

152 Q. It's the Pulse incident that is reviewed and had been reviewed up until the introduction of this on the 18th August, it was the Pulse that had been reviewed to determine what occurred?
A. It's not uncommon for members, before finishing duty, to leave a report of incidents that they had attended
in addition to what would be on Pulse. That wouldn't be uncommon beforehand. Indeed, this is all captured at chapter 33 of the Code. There's nothing really new in this.
153 Q. There's nothing new in it?
A. No, it's in the Code, chapter 33. It's a reemphasis of that. It had been re-emphasised to us in Athlone, I think sometime in March or April, after I arrived or just in or about that time, from the assistant
commissioner, to the chief, the superintendent's office and Inspector minnock had, I suppose, brought it to my attention again, that it had been, I suppose, re-emphasised and perhaps we could re-emphasise it again. I changed it slightly to try and capture good work as well, where people might, I suppose, outline good detections that had been made in that way, so as we could highlight these issues to the command structure in the Garda organisation.
154 Q. Yes. You go on to say that at in that paragraph.

In the second paragraph you say:
"To ensure the reporting system works swiftly, the sergeant on duty at the time the incident occurs, by either bei ng reported or di scovered, or in the sergeant's absence the station orderly or menber in charge, will repair a short, concise report and e-mail it to the district office e-mail and CCit to myself, Inspector Farrell, Inspector D/Sergeant Curley and sergeant in charge, Sergeant Baker."

That seems to put an obligation on the sergeant on duty at the time of the incident?
A. Or in his absence, yeah, the station orderly or the member in charge at the investigation.
155 Q. They're under an obligation to do a concise report?
A. Concise report and e-mail it, yeah.

156 Q. So is the concise report being done by the member or is
it being done by the sergeant or supervising sergeant?
A. well, if the supervising sergeant was there, I would prefer that he would do it, ideally, but sometimes he wouldn't always be there.

So what's envisaged in paragraph 1, a short or concise report, refers to a report that should be done by the sergeant, is that right?
A. In the ideal circumstances, if there was a sergeant on duty. I would expect him to know about the incident and outline, I suppose, the details on the report. Well, there's always a sergeant on duty, isn't that right?
A. Not always.

159 Q. Is there not a sergeant in charge of the station?
A. Well, that role is a daytime role.

160 Q. And in the absence of the sergeants, the obligation is on the station orderly or member in charge?
A. Yes.

161 Q. Is that right?
A. The station orderly or the member in charge of the investigation.
Q. Well, is it the member in charge of the investigation or is it the member in charge of the Garda station?
A. Well, the member in charge of the Garda station only has effect in relation to the detention of the the Criminal Justice Act 1984.
Q. okay. I would like to be clear in relation to this, I am sorry if I am going back over it again.
A. No problem.

164 Q. Paragraph one refers to an obligation that is placed in the first instance on the sergeant, is that right?
A. Yes, if the sergeant is on duty, yes. well, the obligation in the first paragraph refers to the sergeant in charge, is that right?
A. The sergeant in charge?

167 Q. Sergeant on duty?
A. Sergeant on duty, yeah.

168 Q. Yes.
A. Ideally, if that -- you know, in the ideal world, it would be sergeant on duty that would, I suppose, submit the short report.
169 Q. And in the absence of the sergeant on duty, then the obligation falls either on the station orderly --
A. Yes.

170 Q. -- or the member in charge of the investigation?
A. Yes.

171 Q. And then we go on to:
"Reports are requi red for all Pul se category types whi ch are deemed serious and likel y to generate community/ medi a interest."

> Is that right?
A. Yes.

172 Q. "I n addition, this reporting system should be used to hi ghl i ght excellent police work carried out."

Then, on page 2122:
"The foll owing inf ormation is the mi mum that is essential to provi de conci se and accurate details: The 11:29 date, time and place of occurrence; brief and concise narrative outlining the occurrence; details of all vi ctims, including age and gender; details of any arrests made or pl anned to incl ude power of arrest used, detention used, name, age, gender of persons arrested; the details of investigative steps taken and those pl anned or suggested; any ot her inf ormation deemed necessary to provi de a compl ete pi cture.

Please bring to the attention of each member for i mmedi ate information, implementation and for strict compl i ance. "

We then move on to item J: A process to restructure the existing crime and drug unit, which is to be
implemented on the 19th September. And then, a restructuring of the immigration services in the district on 22nd October 2015. And then, an
application to appoint resources to the district crime
unit was introduced on the 5th October. And then you say:
"Request for a risk assessment of Garda A in term of the role he hel d on 5th Oct ober 2015."

Now, the other initiatives that you introduced from $N$ to $V$ are all initiatives introduced after the 5th October, is that right?
A. Yes.

173 Q. And go through to 21st March of 2017, which were daily unit briefings, is that right?
A. Correct.

174 Q. Now, obviously, that's quite an extensive --
A. I suppose, I have five years experience in the rank of superintendent.
Q. Yes.
A. I served in three different roles. In addition to that, I suppose I wanted a performance leadership type approach myself and the organisation at the time had been coming under quite an amount of criticism in terms of the investigation of volume crime, governance and accountability and actioning. I suppose I was trying to allow my managerial expression improve and create efficiencies and effectiveness in the policing service that we were delivering to the community in the Athlone district. And the team, particularly the sergeants, were very willing to take part in that and they were innovative in their approach to it and I was delighted
to have that from them.
176 Q. Now, I think you go on in your statement to deal with 13th March 2015. You say at the request of Inspector Farrell you met sergeant Haran.
A. Yes. looking at his position with Garda keogh and from what he told me, I suppose he wanted a break, as it were, and he didn't want any perception to be created because of his entirely one handed support, one man support for

Garda Keogh, that there would be anything other than neutrality on his part. I could understand that when I listed to him. I asked him was now a good time for change to happen and he said he'd think about that. He didn't want to let down Garda Keogh in any way at all. That was the tone of the conversation. It wasn't a forced conversation, it was something that happened in a very natural way, out of the blue, and it was my first time to meet him.
180 Q. If we can just have page 11756 on the screen. This is a statement that Sergeant Haran made to our investigators. Line 115. We will start at line 113:
"I have been asked in respect of the above extract to comment on the veracity or otherwise of what has been attributed to me by Chi ef Superintendent Pat Murray."

That's in relation to your assertion that he was the person who raised this issue. He says:
"My recollection is that this was suggested to me. I was open to it and I had no issue with hi msaying that. l felt he, as my boss, was telling me it would be a good i dea. I thi nk that Superintendent Pat Murray felt that Sergeant Yvonne Martin would be better placed as an independent person and that it would be good to have her in that role. I saw myself as impartial and still feel the same way. I would like to clarify, I did not see myself as being the onl y person supporting Garda

Keogh. "

You see there, he's suggesting it was you who introduced the issue as to whether or not he should continue in his role supporting Garda Keogh.
A. Yeah.

Are you sure that it was he introduced it?
A. Yeah. I had never met Sergeant Haran before, so when he brought up Garda Keogh and the conversation arose in terms of what he had been doing, he said he was concerned that perhaps people didn't think he was neutral and out of that conversation came, I suppose, the suggestion, would he relinquish the role or like to relinquish it, was it too much for him, did he want to step back. And that was something he considered.

There was nothing forced or planned or anything about that, it was something that came up naturally during the course of conversation.

182 Q. At that time Sergeant Haran was engaged, I think in community policing, isn't that right?
A. He was.
Q. I think that Sergeant Moylan was Garda Keogh's supervising sergeant, isn't that right?
A. Yes, but he was absence quite a bit.

184 Q. He had other duties at that time to attend to, is that right?
A. He was involved with a the Association of Garda Sergeants and Inspectors at a national level and he was away very frequently in that role. .  4

185
Q. Yes.
A. And to, I suppose, allow Sergeant Haran to, I suppose, you know, move away, if that's what he wanted to do. And if Garda Keogh kept coming to him, it was up to Sergeant Haran to continue to engage with him or not. But there was an alternative, let's say, provided.
191 Q. Well, is this in relation to work issues or in relation to welfare issues?
A. In my mind, I had tried to separate welfare from work.

192 Q. Yes. Just to be clear in relation to this?
A. That was my intention, yeah.
Q. Sergeant Moylan's obligation as the supervising
sergeant --
A. Yes.

194 Q. -- referred to work issues, is that right?
A. Yes, work, absolutely.

195 Q. I suppose on occasions welfare issues might feed into that and over spil1 into that, isn't that right?
A. Yes. And that there would be, I suppose, someone there to deal with welfare issue.
Q. When he was away, then it was the role of Sergeant Haran to deal with work issues and he had also been dealing at that time with welfare issues in relation to them?
A. He had. I think it might have been quite draining on him, you know, he received quite an amount of calls at various times of the day and evening.
So clearly Sergeant Yvonne Martin wasn't going to have any responsibility in relation to the work issues?
A. No.
Q. It was purely from a welfare point of view?
A. Yes, absolutely, that was my intention. Sergeant Martin had her own unit to supervise. She, I suppose, was unconnected to the station before and had arrived a short time before I did.

199 Q. What was her unit at that time?
A. Oh I'm not sure. B, just off the top of my head. I 11:40 think it's B.

200 Q. If we could move on then. We dealt with a number of the meetings that you had. You had a meeting with Sergeant Haran. Did you also have a meeting with

Inspector Minnock? Several meetings with Inspector Minnock?
A. In relation to? I had many meetings with Inspector Minnock.
Q. The issue in relation to the car tax?
A. Oh yes, Inspector Minnock gave me the file that Superintendent McBrien said she would leave him. And I discussed it with him.
Q. If we could have 744 up on the screen, please? This is a search that was done by Inspector Minnock in relation to the car tax.
A. Yes.
Q. You can see there an e-mail that was sent to Tara McKinney in the motor taxation office, dated 19th March 2015. Was this done on your instructions?
A. I asked Inspector Minnock to make enquiries at the tax office to see what the factual position was in relation to Garda Keogh's tax.
Q. It was known that Garda Keogh had motor tax but the issue was whether or not it was in the right category, isn't that right?
A. Yes. The way it was explained to me was that it may not be in the correct category.
Q. It was being taxed as a goods vehicle?
A. Instead of private.

206 Q. Instead of private?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. The e-mail reads:
"Tara, I woul d be obliged if you could provi de me with the taxation hi story of -- "

Then a vehicle
" - particul arly covering the period June to Decenber 2014. "

That related to the timeframe of the claims that had been put in by Garda Keogh, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

208 Q. "I understand the vehi cle is taxed as per our records. However, I aminterested in the class of tax, private or commercial? If taxed as a commercial vehicle, I would be looking for a copy of the si gned decl aration that the vehicle is a goods vehi cle and would appreci ate a scanned copy of same or otherwi se a copy in the post."

Why were you looking for a declaration that might have been signed by Garda Keogh in relation to his motor tax?
A. I don't recal1 1ooking specifically for a declaration, I just looked to establish what was the tax situation with the vehicle.
209 Q. You think Inspector Minnock might have done that himself, is that right, of his own initiative?
A. I'd say so, because I didn't specifically ask for a declaration.
Q. Would it have been something that you would have asked for?
A. No. No. I merely wanted to establish what the factual position is with the tax before I met Garda Keogh to discuss it with him, so I was armed with accurate information. material. He deals at line 630 with the meeting on the 4th March. Sorry, that is the wrong -- I beg your pardon, we've got the wrong reference there. If we just move on from that for the moment. I just got the wrong reference to that. I will come back to that, if you don't mind.

So anyway, this was in the lead up to the meeting that you had on the 26th March with Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.

213 Q. What was in your mind when you to meet him? First of al1, where did the meeting take place?
A. In my office. The primary purpose of the meeting insofar as I was concerned was to pay the monies that were owed to him, if the issue could be solved with his tax.

214 Q. This is at 4:50pm. If we could just look at your note,
which is in volume 8 at 21887. Okay, perhaps can you go through this yourself in relation to your recall of the conversation that you had, aided by your note. This was the first time that you met him, is that right?
A. This was the first time I met him and he felt we had met before when he was a garda in Bray and I was an inspector in wicklow, but I didn't have any recollection of that meeting. I suppose the investigation came up in relation to his sick days and that was the first part of the conversation. I brought his frequent absences to his attention and I was trying to find out if I could, I suppose, support or help him to attend work more frequently. And I asked about the cause of them, the absences. He was vague about that, 11:47 he just said he didn't like to be there when certain people were there. And he explained that he had gone sick the Sunday previous because a certain member who was off came into the station. And he didn't want to say who that was.
215 Q. Did you know who it was anyway?
A. Yes, I did. I had an idea who it was, yeah.

216 Q. Is that Garda A?
A. Garda A.

217 Q. How did you become aware of that?
A. That came up in my conversations in Athlone during that month, that Garda A was the subject of Garda Keogh's allegations.
218 Q. Your note says:
"He was reticent to di scuss the ongoing investigation and his part in that."
A. Yeah.

219 Q. Did you bring up the subject of that?
A. I can't recall specifically who brought it up, but it came up in the course of his absences. You know, I was asking about the absences, the frequent absences and it came up in that.
You then go on to say: "I expl ai ned I was anxi ous 11:48 rel ease hi s in and out si ck days --"
A. Yes.

221 Q. " -- since l care and told himl felt it was not satisfactory --"
A. Yes.

222 Q. "-- re work, the organi sation his colleagues etcetera."
A. Yes.

223 Q. Had you already taken a view at that stage that his absence from work may not have been as a result of what was certified on the medical officer?
A. No, I did not. I had taken no view, I was only meeting him for the first time. Resources were a problem everywhere in the Garda Síochána at that time. There had been no recruitment since 2009. One had the resources one had and no replenishments occurred in that period. The optimisation of resources was something that was a priority to me.

224 Q. You then go on to say:
"I asked what the sauce of his ad hoc appearance at work were."
A. Yes.

But sure had you the medical certificates that indicated that he was suffering from work related stress?
A. But $I$ was also aware that he was drinking.
Q. I mean, were you already at this stage calling into question whether he was genuine, genuinely out of work due to work related stress?
A. I couldn't possibly do that, because I don't have any medical qualification. But $I$ was trying to ascertain if there something I could do to help him come to work more frequently. He could be a valuable resource in terms of policing.
You see, chief superintendent, you're asking him a question as to why he is out of work, you're aware that he has provided certificates saying that this is as a result of work related stress?
A. But I'm also aware that alcohol, during periods of absence, is an issue.
Q. We11, perhaps a question might be: I know that you're out of work from work related stress, is that causing you to drink more than you would otherwise drink?
A. The note is not verbatim as to the way the conversation 11:51 went.

229 Q. Did you adopt that --
A. No, I didn't. I didn't ask that particular question, no. You know, I just wanted to know what he felt the cause of his work related -- or his absences were and he said it was stress.
Q. Then you go on to say:
"He said he di dn't like to be here when certain people were here."
A. Yes.

231 Q. Did you not say, look, I know, I understand?
A. No.

But you did know?
A. I had an idea, yes. I knew he made allegations against Garda A.
Q. Yes, but you did know --
A. That's what came into my mind.

234 Q. You did know what he was talking about?
A. We11, Garda A came into my mind when he said that, yeah.

235 Q. And you knew that it must have been difficult in the circumstance, both for Garda A and for Garda Keogh?
A. It was difficult for everybody, yes, absolutely.

236 Q. No, but it must have been particularly difficult for both of them?
A. Absolutely.

237 Q. One the accuser and the other the accused?
A. I understood that perfectly.

238 Q. Working together in Athlone Garda Station?
A. And I had lots of experience of dealing with issues of garda wrongdoing in my time, so I understand exactly how both Garda Keogh and Garda A felt, because I have
felt with people in similar -- who were in similar predicaments in different investigations I did around the country.
239 Q. You say:
"He said he went sick Iast Sunday eveni ng after a certain member who was of $f$ came into the station."
A. Yes.
Q. Then you say:
"I asked who and he woul dn't say."

But you knew who it was?
A. It was very important for me to have Garda keogh engage with me, if I could. So they were questions designed to elicit information from him in order that I could build up a rapport with him.

241 Q. You then go on to say:
"I told himanyone working here can come in at any time 11:52 and nothing can be done about that."
A. Yes. And that's a fact.

242 Q. Then you say:
"I di scussed work rel ated stress in tern玉 of his coming 11:53
to worked today, if work rel ated stress was the issue."
A. Yes.

243 Q. Just explain what you meant by that.
A. So I was trying to, again, elicit a conversation around
what was going on in his life, so that I could, if at all possible, gauge what I needed to do to support him.
244 Q. That might portray a sort of scepticism on your part about his excuse for not attending work?
A. I couldn't be sceptical because I hadn't ever met Garda 11:53 Keogh before. I was trying to build up a rapport with him to try and find out what was going on and what could I do to support him attending work more frequently.
well, would you agree with me that the notes, as you have recorded them -- did you record them at the time?
A. After he left.
Q. After he left?
A. Yeah.

247 Q. why did you do that?
A. Well, because he had brought up an issue during them in relation to an allegation against the district, in relation to issues with cars.
248 Q. What allegation is that right?
A. An allegation about people having cars not properly 11:54 taxed.

249 Q. But why did you make a note of the entire conversation if that was the only matter that was of interest to you?
A. We11, I just recorded the entire conversation because I 11:54 was going to send them to the CMO and I had made decisions there about sergeant Martin, his tax and his welfare. So I recorded the entire conversation, and I am very glad I did.
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250 Q. You then go on:
Q. You know he takes issue in relation to that?
A. I do. That was a question I asked him. I wasn't aware 11:55 that he had attended the СМо before. That's what he said to me, and I recorded it. That, I suppose -- I wondered why he said that at the time. I found it hard to believe when I thought about it after, having looked, you know, made myself aware of the previous illness regarding alcohol in 2012.

254 Q. "I said l would send himto assess his stress because the in and out appearances do not, in my vi ew, support what he is saying."
A. Mm .

