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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVB, ON TUESDAY, 3RD DECEMBER 2019:

## CH EF SUPERI NTENDENT PATRI CK MURRAY CONTI NUED TO BE DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY MR MARRI NAN, AS FOLLOVB:

1 Q. MR. MARR NAN Good morning, chief superintendent.
A. Good morning, Chairman.

2 Q. If we could have page 184 up on the screen. What were the circumstances giving rise to this direction that you sent to the sergeant in charge and for the attention of all members? what was the background to you...
A. Chairman, as I said yesterday, I met Garda Keogh on the 26th March for the first time, and during the course of dealing with his tax with him, he got annoyed, as I said, and in what $I$ felt might be a reactionary way, he made a general allegation that are other people who may have issues with their cars. And when I heard that, I tried to explore it with him, but he wasn't anxious to give me any information that might help any further with it. The allegation was just left there in that fashion.
3 Q. Did you make any other enquiries, perhaps of the inspectors or the sergeants, whether or not this was an 10:31 issue?
A. We11, I asked Garda Keogh first.

4 Q. Yes.
A. And then he wouldn't go further. And I told him I
couldn't unhear it and I would have to deal with it. But he was anxious then that perhaps I not deal with it.

5 Q. Yes.
A. Then I told him I would take his views on board, but I couldn't unhear it and I would have to think about it. So I did discuss it with both inspectors, to see how would I handle this.

We11 first of a11, when you spoke to them, did you ask them was this an issue? Were there members who were not complying with the law in relation to their vehicles?
A. I told them what had happened and neither of them expressed any concern in that regard to me. We discussed it and how we might deal with it or what we
might do about it. I felt that I suppose, every member -- the allegation was, you know, toward every member in the absence of any information directly alleging any pain against anyone, and I felt, I suppose, that everyone is entitled to the presumption of innocence
and I couldn't go about, in the absence of specific information, accusing anybody of anything.

7 Q. So this direction was solely based on what had been said to you by Garda Keogh?
A. Absolutely, yeah.

8 Q. And you had no other anecdotal evidence to suggest that there were guards who weren't complying --
A. No.

9 Q. -- with their obligations under the Road Traffic Act.

In any event, it's dated 22nd th Apri1 2015. It is:
"Members private vehicles.

I refer to the above and wi sh to inf ormeach member that I have been made aware in a general way that the private vehicles of some nembers are not in order in rel ation to..."

And then you 1ist:
"...no val id tax, no valid insurance, no valid NCT certs and no valid Driving Li cences."

I don't think Garda Keogh had actually itemised the offences which he believed had been committed by other members?
A. No, he left it in a general way. He said that members had issues with their cars. I didn't know how to take that.
"In order to allay any fears that exist, l wish to advi se all members that commencing on 1st June 2015 I will have the necessary checks carried out as follows. . ."

So you are giving a period in which members are to -if they aren't complying with the requirements under the Road Traffic Act, this period is a period of grace, as it were, for them to put their act and get their act
in order.
A. Yeah, I don't see it like that, because I had no information that anyone wasn't complying with the Road Traffic Act. It's not normal for members of An Garda Síochána not to comply with the Road Traffic Act, in my 10:34 experience. You know, I haven't come across it too many times in my career.
11 Q. "All menbers will be asked to vol untarily present their vehicles and Driving Licences for inspection to their i mmedi ate supervisors, who will certify all is correct. 10:34

The supervi sors will in the same manner be asked to present their Driving Li cences and vehicles for inspection to their immediate inspectors, who will certify all is correct.

I will ask both inspectors to present to me.

In turn will present to the divisional officer.

In that way I will be in a position to confirmmenbers' private vehicles are in order in the district.

Al menbers are reminded that any cl ain invol ving the use of a mentber's private vehicle will only be approved 10:35 if the vehicle being used complies with all road traffic legi slation in force."

Had you previously, before you arrived in Athlone,
issued a similar direction in relation to any other station?
A. Not that can recall.

12 Q. Pardon?
A. No, not that I can recall. well, I thought you were indicating that this was quite exceptional, that as far as you were concerned most members of An Garda Síochána complied with the requirements under the Road Traffic Act?
A. That's my experience, yes.
Q. You're not in a position to say definitively that you didn't?
A. I don't recall issuing one. I can't recall if I issued a similar direction in the past. That's all I can tell you about that.
A. I can't tell you one way or the other, because I can't recall at the moment whether I did or not. But I mean, any person that uses their car on duty, that's allowed to, makes an application where they certify that
everything is correct with their car, on the form that they're applying. So, that's the normal circumstances in which I would deal with them, issue of members using their vehicles on duty.

17 Q.
You know what Garda Keogh's complaint is in relation to this; that he sees it as being victimisation of him insofar as he was disciplined for a revenue offence in relation the taxation of his vehicle. And what he says in relation to this is that people who perhaps were guilty of more serious offences, such as no insurance, no Driving Licences, were given a period of grace to get their act together, as it were. what do you say in relation to that?
A. Well, I think the complaint has, I suppose, conflated or twisted my action into a negative against Garda Keogh in an unfair way. Garda Keogh, I suppose, made the allegation in a general way, he wouldn't back it up in any way when I asked him. I felt that $I$ was in a position where to do nothing wasn't an option for me, having heard what he had to say. Having discussed it with my inspectors and decided on this course of action, to be fair to the hundred or so other employees against whom the general allegation was made in that way.
18 Q. You were interviewed by our investigators in relation screen, please. And if we can scroll down to line 1051. You say:
"I deci ded to have everyone's vehi cle checked. । understand one other menber was in a similar position to Garda Keogh and was dealt with in the same fashion, i.e. by way of regul ation 10."

Further on, at 3079, please, at 1080, the question is:
"I have been asked, gi ven that । issued a regul ation 10 notice to Garda Ni chol as Keogh after he had remedi ed the situation regarding his car tax, and then gave
other Garda menbers a grace period of approxi mately five weeks to remedy any defects rel ating to tax, insurance, NCT, Driving Licences, whether this amounted to me targeting or di screditing Garda Ni chol as Keogh as per termof reference (p)."

Your answer is:
"No, absol utely not. I have expl ai ned how that came about. As noted above, there was one person who had to $10: 40$ back tax and that was dealt with in the same way."

Now, this was dealt with by the Tribunal in a series of letters, which I don't intend to open, but they're in volume 54 and they're from page 15229 to 15236 , for the 10:40 benefit of the parties. But the initial letter is written by the Tribunal's solicitor Mr. Davis to Alison Morrissey in the Chief State Solicitor's office:
"We refer to previ ous correspondence in rel ation to the above and would be obliged for confirmation as to whether Garda Brendan Madden --"

This is the garda who was eventually nominated as the guard who received a regulation 10 .
" -- was di sciplined by way of regul ation 10 or in any ot her way arising out of the resol ution of his car tax issue in 2015/2016. If he was di sci plined by way of regul ation 10 , pl ease l et us have a copy of the docurent. We look forward to hearing fromyou as soon as possi ble."

Now, it appears that Garda madden wasn't disciplined by way of regulation 10 , you would accept that to be the position?
A. I wouldn't accept it to be the position. He was approached by a sergeant, I understand, who was I suppose to deal with this issue. To explain my involvement in it, because the certification of this was a live reminder in my office being dealt with by a clerk there to ensure it was being brought to a conclusion in a swift way. The initial report about the guard in question was made to me by his then sergeant, who had checked the other members and indicated that Garda madden had a tax disk goods on his vehicle, but that all his other documents were in order. She indicated that she highlighted the matter
to him and asked him to rectify it. He then unfortunately was injured on duty and went sick for a period and the sergeants in that station changed. And Sergeant Moylan was transferred there. And in a reminder that went to him, I asked him to deal with the 10:42 matter immediately, as it was running since May '15 and Garda Madden was the last person to have certified. Sergeant Moylan indicated to me that Garda Madden was on sick leave. I said despite the fact he is on sick leave, it needed to be certified that his vehicle was taxed and therefore you should visit him to deal with the issue. I asked him to report back to me on that. And he did report back to me to indicate that Garda Madden had corrected his tax and he had spoken to him about it and gave him advice.

I think I explained yesterday, the discipline regulations and part 1 in regulation 10 allows unfettered, I suppose, discretion to the person dealing with the issue to deal with it under regulation 10.
It's a matter for Sergeant Moylan to indicate what way he felt the advice he gave to Garda Madden was dealt with or treated.
19 Q. If we could have volume 31, page 87 --
MR. KELLY: Judge, just before my learned Friend goes
on to that, could I ask what it was that the chief superintendent has been reading from, documents relating to this.
CHA RMAN Yes.

WTNESS: They're documents that were supplied to the Tribunal, $I$ understand, it's in relation to the tax. Documents written by me.
CHAN RMAN Chief superintendent, just what is it, so that Mr. Kelly and everybody else knows exactly where
we --
WTNESS: It's the file in relation to Garda Madden's tax, car tax.

CHA RMAN You have the materials relating to -WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAK I suppose in fairness to Garda Madden, who isn't accused of anything and isn't here, we should -I suppose there it is, he has been mentioned.

MR. MARR NAN He has been mentioned.
CHA RMAN It's is not exactly the most heinous matter, 10:44 I think everybody would agree. So there it is. But what you are actually referring to are the notes which have been supplied to the Tribunal. Do we have those?

MR. MARR NAN I was just about to open the report from Sergeant Moylan in relation to the matter.
CHA RMAN Okay. But just before we go anywhere, so that we all know exactly where we are, chief superintendent, can you identify, is it a bundle of documents you have in front of you? There's no suggestion of any impropriety or anything, we just want 10:45 to clarify where we are at the moment. So the documents that you are referring to are documents in the Tribunal's voluminous disclosure?

WTNESS: Yes, I understand that.

CHA RMAN Okay. Can you identify them a bit more precisely so that we all know what documents you're actually referring to?
WTNESS: They start off with a document from Sergeant McDonnell in Kilbeggan.

CHA RMAN Okay. Can I ask you this, is there a Tribunal number on them?

WTNESS: Not on the one I have.
CHA RMAN Not on the one have you. Thanks very much, okay. At least identify the document. So they are Sergeant McDonne11, is that right?

WTNESS: Sergeant McDonne11.
CHA RMAN In Kilbeggan?
WTNESS: And then a trail of correspondence after that.
CHA RMAN And a subsequent trail of correspondence from there. Now, Mr. Marrinan, can you help us with the trail that begins with sergeant McDonnell in Kilbeggan.
MR. MARRI NAN Page 8785 of the materials, volume 31.
CHA RMAN 8785.
MR. MARRI NAN Yes.
CHA RMAN okay. Let's just do that for the moment. MR. MARRI NAN It's is a letter to superintendent Murray dated 15th June 2015.
CHA RMAN And may I take it then that the next -chief superintendent, when you're referring to a document, would you be good enough to let us know what it is, what date it is, so that we can identify the
specific number it is so we all know where we are going, do you understand?
WTNESS: I do.
CHA RMAN That it will certainly help me in looking at it afterwards. Anyway, so we have the account. If I understand it, where we stand at the moment, the sergeant identified this as an issue, a similar issue, it would seem, taxed as a goods, whereas in fact should be taxed as private. That's the understanding of where we are. The garda in question, before the thing came to a head or could be processed further, got injured on duty and was now on sick leave. Okay. The sergeant changed. So a new sergeant, that was Sergeant Moylan, came into the picture instead of sergeant McDonne11.
A. Yes.

20 Q. CHAN RMAN who had been previously dealing with it?
A. Correct, Chairman.

21 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. You directed, suggested that Sergeant Moylan, notwithstanding the fact that the garda was on sick leave, that he should go out and speak to him and get this sorted out?
A. Yes.

22 Q. CHA RMAN It was sorted out, if I understand, in the sense that the garda corrected the tax on his car?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

23 Q. CHA RMAN And if I understand where the evidence is at the moment, it is that, was it a matter then for the sergeant to deal with it under your general authority or what was the situation?
A. That was the nature and tone of the way the whole idea of the check was drafted, that the sergeant would deal with any issue and if they weren't in a position to deal with it, to bring it to my attention.
24 Q
CHA RMAN okay. So was it a matter for him to say, make sure you don't do this again or to issue a notice or to proceed under regulation 10 ? was that within the sergeant's authority?
A. Yes, I was leaving that to the sergeant.

CHA RMAN okay. And was that something that could be left to a sergeant's authority?
A. We11, yes, Chairman. I am satisfied that that is something that was within the sergeant's remit.
Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. And that the discipline regulations allow for that.

CHA RMAK Okay. Now, I'm sorry for interrupting and just summarising, but that's my understanding of where we stand at the moment. And we have the document 8785 , Mr. Marrinan, and we are going to proceed from there, is that right?
MR. MARRI NAN We11, I'm not going to go back that far. WTNESS: Just before Mr. Marrinan goes on, just to make it very clear in relation to the member in question.
CHAI RMAN Yes.
WTNESS: I think he offered some excuse, in that he was a farmer and he a herd number and this was a second vehicle he had. You know, he felt that because of the occupation or part-time occupation he was involved in
with the farming, that it entitled him to have the vehicle taxed in a goods class, which slightly differed from Garda Keogh's situation. And I am sure the sergeant took that into account.

27 Q.
MR. MARR NAN But, chief superintendent, I think there 10:50 was also a substantial difference between he and Garda Keogh, because he was in breach after the 1st June, after the period of grace, he continued to tax his vehicle as a goods vehicle, isn't that right?
A. I don't know that. He back taxed it, corrected it. I 10:50 don't know to what date. I don't have that in front of me. He that too.

28 Q. Perhaps if we have page 8792 up on the screen please because this is the report from Sergeant Moylan in relation to the matter. He sets out the background there, that he took over responsibility for kilbeggan Garda station on the 20th July. This is clearly after the 1st June, and the period of grace, if you can call it that, has expired. Then in November 2015 he received correspondence in relation to a query of a privately owned vehicle. Then he refers to correspondence, in the second paragraph, that he received from you, his district officer, in January 2016 to visit the guard, to certify that his vehicle was taxed correctly. He arranged to meet him. He

[^0]done. "

So, therefore, the offences continued on into January 2016, some six months after the direction that you had issued. He then goes on to say:
"I informed himthat it was my bel ief that he had an obl i gation to tax his vehicle privately if it was being used other than in the course of his busi ness. He accepted my expl anation and tol de he would tax it privatel y and call in to the station to show me his tax di sk when he had it done.

I understood thi s advi ce whi ch I gave to the guard as negating the need for any further di sci plinary action, as I subsequently i nspected the di sk at Kil beggan Garda station in February 2016, took a copy of it and reported the fact to the district officer that was all now in order."

So, I think the point here is, chief superintendent, that when you were questioned about this by the Tribunal investigators you held this case up as a case that was dealt with in a similar fashion by way of regulation 10 , as that of Garda Keogh's?
A. That was my understanding.
A. That the sergeant dealing with it had given advice.
Q. But do you accept that it wasn't dealt with in a
similar fashion?
A. In that there was no notice given?

31 Q. Yes.
A. The actual notice?
A. But that was a matter for the sergeant to make that Yes. decision. He the same unfettered -But do you accept that it wasn't dealt with in the same way and in the same manner in which you dealt with it?
A. Well, I mean, I accept there was no notice given to the particular guard in question.
Q. Do you accept you didn't deal with it in the same manner?
A. Well I wasn't dealing with it.
A. I accept it was dealt with -- you know, there was no notice given, that's what I accept. I accept that the difference is that there was no notice given, that the actual regulation 10 notice wasn't given to this guard. Well, we will move on from that then in relation to that. We have a statement from Garda Madden, it's at page 15236. He says:
"In November 2015, I was contacted by Sergeant Cormac Mbyl an of Kil beggan Garda station regarding the taxing of my privately owned jeep. I informed Sergeant Mbyl an that I was recovering froma serious operation, having been injured on duty and that I would contact himin early J anuary 2016, where it was antici pated that I
woul d be ret urning on duty. I was agai $n$ contacted by Sergeant Mbyl an in January 2016 and I took his informed advi ce and changed my tax on my jeep to private."

It doesn't say anything there about being disciplined.
" 1 got a new tax disk for my jeep and produced it to Sergeant Mbylan in Kil beggan in February 2016."

Then he goes on to say that he taxed it commercially because he was an owner of a farm and had a herd number and that his jeep was used primarily for farming. Is there anything else you want to say in relation to that?
A. No. No two cases are the same. The standard is what's $10: 55$ important and I left it to the sergeant to deal with any issues that arose on their unit in relation to any issue that they might find and this was the only one brought -- that came to my attention. I think Garda Keogh's may have been certified again to have been all correct in this process, the same as everyone else.
37 Q. Just before we move on to issue 7, if I just refer you to contact that you had with Detective Superintendent mulcahy. If we could have volume 13, 3910 up on the screen, please. This is a statement from Detective Superintendent mulcahy. If we can just scroll down. Sorry, if we stop there.
"On 27th April 2015, I rang the reporter to update him
on the i nvestigation and enqui ring regar ding his wel fare. He confirmed to me that he a planned meeting with Mck Qui nn, the welfare officer, on the 1st May. I al so rang Superintendent Pat Murray and advi sed him regarding the action taken and the reporter had asked ne to ring himand expl ai $n$ to hi mothat he was not bad."

Do you recall that, that telephone conversation?
A. I do. That telephone conversation came about as a result of Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and I interacting around Garda Keogh's welfare and to have a, I suppose, a welfare officer assigned to him.
38 Q. At that stage you had two meetings with Garda Keogh, is that right?
A. Yes.

39 Q. I understood you to say that in relation to the first meeting that the two of you shook hands and that the second meeting ended amicably
A. Both meetings ended amicably, yes.

40 Q. Did this surprise you, that Detective Superintendent Mulcahy was conveying a message to you from Garda Keogh that he wasn't a bad person?
A. Yeah, well I didn't know what was meant by it and neither did Detective Superintendent Mulcahy.
41 Q. It may suggest that relations weren't particularly good 10:59 at that stage and that Garda Keogh was being somewhat defensive in relation to what he might have been perceived to have been a close examination of him by you?
A. I don't know what his perception was. He has told us here that he had some preconceived idea, that I was sent to Athlone on day one to get him. I'm afraid I knew nothing about that until very late, when all these things started to manifest against me. okay, if we can move on then to issue 7, and it concerns events between the 11th July and the 14th Ju7y. I think that you were contacted by Sergeant Cormac Moylan on the 14 th July at 9:05am. If we could have page 2218 up on the screen, please. This is an e-mail that was sent to you from Sergeant Moylan and it reads:
"I am not sure if you are aware that Nick Keogh has not been in work all weekend. He went sick last Thursday and Friday and reported fit for duty on Friday ni ght but has not attended yet. I was on I eave on Sat ur day and it appears he did not appear into work on that ni ght. He was not on l eave on Sunday or Mbnday ni ght either and did not turn up for work. I have tried calling hi mbut he has not or returned my calls.

Just said l'd let you know, meant to say it to you earlier as wasn't sure if you knew. It appears from ot hers that he has 'broken out' and is drinking in Tul I amore."

If we just go to the statement of Sergeant Moylan in that regard, it's at page 607, paragraph 4.2 , if we
scrol1 down.
"I was Garda Keogh's unit sergeant at the time of his si ck report on 9th July 2015 and subsequent call to report of $f$ sick on 10th July 2015. However, I was on annual I eave on the 10th and 11th July 2015 and resting on the 12th July. I returned to work on Mbnday, the 13th July, when I became aware that Garda Keogh had not shown up for duty on the previ ous two days. I tried to call him to no avail. I subsequently reported his absence to the di strict officer, Athl one, Superintendent Murray by e-mail.

The e-nail was sent to the di strict inbox at 3: 15amon the 14 th Jul y ."

And then he details the e-mail that I have just opened. At 4.4 on the following page, 608 , he says:
"At 00: 29 I recei ved the following Facebook message from Garda Keogh: 'Sorry about this week, Cormac. I missed your call and haven't credit to call you back.'"

Then he said he didn't acknowledge that message. As a result of receiving the e-mail, did you then make contact with Garda Keogh?
A. I did, on the 15th of Ju7y.

43 Q. Will you just tell us the conversation that you had in that regard?
A. I phoned Garda Keogh at about twelve midday to find out what had happened, that he hadn't turned up to work.
44 Q. Your note in relation to this, and it might help you, the first note to be found is at page 2219 and it's dated, it says:
" Wednesday, 15th Jul y 2015. Phoned Garda Ni ck Keogh re absent without leave. See notes."
A. Yes.

45 Q. If we go over the notes to page 2220, Wednesday, 15th July is now Tuesday, the 14th July?
A. Yes.

46 Q. Can you say how that happened?
A. It's a mistake on my part. I conflated the date on the e-mail when I was writing the note.
47 Q. And also the day of the week?
A. Yes, which was the same day, the 14th.

48 Q. But I think your position now is that you accept that in fact it was Wednesday, the 15th Ju7y, is that right?
A. That's always been my position.

49 Q. Well, I wonder whether that is correct, but we will come to that now in a minute. But anyway, the note reads:
"Tuesday, 14th Jul y 2015.

Report to me by Sergeant Mbyl an that Garda Keogh was AWOL for four days, Sat ur day the 11th July to Tuesday the $14 \mathrm{th} \mathrm{Jul} y$. Phoned member at twel ve noon. Spoke to
himfor 15 mi nutes."
A. Yes.

50 Q. Will you just tell us now, with the aid of your note there, what you recall being said?
A. It was a very open and frank conversation that Garda Keogh was very open with me in dealing with it. And he admitted that he was absent without leave and he went on to explain that, that he had signed off sick on the 10th July, after drinking for a few days, and he had forgotten that he had reported off sick and then didn't 11:06 go to work and he continued drinking. And he admitted that he had a drink problem and that he had stopped going to AA. He went on to describe to me then his drinking habit and how he would drink.
51 Q. Yes. Is there anything else there that you think might 11:06 be important?
A. Yes. We11, he brought up the whistleblower case and he explained that he was worried about Garda A and another member and that they might get him. And then I put the alternative to him and I explained or challenged him that they had done nothing since it came to light and nothing had happened since Garda A was informed or questioned about the allegation. So I was trying to allay his fears in that regard. I challenged him about not answering the sergeant's call during the weekend and he said he no credit. I put the point that credit wasn't required to answer a call. And he indicated at that stage that he had to continue going sick as well. I said to him then that $I$ had to request a case
conference and I would have to consider discipline and I would seek an explanation from him in writing.
52 Q. Do you recall whether or not he mentioned the fact that he had phoned Sergeant Moylan or had contacted him via his Facebook?
A. He did mention Facebook to me, yes. Yeah.
A. That he had used Facebook to contact the sergeant. And I said that wasn't -- I didn't feel that was an acceptable way to make contact about a matter as important as being absent from work for four days.
54 Q. So how did you leave him on that phone call?
A. He wanted me to ignore it, if I could. And I said to him that I felt it was poor behaviour, he had let his colleagues down and there were resource issues obviously over the weekend in relation to what had happened. And there was a concern for him as well, no one knew where he was for four days. And I felt, you know, drinking, while it might be an explanation, that it wasn't or couldn't be an excuse in my view.
55 Q. Then if we could have volume 11, page 225. 2225, I beg your pardon. This is a letter you sent to the sergeant in charge on the 16th July. It's headed:
"Absent without I eave - Garda Keogh.

Garda Ni ck Keogh, unit C, reported fit for duty on Friday, 10th July 2015. However, he failed to report..."

Then you set out the days.
"An expl anation by ret urn is now requi red from the mentber."
A. Yes.

56 Q. Well, he had given you an explanation on the phone, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

57 Q. Why were you writing then looking for an explanation?
A. I explained to him that $I$ was considering discipline and that I would seek an explanation from him. I was open and upfront with him about that, and this was the follow up for what I said I would do.
58 Q. And then his response is at page 2227 of the material, 11:10 dated 21st Ju7y 2015?
"Ser geant Mbnaghan, with reference overleaf, I made a mistake regarding the reporting unfit for duty. I
thought I was still on sick those days. I apol ogise
for same. Si ck cert is attached. Forwarded for your inf or mation. "

And then at page 2228 of the material, we have the sick cert dated 16th July 2015.
"This is to certify that the above patient was medi cally unfit for work from 9th July to 15th July due to work rel ated stress. He was certified medically fit
to work on the 16th July onwards."
were you happy with the medical certificate that had been sent in?
A. Well, it appeared clear to me from the certificate that 11:11 perhaps Garda Keogh may not have been to the doctor until the 16th July.
59 Q. Was that the only issue that you had with it?
A. It appeared to be a retrospective medical cert to cover the period that he was absent without leave.

