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## CH EF SUPERI NTENDENT PATRI CK MRRAY CONTI NUED TO BE DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY MR MARR NAN, AS FOLLOWG:

CHA RMAN Good morning. Yes.
1 Q. MR. MARRINAN Good morning, chief superintendent.
A. Good morning, Chairman.

2 Q. Just before we move on to issue 15, which is the
alleged denial of commendations, was there anything arising out of yesterday's evidence that you were particularly concerned about?
A. No, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
3 Q. MR. MARRI NAN The first of these issues concerns the quite serious incident that occurred on 4th August of 2015, where an elderly taximan was stabbed. This was quite a serious offence, isn't that right?
A. It was.

4 Q. I think it was an offence that received some degree of notoriety in the town of Athlone?
A. It did, Chairman. There was quite a lot of media publicity about it. The gentleman was well into his 70s, and he had, after retirement, engaged in taxiing, work as a taximan, and this happened to him late at night.
5 Q. I think it was an incident that you took an interest in, isn't that right?
A. Well, it was a serious and critical incident and one of public notoriety and was going to cause concern in the community. We knew that. I was very anxious that we would, $I$ suppose, deal with it as quickly as possible and bring some level of comfort to the community, particularly the elderly community around town.

6 Q. If we could just have page 86 up on the screen. This is what Garda Keogh says in relation to this incident. If we scroll down to line 1236, please.
"What I mean by being taken off the case is the record of my invol vement was erased fromPulse. It is possi ble that a detective unit took over the case and I have no issue with that. It is just included in my statement because I was removed fromPul se entirely though I had worked on the case, and where any commendati ons arose l would not be included. I do not know who removed me from Pul se but I amsure this may be checked. I would have no issue if I was removed fromi nvesti gating garda to assi sting garda on Pul se, rather than being removed al together fromthe i nci dent."

If we could then just briefly look at the entry that he made in relation to this, which is at page 13323, please, Mr. Kavanagh. That will come up on the screen. You see there, the 3rd August, he has:

[^0]A. Yes.

7 Q. Then if we go over across the page, you will see, it seems to be blanked out but it's Saturday 8th:
"I noticed l was removed on Pul se fromstabbing
taxi man. I sei zed cl othes and car T."

That's technical examination, is that right?
A. Yes.

8 Q. If we can look then at your answer to this in your statement. If we look at 2056, please. You say here at the bottom of the page, if we could scroll down to the bottom, please:
"On 3rd August 2015, two serious crimes of robbery were 10:37 committed in Athl one within a number of hours of each ot her, both had a common denomi nator, in that both vi ctims were el derly males, one a taxi driver and one a shop owner. A reticul ous investigation was carried out in rel ation to both crimes. It was coordi nated by then 10:37 Detective Sergeant Curley and his team I was not aware of Garda Keogh' s i nvol vement in either of those crimes, whi ch were investigated together. The cul prits for both crimes were prosecuted and convicted at the Circuit Court sitting in Longford on 8th Novenber of 2016, at which I was present with both victims."

So there you're stating that you were unaware of Garda Keogh's involvement in relation to the matter. If we
could have 3093 of Volume 11 up on the screen, please. This is your interview with the Tribunal investigators.
A. Yes.

9 Q.
If we scroll down to question 1310. Again you refer to the fact that it was quite a series incident and it followed on from another incident of a similar nature and both were investigated together. Again you point out there was a certain notoriety about it and you refer back to your statement. You say that you took a hands on approach with the case and that you had no knowledge of Garda Keogh's involvement. You say:
"I don't thi nk he supplied a statement to the i nvestigati on file whi ch went to the DPP. The file was done and compl et ed through the inci dent room and chi ef superintendent and I visited one of the victins the eveni ng after it happened. I had no know edge of Garda Keogh being i nvol ved in that one and to the best of my recollection and know edge there is no statement on the i nvesti gation file fromhim so l would interpret that as himhaving very little or not invol vement."

You then state:
"I bel ieve he handed in a piece of cl ot hing to the exhi bits officer."

Was that as a result of enquiries that you made since you had made the statement?
A. Yes. I had an opportunity to look at the actual file.

10 Q. Then you say -- sorry?
A. Sorry, before I met the Tribunal investigators.

11 Q. So that was an additional piece of information that you gleaned?
A. Yes.

12 Q. So that, rather than having no involvement you say that you believed that he had a limited involvement?
A. That's what the file -- the exhibits chart on the file, I saw that, he was recorded as handing in some clothing 10:40 to the exhibits officer.

13 Q. You say:
"Pul se leaves a foot print. It is an audit trail of anyone who went through the inci dent and I can't see anyone havi ng any reason to do what Garda Keogh al I eges."

Just in relation to that, the entries on Pulse are designed to be an audit in relation to where there is an investigation, isn't that right?
A. Yes. Every interaction with Pulse leaves a footprint.

14 Q. Yes.
A. Electronically, that can be audited.

15 Q. And if Garda Keogh had seized clothes as an exhibit, he 10:41 should have been on the Pulse entry as an assisting member, isn't that right?
A. Yes. We11, I understand that he put the entry on Pulse, I understand that now.

16
Q. No, but I am just saying in normal circumstances it would be a record of anybody who had any dealings with the investigation?
A. Yes, indeed. It's an electronic record.

17 Q. So, for instance, if somebody was looking after exhibits, they ought to be on Pulse, isn't that right?
A. Yeah. It wouldn't always happen that they would be, because the file would be the primary source of information and I suppose Pulse is a storage of data there. In the ideal world everything would go on it and it would be accurately kept at all stages of the investigation. That doesn't always happen in practice and there have been some failings in that down through the years, which have led have controversies in itself. So the file is, I suppose, the primary source of information, as it were, in relation to anyone who had any dealings with the investigation.
18 Q. If we could look at the Pulse entry then itself, the first page of it is at page 533 of the materials. There's no need to go through all this document. It sets out the time the incident occurred, when it was reported, the time it was reported, the details of what was stolen, the details of the injured party, the names of suspects. We now know that all these were matters were recorded by Garda Keogh, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

19 Q. If we go down, we will see that reporting garda has Garda John J Glennon. That appears to be an error?
A. Yes.

20
Q.
Q. page. There were quite a number of them. And then we go on to 534. Again, there are another eight gardaí there as assisting gardaí. These would have been guards who were at the scene, first responders?
A. Yeah. And people who, I suppose, formed part of the investigation team that began soon after the incident occurred.
Q. And then if we just scroll down page 534 , we see in the third last line there, under "narrative":
"I nci dent recategorised to robbery and Garda decision of daily PAF meeting."
A. Yes.
Q. If we could just please have up on the screen page
14706. This was a report through an e-mail. Is this the type of report -- it's from the superintendent Athlone, was this the type of report that you envisaged, how it should be set out in relation to serious and critical incidents?
A. I suppose that report was I think on the 4th August, so it's before I issued that instruction. But, yeah, I suppose it's something I had envisaged, it's an e-mail that was sent to me.
But sorry, the e-mail itself, the body of it, is that the sort of report that you envisaged would be sent?
A. In a broad sense.
A. In a broad sense, yeah, maybe with some more information perhaps of the notoriety of the crime.
31 Q. But we discussed this yesterday --
A. Yes.

32 Q. -- in relation to the duty of a sergeant --
A. Yes.

33 Q. -- to send in a report?
A. Yes.
A. Absolutely, yes.
Q. And the importance of that report was that it would alert senior management to matters that would be important for senior management to know at the outset of any investigation?
A. That's correct, and it would kick start the process of investigation, where the structure of the team that
would be put together to deal with this would roll into place and make some progress on it at an early stage. So it's dated 4th August 2015. It's:
"Subj ect: Assault causing harm"

I think the incident was recategorised to robbery at the PAF meeting?
A. That's correct, reclassified at the PAF meeting from assault to robbery.
And it's sent on the 4th August at 4:33 and it's received on the 4th August at the same time.
"With reference to the above, Gardaí recei ved a call in rel ation to taxi driver having been mugged at a certain I ocation in Athl one at approxi mately 1:35am When Gardaí arrived the taxi driver had made his way to the grounds of another location. He had recei ved several slash wounds to the cheek of his face, a slash to his neck area and a deep laceration to the thumb area of hi s hand. He was attended to by anbul ance personnel and was conveyed to Ballinasl oe hospital, where he is confortable. He reported that he collected two mal es wearing hoodi es outside a location in Athl one and they asked to be brought to another location. When they
arrived there, they attacked himwith a knife and stole hi s watch and taxi money, approxi mately $€ 100$. They ran in a certain direction. He was not in a position to gi ve any sort of description of the cul prits. The car
was towed to the ABS recovery for examination. Garda CCTV was vi ewed and further enquiries have to be carried out in relation to local CCTV. Family menbers were contacted. Garda Keogh is investigating mentber and will attend to further enquiries when he returns fromrest days. A search was carried out by members under [a location] and in the general area where the i nci dent happened and nothing was found. Forwarded for your information, please. "

That clearly indicates that Garda keogh is the investigating member, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
A. Yes.
A. No.
Q. Yes. You told us in your statement that you don't have a recollection of Garda Keogh being involved in this incident?
A. Yes.

And then in your interview with the Tribunal investigators you say that you think that he had limited involvement. But he was the investigating
member, member in charge of the investigation at one stage, isn't that right?
A. At a very early point in time, yes.
Q. And here you have been notified of that?
A. Yes.

Isn't that right?
A. Yes.

44 Q. In circumstances where you weren't happy really that he was doing his work, isn't that right?
A. We11, I suppose I had raised some concerns, yes.

Yes. I suppose of anybody that you had been dealing with at that stage in Ath1one Garda Station, you wouldn't have been happy with him being the investigating member of such a serious offence?
A. Well, he may well be allowed to be the investigating member, as he was with the theft of the trailer, but he would need quite a bit of support. And this was an investigation that one person wouldn't be able to handle anyway, this was a team based approach.
Q. I think Garda Keogh has no difficulty that this matter went to the detective unit and he even seems to think that it was perhaps more appropriate that they would take over the investigation of such a serious incident?
A. It would be quite normal, yes, Chairman.

When you saw that e-mail, were the alarm bells not ringing for you at that stage, to say, well, look, we can't have Garda Keogh leading this, we will get the detective unit to take over?
A. I can't recall seeing the e-mail. But when I went in to work that morning enquiries had already begun and Detective Garda Cogavin and Divilly, who were in, had already begun to make enquiries. So when the meeting happened at 10am, a certain amount of enquiries had
already begun and some CCTV had been procured, which gave a broad indication of a particular subject.
48 Q. Yes. I am more concerned about your response and reaction when you got this e-mail?
A. Well, $I$ don't recall getting the e-mail and when $I$ saw it here, that was, you know, the first time it came into my mind again. And I have no recollection of actually reading it on the night, $I$ see it came to me at 4:30, or the following morning.
But you would have got your emails the following morning?
A. Absolutely.