255 Q. So, this is the first meeting you had with him?
A. Yes.

256 Q. You've had some anecdotal evidence of his drinking from Superintendent McBrien and from Sergeant Haran, you have the medical certificates that he supplied to the because of his attendance in the Garda station and his in and out appearances, that it doesn't support what he's saying?
A. Yes.
Q. Just explain why you took that view, when you indicated to the Chairman that this was your first meeting with Garda Keogh.
A. So, when you look at the absences that were there, some 11:56 of them were very short-term, some of them would coincide with days before rest days, he would come off sick for the rest days and then work after or go sick again. So, it was difficult for me, without him explaining it to me, to understand when you would be stressed on these particular days but then okay to come to work on these particular days. And if there was something there that I could do.
Q. Did you ask him about that?
A. Yeah. That became part of the conversation, absolutely.
Q. No, but did you ask him about, you know, that you couldn't really understand or get your head around some days in, some days out, that he was --
A. Yes, when I write that line, that's what -- generally the conversation was about that.
Q. Is it just the way that your notes are worded? Because it looks as though you have come to a conclusion at a very early stage?
A. I have drawn no conclusion. And I sent him to the CMO so as that some welfare programme could be put in place for him. I was very open with the CMO because I mentioned stress in the report that I sent to him. So, I had no difficulty with --
Q. But you're already challenging him in a way, aren't you?
A. I didn't feel I was challenging him. I was trying to build up a rapport and trying to, I suppose, ascertain information and he was very reticent and, I suppose, unwilling to engage with me in an open way.
Q. Well, he was reticent in engaging with you in relation to a discussion concerning the investigation and his part in it?
A. But he was also reticent in relation to his absences, the reasons for them, why exactly he -- who exactly he was talking about. It was a very vague response. And I wondered why.
Q. So you're really questioning him here at this first meeting?
A. We11, I saw my role as trying to ascertain what the issues were before I decided what needed to be done.
Q. "He said no and I said that I would send himto assess the stress because the in and out appearances do not, in my view, support what he is saying."
A. Yes.
Q. "He decl ined answering questions re points he was making, i nstead asking me to contact Detective Superintendent Mul cahy and Superintendent MEBrien."
A. Yes.
A. Whatever it was, the whole conversation, about his absences...
Q. What role or function did you think that Detective Superintendent Mulcahy might have in relation to it?
A. I hadn't an idea at that time.
Q. Was he inviting you to contact them concerning his work related stress and welfare issues?
A. In relation to anything I wanted to know about him, his general invitation was that those two people would be able to tell me, rather than him.
Q. You said:
"I said l woul dn't contact anyone for anecdotal info, but would ask hi mand it was up to hi m whet her to answer or not."
A. Yes.
Q. If this was in relation to welfare issues, if it was in relation to work related stress and his drinking, would it not have been reasonable for him to say, look, Superintendent McBrien will fill you in and tell you about the difficulties that I've had, or Detective Superintendent Mulcahy, who is involved in the investigation and has put in place welfare supports, wil1 te11 you about all these matters?
A. Well, as it turned out there were no welfare supports in place at all then, in a formal way, as it turned out. But I'm sure we'11 get to that.
Q. Was it not reasonable for him to adopt that position with you?
A. Well, not as far as I was concerned, because I was in charge of Garda Keogh, I had responsibility for his welfare and I wanted to deal directly with Garda Keogh and help him in as much as I possibly could, to come to work and to do his work.
Q. You go on to say:
"I asked himif he was doing any work."
A. Yes.

275 Q. "He sai d, what do you mean?"

Then you said:
"You're getting wages."
A. Yes.

276 Q. "Are you doi ng Garda work, enf orcement, i nvesti gations, communi ty engagement et cetera?"
A. Yes.

277 Q. "He said he was doing very little."
A. Yes. And I could imagine that would be the case, but the absences I had noticed.
Q. Well, obviously if he is absent from work he's not doing any Garda work?
A. Yes.
Q. But nobody had suggested to you that when he was present and conducting his work as a garda, that he was doing so in --
A. No, absolutely not, no one had suggested anything.
Q. There was no issue in relation to the quality of his work?
A. Not that I -- no one had made me aware of anything at that stage, no.
Q. Well, did you ask anybody?
A. No.
Q. Other than the drinking problem that he seems to have, does it impinge in any way on his ability to perform his functions when he is here?
A. It would be ridiculous to suggest that someone with intermittent absences in that fashion, that may be related to drink, that it wouldn't impact on work. It would be difficult to understand how that wouldn't impact on work.
Q. So your view is that it must have had an impact on his work?
A. Well, it must have had, yeah.

284 Q. Even though you received no complaints from his supervising sergeant?
A. No. He told me himself he was doing very little. And I can understand how that would be the case.
Q. You then go on to say:
"I said l coul dn't condone that and asked hi mhat he
was doing and was he following up on inci dents being reported to him"

And then he mentioned a case to you. Just tell us what that was about, that he mentioned to you?
A. He just mentioned it was a harassment case and we didn't discuss it any further. He was having some difficulty with it in terms of not being able to bottom it out in a sufficient fashion, in a timely fashion.

And I could understand that, considering, you know, the absences, that was understandable. But things couldn't s7ip through the cracks either, you know.
Q. You note here:
"He agreed that that wasn't fair to the victim"
A. Yeah.
Q. That's something you pointed out to him?
A. I put that to him, look it, how do you think this person would feel?
288 Q. Then you say:
"I asked hi mif there was a sergeant available for him to link into."
A. Yes.
Q. We11, at that time you knew that there was?
A. Yes.

290 Q. You knew there was supervising sergeant, Sergeant Moylan, and also in relation to welfare issues, Sergeant Haran, isn't that right? You say:
"He di dn't really answer."

And then you said:
"। said I was asking Sergeant Yvonne Martin to link in with himin rel ation to all workplace issues."
A. Yes.
Q. Well, that should be really welfare issues, isn't that right?
A. Probably the word is wrong there, yeah.
Q. But did you say in relation to all workplace issues?
A. No, I said welfare. No, I said welfare.

293 Q. Are you sure about that?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Because you have recorded workplace?
A. I appreciate that. But my, I suppose, mindset in relation to Sergeant Martin, she couldn't engage or I suppose deal with him on workplace issues because she was on a different unit. She had her own unit. And it 12:05 was about welfare. And to have someone there for him to contact, if he felt he needed to talk to somebody. 295 Q. "He asked why her, as he di dn't know her."

And you replied:
"For that very reason, as she was new here, like I, and she would be a support to hi mand allow hi mattend work regul arly."
A. Yeah.

296 Q. Then you have a note here saying:
"I advi sed that he di scuss the shortfalls in the assault case/harassment case with her."
A. Yes, if he wished.
Q. "She would put supports in pl ace to ensure thoroughness in the investigation."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q. "He agreed to same and to use her."

You know that he is taking issue with this and he is seeing it in circumstances where he is now going to have three supervising sergeants, as he put it, scrutinising his work. You understand that to be his
A. I do, but that is entirely erroneous on his part. The supervising situation that applied to Garda Keogh before I arrived continued after I arrived. I did
nothing more than introduced Sergeant Martin as someone who he could contact in relation to his welfare, if he was of a mind to.
Q. You then go on to say:
"I then spoke to himin rel ation to his travel cl ai n® --"
which had been left for you.
"-- as his vehicle was taxed goods."

And then you say:
"He got slightly annoyed."
A. He did.
Q. You told him that:
"... I had been on to the tax office and showed him what I got re his vehicle, explaining the probl em was
left for me and I wanted to be sure the vehicle was not wrongly taxed. "
A. Yes.

302 Q. Then you say:
"He admitted it was taxed goods and shoul dn't be."
A. Yes, he was very open about that. He indicated that he had bought the vehicle as a goods vehicle and he kept taxing it in that way each year, even though he knew
that it was in the wrong class.
A. I explained -- he asked me what was I going to do and I explained to him that my, I suppose, number one priority was to pay the claims that were outstanding for some time, but that he needed to correct the tax to 12:09 do that and if he did, and I remember saying this to him, that I would deal with him in the same way as I would deal with someone if I was a garda and I stopped him on the street, I would give them a chance to correct it and I would give them a caution then.

305 Q. Is that by way of regulation 10?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you mention regulation 10 ?
A. I did, yeah.

307 Q. Are you sure about that?
A. I did, and I explained to him that that would close off the matter and that no one could ever come back to him again about it. You know, that came about in me answering the question, what are you going to do about it? And it was a holistic solution on it. You need to 12:10 correct your tax, I am going to pay your claims and I'm going to close this down by way of regulation 10.
308 Q. You hadn't discussed with Superintendent McBrien how she was going to deal with the matter?
A. No.
Q. And that hadn't been an issue?
A. No.
Q. And you hadn't discussed whether or not she had intended to discipline, isn't that right?
A. No.

311 Q. You had been alerted to the fact that the delay in dealing with this matter wasn't Garda Keogh's, of his making, obviously the wrong taxing of his car was of his own making, but in terms of dealing with the matter, it wasn't of his making, isn't that right?
A. In terms of dealing with the matter. Yes.
A. It had been -- the claims had been there for quite sometime, I saw that on the file.
Q. In terms of Garda Keogh, did you have access to his personne1 file? I am sure you did.
A. I can't recall looking at his personnel file. I just can't recall that. We then move on. I will return to that in a moment.
"I told himl would deal with himmyself if he did that, in the same way I would deal with someone I
stopped, if I found the same probl em He got annoyed, bl aming them "
A. Yeah.
Q. "But woul dn't say who."
A. No.
A. He was annoyed then and he felt that people were using this to get at him. But he wouldn't say who he meant or who he felt was doing that. He was very vague.
Q. You go on to say:
"He criticised Chi ef Superintendent Curran re trying to create compl ai nts agai nst him"
A. Yes.

319 Q. "He said he hadn't thought what was for himin the or gani sation. "
A. The conversation moved on then to -- away from that topic then to me again trying to elicit information about his, I suppose, views on, you know, what was for him in the organisation, how could I help him with that 12:13 in terms of reigniting the value he had said he got from his work previously.

320 Q. Was there any discussion at that stage in relation to the possibility that he might be transferred?
A. No, I think that was in the next conversation.

321 Q. You say:
"He sai d he hadn't thought about his future. He joined An Garda Sí ochána in 1999. That he was in Bray,

Bal lynacargy and in At hl one."
A. Yes. So he gave me a résumé of, you know, the work he had done and I listened to him on that. Again, I was trying to, you know, I suppose, as it were, bring him back to that place where he was and he appeared to have --

322 Q. You note that you went over the three issues that you had brought up during the course of the discussion, is that right?
A. Yeah.

323 Q. Number one is ad hoc appearances at work and referral to the CMO?
A. Yes.
Q. You say:
"I was skeptical re his excuse."
A. Yes.
Q. $\quad$ I felt the CMD could put supports in place for him"
A. Yes.
Q. What did you mean by that?
A. We11, I felt that the CMO could best assess the situation in terms of what welfare programme was required. In referring him to the CMO, I completed the form where I ticked all those boxes, asking the CMO to give advice in relation to how best he could be facilitated at work in terms of a welfare programme.

327 Q. "2. Sergeant Martin to be his contact rework issues to support his renewed attendance at work."
A. Yes.

328 Q. "3. The correction of his car tax and the payment of his clains."

And that you would deal with him yourself by way of regulation 10.
A. Yes.
A. So, I wasn't sure whether he was saying this in a reactionary way or whether he had some specific information. He said that other members had issues with their cars. I told him that -- I first of all asked him if he had specific information or if he wanted to tell me something he knew, so as I could act on it. But he was very vague about it. Then he said he didn't want me to do anything about it at all. And I told him I couldn't unhear what he had said. And I felt I was in a position then where if I did nothing I had a problem and if I did something, I could possibly find a problem. So I told him I would think about it and I would take his views on board but that I couldn't unhear it.

330 Q. I think the meeting then came to an end, is that right?
A. Yes, we shook hands then and the meeting came to an end.

331 Q. Just if we can go to what Garda Keogh says in relation to this meeting in his statement to the Tribunal, at page 126 of the materials, please. If we scroll down the page to 5 there.
"I met himfor the first time on 26th March 2015, after being called into his office. He advi sed me that my t wo seater Land Rover van was taxed as commercial. He sai d there was a probl em with my motor tax. My Land Rover van should be taxed, he cl ai med, as a private car or, as he put it, non-goods. He sai d that he has been down to the motor taxation of fice looking for decl arations about my motor tax."
A. Well, I had all the declarations I needed in what was returned from the tax office, that there was a declaration signed by Garda Keogh. It was never my intention to treat Garda Keogh as a suspect in this in any shape or form.
How could he have known that anybody was looking for declarations in the motor taxation office at that time?
A. I don't know.

Unless you told him?
A. I didn't tell him. Absolutely not. material and the e-mail in relation to this matter in the not too distant past, long after Garda Keogh had made this statement to the Tribunal?
A. I never mentioned declarations to him. I showed him everything I got from the tax office in a very open way. I put that in front of him and I allowed him to see it. I never mentioned declarations to him.

335 Q. We11, he is saying that this is what you said to him, that you were looking for declarations about his motor

## tax?

A. No, I told him that I had made enquiries with the tax office to establish the facts and I showed him everything I got from the tax office.
Q. "I thought this very odd. I poi nted out inter alia that the NCT authorities would not process my van as private (it had been tested commercially by the Department of the Envi ronment) it had no back seats, it was used for police duty and to carry dogs."

Did he point that out to you?
A. No. Indeed, that doesn't make sense, because he was able to tax his jeep the next day without any difficulty whatsoever. Garda Keogh well knows that one cannot use one's vehicle for police duties in any way. One may use one's vehicle on duty to travel from point A to B, provided one has permission to do so.

337 Q. "He then asked me about my sick leave. I said that I was suffering from work rel ated stress, my stress had to do with the ongoing internal investi gation into garda coll usi on in criminal Garda operations from At hl one Garda Station."

Then he says that you said to him:
"You're under no stress. And he repeated this for emphasis."
A. No, I did not say that.

338 Q. But certainly you were skeptical of it?
A. Skeptical of the excuse. I, in a very open way, sent a report and a referral form to the CMO, highlighting work related stress.
"He said that he was sending me to the chi ef medical of ficer if l woul dn't give hi many ot her reason than work rel at ed stress for my sick leave."
A. That's entirely untrue.
A. Absolutely.
Q. "He al so, oddly, asked me who my solicitor was."

Did you ask him that?
A. No. I couldn't envisage why he would need a solicitor. So I did not ask him that. That never came into the conversation in any way at all.
"I told himl coul dn't disclose that information to him it was al so part of the internal investigation."
A. That did not happen.

344 Q. He said:
"He asked me if I would take transfer."
A. No. I would be very happy to deal with the context of that, but it happened in the next conversation.

345 Q. Yes. We will come to that.
A. Yes.

346 Q. But are you saying that this wasn't during the course of this conversation?
A. No, no.

347 Q. "I replied, no, that l di dn't want a transfer. I had
not asked for a transfer. I bel ieved the transfer he was proposing was an attempt to prevent me from observing cl ose- up the patently i nadequate criminal i nvesti gation into garda collusi on with criminals (condoned by management). "
A. I had nothing to do with any investigation in relation to him, so I knew nothing about it. So that did not -that conversation did not arise.

348 Q. "The non-i ntervi ewing of witnesses, etcetera, in the i nvesti gation of my substantive compl ai nts."
A. No, that was not the discussed.

349 Q. "The cl eani ng out of the storeroom cont ai ning dr ugs following my protected disclosures, the absence of forensic engi neers in preserving el ectroni cs et cetera."
A. As I have already stated, that was not discussed.

350 Q. So clearly we have your notes and your account of that first meeting that you had with Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.

351 Q. And we have had his account when he was giving evidence in relation to the same meeting. In a broad sense, he 12:23 is suggesting that from the very off that you were quite hostile towards him, that you were sceptical of his claims in relation to work related stress, that you advised him that he wasn't suffering from work related
stress and he says that you confronted him in relation to the motor taxation issues and that you told him to put it in order, and that there was no mention in relation to regulation 10 . What do you say in relation
to that? every other consideration was taken care of. There was no hostility on my part. I had never met Garda Keogh before. I had no motive to do anything other than my job and my duty. And I think my history reflects that.
352 Q. Could you just deal with that for a moment? Because it's something that you dealt with in your statement to the Tribunal investigators and I think it's a point that you wish to make in relation to the question of motive?
A. Yes. As I've said, I never worked with anyone in Athlone before, I never worked there before. I had no motive in any shape or form to do anything that Garda Keogh alleges.

353 Q. In any event, going back to 2187 and your notes. 2189,

I beg your pardon. You have a note then, it's not of the conversation, but you said that you saw Garda A in the station throughout the evening, up to when you left at 7 pm .
"Hi s presence creates a scepticismre Garda Keogh's excuse of work rel at ed stress as expl ai ned by him"
A. Yes.
Q. Was that your feeling at the time?
A. So, the vagueness with which Garda Keogh dealt with, I suppose, what $I$ was trying to ascertain from him, didn't allow me to, I suppose, understand where he was coming from in terms of he didn't want to be there when certain people were there, because $I$ had just seen Garda A there at 7pm, at a time when Garda Keogh was there. And I made that note after seeing him. Garda A was on a different unit completely to Garda Keogh, I think he was on unit $E$. There may have been crossovers during the roster tours that Garda A worked. So the excuse --

355 Q. Sorry, just one moment.
A. Sorry.

356 Q. I think that then you wrote a letter to Chief Superintendent Lorraine wheatley, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

357 Q. This is to be found at page 2191 of the material. It's entitled "Si ck report Garda Ni chol as Keogh."
"As a result of utterings in Dáil Éi reann in May 2014 by M . Luke M ng Fl anagan, it became public know edge that Garda Ni chol as Keogh, Athl one Garda Station, had provi ded information to the confidential reci pient alleging mal practice and corruption agai nst certain Garda menbers in Athl one. I understand the matters al leged are bei ng investi gated by assi stant cormissioner Western Regi on. Garda Keogh has continued toed work in Athl one in the interimperiod."

You say:
"I was transferred to Athl one as di strict officer on 9th March 2015. I first met Garda Keogh on Thursday, 26th March 2015. One of the issues that arose in my di scussi on with hi mas his sick absences, whi ch appeared to be occurring frequently and in a haphazard fashi on. While Garda Keogh was reticent to di scuss any issues he may have with me, I nonethel ess felt it
prudent to put an arrangement in place in Athl one to support himin the work envi ronment as he is indicating work rel ated stress as a source of his absences. With that in mind, l have allocated a female sergeant who is new to the district to act as a district point of contact for the member, to di scuss and, if possi ble, sol ve any workpl ace issues he may have in Athl one in order to allow hi mattend work more frequently.

As an additional measure l wi sh to have an appoi nt ment with the chi ef medi cal officer arranged for Garda Keogh, in order that professi onal expertise can advi se of ot her workpl ace supports whi ch may assi st the member. The member indi cated that he had not attended the CMD previ ousl $y$.

The member has a total of 184 si ck days in the past four years. Forty ei ght of those occurred si nce J anuary 2014, with $52 \%$ occurring on early tours of duty. The member has availed of 34 days annual leave from 1st March 2014 to 31st March 2015, with 92\% of I eave taken on early tours al one.

I bel ieve both the menber and the organi sation woul $d$ benefit by referring hi mto the Occupational Health Service at this time."

That was the view that you had and you were anxious that he would see the chief medical officer?
A. I was, I felt that a welfare programme would be initiated by the chief medical officer and I completed a referral form along with a report.
358 Q. Now, during the interview with our investigators, at page 3070, you say:
"The matter was mentioned in Dáil Éi reann on 1st April 2015 by Mck Wallace TD. I kept meticul ous notes and records of my interactions with Garda Keogh fromthat
poi nt on. "

And then, at 3076, there is a second mention there of the car tax issue being raised in Dáil Éireann. Have you got a reference to that, that you could assist us with? Because you'11 be aware of the fact that the Tribunal have obtained a copy of the Dáil record for the 31st March, when Deputy Mick Wallace spoke during Leader's Questions, you have seen that?
A. Yes.

359 Q. Is that what you are referring to?
A. Yes.

360 Q. There's no reference to the car tax issue or any conversation that Garda Keogh had with you?
A. I suppose, how that knowledge came to me was, on the 1st April, when I got phone calls about a Dáil outburst towards the then Taoiseach, and I hadn't read the Dáil record and my understanding from the phone calls was that the tax had been an issue.

361 Q. Who told you that?
A. It was -- they were phone calls I got from then Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin and Detective Superintendent Mulcahy on the 1st April.