60 Q. And did you see something wrong with that?
A. No, but I thought it was unusual, you know. I felt that he tried to report off sick again as if he hadn't reported off sick on the 10th as well, on that same day, the 15th. I thought both those things were unusual, in that he was trying to explain this in some way without dealing with the underlying issue that had caused the problem, when he felt it was going to recur.
61 Q. Did you think the contents of the medical certificate were false?
A. I couldn't question the contents of a medical certificate from a doctor. I have no business doing that.
Q. Did you confront Garda Keogh in relation to your concerns about the medical certificate?
A. No. I had asked him for an explanation. He had sent in an explanation, and I had, what I had.
63 Q. But you had a problem in relation to the medical certificate, is that right?
A. I had a problem, two things: The retrospective aspect of it and the fact that he had tried that day or did that day try and report off sick again, as if he had never reported off sick on the 10th. Those two things together.

64 Q. So anyway, you report to the chief superintendent in relation to the matter. If we could have page 8800 on the screen, please. This is a letter dated the 19th July from you to Chief Superintendent Lorraine wheatley.
"Si ck report Garda Keogh.

I refer to the above named member, who, following my request, was revi ewed by the Occupational Heal th
Service on the 19th May. Unf ortunatel y Garda Keogh's absences from work continue on a very frequent basis. At present, a pattern has devel oped where he reports unfit for duty on early and late tours, works on ni ght tours and reports fit for duty to avail of rest days."

Was that your belief in relation to the matter?
A. That is what was happening, yes.

65 Q. "On Friday, 10th July 2015, the member reported of $f$ sick leave and fit for duty but was then absent without 11:14 I eave for four days bet ween Sat ur day, 11th July 2015
 four rest days, the nember has appeared to work today, Sunday the 19 th July. As I amsure you will agree,
thi s type of attitude towards work commitments is unacceptable and must be addressed i meedi at el y so that the di strict force can have confidence in that the work demands placed on themapply fairly and objectivel y to
every member."
A. That's my view.

67 Q. How strongly did you hold that view?
A. I hold that view in relation to behaviours of this nature, where alcohol is involved, where it impacts on the workplace.
A. Well, it's a mistake by me, you know. I conflated, as I said, the e-mail Sergeant Moylan sent on Tuesday the 14th with the date $I$ made the phone call.
69 Q. "As a reason for being absent without leave, he i ndi cated that when he reported of fick on Friday, the 11:15 10th July, he was very drunk, had been drinking for a few days and had forgotten he had reported of $f$ sick. The nember admitted having an al cohol problem The member's unit sergeant had tried to contact the menber
while he was absent without leave. The menber acknow edged he had not returned calls to his sergeant, indi cating he no phone credit. Credit is not required to answer an incoming call."

You don't indicate there to the chief superintendent that Garda Keogh had contacted Sergeant Moylan on Facebook?
A. I indicated that I didn't feel that was an acceptable form of communication for Garda Keogh, you know. When he realised that people had been wondering where he was, I felt he should have contacted the sergeant or the station to explain where he was and how he was.
70 Q. "The nember indi cated that he intended continuing with the present pattern of reporting sick and unfit for duty at will.

Under separate cover, I intend recommending di sci pl i nary proceedings under regul ation 14 commence agai nst the member for being absent without leave. In
addition, I wi sh to request that a case conference be hel d as soon as possi ble with Garda Occupational Health Service and Human Resource Management to di scuss the nember with a view to deciding on a course of action to assist a full return to work or a sanction based alternative should the member continue to ignore his responsi bilities and work commitments."

What did you mean by that; "a sanction based
al ter native"?
A. That that was going to be for the occupational health department to decide on what was the best way to go forward with this. It was clear that Garda Keogh needed treatment, in my view, of some kind or another. I'm not a medical expert. And I wanted to ensure that this behaviour wouldn't re-occur. I felt that the explanation given by Garda Keogh later on to me -- you know, I wasn't happy that it wouldn't recur.
71 Q. What was in your mind in relation to what would constitute a sanctioned based alternative?
A. That would be for the organisation and the occupational health section to decide then, $I$ had dealt with --

72 Q. What does that mean, what does a sanctioned based alternative mean?
A. A sanctioned based alternative would depend on how the occupational health and the CMO would view the member's ability to return to work and if he were, I suppose, certified as fit to work and then wasn't returning or continuing to behave in a fashion that wouldn't allow him attend work, we11 then there would have to be a sanction.

73 Q. What sort of sanction?
A. Well, the only sanction available in the Garda organisation is disciplinary regulations.
74 Q. You thought it had come to a head at that stage, did you?
A. We11, I mean, for anybody in any workplace to stay out in that fashion for four days, it's just not
acceptable. No organisation could governance its functions if employees are to behave in that fashion.
Q. so as far as you were concerned it had come to a head at that stage?
A. I felt that Garda Keogh needed treatment at that stage. And the purpose of that report to the chief was to have a case conference as soon as possible to try and, I suppose, see what could be done from an organisational perspective. I couldn't do any more, I felt.
What you're clearly indicating there is that there should be a course of action which would assist Garda Keogh's full return to work.
A. Yes.

77 Q. Or, in the alternative, some form of disciplinary sanction?
A. If Garda Keogh wasn't facing up to his responsibilities in that regard, yeah.
Q. So in your mind this is how it should be dealt with?
A. Yes. I suppose the onus to manage his health is primarily Garda Keogh's. The organisation has
fantastic supports available to allow that to happen. But it's his responsibility to manage his health.reporting in fit for duty when he was clearly drunk, is 11:20that right?
A. Yes. I was going to report under separate cover on that.
Q. The letter that you write is on page 2221 of the
material. It's dated 4th August 2015. It says:
"I refer to the above and wi sh to report the fact that Garda Ni chol as Keogh was absent without leave for four days bet ween the 11th July and the $14 \mathrm{th} \mathrm{Jul} y$ i ncl usi ve. "

Then you summarise the sequence of events. At 3 there you say:
"Garda Keogh was absent wi thout I eave. Ser geant Mbyl an, his unit sergeant, tried personally and through ot her menbers of the unit to contact the member over the period of absence by phone. The calls went unanswered and the nember did not call back."

Once again you hadn't referred to his attempt to contact Sergeant Moylan on Facebook.
A. That's not an acceptable form of communication in my view.

81 Q. In your view?
A. In my view.

82 Q. I mean, it does indicate that he wasn't simply ignoring Sergeant Moylan?
A. No, I accept fully, and he explained that to me, that he contacted with the sergeant by Facebook.

83 Q. Yes. But you haven't alerted the chief superintendent to that?
A. Well, I mean, that's not the issue here. The issue is
the absence without leave. That's the issue that I am reporting.
84 Q. And then:
"On Tuesday, the 14th July I contacted the mentor by 11:22 phone. "

But that is in fact incorrect?
A. Yes, and I have explained that.

85 Q. "He agreed he was absent without I eave and indi cated he 11:22 had reported off sick while he was drunk but had forgotten he done so. He had no excuse for not ret urni ng Sergeant Mbyl an's calls."

We11, he did offer an excuse, but it was an excuse that 11:22 you didn't accept.
A. I didn't find it acceptable, yes.

86 Q. But he had offered you an excuse, isn't that right?
A. Yes, he had.

87 Q. And he said that he had no credit?
A. Yes.

88 Q. "On the 16th July l sought a formal expl anation from the menber and he replied in a vague and unaccept able expl anation. "

Was that the view that you had of --
A. That's my view; that he didn't seem to understand the import of what had happened, to miss work in that fashion.

89 Q. And then at 6:
"In order to create a defence to any possi ble breach of di scipline, the menber submitted a retrospective medi cal certificate dated the 16th July. The certificate indicates that he was most likel y not examined by a doctor until the 16th July. In addition, he attempted to report of $f$ sick on leave $15 t h \mathrm{Jul} y$ for a second time."

Why were you expressing the view that the medical certificates indicated that he most likely had not been examined by a doctor until the 16th July?
A. Because it was dated the 16th July.

90 Q. But you don't know whether he was examined by the doctor on the 11th July, the 12th July, the 13th July, the 14th July, the 15th July and merely got a certificate that was dated the 16th July, covering the period of time; you didn't know that, did you?
A. It appeared to me from the date on the cert and his attempt to report off duty or off sick leave for a second time, that he hadn't visited a doctor until the 16th. That's a view I took from what was in front of me.
91 Q. If you turn over to page 2222, please:

[^1]I think that is:
" -- for his responsi bilities to the organi sation, whi ch appears to stemfromover indul gence in al cohol, I respectfully recommend that the member be dealt with under regul ation 14 of the di sci pline regul ations for his absence without leave amounting to four days."

There is no mention there of the certificate and work related stress. This is being put down purely to the abuse of alcohol, isn't that right?
A. That's what Garda Keogh said to me, that he had been drunk --
92 Q. But you're putting Garda Keogh's absence from work down to purely an issue of alcohol dependency, isn't that right?
A. That's what he tole me, that's the excuse that he gave me; that he was drunk and he couldn't come to work.

93 Q. Insofar as he has a certificate saying that he is suffering and had, you knew, certificates over a long period of time, that he was suffering work related stress, nevertheless you don't make any reference to that in your report to the chief superintendent?
A. Garda Keogh explained to me that alcohol was an issue. He never mentioned work related stress as an excuse to 11:25 me when I spoke with him.
94 Q. We11, I wonder whether that'`s right. I mean, you had your initial discussion with him on the 26th March?
A. Yes.

95
Q Garda Keogh?
A. Absolutely, and I put that on a file going to the CMO.
Q. You know, I asked you yesterday as to whether or not your notes perhaps showed and displayed that you were sceptical that he was suffering from work related stress and that perhaps you were putting everything down to alcohol dependency. Was that your mindset throughout this?
A. No, alcohol is a major factor in Garda Keogh's life for quite some time. You know, it caused his absence from work on this occasion. I felt that the, I suppose, behaviour should be marked, that it was important that it be marked and that someone independent would look at it under the discipline regulations and make whatever decision they chose.

97 Q. Were you of the view at that stage that Garda Keogh was a malingerer?
A. Had alcohol problem was, I suppose, a major basis of him not coming to work on a frequent basis, I felt.
98 Q. Were you of the view that he was malingering?
A. No. I felt he had issues, he had a sickness, an illness, an addiction that he needed to deal with, but he wasn't prepared to deal with it.
99 Q. What sickness do you say he had?
A. Well, I said, you know, his alcohol addiction problem.

100 Q. What about stress?
A. I'm not a medical expert. He said he had stress. His doctor certified he had stress. He obviously had
stress. And one fed into the other. And the other fed into the other.

I wonder, chief superintendent, I mean, if it is the situation that you believe perhaps Garda Keogh was hiding behind medical certificates indicating that he was suffering from work related stress, when in fact the real problem was that he was an alcoholic. If that is so and that was your view, just say it was your view?
A. I didn't have any view in that regard. It's quite clear that Garda Keogh had stress because of the situation he was in, in relation to the whistleblower allegations and obviously that would cause stress
anybody. What part alcohol had in that and how they mixed together and what the combination was, I simply don't know. On this occasion, I dealt with what I saw in front of me.
104 Q. Did you make any enquiries from the inspectors or the sergeants in relation to what might be causing Garda Keogh's stress at work?
A. He explained to me himself what was causing it.
Q. Did you make any enquiries of anybody else?
A. No.
Q. Did you go at that time back to Sergeant Yvonne Martin and ask her for a report in relation to any interactions that she may have had with Garda Keogh?
A. No. At this point in time Garda Keogh, in an arrangement with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and I, had a full-time welfare officer assigned to him.

107 Q. Did you go back to Sergeant Martin?
A. No.

108 Q. Did you ask her for a report?
A. No.

109 Q. Did you go to Sergeant Moylan, who was his supervising sergeant at the time?
A. No, Sergeant Moylan had reported the issue to me, escalated it to me.

110 Q. Did you ask him did he observe any issues at work that might be the stress factors for Garda Keogh?
A. No.

111 Q. Did you go to Sergeant Haran --
A. No.

112 Q. -- and ask him how Garda Keogh was and had he confided in him any issues that were causing him stress at work?
A. No, I did not, Chairman.

113 Q. Why didn't you do that?
A. I didn't -- I put Garda Keogh on to the occupational the 19th May. As far as I was concerned, he was under their care in addition to the care of the welfare service, who directly report to human resource section,
under whose re commit occupational health sits. And I had left the care of the Garda Keogh in their capable hands.

If we just move on. I think at page 2232, this is a 1etter from the chief superintendent to you dated 10th August 2015. It's dealing with the alleged breach of discipline, internal discipline of Garda Keogh. She says:
"In accordance with regul ation 14 of the Garda Sí ochána 11:30 (Di sci pline) Regul ations, I have appoi nted Superintendent Al an Mur ray to investi gate the breaches of di sci pl ine al leged agai nst Garda Keogh. "

If we could have page 2233 up on the screen. This is a 11:31 letter from you to the overpayment department HRM.
A. Yes.

115 Q. In Navan. And this is before any disciplinary proceedings have taken place. Then you point out:
"The above named Garda Keogh was absent wi thout I eave fromthe 11th to the 14th July 2015 incl usi ve (SAMS updat ed). "

Had you caused SAMS to be updated at that time?
A. The district clerk would update SAMS automatically for me. I had no involvement with SAMS.

116 Q. "Pl ease recoup any over payment of wages fromthis empl oyee for the rel evant dates."

These were medically certified as dates he was out sick, isn't that right?
A. Well, as far as I was concerned he was absent without 1 eave.

117 Q. That was going to be the subject-matter of disciplinary proceedings and Superintendent Alan Murray was going to examine the circumstances in which that occurred?
A. Absolutely, from a disciplinary perspective.

118 Q. Yes.
A. But like that letter to the overpayments section was me complying with a policy on overpayments that doesn't allow me any discretion where public money is concerned. It's a matter for the overpayment section how they deal with that. You know, I mean I am just bringing it to their attention.

119 Q. You dealt with this in subsequent letters, that I am not going to open and go into?
A. Yes.

120 Q. They're there in the papers.
A. Yes.

121 Q. You're familiar with them?
A. Yes.

122 Q. And the response from the overpayment section.
A. Yes.

123 Q. They seemed a little bit surprised that the issue was arising.
A. I don't know how they are surprised when the HQ circular is there, 68/15.
Q. Was this not a matter that maybe your clerk, your district clerk could have dealt with? You seemed to be dealing with all this issue personally?
A. Well, the first letter, I'd imagine by looking at it, was written by the district clerk and the subsequent correspondence that came back then was directed towards me.

In any event, I think that the disciplinary proceedings were in respect of two issues; neglect of duty, which related to -- and we will see this at 8836 of the material, breaches of discipline alleged. Neglect of duty. That deals with the reporting fit for duty. And then discreditable conduct. That concerns the sick certificate, isn't that right?
A. I don't know. I had no involvement in the matter after 11:34 that.
Q. You had no involvement. What was supplied to Superintendent Pat Murray -- or to Superintendent Alan Murray, was your report of the 4th August, two SR1 forms that were completed by Garda Buckley and Sergeant 11:34 Cormack, again a minute from you seeking the explanation from Garda Keogh, and a report from Garda Keogh dated the 21st July, medical certificate of Garda Keogh and then an SR1 form. I suppose the point about this is, I understand Garda Keogh's case to be that the 11:35 date, whether it was Tuesday, they 14th July or Wednesday, the 15th July, was important and significant. Do you understand why he is saying that?
A. I don't really. But no one ever asked me about the
date until these things began to manifest and I never had a problem, I made a mistake on the date and that's my mistake.
127 Q.
I think that Garda Keogh's position in relation to this is that the impression given by saying that it was the 14th July, indicates that that was a day on which Sergeant Moylan was saying he was trying to contact Garda Keogh and that his calls went unanswered. By you stating that you phoned him on the 14th July and that he answered your call, would indicate that he was deliberately ignoring Sergeant Moylan's calls. Do you understand?
A. Yes, I never saw that, I never took that into account at all.
128 Q. You didn't intend --
A. No, absolutely.

129 Q. -- through your error --
A. No.

130 Q. -- to create that impression?
A. Absolutely not. And I accepted the fact that he did try and make contact through Facebook. But I did not intend to create that impression in any way at all.
131 Q. Now, I think on 8th October 2015, if we could have page 8822 up on the screen, please. That sets out the findings and you were notified of that, breach number 1 , a fine of $€ 300$, and breach number 2 , not in breach. I think you had met with Garda Keogh on 30th August 2015?
A. Yes.

132 Q. At 9pm. Could we just have this up on the screen, please, it's page 2246 of the materials.
"Met the member to serve an IA12 for superintendent Mullingar re di sci pl ine AhOL. "

You say:
"It was cl ear that the member was annoyed at events."
A. Yes.

133 Q. How did he express that annoyance?
A. He protested, I suppose, that this shouldn't be happening and it was on7y happening to him because of, you know, what he was involved in.
"It was clear the member -- I expl ai ned to himl had i ndi cated this might happen because of his cavalier attitude towards his work obligations."
A. Yes.
Q. That's how you regarded it at the time, is that right?
A. Well, yes, as I explained, you know, that's how I saw 11:39 the absence and the nature of it.
136 Q. I think he asked you to explain regulation 14?
A. He did. He was annoyed and then he calmed down a bit and I went through regulation 14 with him in full, explaining it fully to him, that this was deemed -being investigated by Superintendent Alan Murray and that he would look at it independently and Garda Keogh would have an opportunity to meet with him. I went through the entire gambit of regulation 14 with him to
allay his fears.
137 Q. "I al so enquired as to his welfare and al cohol addi ction problem"
A. Yes.

138 Q. You indicate he was reticent to discuss the same?
A. Yes.

139 Q. You were aware of at that time from Detective Superintendent Mulcahy that he was engaging with Garda Quinn?
A. Yes.

140 Q. Did you discuss that engagement with Garda Quinn with Garda Keogh?
A. I never contacted Garda Quinn. Detective Superintendent Mulcahy was the point of contact and I understand Chief superintendent wheatley also contacted 11:40 Garda Quinn.

141 Q. Yes. what I am asking, it's in your notes here, you say:
"I amaware he engaged with welfare service, Garda
Qui nn. "
A. Oh no, that's a note to --

142 Q. To yourself?
A. I'm aware of that myself, yeah.

143 Q. So that wasn't --
A. No, no.

144 Q. Then you say you asked him about his work and you say you noticed poor work standards?
A. Yes.

Yes
"I said if he continued as at present I would have to consi der reducing the risk he posed by taking himoff out door duty."
A. Yes.
Q. "He asked me to continue to send himmy issues in writing and he said he would do what he liked."
A. Yes.

149 Q. You assured him that he could not and that the meeting 11:42 ended on that. That exchange at the end, is that something that you are sure about?
A. Yes.
Q. If we just look at Garda Keogh's note in relation to this, it's at page 13326. Down at the end we see:
"9pm superintendent arrives to the station."

Did you go in specifically to serve the papers on him?
A. I had the papers Superintendent Murray in Mullingar sent to me and I wanted to ensure confidentiality around them. I went to the station to do some work and Garda Keogh was there, so I served them at the same time.
Q. He doesn't make any recount of what actually transpired at that meeting in his note. But in terms of his comments in the latter portion of your notes there, did you not feel that you were entitled to actually discipline him there and then?
A. No, I wouldn't see that. This was the reaction of someone who was very annoyed at me for having, I suppose, reported the matter of his absence without leave to the chief superintendent. It was a reaction in that way.
152 Q. I mean, it certainly would on the face of it amount to insubordination?
A. I can understand him being annoyed, he a view that this was all being done to target him in some way. I couldn't satisfy him that it wasn't, that it was just a 11:44 normal part of business, that the organisation has rules and regulations that have to be abided by. And he had an obligation to comply with those rules and regulations.
153 Q. If we could just look at the case that Garda Keogh makes in relation to this matter. It's at page 136 of the materials. This is in relation to the issue of the date that I referred you to. If we look at four lines down:


154 Q. The phone call.
A. The phone call?

155 Q. Yes.
A. Was on the 15th?

156 Q. Yes.
A. Absolutely.

157 Q. But he is attributing a motive to you and you have 11:46 already dealt with it?
A. Yes. No, I genuinely had no motive in that regard, it was a simple, genuine error on my part.

158 Q. Now, he then goes on to say, which is a matter that has
been withdrawn and I think that he has acknowledged his letter. But nevertheless it's there and he said it at one stage. In the last paragraph there before 15, and then he says:
"Pat Murray then vi ndi ctivel y requested an acknow edgment of his findings to himin circunstances where it was a contest between my version and that of Pat Murray."

And then:
"He acted as formul at or of the charge, judge, witness gi vi ng untrue testimny and now enforcer of a cap in hand acknow edgment."

Now, I think the position is that he has withdrawn that in relation to the fact that he acknowledges that you had nothing to do in relation to the deciding of the issue, which was a matter for Superintendent Alan Murray.
A. Yes.

159 Q. Now, I think having served the notice on him, I think that subsequently he was advised of the result also of the outcome of the disciplinary proceedings and then he 11:48 lodged an appeal in relation to that. It can be found at page 8854 of the materia1. Again there, we see, and I'm not going to open all this to you, it is dated 2nd December. Again he is focusing on:
"Superintendent Murray's report states that this phone call was made on 14 th Jul y 2015. The phone call is rel evant, in that l outlined to Superintendent Murray as honestly as I could as to the mistake I had made and 11:49 how it care about. In the said report it implies that I del i berately did not answer a phone call from Sergeant Cormac Mbyl an when I had expl ai ned this to Superintendent Murray, that I contacted Sergeant Mbyl an on Facebook, expl ai ning same to hi mprior to the phone call from Superintendent Pat Murray."

You had cause to serve papers on him in relation to these matters. Did you know at that stage that that was an issue for Garda Keogh?
A. I didn't look at the papers. It was -- as I say, I met him on the 22nd October in the same fashion $I$ had on the 30th August, to serve the documents, this time from the chief superintendent. I merely handed him the documents and got him to acknowledge it.
160 Q. Were you not curious to read it, to see what his case was?
A. No.

161 Q. No?
A. No.

162 Q. So your evidence is that you were totally unaware that this was an issue that concerned Garda Keogh?
A. Yes. No one brought that to my attention for quite sometime. And I would have readily corrected my
163 Q. Is there anything else that you wish to say in relation to that?
A. No.

164 Q. That issue generally?
A. No. No. The date situation is a mistake on my part. Garda Keogh made a mistake for a while, albeit influenced by my mistake. So I don't have a monopoly on wisdom, I made a genuine error. I am willing to correct that at any time.
Q. Okay. If we could then go on to deal with issue number 9, the alleged criticisms of the criminal investigations of Garda Keogh. We'11 deal with the first one, which you refer to in your meeting with Garda Keogh that we just dealt with, and that's the theft at Custume Place on the 4th July. Garda Keogh's case in relation to this is that he believes that you were hypercritical of him in relation to this and other matters and in consequence you were seeking to target him.

The relevant crime files are at page 190. If I could first of all have that up on screen. This relates to one of the injured parties. Effectively it's the same incident?
A. Yes.

166 Q. But there are two injured parties.
A. Yes.

167 Q. This crime file came to you on the 30th July, when you
were reviewing crime files, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. The nominated supervisor was sergeant Moylan and the remarks of the supervisor:
"The CCTV was vi ewed but of no evi dential val ue as camera panning qui ckly past premises."

Are you familiar with Sergeant moylan's handwriting?
Can you read the next line there? Is that collated? or collected, is it?
A. Collated.
Q. Collated?
A. That is:
"Suspect collated at Custume Place."
Q. At the time of the offence, is that right?
A. Yes.

171 Q. "Possible suspect".
A. Yes.

172 Q. And then "statement of injured party encl osed." Thank you, that's of assistance. Then there's additional comments on the next page, page 191, at number 12 , if you scroll down, Mr. Kavanagh, please.
A. Yes.

173 Q. "CCTV vi ewed with injured parties and information passed to menbers on patrol."
A. Yes.

174 Q. And then: "I nvestigating menbers comments", and then
it's the name of the suspect:
"...in area around time of the crime."

Then he says:
"No other evi dence. "
A. Yes.
Q. Then page 192 you have the statement of the injured party, who doesn't nominate any suspect, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

176 Q. Page 193. Then, if we go to 194 , which is really almost a duplication of what we saw on 190; isn't that right?
A. Yes.

177 Q. At 195:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "Additional enqui ri es conducted: I nfo passed to patrol } \\
& \text { cars and menbers on duty in area. }
\end{aligned}
$$

I nvesti gating menber comments: Suspect in area ar ound the time of crime during the triathlon. "

Then at page 196 we have a statement of the injured party, isn't that right?
A. The second injured party, yes.