50 Q. And you would have updated yourself before going to the PAF meeting?
A. Yes, absolutely.

51 Q. The purpose of the PAF is update you.
A. Yes.

52 Q. So the e-mail would have been available to you at PAF meeting?
A. Oh, I have no doubt the e-mail was in my in-box and I more than likely read it and I am sure the e-mail system would be able to indicate that.

53 Q. At the PAF meeting, the offence was recategorised, isn't that right?
A. Yes. On analysis, yeah, it was a robbery, a clear robbery, it was a stealing, attended to by the use of force and the person was subjected to --

54 Q. And also, Garda Divilly was assigned to be the investigating member, isn't that right?
A. Yes, at that stage, yes.
A. Yes.
Q. I am just wondering how is it that those two matters, the e-mail and the discussion at the PAF meeting, escaped your mind when you came to make a statement in relation to Garda Keogh's involvement in relation to this offence?
A. I suppose, it was four years previously and I just hadn't looked at the material in the same way I did before the interview with the Tribunal investigators. I hadn't access to it when I made the statement, I was working off my own records and diaries and notes. It's just, you know, from your evidence yesterday in relation to the concerns that had you about Garda Keogh and his capacity to carry out his duties, I am just wondering how you wouldn't remember an incident such as this that was such a serious incident and that Garda Keogh's involvement and initial involvement wouldn't have stuck out in your mind?
A. I wasn't watching everything that Garda Keogh was involved in that degree. In fact, every incident or
issue I dealt with with Garda Keogh, it came across my desk. I never looked for anything in that fashion.
60 Q. Now, I think that we have a statement from Garda Shankey-Smith and also a statement from Mr. Brian Savage. I don't need them up on the screen. They're page 6202 of the material and 6203. But this concerns the trail that was left on Pulse?
A. Yes.

61 Q. It appears that Sergeant Curley had removed Garda Keogh from Pulse. And it may well have just been simply inadvertence --
A. Yes.

62 Q. -- that the investigating member was put down as Garda Divilly and that Garda Keogh ought to have been put down as assisting member, isn't that right?
A. Oh absolutely.
A. Yes.

64 Q. So when Garda Keogh says that this ought to have been done, he's correct in that regard?
A. He's very correct, yes.

65 Q. Yes. He suggests that this was done in a way to remove him from the incident because of the work that he had done and in some sense that this is a targeting of him. what do you say in relation to that?
A. I can understand in relation to what was going on in his life, that may be a perception that he held. And when he saw, I suppose, everyone else that had been at the scene with him continue as assisting gardaí on the
incident and he didn't see himself there. But what I understand what happens when someone is removed as an investigating person, it was -- I suppose there was an understanding that that person automatically dropped down to an assisting role without having to be removed and reentered, and that wasn't the case and no one seemed to realise that at the time.

66 Q. I referred to it yesterday, the transcript of his telephone conversation to the Pulse centre is at page $12639 ?$
A. Yes.

67 Q. And goes through to 12646 ?
A. Yes.

68 Q. It appears he was on top of the case at that stage and gives all the relevant details in relation to the investigation?
A. Yes.

69 Q. Isn't that right?
A. He was tasked to put the incident on with the call centre and on Pulse, yes.

70 Q. He seems to be familiar with all the details of the incident?
A. Yes.

71 Q. You couldn't criticise him in any way for his interaction with the Pulse centre, isn't that right?
A. No. There's a little bit of indecision about the classification, but that's is normal and that's what the PAF process is designed to do; to, you know, make those corrections in the morning. No issue with that.

72 Q. He also makes the case that a number of investigating members received commendations?
A. Yes.

Was it when it went to the Circuit Court eventually that it was after that, that commendations were handed out?
A. I think the EPW1 form in line with the policy was completed then by Inspector Curley, then Detective Sergeant Curley.
74 Q. A large number of the members who were investigating received commendations, but not all of them, is that right?
A. I think 11 out of 23.
Q. Yes.
A. But I suppose this investigation and the one that followed a number of hours later were treated as one and there was a common denominator in relation to the suspects. The first one involved two culprits and the second crime, which was again targeted at an elderly male, involved four, and one person was common to both groups. And the two investigations were treated as one, with the same group of youths, I suppose, having knowledge of being involved in some conspiratorial way in both crimes.

77 Q. He makes the case that he believes that he was removed from Pulse so that he wouldn't be up there to be considered for commendations, for a commendation. And, of course, if he wasn't on the Pulse and hadn't been shown to have a role in relation to the matter, he wouldn't have been considered, is that right?
A. That's right.

And, of course, you would make the case, well, he was removed from Pulse at a very early stage and there wasn't an issue in relation to commendations and you didn't know that the matter was going to be investigated as we11 as it was leading to prosecutions and convictions and thereby commendations?
A. Yes.
Q. Yes.
A. I suppose commendations seem to be confined to the period from the morning of the 4 th, when the investigation began, as it were, and then it became intertwined with the second crime and the two of them were treated together. I think the investigation went on over about four days. I suppose the work that went into it in that period it seems to have been a determining factor in the decision that was made as to who would be nominated.
80 Q. Just come back to something that you said there a
moment ago when you referred to, that you could understand in relation to Garda Keogh and the place that he was in at that particular time?
A. Yes.

81 Q. Can you understand how he may have felt having seen his name erased, as it were, from having been involved in a major investigation like that?
A. Sitting here now, I can see that, and the entry in his diary absolutely reflects his mindset in that vein.

82 Q. And would you accept that it might have inadvertently fed into the concerns that he had at the time and his perception --
A. I do, I accept that.

83 Q. -- of how he was being dealt with by management?
A. I do.

84 Q. And also the fact that ultimately people in the Garda station were to receive commendations.
A. Yes.

85 Q. That that may also have fueled his concerns.
A. Yes. I can understand that.

86 Q. You can readily accept that?
A. But no one had any motive, you know, in relation to that perception that he had. There was no motive for anyone to do it that way and it seems to have just been 11:02 something that occurred in an inadvertent way.
87 Q. Is there anything else you wish to say in relation to that?
A. No, Chairman.

88 Q. If we could then move on please, this was the lady who got into trouble in the River Shannon on the 22nd September, which is a few weeks later after the last incident.
A. Yes, Chairman.

89 Q. If we look at Garda Keogh's diary entry, it's at page 1330. It's an entry there on the 21st September. It says:
"Pulled I ady al ive out of the Shannon by hai r."

And then there is a note here:
"Sergeant Mbnaghan said he will look for commendations for the unit."
A. Yes.

90 Q. And then he says:
"Doubt l'II get one."

If we could then look at his interview with the Tribunal investigators, at page 91 of the material. And if we scroll down to 1313 , please. He says:
"Sergeant Mbnaghan was the sergeant present at the scene, who later applied for commendations for ever yone. "

Did Sergeant Monaghan apply for commendations?
A. Not as far as I know. No, I have no recollection of 11:04 that, of him ever applying for commendations.
91 Q. "It is my bel i ef that no commendations were granted as I was the one who rescued the lady from the water. But nobody told me that. In my experience a rescue such as
thi s would bring about commendations fromthe Gardaí unusually in this situation. Only Irish Water Safety gave an award."

And then:
"Thi s award was gi ven on 8th November 2016, whi ch was over a year after the inci dent occurred on the 22nd th September. It is my bel ief that the commendation bel at edl y triggered from An Garda Sí ochána for an award 11:05 fromthe Irish Water Safety, coinci des with the issuance of and Garda recei pt of my application to the Personal Injuri es Assessment Board in respect of my ci vil proceedings agai nst the Gardaí."

Now, I think that Garda Keogh, when he was confronted with your letter that you wrote to the chief superintendent and then the letter that you wrote to the Irish Safety Board, accepted that that couldn't be correct.
A. okay.
Q. That allegation was, nevertheless, made against you, isn't that right?
A. Yes, for some time.

93 Q. What impact did that have on you?
A. It was a very damaging allegation, I suppose, you know, against me. I suppose it had gone on for some time and it had an impact obvious7y on my character, my reputation and my career.

94 Q. He then continued on:
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"It is my belief that this was a gui se to counteract the recei pt of the said application as it was difficult for the Gardaí to performa $U$ turn of thei $r$ earlier position not to follow Sergeant Mbnaghan's recommendati on for commendation, hence the unusual of the sole award from the Irish Water Saf ety."

If we can look at the Pulse entry in relation to this incident, it is to be found at page 9211. That entry sets out the location, the scene and then there is a narrative of what occurred. It says:
"Recei ved phone call from Malin Head coast guard that a 11:07 I ady had tel ephoned themstating that she was in the river in Athl one. Garda searched the banks of the river and found a lady swi mming in the river at the strand Athl one. After several attempts, Gardaí removed the I ady fromthe water. Anbul ance was called. The I ady was placed in the ambul ance. Was very agitated. Mydoc was called to sedate the patient. Patient transferred to hospital under Garda escort and the family were notified."

Then it has the Gardaí and Garda Keogh is listed as an assisting garda and we see that Sergeant Monaghan was in fact the supervising member.
A. Yes.

95
A. I do remember, yeah. It would be normal, something like that, for me to maybe write in hand on the incident summary at the PAF 'good work, consider EPW1' or something along those lines. But I remember speaking to Sergeant Monaghan and having a discussion how he would like to deal with it, considering that we had already used the Seiko Irish water Safety awards as a way of commending excellent work of a similar nature a number of months previously.
98 Q. In relation to your discussion with Sergeant Monaghan, not in a formal way, did you in an informal way ask him what happened?
A. Yes, absolutely, and he explained to me what happened as outlined in the incident, yeah.
99 Q. Did you realise that Garda Keogh was to the fore in relation to it, insofar as he was the person who reached out and pulled the lady from the water?
A. I don't think it went into that much detail, but he outlined the team involvement that occurred in relation 11:09 to it, and he was commending I suppose everybody on his team for the way they handled it. He didn't name anyone in particular and he didn't concentrate on Garda Keogh or any other member associated with it, to the
best of my recollection.
Q. time that it might have been, given the circumstances of Garda Keogh, given what we have spoken about earlier on and the position that he then found himself in, that 11:10 this was excellent police work.
A. Yes. commendations --
A. Yes.
A. Well, either that or the Seiko or indeed both, could be options, yes.
A. We11, I suppose the policy in relation to EPW1s indicate that the sergeant is the one who would initiate the commendation by completing the form and
submitting it to me and then I would submit it in turn to the divisional award board.
Q. So you are saying the reason that you didn't recommend a commendation was because Sergeant Monaghan hadn't initiated the process?
A. Whatever would come up to me, I would certainly have endorsed it and forwarded it in that fashion.
Q. So you would have done so had Sergeant Monaghan initiated it?
A. Absolutely, yes.
Q. So the fact that it wasn't done in this instance is down to Sergeant Monaghan not making the recommendation?
A. Well, I suppose he did send in a Seiko form.
Q. Yes.
A. He sent in that form. And that was the way it went then and I suppose, as you said, I did send a report that day to the chief superintendent.
110 Q. We will come to that now. It's at page 9210 of the material, please. This is a letter that you sent to the chief superintendent. Perhaps if we just blank out the -- just move it up, it refers to the type of incident it was, which mightn't be accurate in any event?
A. Yes.