362 Q. And they told you that this had been raised in the Dáil?
A. That was their -- yeah, that was the impression got from the conversations, that the tax had been raised in the Dáil. But now it appears that it was a catalyst to allow utterances to be raised in the Dáil. .
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Q. But that becomes translated in your statement to the Tribunal?
A. Yes, I got the date wrong, on the 1st April, it should be the 31st March, I suppose, in relation to the Dáil.
Q. But more importantly, I think that you make a case, first of all, this is the catalyst for you keeping notes of your conversations --
A. Yes.
Q. -- with Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.
Q. We know that's not right, because you took an extensive note on the 26th March. But you also say that you became quite cautious of talking to Garda Keogh in relation to issues because of the fact that you were surprised that a conversation that you had on the 26 th March should be repeated, or the topic should be repeated in Dáil Éireann on the 12th April?
A. Yeah, I thought it was bizarre that my dealings with him would end up in issues being raised in the Dáil. I thought that was bizarre.
Q. If we can, before we move on, just deal with that. I think on the 1st April that you had two telephone conversations with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy, one at 10am in the morning and one at 2:32?
A. Yes.

We see that in your notes at page 2490, you have a note saying:

[^1]Cormissioner Ó Cual ái $n$ by three and Detective Superintendent Mul cahy re Dáil utterances and Garda Keogh. "
A. Yes.

What was discussed in the three conversations that you had with Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin?
A. The first telephone call at 9:58am, that was very short, because it was followed at 10am by a call from Detective Superintendent mulcahy.
Q. Yes.
A. So the first call from Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin was simply asking me what -- had something occurred because there was a Dáil out burst in relation to Athlone.
Q. Yes.
A. Detective Superintendent Mulcahy rang me at 10:00 asking me the same question, and I didn't know what had occurred that led to that, at that time.
Q. Yes. Any other conversations?
A. No. They were very short. And the next call was at 12:36 $1: 45 \mathrm{pm}$, from then Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin, who informed me that Detective Superintendent Mulcahy had made contact with Garda Keogh, who told him that he was the source of the information that led to the Dái 1 utterances and that the tax was a catalyst for that.
373 Q. That the tax had been the catalyst for that?
A. Yes, the tax and the CMO, because he felt people were getting at him.
374 Q. Yes.
A. Detective Superintendent Mulcahy rang me then at 2:32, to give me the same information.
Q. Did you, during the course of those conversations, either with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy or Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin, did you discuss and ask them what welfare supports had been put in place for Garda Keogh?
A. I had that discussion with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy at that time and he said that he didn't think Garda Keogh wanted welfare at that particular time. And I explained to both of them what I was doing in terms of referring him to the CMO, to ensure some type of welfare programme would be created or that there would be some support from the proper welfare structures in the organisation, outside of anything I could do.

So other than being advised that Detective Superintendent Mulcahy had spoken to Garda Keogh, who said that the car tax issue and the referral to the CMO had been the catalyst --
A. That's correct, yes.

377 Q. -- for him going to Deputy wallace.
A. Yes.

378 Q. You jumped to a conclusion that those issues had been raised in the Dáil by Deputy wallace, is that right?
A. I did. But again, you know, the way it was explained to me is that the tax and my interaction with him and the referral to the CMO had caused this. So I assumed that it had been mentioned.
Q. And you assumed that right up until you made the statement to the Tribunal, isn't that right?
A. I assumed that right up until I saw in the disclosures the record of the Dáil on the 31st March.
Q. It was something that caused you concern at the time. You were unhappy because you believed that your conversation with Garda Keogh had actually been referred to in the Dáil and that these issues had been raised, isn't that right?
A. My level of anxiousness about that wouldn't matter, whether it was raised or not. The mere fact that the conversation that I had had with him, which I thought was one that was going to solve problems, would end up being, I suppose, delivered to a TD and then being raised in Dáil Éireann, did cause me concern, yes, and I found that bizarre. I had never come across anything like that before.

MR. MARR NAN Chairman, we're going to proceed, because we had anticipated that we would have another witness here at 12:30 but we're going to proceed because she's not available at the moment. CHA RMAN Very good.
MR. MARR NAN Is that al1 right, chief superintendent? WTNESS: Yes.
381 Q. Sorry, I am just referring to the page number, 431, which is the note of your conversations on Wednesday, 1st Apri1 2015.
A. Yes.

382 Q. You then refer there to the conversations with

Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin at 9:58, 1.45 and 5:06?
A. This is at that page 2491?
Q. Sorry, 2491. It's 431 of your material. 2491.
A. Yes.
Q. "Re out burst of Mck WAllace". You say:
"Expl ai ned re letters sent to Cl are Dal y from D office and my conversation with Keogh re his welfare, work supports and his work and car tax and what I was doing. 12:41 AC wanted to know who from Athl one was on to Mck
Wallace. I told hi mthe general perception was it was Gar da Keogh. "

Is that right?
A. That was -- in the first conversation he simply asked me, I didn't know. In the second conversation I told him the general perception was -- but at that stage he had the information from Detective Superintendent Mulcahy.
385 Q. Then it says:
" AC' s last phone call was for me to ask Garda Keogh re his welfare, considering he told Detective Superintendent Mul cahy he felt people were closing in 12:42 on him"

Particularly a named chief superintendent
A. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. At 10am and 2.32.
"He had made contact with Garda Keogh and tol d himhe had rai sed the issues with Mck Wallace as he felt the job was supporting the chi ef superintendent -- "

Who, we are not going to name.
" -- when his tax, CMD mentioned to him"
A. Yes.

391 Q. "Expl ai ned to Detective Superintendent Mul cahy my conversati on with Garda Keogh. He expl ai ned their
investigation was nearly finished and Garda Keogh was anxi ous to be finished as soon as possible, and this was a source of his concern as well."

Then you say that you advised Chief Superintendent wheatley of those matters; is that right?
A. I did.
Q. Just tell us about that?
A. That was advice in relation to the protections that he should have as someone who made a protected disclosure or a confidential reporter. He wanted to ensure that I 12:44 fully understand the confidentiality around not disclosing Garda Keogh's name. Indeed, for all intents and purposes I wasn't to know, I was to strike from my mind that I knew he had anything to do with the Dáil utterings, or that it was him that was referred to in 12:44 the Dáil utterings the day before.

394 Q. Now, I think that on the 2nd April, if I could have page 2190 up on the screen, please, I think that you wrote to Inspector Farrell and the sergeant in charge?
A. Yes.

395 Q. And the heading of that is:
"Si ck report Garda Ni chol as Keogh.

I refer to the above and I wi sh to advi se you of the foll owing.

1. I have allocated Sergeant Martin as a liai son person for Garda Keogh, to allow hi m di scuss any work rel ated i ssues he may be having with a vi ew to sol ving any issues that may arise. Both Sergeant Martin and Garda Keogh have been informed of this workplace support."
A. Yes.

396 Q. "2. Sergeant Mbyl an and in his absence Sergeant Haran supervise unit C, to whi ch Garda Keogh is attached. Both those sergeants should continue to supervise the member in the normal way in rel ation to any work out put 12:45 requi red of the member resulting frominci dents he attends or matters he is investigating. Sergeant Mbyl an should sit down with Garda Keogh, go through his notebook, Pulse, the DPP and crime files lists and ascertain if he requires hel $p$ with any ongoing cases as 12:46 he mentioned an harassment case he may be in difficulty with. Any issues arising should be immedi ately reported. "

I suppose a number of issues arise there. In the absence of any complaint from any supervising sergeant or inspector, why did you deem it necessary that Sergeant Moylan should go through Garda Keogh's notebook and his pulse entries and files for the DPP
and his crime files?
A. That came about as a result of the conversation $I$ had with Garda Keogh, where he said he was having difficulty with that particular case. And I wanted to make sure that nothing else was in difficulty for him that would cause him difficulty.
Q.
A. I think that was a very prudent thing to do and a supportive thing to Garda Keogh, because if he had been in any difficulty or if anything had arisen, it was going to be able to be cured and fixed, not allow any further complications to arise for Garda Keogh or any member of the public in relation to issues he was dealing with them on.

401 Q. And then you have:
"Any i ssues arising should be i mmedi atel y reported."
A. Yeah.

402 Q. Why was it necessary to report any issue that might arise?
A. If the sergeant felt there was anything I needed to
know about that he couldn't handle. I was leaving that option open to him there.
403 Q. You see, in the normal course of events one might have expected you to write a direction to Sergeant Moylan to offer any assistance to Garda Keogh in relation to any issues that might arise for Garda Keogh in relation to his work. But this is very specific. It's a direction to Sergeant Moylan to go through a notebook, Pulse entries, etcetera?
A. Yes.

404 Q. Can you perhaps understand why Garda Keogh might perceive that as being an examination of his work by you as the new superintendent coming in?
A. I think that's a very subjective view to take, considering the issues Garda Keogh had in relation to his absences from work.
Q. Yes.
A. And I think it was a prudent measure on my part, to ensure that nothing was going to arise that would cause him further problems or further exacerbate any issues he may be having in the workplace. Because if things were being let lie, as it were, that was going to cause problems and I didn't want that to happen.
406 Q. Well, in hindsight do you think that it was perhaps an over reaction in the circumstances?
A. No, I don't. I think it was quite prudent on my part. The sergeant, I understand, did that check. I didn't follow up on that. I left it to the sergeant to make sure Garda Keogh was okay with everything.
Q. What you were actually doing was directing an audit of Garda Keogh's work, isn't that right?
A. No, I didn't see it like that. I saw it as, I suppose, a prudent move to ensure that there was no risk either for Garda Keogh or the organisation.
Q. At page 596 of the material, this is the statement from Sergeant Yvonne Martin. At 3.2 there, she says:
"Superintendent Murray appointed me as Iiaison of ficer for Garda Keogh to allow himto di scuss any work rel ated issues he might be having with a vi ew to sol ving any potential issues."

Then 3.3
"Superintendent Murray di scussed this role with me prior to the date of recei pt of the above direction. Garda Ni chol as Keogh was notified of this facility by Superintendent Murray. Garda Keogh chose not to avail of this resource and never spoke to me in my capacity as liai son of ficer."

Did you ever ask for a report at any time from sergeant Yvonne Murray?
A. Martin.

409 Q. Martin, sorry?
A. No.

410 Q. Did she communicate to you at all?
A. I would be in contact with her very frequently in the
workplace, yeah.
411 Q. Did she indicate to you that Garda Keogh wasn't availing of the facility that you had offered?
A. I cannot recall her ever saying that to me, no, directly.

But you didn't follow up on the matter?
A. No.

413 Q. And ask for a report from her?
A. I left Sergeant Martin as a resource to Garda Keogh if he wished to do so. I couldn't be prescriptive in terms of what Garda Keogh might or might not do.

414 Q. Then if we go to page 606 of the material, this is the statement from Sergeant Moylan to the Tribunal. Then paragraph 3.3, referring to the direction that I opened a few moments ago.
"I believe it's a recognition of the fact that I had taken up position on the National Executive of Associ ation of Sergeants and Inspectors in April 2013 and as such was not al ways working the same shifts as my unit."

That's what we discussed earlier on, isn't that right, chief superintendent?
A. Yes.

415 Q. "The correspondence al so requested that I sit down with Gar da Keogh and go through his notebook, Pul se, DPP and crime file list. I duly did go through Garda Keogh's Pulse, crime file and DPP list. I do not recall going
through his notebook. I bel ieve I was satisfied that all rel evant inci dents were covered in the areas gone through. When I was going through the list or issues in rel ation to Garda Keogh, I remember showing hi m what I was submitting bef ore submitting same, to ensure he was satisfied with the line being taken."

Did you receive a report from Sergeant Moylan at any time that he had undertaken the tasks that you had deputed to him and that he had gone through the various 12:53 notebooks and crime files?
A. No, I never looked for -- followed up on that. I allowed the sergeant to deal with it. And what I assume he is referring to there is that there were some files or ongoing issues or investigations that Garda Keogh may have had that he submitted or moved on.

416 Q. At 3.4 he says:

On page 46, line 660, there is again a reference to me bei ng requested to go through Garda Keogh's outstanding 12:53 inci dents, in particul ar..."

And he quotes
"...a harassment case he may be in difficulty with. I 12:54 recall deal ing with this as part of the review but l recall it not bei ng overly compl icated to rectify, save for an explanation about the passage of timein the i nvesti gati on si nce the compl ai nt was made. Thi s was
negated by the i nj ured party, who wi shed to wi thdraw the compl ai nt, whi ch l bel i eve she duly did and the matter was then closed off."

Is that what we were referring to earlier on?
A. Yes, and I couldn't have known about that case unless Garda Keogh said to me, that there was a difficulty.
417 Q. Yes. We then move onto the second meeting you had with him.

CHA RMAN I think we will take a break there, before you head for the second meeting, Mr. Marrinan. Mr. McGuinness, if the parties in the other matter are present after lunch.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN We will take that up, otherwise we will proceed with Chief Superintendent Murray.

MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes. The witness has been here, but one of the legal representatives hasn't arrived yet. CHA RMAN That's not a problem. I mean, we want to accommodate people as far as possible and I know there is an issue. So that's not a difficulty. If all that clarifies itself over lunch, we can do it. Otherwise, Mr. McGuinness, what I think we will do is, we will suspend the questioning of Superintendent Murray a little early to enable us to do that this afternoon. okay. Thanks very much.

THE HEARI NG THEN AD ORNED FOR LUNCH AND RESUMED AS FOLLOVS:

CHA RMAN Now, thank you very much, chief superintendent, yes. Thank you very much. Now, Mr. Marrinan.

418 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Chief superintendent, we're about to come to the 3rd April of 2015. First of a11, I don't know if you have been advised that we intend to continue until three o'clock?
A. Yes.

419 Q. You have been advised that, and then we are going to take Garda Stephanie Treacy, if you don't mind.

CHA RMAN I am having a tiny bit of difficulty hearing that last exchange, Mr. Marrinan. We were going to April '15, isn't that right?

MR. MARR NAN Until three o'clock and then we are going to take Garda Stephanie Treacy, so we require you back tomorrow then; is that all right?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN I think you will be coming back for a day or two after that as well.

WTNESS: I would imagine so, yes.
420 Q. MR. MARRINAN Before we come to the meeting on the 3rd April, and one has to be conscious of the fact that you are only moving into your third week on the job and you had other duties to attend to, is that right?
A. Yes. I was doing quite a bit of analysis at the time and I had some, I suppose, legacy issues left over from
my previous two roles I was trying to deal with as well. It was quite a busy time, yeah. Could you give us an indication of a volume of work and the time that you were putting into it in around about that time?
A. Well, I suppose in Athlone itself, in 2015 there were some 9,000 odd Pulse incidents that I had to monitor, manage and control. There was some 5,000 correspondence record numbers generated in my number alone and correspondence relating to each one of those would have moved around laterally and upward and downward at different times. In the District Court that year, I just note that there were in and about 9,500 prosecutions in the district. I found myself working on average 61 hours a week between March and December of 2015, in dealing with the duties allocated to me as a result of the role $I$ held.
422 Q. And again, before we deal with the 3rd April 2015, you will appreciate that I am going through and I am examining various documents and also the statement is that you have provided to the Tribunal?
A. Yes.

423 Q. And also the interview that you had with the Tribunal investigators, that I think goes to 116 pages. If I am not dealing with something, be sure to say if you think it's important and that you'd refer me to deal with it.
A. Okay.

424 Q. I don't want to give you the impression that I might be skipping over any part of your statement?
A. Yes.

425 Q. Or your interview with the investigators, okay?
A. Yes.

426 Q. So up until lunchtime, was there anything additional that you feel that you should have added?
A. No.

427 Q. Or did we cover everything up until that point?
A. The only thing I would say is that in I suppose devising and designing and developing an accountability and governance framework that, you know, I had a team-based approach to that. That involved the majority of the people at sergeant rank in Ath1one, including, I suppose, the people who were in key roles there in designing and developing that and then the implementation of it as well. So I wasn't -- lest the impression be given that I am working on my own in some fashion like that, it was very much a team-based approach. And it's something that I encouraged; to try and have an empowered team work type approach in managing the district.
Then we will come to the second meeting that you had with Garda Keogh on the 3rd April 2015. I think your note of that meeting, we can find that at page 2194. would you just give an account yourself of the meeting?
A. Yes.

429 Q. With the aid of your note. It commenced at 5.40.
A. I was leaving the station and Garda Keogh approached me and in line with, I suppose, the arrangement we had in relation to his car tax, he wanted to show me that he
had corrected the car tax. So we returned to my office. And he had all the material with him, including the receipt for the arrears and the actual tax disk that he had obtained on correcting the issue. He gave me those documents when we went to the office and we photocopied them, in order that I could attach them to the claims, the file for the claims, to ensure that there was an account there in terms of when an audit would occur to show that the issue had been dealt with and finished out and the file was closed. And so I attached them to the claims file. Completed the regulation 10 and he signed for that. We went along then to discuss, I suppose, having left that all behind us, I felt that he was unburdened in a way, because we had a very frank, open and honest discussion about him and his career and what I could do for him and the value that he had got from his career at one stage. And I was making the point that if I could do anything that would allow that to return, I was more than prepared to do that within whatever was my gift or whatever support I could give.
430 Q. He then said that he had to continue going sick for the month?
A. He did.

431 Q. or so?
A. Yes.

432 Q. And he'd 1et you know what he was doing next?
A. I understood that. And all I did was, I asked him to, you know, kind of ensure that he complied with the

Now, I think that Garda Keogh indicated that he was feeling well and that he would work until 3am; is that right?
A. Yes, he said he was on duty until 3am that morning.

434 Q. Did you make a comment then in relation to his future reporting?
A. Yes. As I just said to you, I asked him if over the next month when he was going sick that he would report it in a proper fashion so as the resource issue would be able to be planned for.
Q. And then, did you discuss about his referral to the chief medical officer?
A. Yes. So on the second I had completed the referral and I gave him the normal advice that's associated with that, that would come down from the CMO in the normal way, about confidentiality and about bringing medical records with him if he wished. That was generic kind of advice that would normally be issued by the CMO when one refers someone to the CMO.

436 Q. Then there was a discussion in relation to Sergeant

Martin and what you had put in place, is that right?
A. Yes. And that was just, I suppose, a repeat of what we had discussed the previous day or at the previous meeting. Any difficulties he had, you know, to them to them, not to let things get out of hand or fester, as it were, where they would cause difficulties.
Q. Yo
"He agreed within hi nself to try and reignite his val ue fromhis career."

What do you mean by that? what was that discussion?
A. That was a conversation about how he had got value from his career up until these issues had occurred.
440 Q. Yes.
A. And I was trying to get to him that it wasn't beyond him to try and get back there, and if there was anything I could do to support that or to help in that regard, $I$ would do it.
"I put the other side of the argument to him"
A. Yes. Which was that, look it, this was bound up in the claims that you submitted and I suppose the state couldn't be seen to compound the incorrect tax by in the normal way paying your claims, knowing that that was occurring.
448 Q. We can see there the regulation 10 that you filled out when you were with him. This is at page 8766 . We see his name there and then:
"I wi sh to informyou that the matter described at A bel ow is minor in nat ure and is suitable to be dealt with informally."

And then you set out the conduct, you see there?
A. Yes.

449 Q. Did you have that filled out in advance of your meeting with him?
A. No, I wrote that out when he was there.
Q. Yes.
A. I had offered Garda Keogh the option of dealing with his tax in this way. I didn't know whether he was going to take up that offer or not until he came back to me.

451 Q. We will see there that he has signed an acknowledgment of the notice at the end there?
A. Yes.

452 Q. That's his signature. You indicate in the statement that you made to our investigators that you dealt with him by way of regulation 10 on the basis that it was a minor matter and that you had issued other notices during your time in 2015 in Ath1one.
A. Yes.

453 Q. And we have copies of those notices. I am not going to 14:19 deal with them in any great detail, but if we could look at 8794 in the first instance, please. This actually concerns Garda A?
A. Yes.