178 Q. Again, I don't think any suspect is nominated there, is that right?
A. Yes.

179 Q. Then if we could just have a brief look at the Pulse entry. If we could have that up on the screen, page 8891 to 8892. It has that it's a theft on the Pulse incident summary?
CHA RMAN Just give us a moment while we go around the houses. Thanks very much.
MR. MARRI NAN I beg your pardon.
CHA RMAN That's all right.
MR. MARRI NAN You see Pulse incident.
CHA RMAN Now we have it, now we can read it.
MR. MARRI NAN Yes. Pulse incident category, it says theft. Then the report of the time, nine o'clock in the evening. The scene type, it was a house. Then it has the address. Then it's the review status. It says 11:56 that it was reviewed, on the right-hand side of the page there, on the far right column. And then there is the narrative. Then $I$ think when we are reading a narrative on Pulse. The first entry appears as the last entry, is that right? But in any event:
"I nj ured party's purse left in upstairs room Triathl on public deno house. Purse was stolen. CCTV moving camera vi ewed but to no avail."

And then:
"Updated. CVSO I etter. Cont acted injured party. Updated crime file submitted on the 28th August, plus
report fromGarda Keogh. "

Then further down it has, in the last box under:
"Revi ew records of inci dent Pul se."

I think that would be the two names of the two injured parties who would potentially be witnesses. Maybe that's not right. It refers to:
"Public had access to the room"
would that be further inquiries that were carried out?
A. No, that's reviews carried out by civilian inputers at the call centre in Castlebar.
Q. Yes, all right, thank you.

CHA RMAN Sorry, I am not seeing that.
181 Q. MR. MARRI NAN "Revi ew records for inci dent Pul se ID." CHA RMAN oh yes.
MR. MARRI NAN At the end of the page. There's two
entries there. And these were done by --
CHAI RMAN This is the pulse management.
A. Data management review.

182 Q. CHA RMAN This is the Pulse central management.
A. Known as GISE, yes.

183 Q. CHAI RMAN Exactly. I couldn't remember it. So the GISE officials look at that?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN okay, thanks.
Q. MR. MARR NAN One of them has noted on the 4th July:
Q. There is no point in going through it. And that relates to the second victim, as I say. Presumably this matter was dealt with initially at a PAF meeting, is that right?
A. The incident would have been reviewed at the morning PAF meeting, yes, and a request for a crime file.
Q. And no issues in relation to the investigation were identified, is that right?
A. We didn't know anything about the investigation at the PAF meeting.
Q. Well, nothing arose in relation to the incident at the PAF meeting?
A. Nothing other than the request for progress on the

189 Q. Yes.
A. In order that we could monitor.

190
Q. Which is the creation of the crime file?
A. The crime file.
Q. Yes.
A. And an investigation process that would have taken place, yes.
Q. The crime file, in the normal course of events went from, at that time, because it subsequently changed, but at that time in the normal course of events it would have gone through the supervising sergeant?
A. Yes.

193 Q. Isn't that right? He doesn't appear to have picked up on any issues?
A. Yes.

194 Q. Had he picked up on an issue that was of concern to him, he would have referred it back to the member investigating it, is that right?
A. Yes.

195 Q. In the ideal world, that is?
A. Yes.
Q. But in any event, this had been signed off by Sergeant Moylan?
A. It had been sent to me, yes, to my office.

197 Q. And sent on to you?
A. In the normal course of correspondence that occurred, yes.

198 Q. Your response, having read the crime file, is at page

197 of the material. It refers to the two crime files. It says:
"The attached two crime files are returned for further attention as follows:

A suspect has been identified in both cases. What efforts have been made to deal with them

Why is it that both inj ured parties who are witnesses appear to have written out their own statements on form C8 rather than the i nvestigating menber taking down the st at ement?

Each and every reported crime must be brought to an i nvesti gati ve concl usi on, so the inj ured parties and publ ic in general can have confidence in the police servi ce we provi de."

What was your concern in relation to the statements
A. They weren't taken by the investigating member. They were written out. On reading them, it was clear that those witnesses had further information that they could give in relation to what had occurred. And it didn't seem to, I suppose, have been elicited from them in an investigative way. One of the objective of statements is to gather evidence.

199 Q. There is no direction to re-interview the witnesses?
A. I mean, I suppose that would be kind of painting by numbers for someone who would be investigating crime. This is a basic, the first, I suppose, you know, action in relation to someone who is reporting crime, who is a witness; is that a statement would be taken from them in a proper fashion.
Q. Yes, but was it the fact they had written out their own statements that was the problem rather than the contents of their statements?
A. No. It was the facts, the information that they appeared to have or evidence that they appeared to have wasn't being elicited from them in a proper way.
201 Q. What are you referring to?
A. I'm referring to the content of the statement, particularly the second page, with the crossed out writing. It appears they had more information, when I read the statements.
Q. If we just go back to that?
A. That's page 193.
Q. 193?
A. Yes.
Q. How do you say that that --
A. We11, they appear to have had some interaction with a suspect.
Q. Where is there --
A. "Person who was suspected of steal ing these has conf essed to entering the building and eating food on the stairs."
Q. Right. So, you thought that that was an issue?
A. I felt that the witnesses had more information and I felt that, you know, just merely to, 1 suppose, allow them write their own statements was contrary to the ethos and training of members of An Garda Síochána. okay. But there's no direction to re-interview and to elicit this information from the witnesses?
A. The whole purpose of carrying out an investigation is to gather evidence. They are the primary source of evidence. That would be, you know, a basic step. I didn't feel the need to, I suppose, be prescriptive in that nature and to that extent. If I had to do that in every case, it would be absolutely mind boggling to consider that an organisation could run without people understanding their basic roles, having been trained in a very thorough fashion and having a number of years service and having done investigations previously. is there an absolute prohibition on that?
A. We11, a witness who has information, that might be evidence, and if's is allowed to go unchallenged and if 12:05 An Garda Síochána are using it as a foundation or a basis on which to take action in an investigation, it would be wholly inappropriate and I shutter to think how I would prosecute such case in the District Court. We11, are you saying there is an absolute prohibition, or is it a matter of best practice?
A. It's absolutely best practice.

210 Q. Yes.
A. And I have never, I suppose, seen -- I have seen, I
suppose, suspects present statements in answer to allegations in their own hand. But I have never seen anyone just allow a witness who had evidence to just write it out and leave it at that and, I suppose, allow that to conclude matters. I couldn't -- that wasn't a stand that was acceptable to me. I had come to an Athlone and I had initiated new systems and processes, I had an obligations under the Garda Code to monitor the thoroughness, accuracy of investigations and the direction of them. And I had obligations, you know, to $12: 07$ make sure that each and every incident was brought to an investigative conclusion in as far as possible.

I suppose my obligation was carried out by the members of An Garda Síochána who were attached to Athlone district and I had to ensure that they did their job in a correct manner, so as that the organisation could allow, trust, the trust of the public in carrying out its investigative function in dealing with issues that they had complained about in a proper fashion.
Garda Keogh gave evidence in relation to this and he takes issue and says that this is something that he had done on other occasions. He was cross-examined by your counse1 and it wasn't suggested to him that there was an absolute prohibition on doing this but that it was
best practice that a Garda should take a statement. So
I am wondering whether you can point to any of the rules or regulations covering this, that would demonstrate in a clear, unambiguous way that there is
an absolute prohibition on a garda inviting a person merely to write out their own statement?
A. I would say that the whole training and ethos of An Garda Síochána revolves around best practice, best international practice and best practice benchmarked against international practice. A11 of the research included in the Garda Síochána investigating interview mode1 indicates that it's best practice to take a statement from a witness to elicit information in order that evidence can be gathered to bring a case to conclusion.

212 Q. That's not really the answer to my question. My question is: Can you point to any regulation anywhere in the manual or otherwise --
A. Well, I think --

213 Q. Just let me finish. Can you point to any regulation anywhere that demonstrates an absolute prohibition on a member inviting a person to write out their own statement?
A. No, I can't, but I think a reading of chapter 3 of the crime CIT manual, Crime Investigation Techniques Manual, will give an understanding of that. I think a reading of the HQ 29/14, the Garda Síochána Investigative Interviewing Mode1, will give an indication of what's required.
214 Q. We will look at Garda Keogh's response then, if we might. It's at page 201. He says:
"Sergeant Mbnaghan, this was the day of the triathl on.

The suspect, al ong with hundreds of other people, were in the area. There is no evi dence to link that suspect to this crime."

That's very clear, isn't it?
A. Well, the triathlon occurred early in the afternoon, this crime was reported at 9 pm .
Q. No, what he is saying there is that there is no evidence linking the suspect to the crime?
A. Well, I don't know how he could say that, because he hasn't gathered the evidence from the witnesses in a proper fashion.
"In rel ation to why both statements were taken the way they were, on C8s, is because I was on my own in the public office during the triathlon. It was very busy when the two inj ured parties arrived in, so l did the best I could under the circunstances."

So that's the reason he is giving for departing from what would have been the best practice. He says in evidence that he read the statements over to the injured parties, he invited them if they wished to add anything to their statements and they signed off on them. In what he is putting forward as being very exceptional circumstances - being alone in the public office, dealing with two members of the public - you didn't think that the matter should rest there, is that right?
A. No. And that wouldn't be an acceptable standard at
al1. The triathlon, as I said, occurred much earlier in the day, and this was 9 pm at night.
Q. The town would be busy, presumably people stayed on, drinking and eating?
A. It may or may not, yeah, there's normally plenty of help around on those days and as per Garda Keogh did in other issues in relation to olivia o'Neill that are here, someone could have been, you know, procured to I suppose deal with this proper if he was busy and didn't feel he could deal with it himself.
Q. Did you make enquiries as to whether or not he was the only person on the desk?
A. No, it wouldn't be, I suppose, a way of doing things. And when I sent back the file, I would have expected that it would have been corrected and perhaps the case would have been followed up and that information that the witnesses appeared to have would be elicited from them, which might give an indication as to the culpability of the suspect. I have, I suppose, in my experience, been an operational policeman for all my service really, with quite an amount of experience in crime investigation.
219 Q. Did you write under separate cover to the sergeant, indicating that you were unhappy that he had supervised it in the way that he had?
A. No.
Q. why not?
A. Because the process at that time, the sergeant missed it, he didn't comment on it. I don't know what his
issue was. I wrote back to him asking those questions and the reply came up again, through the sergeant from Garda Keogh.
221 Q. we will just look at this, it's page 202. It's dated
the 3rd September.
"The expl anation given in this case for what I see is a Iaissez faire attitude towards the investigation of two crimes is far fromsatisfactory. Garda Keogh appears to need advice in rel ation to the purpose and scope of intervi ewi ng witnesses and in that regard should be advi sed in rel ation to the exi sting instructions at chapter 3 of the Crime Investigations Manual. The manner in which these statements formpart of an investigation is contrary to the training and ethos of members of An Garda Sí ochána and does not allow for this organi sation to assure the victins in this case the best possible effort has been put into investigating the crimes reported."
A. Yes.

222 Q. That's your opening paragraph?
A. Yes.

223 Q. That's quite forceful?
A. As I said to you, when I came to Athlone I wanted to, I suppose, set a standard, create efficiencies, have performance as a paramount and this was, I suppose -in my view I am setting out my position very clearly here, in a direct way.
224 Q. You then go on to say:
"The basis of any investigation is the injured party's statements and in these cases the injured parties nominate a suspect."
A. Yes.
Q. That's actually not right. One of them did, but the other didn't?
A. We11, both of them were together when this happened. So I am sure if information was elicited from them, that would have been the case.
Q. Well, is it the case that Garda Keogh was damned if he did and damned if he didn't?
A. I suppose I wanted the investigation to be carried out in a proper fashion. I felt there was information there from those witnesses that would lead to evidence against the nominated suspect, who was a well known criminal in the area.

228 Q. You then continue on:
"The issue must be explored in a proper fashi on with them Indeed, Garda Keogh has al so nomin nat ed the same suspect on the crime tracking file."

That seems to be an error.
A. In what regard?
Q.

Is that the same suspect has been nominated by the injured party?

12:17
A. Yes. In what I saw and the information they obviously had and the suspect Garda Keogh nominated, I concluded that that was the same person.
Q. Where did you get that from?
A. From what they were saying here.

231 Q. Where?
A. In their statements, that they had spoken to a suspect.

232 Q. Where is that?
A. Who confessed to entering the building.

233 Q. Where is there a suspect nominated by name?
A. Not by name, no, but they had a person who they spoke to.

234 Q. But where is the evidence to suggest that they both nominated the same suspect?
A. What I mean by that is that they had spoken or dealt or 12:18 had information in relation to a suspect which Garda Keogh had nominated.
235 Q. You're discerning from a portion that had been crossed out in a statement; in other words, had been excised from the statement, after it had been read over, as being presumably inappropriate to put in. And Garda Keogh has separately nominated a suspect himself. where are you drawing the conclusion that both suspects had been nominated -- the same suspect is being
nominated by both injured parties and by Garda Keogh?
A. Well, knowing the gentleman in question who was suspect, this is the type of crime that he would be involved in. I felt that if information was elicited from the witnesses, you know, it would be very apparent 12:18 that he was likely involved.
"That issue must be expl ored in a proper fashi on with them I ndeed, Garda Keogh has al so nomi nated the named suspect. It is incumbent on us to ensure we explore the various available options to assist in gathering evi dence. The case of DPP v. Reddy i ndi cates the I ow threshol d in rel ation to reasonable suspi ci on that exists in order to assist investigations. The tools available to Garda Keogh to assist himwith his work are not used in this case."

What did you mean by that?
A. There are powers available to Garda Keogh.

237 Q. Specifically?
A. That he had powers of arrest and search and other powers that would be available to him, to allow him to further this investigation.

238 Q. So are you suggesting that he ought to have arrested --
A. I am suggesting that they are options. I consider that guidance, advice and direction. And it also, I suppose, allowed the sergeant and, indeed, Garda Keogh to understand where I was coming from. I felt I was very open and honest in expressing my feelings there in the standard I wanted applied in relation to this and
all other investigations of volume crime, to, I suppose, go hand in hand with the new procedures that I had introduced.
You go on to say "In order to bring these matters --" it should be "-- to an acceptable concl usion for the vi ctims, please address the foll owing: Garda Keogh should be gi ven formal advi ce regarding the investigation of crime and the importance of intervi ewing witnesses. Chapter 3 of the crime investigation manual is a source of reference; what efforts have been made to incl ude/ excl ude the suspect identified, as two months have passed. This matter needs urgent attention; Sergeant Mbnaghan should ensure that Garda Keogh is supervised in bringing this matter to the concl usi on so that the victins office can advi se ${ }_{12: 21}$ the injured parties of the efforts An Garda Sí ochána put into sol ving their crimes."
"Sergeant Mbnaghan shoul d ensure that Garda Keogh is supervised in bringing this matter to a concl usion so that the victims office can advi sed injured parties of the efforts An Garda Sí ochána put into sol vi ng their crimes.

Report without fail by the 20th Septenber."

Garda Keogh has made the case that this was a long letter, you've set out your concerns and they are extensive. And he feels that it would have taken you a
considerable period of time to sit down and write that letter, expressing your concerns in relation to this investigation. Did it take you a considerable period of time?
A. No. Writing letters is something I would do every day of the week when I was a superintendent. It was second nature to me.
240 Q. Now, in relation to how you were dealing with other members of An Garda Síochána at the time, and the number of files and crime files that were passing through your desk, can you just give us an indication in relation to how many and how many you might have sent back?
A. Yes. The process began in or around the 1st July. I was on annual leave until the 13th and when I came back 12:22 both inspectors went on leave and I was dealing with most of the correspondence at that stage. But in 2015, after the process came in, I returned 44, I suppose, crime files to different members. These ones to Garda keogh and the rest to other members, out of 184 that were submitted that year. And in '16 again that continued, 68 returned out of 536 that came in. In '17 53 returned out 502 that came in. That's a monitoring and control and an audit process that we were going through. I would give the benefit of my experience, as 12:23 would the inspectors, in pointing out other avenues of inquiry, to allow fruition to develop an investigation, with the primary objective of providing as good a service as possible to the public and ensuring that
criminals are brought to justice and the people would be kept safe.
Q. What you described as laissez faire attitude, did you see evidence of that in other members in Athlone at the time?
A. If I saw evidence, I would be quick it point it out. I am quite candid like that. I did call people to account on various occasions.
Q. In a similar passion, using that expression?
A. I could have used -- I'm not sure if I used that express before, I could have. If I saw something that needed attention, $I$ would call it out.

243 Q. If we could have page 208 up on the screen, please, Mr. Kavanagh. This is Garda Keogh's response. He says:
"Wth reference to the above, I have al ready written on this and expl ai ned verbally to Superintendent Pat Murray regarding the statements, whi ch are legally bi nding and val id, made by the injured parties on C8 forms."

I think that is a reference to his meeting with you, that we have already gone through, on the 30th August, is that right?
A. Yes.

244 Q. "Whi ch were read over to both witnesses, who si gned same. When I got a chance, l brought --"

And then "one of the witnesses" or "the witnesses" " -- into the CCTV roomto vi ew the footage with her but it did not show the suspect enter or leave the buil ding. I al so wi sh to point out that neither of the wi tnesses named a person in their statements. I nomi nated a suspect who was in the area at the time, al ong with hundreds of other people for the triathl on event. There is no evi dence to link himwith this crime."

If we just --
CHA RMAN Just give me the date of that again, Mr. Marrinan.

MR. MARRI NAN It hasn't a date on it.
CHA RMAN But the 22nd September, it's stamped.
MR. MARR NAN It is stamped the 22nd September. CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Sorry.
MR. MARRI NAN It's attached to a letter sent by Sergeant Monaghan to you on 5th October 2015. And he says:
"W th reference to the above, pl ease find attached report from Garda Keogh. Chapter 3 of the Crime I nvestigation Manual has been brought to the attention of Garda Keogh. Garda Keogh nomi nat ed the suspect for these thefts but since then he has been unable to link him with the crimes. All CCTV was vi ewed and this gave no leads in the investigation. Thi s case cannot be progressed at this time and any devel opments will be
reported to your office as they arise."

And then you note, and it's stamped 6th October, and if you just read your own handwriting there, please?
A. Yes "I note your views. The crime files have been sent to the victim office, who will informthe injured parties of the efforts made and the result. I do not expect to see a repeat of this situation by the menber i nvol ved. "

It's something I will come to later on, but did you form a suspicion in your mind in relation to why the injured parties had written out their statements?
A. No. I didn't know, but like, in what $I$ had sent down, I had hoped that Garda Keogh would correct that and would go out and, I suppose, put an effort into investigating this crime and bring it to as good a conclusion as possible. As time passed by, that became irrelevant, because of the chances of success lessened considerab7y.
247 Q. CHA RMAN Were you satisfied that it was concluded when he viewed the CCTV with the suspect?
A. No.

CHA RMAN Te11 me why, chief superintendent, why that wasn't satisfactory?
A. I don't know what occurred, you know, in viewing the CCTV. That wasn't apparent, it's just something that's written down. So to allow someone come in and view CCTV in that fashion, wouldn't be evidentially correct

CHA RMAN You're looking at downstream problems that might arise?
A. I am, yeah.
A. Yes.

255 Q. CHA RMAN If we ignore the crossing out bit, somebody confessed to something?
A. Yes.

256
Q
CHAL RMAN
But apparently it didn't show up on the

CCTV. That's what ultimately appears to be the situation?
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Okay. But you're unhappy. You say, okay, that may seem like a practical way of doing it, to an outsider, but because of possible downstream consequences, if there were to be a trial, you wouldn't think that was an appropriate way of doing it?
A. No, I wouldn't say for a trained member of An Garda síochána it would be something...

CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
MR. MARRI NAN Was this the first crime file that had passed your desk from Garda Keogh?
A. Yes. In the new process, yes.

259 Q. Was that something you were looking for?
A. No. As I said to you, I came back from holidays and the inspectors I think went on holidays and I was dealing with everything.
Q. So you don't recall having observed another crime file having crossed your desk by Garda Keogh?
A. Before this?
Q. Yes.
A. No.

262 Q. You're very certain of that?
A. We11, a new process had begun, I don't recall having 12:31 dealt with a crime file before this one.

263 Q. Bearing in mind your interactions with Garda Keogh and what you had been advised of his difficulties, your conversations with Sergeant Haran, to a lesser extent

Superintendent McBrien, but also your conversations with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy, and the attempts to put in place welfare and personnel to deal with him?
A. Yes.

264 Q. Did you think that the tone of the letter that you sent, talking about the ethos in An Garda Síochána, mightn't just be appropriate to somebody in his position and that maybe it could have been dealt with by a more gentle reprimand?
A. No, I was setting out my position very clearly.
A. The standard I wanted applied and how it was to be applied and I would hope that the effort would be put in to achieve that standard.
266 Q. You didn't think of dealing with it perhaps by calling Sergeant Moylan in and saying, look, this isn't really satisfactory, it's not how I want things done, will you have a word with Garda Keogh and make sure that he is applying himself to his work? You didn't think of dealing with it in that rather informal way?
A. No, I dealt with it in a formal way. Yeah, that's the way I normally like to work.
267 Q. Pardon?
A. I normally like to work in a formal fashion.

268 Q. Yes.
A. This was formally part of a crime file, which was going to be there for everyone to see.

269 Q. Now, we know later, and we will come to this in due course, but later on, one of the reasons that Garda

Keogh is placed on indoor duty is that you had formed a suspicion in relation to why these two witnesses had written out their own statements?
A. I don't follow.

270 Q. You don't recall that; that you were concerned that perhaps Garda Keogh mightn't have been himself in a position to write out the statements? We will come to it in due course, if it's not a matter that springs to your mind. You weren't suspicious that maybe he was drunk on duty?
A. Yes, but I mean, that doesn't hold then, you know.
Q. okay. We will move on then to -- that was the end of the matter and it didn't go any further. And then if we can just go forward then to the theft of a trailer
at Dublin Road, the 17th August. Again, if we could just perhaps in the first instance look at the Pulse entry in relation to this. I will just get the reference number now, I'm sorry. Yes, it's at 8921 of the materials. Again, we see there the occurrence date, the time it was reported, the time it occurred, 4:30am. where? In a driveway. The scene. And then there's a narrative. If we go down to the bottom there:
"I nj ured party reports trailer stol en from dri veway of house. "

And then it's updated on 11th August 2015, when the crime file was submitted, it says:
"No suspects."

And then it's updated on the 28th August, a vehicle is added, isn't that right? And then it's updated on the 11th September, the time of occurrence is updated. And then eventually it's updated by reference to CCTV footage of two possible suspects forwarded and uploaded to GTube, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

276 Q. If we then can look at the crime file in relation to it, which came to be reviewed by you. If we go to page 2300, please. This is the file that was reviewed by you:
"Crime category: Theft."

It has the injured party, the date. And then the remarks of the supervisor:
"CCTV vi ewed to no avail as it is of poor quality. No ID for suspects."

And then it has the signature of the supervisor. That is Sergeant Monaghan I think, is that his signature?
A. Yes.

277 Q. Then on the next page, at 2301, this was filled out by Garda Keogh:
"Gar da CCTV vi ewed. Crime occurred 4: 31-4: 34am "

Then there is a date. I can't see what is written in the corner.
"8th August 2015. Poor qual ity foot age of car noving
with stol en trailer hitched."

And then:
"I nvesti gating menber's comments: Unable to make out regi stration number, col our or type of car."

So those were the matters that were contained in the
report. You then raise a query in relation to this based on what's contained in the crime file, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. This is at page 2299. This is on the 14th August. It refers to the theft at Dublin Road and then also to criminal damage, which I will come to in due course?
A. Yes.
Q. At Mulligan's filling station?
A. Two crime files came to me together.
Q. "Who wrote the statements of attached C8s?"

Now, I think there's been assumption made, I think it might be incorrect, that this refers to what we have just been discussing in relation to --
A. No.
Q. It doesn't?
A. It refers to the statements that were attached to both these files that came to me together.
282 Q. Yes. why did you ask that question?
A. I thought I noted that the writing was different to Garda Keogh's and I just wanted to be sure the same thing hadn't happened again.
283 Q. A11 right. You say:
"In rel ation to the stol en trailer, who supplied the CCTV?"

It's apparent from the report that you received that it
was Garda CCTV, isn't that right?
A. I didn't note that at the time. Garda is written in there now, but at the time $I$ didn't note that. It said CCTV.
Q. All right. If we can have it back up on the screen, 2301, please.
A. Yes.
Q. "Garda CCTV vi ewed, crime occurred..."