111 Q. You say:
"I refer to the above and wish to draw your attention to the excellent work carried out by the members
i nvol ved I ed by Sergeant Mbnaghan in thi s case, who at 3am in the dark, located a lady in the water and saved her life."

Then you say:
> "The actions of Sergeant Mbnaghan and hi s team warrant mention and I have asked that they notify Irish Water Saf et y so thei $r$ good work is acknow edged. "
A. Yes.

112 Q. Then if we go over at page 2383, this is the letter that you wrote to the Just in Time Seiko Rescue Award?
A. Yes.

113 Q. "Pl ead find at tached compl et ed application formin respect of a Sei ko Just in Ti me Rescue Award. "

And then you refer to the incident and you say -- which is the narrative, more or less, that is on the Pulse entry, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

114 Q. And you point out that:
"Ser geant Der mot Mbnaghan, Garda Ni chol as Keogh, Garda Ci ar an Dempsey, Garda Mary Murphy, Garda Karl Mbore, J oanna Connolly and Garda Reese Gleenon, all of At hl one 11:13 Garda Station, rushed to the I ocation and commenced searching thoroughl $y$ al ong the shorel ine in an effort to locate the di stressed female. Thei $r$ search was severel $y$ hampered by the darkness and the difficult
weat her conditions. They subsequently located the female about 15 feet fromthe bank, swi ming up and down. They spoke at length cajoling her and after several attempts renoved her fromthe water."

I suppose you don't highlight Garda Keogh's role in pulling her from the water there, but you are dealing with them as operating as a team, is that right?
A. I am. And I suppose there was an application form completed by Sergeant Monaghan that went with that and I summarised what was in that.

115 Q. You then go on to say:
"The speed in which the menbers acted, their dedi cation and commitment in such inclement weather conditions ensured a positive outcome to what could possibly have been a tragic inci dent. I hi ghly recommend the nominees to be considered for a Seiko Just in Time bravery award. "

Now, in relation to that, we know that there was a national award ceremony held the following year, on the 8th November and Garda Keogh was invited to receive his award at that, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

116 Q. Garda Keogh, in relation to this, believes that he wasn't nominated for a commendation and none of his unit were nominated for a commendation for good police work and the reason the others weren't was because if
you nominated the others, he'd have had to have been nominated?
A. Yes.

117 Q. Do you understand?
A. I do.

118 Q. He also makes that case in relation to the incident involving the taxi driver?
A. Yes.

Where he makes the case that the other personnel on his unit who had responded to the incident weren't
nominated for a commendation because he ought to have been nominated for a commendation. what do you say in relation to that?
A. I wouldn't agree with that at al1. Those type of considerations were never a factor in this. I think
what led to the Seiko award here was the way that award was used in the past when I nominated a group of members previously. And in the assessment of that situation, Seiko decided to award them Seiko watches. I think that might have been a factor in heading that direction with this one. And I remember having that conversation with Sergeant Monaghan at the time. And there was no other reason for it, other than that. And no slight on Garda Keogh in either incident and those things were under consideration.
The earlier nominations that you made, for an incident again at the River Shannon.
A. Yes.

121 Q. In that instance a number were nominated for the Seiko

Just in Time awards, and they all received it?
A. Yes.
Q. But one of them I think who had been involved in catching a person who had -- or grabbing them by the hoodie, I think it was, who had tried to throw themselves from a bridge.
A. Yes.
Q. He also received a commendation as well the Seiko Just in Time award. I suppose that demonstrates that a commendation, a Garda commendation remains important, 11:17 isn't that right?
A. Absolutely, and there's no issue with that, indeed.
Q. I think we can move on from that. Is there anything else that you wish to say in relation to that?
A. No, Chairman.
Q. I am now just going to deal briefly with an issue concerning an entry that was made by Garda Keogh on the 28th October, in relation to his sighting of, he alleges, Ms. B driving in the vicinity of his home in a car?
A. Yes, Chairman.
Q. This is a matter, and if $I$ can deal with it in short form, if it's possible to deal with it in that way. And we will see if it is possible to deal with it in that way in the first instance. This was a matter that 11:19 was entered on Pulse by Garda Keogh, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. There was a view taken that that wasn't the appropriate way to report an incident of this nature, isn't that
right?
A. Yes. That's an organisational view, Chairman.

128 Q. Yes. But nevertheless, it was an investigation conducted by Gardaí in Tullamore?
A. Tullamore, yes.

129 Q. Garda Keogh nominated a particular time when the incident occurred?
A. Yes.
Q. The matter was investigated. Ms. B refused to make a statement?
A. Yes.

131 Q. But nevertheless told Gardaí that she wasn't in Tullamore at the time?
A. Yes.

132 Q. But declined to make a statement?
A. Yes.

133 Q. And as such didn't cooperate with the Gardaí?
A. Yes.

134 Q. She indicated that her car had been left in on the 28th october for a pre-NCT test?
A. Yes.

135 Q. Enquiries were made with the garage man, he couldn't confirm the date and all he could confirm was that the car had been left in in or around about that time for a pre-NCT test, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman.
Q. So there was no proof available to the Gardaí that her car had been left in for an NCT test on the day in question?

137 Q. As a result of that, no statement was taken from the garage man because it actually established very little?
A. Yes.

138 Q. The CCTV footage was viewed by an investigating member?
A. Yes.

139 Q. He made notes, which demonstrated that the car was seen in Athlone.
A. Yes.

140 Q. Earlier on in the afternoon?
A. Yes.

141 Q. And then was seen later on in the evening?
A. Yes.

142 Q. Once leaving her premises?
A. Yes.

143 Q. And on the second occasion returning to it?
A. Yes.

144 Q. That left a single issue in relation to the matter, as to whether or not the car could have been in Tullamore?
A. Yes.

145 Q. Isn't that right? That CCTV footage didn't exclude the possibility that the car could have been in Tullamore?
A. I suppose it created a situation where the time made it, I suppose, nearly impossible because the time of the incident, around five to six, and the sighting of and locations involved, made it, I suppose, extremely tight time wise to have got --
146 Q. When you say tight, it didn't establish that the
offence couldn't have been committed?
A. No, absolutely not. That required probably more investigation.
147 Q. What it did was, establish in your mind a question mark whether or not the lady in question could have driven the distance that she drove in the time that had been allocated to do that?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

But the timing was such, and I can open this up, and we can go through the actual timing, we can look at the times on the CCTV, and I want to avoid that?
A. Yes.

149 Q. That's why I am dealing with this in a general way. But do you accept that the timings that were recorded in the notebook entry and in the report by the investigating member didn't exclude the possibility that in fact she had left her home and that she had in fact gone to Tullamore and that she had returned to her home?
A. It didn't exclude it completely, Chairman.

150 Q. No. Garda Keogh gave a statement in relation to the matter?
A. He did.

151 Q. Where he made a positive assertion that it was she who he had sighted near his home in her car, isn't that right?
A. I think he was adamant about the car.

152
Q. Yes, sorry, the car.
A. Yes. He said a lady or a person with long hair.

153 Q. Yes. Well, that's very helpful, because if we can move then to your report in relation to this matter, which is at page 8662. Obviously this incident occurred on 28th October 2015, which is shortly after Garda Keogh had been placed on indoor duties. Your report is on the 24th February 2016. If we can go to page 8663 of the material?
"It appears that Garda Keogh's alleged observation regarding the presence of $M$. B around his home nay lack credi bility."
A. Yes.

154 Q. Now, on what basis did you make that assertion?
A. I suppose that was as a result of the information that was supplied to me about the CCTV and the tight timeframe. I was well familiar with the geographical locations that were mentioned here. And in my mind, from knowing the geographical locations and travelling both directions many times, $I$ found it almost impossible that the drive could be done in that time. $\quad 11: 25$ That was in my mind.
155 Q. Well look, I just went through a summary there with you, and you agreed with me?
A. Yes.

156 Q. And I don't really want to have to open up this file if 11:25 I can avoid it?
A. Yes.

157 Q. And looking through the report. But I thought that you had agreed with me that --
A. That it would be possible.
Q. It would be possible?
A. You would have been driving quite fast and possibly reckless.

159 Q. A11 right.
A. Yes.

160 Q. But on that basis, even though this is possible and what Garda Keogh is saying is possible, and Ms. B has declined and refused to make a statement, and there is no other evidence to suggest an alibi for her or otherwise, you have made a statement here that his observations may lack credibility. And you have dismissed his allegations. Now Garda Keogh says that this is evidence of an attitude towards him, do you understand?
A. Yes.

161 Q. What do you say in relation to that?
A. I disagree with that entirely. when this first came to my attention in November of '15, what concerned me was that it could have occurred -- I was aware that Ms. B and her property had been searched on the 9th October and I was concerned that if this happened there was a security issue here and if this lady was targeting Garda Keogh following that search, well that was quite serious. What concerned me there was: what would a superintendent in Tullamore have to do to -- I suppose what measures or what risk assessment would have to occur and would measures have to be put in place in relation to Garda Keogh around his home? And that was
my primary consideration. I remember speaking to superintendent in Tullamore at the time about it, in the hope that we might bottom this out to try and decide it. I suppose the manner in which the incident was put onto Pulse as well didn't give anyone an opportunity to ensure that we get the best possible opportunity to deal with it. And Garda Keogh's first report on the 6th November, he didn't seem to make much of it and put it down to a coincidence.
162 Q. You're saying "his alleged observation of ME. B around the presence of his home may lack credi bility"?
A. Yes.

163 Q. This credibility issue of a member of An Garda Síochána, who has made a statement after the statutory declaration and signed a statement and this is an attack on his credibility?
A. It's not an attack on his credibility, but I am saying it may lack credibility in terms of did he get the right number, could he have been correct in it. And I suppose it would have been important to know why he chose to deal with it in the fashion he did on the evening, considering the longstanding and well known policy in the organisation, that if one is involved personally in an incident like that, like one would have to report it to the local Garda station and not incident if one were a victim and now one is, $I$ suppose, compromised in some way in entering, putting an incident on Pulse, which may give rise or an attack
by anybody to why that was done in that manner.
Q. In the previous paragraph, the last line:
"I understand superintendent Tullamore now intends making the inci dent inval id. "
A. Yes.
Q. If we carry on:
"The manner and circunstances under which the inci dent was created by Garda Keogh vi a GISC requi res
expl anation, in that Garda Keogh, who was of f duty, did not contact Tullamore Garda station at the time of his al leged observation. Neither did he report the matter to anyone ot her than GISC. The creation of an incident by Garda Keogh, whi ch he has intertwi ned with a whi stlebl ower investigation, merits further expl anation by the menber in light of the clear assertion by M. B that her car was at a garage that afternoon and that neither she nor her car were in Tullamore. Therefore, I respectfully suggest that a member of inspector rank 11:30 be tasked with carrying out a fact-finding exercise in rel ation to the creation of the incident by Garda Keogh. "
A. Yes.