454 Q. "Negl ect of duty -- "
A. Yes.
Q. " -- without good or sufficient cause. Failing to submit an investigation file in rel ation to the seizure of controlled drugs on 20th Novenber 2013."
A. Yes.

456 Q. One might have thought that that was quite a serious matter, would it not be?
A. I looked at each case on its merits, looking at the individual in the circumstances, each time I had to
deal with someone in relation to issues that arose. This, the bringing forward of this matter came as a result of the analysis $I$ was carrying out, which led in turn to the introduction of the new type of accountability process. I looked at this case and the merits of it and I decided that this was the best way to deal with it. It was a legacy issue, where, I suppose, errors had occurred that prevented this particular file from being dealt with until July '15. But it was dealt with to conclusion and a prosecution ensued. And I weighed up all the merits of the case in making my decision as to how to deal with it.
457 Q. 8795, please, Mr. Kavanagh. This refers to another garda and it relates to neglect of duty again?
A. Yes.

458 Q. He had a certain function in Ath1one but he:
"...extended the i mmi gration regi strations of 129 students for a period over that whi ch was allowed,
thereby carrying out your duties in a negligent manner."

Again, that seems quite a serious matter?
A. We11, that as a result from an audit $I$ asked to be conducted of emigration services in the district by the Garda National Immigration Bureau. And when the inspector there visited and audited, he found this discrepancy in the auditing. I looked at the circumstances of the case and I dealt with this member in the fashion chosen. Again, it was something that occurred prior to my arrival. I weighed up all the merits of the case and I designed a new immigration structure following the revelation of this discrepancy, to bring more accountability to that and I have that demonstrated in my statement there. I suppose that particular member then came to my attention later on that year and on that occasion, him having been dealt with this way, $I$ recommended a regulation 14 on the second occasion where discrepancies occurred.
459 Q. 8796, this is against a member who seized 4.87 grams of heroin?
A. Yes.

460 Q. Again in 2013, and failed and neglected to submit a file in relation to the seizure, on the 22 nd October 2015?
A. Yes. Again, the situation in that, that came about as a result of the analysis $I$ was carrying out and it was a similar type situation that had occurred in the drugs
unit before my arrival. I discovered the discrepancy and that this file hadn't been brought to conclusion, ensured that happened and I looked at the circumstances again and I dealt with it in this manner.
461 Q. Then 8797, it's against another member in Athlone with you, in the case of an alleged rape offence?
A. Yes. I can't read your handwriting there, would you just mind reading the rest of that?
A.
"That you, in the case of an alleged rape reported to you in Septenber ' 10 , wi thout good and sufficient cause failed and negl ected to carry out a proper investigation and al owed the case go without investigation for four years."
Q. And again, that was something that was then dealt with under regulation 10. Were there any particular reasons in that instance as to why?
A. Yes, that again was an issue I discovered in carrying out analysis in the district. This particular female member had some serious welfare issues, which were ongoing. My diary tells me I met her on the 20th March, where we discussed this. In addition to applying this regulation 10 , having ensured that the investigation was brought to a conclusion, albeit late, 14:25 I also switched her to a different unit so that additional supervision would be available to her. And I chose to deal with it in this fashion in all of the circumstances that presented in the case to me.

464 Q. We11, I suppose Garda Keogh's position would be that the five regulation 10s that I have opened to you there, and we have had a brief look at and every case must depend on its own particular set of circumstances, but he would say that that stands in stark contrast to his misdemeanour as he would see it?
A. I wouldn't agree with him. I think he takes a subjective view on that, not knowing the circumstances in the other cases. But in addition to that, Garda Keogh's I suppose could be considered more serious in that his case was one where I suppose he had purposefully continued to engage in committing what was an offence over a number of years, knowing that it was wrong. while in the other case it was neglect of duty in terms of dealing with work issues, albeit quite serious, but the circumstances indicated to me that the regulation 10 option was the best in each of those cases.
465 Q. If we could just look at Garda Keogh's account of this meeting, if we just look first of all at his diary entry, which is at page 13305. If you look on the right-hand side:
"Met superintendent re tax. Showed himtax disk and recei pt. He then gave Section 10 discipline for same. I said l wrote a report months ago re this, asking was there a problemand poi nted out it should have been dealt with then."

Do you recall him saying that?
A. No. When I met Garda Keogh that evening, he was resigned to the regulation 10 because it was part of the agreement we had.

466 Q. You see, that note might be read as suggesting that it came as a bit of surprise to him.
A. I wouldn't see that, and the fact that he acknowledged receipt of it, you know, indicates to me --
467 Q. No, the fact that the regulation 10 had been in fact utilised on the occasion, because it appears what he is 14:28 saying there in his note, he says:
"He gave Section 10 di scipline for same. I said I wrote a report months ago re this, asking was there a probl em"

That's in relation to the road tax clearing.
"Poi nted out it should have been deal t with then."

You don't recall him saying that in any event?
A. But I go further and I say he didn't say that. Like regulation 10 was offered by me as part of the solution on the 26th March. What occurred in the Dáil and what I learned on the 1st April then -- if I hadn't made it clear on the 26th March, I don't think I'd have produced it just as Garda Keogh says, you know, the tax issue being a type of catalyst for an outburst in Dáil Éireann. From my perspective, it was what we agreed
and I brought it to a conclusion and closed the matter off. we scroll down. That's fine. He says:
"After I had been induced to pay motor tax at the private rate."

Do you agree with that expression of his position?
A. Absolutely not. Garda Keogh was a member of An Garda Síochána for 15 odd years at that time, he knew what it meant to have correct car tax. I am sure he had enforced the road traffic legislation under the Finance Act in relation to car tax in his time as a garda and he understood perfectly what it meant to have one's car 14:30 and documents correct.
469 Q. He says:
"On 3rd April 2015 I was di sciplined on such grounds.
I pointed out to Superintendent Pat Murray that my noncompl i ance had been known since Septentber ' 14, when the matter had been searched on Pul se by the caller and had not been brought to my attention then."

Do you recall that conversation?
A. No, in fact, it didn't happen.

470 Q. "I recei ved no expl anation as to why the matter had been parked for six mont hs and that such six mont hs had subsequently been used to suggest that l had been in
noncompl i ance. "
A. That doesn't make sense, because he been non-compliant for a number of years, in a knowing way.
471 Q. You have heard him in evidence describe how, when he gave you the documentation, that you went hastily to the photocopier to photocopy it and he says that he knew that he was in trouble and that was the reason why he knew he was in trouble then?
A. That didn't happen. We went back up to my office, the office is about 25 feet long by maybe 15 feet wide, there's a table in the middle, a kind of conference table that we would sit at to have meetings. There is a photocopier in the corner. It's right beside the table we were sitting at. I heard him describe me running. It wouldn't be possible, number one; I didn't 14:32 do it, number two. And this was Garda Keogh presenting the documents to me in accordance with the agreement we came to on the 26th March. The fact that he had them al1 with him, ready to show me, indicates that he, you know, took it as that; that he would have produce them and present them to get this dealt with. with the informal breach or resolution of minor breaches. Regulation 10 there:
"Not wi thstanding anything in these regul ations, a member whose duties incl ude the supervision of another nember may deal informally with a minor breach of di sci pl ine by that ot her menber, whet her by advi ce,
caution or warning, as the circunstances may require."

Does it always have to be in writing, as it was put in writing on this occasion?
A. It doesn't. It doesn't always have to be in writing. I have quite a good working knowledge of the discipline regulations. And no, it would always have to be in writing. But one must make some type of record in the notebook or something that that had occurred.
I am just wondering, would it have been permissible for you to simply have said to Garda Keogh, that wasn't satisfactory and don't do it again and will you give me an assurance that you won't do it again, and leave the matter at that? was that open to you?
A. Oh it would, yeah. But I didn't choose to do it in that fashion on this occasion or in the other four that you've opened to me.
474 Q. okay.
A. I was the superintendent. I suppose I was dealing with this matter personally to ensure confidentiality for Garda Keogh. It was left personally for me by my predecessor, who was also at superintendent rank. And it was important that, I suppose, there would be a full and transparent process, which was brought to a conclusion by the issue of this notice and that in turn 14:34 then allowed the payment of the monies owed to Garda Keogh in a very straight fashion.
475 Q. Looking at the regulation itself there, "Whether by advi ce", would it have been permissible for you maybe
to advise him that his car was inappropriately taxed and that there was to be no recurrence, without actually, as it were, formulating a charge against him as set out in the regulation 10 notice?
A. I did provide that advice at section B of the regulation 10 notice.
Q. Yes.
A. In that fashion.

477 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

478 Q. Okay. But in any event, you say it was entirely appropriate?
A. Yes.

479 Q. The fact that issues, in your belief, had been brought to the attention of the Dáil by Deputy Mick wallace, a mistaken belief, as we now know to be the position, but do you think in any way that that might have coloured your view of this?
A. Absolutely not, because this was part of the over all solution offered to Garda Keogh on the 26th march.
That didn't colour anything in relation to this, because I had already -- this was part of the deal that we had agreed. If he produced it, I would deal with it in this fashion. In fact, that should have made me step away from it, rather than go towards it.
Now, if we could just have volume 11 at page 3026 up on the screen, please. And if we scroll down to line 245. This is your interview with the Tribunal investigators. This is an assertion that Garda Keogh had made during
the course of his interview with the Tribunal investigators, where he said:
"Pat Mrray, after disciplining me on this matter, notor tax di sci plinary proceedi ngs, said he could organi se a transfer for me to Birr. I had never asked to be transferred to Birr and I refused."

And then your answer to that is:
"। am delighted to get an opportunity to address this."

And then you go on to state your position. Would you just state your position there now for us please?
A. I will. The meeting on the 3rd April lasted about half an hour. The regulation 10 part of it and photocopying his details was over in a matter of minutes, and the rest of the conversation was about Garda Keogh and his career, the value he might get to it if he were to return to the mindset he had before all this happened. And it was in that context that the conversation around the transfer occurred. The point I was making is: How do I help you? What can I do to help you? You're in a process now that can't be influenced, but how are you going to take care of yourself and what can I do to help? What options are open to you? And is a transfer of one of them? And if it is then, I remember saying to him, put your compass on a map in Tullamore, where he lived, and go in a circle then and see what might
suit you, and in doing that exercise in one's mind -- a number of stations were mentioned in that same radius, Birr, Kildare, Edenderry, Enfield and the conversation was in that type of fashion.
Was the mention of a transfer and the possibility of a transfer mentioned in the context of him having difficulties in Athlone Garda Station because Garda A was there?
A. No. It was about how he could, I suppose, bring himself back to get value from his career.
482 Q. But how did it a transfer accommodate that?
A. So if Athlone was a hindrance or if there were --

483 Q. What led you to believe it was a hindrance?
A. Because in the conversation I had with him, the issues that he brought up about Athlone were, you know, causing problems for him, he felt, the investigation and it was in that context, to see would this be of any benefit for him.
484 Q. Exactly what did he say about the problems that it was causing him, him being in Athlone?
A. The investigation itself and, I suppose, the fact it would be difficult for him to be there when it was going on. That type of a conversation about that.
485 Q. Did you have any view yourself in relation to that?
A. I didn't know much about the investigation. I knew that allegations were directed towards Garda A, but I didn't know, I suppose, what the ins and outs of it were. But it was having an effect on him, there is no doubt about that. And I suppose how does he help
himself? Is moving away from Athlone, even on a temporary basis, something that may help him? It was in that vein that the matter was discussed.
was there an implied recognition as a result of this conversation on your part, that it mightn't have all been drink related, that there might have been a work related stress issue there for him?
A. I didn't know, simply. Pardon?
A. I didn't -- I wasn't sure. I didn't know. At that stage I had referred him the day before to the CMO. well, he is quite clearly in the course of that conversation with you indicating that he is finding working in Athlone stressful, is that right?
A. Well, he wanted to continue working in Athlone, because 14:41 he wasn't sure about this transfer, he said he would have to think about it. He wasn't sure what way it would go for him. It was in that context that it was discussed. It is a very normal conversation. It lasted about half an hour and it was mostly about Garda 14:41 Keogh.
489 Q. We11, you see, if Garda Keogh was just simply suffering from a drink problem, a transfer to another station wasn't going to help him at all, isn't that right?
A. I don't know. I honestly don't know. A new 14:42 environment may allow him to clear his mind. It may allow him to take control of his life and manage his health.
490 Q. Do you even now recognise that Garda Keogh may have
been under a very stressful situation by remaining on in Athlone Garda Station after he had become a whistleblower?
A. I suppose obviously the situation was stressful for Garda Keogh, but to the best of my knowledge he never looked for a transfer, he never looked to move away from Athlone. I did hear him say here that he wanted to be in Athlone because he felt that is where he could oversee the investigation that he felt was his baby.
491 Q. If we can move on then to the 7th April, and if we can look at a letter that you sent to the chief superintendent in Mullingar, it's at page 8767 of the materials. You write:
"I refer to the above and wish to report that the nember submitted cl ai m for the use of his private vehi cle on 11/ $1 / 205$. The menber indi cated the cl ai $\mathrm{n} \Phi$ refer to the following dates..."

And you set them out.
"In total the clains amounted to €415. 99. The cl ai ns were left for me when l arrived in Athl one as di strict officer on 9th March 2015. It was brought to my attention that Garda Keogh may not have had his vehi cle 14:43 properly taxed. I made an enquiry with the motor tax office and was provi ded with documentary evi dence i ndi cating that Garda Keogh had taxed his vehi cle as goods class when it should have been taxed private, a
result in loss of revenue to the State of $€ 377$ resulted each year.

I met Garda Keogh on 26th March 2015. He admitted taxing hi s vehicle in the wrong class. I gave himan opportunity to correct his tax and pay any arrears due. He did so on the 27 th March and provi ded proof of same to me on 3rd April 2015. I then dealt with himby way of regul ation 10 di sci pl ine regul ations, copy attached, and approved his cl ai m® for payment. The matter is now 14:45 cl osed. "

You don't note there in your letter to the chief superintendent that on the 26th March you advised Garda Keogh that you would deal with the matter by way of regulation 10 if he got his tax in order. why don't you refer to that in your letter?
A. There's no reason to refer. The decision was entirely mine. The discipline regulations, as they're framed, don't allow me to have any access to initiate
discipline at superintendent rank, unless by the use of regulation 10. It's an unfettered use of that, that $I$ have as a superintendent, as has an inspector or sergeant. And under the discipline regulations the only one that has the delegated authority from the
Commissioner to initiate discipline is a chief superintendent. So, I just closed the matter out and I was informing the chief superintendent that the issue had been dealt with.
Q. If we go to page 15694 , please. This is the same letter which has been copied to Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin by mail on $8 / 4 / 2015$. Why did you copy it to Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin?
A. First of all, that's my handwriting on the top right-hand side. I sent the very same file to the Commissioner by way of e-mail, to show him that the issue that he phoned me about on the 1st April was closed off. I note that he in turn, from the disclosures that I have read, reported that to the Commissioner, who in turn reported it to the inspectorate and GSOC. I think under the confidential reporting and malpractice regulations, there is an onus on the Commissioner to inform GSOC and inspectorate of updates and developments in relation to confidential reporters. That's what he did with it and I sent it to him, after having a discussion with him on the 1st April, as I told him I would at the time, that I'd inform him when the matter had brought to a conclusion.
493 Q. Now, I think --
A. It wasn't uncommon to send reports to assistant commissioners and I did that in Athlone to the assistant commissioner Eastern Region at times, when issues arose that required his attention.
494 Q. In around this time you had a number of calls. If we could just deal with those. The first note of it is 2492, this is 20th April 2015. You received a call from Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and he advised that Garda Keogh rang the night before and was drunk
and began to give out about the delay in the investigation and wanted Garda A arrested; is that right?
A. Yes.

495 Q. You note that:
"Will bring down the Commi ssi oner, Assi stance Commi ssi oner and AGS through Mck Vallace and Cl are Dal y. "
A. Yes.

496 Q. And then:
"Became psychotic and di sturbing. He thought that Garda A will shoot both of them Has rats running around his computer and has superi mposed Commi ssi oner's 14:48 head on them $D /$ Superi ntendent Mul cahy to look into wel fare."

What did you make of that?
A. It was obviously the result of an overindulgence in
alcohol. This was a man who needed medical
intervention, like the CMO and a welfare programme. That became very apparent from that. That was the way the matter was reported to me by Detective Superintendent Mulcahy. From our conversation there, 14:49 both of us were concerned, it became apparent that Garda Keogh hadn't been liaising with the welfare service in a formal way.
497 Q. Yes.
A. We spoke that time in order that we might have a full-time welfare officer assigned to him or link in with him, to try and help him.
498 Q. And the following day --
A. And that call was a catalyst for that.

499 Q. The following day you received a telephone call from Detective Sergeant Curley, it's at page 2493?
A. Yes.
Q. Where you say:
"D/ Ser geant Curley got a call from Garda Keogh at 11am Tol d hi m Mck Wallace and Cl are Dal y are asking hi m about del ay in a murder trial."

Then a superintendent and a sergeant. And he then advised you that -- I am just trying to make some sense of it.
"... was expl ai ni ng to Eamonn, Garda Keogh tol d he..."

Can you make some sense of what that telephone call says?
A. Yes. Garda Keogh was telling Inspector Curley that he thought that Inspector Curley and the other member, who he had named, were okay. He wanted to get someone who was then a chief superintendent.

501 Q. If you go over to page 2494, this is a note that you have:
"Calls from D/ Superi nt endent Mul cahy re Garda Keogh. He al so phoned D/ Sergeant Curley."
A. Yes.

502 Q. "And was dr unk."
A. It's the same note, yeah.

503 Q. Is that a reference to the two earlier calls?
A. Yes.

504 Q. The one on the 20th?
A. It's the same note, the one you have opened there, there's an actual note from my diary itself and then it 14:51 goes into more detail in a secondary note.

505
Q. So they're not additional calls?
A. No, it's the same one.

506 Q. And the one from Detective Superintendent Mulcahy you note that again, even though it was at 11am in the morning, that Garda Keogh was drunk?
A. Yes.

507 Q. I think you then wrote to the superintendent on 21st Apri1 2015?
A. Yes.

508 Q. The letter is at page 2495?
A. Yes.

509 Q. That concerned a report that we will just look at briefly. But you write to the chief superintendent:
"I attach for your inf ormation a report from Detective Sergeant Curley regarding a phone call he recei ved from Garda Keogh. As a result of my interaction with Det ective Superintendent Mul cahy, Western Region, I am
aware that Garda Keogh has been behaving in an unusual and di sturbing manner and is using al cohol. Detective Superintendent Mul cahy has arranged that the member meet with Garda Mck Qui nn, wel fare officer. I understand that this is acceptable to the member and a meeting has been arranged to take pl ace today, 21st April 2015."

You had been led to believe that by?
A. Detective Superintendent Mulcahy, who I had discussed it with.

510 Q. "As you are aware, I put supports in place for the nenber in Athl one and made a referral to the CMD to expl ore ot her available supports. There are no ot her avenues available to me to support the menber."

And then a copy of the report of Sergeant Curley is to be found at page 2496. If you just look briefly at that.
"I wi sh to report that on the above date Garda Ni chol as Keogh. .."

And this was on the 21st Apri1.
"... phoned me on my official phone. He sounded agitated and nervous.