Are you suggesting that the word "Garda" was written in 12:41 afterwards?
A. I'm not suggesting anything, but it wasn't apparent to me that it was Garda CCTV at the time.
Q. But it would appear that it was your error in relation to it?
A. It may well have been, it may well have been.
Q. Well, are you accepting the document on its face as being a genuine document?
A. I have no choice but to accept that the document is a genuine document.
Q. So it would appear that it was your error in relation to --
A. It may we11 be my error, yes.
Q. "Who supplied the CCTV?"
"There is no statement fromthat person on the file."

There wouldn't be if there was Garda CCTV?
A. Yeah. Well, if someone downloaded it, there still
would be a statement, because it would be essential proof.
Q. "Has any effort been made to enhance the CCTV?"
A. Yes.
Q. "Should it be circulated in any way?"
A. Yes.
Q. "Where is the CCTV now?"
A. Yes.
Q. well, those questions would appear to be inappropriate if you had realised that it was Garda CCTV; isn't that right?
A. No. I suppose I didn't realise it was Garda CCTV at the time and those questions are there, you know, with me not realising it was Garda CCTV.
Q. But the questions wouldn't be appropriate if it had been Garda CCTV?
A. I wouldn't say it would be totally inappropriate. Because the CCTV, irrespective of whether it was Garda 12:43 or not, was there, it would have to be downloaded by somebody and it would have to be held as evidence in that regard. Because at that stage that was the only, I suppose, tangible explanation that we may be on to
some lead that needed to be followed. some lead that needed to be followed.
Q. Your letter is addressed to Sergeant Monaghan and he sent it on to Garda Keogh on the 18th August. That is at page 2297. Nothing arises in relation to that. And then at 2298, Garda Keogh responds.
"1. Garda Ni chol as Keogh wrote both statements."

A11 right?
A. Yes.

297 Q. Did that put your mind at rest?
A. Yes, absolutely.
Q. And then:
"3. It is Garda CCTV, whi ch is stored on computer." 12:44
A. Okay.

299 Q. "The inci dent happened at ni ght and the qual ity is poor."
A. Yes.
Q. If we look at page 2296, this is the letter that was sent by Sergeant Monaghan and it's dated the 28th August.
"With reference to the above, please find attached report from Garda Keogh. He states that he wrote out the statement fromthe injured party on the form C8."

It appears that there was just simply one statement that had been taken?
A. There was statements from both the crimes.

301 Q. He then goes on to say:
"The only CCTV footage available to cover the I ocation of the theft is Garda CCTV and on vi ewing it, the qual ity is poor and it was ni ghttime and this CCTV is stored on the hard drive in the station."
A. Yes.
Q. That's right, isn't it?
A. Yes. So it seems apparent that I hadn't understood that it was Garda CCTV.

303 Q. Now this relates to entirely different CCTV footage that had been obtained from Kilmartin's.
"Garda Keogh has si nce obt ai ned CCTV foot age from
Kilmartin's N6 centre and this shows two possi ble suspect vehicles, whi ch he has updated the i nci dent with. Enquiries are ongoing in this case and progress will be reported."

So did that allay your fears in relation to the issues that you raised?
A. I was glad to see that additional CCTV, which gave a definite lead to follow, had now been identified.
304 Q. Well, it had already been identified by Garda Keogh?
A. But I didn't know that.

305 Q. You didn't know that. Then you raise a further query, this is page 2295, it's dated 3rd September 2015.
A. Yes.
Q.
"The inci dent regarding the theft of the trailer requi res further expl anation in rel ation to the CCTV. It appears the crime file was submitted premat urel y, i ndi cating no evi dence was available, and now evi dence has come to light following a request for further i nf ormation. "
A. Yes.

That seems to be a misunderstanding on your part?
A. That was my understanding at the time.

308 Q. Yes. But it seems to be wrong, isn't that right?
A. We11, after hearing the evidence here, it appears that Garda Keogh had gone to Kilmartin's and I wasn't aware of that.
Q. "The following issues have not been dealt with: My question in rel ation to the CCTV in correspondence dated 14th August has not been answered."
A. Yes.
Q. We11, I suppose it was answered, because Sergeant Monaghan had answered it and advised you that it was Garda CCTV and was stored in the station?
A. Yes.

A11 right. Isn't that right?
A. Well, I was looking for, I suppose, the evidential proofs that may be necessary to be included in the file 12:48 in relation to it, because it was something that may become apparent at prosecution stage if that were to happen, and I was thinking a couple of steps ahead. 312 Q. Well, the questions were: who has it? where is it?The crime report form has that it is Garda CCTVAnd here you are still pursuing it?
A. I also asked: was there a statement from a person who downloaded it? Did it need to be enhanced? And should it be circulated in any way?

316 Q. And then:
"2. The car identify identified was invol ved in a burgl ary in Ballinasl oe on 9th August 2015. What I iai son has occurred with the investigating member of that inci dent?

How is it proposed to allow the CCTV harvested to assist the investi gation?

Where is the CCTV now from an evi dential exhi bit point of vi ew?"

That's relating to a different CCTV
A. This is the new CCTV.

317 Q. That's the CCTV that has come to light, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

318 Q. "Ser geant Mbnaghan should supervi se the proper
i nvestigation of this crime so that we can show to the victimthat we were thorough and professional in our approach to sol ving the crime."

And then, if we go on, Sergeant Monaghan receives that 12:49 from Sergeant Baker. That's at page 2294. If we could go forward then to 2293 of the material. There we have the handwritten response. If we can scroll down, Mr. Kavanagh, the handwritten response from Garda

Keogh. Again he says:
"Garda CCTV is of poor qual ity."

Then he says separately:
"Saved Kilmartin's CCTV, downl oaded. St at ement regarding same is attached to the file."

That statement was attached to the file, isn't that right?
A. Yes, yeah.
Q. "Garda Keogh has spoken with Garda Eoi n Fox and supplied Garda Fox with a copy of Kilmartin's CCTV of car and suspects. Both inci dents connected on Pul se and warning attached to--"

There is a name there.
" -- whi ch is registered to a fal se address."

That's a motor car.
A. Yes.

320 Q. "CCTV forwarded with request to be put on GTube on the 10th Sept enber."
A. Yes.

321 Q. "Garda Keogh has ori gi nal CCTV. Copy of same forwarded to Garda Eoi n Fox. "

He sets out the date there. That is sent on, again on the 19th September, if we can go to page 2292 of the material. This is from Sergeant Monaghan to you:
"Wth reference to the above, please find attached report from Garda Keogh in rel ation to this case.
Garda Keogh has addressed points $1-4$ rai sed in your report.

All the CCTV is saved and the originals are in possessi on of Garda Keogh. A copy of this CCTV has been forwar ded to Gar da Eoi $n$ Fox in Ballinasl oe and Garda Keogh has been in contact with this member in rel ation to possible suspects for both cases and another copy has been forwarded to collat or in Mullingar to be upl oaded to GTube. Garda Keogh has put 12:52 a warning on Pulse in rel ation to the suspected offending vehi $c l e$ and has made contact with gardaí in Kildare, where the car is registered to. This is a fal se address.

This crime is still under investigation and any further progress will be reported as it arises."

Then you noted there:

CHA RMAN "Of crime".
A. "Of crime".

322 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Yes "of crime". Then what does it say that?
A. "Report on the efforts of identification by $1 / 11 / 15$." That's the identification of the suspects.

323 Q. We know that Sergeant Minnock sent an e-mail on the 31st August to Garda Keogh, praising him for the work that he had done in relation to this. It's at page 218.
> "Garda Keogh, good work in advancing this i nvest i gation. "

There does seem to be some confusion that arose during the course of this. If I can summarise it in this way, and correct me if I am wrong in relation to this, if I can short-circuit matters it would be helpful: It
would appear that Garda Keogh investigated the original complaint and that he did so properly, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Garda Keogh used his initiative and he went to Kilmartin's and found --
Q. No, I haven't come to that.
A. Sorry.

325 Q. He investigated the original complaint in the first instance properly, isn't that right?
A. I don't understand what you mean.

326 Q. He took a statement from the injured party?
A. Yes.

327 Q. He viewed CCTV footage?
A. Yes.

328 Q. which was Garda CCTV footage?
A. Yes.

329 Q. It was in the safe custody of the Gardaí in Ath1one, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

330 Q. You then raised queries in relation to it because you
were acting under the misapprehension that the CCTV footage related to non-Garda CCTV footage?
A. That's what I thought.

331 Q. It was an innocent mistake that you made in the circumstances. You raised those queries with Garda Keogh.
A. Yes.

332 Q. Unbeknown to you, Garda Keogh in actual fact had gone further in relation to the investigation and acting on perhaps a hunch or just good police work.
A. Yes.

333 Q. He went to Kilmartin's.
A. Correct.
Q. -- that people who had taken the trailer may have been foolish enough to call in and get petrol in a garage nearby?
A. Yes.
Q. Then a series of questions go back and forth in relation to the original CCTV footage. And you're not aware still that it's Garda CCTV footage but Sergeant Monaghan eventually informs you of that?
A. Yes.
Q. Isn't that right? And arising out of those enquiries, it appears that in the meantime the CCTV footage that Garda Keogh had asked for in Kilmartin's had become available?
A. Yes.

338 Q. And in around the same time Garda Keogh had viewed that and had identified a suspect vehicle?
A. Yes.

339 Q. Then the matter had been progressed from there?
A. Yes.

340 Q. Your subsequent enquiries then in relation to the CCTV footage related to the Garda CCTV footage in the first instance?
A. Yes.

341 Q. And then secondly in relation to the second CCTV footage from Kilmartin's?
A. Yes.

342 Q. And Garda Keogh in actual fact had got a statement and the CCTV footage had been supplied to him?
A. Yes. Well, he got a statement on the 9th September.

Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. And the CCTV footage had been supplied to him?
A. Yes. Sometime in late August, I understand. And I had 12:57 been keeping in touch with Sergeant Monaghan in relation to the progress and I knew he was assisting Garda Keogh.
Q. In your statement, and I will summarise this as broadly as I can, but in your statement to the Tribunal investigators and to the Tribunal, you seem to think it was as a result of your intervention and the queries that you raised in the first instance that led to a successful prosecution?
A. Yes. I suppose, in the first instance and continuing to follow the investigation, both myself, Sergeant Monaghan and Inspector Curley, you know, ensured that this wasn't going to go being detected and we supported Garda Keogh in doing that, you know, even though he was in a difficult place at the time.
346 Q. Yes, but it would appear that Garda Keogh had investigated the matter thoroughly?
A. Yes, indeed, with the assistance of Sergeant Monaghan and his unit colleagues.

347 Q. It would appear that Garda Keogh had investigated the matter thorough7y?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And as a result of good police work, it led to the solving of this crime, isn't that right?
A. Absolutely, and I acknowledged that in the correspondence, when I said I appreciated the additional enquiries made and the efforts that were made to deal with this.
Q. Did you think that that was adequate in the circumstance, in the light of all the queries that you had initially raised mistakenly in relation to the Garda CCTV footage?
A. Well, I was mistaken in relation to the Garda CCTV footage, but I would say the other queries I generated were legitimate queries, in me doing my -- performing my role as a superintendent, monitoring and being responsible for the thoroughness and accuracy of all investigations in the district.
MR. MARRI NAN Thank you very much chief
superintendent. We are now going to move on briefly in relation to the criminal damage of Mulligan's and perhaps we will leave is there.
CHA RMAN Perhaps we will leave it until after lunch, Mr. Marrinan, before we move on to that the matter. Thank you very much.

THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED AND RESUMED, AS FOLLONG,

## AFTER LUNCH

350 Q.
MR. MARR NAN Was there anything else that occurred to you over lunch that you might wish to expand on in
A. Just in relation to the last crime file we discussed, I did put supports in place to lead Garda Keogh through the arrest phase and involved in every stage of that, right up until the 18th November, when the arrests were 14:01 made.

351 Q. Yes, yes. I think we see that in the papers.
A. Yes.

352 Q. It's good that you high1ight that.
CHA RMAN Sorry, say that again, Mr. Marrinan?
MR. MEGI NESS: He put supports in place for Garda Keogh.

CHA RMAN No, it was just your last comment. I heard what the chief said. You said, we see that --
MR. MEGU NESS: we have that in the papers.
CHA RMAN Sorry, thank you. No, no, I just didn't quite hear, thanks very much.
353 Q. MR. MARRINAN If we could then go on and deal with the criminal damage at Mulligan's Petrol Station on the 3rd August. Perhaps we can just look at the Pulse entry in 14:01 the first instance in relation to this. It's at page 8940, Mr. Kavanagh. This is the Pulse entry. It says the incident category. Up at the top there we see it's criminal damage?
A. Yes.

354 Q. 3rd August 2015. It's a petrol service station and then there's the narrative.
"Two mal es wearing track suits and hoodi es threw rocks at a petrol station, cracking a pane of glass. CCTV to be vi ewed, to be downl oaded. No suspects. Faces not vi si ble."

Then we see it's updated subsequently, but that's the initial entry. Then we see that Garda Keogh, assisted by Garda Glennon, is investigating and Sergeant Monaghan is the supervising garda in relation to it. Over the next page, we can see the damage that was caused. I think it doesn't assist us any further in relation to that. Then if we look at the crime form, which is page 8942 of the materials. We see there, it's a very poor photocopy, unfortunately, but we can just about make it out. Again:
"Crime category: Criminal danage.

Mulligan's filling station, Roscommon road. "

Then the date and then investigating member. And then the remarks of the supervisor. Again, this was supervised.

[^2]And that's signed by Sergeant Monaghan. And then if we turn over the page to page 3943 , we will see at 7 , if we scroll down there -- I beg your pardon, it's 8943, Mr. Barnes. Yes. If we scroll down there we will see on under 7, CCTV, it's ticked. Then:
"8. House to house enqui ries."

Were apparently carried out. Then number 9:
"Cri me prevention advi ces."

Apparently they were also handed out. Then under suspects, under 10 there, there is nobody indicated. And then under 12:
"Additional enqui ries: Area was searched for cul prits."

So then if we just look at the statement that was attached to the crime file, $I$ think at 8945, is the statement of, I think it's the owner of a premises at Mulligan's filling station. And at the second part of the statement, he said:
"I vi ewed the CCTV wi th the Gardaí, whi ch showed at 3: 37am on the 3rd August, two mal es track suits and hoodi es covering thei $r$ faces, al so wearing gloves, ran
up to the shop door and each threw an obj ect at the wi ndow, causing it to smash. I di d not gi ve anybody permissi on - - "

And if we go over the page, Mr. Barnes, to 8946:
" -- to danage or interfere with my property. The CCTV will be downl oaded in due course."

That statement had been read over and I think that was taken by Garda Keogh, as we can see from the introduction on the previous page. So that's where matters stood. Then we go back to a document that we opened earlier on, I just didn't open this paragraph, at page 215, please. You raise an issue in relation to 14:07 this.
A. Yes.

355 Q. And you say:
"In rel ation to Mulligan's, it appears --"

And then you have a named person or a family, is it?
A. Yes.

356 Q. " -- may be suspect."
A. Yes.

357 Q. "Was this put to themin any way?"
A. Yes.

358 Q. Where did that come from?
A. So, the particular family in question were very active
at that time. I note from my diary at that time that I have entries in about them on the $2 n d, 3 r d, 4$ th and 14th August. At the morning meeting, at the PAF meeting a11, I suppose, activities or criminal activity would be discussed. I think it's quite likely that their nomination arose as a result of something that occurred at one of those meetings.
359 Q. Are there any notes of those PAF meetings that would support that?
A. No, I don't, other than I have notes about the particular family in my diary on the 2nd, 3rd 4th and 14th August.
360 Q. So this was you nominating?
A. This was me, yes. I suppose to guide them, guide Garda Keogh towards possible suspects and, you know, considering that CCTV was available, perhaps their stature, their build or some element of them would be, I suppose, identified by somebody perhaps in the Garda station or even the --
361 Q. You might appreciate, I don't know, but in your letter it doesn't come across that way. It says:
"In rel ation to Mulligan's, it appears that [certain family] may be suspect."
A. Yes.

362 Q. And then:
"Was it put to themin way?"

So it's taking quite a jump there, isn't it?
A. Yeah, well I suppose just the level of activity $I$ think that were involved with the family at that time. They also had access to a house that was close by to that filling station as well $I$ think, and it may possibly have been them. I just wanted that avenue explored. If there was nothing in it, there was nothing in it. But I was, I suppose, guiding the direction of the investigation, to ensure there was no stone was left unturned and I felt always that the public would demand that kind of a service from us.

363 Q. Yes, chief superintendent, but this comes in the context of a letter which has raised three queries. One in relation to who wrote statements in relation to the Dublin Road incident. And it appears there was one 14:10 statement. But then second of al1, a query in relation to Mulligan's, saying that people were a suspect who hadn't been nominated as a suspect. And then querying whether or not this was put to them. And then in relation to the CCTV, which we discussed earlier on, and I am not going to go back onto that. But these were all directed at Garda Keogh, isn't that right?
A. They were directed to the sergeant in charge of Ath1one as far as I was concerned. They were cases Garda Keogh was involved in but $I$ do indicate that they may be suspect. I was giving some guidance as I saw it and I saw that as a my role in not merely rubber stamping a crime file that came up, but I felt my role was to add value in the service to the public in terms of how
volume crime was investigated, so as that the victim would be at the centre of what we did in a holistic type way. And I think the structures I set up, you know, ensured that that was the case and it was a
matter for me then to ensure that everyone understood the standard that I had set and that that would be applied then fairly across the board, with a view to improving the service, creating efficiency and effectiveness in the service we're delivering.
364 Q. Perhaps a line along this line would be: Has the investigating member considered that a member of such and such a family might have been involved? If so, then in those circumstances investigate further. But this is a statement that these people are suspect?
A. I said they may be suspect.

All right.
A. You know, my use of language is open to interpretation but my intentions were honourable. I have no doubt about that. And, indeed, that's the way I approach things with all of the other crime files I sent to every other member as well.
366 Q. Then if we go over to page 21 --
367 Q. CHA RMAN Just before we leave that, chief superintendent, can I ask you: what did you envisage when you say "may be suspect, was this put to themin amy way", what did you have in mind?
A. Could we establish --

368 Q. CHA RMAN That somebody would go and say, where were you on the blank day or blank? It was the suspect
people?
A. Yeah, could we establish where they might be or -yeah.
369 Q. CHA RMAN The suspects were the people whom had you in mind, that somebody would go and say?
A. Yeah.
Q. CHAL RMAN okay.
A. Additionally then, you know, if their stature or some element of clothing might become apparent in the CCTV. CHA RMAN I understand that point about the CCTV. okay, thanks very much.

371 Q. MR. MARRI NAN If we go on then to page 217. This is again a response from Sergeant Monaghan, we have opened it in relation to the other issues. He says:
"In rel ation to PI D...."

And that's the number that we are concerned with here.
"... Garda Keogh indi cates that there is no evi dence to suspect the persons nomi nated of this damage and on speaking to the owner, he is happy that it was no that particular family as they do not frequent this area. Any devel opments will be reported."

Attached to that was 216 , which we have already opened but we didn't open this paragraph. It's from Garda Keogh and it's dated, is that the 23rd August, $I$ think. No, I think it's the 28th August.
"In relation to --"

And he refers to the family
" -- bei ng suspects, there is no evi dence to suggest this. When I spoke to the owner, he did not feel it could be themas they do not frequent the area."

So there you have it, I mean Garda Keogh is
responding and saying these people weren't nominated as suspects.
A. Yes.
Q. They're not considered as suspects, he has spoken to the owner of the petrol station.
A. Yes.
Q. And he is not nominating as suspects or perhaps people who had a grievance or otherwise against the petrol station. So, this family are off the pitch, as it were, all right, as far as Garda Keogh is concerned?
A. Yes.
Q. Then if we go to 219 , which we have opened earlier on today, and your response in relation to it is, you say:
"The crime file in rel ation to Muli igan's --

This is the last paragraph.
" -- has been sent to the victins office so they can
informthe injured party of our lack of progress due to the unavailability of avenues of enquiry to progress the case."
A. Yes.

375 Q. If we just deal with what Garda keogh has to say in relation to this. If we could have page 62 of his interview with the Tribunal investigators, and if we look at line 887 there. This is a quote but it covers in general what he is alleging in relation to these matters that I am questioning you on now.
"My police work was again irrationally scrutini sed and minutely criticised by Pat Murray."

Then if we go down to 892:
"It was very simple, Superintendent Mirray has set out in a report dated 14th August 2015 the following: 'In rel ation to Mlligan's, it appears [family] may be suspect. Was this put to themin any way?' In my view 14:16 this was irrational because the families live on the other side of Athl one, the Westmeath side of Athl one, and have no transport. Mulligan's garage is on the Roscommon si de of Athlone, well away from where they live. I amstill baffled as to how he suggested them as being suspects in the crime and there is absol utely no evi dence to suggest it was that family. Separately, in my viewit is oppressive in the manner that Superintendent Murray is pie out of the sky nominating
these suspects and criticising me for not nominating the family that live two miles away and have no transport."

So, what do you say in relation to that?
A. I didn't criticise Garda Keogh in any way for not nominating suspects. I merely included them so as that avenue of enquiry might be conducted in order to, I suppose, ensure that there was no stone left unturned. Like, Garda keogh would well know that the absence of transport wouldn't prevent a family who were as active as the [blank] --
CHA RMAN I think you better try to avoid referring to anybody's name, for fear --
A. That family, from moving around in order to commit crime. That was the type of people they were, and they were very active at that time.

376 Q. MR. MARRI NAN This was the third crime file that you had raised issues in relation to, to Garda Keogh. Were there any crime files at that time that you didn't raise an issue in relation to?
A. I think there was one in the 44 in that year that I didn't raise an issue in.

377 Q. In relation to Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.

378 Q. One in 44 that you didn't?
A. We11, I mean, I returned 44 to various members, there were four that I dealt with that Garda Keogh submitted.
379 Q. Yes.
A. But there was another one, a fifth one, that I didn't return to him.
Q. In relation to Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.

381 Q. Have you got the date for that?
A. I think it was in November of '15.
Q. November of '15?
A. Yes.
Q. At a time when he was on indoor duties, is that right?
A. It was a file that was, I suppose, one of the issues that he had dealt with before he went on indoor duties.
Q. This is the third file and they have all been returned to him, comments have made in relation to them. The first of those comments primarily relates to the fact that the injured parties made their own statements. You're also now unhappy with the fact that he asked them to view CCTV footage, even though you didn't raise that issue at the time, isn't that right?
A. Sorry, I didn't get that question fully.
A. No.
Q. Yes. And then we have a situation where the second incident, being the theft of a trailer, and there were a series of misunderstandings there in relation to

Garda CCTV, but I think that you acknowledge that Garda Keogh did in fact do good work in relation to that which led to the solving of the crime?
A. Yes, and we tried to support him being involved in it right to the very end.
Q. Then we have this incident in relation to Mulligan's, where you have nominated suspects and both he and his sergeants have returned to say that these suspects weren't nominated by anybody at the time, that it has been put to the injured party and they're not considered suspects and you seem to have accepted that.
A. Yes.

389 Q. So then we move on to robbery from the person on the 13th September?
A. I would just like to say, you know, I suppose my dealing with the crime files was the same for Garda Keogh as every other member in the station. If I felt a query needed to be generated, if I felt guidance or a direction needed to be given, $I$ did that irrespective of who the member was.
390 Q. Now, we come to deal with the robbery from the person. In the first instance, if we could look at the report that had been sent in by Garda Keogh, it's at page 229 of the material. It's a handwritten report, robbery from the person. He gives the Pulse ID number at the top. Have you got that?
A. Yes.

391 Q. Is that right?
"W th reference to above, a robbery fromthe person who reported at 4am on the 13th September, [the injured party at a certain location, date of birth and tel ephone number], was intoxi cated and after pointing out the scene was brought home by Gardaí. Garda Keogh is going on rest days and has two days annual leave booked and is not due to work until 19th September 2015. Thi s was a serious incident and the injured party may have injuries. Could this be forwarded to D/ Branch for favour of imedi ate investi gation."

Is there anything wrong with a member referring a matter to the detective branch for investigation?
A. Well, the system that was in place at the time meant that would come to our morning meeting, so we could decide on the best course of action. Ideally in a situation like a robbery, things would need to happen very quickly. You know, robbery is quite a serious offence and things need to happen very quickly. We had a system in place that would allow, I suppose, immediate action by the next available group of people coming on to, I suppose, immediately commence the investigation, and that was important in a situation like this.
392 Q. Do you believe that this comes under your direction that you issued on 18th August 2015, in relation to reporting of critical or serious incidents?
A. I'd say there isn't enough information in it, there isn't enough information in it to allow, $I$ suppose,
people who might be dealing with it in the absence of Garda Keogh to have a full and comprehensive knowledge of what might be happening.
393 Q. Do you believe on the basis of the material that was available that this would be regarded as a critical or of a serious nature?
A. The incident is serious?