166 Q. So now the focus is on Garda keogh and the creation of the incident?
A. No, I wouldn't agree with that. The focus -- my intention was, suggesting to the chief superintendent perhaps someone impartial other than me would make some
assessment on this. I would -- in my eyes at that time I would never be deemed impartial by Garda Keogh. So any assessment I would make of it would only be construed in one way; as a negative toward me and a negative toward Garda Keogh by me. And I wanted someone else to look at this. And I sent over the file with all the papers and the CCTV, suggesting to the chief superintendent that if we could bring it to conclusion, it would be fantastic. And if this lady were there, well then there was a different issue to be 11:31 considered.

167 Q. Is there anything else that you would like to say in relation to that?
A. No, Chairman.

168 Q. If we can just move on then to issue number 12, which 11:31 is complaints by Garda Keogh in relation to the misrecording of his sick leave and reduction of his salary. You might just bear with me as I go through some documentation here. There is quite a lot of it, but I intend to try and deal with only the relevant matters that are there for consideration.

If we just have 1678 up on the screen. This is a note from Superintendent McBrien, dated the 4th March. Scro11 down, please, Mr. Kavanagh. 4th March 2015:
"Duty Athl one. Met with Superintendent Murray."

This is the handover of roles. And then:
"Updated himon di strict and nembers etcetera. Gave hi ma copy of my notes re Garda Ni ck Keogh. Di scussed clains. "

What did those notes relate to?
A. I have no recollection of ever receiving or seeing those notes. When I saw that in the disclosures and when I saw them appearing a number of times, I made an enquiry in Athlone in relation to what notes were handed in and it appears that a set of Superintendent McBrien's notes were found in a drawer in a sealed envelope in the superintendent's office. So, when I met Superintendent McBrien, she didn't give me notes that day, nor did she give me the file in relation to his tax but she left that file for me. I just have no recollection of ever receiving or seeing notes belonging to Superintendent McBrien.
169 Q. Thank you. If we can go to page 14485, please. This is a letter on 19th March 2015, before you met Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.

170 Q. It refers to sick leave from the 2nd March to the 14th March, 12 days. There is a note here:
"Garda Keogh has indi cated that he suffered froma prescribed di sease caused by the nat ure of his work. As a result l have to complete a section of the form"

Is that a reference to work related stress?
A. I got a form called an MC1.
Q. Yes.
A. Garda Keogh had indicated on that -- that he ticked the box in relation to a prescribed disease and I don't think there was any more information on it. And I was required to sign it, and I sent it back, just looking for more information.
Q. If we could have 14486 up on the screen, please. This is the form you're referring to, is that right?
A. Yes.

173 Q. Then, if you look there, you will see:
"Describe i njuries you recei ved. "

You will see:
"Wbrk rel at ed stress."
A. Yes.

174 Q. This is the form you're referring to, is that right?
A. Yes.

175 Q. Then if you look down:
"Prescri bed di sease.

Type of di sease. "

There is the beginning of work related, then the first $s$ and then it's just crossed out because it appears
above?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that the form that you're referring to?
A. Yes.

177 Q. You then go on in the second paragraph:
"Ther ef ore, Garda Keogh should set out what prescribed di sease he is suffering fromthat is caused by the nat ure of his work."

You haven't then referred to it as work related stress. And I wonder, is that a reflection of the view that you had?
A. Absolutely not, I was just dealing with a form that was in front of me. It just arrived in a single sheet. I was required to append my signature to it. And before I sent it anywhere, I just wanted to make sure that it was completed correctly and that I understood what it was about. I don't recall ever receiving the form back.
178 Q. Then if we can deal with the Garda Code, paragraph 11.30. This is at page 7957. If we scroll down the page to 11.30, "recording of absences". You see there:
"All absences from duty, save those occasi oned by rest days, shall be recorded in the appropriate form D5. Separate forms should be used in respect of each nember. The district officer will make arrangements for the completion and filing of the forms. Forms D5
in respect of officers will be compl et ed by the di vi si onal officer and will be sent to the regi onal /branch assi stant commi ssi oner at the end of the l eave year."

And then if we can go to 7962. 11.35, if we scroll down the page, please, Mr. Kavanagh. We see:
"Record of si ckness."

If we look at the last two lines there:
"FormD5 by the district officer in the case of members up to and incl uding the rank of inspector and by di visional officers in the case of of ficers."

This is the obligation that's placed on the district officer, is that correct?
A. Yes.

179 Q. And we see, if we go over to 9306 , we will see that form, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

180 Q. We see on the right-hand side there "work rel at ed stress"?
A. Yes.

181 Q. Work related stress is identified, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

182 Q. If we could then go to 8205. This is HQ Directive 139/10, it's the obligation of local management in
relation to investigations. If we just read this:
"Where menbers report non- effective for duty as a result of an injury on duty or work rel ated stress, a thorough investigation shall be carried out i mmedi at el y 11:38 and the outcome reported to assistant commissioner HRM for the attention of the CMD. The menber concerned shall be advi sed of the empl oyee assi stance service, peer support and any ot her support deemed necessary. Local management shall address the issues causing the menber's stress."

I think that that's the obligation that is put on the district officer, isn't that right?
A. Yes, the district officer has the applications.

183 Q. If we look at page 8206 then, it refers to:
"Meetings on referral to the chi ef medi cal officer."

It says:
"District officer, superintendents will ensure they meet with each nember who is referred to CMD for revi ew and firstly di scuss the reason that the member is being referred to the CMD, is to determine their medi cal
fitness for policing duty. Advi se the member to
forward all rel evant case notes and/or medi cal reports for treating certifying doctors, incl uding specialist report and test results rel evant to his/her current
medi cal condition to the Garda Occupational Heal th Service on or prior to the review date. Menber should be assured that these medical reports will be treated in the strictest medi cal confidence by the CMD, who will consult with the menber's treating certifying doctors. Members should al so be advi sed that if this thei $r$ condition is sufficiently complex, they may be referred to an independent medical adviser by the Occupational Health Service who is expert in the area of thei $r$ compl ai nt and may al so be referred, if necessary, for further tests. The menber's treating certifying doctor will al so be made aware of this by the CMD."

The next obligation:
"Di scuss any ot her non-medical issues whi ch may have a bearing on the member's medical fitness for duty. Medical fitness of the nember shoul d not be di scussed but rather other detriments of fitness such as work performance, coping skills, effort to overcome coping difficulties and rel ationshi p in the working envi ronment, as well as any obstacles of a non- nedi cal nat ure whi ch are interfering with the member's desire or ability to return to work."

We don't have a note of you having discussed any of these issues with Garda Keogh before he went to the see the chief medical officer on the 19th May?
A. I think on the 3rd April, and I think I mentioned it yesterday in evidence, $I$ had a discussion with him about his medical records and the confidentiality of them, in my meeting with him on 3rd April 2015. I had completed the referral form on the day before, on the 2nd, and I went through it, I suppose that's
information that is common to everyone that is referred to the CMO and it's a common request that that be done and I did it on the 3rd April when I met him, having discussed with him that I completed the referral the day before, on the $2 n d$.

184 Q. Did you discuss his performance, his coping skil1s, his effort to overcome coping skills, the difficulties and relationships in the working environment, as well as any obstacles of a non-medical nature which may interfere with the member's desire or ability to return to work?
A. I think I did, and my notes of the 26th March '15 and 3rd Apri1 '15 reflect that.
Q. It then goes on to say:
"It is of the utmost important that the di strict officers/superintendents meet with members in advance of their consultation with the CMD. A summary mend of this meeting with be forwarded to in advance of the medi cal appoi nt ment to the assi stant commi ssi oner HRM "

Did you do that?
A. No. Outside the 3rd April, I didn't.

186 Q. Did you send a memo of that meeting in the chief medical officer?
A. No.

187 Q. Or to the assistant commissioner HRM?
A. No, outside of my report on the $2 n d$ April, I didn't. 11:43 That was the intention of that report; that it would go to the HRM department or the occupational health department.
Q. Then further down:
"Management meetings: Absence management is critical to the well being of members of the organi sation. Local management will take a proactive role in the monitoring of sickness absence, in order to ensure that effective interventions are put in place. Absence will be an item on the agenda for all accountability meetings from district to regi onal level. Absence in excess of 28 continuous days or where a pattern of absence can be identified, will be monitored and actions identified to manage the member back to work. Emphasis will be 11:44 pl aced on the rehabilitative actions required. "

Did you do that?
A. Yeah, at the daily PAF meeting absence was a recurring item on the agenda. I designed a new accountability $\quad$ 11:44 form, which would make all of us in Athlone accountable to the chief superintendent on a fortnightly basis. And we completed that form on a monthly basis for discussion and to show, to demonstrate in an open and
transparent way what was occurring in the district. And absent management was also on that, with a list of the members who were on long-term sick and anybody with short-term sick absences then was captured in a separate numerical type chart.
If we go to page 3644 of the material, please. This is Dr. Oghuvbu. At the top there, section 15, this is in reference to Garda Keogh's statement, but he states?
"It is my understanding that the acceptance and classification of a period of absence as work rel ated stress by Garda absence section is not exclusivel y based on the information provi ded in medical certification submitted by the member. It al so i nvol ved HRPD absence section and local managements ascertai ni ng the work-rel ated factors or stressors being reported by the menber. I understand it is the practice of HRPD absence section to record absences as ordinary illness prior to the work-rel ated ci rcunstances bei ng established."

His understanding is that there's an obligation on local management there in relation to issues surrounding work related stress and its categorisation, is that right?
A. Yes, and I tried to explore those factors, yes.

190 Q. Then if we could go, please, to page 3270. We have already opened this. If we go down to the bottom of the page. This is a letter from you to the chief
superintendent dated the 2nd April. You say:
"As an additional measure, I wi sh to have an appoi nt ment with the chi ef medical officer arranged for Garda Keogh in order that professional nedi cal expertise can advise of other workpl ace supports whi ch may assist the menber."
A. Yes.
"The menber indi cated that he had not attended the CMD previ ously. "

Isn't that right?
A. Yes.

192 Q. And then, on the next page, at 3271, in the second last paragraph you say:
"I believe both the menber and the organi sation would benefit by referring himto the Occupational Health Service at this time."

Then if we could go to page 14500. This is a letter from Alan mulligan, who is the director of Human Resources and people development, to the chief superintendent. You will see there:
"Prior to the member's revi ew, local management shal I meet with the menber and di scuss the following:

The reason the menber is being referred to the CMD is
to determine the member's medical fitness grade for policing duty."

I think you say that that's something you had already addressed?
A. Yes, and that is common to everyone. That generic terminology is common to everyone who is referred to the CMO.
Q. "Advi se the menber to forward all medi cal reports." And that's something that you say that you had already done?
A. Yes.
Q. "Any ot her non- medi cal i ssues."