He stated that he was being used by TDs Cl are Daly and

Mck Vallace. He stated that they were seeki ng to mention in the Dáil a murder case and the fact that the accused is wal king around town on bail for four years. He went on to say that they had recei ved letters from the public on this and that they had asked himto get a phone number of an indi vidual. And that he didthat. He stated that he was trying to stop themfrombringing up this matter in the Dáil and that if it came up he wanted me to know it di dn't come fromhim

Then went on to say he is proud of his work in the Guards and his family have a proud tradition of working in An Garda Sí ochána. I interjected on a number of occasi ons and advi sed himthat it was a conversation he would be best having with Decl an Mul cahy, Detective Superintendent, whom he informed me was his cont act person for his compl ai nt. He replied that he had al ready informed himof this and he was now informing me because if it came out, it may reflect badly on me as the detective sergeant Athl one and he wanted me to know it di dn't come fromhim

He stated that he was going to hol d of Cl are Daly and Mck hallace frombringing this matter up in the Dáil for as long as he could but he might not be able to do so long-term

I had never previ ously had a conversation with Garda Keogh on any subject rel ating to issues surrounding
allegations he may have made agai nst gardaí based in At hl one.

Forwarded for your information."

Now, one has to note there that he doesn't refer to the fact that Garda keogh was drunk during the course of that telephone conversation.
A. He is being kind to Garda Keogh.

511 Q. Pardon?
A. He is trying to be kind to Garda Keogh. We had -Detective Sergeant Curley came to me about it.
Q. You might correct me if I am wrong, but in your original note on 2493, of your conversation with Detective Sergeant Curley, you haven't noted that he said he was drunk when he was dealing with Garda Keogh, that Garda Keogh was drunk, should I say. The note where you first mention this is, the composite note, at 2494. Can you say why that is, or it may be totally inconsequential.
A. I can't. I am happy enough that when I discussed it with Detective Sergeant Curley that morning, that he indicated to me that he felt Garda Keogh was drunk.
513 Q. Just for the sake of -- no, that's outside the timeframe that we are now looking at by quite a
substantial amount. So we are going to move on now, in relation to the car tax issue itself and how you ultimately dealt with it. This might be a convenient time to interpose Garda Stephanie Treacy.

CHA RMAK Very good. Just clarify the question of the car tax, why are you moving on that one?
MR. MARR NAN Just on to how he dealt with it generally within the station.

CHA RMAN Oh sorry, yes, I am sorry. Thank you very much. With others, yes.

MR. MARRI NAN Yes.
CHA RMAN So you want to suspend operations there and I think it's probably unlikely that we will be returning to Chief Superintendent Murray, is that right? Very good, thank you very much.

WTNESS: Thank you.
CHA RMAN So we will ask you to come back tomorrow, chief superintendent.
WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN Even if we finish up a little earlier. WTNESS: Thank you.

## THE WTNESS THEN STOOD DOWN

MR. MEGI NESS: Chairman, the next witness is Garda Stephanie Treacy.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
GARDA STEPHAN E TREACY, HAV NG BEEN SVDRN, WAS

WTNESS: Garda Stephanie Treacy, Athlone Garda
Station.

CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
514 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Garda Treacy's statement may be found at page 469 onwards.
CHA RMAN Thank you.
515 Q.
MR. MEGU NESS: Garda Treacy, I think you're stationed
 in Dundalk, is that correct, or in Athlone?
A. In Athlone, that's correct.

516 Q. When were you attested as a member?
A. In 2008.

517 Q. I think you were first stationed then in
Carrick-on-Shannon after that, and you left there in 2011?
A. That's correct.

518 Q. And you have been there with the exception of a temporary transfer to Dundalk --
A. That's correct.

519 Q. -- for a short period, for a year in fact, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

520 Q. In 2016. Now, I think you were interviewed by the
Tribunal investigators and you were shown a copy of your report that you had written in relation to the statement of Cheyanne O'Neill, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

521 Q. That was a report that you wrote on 29th May 2014, following events in the station on 28th May 2014?
A. That's correct.

522 Q. Could you just, doing the best you can from your recollection moment, could you tell the Tribunal what
occurred on the 28th? You were on duty there in the late afternoon, as $I$ understand it?
A. That's correct. I was on duty. I was on the early duty day, due to finish at 5 pm . The sergeant, Sergeant Haran, sometime in the late afternoon approached me, and he was the sergeant covering the late unit. He asked me -- he informed me that Ms. O'Neil1 and Cheyanne were in the station to make a statement and he asked me as favour to oblige in taking that statement, as, I don't know, I think he said it was either they couldn't do it at the desk and he didn't have any other members.
523 Q. Okay. Now, first of all, did you know Ms. O'Neill and her daughter or either of them?
A. Yes, Ms. O'Neill more so than her daughter. I knew of her daughter but I knew Ms. O'Neill.
Q. Had you been aware of this, sort of public order incident that had been going on since the early hours of the 26th/27th May?
A. Yes. I wasn't aware of the actual incident she was making a statement about but I was aware of the over all bad feeling that was in the estate and there was numerous public order incidents.

525 Q. Yes. Was that a sort of ongoing sword that would erupt from time to time?
A. Yes.

526 Q. Was Ms. B one of the persons inter alia on one side of the feud at different stages?
A. Yes.

527 Q. Now, in terms of what Sergeant Haran told you, did he say anything to you about what Ms. O'Neill wanted to make a statement about?
A. No.
Q. Did you see Ms. O'Neill at any stage speaking to Garda Keogh?
A. No.

529 Q. Had you been in the public office yourself at that point in time?
A. No.
Q. Where were you when Sergeant Haran came to ask you to do this duty?
A. I was in the back office, it was known as the files room.
Q. okay. either outside the pub7ic office or at the hatch of the public office?
A. No. This office was situated down the corridor, close to the rear door of the station, not near the public office.

532 Q. Okay. So did you go out and did Sergeant Haran introduce you to Ms. O'Neill or did you just go over to her yourself?
A. I just went over to her myself, from my recollection. As I said, I knew her.

533 Q. Yes.
A. So I went out to the public office to her.

534 Q. Okay. Did you have any conversation with her there about what she wanted to make a statement about?
A. No, not there. I brought her up to an interview room.

535 Q. And you brought her daughter with her?
A. Yes.

536 Q. At what stage did you understand that her daughter had apparently been threatened and that it was she who would be making the statement?
A. Before $I$ took the statement, in the interview room.

537 Q. Yes. Now, did you commence taking the statement then?
A. Em...
Q. Or were you getting sort of a description?
A. From my recollection, I was getting a background of the incident, because I wasn't aware of what they wanted to make a statement about. So I was getting background to the incident and I think maybe having written the first line.

539 Q. Had you put the paper on the table and commenced the first line or two of the statement?
A. Yes, from my recollection, yes.
Q. All right. Was it just the three of you in the room at that stage?
A. Yes.

541 Q. Now, when you were getting the background, were you getting that exclusively from Ms. O'Neill or from Ms. O'Neill and her daughter?
A. From the two of them, but mostly Ms. O'Neill.

542 Q. Yes. Doing the best you can, can you recollect what she said to you at that point?
A. Just in relation to the background?

543 Q. Yes.


Q. Did she mention any particular garda at that point or at a11?
A. No.
Q. And in relation to each of the three things that you have told the Chairman about, you have said that that right?
A. Yes, Ms. O'Neill, yes. And are you fairly clear about that?
A. Yes.

550 Q. Is it the case then that you certainly didn't think, or did you think that she was telling you that she knew of these things from her own knowledge? Or did you think that she had been told this by somebody else?
A. That she had been told this by somebody else. She said she had been told. statement that Cheyanne was going to make or started making?
A. Yes. She said that she had been told that it had to go in the statement, to make sure it went into the statement that Cheyanne was going to make.
552 Q. Did you ask her anything then?
A. I did. I asked her who had told her this and she replied that Garda Nick, just now at the counter downstairs.
553 Q. Well now, your question there seems to have been related at least to the issue as to who had told her to make sure that the information went into her and Cheyanne's statement and she told you Garda Nick, down below. But was she confirming to you that she had been told the other things by Garda Nick downstairs, was that your understanding?
A. That was my understanding, yes. That's what she told me.

554 Q. okay. So to be clear then, you didn't specifically ask her whether Garda Nick had told her the first three things or all of them?
A. From my recollection, when I said, who told you all this?
Q. A11 right.
A. And she said, Garda Nick, at the counter downstairs.

556 Q. So, are you clear in your own mind that your question and her answer embraced all of the things that she told you she was told?
A. Yes.

557 Q. And that it all related to being told them by Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.

558 Q. What was your reaction to that?
A. I found it uncomfortable and I wanted advice on it. I wanted to ensure that $I$ did the right thing in that instance.

559 Q. Yes.
A. So I left the room.

560 Q. Yes.
A. And sought advice.

561 Q. Were you unsure as to what to do or what the correct 15:09 position to do adopt would be?
A. Yes.

562 Q. All right. I suppose one course of action could have been to go straight down to Garda Keogh and ask him had he said any of these things. Did you consider whether 15:09 you might have done that?
A. No, I never considered it.

563 Q. Okay.
A. No.

564 Q. In any event, I think you were here for Ms. O'Neill's evidence last week, were you?
A. Yes.

565 Q. She said in fact a number of different things, each of which I will ask you to deal with. She said that she said that there were ears in the Garda station. Did she say anything about ears in the Garda station to you?
A. No. First of all, can you recollect what you reported to Sergeant Keane?
A. Yes. I told her that I was taking a statement from Ms. O'Neill and that while taking the statement, she
told me that Garda Keogh had given her information about Ms. B and that she had been told to ensure that it was incorporated into the statement. And I told her the information.
570 Q. Yes. Did she offer any view about what to do at that stage or was there any discussion with her about just going down to speak to Garda Keogh?
A. No.

571 Q.
Is it the case then, that she took it straight to Inspector Farrell, is that right?
A. Yes.
A. No. Inspector Farrell would always be available for assistance and guidance.
573 Q. Yes.
A. But you would normally go to a supervisor, your immediate supervisor first.
Q. Yes. Did you explain it in the same way to Inspector Farre11 as you had to Sergeant Keane?
A. Yes.

575 Q. Did he ask you any questions?
A. Not that I recall. I think he -- I don't recall him asking me any questions.
576 Q. okay. And what did he advise?
A. He advised that the information shouldn't go into that 15:12 statement and that she should -- Ms. O'Neill should be -- that I should continue taking the original statement as planned.
577 Q. Yes.
A. And that Ms. O'Neill should be invited to make a separate statement if she wished about any allegation she had, and she should be informed that she can make a statement, she can go to the superintendent or straight to the Ombudsman Commission.
Q. I mean, did you consider that she had made an allegation to you that warranted a statement to a superintendent or to GSOC, about a guard?
A. No. I considered -- the way Inspector Farre11 explained it to me was, he said, if she had been in to make -- if Ms. O'Neill had been in to make the statement and in the middle of making the statement she also said, oh and my house was burgled by Joe blogs, he said, would you incorporate it into the statement. I said, no. He said, what would you do? I said, I would take a separate statement, it's a separate investigation, it's a separate allegation. He said, exactly. He said, this is the exact same thing, invite her to make a different statement if she wishes to. And that's exactly what I did.
579 Q. Yes. From point of view of how Ms. O'Neill presented herself to you and when she told you that she had been told these things, did it appear to you that she was making a complaint about Garda Keogh or just telling you about information that she did want to put into a statement?
A. No, it didn't appear that they was making a complaint, no, just telling me the information.

580 Q. We11, how long would you say you spent with Inspector

Farre11 and Sergeant Keane?
A. Em, possibly ten minutes or so. I can't say exactly.

581 Q. Okay. Did Sergeant Keane come in to the room with you when you went back?
A. When I returned to Ms. O'Neill, yes.

582 Q. And had she been in the room before that?
A. No.

583 Q. okay. So from the point of view of where things had been left, you had perhaps commenced to write the first line of the statement, you left of your own accord to see Sergeant Keane, leaving Ms. O'Neill and Cheyanne there, is that right?
A. That's correct.

584 Q. You came back in with Sergeant Keane then?
A. That's correct.

585 Q. Did you recommence taking the statement or did you address Ms. O'Neill about this issue?
A. I think I introduced Ms. O'Neil1 to Sergeant Keane.
Q. Yes.
A. We addressed this issue before I commenced taking the statement.

587 Q. Yes. Did each of you speak to Ms. O'Neill or was it the sergeant or yourself or both of you?
A. Both of us, I believe.

588 Q. Okay. Can you recollect what you told her?
A. Yes. We told her that if she wanted to make any complaint in relation to Garda malpractice or anything like that, that there were different ways she could go about doing so. That she could go to the Ombudsman

Commission, that she could meet with a superintendent and that she could make a witness statement to the Gardaí.
were you linking or did you link this suggestion about possibly making a statement about Garda malpractice, did you link it with what she said about Garda Keogh? I mean, did you address it in that way?
A. Well, there was -- I mean, I wasn't going to put words in her mouth. It could have been, I don't know, it could have been about Garda Keogh or it could have been about the information that she now had, regardless of who gave it to her. But if there was allegations that she now had, that's what I presume she would have been making a statement about.
Yes. Ms. O'Neill disputed vehemently that she hadn't been told about going to the Ombudsman by I think either of you at that stage.
A. Yes. Have you got a clear recommend of that?
A. I have a very clear memory of that. That was most definitely explained to her and explained very clearly I think to her. Because it was -- that part was important to me, because up until that point it wasn't about me. It was -- she had mentioned certain gardaí, she hadn't mentioned names and she had mentioned Garda Keogh. And these were allegations of malpractice and covering up for Ms. B, and I wanted to be very sure that she was very clear and aware that I was not covering up anything or nor trying to cover up anything
okay. Had she in fact mentioned any guard by name
while in the room with you, either initially or when you came back?
A. Just Garda Nick.
Q. Just Garda Nick. I am sure you have heard that or read it or both, that he simply told her to name names and name any guards involved. Did she mention anything about just being told to name names?
A. No. When I explained to her -- when Sergeant Keane and

I explained to her about making a statement, making a complaint to the Ombudsman or making a statement, she said that she didn't have any complaint to make and she was just saying what she had been told to say.
Q. okay.
A. So when I explained this to her, I knew myself that she understood when she replied to me.

Just Garda Nick.

Q Yes. I mean, did you ask her to make a statement in relation to Garda Keogh?
A. No.
Q. Did you ask her to make a statement against Garda Keogh?
A. No.
Q. Did you suggest to her that she should consider making a complaint about Garda Keogh to the superintendent or to GSOC?
A. No.
Q. In your answer to the fourth last question, you
or Ms. B or for any guard or for anyone.
referred about making a complaint to the Ombudsman. Now, a lot of people use the shorthand GSOC, can you recollect, did you use the full title of GSoc or did you just call it GSOC or did you just call it the Ombudsman?
A. I think I called to the ombudsman. I think, from my recollection. when I am speaking to members of the public I would generally refer to it as the Ombudsman. But would that not require you to explain that this is the Ombudsman for people who want to make complaints about guards, if they have a complaint?
A. Em, I think -- we11, when we say the Garda Ombudsman, I don't know that I explained fully what their role was. I don't think I did.
Q. All right. You didn't have any forms with you for making a complaint to the Ombudsman?
A. No.

601 Q. In any event, Ms. O'Neill said she wouldn't make a statement or didn't want to make a statement about any such matter, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did she respond to that invitation by saying anything further?
A. In relation to what we had explained to her?

603 Q. Yes.
A. She said, I don't have any complaint to make, I was only saying what I was told to say.

604 Q. At that stage did she say who or where she had been told what to say?
A. Not at that stage, I believe.

605 Q. You took a statement from Cheyanne then; is that right?
A. That's correct.

606 Q. Did Sergeant Keane remain for the whole of that process?
A. No.

607 Q. At what stage did Sergeant Keane leave the room?
A. I think after Ms. O'Neill had been advised and said that she had no complaint to make, I think Sergeant Keane left the room at that stage.
608 Q. Just to be clear, how did it come about that you actually wrote the report of the 29/5?
A. Sorry, I don't understand.

609 Q. A member of the public had come in with her daughter to make a statement about an incident and you had taken a statement from her daughter?
A. Yes.

610 Q. Now, did Ms. O'Neill herself want to make a statement about the incident?
A. About the incident that she was originally reporting?

611 Q. Yes.
A. No, I don't believe so, or I didn't take one off her that day anyway.
612 Q. Al1 right. Did you refuse to take statement from her about the incident?
A. No, no, not at all.

613 Q. okay. So you have taken the statement from Ms. O'Neill's daughter?
A. Yes. moment ago that you felt it was pertinent that this was sent up through the channels in a formal way?
A. Yes.

618 Q. That seems then, on the basis of your subsequent answers, to have been your decision?
A. I believe so.

619 Q. Okay. Perhaps we will just look at the report at page 484. It starts, it's headed:
"St at ement of Cheyanne O' Nei II."

Just from the point of view a minor discrepancy, Inspector Farre11 subsequently refers to Ms. O'Neil1
having made a statement of complaint in respect of her daughter. But that's not accurate.
A. No. No.

620 Q. There was only the one statement taken that day, from the young person?
A. Yes.

621 Q. Now, you see the last line in the first paragraph:
"Garda Keogh was unable to leave the office to take a st at ement, so Ser geant Andrew Har an asked Garda Treacy to obl ige."
A. Yes.
Q. Is that something you were told on that afternoon or did you learn that subsequently?
A. No, I was aware at the time that Garda Keogh was the public officer and Sergeant Haran -- I believe that's what Sergeant Haran told me at the time. It most likely is, as the report was contemporaneous.

623 Q. The second paragraph then records the three items that you told the Tribunal Ms. B [sic] told you about, isn't 15:25 that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

624 Q. Without reference to any other member of An Garda Síochána?
A. That's correct, yes.

625 Q. And you identify the member. The next line says:
"Mb. O' Neill inf ormed Garda Treacy she was tol d to make sure the above inf ormation goes into her and Cheyanne's
st at ements. "

And then you're recorded as asking who advised her of this. And you write there:
"Mb. O' Neill said 'Garda Ni ck, just now at the counter downstai rs'."

This refers to everything in the preceding two paragraphs, is that your evidence?
A. Yes. A report, it's obviously a more formal way of getting it across than a conversation. The conversation between Ms. O'Neill and I would have been slightly more informal.
626 Q. Yes. It's not a criticism, but the last paragraph omits any reference to going to Inspector Farrell or getting advice. Is there any reason why you might not have included that?
A. I think really -- I don't know why. I don't know why. There's no reason for it at all.

627 Q. A11 right. It concludes then:
"Mb. O' Neill said she did not have a compl ai nt to make in rel ati on to the Gardaí and was onl y going on advi ce she had recei ved at the counter."

Is that something she said to you at that point?
A. Yes.

628 Q. You sent that up to the sergeant in charge of Ath1one

Garda Station. who should have got that then at that time?
A. From my recollection, it could have been Sergeant Baker, now Inspector Baker, possibly. It would have been whoever was the sergeant in charge at the time. I 15:27 think it would have been Inspector Baker.
629 Q. Yes. The Tribunal has seen Inspector Farrell's report that went up to the chief superintendent, while he was acting superintendent. Did you see that at the time or did he speak to you after your report had gone in?
A. No.

630 Q. Did either of the sergeants in charge speak to you in relation to your report?
A. No.

631 Q. Did anybody come and speak to you about the report?
A. No.

632 Q. Perhaps we will just look at one or two lines of that. At page 653, it's the second page of Inspector Farrell's report of the 29th. On the fourth line of that, it records:

[^2]First of all, did you describe Ms. O'Neill as having concerns about the advice she had been given, or do you remember how you described it?
A. No, very factually repeated what she told me.