394 Q. Yes.
A. Yes, absolutely.

395
Q. We discussed this yesterday and your direction, which is at page 2121. In the first instance, the obligation was on the sergeant on duty to report this matter, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. In the absence of the sergeant on duty, then the station orderly?
A. Yes.
Q. So when this came before your daily PAF meeting, what you had then available to you was the short report from Garda Keogh and no report from the sergeant or from the station orderly, is that right?
A. It wasn't envisaged ever that there would be three reports, just one, and whichever one of those people who were there to do it, that would be the person that should, I suppose, provide the details, so as that we would have as much information as possible.
399 Q. If we look at the Pulse entry would you viewed the
following day at the PAF meeting, it's page 225 of the materials, please. It's reclassified there and we will come to that in a due course, insofar as the category.
A. Yes.

400 Q. But it has the date on which it occurred, at 2:30am to 3:30am. The date on which it was reported, which we see at 4am, I think it is, I can just about make it out. We have where it occurred on the far right there, under latitude and longitude?
A. Yes.

401 Q. It gives the precise location. And then the narrative can be seen further down there in the box on the 1eft-hand side.
"I nj ured party wal king home through St. Mell's to
Sarsfield Square and under the train bridge, was magged by two mal es. Had $€ 20$ stol en. Patrol of the area with i nj ured party, who poi nted out the scene, with negative results. Suspects were Irish, in thei $r$ 20s wearing, white Air Max top and black tracksuit..."

Then if we go over to the next page, because we see a continuation of it at page 226
"...black tracksuit bottons. Number two wearing a bl ue 14:27 MEKenzie wi ndsheet or top. Both fled towards waste ground behi nd Sarsfield Square."

There is a note there saying that there is no CCTV
footage. So that sets out the details in relation to it, isn't that right?
A. It's a very brief outline, yes.

402 Q. There is a further incident summary report, which duplicates what we just read there from the Pulse?
A. Yes, and it's the incident summary report that we will be working from at the PAF meeting.
Q. You would be working from that?
A. Yes.

404 Q. Then we just better have a quick look at it. 496.
This is printed off instead of the Pulse entry itself; is that right?
A. Yeah. This is the way it comes off with the 003 report, that the sergeant in charge would bring to the meeting.
405 Q. But it has all the details?
A. Yes.

406 Q. We have it there. Under the narrative?
A. Yes.

407 Q. That is the same as set out --
A. Absolutely.

408 Q. -- in the Pulse report. Now, I think at the PAF meeting, I think that Sergeant Baker, Inspector Minnock and Sergeant Curley were there, is that right?
A. Yes.

409 Q. Who was it that raised an issue in relation to this Pulse entry?
A. Inspector Baker, who was then the sergeant in charge, brought the matter to attention. It had happened in
the early hours of Sunday morning and it seemed to be coming to attention for the first time. So we had missed an opportunity, I suppose, all throughout Sunday to make some effort to deal with it.
410 Q. So what was the concern at that stage?
A. The concern was that we had missed an opportunity on Sunday to deal with it and the passing on the information, I suppose, hadn't occurred in the fashion that we would have liked.
411 Q. Well, in the first instance Garda Keogh had given a short report in relation to the matter to the sergeant in charge of Athlone Garda Station, isn't that right?
A. I'm not sure how the transfer of the report took place.

412 Q. If we look at 229?
A. Yes.

413 Q. It's addressed to the sergeant in charge?
A. It is, yeah.

414 Q. And it's indicating that he is going on leave and that it would be better if a member of the detective branch dealt with it?
A. Yes.

415 Q. So that was then a matter for the sergeant in charge to deal with?
A. Yes.

416 Q. As he or she saw fit?
A. I suppose Inspector Baker is best placed to explain the workings of her office there, but for whatever reason it didn't appear to get the attention it deserved immediately when it happened by way of passing on to
someone who would immediately roll into place and begin the enquiries on Sunday morning.
Quite clearly this report doesn't comply with the direction that you issued on the 18th August?
A. well, I would have liked to have seen more information. well it doesn't even purport to be a report as such. I am just wondering whether or not this was a matter for the sergeant in charge, once they received this, as to what they did with it?
A. Well, under normal circumstances, like as I said, you know, some investigative process would immediately begin to roll out.
419 Q. That would be the obligation of the sergeant in charge, having received this from Garda Keogh?
A. Yes. And I suppose the e-mail that we had envisaged in 14:31 the document you mentioned there, allows that early alert process, so as that none of this happens and things don't get lost. Detective Sergeant Curley and Sergeant Baker have access to emails on their phone and would be able to -- as do I, and would be able to sort of ensure that some element of investigative process would begin immediately. Robbery wasn't a hugely common offence in Athlone and I think for 2015 there were six robberies. Two of them we will probably be speaking about later.
420 Q. Now, you write a letter arising out of this, it's at page 505. This letter is written to the sergeant in charge but it's not written to Garda Keogh's supervising sergeant. Is there some reason why it was
written to the sergeant in charge?
A. That letter comes sometime after a whole series of things happened looking into that robbery. Yes.
A. It's not immediately after. There's a series of events $14: 33$ between the report arriving and that letter that took place.
CHA RMAN what is the date of that letter, Mr. Marrinan?
MR. MARRI NAN This letter is 23rd September 2015.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. MARRI NAN Have you a preference that we would deal with it in the chronological order, in terms of you're referring to the reclassification of the crime?
A. No, I am referring to the enquiries that were carried out on the 14th of September and later on into that week by two different members and I suppose conversations I would have had with Inspector Curley before it arrived to the PAF meeting on the $23 / 9$, so as we could make a decision.
423 Q. CHA RMAN But at this point, if I am understanding, at this point you're referring back to the original report and you're saying that's not satisfactory?
A. Yes, Chairman.

424 Q. CHAI RMAN I know things happen in the middle. 14:34
A. Yes.

425 Q. CHAD RMAN But that is essentially what the -- is that right?
A. Yes. And I suppose, the things in the middle, and I
can explain them briefly.
426 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. Garda A was detailed to take a statement by Inspector Curley from the injured party. He did that. Inspector Curley approached me again that evening. We decided we'd have another member go back to the injured party again.

427 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes.
A. We were anxious to bottom this out. We were anxious to find out what was going on and why a change of heart had occurred. I suppose in doing that, different pieces of information came in that in some degree it was new information and the injuries didn't seem to tally with --
428 Q. CHA RMAN Now, let me interrupt you for a second, chief superintendent. I understand because it's another area that is to be looked at.
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN which is the circumstances in which it came to be reclassified.
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN I understand a11 that.
A. Yes.

431 Q. CHA RMAN But specifically at this point, we have a report. Mr. Marrinan has been asking you about the function of the sergeant in charge.
A. Yes.

432 Q. CHA RMAN But whoever had the obligation of recording it, you say in your letter, separate from anything
else.
A. Yes.
Q. CHAN RMAN This report isn't satisfactory.
A. Yes. Yes, that's what I say, yeah.

434 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Now my question is: would you have considered the information on Pulse to be reasonably satisfactory as a description of what happened and who did what and what efforts were made?
A. I suppose in the circumstances, the way it turned out, it's scant what's on Pulse, it's a very brief description.
Q. CHAN RMAN okay.
A. I suppose it was kind of -- the new information that came to light, a different version sort of, interfered with what was on Pulse in a way. At that meeting on the 23rd September we decided to deal with it in three different -- or three actions.

436 Q. CHA RMAR okay. So if I am understanding, and I'm sorry, Mr. Marrinan, for interrupting. If I am understanding, you say we have to look at what happened 14:36 in the meantime in order to understand the nature of the complaints --
A. Yes.

437 Q. CHA RMAN -- about the deficiency --
A. Yes.

438 Q. CHA RMAK -- or alleged deficiency, suggested deficiency of the report, is that right?
A. Yes. I think the middle --

CHA RMAN Then maybe that's the best way to proceed,

Mr. Marrinan. I understand exactly, that would have been my question, but maybe just to proceed --
439 Q. MR. MARRINAN we will proceed on that basis. But I think that the first thing that happened was that, in actual fact, it was Garda A who went out and took a statement from the injured party?
A. Inspector Curley asked Garda A to take a statement from the injured party. But nothing else had occurred other than that?
A. I don't know. Inspector Curley asked Garda A to carry out enquiries and he came out with a statement. I don't know --

441 Q. Can we look at the statement, it's at page 504 of the materials. It's a brief statement, so I will go through it quick7y.
"I remember last Sat ur day ni ght I was wal ki ng home at 2am or 3pm I was wal king near the bridge at [a certain location]. I saw two lads approach me and asked me for a ci garette. I said I had none and one of 14:38 themshouted at me and hit me across the forehead with a copper bar and fell to the ground and one hel d me down and searched my pockets, and the other fella was ki cking me in the chest. I started to fight back and he then hit me with a bar agai $n$ a few times. They took 14:38 a $€ 20$ note and about..."

Something.
CHAN RMAN "Three or four euro in change out of my
pockets".
442 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Thank you, Chairman.
... in my pockets. They ran of $f$ al ong the side of the foot ball pitch towards the railway line. I reported that to the Guards that ni ght but I don't want any more done about it. I am not really pushed about it now, I just want to forget it ever happened."

So that's the statement that was taken.
A. Yes.

443 Q. which is in fact bereft of any detail in it?
A. Well, it describes a very serious beating.

444 Q. But it doesn't describe the assailants, for example?
A. No, no.

445 Q. It doesn't describe quite a number of details?
A. Absolutely.

446 Q. Did anybody raise this issue with Garda A?
A. I suppose Inspector Curley is best placed to deal with that, but he approached me on that evening and we discussed this and he decided to send a second member back to the injured party.
447 Q. Why was that?
A. He wanted more detail from the injured party --

448 Q. A11 right.
A. -- in relation to what happened. Because, as it's described here, it's quite serious, he got a very savage beating, that should be very apparent on him, and he sent another member back to make more enquiries.

449 Q. Was a letter sent out to Garda A in relation to the quality of the statement he had taking?
A. Not by me.

450 Q. No. So then if we move on then, I think that the next we have is a letter of 14th September 2015, from Inspector Curley to you and it's at page 500 of the materials.
"Pl ease find attached statement fromthe i nj ured party in thi s case. On the 14th September, I tasked Garda A to intervi ew the victimand he recorded the attached statement. Garda A reported that the vi ctimwas rel uctant to meet with him stating he di dn't wish to pursue the matter. I encour aged Garda A to record a statement fromhim which is attached.

In summary, the vi ctimstates that he was robbed by two mal es who initially asked himfor a cigarette. He stated that they had hit and ki cked himand stole € 20 and some change fromhis pocket. The victimstates he does not wi sh to pursue the compl ai nt.

The witness statement as recorded is lacking in detail regarding description of offenders. However, as the victimis rel uctant to cooperate it is difficult to envi sage how a prosecution could be successful, even if a suspect could be identified.

I recommend consi deration be gi ven to recategorise the
inci dent due to the attitude of the vi ctim"
Of course, that isn't a basis to recategorise, sure
it's not?
A. No.

452 Q. What was discussed?
A. Broadly the outline of his report there and the statement Garda A had. He decided that he would detail another member to go back then to the injured party.
453 Q. I think that that was done and we have a report that was sent in, it's at page 498, from Garda John Divilly?
A. Yes.

454 Q. "With reference to the above, I was requested to speak to the injured party to answer four questions namel y:

1. The reason why he does not wish for this i nci dent to be investi gated.
2. A better description of the of fenders.
3. What i nj uries he recei ved.
4. Had he any al cohol consured. "

Now, of course, those were all dealt with by Garda Keogh, who has a description of the assailants and he refers to the fact that the injured party was intoxicated. Then replies to the questions:
"Has informed Garda Di villy that he just wants to forget about this inci dent. He was not seriously i nj ured and does not want the matter i nvestigated. He says he has not been intimidated and is not pursuing this matter."

Then there is a description of the two assailants. Then he describes having received a bruise to his head and cuts to his knuckles, which was caused when he attempted to fight off his assailants. His mother is a 14:43 nurse and treated his injuries at home. He didn't attend a doctor or hospital. He said he was drunk at the time of the incident.
"Garda Divilly informed the injured party that it was 14:44 hi s choi ce if he di d not want the matter to be i nvestigated but if he changed his mind, to contact Gardaí. Garda Di villy i nf ormed himthat it would be better for the investigation to start sooner. However, he is adamant that he does not wish for the matter to be i nvesti gated. "

But it was still open to him if he wished to come forward --
A. Yes.

455 Q. -- to make a statement, that the matter would be investigated?
A. Yes.

456 Q. But it appears that the matter was in fact
reclassified, isn't that right?
A. Well, the report from Garda Divilly adds further new information in relation to the description and it also, I suppose, gives a different view of a bruise to his head and cuts to his knuckles. There's no mention of an injury to his leg in any shape or form. It just brings new information into the situation again. we met then on the 23rd September in relation to the incident and discussed it, as to what we would do with it, and we decided on three actions.
457 Q. which were?
A. which were to reclassify it to attention and complaints; to write and ask why, I suppose, or how, I'd try and find out how the incident hadn't been passed on in the way that might allow it to be dealt
with. In addition to that, then see what other information Garda Keogh might that might help us in our final decisions on it. And the third one was to leave it on the PAF review system, and that's what happened, so that it could be reviewed again.
458 Q. If we just have page 7982. This is chapter 33 of the Garda Code, in relation to crimes and offences reporting and recording. If we look at paragraph 3 there, it states:
"If the criteria to record are satisfied..."

That's record on Pulse.
"...reasonable probability and no credi ble evi dence to the contrary and the victimdoes not want the matter taken any further, a criminal offence should nonet hel ess be recorded. "
A. Yes.
Q. That's very clear, isn't it?
A. Well, HQ circular $139 / 03$ is the crime counting rules. It's much the same as that really, but number 1 on that gives me, I suppose, the delegated authority to make decisions around reclassification of crimes, taking into account that quality and the other regulations that are there about that. There are in the pages in the disclosures as well. That creates a situation where I and my team are allowed to make that decision in the best interests --

460 Q. So you determined this wasn't a credible complaint; is that right?
A. well, on the balance of probability, I found the new information, as explained to me, and that was the view of the people in the room around me as well, and I made 14:47 the decision as I am the one that has the delegated authority to do that.
461 Q. was this regarded as a significant and important decision and if so, why?
A. We had spent some time that week trying to make sure that, you know, we could take it as far as we could, if it had occurred, that it was serious. we wanted to know who was doing it, you know, who might do it. who could it possibly be and could we, I suppose, even have
an idea who they were in order that we would prevent anything further happening. CHA RMAN I can understand, chief superintendent, I can understand that the local superintendent would be a fit frustrated, when it looks like an outstanding crime, an unsolved crime, and there's no way he can solve it. I can understand that that that would be a frustrating experience. But the rule seems very clear. Even if I say, look, I want to do nothing about it, if it's a crime then it has to be recorded, even if, as I that -- do you understand me? As I say, I can understand a degree of frustration, but it does seem pretty clear.
A. Chairman, the fact that it's on Pulse as a robbery wouldn't have any bearing in terms of my frustration, because if the injured party didn't want to do anything about it, that would be captured on the narrative and that would explain its lack of detection or efforts.
A. But with the crime counting rules, if there's, I suppose, an issue as to whether it happened or not and on the balance of probabilities that's a decision $I$ and my team made, we made it in the best interests of capturing what we thought was data quality, there were some issues and new information that was coming each teach the injured party had spoken to, I suppose added to that, and we made that in the best -- with the best intentions possible. And not to, I suppose, frustrate or hide anything. I was in the business of looking for resources, so I wasn't in the business of hiding anything.
467 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. A11 of my interactions had been opened, transparent and 14:50 honest in --

468 Q. CHA RMAN I'm sorry, don't think I am suggesting propriety or impropriety, $I$ am trying to be as neutral as I can. As I say, I can somewhat understand somebody saying, here's a case, $I$ can't investigate it as matters stand?
A. Yes.

469 Q. CHA RMAN which I could understand as being a -- I mean have you explained your answer to that?
A. Yes.

MR. MARRI NAN Before the decision was made, did anybody go back to Garda Keogh, who perhaps was best placed to give a description of the demeanour of the injured party?
A. No. No, to the best of my knowledge no one went back to Garda Keogh.
Q. Why not?
A. I don't know.

473 Q. Do you think it is something that should have been done?
A. We11, I wrote to him then on the 23rd September in relation to it.
Q. I know, but this is after reclassification. Prior to reclassification, do you think it's something that should have been done?
A. No, because Garda Keogh had no real involvement in the investigation outside of meeting the man on the first night. He was in possession of information from that.

475 Q. But he took him on a tour of the area?
A. Yes.
Q. He looked for CCTV, if there was any, that could help?
A. Yes. But he didn't outline where he had looked or, you know, matters to that effect that might help.
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Q. He interacted with the injured party?
A. He interacted and brought him home, yes.
Q. He told us in evidence that he had additional evidence to give insofar as meeting the injured party who was coming in a taxi to the Garda station?
A. Well, that information didn't come until much later.
Q. But that's because nobody made any enquiry of him?
A. But, I mean, he furnished a report on the first night which didn't contain that information. There was a potential witness perhaps lost. And that was the type of situation I was trying to indicate that had occurred here, that I suppose wouldn't meet the standard that I wished to apply and in turn wouldn't demonstrate that we were providing the best possible service. I too was accountable to the chief superintendent and I had to, I 14:52 suppose, account for myself every fortnight to her.
Q. You see, chief superintendent, the letter that was written by Garda Keogh on the morning of the offence was addressed to the sergeant in charge?
A. Yes.

It's not entirely clear that that was intended to be the report that was envisaged by you in your direction of the 18th August. But the sergeant in charge had that obligation, to prepare an adequate report for your purposes. Do you understand?
A. I understand what you are saying. That didn't happen, yeah.

482 Q. So therefore, if the sergeant in charge on receiving that report considered it didn't measure up to what you
were requesting, the obligation was on him or her to compile the report and they then should have compiled a report and sent it to the PAF meeting, is that not correct?
A. The sergeant in charge brought that information, but the person with the information was off duty.
Q. The sergeant in charge had the obligation to prepare an adequate report under your direction of the 18th August, is that right?
A. The sergeant on duty on the night, if there was one.

484 Q. The sergeant on duty.
A. On the night --

485 Q. Yes.
A. -- that the incident occurred, should be full owe au fait with what the information would be.
Q. He or she had the obligation --
A. Yes.

487 Q. -- to bring a report to the PAF meeting that was adequate?
A. Well, it wouldn't be to the PAF meeting because they too could be off duty, but to leave a report with adequate information there.

488 Q. For the PAF meeting?
A. Yes. Well even before the PAF meeting, because this happened over a weekend, the PAF meeting happened on Monday morning, so there was time lost on Sunday there where enquiries could have commenced.

489 Q. I am not entirely sure that I understand, chief superintendent, how you can say time was lost. Garda

Keogh presumably was going off duty that very morning?
A. Yes.

490 Q. He has indicated to the sergeant in charge the Pulse entry, there's a brief report there indicating that he is going off duty and he is not going to be on duty and 14:54 somebody in the detective branch should take over the investigation?
A. Yes. That doesn't appear to have been passed on to me.
Q. But that's not Garda Keogh's fault?
A. Oh I never blamed Garda Keogh for that.

492 Q. We come to your report at page 505, the queries that you raised in relation to this investigation. It's addressed to the sergeant in charge, as I say.
"I refer to the above matter and my correspondence attached regarding reporting inci dents."

Okay, this is your report, it's set out on page 2121, on the 18th August, is that right?
A. Yes.

493 Q. "In this case the inci dent on the face of it was serious."

This is the first correspondence that you have written in relation to this case, is that right?
A. Yes, I was sending it to the sergeant in charge of Athlone.
Q. It's after it's been reclassified, is that right?
A. Yes. indi cation of what investi gative steps were taken at the initial reporting stage regarding the scene --"

Now, the Pulse entry does give these details, isn't that right?
A. Well, it doesn't, I suppose, outline -- it outlines in the GPS coordinates where the scene is but it doesn't outline exactly what was searched.
Q. It says that he took the injured party on a search of the area?
A. Drove him around to see could he identify them, yeah.
Q. He tells with the next line in your letter, CCTV issues, he says there's none?
A. Again, it doesn't say where was checked for that, how far was the check carried out? short, concise report?
A. Yes. I suppose I hoped that vital information would be included and I didn't expect to have to be exactly
prescriptive to every experienced member of the Garda in the district.
501 Q. You see, if we go back to your direction of the 18th August, it's a short, concise report in addition to any entry made on Pulse?
A. Yes.

502 Q. But in any event, injured parties, I think that's identify in the Pulse?
A. Yes.

503 Q. And, indeed, in his report. An account of events, this ${ }_{14: 57}$ is dealt with in pulse in a brief form?
A. In brief form, yeah.
Q. Descriptions of assailants, that's dealt with?
A. Description of clothing is dealt with, yeah. Like, I suppose new information came from Garda Divilly's visit ${ }_{14: 58}$ then which describes something.

505 Q. There is a description of the assailants in the Pulse entry, isn't that right?
A. Males in their 20s and their clothing is described.

506 Q. Yes.
A. But Garda Divilly intervention added another dimension, there's some features described.
507 Q. What was taken? we know from the Pulse entry how much was taken?
A. Well, yes, $€ 20$, then the coins or the additional money. ${ }^{14: 58}$ 508 Q. What violence was used?
A. That was, I suppose -- there was new information coming all the time about that. It was initially a leg injury, then it was bad beating with an iron bar or a
copper bar and when Garda Divilly it was just a bruise to the forehead and cuts to the knuckles.
509 Q. What injuries were received? whether photographs were taken, etcetera?
A. Yes.

510 Q. "These issues are the basic steps required at the commencement of any investigation."
A. Yes.

511 Q. But in actual fact almost all those matters are dealt with by Garda Keogh on Pulse, is that not right?
A. Yeah, and they're all matter that you would record in your notebook and the duty of the first member at the scene are set out in the CIT manual.

512 Q. Did he have all those details in his notebook?
A. I don't know. I don't know.

513 Q. "The duties of the first member at the scene are al so set out clearly in the CIT manual but are not recorded in this report."
A. Yes.

514 Q. "I require an expl anation, please, as to why this matter was dealt with in the fashi on chosen."
A. Yes.

515 Q. So it's is addressed to the sergeant in charge?
A. Yes.

516 Q. It's his or her obligation to provide that report?
A. Absolutely. And I expected him to do that, yeah.

517 Q. Yes. And did you get a reply from the sergeant in charge?
A. I got a reply Garda Keogh through his unit sergeant.

518 Q
Q. But it's the sergeant's obligation to deal with the report and why these matters weren't contained in the report?
A. The sergeant, yes.

519 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah. I would have liked the sergeant to have taken a more comprehensive approach.
520 Q. This is then forwarded on to Garda Keogh. If we look at page 235 of the materials, this is his response. It seems to be dated the 29th September.
A. There may be one before that, page 232.

521 Q. I beg your pardon, yes, this one, it's upside down, but it's dated the 20th September. He says:
"With reference to the attached report, this inci dent was reported to Gardaí at 4amon 13th September 2015. The inj ured party was brought to the scene, where it was searched. The injured party was driven around the area in an effort to identify the suspects."

All of this, of course, is in the Pulse entry.
"There is no CCTV in the area the inci dent occurred.
The i nj ured party was then brought home and placed in the care of his mother. When I returned to work on the 15:01 19th September, having al ready written a report on the i nci dent and put it on Pulse, I rang the injured party, who informed me that he had made a statement to a detective to the effect that he did not want the matter
pursued by Gardaí. The attached report from
Superintendent Murray is nothing short of a formof harassment towards myself."

That was sent with an accompanying letter from Sergeant 15:02 Monaghan and it's at 233 of the material. And he says:
"Wth reference to the above, please find attached report from Garda Keogh in rel ation to your report of the 23 rd September. He reports that the injured party was brought to the scene and that the area was searched. The injured party was driven in the patrol car around the town in an attempt to identify any suspects. There is no CCTV in the area where the i nci dent took pl ace. He was then brought home and pl aced in the custody of his mother. On returning to work on the 19th September, he made contact with the i nj ured party to obtain a statement and the injured party informed hi mthat he had al ready made statement to a detective garda in Athlone, withdrawing his compl ai nt."