And that's something you say that you had already done, even though it appears that Mr. Mulligan doesn't appear to have been aware of that when he wrote the letter.
A. It's a very generic type letter, it's in common use, yeah.

195 Q. Yes, indeed. Then if we can go to page 9429. This is again Alan Mulligan writing to the chief superintendent.
"It is noted the above mentioned menber's absence from 20th April 2015 to 25th April 2015 was stress rel ated.

You should now intervi ew this menber in order to establish the source of the menber's stress and if it
is suggested as being work rel ated, a ful l investigation should be carried out.

This branch requires a full report, referral formand medi cal certificates in accordance with Code 11. 34 rel ating to the above menber's absence."

At 9428, Chief Superintendent wheatley refers that to you on the 12th May, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

196 Q. And then, on the 29th May, at 9436, you respond to that, to the chief superintendent. In the first paragraph, four lines down you say:
"Wen I met the menber on the 26th March, I di scussed hi s work absences, incl udi ng the fact that his medi cal certificates were indicating that he was suffering from work rel ated stress. The menber was qui ck to point out that he was a confidential reporter and had certain protections in that role. He indicated the assistant cormissioner Western Regi on was investigating reports and allegations he has made to the confidential reci pient. Outside of di scl osing that the mentber was reticent to di scuss the work rel ated stress he indicates he is suffering from rel ying instead on the protections he has in the confidential reporting l egi slation.

In these circunstances I cannot further expl ore the
situation with the menber. I am aware anecdotally that a full investigation is bei ng carried out into the nember's clai ms of corruption and mal practice. I have no further information in rel ation to that investigation. I understand that the menber is engagi ng with the welfare service via the investigation he is invol ved in. I did not, however, advi se him of its benefit to him"

I am just wondering in relation to that, you obviously clearly regarded your conversation with him on the 26th March as complying with your obligation to thoroughly investigate the matter. Did you advise Garda keogh on the 26th march that what you wanted to discuss with him was necessary in relation to an assessment of his work related stress and was part of an obligation that was placed on you to make an assessment in relation to his claims of work related stress?
A. No, I didn't, I suppose, set it out in maybe clearer position. But I attempted to explore his work related stress or what the causes of it were, and he wasn't inclined to discuss it with me and he made that position clear. I do recall him saying here that that was his position now even, that he didn't want to discuss it with me, because he felt that I was in some way a cause of that stress. And I don't know how that could be, because I was meeting him for the first time and perhaps he had a preconceived notion of me. But when I got that from the chief superintendent, I felt
that perhaps no one had seen my 2nd April report or that it had crossed over in the wrong way, because I had set out the context around which Garda keogh came to be involved in the absences and the work related stress that he was indicating. And it was clear to me, 11:53 anyway, in writing the document and sending it forward that because of the nature of the work related stress and its intertwined connection with the whistleblowing investigation, that it was going to be almost impossible for me to find out what was causing the stress because of that intertwined position. In that, he couldn't tell me anything about it, nor could anybody else. And I felt that getting him to the CMO and having medical expertise assess the situation in as far as stress was concerned, while allowing them to know that its overriding, I suppose, component was the whistleblower investigation he was involved in, was a prudent step on my part. I wanted to hand him over to professional medical expert care.
197 Q. Did you see the conversation that you had on the 26th March with Garda Keogh as relieving you of any further responsibilities to investigate the causes of his stress?
A. I couldn't see how I could do that, because of the constraints that were impeding me from going further and impeding him from giving --
198 Q. Did you raise that issue with the chief superintendent at any time?
A. Yes, the chief superintendent was also well aware of
that issue and we discussed it. And that was an impediment, I suppose, to preventing us delving further into the issue, I felt.
Q.

Did you raise that issue with the HRM?
A. We11, I know the chief superintendent had some communications with them outside of what I had in relation to this issue.
Q. Did you raise the issues with the ó Cualáin investigation?
A. No. I didn't, no. The chief superintendent and I confined our communications with the medical health section in HR department.
Q. We know that you sent on a copy of a report to Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin in relation to the tax issue?
A. Oh that was a different thing.
Q. Yes.
A. That was closing off, I suppose, an enquiry that he was making of me, which led to a -- was a catalyst for an outburst in Dái 1 Éireann.

203 Q. You see, this is an obligation that appears to be imposed on the district officer, with a view to first of al1 identifying what it is that's causing the stress. And that would involve talking to the member. You say that Garda Keogh didn't wish to discuss that
matter with you and declined to do so. But you didn't te11 him the importance of that discussion and the impact that it could potentially have in relation to how he would be paid if he were out sick, do you
A. Yes, I do. And I didn't I suppose go that far in making that as clear as you possibly do here. But my intentions were that when he became -- when he would come under expert medical care and in dealing with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and when the employee assistance service would come on train with him, people who he would be dealing with in a supportive way, who he might listen to and who well knew all those things, and would be well in a position, it being their specialised field, to explain all that to him, that was my train of thought on the whole thing. I just didn't see how $I$ could delve further in the circumstances that were presented to me.
204 Q. If we could just move forward then to page 3205, please. Sorry, we might go back, I beg your pardon, yes, to page 3205. It seems to be an e-mail that was sent, it seems to have been perhaps forwarded to you or a copy of it. No, it's from Mr. McLoughlin to Chief Superintendent Lorraine wheatley. It's dated 4th June 2016.
A. Yes.

205 Q. "Lorraine, was a work rel ated stress i nvesti gation conducted?"

So this matter has arisen again, isn't that right?
A. Yes, this is the head of $H R$ who reports would have gone to a year previous7y.
Q. And over the page, at 3206 , this is an e-mail from

Assistant Commissioner Fanning, again refers to this:
"Lorraine, Garda Keogh reports si ck with work rel at ed stress. Can you confirmif an investigation carried out in accordance with the regul ations into the work rel ated stress and the outcome of it."

Then if we go over to 3207. It's an e-mail from Chief Superintendent Lorraine wheatley to Mr. McLough1in. Then:
"The CMD has deerred Garda Keogh unfit for duty. He was agai $n$ revi ewed by hi $m$ about two weeks ago. I spoke with the CMD s office and his reviewing doctor and he advi sed me that he wants to hold an early conference with me and John Barrett in respect of Garda Keogh bef ore he issues advi ces on his suitability to return to work. I would wel come an unit to di scuss this case with you in the light of your e-mail. I understand that Garda Keogh's recent certificates fromhis own doctor have himcertified unfit due to stress. However, in the light of all the attendant issues in respect of this menber, I would like to di scuss this member's case with you in early course. Perhaps you might be in a position to get an update fromthe CMD s office in respect of this member and we can di scuss on Tuesday."

It would appear that at this stage this issue had been
identified again as being an issue, whether or not an inquiry had been conducted. And if we go over to page 3208, this is from you to Chief Superintendent Lorraine wheatley
"Yes, it's a really funny questioning, considering he's a whi stlebl ower and an investigation into the entire set of allegations he is making, which Garda Keogh may say is causing himstress, was carried out by AC Ó Cual ái $n$. The reason he is prevented by the CMD from working is because of al cohol addiction. Don't know why Tony has copi ed all these peopl e either. M ght be one to sort out on the phone. All very strange. A lack of commication is a maj or stuntbling block here. Don't get me started!"

In relation to that, this is an e-mail where again the work related stress aspect of it --
A. Yes.

207 Q. -- is being to some extent dismissed by you, and you are highlighting the alcohol addiction, isn't that right?
A. No, that's not true at all. In fact, I feel that reinforces the point I made earlier, that people didn't seem to understand that locally it was impossible to delve further into this.

208 Q. Yes.
A. The cause of the stress was quite possibly the involvement in the whistleblower allegation. That was
a11 the medical department or $H R$ should need to know in order to get expert help for Garda Keogh. And they didn't seem to, I suppose, comprehend or want to communicate in any way in relation to overcoming this impediment that they saw, which seemed to involve carrying out an investigation where $I$ felt that was impossible in the circumstances that were presented to me.

There is, in fact, a full response by Chief Superintendent wheatley to the executive director of HRPD. It's at Volume 20, 6169 of the materials. It is dated 8th June 2016. We see there in paragraph two, at line four, she says:
"Efforts have been made locally to establish the source 12:04 of the menber's alleged work rel ated stress. However, the menber is rel uctant to di scuss the matter as he has indi cated that it arises out of matters whi ch he has reported through the confidential reporting mechanism and matters whi ch he does not want to di scuss with management within the di vi si on."

Again, that's referring back and a reliance on your conversation with Garda Keogh the first time that you met him?
A. We11, I think Chief Superintendent wheatley at that stage had met Garda Keogh herself on the 17th May, just before she wrote that report.

210 Q. Then if we turn over the page, 6170, and we go down to
the fourth paragraph:
"Superintendent Murray, Athlone, made the necessary enquiries in order to establish that Garda Keogh's wel fare was being addressed by Detective Superintendent 12:05 Mul cahy, who had been tasked with carrying out an i nvesti gation on behal for Deputy Commissi oner Ó Cual ái n. It was establ i shed that Garda Keogh was in contact with Garda Qui nn of the empl oyee assi stance service and that he was availing of this service. Thi s 12:05 was the extent to whi ch the enqui ry could be made with the investi gation team as all other matters could not be touched upon due to the confidential nat ure of the enqui ries being conducted by the investigation team"

And that's the matter that you alluded to earlier on, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

211 Q. But just reviewing that and coming back to your meeting with Garda Keogh on the 26th March, that was primarily to deal with the issue of the road tax, is that right?
A. We11, I think there were three issues; absence and, following that conversation, a decision to refer to the CMO and the road tax. We11 I think the payment of the monies owed to him was the primary consideration, road tax was an impediment to that, and then there was whatever work supports that I could put in place in Athlone within my limited gift.
212 Q. If we could just move onto the actual referral to the

CMO. It's at page 14488 of the materials, please. It's the referral form, $I$ think that you filled this out, is that right?
A. I did, Chairman.

213 Q. And then:
"Pl ease i ndi cate the reason for referral by ticking the appropriate box."

And you have:
"Frequent short-termsi ckness absence that exceed 12 accuml ated days in a year."

And then:
"Management concerned re ment al heal th of empl oyee."

And then you go and deal with the nature of the work that Garda Keogh was performing and then the attendance record. And then:
"Background detail.

Ot her work rel at ed issues.

Is the member experi encing or reporting to experience difficulty carrying out thei $r$ usual duties? No.

Have efforts been made to resol ve coping difficulties at work, if reported? Yes. See attached report."