633 Q. Inspector Farre11 seemed to have envisaged three possible options there, or two options perhaps; invited to make a statement outlining her concerns and also then that she be made aware of the options available to her, which seemed to then involve another two options, going to the superintendent or GSOC, and/or GSOC. Did you understand your instructions that had been given to you by Inspector Farre11 in that way?
A. Yes.

634 Q. You did?
A. Yes.

635 Q. Okay. So you invited her to make a statement, invited Ms. O'Neill to make a statement about what she had been told by Garda Keogh, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you also advised her about an option of making a statement to the superintendent, is that correct?
A. Of meeting with the superintendent.

637 Q. Of meeting the superintendent?
A. Yeah, speaking with the superintendent.

638 Q. To bring her concerns, it wouldn't necessarily include a statement then, is that right?
A. I am unaware. I am unaware.

639 Q. Can I just ask you, Garda Treacy, what were your relations like with Garda Keogh as a colleague? Had
you known him a long time and got on well with him? How would you describe your relations?
A. Yeah, we got on fine. We never worked on the one unit but we never had any issues at all. Yeah, Garda Keogh was all right.

640 Q. Did bring it to the attention that Garda Keogh spoke to you on the phone at some stage, is that correct?
A. Yes.
A. I was dealing with a family, I was with a family in relation to a serious incident. I rang to speak -asked to speak to a sergeant one evening, I think it may have been a Sunday, I rang the Garda station and Garda Keogh answered the phone on that date.
642 Q. Yes.
A. I don't have any notes to say exactly what was said, I can't recollect exactly what was said, but I know it was an uncomfortable conversation. Garda Keogh challenged me. He brought up the incident. I asked to speak to a sergeant. Garda Keogh brought up the incident with Olivia O'Neill, he asked me why I had gone to management about it. As I said, I can't remember word-for-word what was said but I know it wasn't a pleasant conversation.
643 Q. He was querying you in some way about why you had gone to management about this?
A. Yes.

644 Q. Is that right? I think you raised that issue with Sergeant Keane, was it, or was it Inspector Farrell?
A. I believe it was with Superintendent McBrien.

645 Q. I beg your pardon.
A. Yeah.

646 Q. Superintendent McBrien.
A. Yeah. Garda Keogh had told me in that conversation that it was going to go further. I think he may have said that $I$ was going to be interviewed about it. As I said, I felt it was uncomfortable and I didn't know what I was being accused of or what was being alleged against me. And I went to the superintendent about it. 15:33 647 Q. Yes. Superintendent McBrien's account of that is in Volume 5, at page 1187. Perhaps we will just look at that. In the second paragraph there, she describes:
"On the 9th July, Garda Stephanie Treacy met with me and said she was concerned about the Oivia O Neill i nci dent. She said she works with both Garda Keogh and Garda A and she gets on well with them both. She was concerned because one evening in ringing the station, the tel ephone was answered by Garda Keogh. He i ndi cated to her that the Oivia O Neill incident could be going further."

What did you understand that might mean, if you did understand it meant something?
A. I didn't know exactly what it might mean but I -- it concerned me. I was concerned that a complaint was being made against me, or that an allegation of some wrongdoing was being made against me.

648 Q. She records then:
"I had a conversation with her about this. I offered her the services of the Garda welf are officer. She declined and said she gets on well with Sergeant Keane and she would contact her if she needed to. I al so advi sed her to contact me if she had any difficulties."

But do I understand your evidence, you had no incident with Garda Keogh before or after this which led to any $i 11$ feeling between you?
A. No.

649 Q. You didn't have to go back to either Superintendent McBrien or Sergeant Keane, did you?
A. No.

650 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you. If you could answer any further questions.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. who is on your team? Ms. Mulligan, is it? Thank you.

## GARDA STEPHAN E TREACY VAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY ME.

MLLI GAN, AS FOLLOVS:

651 Q. MS. MLLI GAN Good afternoon, Chairman. Good afternoon, Garda Treacy. If I am not speaking into the microphone, please remind me. Garda Treacy, just to
confirm, I think it says in your statement that you started in Athlone in 2001, but that's 2011; isn't that right.
A. That's correct.

652 Q. I think it's just a typo. In terms of that then, your relationship with Sergeant Keane is, would you call it quite a close relationship?
A. A close working relationship.
Q. Yes. would you be friendly both inside and outside of work?
A. We don't really socialise together outside work, apart from Garda occasions, Garda dos.
654 Q. okay.
A. But we have a good working relationship.

655 Q. You have a good working relationship. Just to be clear, is she the person that would you normally go to if some issue did arise? Is she kind of the first port of call? She is your direct sergeant in charge.
A. She was my direct sergeant, my unit sergeant, my direct supervisor, so...
656 Q. At the time?
A. At the time.

657 Q. Does she continue to be your direct sergeant?
A. No.

658 Q. No. Okay. In terms of Inspector Farrell then, is it 15:36 fair to say that you would normally go to Sergeant Keane before you go to Inspector Farrell?
A. You would go to a sergeant, yeah, your supervisor.

659 Q. Yes.
A. Mostly.

660 Q. But you have a good relationship with Inspector Farrell, is that fair?
A. Yes, a good working relationship.

661 Q. And in relation to both of these two superior officers, 15:37 is it fair to say that if they tell you to do something, you take their direction, subject to it making simple sense to you, is that fair?
A. Yes.
A.
Q. Okay. Just in terms of the history and your involvement in Athlone since you have been there, since 2011. In cross-examination on Thursday, Inspector between Ms. B and Garda A in the community since about 2012. Did you have any awareness of that allegation being in the community at the time?
A. Never.
Q. Okay. And is it fair to say that Inspector Farre11 didn't raise that issue with you in and around 28th May 2014?
A. Which issue?

667 Q. He didn't tell that you there had been a rumour in the community, that he had been aware of?
A. No.

668 Q. No? That's not something that came up, is that right?
A. No, that's not something that we ever spoke about, no.

669 Q. Okay. And in terms of Garda Keogh being a whistleblower, is it fair to say that you became aware of that on 8th May 2014, in terms of either newspaper or media coverage?
A. Yes.

670 Q. Yes. Is it fair to say then that -- I am not sure if you were here when Sergeant Haran gave his evidence, but were you aware that the unit was, we'11 say, informally briefed by Garda Keogh on the 8th?
A. No. No.

671 Q. Were you in work on the 8th May, do you recall?
A. Em, yes, I believe I was, because -- I think I was working the early shift, yes.

672 Q. Did you become aware that there was -- that this unit briefing had arisen?
A. No.

673 Q. No. Nobody told you about it either the following day or nobody discussed it with you?
A. No. From my recollection, no.

674 Q. I just want to confirm in terms of the Pulse entry, 15:40 Mr. Kavanagh, at page 1802, I know everyone here has seen it extensively. But just to confirm, Garda Treacy, prior to Ms. O'Neill coming in to give her statement, had you had sight of this Pulse entry?
A. I don't believe I did, no. I think the first one I saw 15:40 was in disclosure. I can't -- that's to my recollection.

675 Q. Okay. Was there any awareness in the station at the time that this Pulse entry existed?
A. Yes.

676 Q. Yes. Can you recal1 to the best of your knowledge and belief when or how you became aware of that, who told you or any details surrounding it?
A. I can't recall. I recall slightly being aware of a Pulse intelligence entry but I definitely don't remember being aware of the wording or anything like that.

677 Q. And again, you don't remember who told you, is that right?
A. I don't remember, no.

678 Q. Do you remember if it was any cause for concern by members or was it the subject of controversy?
A. Again, I don't really -- I don't really remember. I don't remember talking about it in depth or anything

1ike that.
679 Q. Okay. Just in terms of, I think Olivia O'Neill refers to you to as Garda Stephanie in her own
direct-evidence. I think you have said again in your direct-evidence that you were familiar with Ms. O'Neill, approximately how many times did you meet Ms. O'Neill, give or take?
A. I couldn't even give an approximate. It's is a lot.

680 Q. Okay, several times?
A. Yeah.

681 Q. More than ten?
A. Yeah, probably, yeah.

682 Q. And would you have had interview contact with Ms. O'Neill at that time?
A. Em, possibly not. I am not sure that I had interviewed 15:42 her at that stage. I don't think so.

683 Q. Without giving too much detail about individual incidents, can you just confirm some of the context of when you had met her previously?
A. I'd met her, more so in relation to members of her family than she herself.

684 Q. In terms of when you're taking a statement from Ms. O'Neill, did you take into account -- for example, did you have any awareness of her literacy skills?
A. No.

685 Q. Did you have any -- did you ask?
A. No.

686 Q. Did you have any awareness of any limitations that she may or may not have?
A. No.
Q. Did you ask?
A. If she had limitations? In what respect? No.

688 Q. I think she gives her own evidence about her memory and things like that, just any limitations you might want to be aware of in taking her evidence. Did you consider you might need to take it slower, that you might need to ask individual questions, that you might have to take it at a slower pace? Anything like that, that you took into account when taking a statement from 15:43 an individual?
A. No, when taking a statement from anybody I -- we speak about it first and I read over the declaration to the person, I ask them if they understand that and I would presume that if they had any difficulties, that's when they would bring it up.

689 Q. Okay. Just on that basis, can I just ask you to have a little look at page 1889. Again, this is your own report. Can you see that, Garda Treacy?
A. Yes.

690 Q. I wonder could you just have a little look at the second paragraph and then the third paragraph. And then the fourth paragraph says:
"Garda Treacy asked Ms. O' Neill who advi sed her of this 15:44 and Mb. O'Neill said 'Garda Ni ck, just now at the counter downstairs'."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.

691 Q. Is it fair to say that there are two questions and that there is no, we'11 say, question one, answer one, question two, answer two. I think that's a fact. Can I just ask why that is the case? why were they amalgamated and bundled into one answer?
A. Because I believe the way I phrased it was: And who told you all this? And that was her reply. Just on that note, Garda Treacy, I asked Sergeant Keane on Thursday had she ever made an allegation of coaching or fabrication against a colleague and she said neither before or since. And I just want to ask you the same question. I presume the answer is the same; you have never made that allegation against any other colleague, is that fair?
A. I would definitely like to point out I am not making any allegation against a colleague. I am not making any allegation against Garda Keogh. I am repeating only what Ms. O'Neill said to me. I am not saying that Garda Keogh said it to her, I am saying that she said that to me. of the Chairman, you did say that you wished to pursue this matter in a formal way, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, I thought that information should be passed through the channels, through the correct channels, yes.

694 Q. And that's after Ms. O'Neill refused to make a statement of any kind to An Garda Síochána?
A. Yes.

695 Q. Therefore, we're left with what we might describe as hearsay, it might be double layered hearsay, because we're not entirely clear what Ms. O'Neill is saying and it's your report of what Ms. O'Neill was saying, isn't that right?
A. Exactly, I sent a report up of what was being said to me.
Q. And just to be clear, no one ever asked you in terms of either Sergeant Keane, Inspector Farre11, Noreen
MCBrien or Chief Superintendent Mark Curran, no one ever asked to you clarify those three statements, did they? No one ever came back to you about it, no one ever questioned it or raised any concerns about how this report was put together, is that fair?
A. That's correct. I can't swear that we didn't speak about it when I spoke to Superintendent McBrien, but as far as I know that would be the only time that I would have spoken about this incident.
697 Q. Okay. Mr. Kavanagh, I wonder could we just go to Thursday's transcript please. If we could go to page 15, line 6. Day 121, my apologies. I just want to clarify -- page 15 and 1ine 6. I think it's the case that Ms. McGrath put it to Sergeant Keane and she says:
"And agai $n$ you will have heard the evi dence over the last number of days with various witnesses. Just to cl arify you're your own understanding, that the Garda misconduct was an allegation effectivel y of coaching or
incl udi ng inf ormation in a statement, is that fair to say?"

The answer:
"From what Garda Treacy said to me, yes."

So do you agree or disagree with Sergeant Keane's understanding?
A. I agree that personally I believed and I believe that if that was told, if that information was given by any member of An Garda Síochána to any member of the public, that that's highly unprofessional. I believe that would be misconduct. But I also believe that the allegations in relation to Ms. B and certain Gardaí, they are also misconduct.

698 Q. Okay. That's not the answer to my question, Garda Treacy. My question was: Do you agree or disagree with the statement or the understanding of sergeant Keane?
A. Sorry, I don't understand the question.

699 Q. Do you agree with Sergeant Keane's understanding of events about the allegation of his conduct was in relation to coaching?
A. No, as I said, the word coaching never came into it.

The allegations -- I say that there were two allegations; one, that Ms. B told -- or Ms. O'Neill told me that she was told this by a garda, and I believe that, yes, that was Garda misconduct, but I
also believe that the other allegations should have been -- should be investigated, if they were allegations made by Ms. O'Neill.
700 Q. So, was Sergeant Keane incorrect in her understanding of what you are alleging?
A. No. Sergeant Keane was very correct. I was repeating what had been said to me. I am going to repeat myself, Garda Treacy, just to be absolutely clear: Sergeant Keane was clear that she understood you were making effectively an allegation of 15:51 coaching, including information in a statement, she says:
"From what Garda Treacy said to re, yes."

That was the allegation that was being made. And my question is: Is Sergeant Keane correct in her understanding of what you were putting to her? She can be incorrect but I need to know if she's incorrect.
CHA RMAN I think the question you mean to ask is, do you agree with that. It's not for her to say whether she's correct or not, what she can say is whether she agrees or not.
MS. MLLI GAN Very good, Chairman.
A. Yes, I agree. I agree that -- no, I don't agree, sorry, that Ms. O'Neill was making that complaint. I don't, I don't agree that Ms. O'Neill was making an allegation against Garda Keogh at a11. But I agree that if that information was given by Garda Keogh, then
that would be Garda malpractice.
702 Q. Okay. Just again for the benefit of the Chairman, what is the allegation of misconduct that you were reporting up the line, as you said, it was necessary to do in a formal manner?
A. There are two allegations to my mind of misconduct. Number one, that information was given by a garda to a member of the pub7ic, in a pub7ic area or anywhere, of very sensitive information. And number two, allegations of Ms. B being protected by certain gardaí. okay. And is it your understanding that Sergeant Keane understood you to be making two allegations and not one?
MR. KANE: Judge, I am sorry to interject but we are having a lot of discussions around interpretations. Garda Treacy's evidence is essentially what she committed to writing. That's her account. I think it's unfair that -- and I didn't interrupt on the first opportunity I had, I think it's unfair that she is being subjected to sustained questioning on the interpretation of what Ms. O'Neill said.
MS. MLLI GAN Respectfully, Chairman, I think Sergeant Keane gave her own evidence, that she relied entirely and took no notes because she was absolutely certain as to what Garda Treacy was alleging. I am trying to
clarify whether or not Garda Treacy was certain about what she is alleging and what that was. Because if there is a discrepancy between the two of them, that is something that the Chairman has to consider, and that
is why I am pursuing this line of questioning.
CHA RMAN Sorry, let's just clarify where we are. We know that Garda Treacy spoke to Sergeant Keane, reported to her what had happened. We know what Sergeant Keane said she understood from that.

MS. MLLI GAN Yes.
CHA RMAR This witness has given her evidence as to what she meant. How can this witness pass judgment as to whether the sergeant is correct or incorrect in the sergeant's understanding of what this witness told her? Te11 me how that can happen.

MS. MLLI GAN Judge, I am not asking Garda -CHA RMAK No, but you did ask that. I don't want to be unfair to you. I don't want to stop you asking something. At the same time, I am having difficulty in 15:55 following how this witness can comment on the correctness of the understanding of another witness. MS. MLLI GAN Chairman, all I am trying to identify is: Is there a discrepancy between the two? It appears that there may be a discrepancy.
CHA RMAN Yes.
ME. MLLI GAN That's all 1 am trying, to give the opportunity -- that I put every version of that to Garda Treacy, to make sure that the Chairman is clear. CHA RMAN I have no difficu7ty with a discrepancy and you have established that and you have asked does this witness agree with that statement, which I think is the proper question. As I said, I completely understand that.
M. MLLI GAN Very good, Chairman, I will continue on in that vein. I am obliged.
CHA RMAN I am keen not to shut down any legitimate line of cross-examination. If you can show me how that is a -- another way of looking at it is this: what does it matter what this witness thinks of what another witness thought?
MS. MLLI GAN We11, Chairman, I am going to reserve comment for the moment and I am going to move on.
CHA RMAK Okay, thanks very much.
M. MLLI GAN If you are satisfied with that. I just want to continue then in that vein.
CHAN RMAN Yes, of course.
704 Q. ME. MLLIGAN I am going to continue in that vein, Garda Treacy, in relation to your conversations with Inspector Farre11. If we could again, Mr. Kavanagh, open page 8687. Again, it has been opened to the Chairman -- my apologies. Do you have that, Garda Treacy.
A. Yes.

705 Q. Just the bottom of page 8687, it says:
"The advi ce allegedly gi ven by Garda Keogh was not appropriate in the circunstances and projects the image of An Garda Sí ochána in an unf avourable light."

## Do you see that?

A. Yes.
Q. I just want to be clear, you didn't see this letter, is
that right?
A. No, I don't believe so, no.

707 Q. No one asked for any further clarification on your version of events as you saw them in and around the 28th to 29th May 2014?
A. I don't believe so. No.
Q. No. And in terms of what Inspector Farre11 says about projecting the image of An Garda Síochána in an unfavourable light, your position is that means two things and not one thing; it's first Garda misconduct of Garda Keogh and second, Garda misconduct in terms of the allegation in relation to Ms. B being covered for by guards, is that right?
A. I mean, I can't speak for Inspector Farrell but "projects the i mage of An Garda Sí ochána in an
unf avourable light", I believe that if that information was given by a guard to any member of the public, then I would agree with that, that it absolutely projects the image of An Garda Síochána in an unfavourable light.
709 Q. Again, I wonder if we could just go to the transcript, Mr. Kavanagh, $I$ think it's day 121 again, the Thursday and it's page 129, lines 1-7. I just want to be clear:
"I can honestly say that the coaching aspect of it di $\mathrm{dn}^{\prime} \mathrm{t}$ come in to me, didn't come into my mind on that ni ght."

I just wanted to ask you about that. From your point
of view, the meeting that you had, I think you said in your direct-evidence that lasted about 15 minutes. Do you think that you think that you were clear about an aspect of fabrication or coaching or Garda keogh putting information in to a member of the public for the purposes of creating an allegation? Do you think you made that clear to Inspector Farrell?
A. All I can say is that I repeated to Inspector Farrell exactly what had been told to me.
710 Q. Okay. Do you think you were clear?
A. Yes, I think I was clear. I think I repeated it exactly as it had been told to me.
711 Q. okay. So, can I just ask then: is the error yours or is the error Inspector Farrell's?
A. I don't see that there's an error.

712 Q. Something has -- sorry, just bear with me, Garda Treacy. Something has gotten lost in translation, if I am correct, which I think I am, because yourself and Inspector Farrell on 28th may 2014. And my question is whether or not that breakdown in communication was yours or whether or not that breakdown in communication is Inspector Farrell's?
MR. KANE: Judge, again I am very sorry to interrupt and I am sorry to Ms. Mulligan. Garda Keogh has given evidence twice to say that that Garda Treacy did against that grain. I'm happy to open the transcript, I don't think it is necessary, but I am happy to open the transcript to you, Chairman. He said it twice in
his evidence that Garda Stephanie Treacy did nothing wrong and I am a little bit concerned about --

CHA RMAN Surely, Mr. Kane, counsel is entitled I think to explore the matter. Certainly I would be grateful if you would explain what the mistake is. what's the error? You say somebody made an error. ME. MLLIGAN Yes.
CHA RMAN Something was lost in translation. okay, what was lost in translation?