That's signed by Garda Monaghan. Should that not really have been the end of the matter?
A. Well, the tone of the report indicated that Garda Keogh 15:03 wasn't happy with me or didn't feel that I could make enquiries of him. My intentions were honourable. I was trying to bring some conclusion to this if possible. I kept it on the review system. And I was
hoping that we could, I suppose, get more information as to what happened on the night, so as we could, I suppose, analyse that with what we had already. I didn't want to merely close the matter out and leave it like that, if I could possibly come to some conclusion on it.

522 Q. Then you respond at page 234 of the material?
A. Yes.

523 Q. "I note Garda Keogh's response to date. "

Sorry, Chairman, it's the 13th October.
"I note Garda Keogh's response to date, whi ch is far fromsatisfactory. In order that I can be assured the organi sation's objectives regarding the investigation of crime are met in this case, Garda Keogh would be well advi sed to take careful note of his statutory obligation to account as set out at section 39 of the Garda Sí ochána Act 2005, whi ch applies to every menber of An Garda Sí ochána equally, and its inextricable link to the Garda Sí ochána di sci pline regul ations 2007. If the menber feel s he is someway renoved fromhis stat ut ory obl igations, then there may be a remedy open to himunder the policy document Wbrking Together to Create a Positive Wbrking Envi ronment."

We discussed earlier on the meeting on the 30th, that things may have come to a head at that stage, it seems that they have gone a little bit further here.
A. Yeah. Like, I suppose, Garda Keogh may have or had a view of me, I don't know when he formed that view or why, but I had only the objectives of ensuring the organisation's investigative service was met in relation to the case. I only wanted to get the information that he possibly had. I made it clear to him that, despite the fact that he was making a complaint that I was harassing him, that didn't remove him from the obligation to account. He had a remedy open to him, if he felt that $I$ was harassing him or if he felt I was being unfair to him. And I invited him to take that remedy and I feel that, you know, if my intentions weren't honourable, I wouldn't have sent that letter or adopted that approach.
524 Q. Again, I mentioned insubordination in relation to your meeting on the 30th August and why you could have dealt with it --
A. I shudder to think if I had gone down that road, what position I'd be in now.
But I suppose you had tolerated what was clearly insubordination at that time?
A. I knew the position Garda Keogh was in, I knew it was difficult for him. But he continued to come to work and his doctor was certifying him fit for work on a certain day and he was going to incidents and calls and 15:07 meeting the public. My system insisted on follow up. I was very anxious that that follow up would happen. And I understood, you know, Garda Keogh wasn't able at times, I suppose, to follow up because of the issues he
had with alcohol and the impact that was having on his absences. And then he seemed detached from his roles and responsibilities in the Garda station and to the public as a member of An Garda Síochána, in relation to the every day duties that had to be carried out when he 15:07 presented for work. And that was where I found myself.

526 Q. You conclude:
"In the meantime, I await a proper response as to the actions taken on the ni ght that this matter was reported. "

Are you questioning there his investigation of it?
A. No, I amn't, I'm looking for information.

527 Q. But it's all on Pulse, you have it.
A. No, but like I suppose we'11 come to it in a minute, the answer introduced new information again.

528 Q. "I al so expect to see some written record as to what the injured party alleged, to incl ude a description of hi s assailants and an answer as to why my instructions of the 18th August were not complied with."

This matter had been reclassified.
A. I explained how that came about and how I felt I made that with honourable intention was my team, in a measured way, assessing all the information that we had at the time, lending the combined experience, the policing experience that the four of us had to that decision. .

529
A. Yes. injured party has suddenly mysteriously dropped his complaint, despite the fact that he looked serious to me and I said it and I wanted it there. That's number one. And he comes back and then he gets queries about
A. I didn't know what Garda Keogh had. I didn't know. I
simply would liked to have had the full set of circumstances and information that he may have had.
531 Q. CHA RMAN The victim would have to change his mind for a start?
A. Absolutely.

CHA RMAN He says, look, I investigate it, the next thing I come back to work and I find the victim, the incident review list until December, in the hope that new information would come to light that might allow some --
what new information did you anticipate?
it. And it transpires that at the time he gets the queries the matter has actually been reclassified as, so to speak, a non-crime. So, it looks a bit frustrating from his point of view?
A. I see that. I see that, Chairman.

CHA RMAN I mean that he's getting it in the neck, so to speak, for something that is a non-crime. Can you understand?
A. I see his position exactly. In fairness to him, when he came back he contacted the injured party, who told him that somebody had visited. I see how he might form a view in his mind that I was in some way against him, you know, but that wasn't the case. Maybe I added to that, Chairman, in the way I handled it but...
CHA RMAN But your evidence, if I am understanding, your evidence is that although it had in fact been reclassified as a non-crime, your mind was still open to some extent?
A. Yes.

537 Q.
CHA RMAN In the event that something else happened, one of which we agree has to be that the injured party changed his mind and said after all, I am going to pursue it. Is that right?
A. Yeah, or indeed, you know, some new witness will come forward that might have an idea of who we might be

538 Q. CHA RMAK So that stayed the situation until December.
A. Yes.

539 Q. CHAN RMAN when nothing further having happened
relevant to this, you said, we'11 close off?
A. Inspector Farrell actually made the final decision on it at one of the meetings.
CHAI RMAN Very good. Thank you.
540 Q. MR. MARRI NAN If I could just deal with one issue concerning your interview with the Tribunal investigators, it's at page 3048. we obviously have all this material and it's all available to the Tribunal and we can't go over every word of it when you're in the witness box, but there is a comment that you made here in relation to incident, and I just ask you to explain what you meant in relation to it. If we can scroll down, Mr. Barnes, to line 593. This is in relation to Detective Sergeant Curley.
"On Mbnday 14th Septenber 2015, a detective sergeant allocated one of his teamto bottomthis out and as it turned out, the menber did not l believe see fit to contact Garda Keogh at all, whi ch I believe would be unusual and speaks for itself."
A. Yes.

541 Q. What did you mean by that?
A. I meant that Garda Keogh's drinking at that stage was having a big impact on him. He was going off for a number of days and he used to go drinking while he was off duty, and that was commonly known. So the person at the source of the information may not have been available to help, nothing more than that.
542 Q. Then if we can go to 235 of the material, this is Garda

Keogh's response. It's dated the 29th September. No, sorry, it's the 29th October.
"Ser geant Mbnaghan, with reference to the overleaf, I have compl ied in full with section 39 of the Garda Sí ochána Act I note with the exception of how it was reported and injuries."

So there he is setting out his stall, he says that everything is there on Pulse effectively. Then he goes 15:15 on to deal with:
"Garda McMeeting and I were in a patrol car at Church Street at 4am when a taxi parked besi de us, whi ch had come from the direction of St. Mell's. The injured got out of this taxi and reported the inci dent to me. The i nj ured party di d not want medical treatment and stated that he would go to the doctor in the morning. I nj ured party --"
CHA RMAN "If his leg was still at hi m"
543 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Yes. "... was still at him Pointed out the scene, requested to be brought home, whi ch we duly obl i ged. I al so wi sh to poi nt out that this incident was recategorised by Superintendent Murray fromrobbery fromthe person to attention and compl ai nts on the 23 rd 15:16 Sept enber."

That's where matters rested, is that right?
A. Well, that's the new information, yeah, the taxi person
was new to the whole thing at this stage and an opportunity was perhaps lost to try and find that person.
544 Q. Presumably it was still available?
A. Well...

Were any enquiries made in relation to taxi companies in Athlone?
A. Like this was in October. This was, I suppose, nearly two months later, definitely six or seven weeks later. It was a fruitless exercise at that point in time, I
felt. I needed to get more information from Garda Keogh. He wasn't willing to give it. I didn't see any point in pressing the issue. I knew how he felt about me and I felt I was on a hiding to nothing in trying to, I suppose, elicit any more information.
Q. Just before we move on, in relation to this, ultimately what's your criticism of Garda Keogh in relation to the investigation of this robbery that he conducted in the early hours of the morning, before he went off duty?
A. I haven't criticised him hugely in any way up to now. I'm trying to get information from him. I felt there may be more information. I felt, I suppose, more information could have been provided on the night. There's no issue, we had a system in place for incidents like that to be handled over immediately, so as the machine, as it were, the investigative machine would crank up and things would happen and to give ourselves the best opportunity.
547 Q. At the time when the matter was being reviewed, when
could you have sought additional information from him, nobody went to him, isn't that right?
A. Well, he had indicated to me in August that he wanted everything in writing and it was just very difficult. I found it very challenging, dealing with Garda Keogh, in terms of him being available for work, going to incidents, my responsibility to, I suppose, ensure that they are closed out and his view of me, I suppose, you know, the view that he had adopted of me being in some way against him, when I wasn't and I only tried to help him in any way $I$ could in relation to his welfare. But I had to bottom out the stuff. I had to have a standard and it had to apply equally to everybody.
548 Q. okay.
A. It may not be against -- it may be against my
interests. In trying to press Garda Keogh, I felt I had to do the right thing for the right reason. I knew that might be against my interests, and so that's the way it turned out.
549 Q. We know at this time, and we will come to it in a minute, that he was, in late September, involved in an incident at the River Shannon, where he pulled a drowning lady from it?
A. Yes.

550 Q. Did you ever go to him directly and commend him for what he had done at that time?
A. No. But I did ensure that he was commended, yeah.

551 Q. We will come to that in due course?
A. Yes.

552 Q
A.
A. Not directly, but my system was that at the PAF meeting when an incident summary report of that nature would come up, I would write down to the sergeant, good work, consider PW1 or consider commendation. But it was good work?
A. Yeah, absolutely. All of the team performed very well that night.
Q. We have a description from him and he seems to have been in the front line, and I don't think he was actually looking for any great credit for it. But he seemed to be in the front line and he was the person who pulled the lady from the river.
A. Yes, absolutely. Sergeant Monaghan was there and I am sure he will be giving evidence on that.
A. Yes.
Q. You know, all this is unfolding, you're being critical of his work. We have those incidents, there's four of them, where you have sent back the files, quite clearly he is responding in a very negative way and believes asking you, when this arose at a PAF meeting, you saw that he was involved in saving a drowning lady, did you think that this might, as it were, break the ice
between the two of you and it might be a good idea to go to him and congratulate him on the work that he had undertaken?
A. I would have no difficulty doing that. I had no animosity towards Garda Keogh in any way. I am professional and, you know, I am officer now for a number of years and I adopt a professional approach in all my dealings with staff. I have always done that. Garda Keogh wasn't around during the daytime when I'd be there. He worked mostly at nighttime. It was difficult to meet him. I didn't see him around the station. If I had have, I would certainly have said hello to him at any time that I could. But I don't recall meeting him very much during the day.
557 Q. Okay. we will move on swiftly to issue number 10 then. 15:22 This is denial, cancellation of annual leave. If we could have 131 up on the screen, please. This is Garda Keogh's position in relation to this. If we scroll down to paragraph 10. He says:
"I applied to cancel an annual leave day, namel y 31st August 2014, for the purpose of attend ago GSOC appoi ntment on that date under the Protected Disclosure Act. My line manager, Sergeant Mbnaghan, approved my request. Superintendent Pat Murray, who was aware of menbers, count er manded this approval, citing 'absence or proper explanation' (my emphasis) in circunstances where I could not provi de any more specific explanation
gi ven the confidential nat ure of the GSOC di scl osures." Then at page 58 of the material, at line 835 , if we can scroll down to that. This is what he said to the Tribunal investigators:
"They knew I was going to meet GSOC. But Superintendent Murray was looking for a comprehensi ve report of what I was going to meet GSOC about. The protected di scl osures process is supposed to be protected and confidential. The Garda Commi ssi oner O' Sullivan was saying publ icly she supported whi stlebl owers but I feel Superintendent Murray was l ooking to ascertain confidential information about my meeting with GSOC. I felt that I had given an
expl anati on and I did not feel I needed to give further expl anati on than I had al ready set out, namel y that I had to meet GSOC. The superintendent woul d have been aware that there were no papers served on me GSOC in rel ation to any ot her work rel ated investi gation and that I was not a witness to any investi gation being conducted by GSOC, as this paperwork al ways is deal t with through the ranks. As I have said, I believe Superintendent Murray was aware that this meeting with GSOC rel ated to my protected di scl osure and given the $\quad$ 15:24 protections in that legi slation, I felt that l outlined as much as 1 could $i n$ my initial explanation in writing."

If we just briefly look at that before we look at the allegations contained in that. This is a letter written by Sergeant keogh dated the 1st September. Garda Keogh, sorry, dated 1st September, at 9209 of the material. It's addressed to Sergeant Monaghan re annual leave 31st August 2015. Garda Keogh Nick Keogh:
"Wth reference to above, I took annual leave on the 31st August, however I was requi red to meet GSOC on that day in Portlaoise and I requested to have the annual leave cancelled for that day, Mbnday 31st August 2015. Forwarded for your consi deration, pl ease."

You will note there that there's a note at the bottom, under Garda Keogh's signature:
"Appl i cation approved. "

On the 2nd September by Detective Sergeant Monaghan, isn't that right?
A. Sergeant Monaghan, yes.

558 Q. Yes. Or Sergeant Monaghan, I beg your pardon. If we look at chapter 11 of the Garda Code. If we turn to page 7943 , please. If we scrol1 down to 11.3 , at the bottom of the page. This is:
"Granting of annual I eave."

Then if we scroll over to 7944 , at the top of the page:
"2. Applications for annual leave submitted by menbers of garda rank may be granted by the sergeant in charge of the stations, units and sections."
A. Yes.

559 Q. Now, I think it's silent in relation to the withdrawal of annual leave or the an cancellation of annual leave. Presumably it covers that situation, is that right?
A. That instruction was superseded by the Westmanstown Agreement, it's in Volume 48, at page 13488.

560 Q. Can we have that up on the screen?
A. 13488. I think it's at 4.3 and 4.5. Basically it changed to that. It said all annual leave and anything to do with annual leave became the obligation of the superintendent.
Q. So that's been amended then?
A. I think since the roster has changed in 2012, a11 applications for annual leave or anything to do with annual leave came to me when $I$ was the superintendent in every station $I$ was in, including Ath1one.

562 Q. Which section do you say it is?
A. I have it recorded here as 4.3 and 4.4.

563 Q. 4". 3, the West manstown rosters will endeavour to best manage --
CHA RMAN That's not the one. Scroll down the other way, please, sorry, $I$ think we will have a better chance. Keep going. We can have a look at that.
A. Yes, I'm sorry now.

564 Q. CHA RMAN No, no, no. As far as you're concerned, you
say you believe that this scheme superseded the existing one.
A. Yes.

565 Q. CHAN RMAN so that all decisions concerning leave were a matter for the superintendent?
A. Yes, and that's how it ended up with me.

566 Q. CHA RMAN I follow.
A. Okay.

CHA RMAN So you think it was a matter for the superintendent. okay.
MR. MCFÉL OHGGS: Sorry, Chairperson, if I may be of assistance.

CHAl RMAN Thanks very much, Mr. O'Higgins, yes.
MR. MCEÁL OHGGN: It may be of assistance,
paragraph 8.3.
CHAN RMAN 8.3. Thank you very much. 8.3. That's very good. we will try not get dizzy when we go there. very good.
A. There is a mention at 8.5 as well.

CHA RMAN 8.3 and 8.5. Al1 right, thank you very much. Okay, Mr. Marrinan, off we go.
567 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Yes. Sergeant Monaghan mustn't have been aware of that in approving it, had no power to approve it?
A. All annual leave applications came to me on forms and I 15:30 had to countersign them. The sergeant would make a recommendation rather than approve it. I'd say he simply made a mistake.
568 Q. CHA RMAN So Garda Keogh had annual leave for this

## particular day?

A. Yeah, he been granted annual leave.

569 Q. CHA RMAN Now it turns out that he has an appointment with GSOC?
A. Yes.

570 Q. CHA RMAN So he wants to undo the leave?
A. Yes.

571 Q. CHA RMAN So as to be stil1 on duty and going to GSOC?
A. Yes.

572 Q. CHA RMAN That's essentially what was involved here, okay.
A. Yes.

573 Q. CHA RMAN So he wants to undo the annual leave?
A. Yes.

574 Q. CHAN RMAN okay.
A. And take it again, as it were, and allow the day to be duty.

575 Q. CHA RMAN Save it up for another occasion, exactly, yes.
A. Yes.

576 Q. MR. MARRI NAN So we note from that same, 9209, you have written at the top of it "appl ication ref used in the absence" can you read that?
A. "In the absence of any proper expl anation".

577 Q. So just tell us, why did you refuse it?
A. I met Garda Keogh on the 30th August, the night before he wanted to cance1 annual 1eave. We had a discussion and I was serving documents on him for Superintendent Alan Murray in Mullingar. He made no mention of that,
to have the leave cancelled the next day. When I got the application, it came to me retrospectively, I just couldn't marry that up, that, you know, why he didn't mention it to me. And I felt that the couple of lines wrote were vague in nature anyway. And all I wanted was to have some sort of process where I could stand over to cancel his annual leave. I suppose go a little bit further than what he has there.

578 Q. Were you looking for some evidence that he had that particular appointment?
A. No, absolutely not. I had no interest in what his appointment was about.

579 Q.
No, I am not asking you were you interested in what the appointment was about?
A. Sorry.
Q. Were you doubting that he did have the appointment at a11?
A. I didn't -- I simply didn't know. Like, this is just a retrospective application. It hadn't been mentioned to me the night before, so I simply was looking for a
little bit more information. He needn't have mentioned GSOC at a11. He could have put some other excuse on it and it still wouldn't matter, I'd still have looked for more information, you know.
581 Q. What sort of information were you looking for?
A. We11, all I wanted was to say what times he was at the meeting at, to allow me to grant him the full day or a half day or how many hours would it be. So I could have a proper account and governance measure auditable
in relation to annual leave, the westmanstown roster at 8.5 indicating that $I$ had to record annual leave and account for it.
582 Q. I understood you to say that part of this was because you had met him on the 30th August?
A. Yes.

583 Q. And he hadn't --
A. He didn't mention anything to me.

584 Q. He didn't mention anything about a meeting?
A. No.

585 Q. That to my mind calls into question, was there a meeting at all?
A. Well --
Q. Because he didn't mention it to me. Do you understand?
A. No, I've never taken Garda Keogh at anything other than 15:33 his word. But I found it strange that he didn't mention it the night before.
587 Q. What was strange about that?
A. Because he was looking to make a retrospective application then a number of days later to cance 1
leave, when he had an opportunity to mention it to me the night before.
588 Q. So you weren't questioning that he had the appointment and you weren't looking for proof that he was going to meet with GSOC?
A. No. Like I would take him at his word if he said he was going to meet GSOC, or he said he was going to a doctor's appointment.
589 Q. All right. So what were you looking for then?
A. Like I was anxious to know -- a full day's annual leave is 10 hours.
Q. Yes.
A. So how much of that did it take, the meeting. Like, would it be a halfway that he would be cancelling or a full day.

591 Q. That would be a simple question for Sergeant Monaghan to go back and say: Is this cancellation in relation to a half day or a full day or what time is the appointment at?
A. Yes. But I felt that Garda Keogh, who was making the application, should put forward his case and I'd have no difficulty granting it. And I left the door open to him to do that.
592 Q. His reaction is fairly negative towards this. If we look at page 9208, this is his sergeant writing to him, this appears to be the 19th September, I think it is?
A. Yes.

593 Q. Is the date on the left, it's stamped. It's headed:
"Appl i cation for cancellation of days I eave.

With reference to the above, Superintendent Murray has ref used the cancellation of this days leave in the absence of proper expl anation. If you still wi sh to
have this day consi dered for cancellation, can you forward a comprehensi ve report as to the reasons and attach same to your D9 and resubmit."

Garda Keogh believes that that was an intrusion into the confidentiality as between him and GSOC. If it was really just a matter of finding out whether or not he would be absent for a half day or a full day, looking back on it, you weren't really looking for an explanation, you were looking for details of the visit, namely what time is it occurring?
A. Yes. So as I could account for the decision I would make in cancelling his annual leave. I felt it was up to Garda Keogh to provide me with the information to allow me to make a decision in a more meaningful fashion. I had no interest in his meeting with GSOC. I didn't know what it was about. It didn't worry me. That's a matter for himself.
594 Q. You made a note in your diary in relation to this, it's 15:37 at page 2263 of the material. Why did you note this in your diary?
A. As I said to you, I noted all my interactions with Garda Keogh, because things were very difficult, it was very challenging dealing with him and trying to, I suppose, marry my obligations, my work obligations in terms of delivering the policing service and my obligations to him as a whistleblower.
595 Q. Did you consider that this might make it worse?
A. Everything I did made it worse. Other than ignore feel that was an option for me, ignoring things. I felt I couldn't do nothing. I felt I had to try and treat Garda Keogh as normally as I could in terms of
work.
596 Q. "Application to cancel leave for Garda Keogh, who explained he was meeting with GSOC in Portlaoise. Ret urned, ref used in absence of proper expl anation."

In any event, he didn't pursue the matter then, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

597 Q. And the matter died a death at that stage. We now move on from that, is there anything else you wish to say in ${ }^{15: 38}$ relation to that? Were you in any way attempting, as Garda Keogh suggests, to pry into his dealings with GSOC?
A. No. I had no information or knowledge about its investigation. It wasn't of concern to me. That was being dealt with somewhere else for him. I had to try and dealt with him in the workplace in terms of him presenting for work fit, as a resource to me, and to be on the team during periods he was fit and then he had intermittent absences then with work related stress.
But certificates were indicating that he was fit for work on particular days. And that's the situation, that I had.

598 Q. And can we sign off on this on the basis that your only concern at the time was whether it was a half day or a ${ }_{\text {15:39 }}$ full day?
A. Yeah, I just wanted to account for it in a proper fashion, in keeping what I felt were my responsibilities. I was subject to audit myself, you
know, annually by the assistant commissioner, and biannually by the chief superintendent. I had an audit during my tenure in Athlone. These things are looked at and I needed to keep proper governance in the monitoring and control of annual leave, because again it's about resourcing issues and it's about public money, it's about providing a service.
599 Q. Okay, we will move on then to issue 11, which concerns Garda Keogh's confinement to indoor duties. If we can look at page 153 of the materials, please, Mr. Barnes, top of the page there, paragraph 13. He says:
"I was reduced to indoor duty and was confined to desk bound duties in the public office, carrying out ther ef ore the nost stressful job in the station, in circumstances where it was known to management that I was suffering from work rel at ed stress. Thus, on 22nd Oct ober 2015, Superintendent Pat Murray si mply 'with i mmedi ate effect' reduced me to indoor duties. There was no anal ysis or right of representation. He said that he will review the matter again on 1st Novenber 2015. "

нe made an entry in his diary, which is at page 1334, CHAI RMAN Are you sure that is the right number, Mr. Marrinan? I thought Garda Keogh's diaries were five digits, no?

MR. MARRI NAN 13334.
CHA RMAN 13334. okay, here we are. Thank you very
much. Sorry, my mistake.
600 Q. MR. MARRI NAN we see here an entry that he has:
"Ser geant Mbnaghan sai d Superintendent Murray I ooking to speak with me. Gave me appeal s sheet re €300 di sci pline. Sai d he was having a case conference re sick and putting me permanent in the public office."

Then in brackets he has:
"I never looked at him"

Then he refers to another member, further down:
"... has moved back into uni formre his i nvestigation he is to work of $f$ unit C."

Which is the same unit as Garda Keogh. Could you just deal with this aspect of it. At this time Garda A had been suspended, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

601 Q. Garda Keogh refers to the fact that the other member that he has mentioned there was somebody who he was concerned about, and you were aware of that?
A. Yes.

602 Q. Do you know who he is talking to in that regard?
A. I do.

603 Q. Yes.
A. He mentioned the name to me on the 15 th July.

604 Q. It's the same person that he mentioned to you on the 15th Ju7y?
A. Yes, I think so, yeah.

605 Q. Was there any intention at that time by moving that guard back into uniform and putting him on unit $C$, to some way target Garda Keogh?
A. No. That guard, it came up yesterday, he was one of the people that I gave a regulation 10 to as a result of an audit I had carried out by the National Immigration Bureau. My responsibility as district officer meant that $I$ was also immigration officer. The outcome of that audit wasn't favourable. So I restructured the entire workings of the immigration section. I suppose it's at page 2123. I think it would be important to have a look at that. That gives an indication of -- that that member had always worked on unit $C$ and it gives an indication of the extent $I$ went to restructure the immigration services, to take account of the failings in the audit and to have more governance and accountability in that area. That meant 15:45 that this particular member was working more with unit C. There was no intention in any way to get at Garda Keogh by doing that. It was a simple measure that I felt I had to introduce.
606 Q. Is there any more you would like to say about that?
A. No. I just think it's important that the document -- I think speaks for itself and it goes into detail as to how the system would work. It's not directed at Garda Keogh in any way. It's simply a response to failings
that I had uncovered.
607 Q. Now, if we could just deal with two diary entries that you have. Obviously there's the one for the 22nd October but I think we should just briefly refer back to the one of the 30th August, which is at page 2246 of 15:45 the material. This is your meeting on the evening at nine o'clock, that we have already opened, but simply to highlight a matter there. On the fifth line from the end, you say:
"I asked himif events were impacting on his work and said if he continued as at present l would have to consi der reducing the risk he posed by taking himoff out door duty."