What report is that?
A. It's the report dated 2nd April 2015, which accompanied 12:08 this document going to HR department for the СМО.
Q. And that is the report that we have already opened?
A. Yes.
"Is there any reported difficulty rel evant to his or her rel ati onshi p with peer supervisors and those under hi s/her command? Yes. As set out in the report at tached. "

That's the same report, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. That actually merely states that Garda Keogh won't discuss the issue, isn't that so?
A. No, well $I$ suppose it sets a context at the start of the report in relation to his involvement as a confidential reporter. And I felt that setting that context would allow everyone understand where Garda Keogh was. But it didn't seem to give the understanding that I felt it should, when it left me.

217 Q. And then the final box there, we can see:
"Are there any other matters of a non- medi cal nat ure whi ch appears to be interfering with the work performance and enj oyment of work i.e. di sci plinary charges pendi ng, absent wi thout leave, an incompl ete
bullying and harassment file in process, difficulty contacting member etcetera?"

And "yes". And then it says:
"See attached report."
A. Same report.

218 Q. That refers back to the same report?
A. Yes, I was allowing reliance to be placed on the report.
Q. Then at the end of that, if we scroll down, you say, there is a declaration there:
"I can confirmthat I contacted the menber and advi sed the member of this referral to the Garda Occupational Heal th Service and its purpose."

And you signed off on that on the 2nd April, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chairman.
Q. Then if we could go to page 9396 of the material, please. That's an SR1 form. It's dated -- there's a notification date 20/4/2015. We can see there, there is an ordinary illness category and then there is an occupational injury arising from duty category.
A. Sorry, I may have the wrong...

221 Q. Sorry.
CHAN RMAN I can't see it.
222 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Sorry, I beg your pardon. 9328 of the
material, I beg your pardon.
Q. CHA RMAN what did you have to do with this?
A. Nothing.

224 Q. MR. MARR NAN You had nothing. Were you aware -- did you see this at a11?
A. This is a sick report when someone reports sick. No.
Q. No, you didn't?
A. I wouldn't see those.
Q. Yes. You will see that there is a note there on the SR1 " occupational illness arising from duty" and it says " work rel ated stress"?
A. Yes.

227 Q. Yes. Sorry, if we could go back to 9396 of the material that we had up on the screen a moment ago. This is Thursday, the 16th April. It's an e-mail from Mr. Guinan, who is the divisional clerk. He refers to attached correspondence, that I needn't open.
"Certificates in respect of periods of absence fromthe 31st March to the 2nd April are now required to
facilitate payment of the TR remuneration in light of the nember having exceeding 183 days in a four year rolling period."
A. Yes.

228 Q. That's something you became aware of at the time; isn't 12:13 that right?
A. I suppose in my report on the 2nd April, I did outline that 183 days had been reached.

229 Q. Yes.
A. And now this is -- the sickness absence regulations came into being, which I suppose halved the normal allowance for sick pay for everyone in the public sector and this was the first time it was biting for Garda Keogh, to the best of my knowledge. And this document came down to advise him of that. And I remember it, because $I$ had been in contact with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy in relation to a phone call he got from Garda Keogh and inspector, then Detective Sergeant Curley, had made a report to me on the 21st April in relation to a phone call he got from Garda Keogh. And I phoned Garda Keogh that day and recorded it in my diary, but the call wasn't answered. So in order to deliver this to him, I sent it to Tullamore and I had an inspector there give him the document. I think the inspector reported back then at some stage that he had done that. The document went back up along the line.
Q. And in relation to how Garda Keogh was being reported on the SAMS system, you weren't involved in any aspect of that, is that right?
A. I never had occasion to use SAMS until this issue was pointed out to me on 23 rd May 2016. I have no functional role in SAMS. It's a very confidential system, it relates to the recording of absences and I suppose it's primarily owned by the HR department.

231 Q. I think you attended a case conference on 9th December 2015 at the CMO, isn't that right?
A. I did.

232 Q. I think Garda Michael Quinn was also in attendance. And if we could have 3642 up on the screen, please. If we scroll down, about eight lines from the bottom he says:
"My recollection of the proceedi ngs were that each of the main partici pants, the doctor" yourself "Detective Superintendent Mul cahy, all gave our perspective on how we found Garda Keogh when we had dealt with him There was sone di scussi on as to how the member's sick absence 12:16 was bei $n g$ recorded. I took the mai $n$ theme to come from the meeting to be the possi ble consequence for Garda Keogh' s career (and his well being) if he didn't stop drinking and address his addi ction issues by under going a suitable programme."

Do you recall the issue of how his sick absence was being recorded arising at that meeting?
A. No, I did not. AND I received an e-mail from Inspector Downey at HRM at the time, and it bears out the second sentence that you read out there in that e-mail, but not the first. And I made no record of that, nor do I have a recollection of his sick absences being recorded. The first, as far as I'm concerned, that I became aware of that was on 23rd May 2016.
233 Q. Yes. We know that on the 16th May, or we're going to hear that on the 16th May Chief Superintendent Lorraine Wheatley, 16th May 2016, visited Garda Keogh at his home, where he made a complaint in relation to being
recorded on SAMS as being out with the flu and that his pay had been reduced accordingly. We also know, and we will hear from Mr. McLoughlin, who will tell us that on the 20th May he discovered that Garda Keogh was at the time experiencing some difficulties with an alleged misclassification of his sick record. when did you become aware of that yourself?
A. 23rd May 2016, when Chief Superintendent wheatley phoned me.
Q. And what did she say to you at that time?
A. She indicated that she had been in discussions with Chief Superintendent McLoughlin and that Garda Keogh was complaining about the manner in which his absence was being recorded on SAMS. And I remember having my computer open when I was talking to her and I couldn't find the SAMS icon on the computer. I had never used it before. So I went to my district clerk and when I got to her she had already received a phone call from someone in the HR department, directing her to change the manner in which she had been recording the sick absences.
Q. That's Olivia Kelly, is that right?
A. Olivia Kelly, yes.
Q. Now, it appears that Mr. McLoughlin had also sought to address this issue coincidentally on the same day. If we could have 3229 up on the screen, please. If we can just scroll down there, he says:
"I contacted Mb. Cl are Egan of the HR di rectorate and
asked her for her update in respect of Garda Keogh's si ckness management. As a result, on the 23rd May I recei ved by e-nail correspondence from Mb. Egan. Garda Keogh' s absence had been recorded as ordi nary ill ness on the sickness absence management system This had taken place in early December 2015. Garda Keogh was di agnosed as being unfit for duty. I was al so made aware that An Garda Sí ochána's OHD was I i ai sing di rectly with Garda Keogh's treating doctor. Mb. Egan continued as is the procedure in all cases where stress 12:20 is cited as the nature of illness. Garda Keogh's management met with himto di scuss the source of his stress. That management were advised that Garda Keogh di d not wi sh to di scuss such matters as he cl ai med he was under the protection of the rel evant legislation. ME. Egan confirmed in her correspondence to me that her branch was not in recei pt nor were aware of any applicati on for Garda Keogh's si ckness absence to be treated than anything ot her than ordinary ill ness. It was recorded under the Garda management si ck leave regul ati on 2014. Garda Keogh' s accuml at ed si ck I eave in a four-year period was in excess of 183 days and the nember was being paid at the rate of temporary rehabilitation remuner ation. "

It's clear that he became aware of that at that time and then he took some action in relation to it and eventually the issue was rectified, isn't that right?
A. I had no communication with Chief Superintendent

McLoughlin in relation to any aspect of Garda Keogh.
A. What did you mean by that?

239 Q. CHA RMAN This is May '16.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN He had been out of work since the end of December, yes.
A. The investigation in Galway had come to a conclusion and they were, as it were, passing his welfare primarily back to us. document about employee assistance service?
A. A document about his pay.
Q. CHA RMAN I understand.
A. Pay, yes. Chief Superintendent wheatley and the two
inspector and I had met, and Inspector Minnock was appointed to liaise with Garda Keogh and be available to serve these type documents.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MARRI NAN So up until this point in time, as I understand the position to be, Garda Keogh was out sick, he had exceeded the 183 days back in March of 2014-2015
A. '15. March/April 2015, yeah.

You weren't responsible in any way as to how he would be recorded on SAMS?
A. No.
Q. There was an obligation on you to conduct an investigation in relation to the work related stress, because that would have an impact as to how the illness 12:24 would be categorised; is that right?
A. Yes, and there was an obligation on the organisation through me to try and find out what was going on and I did the best I could.
247 Q. That would mean whether or not it could be classified as ordinary illness or classified as an occupational injury, as such, is that right?
A. The investigation alone wouldn't be sufficient, there would have to be, I suppose -- the primary decision in relation to that, to the best of my knowledge, is made between the CMO, the chief medical officer, and the head of $H R$ in An Garda Síochána at executive director 1eve1. And they ultimately sign off on any case where work related stress is to be treated as an injury on
A. Yes.
Q. Both you and Mr. McLough1in sought to deal with the issue; is that right?
A. Yes. I was independent of Mr. McLough1in, yes.
Q. It appears Mr. McLough1in got in there first, but it doesn't matter?
A. Yes.
Q. The matter was addressed?
A. Absolutely.

256 Q. It was then changed to mental health?
A. Yes.
Q. Because there's no category on SAMS that would allow for work related stress. It comes under mental health, isn't that right?
A. Yes. Garda Kelly explained all that to me and furnished add report, you know, indicating what had occurred, and I sent that to the chief superintendent. Q. We know then and we have heard evidence in relation to Garda Keogh's concerns then that arose in relation to the categorisation under mental health. You had no dealings with that whatsoever --
A. No, no.
Q. -- is that right?
A. No.
Q. And we know that later on in relation -- and just for completeness sake, in 1ate September 2016 Mr. McLough1in completely separately of you, Superintendent McLough1in met with Alan Mulligan and John Barrett to discuss the welfare of Garda Keogh and the pay issue and then they sought guidance from the Department of Pub7ic Expenditure and Reform, recommending that he be reinstated to full pay because of the unique circumstances he faced.
A. Yes. I had no knowledge of that until I saw the documents.

261 Q. I suppose that's an acknowledgment that actually these were fairly unique circumstances --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that were being dealt with. I am not entirely sure
that the allegation is there, but just in case it is there, did you do anything to deliberately cause Garda Keogh's illness to be recorded in any form, whether on SAMS or otherwise --
A. No. sent, that you opened there, explaining different aspects of what might have occurred.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MARRI NAN we may have to return to that issue in case there is something that I neglected to introduce.
A. Okay, Chairman.

CHA RMAN I am not understanding that, Mr. Marrinan.
MR. MARRI NAN we may have to return to that in case
there is some matter that I neglected that might be
drawn to my attention. But for the moment we will pass on from that. Do you feel you've said enough in relation to that?
A. Yes, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
A. I had no knowledge of it.

CHA RMAN okay.
by Garda Keogh that the Tribunal's disclosure order was deliberately withheld from him. It's issue number 21 in the issues.
CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. MARR NAN If I could just say at the outset in relation to this, it appears that Garda Keogh was labouring under the misapprehension that the Tribunal order in some way was inviting submissions from people who could potentially come under term of reference ( $p$ ), which we are now examining. I think it is fairly clear 12:31 from the examination of Garda Keogh by Mr. McGuinness that he held that view up until it was pointed out to him that the Tribunal order in fact relates to the earlier modules of the Tribunal?
A. Yes.