ME. MLLI GAN It appears --
CHA RMAN Do you understand me?
Mb. MLLI GAN Yes.
CHA RMAN I see no reason why you can't ask the question.
ME. MLLI GAN Yes.
CHAN RMAN But if you tell us what has been lost in translation, at least we will know what the answer might be.
ME. MLLI GAN I suppose what I am trying to explore, Chairman, is whether or not -- it appears to be from Garda Treacy's statement that she believes that Garda Keogh essentially planted all of the information -- or not that she -- that olivia o'Neill is telling her that Garda Keogh put her forward to make this statement. That may or may not be true.
CHA RMAN This is a little, a little -- I mean, you may ultimately make a submission to that effect.

ME. MLLI GAN Yes.
CHA RMAN You may suggest to the witness that that's
what she is saying. But what she said is, this is what Ms. O'Neill said, I went and I reported what she said. That's what she said. She didn't say Garda Keogh put her up to it or planted it in her head or got her to do it. I mean, that may be a conclusion, that may be an inference that you suggest should be drawn from the Garda witnesses, I don't know. But let's keep it clear and simple. You said something was lost in translation between Inspector Farre11 and this witness, but you didn't say what it was that was lost in translation. Because you actually said to the witness, who made the mistake, was it you or Inspector Farre11? And I just want to know what's the mistake.

MS. MLLI GAN The issue is that Inspector Farre11 doesn't seem to think that was being reported to him on the 28th was coaching. And I am asking, and I had asked in my cross-examination, was Garda Treacy clear about what she was putting forward. She said there were two aspects to what she was putting forward. And the aspect of coaching does not appear to be in the mind of Inspector Farre11 at the time. And I am asking where does that break down of communication come from, was it in --
M. GLEESOR Apologies, Chairman, for interrupting again. Just on behalf of Inspector Farre11, sorry.
CHA RMAN I am sorry, Ms. Gleeson.
MS. GLEESON Sorry, I know the Chair wants to address Ms. Mulligan, I won't interrupt, apologies. CHA RMAN It's al1 right.

M5. GLEESON Just to say that Inspector Farre11, at page 138 of Day 121, he does accept that it could be interpreted as coaching at this stage.
CHA RMAN Yes.
ME. GLEESON And I suggest respectfully that perhaps my Friend just might --
CHA RMAN Hold on, Ms. Gleeson.
MS. GLEESON: Yes.
CHA RMAK Let's keep it simple. Ms. Mulligan says Inspector Farrell made a mistake or you made a mistake. 16:05 A11 I wanted to know is what's the mistake? And the mistake turns out to be an understanding of Inspector Farrell; is that correct.

MS. MLLI GAN Yes. An understanding of what was reported to him by Garda Treacy. I am trying to identify is she satisfied that she was clear that she was making two allegations and putting forward two allegations to Inspector Farrel1.
CHA RMAN okay.
MS. MLLI GAN Because he says he didn't catch it.
713 Q. CHA RMAN Did you put two allegations to Inspector Farrell?
A. No. My primary reason for going --

714 Q. CHA RMAN Did you te11 him what Ms. O'Neill had said?
A. I told him what Ms. O'Neill had said. My primary reason for leaving the interview room and for taking advice was to see does it belong in this statement or not.

715 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. And that's what he advised me on.

CHA RMAK Now, Ms. Mulligan, carry on. Thanks very much. Yes, Ms. Mulligan.
MS. MLLI GAN Very good, Judge. And again, I wonder, Mr. Kavanagh, if we could open Day 117, page 142, line 2. This is the evidence of chief superintendent Mark Curran and his understanding of what comes forward following on -- sorry, Mr. Kavanagh, it's page 142. CHA RMAN Let's try to get the page right.
MS. MLLI GAN Mr. Kavanagh, it's page 142, my apologies.
CHA RMAN Now, Ms. Mulligan.
MS. MLLI GAN And it says:
"But in terns of the information di vul ged that was the most pressing matter, that somebody here has potential inf ormati on about Garda corruption. "

I just wanted to ask you very quick7y, Garda Treacy, nobody came back to ask you anything further about
that. That's the primary concern of Chief Superintendent mark Curran and nobody asked you anything further to clarify your statement about what allegations you were making or anything like that, is that right
A. That's correct, yes.

717 Q. And you don't dispute or take any issue with Chief Superintendent Curran's version of events; is that right?
A. That's correct.

MS. MLLI GAN No further questions.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Who is next?
Mr. O'Higgins, are you next?
MR. ḾCEÁL O H GG NS: May it please you, Chairman, I will be quite brief.

## GARDA STEPHAN E TREACY WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS, AS FOLLOVG:

718 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Garda Treacy, I just want to ask you some questions on behalf of the Commissioner and senior management. Garda Keogh, in his materials and I think also in his evidence, has expressed the position that he was conflicted taking any statement from Olivia O'Neill and that is why he requested Sergeant Haran to assign the task of taking a statement 16:09 to somebody else, hence you being that person. Can I ask you, do you have any knowledge as to why or how Garda Keogh got to take a statement the following day, on the 29th May, from Kayleigh O'Neill, Olivia O'Neill's daughter?
A. No, I had no knowledge of that.

719 Q. Were you made aware that Olivia O'Neill was back in the station on the following day?
A. No.

720 Q. Or that Garda Keogh was in fact the person who took the statement from Kayleigh o'Neill on that particular day?
A. No, I wasn't aware.

MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Thank you very much.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Now, Mr. Dockery, Ms. Gleeson, any questions.
MR. DOCKERY: No Chairman, unless Ms. Gleeson has a question, I should say.

CHA RMAN Have you any questions, Ms. G1eeson.
Mb. GLEESON No.
CHA RMAN Mr. Carroll, any questions.
MR. CARROL: I want to clarify just one very short
matter, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Yes, okay.

## GARDA STEPHAN E TREACY WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. <br> CARROLL, AS FOLLOVE:

721 Q. MR. CARROLL: Garda Treacy, on behalf of Superintendent McBrien, I just wanted to clarify one matter in relation to your evidence. It was just about, the Tribunal's counsel put to you about meeting
Superintendent McBrien after the phone call from Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.

722 Q. Just in the context of matters as to what was
discussed, I think Mr. Marrinan opened, I think it was, 1187, a paragraph of Superintendent MCBrien's notes. It commences on the 9th. 1187, sorry. Yes. I think it was just that, I just want to clarify something.
That paragraph on the 9th July, was when that meeting was, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

723 Q. That's Superintendent McBrien's note of it and I think that was opened to you earlier and you would agree with that, I take it, as an accurate note of your meeting with Superintendent McBrien?
A. Yes.

724 Q. I think also Superintendent McBrien mentioned this in her evidence, you wouldn't have been present, and I just want to point where it's very similar to her note, 16:12 it's at Day 120, page 35, it's the only question I am going to ask you. I think it is line -- it's page 35, line 132. You weren't present, probably Superintendent McBrien was being asked by Mr. Marrinan about this meeting and she answered, if we just go down to line 8, 10:12 just there. This is about you now:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "Garda Treacy was worried because Garda Keogh indicated } \\
& \text { to her that this might be going further. That was, । } \\
& \text { think, in rel ation to a phone call. She was ringing } \\
& \text { the station one ni ght about something. So we chatted." }
\end{aligned}
$$

So this is you and Superintendent McBrien.
"... chatted about it."

And Superintendent McBrien outlined to you that there was no decision yet as to how this would progress. She didn't know how it was going to go, that you shouldn't be worrying and that she then advised you about the welfare and I think you mentioned there Sergeant Keane, you were happy to talk to Sergeant Keane about any welfare issues if you needed to, is that right?

## A. Yes.

725 Q. She then gave you general advice to not worrying and just tension in the station. I don't need to worry about the rest of that paragraph. I suppose in terms of, you were asked earlier about being asked or about knowing what happened about this issue, I think at that 16:13 point, on the 9 th July, as well as looking after welfare issues, Superintendent McBrien was telling you that no decision at that point this been made, that nothing had been concluded in relation to it?
A. Yes.

726 Q. Is that correct?
A. Yes.

MR. CARROL: Thank you.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHAL RMAN Mr. Kane?
MR. KANE: Thank you, Judge, nothing. CHA RMAN Very good.

MR. MEGU NNESS: Nothing further, Chairman.
CHA RMAK Thank you very much. A11 done? Thank you very much. Thank you.

WTNESS: Thank you.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Very good, then we wi11 resume with Chief Superintendent Murray at 10:30 in the morning.

THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED UNTI L TUESDAY, 3RD DECEMBER
2019 AT 10: 30AM

|  | 162:22, 166:2 | 2010 [2] - 7:3, 7:20 | $2490{ }_{[1]}$ - 82:26 | $38{ }_{[1]}-3: 21$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $123{ }^{\text {[1] }}$ - 1:18 | 2011[5]-9:19, 9:26, | 2491 [3]-86:3, 86:4 | $3{ }^{[1]}$ - $3: 22$ |
|  | 125 [1] - 5:10 | 126:12, 149:2, 150:25 | 2492 [1]-118:27 | 3am [2]-100:11, |
| '10 [1] - 106:12 | 126[1]-72:28 | 2012 [2]-58:16, | 2493 [2]-120:7, | 100:13 |
| '13 [1] - 7:5 | $127{ }_{[1]}$ - 109:3 | 150:28 | 124:14 | 3rd [7] - 96:8, 96:24, |
| '14[2]-7:13, 109:21 | 129 [2] - 104:28, | 2013[5]-9:21, 9:26, | 2494 [2] - 120:27, | 97:18, 98:22, 109:19, |
| '15[6] - 7:11, 7:13, | 162:23 | 93:19, 104:5, 105:24 | 124:19 | 113:15, 117:8 |
| 14:20, 31:14, 96:16, | 12:30 ${ }_{[1]}-85: 20$ | 2014 [13]-1:3, | 2495[1]-121:21 | 3RD ${ }_{[1]}$ - 172:9 |
| 104:19 | 12th [1]-82:17 | 44:20, 50:7, 79:2, | 2496 [1] - 122:18 |  |
| '82 [1] - 6:20 | 13 [3]-2:31, 3:8, | 80:10, 80:12, 126:25, | $25{ }_{[2]}-3: 14,110: 10$ | 4 |
| '89 [1] - 6:20 | 30:7 | 126:26, 151:5, 151:8, | 26[1]-3:15 |  |
| 'Garda [2] - 143:6, | 132 [1] - 170:18 | 151:17, 162:5, 163:19 | 26th [16] - 22:3, 22:5, |  |
| 154:26 | $\mathbf{1 3 3 0 5}_{[1]}$ - 107:21 | 2015[36]-9:24, | 23:5, 23:9, 51:21, | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{4}[3]-2: 19,3: 4, \\ 31: 16 \end{gathered}$ |
| 0 | 138 [1] - 166:2 13th [1] - 44:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:2, 16:1, 16:4, } \\ & \text { 16:23, 17:26, 24:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 2,79: 16,82: 12, \\ & 82: 15,87: 8,108: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 31: 16 \\ 4.87[1]-105: 21 \end{array}$ |
|  | 14 [2] - 3:9, 105:19 | 25:29, 32:24, 35:28, | 108:26, 110:18, | $[1]-13: 19$ |
| $003[2]-25: 11,26: 13$ | 142[3]-167:5, | 36:4, 42:28, 43:5, | 112:20, 117:4, 117:14 | $431[2]-85: 25,86: 4$ $46[1]-94: 11$ |
| 003[2]-25.11, 26.13 | 167:8, 167:10 | 44:3, 49:15, 73:2, | 26th/27th [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-94: 19} \\ & 9_{[1]}-126: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | 148 [1] - 5:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 15,79: 16,80: 12, \\ & 80: 28,82: 29,85: 27, \end{aligned}$ | 127:19 | $484[1]-141: 24$ |
|  | 15 [8] - 3:9, 25:5, | 96:8, 97:6, 97:16, | 27th [2]-9:24, 117:7 | 4:50pm [1] - 51:29 |
| 1 [5] - 3:2, 13:20, | 26:8, 109:11, 110:10, | 97:18, 98:22, 103:23, | $28{ }_{\text {[1] - }}$ - 116 | 4th [8]-12:2, 15:17, |
| 31:11, 40:5, 89:4 | 156:22, 156:23, 163:2 | 105:26, 109:19, | 28th [6]-126:26, | 15:29, 16:4, 16:23, |
| 1-7 [1] - 162:23 | $15694{ }_{[1]}$ - 118:1 | 116:24, 117:4, 117:8, | 127:1, 151:7, 162:5, | 17:20, 17:26, 51:14 |
| 1.. [1] - 24:21 | $16{ }_{\text {[2] - }}$ - $1: 5,3: 10$ | 118:27, 121:19, 12 2016 [1]-126:20 | 163:19, 165:16 | 5 |
| 1.45[1] - 86:1 | 168 [1] - 5:12 | $2017[3]-1: 5,1: 9,$ | 29 [1] - 3:17 |  |
| 10 [26] - $3: 7,26: 8$, $68: 16,68: 18,68: 27$, | 169 [1]-5:13 | $\begin{array}{r} 2017 \text { [3] - 1:5, 1:9, } \\ 43 \cdot 11 \end{array}$ | 29/5 [1] - 140:12 |  |
| 68:16, 68:18, $68: 27$, $69: 23,72 \cdot 5,77: 4$ | 17 [2]-1:9, 3:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 11 \\ & 2018[1]-1: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 29th [5] - 126:25, |  |
| $69: 23,72: 5,77: 4$, $99: 12,102 \cdot 27$ | $18_{[1]}{ }^{[1]}$ - $3: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2018[1]-1: 9 \\ & 2019[3]-1: 18,6: \end{aligned}$ | 141:3, 144:19, 162:5, | 72:29, 147:12 |
| 99:12, 102:27, | 1802[1]-152:6 | 2019[3]-1:18, 6:2 | 168:24 | 5,000[1] - 97:8 |
| 103:21, 106:17, | 184 [1] - 80:8 | 172:10 2021[1]-36.7 | 2:30pm [2]-28:23, | $5.40{ }_{[1]}^{[1]}-98: 26$ |
| 106:24, 107:17, | 1889 [1] - 154:18 | 2021 [1]-36:7 | 29:17 | 51 [1] - 2:18 |
| 107:25, 108:3, 108:9, | 18th [2]-36:4, 38:16 | 2038[1]-8:24 | 2:32 [2]-82:24, 84:1 | 52\% [1] - 80:10 |
| 108:13, 108:23, | $19_{[1]}$ - $3: 11$ | $2039[3]-23: 16,$ | 2ND [2]-1:18, 6:1 | $596{ }_{[1]}$ - 92:6 |
| 110:24, 112:4, 112:6, $113: 16,1179$ | $1921{ }_{\text {[1] - 1:9 }}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 32: 13,35: 18 \\ 2085[2]-23: 26,24: 3 \end{array}$ | 2nd [1]-88:22 | 5:06 [1] - 86:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:16, 117:9, } \\ & \text { 117:16, 117:22 } \end{aligned}$ | $1982{ }_{[1]}$ - 6:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 2085[2]-23: 26,24: 3 \\ & 2086[1]-31: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 5pm [1]-127:4 |
| 109 [1] - 30:6 | 1999 [1] - 70:29 | 2099 [1]-32:27 |  | [3]-43:1, 43 |
| 10:00 [1] - 83:16 | 19th [4]-32:23, | 20th [4]-104:5, |  |  |
| 10:30 [2]-24:28, $172 \cdot 6$ | 33:3, 42:26, 49:14 | 106:22, 118:27, 121:8 | $\begin{array}{r} 3[5]-3: 3,13: 19 \\ 31: 8,31: 11,72: 1 \end{array}$ | 6 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 172:6 } \\ \text { 10:30AM } \end{array}[1]-172: 10$ | $\text { 1:45pm [1] }-83: 21$ | $21000_{[1]}-34: 29$ | $3.2[1]-92: 7$ |  |
| 10am [3] - 82:24, | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 1st } \text { [12] - } 31: 14, \\ \text { 80:12, } 80: 27,81 \end{array}$ | 2121[1]-36:8 | 3.3[2]-92:14, 93:14 | 6 [4]-3:5, 5:5, |
| 83:8, 87:18 | 81:23, 82:3, 82:22, | 2122 [1]-42:7 | 3.4 [1] - 94:17 | 156:22, 156:23 |
| 10s [1] - 107:2 | $82: 29,85: 27,108: 25$ | 2187 [1] - 77:29 | $30[2]-3: 17,26: 3$ | $606{ }_{[1]}$ - 93:12 |
| 11 [2]-3:7, 112:26 | $118: 8,118: 17$ | 21887 [1]-52:1 | 3026 [1] - 112:26 | 61 [1] - 97:15 |
| 11-13 [1] - 3:32 |  | 2189 [1]-77:29 | 3070 [1]-80:25 | 6245 [2]-15:12, |
| 11/1/205 ${ }_{[1]}$ - 116:17 | 2 | 2190[1]-88:23 | 3076 [1] - 81:3 | 51:12 |
| $113_{[1]}$ - 45:12 |  | 2191[1]-78:26 | 31 [1]-3:18 | 630 [2] - 15:14, 51:13 |
| 115 [1] - 45:12 |  | 2194[1]-98:23 | 31st [4]-80:12, 81:8, | $653{ }^{[1]}$ - 144:18 |
| $116{ }_{[1]}$ - 97:24 | $2[8]-2: 32,3: 3,4: 6,$ | 21st [5]-24:5, 43:11, | 82:4, 85:4 <br> 32 | 660[1] - 94:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 117[1]-167: 5 \\ & 11756_{[1]}-45: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:8, 31:11, 71:27, } \\ & \text { 89:12, 167:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:18, 122:6, 122:24 } \\ & \mathbf{2 2}_{[1]-3: 13} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32[2]-2: 24,3: 18 \\ & 33[3]-3: 19,38: 23, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11756[1]-45: 10 \\ & 1187[3]-147: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 89:12, 167:6 $2.32[1]-87: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{2 2}[1]-3: 13 \\ & \text { 22nd }[2]-42: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33[3]-3: 19,38: 23, \\ & 38: 26 \end{aligned}$ | 7 |
| 170:2, 170:3 | $20[2]-3: 12,25: 5$ | 105:25 | 34 [2] - 3:19, 80:11 |  |
| 11am [2]-120:11, | 2001[1]-149:2 | $23{ }_{[1]}-3: 13$ | $35[3]$ - 3:20, 170:16, | 7 [3]-1:9, 2:25, 3:5 |
| 121:15 | $2002{ }_{[1]}$ - 6:23 | 24 [3] - 3:14, 25:10, | 170:17 | 744 [1] - 49:9 |
| 12[2] - 3:8, 4:5 | 2006 [1]-6:28 | 25:25 | $36[3]-3: 20,8: 26$, | $7796[1]$ - 110:22 |
| $120{ }_{[1]}$ - 170:16 | 2008[1]-126:9 | 24-hour [1]-26:26 | 9:6 | 78 [2] - 10:3, 10:13 |
| 121 [3] - 156:22, | 2009[1]-53:24 | $245{ }_{[1]}$ - 112:27 | $37_{[1]}$ - 3:21 | 7am[1]-25:25 |