Isn't that right?
A. Yes.

608 Q. So you were of the view when you put him in indoor duties on 22 nd October 2015 that you had already advised him that this might happen?
A. I had spoken to him, yes, and I made him aware of, I suppose, the issues as I saw them from where I was sitting. I understand he had a completely different perspective.
609 Q. You have a note here:
"Met Garda Keogh in my office."

At your request, you were serving the 1A14 papers from
the chief, which we opened earlier on in relation to the result of the disciplinary inquiry.
A. Yes.

610 Q. He acknowledged that. You have a note saying that you noticed his hands shaking a lot, to say that he couldn't properly write his signature. Would you just describe that to us.
A. So, I suppose, I met Garda Keogh for no other purpose other than to serve the documents on him in a confidential way from the chief superintendent. I 15:47 think while engaging with him in that process, I noticed that he didn't seem well to me. I felt on having to sign an acknowledgment further, I remember having to hold the page so as he could sign and his hands were, to me, visibly shaking doing that. And he just didn't seem as if he could focus on what I was saying. And he didn't seem to be able to do that and he just seemed a bit disorientated to me and I just felt that he wasn't well. And I asked him about that.
611 Q. Did you think that he was drunk?
A. No, no. No, absolutely not. No. No, there was no suggestion there was alcohol involved.
612 Q. You suggest that his signature at the end there, and we can see it at 2259 , that his signature in some way would reflect that he had difficulty writing his name?
A. Yeah.

613 Q. If we look just at random and other signatures of Garda Keogh. Perhaps we will look at 216. Just scroll down. There's his signature there. And maybe at 8830.

Again, his signature is there. There doesn't seem to be any great variation, if we go back to 2259 ?
A. Yes. I am just telling it as $I$ saw it. $I$ had to hold the page and I remember asking him to take your time, you know. I didn't intend dealing with the member in that way. That wasn't the purpose of the meeting. Just, when I saw what I saw, I felt concern for him. I asked him was he well enough to be in work and he said he was.
614 Q. You then explained to him that you felt there was a risk of having him to go to incidents as he was having around to follow them up; is that right?
A. Yes.

615 Q. Were there any incidents that arose that that became an issue?
A. Like, I can't recall, but there were some incidents on the PAF lists with Sergeant Monaghan that we had spoken about a couple of days earlier, where there had been an inability to move some of them on, relating to Garda Keogh.

616 Q. There are no notes of that PAF meeting?
A. No, absolutely not, no.

617 Q. I think the Tribunal wrote asking for them.
A. Yes.

618 Q. Do you recal1 what was discussed when this issue arose?
A. I can't now. I made that note at the time on the 22nd, it was fresh in my mind, having on7y met Sergeant Monaghan for a Monday PAF review on the 19th.

619 Q. Then you say:
"I poi nted out the inci dents were not deal thith properly, which l had written on."

Those are the four incidents that we have gone through 15:51 today?
A. Yes.

620 Q. Then you say other items, which we are not able to identity, on Sergeant Monaghan's PAF list, which weren't progressed. You say he has no reason or excuse 15:51 for that?
A. No, he didn't seem to be able to engage with me.

621 Q. Then you explained to him as per your earlier conversation, you reminded him of that conversation, did you?
A. Yes.

622 Q. And that he was to be put on indoor duty, is that right?
A. Yes.

623 Q. That was because you stated "I felt there was a risk i nvol ved to the publ ic and/ or our organi sation"?
A. Yes.

624 Q. What risk was posed?
A. I suppose, if I was meeting members of the public in the condition $I$ found him in, I didn't feel it to be good. He seemed comp1etely detached from being able to engage with me. That's what I found.

625 Q. Would he not be exposed to the public in the public office?
A. Absolutely. But I suppose I was hoping that that would encourage him to come to work, I suppose, in a proper way and fit for work. You know, the supports he'd have there would ensure that the risk would be minimised.

The options I had to putting him indoors were quite limited. I didn't have a suite of jobs that I could assign to him indoors. That option wasn't available to me. So I was limited. I tried to do the best I could in the circumstances that $I$ found.
You see, he alleges this is a form of targeting. But I 15:52 mean, the four incidents that we have looked at and we have gone over them and I don't intend to rehash them, but one concerned the manner in which statements were taken. Then the other incidents, Garda Keogh seems to have been involved in reasonable police work?
A. Yes, but $I$ knew that his colleagues were supporting him on the unit and talking -- Sergeant Monaghan was giving him great support at that time, as were his fellow colleagues, in trying to ensure that he wasn't getting into difficulty with things.
627 Q. We will come to it, not today, but tomorrow, when we are dealing with the issue of commendations, it should be a relatively brief matter but just to deal with it now, I mean, we have a transcript of a call to the Pulse centre --
A. Yes.

628 Q. -- in relation to the robbery of the taxi driver?
A. Yes.

629 Q. Where Garda Keogh is interacting and giving all the
details in relation to the offence and sets out -- he seemed to be on top of the case at that stage, at a very early stage. There doesn't appear to be any evidence forthcoming that he wasn't performing his duties on the ground appropriately. Where would you identify that you thought that -- other than the incident in relation to the taking of the statements and whether or not that was best practice, what other issue have you identified that would suggest that Garda Keogh was unable to perform his tasks?
A. The haphazard nature which he was in and out of work had to have an effect on him.
630 Q. Yes.
A. And it did have an effect on his ability to carry out his work properly. And I can understand that completely.

631 Q. How did that manifest itself, do you believe?
A. In, I suppose, the way incidents were being dealt with in a less timely fashion and that was, I suppose, coming across to me from Sergeant Monaghan as I monitored the PAF list. I suppose I felt that alcohol was an issue. While I didn't notice any alcohol on this day in question, he just didn't seem with it to me. He didn't seem to be able to engage with me.
632 Q. Did you notice alcohol being present on any day in question?
A. No, I never did, no. But I only met him four times.

633 Q. Did anybody report to you, did Sergeant Baker express any concerns --
A. No.

634 Q. -- as the sergeant in charge?
A. No. No, there was never any indication that alcohol was an issue.
Q. Did Detective Sergeant Curley or any of the other guards express any concern to you that Garda Keogh might be misbehaving on duty or be drunk on duty?
A. No.
Q. Just something I asked you about earlier on, and this is at page 691 of material, which is a statement from Inspector Minnock. If we scroll down to the bottom line there of that statement:
"Superintendent Murray consulted with me regarding his decision to detail Garda Keogh to indoor duties."

When did that consultation take place?
A. After I made the decision. So after I did this, I consulted with him. This was something that occurred, it was unexpected to me, I hadn't expected to find Garda Keogh in the condition I did, and I felt I had to take action.

637 Q. "The deci si on was reached following recent interactions bet ween Chi ef Superintendent Murray and Garda Keogh. "

What's that a reference to?
A. I don't know.

638 Q. "And al so a recent deal ing that Garda Keogh had with a nember of the public."
A. I don't know what that's about.

639 Q. "I n thi s instance, Garda Keogh asked the person, i nj ured party or witness to write their own statement."
A. okay.

640 Q. "This would not be normal practice and in my vi ew not best practice."

Of course this goes back to July.
"Chi ef Superintendent Murray outlined to me that he had 15:57 noti ced a si gni fi cant shake in Garda Keogh's hand and this was possi bl y rel ated to his recent absenteei smand could al so have been why Garda Keogh had asked the person to write their own statement."

Okay? So remember I was asking about that.
A. Yes.

641 Q. Whether that was something that was in your mind?
A. Yes.

642 Q. That Garda Keogh may not have written out the
A. Yes.

643 Q. And unable to do so.
A. I don't recall having that conversation with Superintendent Minnock, you know, about that. I know I 15:58 did go to him, I haven't a note myself of what we discussed but I went to him immediately after Garda Keogh left, to explain to him what had happened. And I wanted to ensure that Garda Keogh wouldn't be on
outdoor duty after that.
644 Q. Would you agree with Garda Keogh's contention that indoor duties and working in the public office in particular can be very stressful?
A. There are many stresses with being a member of An Garda Síochána, but I suppose in the hierarchy, being outside on duty and the uncertainty of what one is going to come across, is normally more stressful for most people than being indoors and having the support of someone available to you and dealing with, I suppose, what might be telephone calls and callers to the counter and referring them on to someone else or perhaps sending a car to the issue they had phoned in about or called about. And as I said, I didn't have a huge amount of options open to me and I felt that that option would be 15:59 good for Garda Keogh, he would be in a secure environment, he'd have support there. It would give him time to, I suppose, deal with whatever paperwork had manifested itself in our meeting on 19/10. And, you know, I phoned the sick absence section, the Human Resources section that day to see if I could expedite the CMO conference in some shape or form. I think they have a record of that in their papers here, page 11722.
645 Q. Do you want that brought up?
A. No, I am just making just a reference. So like, I took 16:00 action after noticing what I noticed. I made a phone call to say, look it, you know, I need this conference to take place. Garda Keogh needs some help and he needs to deal with the problems he's having.
Q. You then wrote to the chief superintendent advising her. This is at page 2260. In the second paragraph:
"The nember's hands were shaking quite a lot while l spoke to him to an extent that he could hardly write. As a result of that and other issues regarding work performance, I informed Garda Keogh he would be empl oyed on indoor duties at present with a revi ew date of 1st November 2015. The member acknow edged accept ance of $m y$ decision. I have recently been in contact with the sickness section regarding a case conference in rel ation to Garda Keogh. "

That's on the 22nd October, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

647 Q. Your direction in relation to this is at page 2261. It's addressed to the sergeant in charge, Ath1one, and also the unit sergeant of unit $C$. That was Sergeant Haran, is that right, at that time?
A. Unit C, I would imagine Monaghan.

648 Q. Monaghan?
A. Yes.

649 Q. But I think that Sergeant Haran may have been standing in, I am not sure. But you didn't consult Sergeant Haran in relation to --
A. I didn't consult anybody, because I was presented with a situation and I made a decision on the spot, as it were.

650 Q. Again, that's up on the screen, it's dated the 22nd

October.
"With i mmedi ate effect, Garda Keogh should be detailed for indoor duties with unit $C$.

I have spoken with the menber on this issue. I will revi ew the matter agai $n$ on the 1st Novenber.

Pl ease informall concerned and arrange accordingly. "

And Garda Keogh's position in relation to that is that this was another incident he alleges of targeting and it was effectively broadcasting to all the members by placing him in the public office, that people who were in his position of whistleblowers wouldn't be tolerated, that's effectively --
A. I deny that utterly. That absolutely was not my intention. I have nothing but support for anyone who reports wrongdoing, and my history will show that. Indeed, I've had to arrest a sergeant and two members at garda rank, one twice, in addition to directing the arrest of two other Garda members for wrongdoing. I have a history of supporting the outing of wrongdoing and dealing with it in an effective manner.
CHA RMAN Are you nearly finished on this issue, Mr. Marrinan.

MR. MARRI NAN Yes, I have just two more questions. CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. MARR NAN I think just for completeness sake,
there is another reference to this in your notes, it's at page 2500. I think these were notes before you went to see the chief medical officer on 9th December 2015. And we see there:
"Si ckness and TRR, car tax."

That was one of the issues in relation to Garda keogh. The regulation 10 that arose in relation to that, that he was absent without leave between 11th to 14th. Then there is a reference to intel and Pulse created, that's before your time, isn't that right?
A. Before my time, yeah.

652 Q. Then there is a reference to the incident that we talked about today, the theft of the trailer?
A. Yes.

653 Q. And then the crime files $14 / 07$ ?
A. Yes.

654 Q. Injured party wrote their own statement. Then you deal with a robbery on the 21/9, which we've discussed. And 16:04 then, on the 22nd october, shaking hands and indoor duty. Then we will come to deal briefly with an incident on the 28th October, Tullamore, and you have written "par anoi a" there?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN "Re ot her mentbers".
A. "Re other nembers" yes.

655 Q. MR. MARRI NAN And then "al cohol sickness, shaki ng, etcetera". And we will come to deal with that meeting
in due course.
CHAN RMAN That's unrelated to this issue.
MR. MARRI NAN Yes.
WTNESS: One final thing, Chairman, if I could. You know, in trying to support Garda Keogh, even though he was indoors, I tried to accommodate him in taking part of the arrest phase of the trailer case and made arrangements that he would be accompanied by another member to take part in the arrest and unfortunately he, I suppose, didn't attend to that because of a drinking issue that he had on that particular day. That was on the 18th November.
CHA RMAN In the trailer case, yes.
WTNESS: Just for completeness.
CHA RMAN I understand. Thanks very much, chief superintendent. we will call a halt there. I should have mentioned to you that these are long and detailed sessions, so if you find that you need a break at some point or you just want to clear your head or you want to refresh your memory, just mention it to me. I should have mentioned that earlier.
WTNESS: Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN I am just conscious that I think that for all of us it's quite a heavy session to proceed from 10:30 to 4 o'clock. So, please bear that in mind. CHA RMAN If you need it, okay. A11 right. Thank you very much.
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 98:21, 99:12, 99:22, } \\ & \text { 102:28, 103:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cuts }[3]-123: 9 \\ & 124: 5,134: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { deal [43]-7:1, } 7: \text { : } \\ 7: 15,11: 3,13: 20, \end{array}$ | 52:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:9, 133:14, } \\ & 133: 17,139: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 103:20, 105:25, 106:26, 107:16, | CVSO [1] - 57:28 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:5, 14:11, 14:20, } \\ & \text { 17:28, 18:2, 18:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { decision }[18]-21: 7, \\ 40: 16,116: 20, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:12 } \\ & \text { descriptions [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 107:18, 107:20, | D | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 12,22: 16,40: 23, \\ & 40: 24,44: 15,54: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 125:14, 125:21, } \\ & \text { 125:24, 127:9, 128:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 133:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:3, 109:16, } \\ & \text { 116:14, 125:7, } \end{aligned}$ | ranch [1] | 54:13, 61:8, 67:9, | 132:7, 139:29, 142:2, | 114:28 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:15, 126:16, } \\ & \text { 126:17, 126:21, } \end{aligned}$ | 110:10 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 156: 8,156: 11 \\ & 167: 15,167: 18 \end{aligned}$ | desk [6]-67:12, $73: 11,78: 13,78: 20$ |
| 126:25, 127:7,137:16, 141:3, 141:7 | D9 ${ }_{[1]}$ - 155:28 | 114:4, 114:7, 114:23, | 167:23, 170:10, | 80:25, 158:13 |
|  | daily [1] - 111:20 | 116:12, 118:16, | 170:2 | DESMOND ${ }_{[1]}-4: 3$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 141: 17,141: 26, \\ 172: 17 \end{array}$ | damage [8]-83:7, | 120:19, 135:1, 142:5, | decisions [3] - | despite [3]-14:9 |
|  | 96:22, 97:24, 97:29, | 143:11, 159:19, | 124:18, 125:10, 151:4 | $138: 7,140: 27$ |
| Crime [3]-65:21, | 98:14, 98:21, 100:7, | 161:2, 165:23, | $\operatorname{DECLAN}_{[1]}-3: 5$ | detached [2] - 139:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:13, 75:23 } \\ & \text { crime" }[3]-92: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:21 } \\ & \text { damned [2]-69:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:18, 169:29, } \\ & \text { 172:19, 172:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { deemed }[1]-47: 25 \\ & \text { defects }[1]-12: 12 \end{aligned}$ | \|164:26 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 92: 12,92: 13 \\ & \text { crimes }[8]-68: 9, \\ & 68: 19,72: 17,72: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:19 } \\ & \text { danger }[1]-146: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 172:29 $\text { dealing }[27]-6: 16$ | defence [1] - $38: 3$ <br> defensive [1]-23:27 | $120: 12,120: 24$ |
|  | $\text { data }[3]-58: 23 \text {, }$ | 14:19, 17:16, 20:28, | defensive [1]-23:27 deficiency [3]- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:23, 122:11, } \\ & \text { 160:27, 167:15 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 75: 27,87: 1,124: 22, \\ & 125: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 126:14, 127:11 | 21:14, 27:6, 30:17, | 118:24, 118:26, | $\text { detailed }[3]-117:$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 125:10 } \\ & \text { criminal [10] - 49:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { date }[31]-16: 29, \\ \text { 19:11, 26:14, 32:23, } \end{gathered}$ | 43:6, 45:3, 64:19, 66:26, 73:8, 73:16, | 118:27 | 171:3, 173:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 54: 12,69: 24,83: 7, \\ & 96: 22,97: 24,97: 29, \end{aligned}$ | $38: 20,45: 26,46: 1,$ | 78:18, 79:15, 79:20, | $\text { definitely }[1]-144: 9$ | 59:15, 111:27, 113:1, |
|  | 46:2, 50:28, 51:2, | 109:16, 111:1, 132:6, | definitively ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 113:16, 120:16, |
| $\begin{gathered} 98: 21,101: 4,125: 3 \\ \text { criminals }[1]-74: 1 \end{gathered}$ | 51:7, 51:12, 54:6, | 141:26, 145:5, | 10:24 | $132: 14,134: 14$ |
|  | 75:12, 75:14, 81:6 | 156:20, 163:5, | degree [2]-117:12, | 156:6, 166:1 |
| criteria [1] - 124:26 <br> critical [3]-110:27, | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 82: 4, ~ 82: 18, ~ 91: 10, \\ 98: 25, ~ 98: 29, ~ 108: 5, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:22, 167:28, } \\ & 169: 10,171: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 126:28 | detected [1] - 95:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:5, 146:22 } \\ & \text { criticise }[1]-107: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 110:3, 112:5, 112:6, | dealings [2] - 147:8, | $\begin{gathered} \text { delegated [2] } \\ \text { 125:9, 125:21 } \end{gathered}$ | detection [1]-127:5 DETECTIVE [5] - 3:4, |
|  | 116:8, 137:9, 137:13, | 157:12 | deliberately [3] | $3: 5,3: 12,3: 13,3: 17$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { criticised [2] - } \\ \text { 106:13, 144:20 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 147:23, 155:19, 170:8 } \\ & \text { dated }[25]-8: 1, \end{aligned}$ | deals [1]-45:12 | 46:11, 51:9, 53:7 | Detective [13] - |
| criticising [1] - 107:1 <br> criticism [2]-128:3, | 16:25, 26:5, 29:16, | $\begin{gathered} \text { dealt [42]-12:3, } \\ \text { 12:21, 12:23, 13:22, } \end{gathered}$ | delivering [2] - 103:9, 156:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:23, 22:25, 23:10, } \\ & 23: 20,23: 24,42: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 29:25, 31:8, 36:1, | $14: 22,20: 24,20: 29,$ | demand [1] - 102:10 | $48: 7,48: 13,79: 2 \text {, }$ |
| $144: 17$ <br> criticisms [1] - 54:12 | 38:5, 38:14, 38:18, | 21:8, 21:9, 21:15, | demands [1] - 32:4 | 115:18, 142:14, |
|  | 43:5, 45:23, 52:28, | 21:16, 34:13, 35:18, | demeanour [1] - | 149:19, 167:5 |
| cross [1] - 64:23 <br> cross-examined [1] | 68:4, 86:21, 87:28 | 39:5, 41:23, 44:17, | 128:9 | detective [6] - |
|  | 88:17, 104:28, | 45:2, 51:26, 54:15, | demo [1] - 57:23 | 110:13, 114:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & -64: 23 \\ & \text { crossed }[4]-62: 15, \end{aligned}$ | 106:18, 135:10, | 59:19, 70:20, 78:26, | demonstrate [2] - | 131:6, 135:29, |
|  | $135: 13,143: 1,149: 3,$ |  | 64:29, 129:13 | $136: 20,142: 16$ |