267 Q. Isn't that right?
A. Yes.

268 Q. It relates not to submissions but in actual fact it was merely a preservation order --
A. Yes.

269 Q. -- directed to members of An Garda Síochána?
CHAN RMAN Is this an issue, Mr. Kelly?
MR. KELLY: Excuse me just for a moment.
CHA RMAN I'm not sure it is, Mr. Marrinan. I appreciate Mr. Marrinan is raising it for completeness 12:31 sake, but I am not sure that --
MR. KFLLY: I am quite happy that he does that. My view is, I indicated this to Mr. Marrinan and to Mr. McGuinness, that on the face of it it doesn't
appear to be. However, that is not a view that is taken by my instructing solicitor.
CHA RMAN Perfect. Perfect. So I think that Mr. Marrinan should deal with it.

MR. KELLY: Yes.
CHA RMAR And if that changes, Mr. Kelly, you can let us know. But for the moment, yes, Mr. Marrinan. I think that was explored in some detail with Garda Keogh and in fairness to Garda Keogh, I think he was acknowledging what did appear to be in documents. So in essence, Mr. Marrinan, what do you say is the position? I mean the question, I may as well tell you so as everybody knows, the question $I$ have under number 21, is: Was the Disclosures Tribunal's order deliberately withheld from Garda Keogh? A and B, did Superintendent Murray order that to be done? So those are the questions that strike me as being relevant. Did you have something to do with withholding the Disclosures Tribunal's order from Garda Keogh.
A. No, Chairman. I first learned of this when I received a letter that had been sent by Garda Keogh's legal representatives to Assistant Commissioner Fanning. It came down the line to me, we made our enquiries and carried out the research and sent a report back explaining what had occurred. I really had no knowledge. Inspector Minnock outlined fully the delay that had occurred and how that occurred. That report went back and Assistant Commissioner Fanning asked the chief superintendent in Westmeath to reply to the query
generated by Garda Keogh, which was cc'd to the Tribuna1. And the chief superintendent then did so on the 11th June '17, explaining what the position was.
CHA RMAN I am inclined to leave that, Mr. Marrinan, and see if Mr. Kelly's team forms a consensus and he will exercise his judgment on that matter and you can return to it that in re-examination if any issue arises either from Mr. Kelly's cross-examination or from anybody else. So my suggestion is that we can leave the matter with the chief superintendent's declaration that he has just made.

271 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Now, that deals with all the issues with the exception of the issue concerning promotion. You realise that we will be returning to that. But just to give you an opportunity in relation to the allegations that have been levelled against you in relation to what we have gone through in relation to this. A lot of them were made publicly. we're not going to go into them individually at this stage?
A. Yes.

272 Q. A lot of them were made publicly, do you wish just to address the Chairman in relation to how that has impacted on you?
A. Very briefly, Chairman. Thank you for the opportunity. I suppose I came to Ath1one in a very normal sort of way.

273 Q. CHA RMAN Can I help you a tiny bit on this and help everybody a tiny bit on this? Chief superintendent, first of all, we know that the promotion issue we're
leaving as an operate issue.
A. Yes.

274 Q. CHA RMAN Because it seems to fall separately. It does seem to me that some things are obvious, some things can be left to me to work out for myself, and some things can be made the subject of a submission. But before we get to a stage -- now, I understand your position and you are going to say, look here, these things are being said about me and they were wrong?
A. Yes.

275 Q. CHA RMAN Garda Keogh says, yes, these things were said about you, but they're right. So that's what we are here to decide. Mr. Marrinan and chief superintendent, I am inclined to leave aside the impact, because it seems to me that it's a legitimate point for Mr. O'Higgins, now subject to anything else anybody else may say, Mr. O'Higgins and Mr. Murphy may say, look here, (a) these allegations are groundless, (b) they're unfair (c) they were done in an unfair manner, whatever it is, as a legitimate submission to make and no doubt the other side will argue the other way. I am inclined to leave that over, Mr. Marrinan and chief superintendent. But if Mr. O'Higgins wishes to explore that issue with the chief superintendent, I think it's for him to decide that as Chief Superintendent Murray's counsel. I think that it's for him to do it. My own suggestion is it's probably best left to a later point and as a matter of submission, depending on all the evidence we have and so on. Are
you happy with that, Mr. O'Higgins?
MR. ḾCEÁL O H GG NS: Certainly, Chairman. If I may reserve my position on it.
CHAN RMAN Yes, if you want to raise it. But my belief, my thought is that it's probably more

12:37 appropriate if it's sort of briefly dealt with in that context. Mr. Kelly, you don't probably have a lot to say about that but have you anything to say about it? MR. KELLY: I do. I think it's best if the whole of it is left over, rather than address part of it. I think the sensible thing is to take a break, put it over. CHA RMAN I think so, at the end, when we have had more evidence and everything else. We will have a full picture of the evidence with other witnesses having given their views of the matter. So I am not shutting out anything or $I$ am not unmindful of the impact on you and the impact on Garda Keogh and the impact on the various others, I mean I am not forgetting that. Is that the position then, Mr. Marrinan; you've covered pretty well everything?
MR. MARRI NAN Yes.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. We11 now, it's 12:38 and I thought that we could do with a little break, if everybody was happy with that, and you can sort of get yourself ready for cross-examination and we will start that at two o'clock. Okay. Thanks very much.

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

CHA RMAN Good afternoon. Now Mr. Kelly.

CH EF SUPERI NTENDENT PATRI CK MURRAY WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR KELLY, AS FOLLOVS:
Q. MR. KELLY: Good afternoon, chief superintendent. As you probably know, my name is Matthias Kelly and I am asking questions on behalf of Garda Nicholas Keogh.
A. Yes.

277 Q. Can you tell me what is your view of Garda Nicholas Keogh?
A. When I went to Athlone first, I had never met Garda Keogh before. I have no issue with him whatsoever. I had the height of respect for him, as did I with every other member in the station. And I admired, you know, what he had done in relation to reporting wrongdoing and his history in the Garda síochána reflects my admiration for him in that regard.

However, at this point in time I feel that he developed some type of an unhealthy obsession with me that had a big impact on, as I said earlier, my character, my reputation my career prospects.
278 Q. I see. Well, we will perhaps come on to that another time, as to whether you are a victim or not. Did you see him as a drunk?
A. I never met the man before, so I didn't see him as anything.
Q. No, but you have met him now and have you dealt with him; do you see him as a drunk?
A. No, I see that he had a problem with alcohol.
Q. Do you see him as a poor Guard?
A. No, I don't. But I see that the effects of the alcohol has had an impact on his performance, and that's natural.
Q. Do you see him as an inefficient Guard?
A. Again it's the same answer: I suppose his alcohol problems and how that manifested in the workplace caused performance problems for him.
Q. Bearing in mind that the protected disclosure was made on the 8th May 2014, the previous year, when you joined 14:02 Westmeath, Ath1one, what was your view of what you found there, what you encountered?
A. I found, I suppose, a vibrant work force who were very committed. The people in the key roles had great experience, they had served in the area for a bit of time, they knew it we11. And they were receptive, I suppose, to the reforming element of change that $I$ wanted to introduce.

283 Q. How would you describe your management style?
A. I would describe it as open, inclusive, progressive, 14:03 with an emphasis on, I suppose, team-based results, orientated approach. Very much focused on team empowerment and distributed leadership where possible.

284 Q. So have you got a concern for the welfare of the
ordinary gardaí under your command?
A. I have, welfare for all staff. And I have been, I suppose, prominent in welfare issues in Athlone and in other places that $I$ have served, my history reflects that, $I$ fee1.
Q. What I wanted to ask you about was this: Your predecessor, Noreen McBrien, described the role of the superintendent as being, in her first statement, very supportive of members with difficulties, would you agree with that?
A. Yeah, there are some, I suppose, 40 broad roles and responsibilities which the superintendent must fulfil set out in the Garda Code.
286 Q. Does that include being supportive of members with difficulties?
A. Absolutely, yeah.
Q. okay, the answer is yes, okay.
A. Yes.
Q. She also she was asked by the Tribunal investigators what she regarded as her duties towards a person who had made confidential disclosures. We needn't call it up but the reference is volume 21, page 6211, where she said this:
"I was to ensure confidentiality, wel fare and that the guard concer ned was not adversel y treated. "

Do you agree with that?
A. Absolutely.

289 Q. Would you say that that's how you behaved towards Nicholas Keogh?
A. Yes.
Q. I see. Had you ever dealt with anybody who had made a protected disclosure before?
A. No, but I had dealt with quite a few members of An Garda Síochána who had reported wrongdoing, albeit not under this process.
Q. So you had met him before. How long had you known him?
A. I first him in 2010, when he became my boss, when I was transferred to Galway.

297 Q. You have already told the Tribunal that when you went to Athlone in March 2015, you said that you were unaware of the details of what his disclosure was. But at the same time you say -- perhaps you can have a look at this, volume 11, page 3019. Have you found that?
A. Yeah.

298 Q. You were asked there:
"I have been asked when I first became aware of former Assi stant Commi ssi oner Ó Cual ái n's investi gation into the allegations rai sed by Garda Ni chol as Keogh to the confidential reci pi ent and how l became aware of them
A. I wasn't informed of ficially of anything. When I went to Athl one, members of An Garda Sí ochána attached to Gal way di vi si on were arriving to intervi ew garda members there. There was no formal communi cation with me by anybody about what was happeni ng. So intervi ewers just arrived and they had private arrangements made to interview members in Athl one and I wasn't i nvol ved at all. A lot of intervi ews had happened before I got there and I knew nothing about it."

You were also asked: when you became aware of the investigation what, if anything, I was advised in respect of the scope of the investigation and who were the central parties involved or did I make any enquiries in that regard?

And your answer recorded there is:
"My onl y know edge on that came from Detective Superintendent Mulcahy. He was part of the
i nvestigating team So I have set out when I first began to contact himabout my statement."

You also said when you went to Athlone, that's further down the page, line 150:
"I noticed a pal pable air of fear around the whol e pl ace but I learned that it might not have been just fromthis situation."

What was the palpable air of fear? How did it manifest itself?
A. It took me a bit of time to work that out, because I had barriers to breakdown myself, I was new to the area and new to all the people there. But I suppose a number of issues that attracted national controversy I felt had impinged on maybe the confidence of people.
299 Q. What, were people sort of hudd1ing around talking about it or what?
A. They just lacked confidence, I felt, you know, because 14:09 of the issues that had arisen.
300 Q. There was an air of fear, was there?
A. Yeah, well, I suppose fear in the sense of a lack of confidence and, you know, a fear, I suppose, that
people were looking in constantly over their shoulders. And that was sort of the mindset that had developed because of the national controversies that had arisen. I think you described it as being an air of innuendo about it as well in the station?
A. About?
A. Well, no one seemed to know exactly, but people had been interviewed at the stage when I got there, so certain information anecdotally went around in that regard.

of the papers, there are really five significant contacts with him. I will go through those. You had the first meeting on the 26th March?
A. Yes.