| 61:6, 61:13, 65:22, | 84:3, 85:26, 85:29, | 71:8, 76:2, 84:3, 91:3, | crossovers [1] - | 52:10, 53:11, 59:7, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 67:2, 71:27, 79:26, | 161:15 | 113:1, 115:12, 124:7, | 78:18 | 59:8, 59:11, 59:12, |
| 83:23, 87:20, 92:29, | copied [1] - 118:2 | 132:23, 161:13 | CUALÁIN [1] - 3:7 | 59:19, 80:8, 80:11, |
| 123:16, 148:6, 148:7, | copies [1] - 103:25 | court [2] - 28:2, 28:9 | Cualáin [17]-7:16, | 130:5, 156:27 |
| 153:13 | COPPINGER [1] - | Court [1] - 97:12 | 7:19, 8:13, 11:9, | daytime [1] - 40:15 |
| contacted [1] - | 3:4 | COURT [3]-1:13 | 15:23, 18:24, 19:23, | deal [43]-12:4, |
| 133:22 <br> containing [1] | $\begin{gathered} \text { copy }[11]-24: 1, \\ 32: 29,50: 15,50: 17, \end{gathered}$ | $2: 3,3: 31$ <br> cover [3] - 98: | $\begin{aligned} & 81: 22,83: 1,83: 6 \\ & 83: 11,83: 21,84: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 23,17: 1,17: 8 \\ & 19: 7,19: 8,22: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 76:17 | 81:7, 101:15, 117:9, | 130:20, 137:29 | 86:1, 88:9, 118:3, | 22:10, 23:1, 23:20, |
| contemporaneous | 118:3, 122:17, 126:21 | coverage [1] - | 118:4 | 24:23, 26:28, 31:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-142: 18} \\ & \quad \text { context }[8]-22: 24, \end{aligned}$ | Cork [1] - 8:15 corner [1] - 110:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:18 } \\ & \text { covered [2] - 94:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CULLEN }_{[1]}-2: 11 \\ & \text { cure }_{[1]}-68: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 28,44: 2,48: 8 \\ & 48: 10,62: 8,65: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 75:27, 113:21, 114:6, | corps [1] - 8:11 | 162:12 | cured [1] - 90:19 | $68: 12,68: 13,68: 29,$ <br> $69 \cdot 28,69 \cdot 29,72 \cdot 4$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:17, 115:18, } \\ & \text { 153:18, 169:29 } \end{aligned}$ | correct [49]-8:16, | covering [4] - 50:6, 127:6, 137.27 137.29 | CURLEY [1] - 3:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 69: 28,69: 29,72: 4, \\ & 75: 27,77: 20,82: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| continue [12]-25:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 4,28: 25,43: 13 \\ & 49: 23,68: 10,68: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 127:6, 137:27, 137:29 cracks [2]-32:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Curley [11]-39:20, } \\ & \text { 120:7, 120:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $94: 13,97: 1,97: 18$ |
| 46:5, 47:22, 89:14, | 68:26, 84:21, 109:12, | 64:12 | 120:23, 120:24 | 97:26, 103:26, |
| 96:10, 99:22, 115:15, | 109:16, 117:6, | create [5] - 9:9, 32:6, | 121:2, 121:27 | 104:11, 104:17, |
| 134:27, 149:23, | 124:13, 126:6, 126:7, | 32:11, 43:24, 70:13 | 122:17, 124:12 | 104:22, 106:28, |
| 161:1, 161:12, 161:14 | 126:13, 126:16, | created [6]-25:24, | 124:15, 124:22 | 110:28, 112:22, |
| continued [3] - | 126:18, 126:19, | 26:26, 28:10, 30:4, | CURRAN ${ }_{[1]}-3: 3$ | 112:23, 117:15, |
| $\begin{gathered} 66: 29,79: 9,107: 12 \\ \text { contrast }[1]-107: 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:23, 126:24, } \\ & \text { 126:27, 127:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $44: 28,84: 13$ <br> creates [1] - | Curran [4] - 70:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:26, } 133: 5 \\ & \text { dealing }[21]-16: 27, \end{aligned}$ |
| control [2]-97:8, | 132:20, 136:13, | creating ${ }_{[1]}-163: 6$ | Curran's [1] - 167:28 | $17: 12,22: 20,37: 10$ |
| $115: 27$ | 136:15, 139:21, | creation [1] - 27:10 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 24,48: 11,55: 27, \\ & 69: 8,69: 10,69: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { controlled [1] - } \\ 104 \cdot 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:3, 141:15, } \\ & \text { 142:21, 142:22 } \end{aligned}$ | crime [26]-27:16, | D | $69: 24,87: 13,90: 22$ |
| controversies [1] - | 142:25, 145:18, | $33: 5,33: 8,33: 17$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 26,97: 16,97: 25 \\ & 103: 12,107: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:10 } \\ & \text { contro } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:19, 145:21, } \\ & \text { 146:7, 149:4, 155:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 19,33: 28,33: 29 \\ & 34: 3,34: 10,34: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $39: 20,120: 11,121: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:12, 107:15, } \\ & \text { 111:19, 124:16, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $11: 21,19: 15,152: 27$ | $155: 26,156: 16$, $158: 6,158: 17$ | $34: 23,34: 24,35: 6$ | D/Superintendent [2]-119:16, 121:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:10 } \\ & \text { dealings }[1]-82: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { conver } \\ & \text { 124:28 } \end{aligned}$ | 158:6, 158:17 | $42: 29,43: 22,89: 19$ | daily [8] - 24:23, | deals [3]-51:12, |
| conversation [58] - | 163:18, 166:13, | 90:1, 93:28, 93:29, | 26:2, 27:11, 29:6 | 51:13, 110:22 |
| 17:5, 17:9, 44:11, | 167:26, 168:1, 171:21 | 94:11 | $33: 14,33: 22,34: 9$ | dealt [26]-15:1, |
| 44:16, 45:6, 45:7, | corrected [1] - 99:1 | crimes [4] - 27:16, | 43:11 <br> Daly [5] - 86:8 | 15:2, 16:15, 16:16, |
| $46: 9,46: 12,46: 18$ | correcting [1] - 99:4 <br> correction [1] - 72.1 | $29: 7,35: 26,36: 25$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Daly [5] - 86:8, } \\ \text { 119:9, 120:12, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:16, 37:12, 48:27, } \\ & 77: 8,77: 21,78: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
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| $\begin{aligned} & 35: 5,111: 24 \\ & \text { travel }[2]-67: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:29, 159:25, } \\ & \text { 160:18, 160:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64: 11 \\ & \text { understood }[7]- \\ & 55: 25,99: 28,109: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $98: 4,98: 7,101: 24,$ | $34: 28,34: 29,42: 13$ |
| $74: 16$TREACY$[6]-2: 27$, | 164:19, 166:15 |  | 102:22, 103:14, | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 6,23: 7,23: 9 \\ & 23: 13,35: 11,48: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | TUESDAY [1] - 172:9 <br> Tullamore [3]-6:27, <br> 7:3, 113.28 |  | 104:21, 105:12, |  |
| TREACY [6] - 2:27, 5:8, 125:25, 148:24, 168:11, 169:19 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 25,99: 28,109: 15 \\ & 138: 4,158: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:3, 110:9, 112:26, } \\ & 114: 15,123: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $53: 18,53: 21,58: 18$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 168:11, 169:19 } \\ & \text { Treacy [35] - } 96: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 3,113: 28 \\ & \text { turn }[4]-104: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $159: 12,160: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 114: 15,123: 8, \\ & \text { 123:24, 125:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 26,59: 2,60: 20, \\ & 63: 20,80: 19,89: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Treacy [35]-96:13, } \\ & 96: 18,124: 29, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:25, 118:9, 118:11 } \\ & \text { turned [2] - 62:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 94:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:1, 130:20, } \\ & \text { 133:15. 137:23. } \end{aligned}$ | $91: 14,92: 11,107: 8$ |
| 125:22, 125:28, | 62:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { undertook [1] - 29:5 } \\ & \text { unfair [3] - 159:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 133: 15,137: 23, \\ & \text { 137:27, 137:29, } \end{aligned}$ | 112:18, 114:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 126: 5,142: 10, \\ & 142: 28,145: 28 \end{aligned}$ | TURNER [1] - 2:28 <br> turns [1] - 166:12 | $159: 19,160: 14$ <br> unfavourable [4] - | $141: 4,141: 18,$ | $141: 28,163: 1$ |
| 147:15, 148:28, |  |  | 143:29, 144:8 | viewed [1] - 22:13 |
| 148:29, 152:8, | turns [1] - 166:12 <br> twice [2]-163:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { unfavourable [4] - } \\ & \text { 161:25, 162:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:19, 146:20, } \\ & \text { 151:13, 154:16, } \end{aligned}$ | views [2] - 70:19, |
| 154:19, 154:25, | 163:29 | $162: 16,162: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 151: 13,154: 16, \\ & 156: 7,159: 4,165: \end{aligned}$ | $72: 21$ |
| 155:9, 157:6, 157:18, $158: 8,158: 14$ | two [34] - 7:1, 8:6, | unfettered [1] - | updates [1] - 118:15 | visibility [1] - 32:17 |
| 159:25, 159:26, | 73:4, 82:22, 96:22, | unhappy [1] - 85:6 | updating [1] - 28:29 | volition [1] - 141:14 |
| 160:3, 160:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97:1, 110:16, 121:6, } \\ & \text { 129:17, 129:25, } \end{aligned}$ | unhear [2]-72:17, | upward [1] - 97:11 <br> utilised [1] - 108:10 | Volume [6]-13:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 161: 15,161: 19, \\ & 163 \cdot 17 \text { 163.25, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 72:22 | utilised [1] - 108:10 utterances [3] - | $15: 13,24: 4,52: 1$ |
| 164:1, 165:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 130: 5,143: 9,144: 17 \\ & 145: 6,145: 9,150: 5 \end{aligned}$ | unit [26]-28:18, | 81:29, 83:2, 83:25 | 112:26, 147:12 |
| 166:15, 167:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:6, 145:9, 150:5, } \\ & \text { 155:2, 155:4, 157:26, } \end{aligned}$ | 43:12, 47:4, 47:6, | utterings [3] - 79:2, | $32: 23,33: 5,35: 6$ |
| 168:14, 169:22 | $159: 6,159: 9,159: 12$ |  | 88:20, 8 | 43:22, 97: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 170:23 } \\ & \text { Treacy's [3] - 126:2, } \end{aligned}$ | 159:28, 160:19, | 78:17, 78:18, 89:13, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { vote }[2]-102: 2 \\ & 102: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 162:9, 165:19, |  |  | 102: |
| 159:10, | $43: 19,84: 12,98: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93: 21,100: 5,106: 1 \\ & 106: 26,127: 6,146: 3 \end{aligned}$ | vague [4] - 52:15, | 17:22 |
| TRIBUNAL [2]-1:2, | 104:14, 105:29, $108 \cdot 28,111: 8,114: 4$ | 151:28 | vagueness [1] | W |
| 2:6 | 108:28, 111:8, 114:4, 114:23 | unless [4] - 73:18, 95:6, 117:21, 169:10 | 78:10 |  |
| 72:27, 73:20, 73:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { types [2]-28:21, } \\ & \text { 41:27 } \end{aligned}$ | unlikely [1] - 125:9 | value [6] - 70:21, | wages [1] - 62:19 |
| $85: 2,93: 13,97: 2$ | typo [1] - 149:5 | unprofessional [1] - | 99:17, 101:19, | Wallace [11] - 80:28, |
| $97: 23,112: 28,113: 1$ |  | $157: 13$ | 101:23, 113:19, | 81:8, 84:22, 84:25, |
| 126:21, 126:29, | U | $12: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:10 } \\ & \quad \operatorname{van}[3]-73: 4,73: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $86: 12,87: 21,112: 15$ |
| 141:16, 142:20, 144:7 |  | $3: 20$ | various [6] - 18:4, | $123: 24$ |
| Tribunal's [1] - |  | UNTIL [1] - 172:9 |  | Wallace" [1]-86:6 |
| 169:25 | $124: 28,164: 27$ |  | $97: 20.156 \cdot 27$ | wants [1] - 165:27 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { TRIBUNALS }_{[1]}-1: 8 \\ & \text { tried }[3]-14: 18, \end{aligned}$ | unable [1] - 142:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 75:9 } \\ & \text { unusual }[3]-10: 12, \end{aligned}$ | vehemently [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { warning }[1]-111: 1 \\ & \text { warranted }[1]-135: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $47: 26,77: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:7 } \\ & \text { unaware [2] - 145:27 } \end{aligned}$ | $122: 1,134: 12$ | 137:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WAS [5] - 6:9, } \\ & \text { 125:25, 148:24, } \\ & \text { 168:11, 169:19 } \\ & \text { waste [1] - } 133: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| trouble [2] - 110:7 |  |  | vehicle [19]-49:24, $50: 4,50: 12,50: 14$ |  |
| 110:8 | $99: 14$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { up [83] - 8:17, 8:27, } \\ 13: 28,14: 19,16: 7 \text {, } \end{gathered}$ | $50: 16,50: 25,67: 11$ |  |
| troubling [3] - 44:15, |  |  | $67: 20,67: 21,67: 28$ |  |


| watching ${ }_{[1]}-10: 25$ <br> ways [1]-136:28 <br> weapons [1] - 130:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wished }[8]-66: 6 \text {, } \\ & 66: 13,77: 12,93: 10 \\ & 95: 1,100: 26,135: 2, \\ & 155: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 24,103: 10 \\ & 107: 26,108: 14 \\ & 121: 18,126: 25 \\ & 140: 12,141: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Wednesday [2] - } \\ & \text { 82:29, 85:26 } \end{aligned}$ | wishes [1] - 135:19 withdraw [1] - 95:1 | Y |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 96:26, } 97: 15,133: 2 \\ \text { weekly }[1]-29: 16 \\ \text { weighed }[2]- \\ \text { 104:21, 105:12 } \\ \text { welfare [53]-13:21, } \\ \text { 14:14, 15:4, 15:20, } \\ \text { 15:27, 17:3, 17:15, } \\ \text { 18:28, 19:2, 19:12, } \\ 47: 25,47: 26,48: 5, \\ 48: 8,48: 11,48: 19, \\ 57: 28,59: 26,61: 7, \\ 61: 22,61: 28,62: 1 \text {, } \\ 62: 8,64: 28,65: 9 \\ 65: 13,65: 21,66: 12, \\ 67: 2,71: 22,71: 26, \\ 77: 15,80: 21,84: 6, \\ 84: 10,84: 13,84: 14, \\ 86: 9,86: 24,87: 6, \\ 87: 11,102: 5,106: 21, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 12,6: 15,85: 24, \\ & 96: 23,125: 12, \\ & 125: 15,125: 17, \\ & \text { 125:19, 125:28, 172:4 } \\ & \text { witness [16] - 6:5, } \\ & \text { 85:20, } 95: 17,125: 21, \\ & \text { 137:2, 160:7, 160:8, } \\ & \text { 160:10, 160:16, } \\ & \text { 160:17, 160:27, } \\ & 161: 6,161: 7,164: 29 \text {, } \\ & \text { 165:9, 165:11 } \\ & \text { witnesses [3] - } \\ & 76: 14,156: 27,165: 7 \\ & \text { wonder [4] - 154:21, } \\ & 156: 20,162: 21,167: 4 \\ & \text { wondered }[2]- \\ & 58: 13,60: 13 \\ & \text { wondering [3] - } \\ & \text { 22:1, 38:2, 111:10 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { year }[7]-6: 24,10: 24, \\ 67: 29,97: 13,105: 18, \\ \text { 117:2, 126:17 } \\ \text { years }[12]-7: 1,8: 27, \\ 9: 6,9: 17,21: 19, \\ 43: 15,80: 9,106: 15, \\ \text { 107:13, 109:11, } \\ \text { 110:3, 123:3 } \\ \text { young }[1]-142: 5 \\ \text { yourself }[11]-9: 5, \\ 51: 8,52: 2,72: 4, \\ 98: 24,113: 25, \\ 114: 24,128: 8, \\ 128: 23,136: 23, \\ 163: 18 \\ \text { Yvonne }[7]-45: 25, \\ 47: 13,48: 16,65: 6, \\ 87: 10,92: 7,92: 24 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:17, 119:22, } \\ & \text { 119:27, 120:2, 122:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { word [6] - 17:1, } \\ 65: 11,69: 22,146: 23, \end{gathered}$ | $€$ |
| $171: 17$ <br> WELLINGTON [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { word-for-word [1] - } \\ & \text { 146:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & € 377[1]-117: 1 \\ & € 415.99_{[1]}-116: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2:31 } \\ & \text { Western }[5]-7: 16 \text {, } \\ & 8: 17,8: 22,79: 9 \end{aligned}$ | worded [1] - 59:22 wording [1] - 152:21 words [1] - 137:8 | É |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:29 } \\ & \text { WESTMEATH }{ }_{[1]}- \\ & \text { 4:1 } \\ & \text { Westmeath }[1]-9: 20 \\ & \text { Wexford }_{[1]}-6: 29 \\ & \text { whatsoever }[4]-9: 3, \\ & \text { 22:6, 22:9, } 74: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { workplace [9] - 65:7, } \\ & 65: 12,65: 16,65: 19 \text {, } \\ & 79: 27,80: 4,89: 8 \text {, } \\ & 91: 21,93: 1 \\ & \text { works [2] - 39:14, } \\ & \text { 147:17 } \\ & \text { world [2] - 30:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ÉABHALL [1] - 2:30 } \\ & \text { Éireann [6] - 79:2, } \\ & \text { 80:27, 81:4, 82:17, } \\ & \text { 85:15, 108:29 } \\ & \text { ÉIREANN [2]-1:4, } \\ & \text { 1:5 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 88:6 | worried [1] - 170:23 | Ó |
| ```whilst [1] - 23:19 whistleblower [5] - 14:6, 19:16, 19:21, 116:3, 151:16 WHITE [1] - 3:11 whole [3] - 19:15, 61:1, 140:4 Wicklow [2] - 6:29, 52:8 Wicklow-Wexford [1] - 6:29 wide [1] - 110:10 willing [1] - 43:28 wish [6] - 77:23, 80:1, 89:1, 103:2, 116:15, 122:21``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 44:25, } 171: 12 \\ & \text { worrying [2] - 171:6, } \\ & \text { 171:11 } \\ & \text { write } 8]-59: 20, \\ & 91: 4,116: 13,121: 24 \text {, } \\ & 136: 9,141: 1,141: 7 \text {, } \\ & \text { 143:4 } \\ & \text { writing [5] - 111:3, } \\ & 111: 4,111: 5,111: 8 \text {, } \\ & 159: 17 \\ & \text { written }[2]-126: 22 \text {, } \\ & 129: 14 \\ & \text { wrongdoing }[3]- \\ & 11: 1,55: 28,147: 29 \\ & \text { wrongly }[1]-67: 22 \\ & \text { wrote }[9]-78: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ó } \text { [18] - 3:7, 7:16, } \\ & 7: 19,8: 13,11: 8, \\ & 15: 22,18: 23,19: 23, \\ & 81: 22,83: 1,83: 6, \\ & \text { 83:11, 83:21, 84:5, } \\ & 86: 1,88: 9,118: 3, \\ & 118: 4 \end{aligned}$ |


[^0]:    "As well as di scussing the follow up action requi red on inci dents and updating the list of sel ection of files

[^1]:    " Vednesday, 1st April 2015: Calls from Assi stant

[^2]:    "Inspector Farrell then instructed that ME. O Neill should be invited to make a statement outlining her concerns rel ating to the advi ce gi ven by Garda Keogh and that she should al so be made aware of the options the superintendent at Athl one and/ or the Garda Onbudsman Cormi ssi on. "