| determined [2] - | disciplinary [11] - | Divilly's [1] - 133:15 | DR [1] - 3:11 | 111:14, 111:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 125:16, 126:12 | 20:15, 33:19, 34:25, | DIVISION [1] - 1:12 | drafted [1] - 18:2 | 130:6, 130:10, |
| develop [1] - 73:27 | 35:14, 35:24, 43:18, | ional [1] - 9:19 | drawing [1] - 70:28 | 130:11, 130:21, |
| developed [1] | 44:6, 44:9, 45:8 | dizzy [1] - 151:1 | drink [2]-27:12 | $1: 1,131: 5,134: 1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 31:18 } \\ & \text { DEVELOPMENT }{ }_{[1]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 52:25, 162:2 } \\ & \text { discipline }[15]- \end{aligned}$ | DOCKERY [1] - 4:3 <br> doctor [11] - 30:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:14 } \\ & \quad \text { drinking }[10]-24: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 142:26, 144:19, |
|  |  |  |  | 152:8, 152:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & -3: 16 \\ & \text { developments [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 17,18: 15,28: 1 \\ & 29: 11,38: 4,39: 6 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 9,27: 11,27: 14, \\ & 28: 19,32: 26,67: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 158:13, 161:14, } \\ & \text { 164:17, 167:7, 169:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $75: 29,104: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 15,43: 7,43: 13 \\ & 45: 11,47: 5,50: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 16,38: 22,40: 29 \\ & 41: 5,123: 12,138: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 19,32: 26,67: 4 \\ & 142: 23,142: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $169: 7,172: 22$ |
| diaries [1] - 158:26 |  | 143:18 doctor's [1] - 154:28 | $173: 10$ |  |
| DIARMAID [1] - 2:6 diary [6] - 101:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:21, 159:6 } \\ & \text { Discipline }[1]-43: 11 \end{aligned}$ | doctor's [1] - 154:28 document [13] - | driven [2]-135:18, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 156:17, 158:24, 161:2 } \\ & \text { died }[1]-157: 9 \\ & \text { differed }[1]-19: 2 \\ & \text { difference }[2]-19: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $11: 7,13: 8,13: 10$$13: 15,22: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 12,16: 4,16: 10 \\ & 16: 28,18: 18,84: 17 \end{aligned}$ | driver [1] - 165:27 | e-mail [9]-24:11, |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 13:15, 22:5 disclosure [2] - | 100:13, 115:16 | driveway [2] - 81:7, | 25:12, 25:14, 25:17, |
|  | $15: 28,148: 25$ | $137: 24,160: 26$ | Driving [5] - 8:13, | $92: 18,115: 15$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:18 } \\ & \text { different }[10]-73: 19, \end{aligned}$ | Disclosure [1] - | documents [12] - | , 0:13, 11:11, | EAMON ${ }_{[1]}-3: 10$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { different [10] - 73:19, } \\ & 83: 21,87: 12,89: 24, \end{aligned}$ | 147:23 <br> disclosures [3] | 13:28, 14:27, 15:1, | $12$ |  |
| 116:17, 117:11 | $125: 13,148: 1,148: 10$ | $16: 2,53: 18,53: 20$ | drove [1] - 132:21 | $115: 16,144: 19,166: 3$ |
| 118:14, 118:17, | DISCLOSURES [2] - | DONAL [2] - 3:7 | drowning [2] - | eating [2] - 62:27, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:4, 161:23 } \\ & \text { difficult [6] - 95:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $1: 2,1: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DONAL [2]-3:7, } \\ & 3: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:23, 146:28 } \\ & \text { drunk [9]-32:26, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:4 } \\ & \text { effect }[5]-128: 29, \end{aligned}$ |
| 121:25, 138:23, <br> 145:4, 147:11, 15 | $45:$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { done [19]-20:1, } \\ \text { 20:12, } 27: 21,35: 8 \end{gathered}$ | 35:25, 37:11, 39:13, | $166: 14,171: 3$ |
| difficulties [1] | 12:14 <br> discretion [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 12,50: 19,54: 1, \\ & 58: 21,63: 16,64: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:20, 167:7 } \\ & \text { DUBLIN }[6]-1: 17, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| difficulty [4]-147:4 | $14: 19,44: 13$ | 77:14, 79:17, 92:20, | $2: 19,2: 25,2: 32,3: 28$ | effective ${ }^{[1]}$ - 171:24 |
| 155:13, 162:25, | 14:19, 44:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 14,79: 17,92: 20, \\ & 120: 7,122: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $4: 6$ | 54:24, 140:2, 143:10, |
| 165:20 digits | discussed [13] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:16, 128:21, } \\ & 145: 26,147: 8 \end{aligned}$ | Dublin [3]-81:1, | $171: 13,171: 16$ |
| DIGNAM [1] - 3:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 15,11: 20,97: 7 \\ & \text { 101:5, 102:20, } \end{aligned}$ | door [2] - 100:1 | 83:6, 102:15 <br> due [11]-29:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { effectiveness [1] - } \\ & 103: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| dimension [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:5, 102:20, } \\ & \text { 111:12, 120:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $155: 13$ | 79:28, 80:8, 83:7, | 103:9 <br> efficiencies [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:21 } \\ & \text { direct }[1]-68: 2 \\ & \text { directed }[5]-17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 111: 12,120: 21, \\ & \text { 122:9, 124:9, 137:27, } \\ & 163: 25,168: 27 \end{aligned}$ | doubt [1] - 103:18 doubting [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100:8, 106:1, 110:7, } \\ & \text { 112:3, 122:1, 145:28, } \end{aligned}$ | 68:25 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:16 } \\ & \text { down [36] - 11:27, } \end{aligned}$ | duly [1] - 143:22 | effort [6] - 68:18, |
| 45:6, 102:22, 102:23, | $172: 20$  <br> discussing $[1]$ - down $[36]-11: 27$, <br> $22: 26,25: 1,28: 15$,  |  | duplicates [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 16,79: 13,85: 3 \\ & 114: 4,135: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 160:28 <br> directing [1] - 171:21 <br> direction [20] - 6:10, | 83:15 <br> discussion [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 10,39: 14,40: 8, \\ & 47: 23,49: 25,50: 29 \end{aligned}$ | 113:5 <br> duplication [1] | $\begin{gathered} \text { efforts [9]-61:8, } \\ 72: 11,72: 16,72: 22, \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7: 23,10: 1,10: 20 \\ & 10: 22,20: 4,61: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 39:28, 122:6, 152:27 } \\ \text { disk [5] - 13:27, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 24,58: 3,61: 12 \\ & 69: 11,73: 1,76: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 56:14 <br> during [9]-6:15, | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 7,92: 15,96: 8 \\ & 118: 8,127: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| 63:5, 64:10, 71:25, | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 29,20: 12,20: 16 \\ & 22: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 28,81: 8,90: 8 \\ & 99: 4,99: 5,106: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $27: 25,56: 23,66: 15$ | EGAN [1] - 3:25 <br> either [1]-24:20 <br> element [3]-101:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 102: 8,109: 19, \\ & 110: 25,111: 12 \end{aligned}$ | disorientated [1] - | 112:12, 119:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 26,147: 9,147: 14 \\ & 157: 19,158: 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 115:4, 129:22, 130:8, | 162:18 | 138:18, 142:13, | duties [13] - 108:9, 108:11, 134:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { element [3]-101:17, } \\ & \text { 104:9, 115:21 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:3, 143:15, 170:16 } \\ & \text { directly }[4]-7: 18, \end{aligned}$ | displayed [1] - 40:5 <br> disregard [1] - 38:28 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 138:18, 142:13, } \\ & \text { 146:7, 147:19, 148:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:11, 134:16, } \\ & \text { 139:5, 158:9, 158:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:9, 115:21 } \\ & \text { elicit [3] - 63:6, 65:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 42:29, 145:25, 146:5 | district [13]-9:22, | $149: 24,150: 25$, $159: 13,162: 28$, | 158:19, 161:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:15 } \\ & \text { elicited }[6]-61: 26, \end{aligned}$ |
| DIRECTLY [2] - 5:5, | 19:23, 20:18, 25:11, $25: 14,32 \cdot 3,43: 26$, | 159:13, 162:28, 167:11 | 166:5, 167:15, 169:3, | $62: 12,67: 17,69: 9$ |
| 6:5 DIRECTLY- | $25: 14,32: 3,43: 26$ $45: 2,45: 5,64: 16$ | DOWNEY [2] - 3:15, | 170:8, 171:4 <br> duty [45]-10:28, | 71:4, 80:20 <br> ELIZABETH ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| EXAMINED [2] - 5:5, | District [3]-63:24, | downloaded [6] - | 11:4, 14:2, 17:12, | ELIZABETH 2:29 |
| 6:5 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 9,28: 27,29: 19 \\ & 31: 19,31: 20,31: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 2:29 |
| DIRECTOR [1] - 3:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:14, } 126: 11 \\ & \text { Divilly }[7]-122: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 84: 29,85: 26,89: 9 \\ & 90: 16,98: 7,100: 8 \end{aligned}$ |  | emails [1] - 115:19 <br> emerge [1] - 140:18 |
| DIRECTORATE [1] - | Divilly [7]-122:14, 123:1, 123:15, | downstream [2] - |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EMMA [1] - 3:26 } \\ & \text { emphasis [1] - } \\ & \text { 147:28 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 3:15 <br> discerning | $123: 18,124: 2$ | 77:2, 78:6 | $33: 16,35: 25,38: 21,$ |  |
| 70:23 | 133:21, 134:1 | [1] - 71:11 | 56:20, 80:1, 80:10, |  |




|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { handle }[1]-7: 8 \\ & \text { handled }[2]-141: 14, \\ & \text { 144:25 } \\ & \text { hands }[6]-23: 17, \\ & 43: 3,162: 5,162: 15, \\ & \text { 170:4, 172:21 } \\ & \text { handwriting }[2]- \\ & 55: 9,76: 4 \\ & \text { handwritten }[3]- \\ & 90: 8,90: 9,109: 24 \\ & \text { haphazard }[1]- \\ & 166: 11 \\ & \text { happy }[4]-30: 3, \\ & 34: 9,104: 22,136: 26 \\ & \text { HARAN }[1]-4: 2 \\ & \text { Haran }[5]-42: 19, \\ & 78: 29,170: 19, \\ & 170: 23,170: 25 \\ & \text { harassed }[1]- \\ & \text { 146:26 } \\ & \text { harassing }[2]- \\ & 138: 8,138: 10 \\ & \text { harassment }[1]- \\ & 136: 3 \\ & \text { hard }[1]-87: 7 \\ & \text { hardly }[1]-170: 5 \\ & \text { harvested }[1]-89: 18 \\ & \text { HEAD }[1]-3: 15 \\ & \text { head }[7]-17: 11, \\ & 34: 26,35: 3,123: 8, \\ & 124: 5,137: 28,173: 19 \\ & \text { headed }[3]-28: 23, \\ & 132: 1,155: 19 \\ & \text { health }[7]-34: 2, \\ & 34: 13,34: 17,35: 19, \\ & 35: 22,42: 26,43: 1 \\ & \text { Health }[2]-31: 15, \\ & 33: 22 \\ & \text { hear }[1]-97: 22 \\ & \text { heard }[3]-6: 19, \\ & 11: 20,97: 18 \\ & \text { hearing }[2]-13: 12, \\ & 88: 12 \\ & \text { HEARING }[3]-6: 1, \\ & 97: 1,174: 4 \\ & \text { heart }[1]-117: 10 \\ & \text { heavy }[1]-173: 24 \\ & \text { heinous }[1]-15: 15 \\ & \text { held }[4]-20: 23, \\ & 33: 22,85: 27,119: 22 \\ & \text { HELD }[1]-1: 17 \\ & \text { hello }[1]-147: 13 \\ & \text { help }[11]-6: 21, \\ & 16: 17,17: 4,26: 3, \\ & 67: 6,124: 17,128: 27, \\ & 128: 29,142: 28, \\ & 145: 10,169: 28 \\ & \text { helpful }[1]-92: 29 \\ & \text { herd }[2]-18: 27, \\ & 22: 11 \end{aligned}$ | ```hide [1] - 127:16 hiding[3] - 41:12, 127:17, 144:14 hierarchy [1] - 169:6 highlight [2] - 97:14, 161:8 highlighted [1] - 13:29 himself [6] - 41:28, 67:10, 70:27, 79:19, 80:6, 156:14 history [3] - 38:27, 171:19, 171:23 hit [3] - 119:21, 119:25, 121:19 hitched [1] - 82:22 hold [5] - 32:12, 32:13, 80:26, 162:14, 163:3 holding [1] - 146:19 holidays[2]-78:16, 78:17 holistic [1] - 103:2 home [8] - 110:5, 112:15, 119:17, 123:11, 129:2, 135:24, 136:15, 143:22 honest [2]-71:28, 127:21 honestly [1] - 53:5 honourable [4]- 103:18, 136:27, 138:13, 139:25 hoodies [2] - 98:5, 99:29 hope [2] - 79:13, 140:6 hoped [2] - 76:15, 132:28 hoping [2]-137:1, 165:1 HORAN [1] - 3:25 hospital [1]-123:12 hours [5]-51:13, 114:1, 144:19, 153:28, 155:2 HOUSE [2] - 2:23, 3:27 house [6] - 57:14, 57:23, 81:12, 99:8, 102:4 houses [1] - 57:7 HQ[3] - 44:28, 65:23, 125:7 HRM [1] - 43:16 huge [1] - 169:14 hugely [2] - 115:22, 144:20 HUGHES [2] - 2:29,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 2:30 |  |  | 110:29, 111:28, <br> 114:8, 115:5, 117:12, <br> 117:13, 118:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 140: 26,141: 10 \\ & 141: 21.143: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2:30 } \\ & \text { human }[2]-42: 29 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $161: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { incoming }[1]-33: 4 \\ & \text { incorrect }[2]-37: 8 \text {, } \\ & 83: 14 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | impacts [1] - 32:14 <br> implies [1] - 53:6 |  |  | 43:17, 143:18 |
| Human [2]-33:23, |  |  | 118:13, 124:3, 124:7, | 168:3, 172:19 |
| 169:2 | ly [2]-51:9 | incumbent [1] - 71:9 | 124:17, 125:19, | injuries [6] - 110:9, |
| HUMAN [1] - 3:15 | 128 | indeed [8]-69:28, | 126:8, 126:1 | 117:13, 122:22 |
| nch [1] - 94:1 | import [1] - $37: 28$ importance [1] - | 7 | 129:6, 129:9, 130:5, | injury [2] - 124:6, |
| hundred [1] - 11:22 |  | 103:19, 133 |  |  |
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| $\begin{gathered} \text { 166:8, 168:5, 168:6 } \\ \text { praising }[1]-92: 19 \\ \text { precise }[1]-112: 11 \\ \text { precisely }[1]-16: 2 \\ \text { preconceived }_{[1]}- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 32:28, 40:19, 40:26, } \\ & \text { 41:14, 46:2, 48:3, } \\ & 62: 8,69: 16,77: 21 \\ & \text { problems [3]-77:1, } \\ & 77: 2,169: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Protected [1] - } \\ & 147: 23 \\ & \text { protected [3] - } \\ & 148: 10,148: 11 \text {, } \\ & 148: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pursuing [2] - 89:7, } \\ & \text { 123:4 } \\ & \text { pushed }[1]-120: 7 \\ & \text { put }[29]-8: 29,27: 19 \text {, } \\ & 27: 26,39: 10,40: 3 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:18, 115:3, } \\ & \text { 120:16, 120:27, } \\ & \text { 146:24, 165:5, 170:4, } \\ & \text { 173:24 } \\ & \text { quote }[1]-106: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:2 } \\ & \text { preference }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { procedures [1] - } \\ & 72: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { protections [1] - } \\ & \text { 148:26 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 25,68: 18,70: 26 \\ & 72: 17,72: 22,76: 16 \end{aligned}$ | R |
| 116:12 <br> prematurely [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { proceed [6]-18:7, } \\ \text { 18:19, 118:29, 119:2, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { protested }[1]-47: 12^{\text {provide }[5]-61: 18,} \end{aligned}$ | 91:4, 91:25, 97:8, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 88: 4 \\ & \text { premises }[2]-55: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $119: 3,173: 24$ proceedings [6] - | $\begin{aligned} & 111: 27,134: 25 \\ & 147: 29,156: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97:16, 100:26, } \\ & \text { 101:28, 102:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { raise }[8]-83: 1, \\ 87: 27,100: 15, \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 99:23 } \\ & \text { prepare [2] - 129:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 19,35: 24,43: 19 \\ & 44: 7,45: 8,52: 25 \end{aligned}$ | provided [1] - 144:23 providing [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:25, 106:20, } \\ & \text { 109:10, 135:27, } \\ & \text { 153:22, 155:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:21, 107:23, } \\ & \text { 108:17, 108:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 130:7 } \\ & \text { prepared [1] - 40:24 } \\ & \text { prescriptive [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { process [15] - 22:21, } \\ & 60: 7,67: 28,73: 14, \\ & 73: 18,73: 24,77: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 73: 28,129: 14,158: 7 \\ \text { pry [1] - 157:12 } \\ \text { public }[24]-44: 13 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 161:18, 164:17 } \\ \text { putting }[6]-39: 14, \\ 40: 7,66: 24,159: 7, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:18 } \\ & \text { raised }[11]-10: 18, \\ & \text { 87:22, 91:16, 93:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:10, 133:1 } \\ & \text { present }[11]-9: 8, \\ & 9: 13,9: 17,9: 19, \\ & 31: 18,33: 15,49: 13 \\ & 64: 1,161: 12,166: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 78:14, } 78: 25,115: 11, \\ & \text { 115:17, 115:21, } \\ & \text { 148:10, 153:6, 162:11 } \\ & \text { processed [1] - } \\ & \text { 17:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 57:23, 58:11, 59:3, } \\ & \text { 61:17, 64:18, 66:15, } \\ & \text { 66:25, 66:26, 73:29, } \\ & \text { 102:10, 102:29, } \\ & \text { 138:26, 139:4, 158:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 7,66: 24,159: 7, \\ & 160: 5,165: 5 \\ & \text { PW1 [1] - 146:8 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93: 25,95: 18,96: 12, \\ & 102: 13,107: 19, \\ & 113: 26,131: 12 \\ & \text { ran }[2]-99: 29,120: 4 \\ & \text { random }[1]-162: 27 \end{aligned}$ |




| 82:18, 87:23, 94:5, | 136:17, 142:16, | 131:3, 131:13, | shaking [5] - 162:5, | signed [6]-27:8, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 97:12, 97:19, 97:28, | 143:1, 143:26, | 131:26, 134:23, | 162:15, 170:4, | 60:23, 66:23, 74:27, |
| 98:10, 98:11, 98:14, | 145:21, 149:3, 149:4, | 134:27, 134:29, | 172:21, 172:28 | 99:2, 136:23 |
| 98:17, 99:3, 99:5, | 149:19, 155:17 | 135:4, 135:6, 142:16, | SHANE [1] - 3:23 | significant [3] - |
| 100:11, 112:7 | sequence [1] - 36:8 | 146:7, 150:3, 151:26, | SHANKEY [1] - 3:21 | 45:28, 125:23, 168:11 |
| 112:22, 124:16, | Sergeant [92] - 14:4, | 155:16, 167:2, | SHANKEY-SMITH | silent [1] - 150:6 |
| 129:17, 132:21, | 14:8, 14:21, 15:20, | 170:17, 170:18, | [1] - 3:21 | similar [9]-10:1 |
| 133:3, 139:18, 140:5, | 16:4, 16:11, 17:13, | 171:20 | Shannon [1] - | 10:20, 10:22, 12:2 |
| 141:5, 141:9, 141:11, | 17:14, 17:18, 19:14, | SERGEANT [5] - | 145:22 | 17:7, 20:24, 21:1 |
| 142:18, 144:12, | 21:24, 21:26, 22:2, | 3:12, 3:20, 4:2, 4:3, | SHANNON [1] - 2:13 | $59: 13,74: 9$ |
| 147:11, 156:26, | 22:8, 24:8, 24:11, |  | shape [2]-124:6, | simple [4]-51:28, |
| 159:2, 162:24, | 24:28, 26:27, 28:4, | sergeant's [5] - 18:8, | 169:22 | 106:17, 155:7, 160:23 |
| 165:10, 169:21, | 29:18, 32:22, 33:7, | 18:11, 18:13, 27:25, | shared [2] - 32:7, | simply [11] - 36:23, |
| $\begin{gathered} 172: 3,172: 4 \\ \text { seeing }[1]- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 11,36: 18,36: 24, \\ & 37: 13,42: 2,42: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 135:1 | 32:9 | $41: 22,80: 22,86: 28$ |
| seek [2]-28:2, 29:12 | 42:12, 42:14, 42:19 | $14: 3,41: 26,109: 8$ | sheet [1] - 159:5 | 153:18, 153:20, |
| seeking [2]-45:21, | 45:20, 46:7, 46:11, | series [5] - 12:23, | SHELLEY [1] - 3:25 | 158:18, 160:29, 161:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 54: 19 \\ & \text { seem } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 10,51: 12,53: 8 \\ & 53: 9,55: 3,55: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 11,108: 29,116: 2, \\ & 116: 5 \end{aligned}$ | SHIP [1] - 3:28 | SINÉAD [1] - 4:4 <br> SINéAD [1] - 2:7 |
| $37: 27,61: 26,77: 12$ | $60: 23,65: 29,72: 13$ | serious [13]-11:10, | shook [1] - 23:17 <br> shop [1] - 100:1 | sit [1] - 73:1 |
| 78:5, 92:26, 95:16, | $72: 19,75: 19,78: 29$, $79: 16,82 \cdot 11,86 \cdot 2$, | 21:27, 77:1, 110:8, | short [6] - 92:29, | sits [1] - 43:1 |
| 109:11, 117:13, | 79:16, 82:11, 86:2, | 110:18, 110:27, | 111:21, 114:11, | sitting [1] - 161:23 |
| 126:28, 162:12, | 86:21, 88:19, 89:2, | 111:6, 111:7, 120:13, | 132:27, 133:4, 136:2 | situation [18] - |
| 162:16, 162:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:29, 90:5, 90:6, } \\ & 91 \cdot 1292 \cdot 1894 \cdot 13 \end{aligned}$ | 120:27, 125:27, | short-circuit [1] - | $12: 10,17: 29,19: 3$ |
| $163: 1,164: 12$, $166: 23,166: 24$ | 91:12, 92:18, 94:13, 95:11, 95:21, 95:28, | 131:22, 140:27 | 92:29 | $41: 11,41: 19,54: 6$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { 166:23, 166:24 } \\ \text { sees [1] - 11:6 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 11,95: 21,95: 28, \\ & 98: 12,99: 2,104: 13 \end{aligned}$ | seriously [1] - 123:2 | shouted [1] - 119:21 | $76: 8,78: 2,108: 27$ |
| sees [1]-11:6 send [2]-49:17, | 113:23, 113:24, | $49: 29,53: 13,53: 18$ | show [6] - 19:29, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:17, 110:23, } \\ & \text { 124:7, 125:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 120:21 | $115: 18,115: 19$ $122: 7,136: 5,1$ | 162:9 ${ }^{\text {cherved }} 3$ - 50.4 | $90: 1,171: 19$ | 129:11, 141:27, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { sending [2]-131:26, } \\ & 169: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 143:4, 146:17, | $\begin{gathered} \text { served }[3]-50: \\ 52: 23,148: 19 \end{gathered}$ | showed [2]-40:5, | $\begin{array}{r} 150: 8,157: 22,170: 27 \\ \text { six [3]-20:4, 115:24 } \end{array}$ |
| sense [2]-17:24 | 147:24, 149:3, 149:5, | Service [2]-31:16 | 99:27 <br> shown [1] - 25:9 | $144: 9$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80:18 } \\ & \text { sent }[32 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 149:19, 149:21, } \\ & \text { 149:22, 151:22, } \end{aligned}$ | 33:23 | shows [1] - 87:16 | sky [1] - 106:29 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { sent }[32]-6: 11,24 \\ 24: 11,25: 14,28: 22 \end{array}$ | $155: 7,159: 4,1$ | service [16] - 10:8 | shudder [1] - 138:18 | slightly [1] - 19:2 |
| $30: 4,30: 26,32: 22$ | 163:27, 164:9, | $63: 16,67: 21,73: 29$ | shutter [1] - 63:23 | smash [1]-100:2 <br> SMITH ${ }^{11]}-3.21$ |
| $41: 4,50: 2,60: 25$ | 165:17, 166:20, | $98: 2,102: 11,102: 29$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { sick }[32]-14: 2,14: 9 \\ 17: 12,17: 20,24: 15 \end{gathered}$ | SMITH [1] - 3:21 <br> SMITHFIELD |
| 60:26, 67:14, 73:13, | $166: 28,167: 5$ | 103:8, 103:9, 129:14, | $25: 4,25: 5,27: 8$ | $2: 24$ |
| 75:18, 76:5, 76:14, | 170:18, 170:23, | $138: 4,156: 22,158: 7$ | $27: 10,27: 28,29: 20$ | SOLE [1] - 2:2 |
| 79:6, 86:3, 86:21, |  | services [1] - 160:18 | $29: 21,29: 24,30: 13$ | solely [1] - 7:23 |
| 91:10, 92:18, 103:20, | sergeant [69] - 6:1 | Services [1] - 1:24 | $30: 14,31: 3,31: 4$ | solicitor [2]-12:27, |
| 105:29, 109:23, | $13: 19,13: 26,16: 12$ 16:18, 17:7, 17:12, | SERVICES [1] - 1:29 | $31: 12,31: 25,32: 25$ | 49:5 |
| 120:29, 121:1, $122 \cdot 14,130 \cdot 3,136.5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 18,17: 7,17: 12, \\ & 17: 13,17: 28,18: 2, \end{aligned}$ | serving [2] - 152:28, | $32: 27,33: 15,37: 11,$ | SOLICITOR [1] - 2:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:14, 130:3, 136:5, } \\ & \text { 138:13, 146:24 } \end{aligned}$ | 18:9, 19:4, 20:28, | 161:29 | 38:8, 38:21, 44:3, | SOLICITOR'S [1] - |
| separate [4] - 33:18, | $21: 6,22: 16,25: 3$ | sessions [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 13,51: 6,159: 7 \\ & 169: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3:27 } \\ & \text { Solicitor's [1]-12:28 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $35: 27,67: 23,117: 29$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 8,28: 22,32: 29 \\ & 33: 2,33: 12,36: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 173:18 | sickness [5] - 40:22, | SOLICITORS [5] |
| separately [3] - $70 \cdot 27,90: 14,106.27$ | $36: 26,42: 13,60: 12$ | set [13]-29:2, 68:25, | 40:25, 170:11, 172:6, | 2:11, 2:18, 2:23, 2:30, |
| 70:27, 90:14, 106:27 <br> September [33] - | $67: 23,67: 28,68: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 72:28, 103:3, 103:6, } \\ & \text { 106:17, 113:20, } \end{aligned}$ | 172:28 | $4: 5$ |
| 68:5, 72:25, 75:15, | 71:26, 80:15, 102:23, | 131:18, 134:13, | 106:22, 106:24, | Solve [1] - 126:22 <br> solving [5] - 72:17, |
| 75:16, 81:21, 87:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:14, 111:17, } \\ & \text { 111:22, 113:14, } \end{aligned}$ | 134:17, 137:18, | 112:13, 120:4 | 72:22, 90:3, 96:5, |
| 91:5, 91:11, 95:6, $109 \cdot 14,110 \cdot 2,110.7$ | 111:22, 113:14, 113:28, 114:11, | 140:11, 148:17 | $\text { sign }[3]-157: 24,$ | 109:3 |
| 109:14, 110:2, 110:7, 116:10, 116:16, | 114:16, 114:22, | sets [6] - 19:15, | 162:13, 162:14 | someone [11] - |
| 118:16, 121:5, | 115:8, 115:13, |  | signature [8] - 82:10, | 40:14, 50:12, 54:1, |
| 121:10, 124:8, | 115:27, 115:29, | setting [3]-68:27, | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 11,149: 15,162: 6, \\ & 162: 23,162: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62: 2,62: 4,67: 8 \\ & 76: 28,84: 29,115: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 128:17, 135:10, | 116:1, 117:26, | $79: 10,143: 9$ | $\text { 162:29, } 163: 1$ | $169: 9,169: 12$ |
| 135:13, 135:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:19, 129:23, } \\ & 129: 28,130: 5,130: \end{aligned}$ | seven [1] - 144:9 | signatures [1] - | something.. [1] - |
| 135:26, 136:10, | 130:10, 130:11, | shake [1] - 168:11 |  |  |







[^0]:    "He told me that he would tax it privately and call into the station to show mis tax di sk when he had it

[^1]:    "Havi ng consi dered the menber's hi story of absence and his bl at ant di sregard --"

[^2]:    "No suspects to date."