306 Q. You then had a meeting on the 3rd April with him?
A. Yes.

307 Q. That was to give him a regulation 10 caution?
A. Yeah, as well as discussing other things.

308 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

309 Q. And then 15th July 2015, when you phoned him about his absence from work?
A. Yes.

310 Q. The fourth one, 30th August 2015, when you served him with papers about the absence without leave charge?
A. Yes.

311 Q. Then on the 22nd October, when you handed him a notice and you assigned him to indoor duties?
A. Yes.

312 Q. That's the extent of your contact with him?
A. Yes.

313 Q. Personally?
A. Personally, yes.

314 Q. Yes. Let's look at that first meeting of the 26th March. If we can turn up the minute of that, volume 8, page 2187. You describe that as a general meeting, is that right?
A. I'm not sure I said that. It was a meeting, I suppose, which I felt was designed to pay the monies owed to him
A. Oh no, I never said that. I couldn't determine what level of stress Garda Keogh had. I have been clear on that. The vagueness in which he -- where the discussion went, I couldn't make any determination about the excuse that he was giving.
320 Q. And in your view, him being in some days and out some days didn't really bear it out?
A. Yeah. Well, the work absences were intermittent. So he was reporting fit for work after periods of being out.

He requested that you contact Superintendent Mulcahy and Superintendent McBrien?
A. Yes.

322 Q. And you said you wouldn't do it, isn't that right?
A. I didn't say I wouldn't do it. I said I wouldn't contact them to obtain anecdotal information. That's a different thing.
323 Q. And did you contact him about what he was saying?
A. No. I had contact with Detective Superintendent mulcahy, as it turned out, and that began on the 1st April.

324 Q. You asked him if he was doing any work?
A. Yes.
Q. You didn't tell him at that meeting that his pay might be reduced because of his sick absences, did you?
A. No.

326 Q. You told him that you were appointing Sergeant Yvonne Martin to support him?
A. Yes.

327 Q. You discussed his travel claims and the fact that his vehicle was taxed as goods?
A. Yes.

328 Q. You told him you had already been onto the tax office?
A. Yes.

329 Q. We know that prior to this, on the 19th March, you had Inspector minnock e-mail the tax office, isn't that right?
A. I asked Inspector minnock, yes.

330 Q. And he did?
A. He did.

331 Q. And you saw the e-mail?
A. Yes.

332 Q. Did you show Nick Keogh the e-mail?
A. I didn't show him the e-mail, but I showed him, I
suppose, the file I had coming back from the tax office.
333 Q. You also told him that you saw the statutory declaration, didn't you?
A. No, I didn't tell him that, no, absolutely not. There was no discussion about a statutory declaration in any shape or form.

334 Q.
There's a dispute about that. The Chairman has already been taken to Nick Keogh's entry on that, which is at 126, where he has a rather account. But we will pass on. Did you know at that time that Garda white had checked Nick Keogh's car?
A. No, I did not.
Q. when did you get to know that?
A. During the course of the disclosures or the information 14:16 that came to me in relation to this case.
Q. And you would agree with Garda white, that's not normal practice, is it; for one guard to be checking another's car tax status on Pulse?
A. I don't know -- I don't know the circumstances in which 14:16 that happened, so it's very difficult for me to comment.

337 Q. Well, I would invite you to look at what Garda white says. Volume 3, page 486 . Have you seen that statement before?
A. Only in the disclosures that came to me as a result of this Tribunal.

338 Q. You see, he says there:
"This would have been done to ensure --"
middle of the page:
"I do recall Superintendent MEBrien asking me to do a $14: 17$ check on the car details of random Garda members whose cl ai ns were in the process. Thi s check would have been done to ensure the vehicle was properly taxed and insured under the dates clai med. I cannot recall if Superintendent McBrien or the finance officer handed me 14:17 the clain ns to be checked or l took themfromthe bundle. I do not recall if Ni ck Keogh's vehi cle was one of those checked. Though Pulse entries supplied would indi cate that it may have been. "
A. Yes.
Q. Up at the top, ten lines down:
"I do not recall specifically checking Ni ck Keogh's vehicle on any occasion. It would not be normal practice for me to check Garda menbers vehicles beyond the occasi onal check where a car may be bl ocking access to front car parking spaces in the Garda station yard."

Do you agree that that would be normal practice?
A. I don't know what Garda white means by that. I don't know what circumstances he is talking about there. It's very difficult for me to comment on his mindset. 340 Q. Yes, but you have been in the Guards a long time?
A. Yeah. Well, $I$ am suggesting to you that it certainly wouldn't be normal practice?
A. Again, all I can say is, it depends on the circumstances. I just don't know the circumstances that Garda white faced.
Q. Right, we will move on. first meeting with Nick Keogh you wanted him out of Athlone?
A. No, that's absolutely untrue.

344 Q. Right. If we look at Volume 1, page 126. This is Nick Keogh's account of his first meeting with you?
A. Yes.

345 Q. You see page 126 ?
A. Yes.

346 Q. The 1ast paragraph:
"He asked meif l would like to take a transfer."

Did you ask him that?
A. Not in the first meeting, no.

347 Q. "I replied no, that I di dn't want a transfer. I had not asked for a transfer. I believed the transfer he was proposing was an attempt to prevent me from observing cl ose- up the patently i nadequate criminal i nvesti gati on into Garda coll usi on with criminals (condoned by management), the non-intervi ewing of witnesses etcetera."

So he is completely wrong about that; no transfers were mentioned in the first meeting, is that right?
A. No, not in the first meeting.

348 Q. Okay. If we look at Nick Keogh's diary entry for the second meeting, the 2nd Apri1 2015?
A. Yes.

349 Q. It's in Volume 47, page 13305. If we move it a little to the right, I think. Right. This is the 3rd April:
"Meeting Mullingar. Met Superintendent Murray re tax. I showed himthe tax disk and recei pt and he then gave a regul ation 10 di sci pline for the same. I said l wrote a report months ago re this, asking was there a problemand poi nted out it should have been dealt with then. "

```
Do you see that?
```

A. Yes.

350
Q. Do you agree with that?
A. No, I can't recall him making protestations in that regard. The tax came up at the first meeting and I showed him what I had got from the tax office and explained to him that this had been left for me and that it had an impact on the claims that were there. That's my recollection of that.
351 Q. Then if we look at Volume 11, page 3127. Do you have volume 11?
A. I do.

352 Q. This is a management case conference?
A. Yes.

353 Q. 9th December 2015?
A. Yes.

354 Q. The chief medical officer is there?
A. Yes.

355 Q. If you look on the right-hand column?
A. Yes.

356 Q. It's recording:
"Local management's observations and actions."

The third paragraph there reads:
"Management suggesting medi umtolong-termsupport to be given for a transfer out of Athl one in view of the events that that transpi red there if it is considered to be beneficial for member's sustai ned well being and effectiveness after he would have come through an
appropriate treat ment programme."
A. Yes.

357 Q. So that's a transfer still alive then?
A. That meeting was with the chief medical officer and I was at pains to try and arrange that for a number of months. All options were discussed there in terms of Garda Keogh's welfare. Everyone there contributed very positively to the meeting, that I remember. The human resource section were there, they were positive about that sort of move. I discussed that in a very open way with Garda Keogh on 3rd April 2015, a number of months before this meeting.
358 Q. Yeah, but this is under the heading "Iocal management's observations"?
A. Yes.
Q. So this suggests that a transfer is coming from local management?
A. No, I wouldn't agree that.
Q. oh!
A. The transfer was a solution, one solution, if it were benefit for his sustained wellbeing after he came through a treatment programme. No transfer would be feasted on Garda keogh by the organisation in my experience without him willingly engaging with that, you know, by application.
361 Q. I am suggesting that this is a suggestion coming from local management?
A. No.

362 Q. And it's recorded here as that meeting as coming from

local management?
A. No. I did not make a specific suggestion at that meeting to have Garda Keogh transferred anywhere. This was discussed in the context of an over all probably solution or way of dealing with the problems that Garda 14:24 Keogh had.
363 Q. Looking at the -- this is volume 9, page 2498. Have you got it?
A. Yes.

364 Q. It's one of your minutes?
A. Yes.
Q. But this was a conversation that you were having which was in advance of that meeting we just looked at with
the CMO. And I am suggesting to you that transfer was very much alive in your mind then?
A. Okay. So, while it's a fact that that meeting with Garda Greene took place before the other one, what I am referring to in asking Garda Greene to pass that on to Garda Keogh is our conversation of the 3rd April.
Q. That's right. I think you told the Chairman earlier, I had written down before going to the meeting.
A. That's -- the first part of it is a list of issues that 14:27 this is your aide memoire or agenda for the meeting?
A. Yes.

372 Q. You have in there: Alcohol, sickness, etcetera, etcetera.
"He needs to engage in treatment. To arrange appointment. Tell himhe has to go in himelf. If not, di sci pline will take over."

The next page, if you look at the middle in the second paragraph:
"If he goes in, transfer to be di scussed."
A. Yes.

373 Q. "If not, continue with di sci pline and jobin jeopardy."
A. Yes.

374 Q. What do you mean by that?
A. That was something that the CMO said. And it's reflected in an e-mail $I$ received later from Inspector Downey from Human Resource Management. So was the view at that time, if he didn't cooperate, he would be disciplined and his job might well be in jeopardy?
A. The CMO was, I suppose, trying to map out what he had in mind in terms of Garda Keogh and treatment and how he had to, I suppose, engage with that treatment in a meaningful way in as far as the organisation was concerned. in terms of sanctions or discipline or his job.
And if he didn't?
A. Well, various options would have to be discussed then

And who would judge whether he engaged in a
A. It certainly wouldn't be me anyway. It would be the organisation. The meeting was hosted by the human resource section and I suppose this was being transferred over to their domain.

378 Q. So I am suggesting that from your time throughout that year, 2015, transfer was on the agenda throughout, isn't that right?
A. No. No, as I said, I had a discussion with Garda Keogh on the 3rd April and that's the position. Nothing would ever happen in that regard without Garda Keogh's full involvement and cooperation.

379 Q. Now let's move on to the discrete issues, as it were. We will start with issue 5 , which is the hyper
supervision. You met, as I have understood your evidence, Sergeant Haran on the 13th March?
A. Yes.

380 Q. At that meeting you asked him if there was any perception of him being on one side, is that right? We 14:30 can call it up, Volume 8, page 2041. So you're raising this issue, you see there, with Sergeant Haran?
A. I'm not arranging anything. It was a discussion that began about something else that Sergeant Haran approached me about.

381 Q. If you just look at your diary entry or the file note you have for that, which is at page 2184. This is your file note for the meeting? 143142
A. Yes.

382 Q.
"Friday, 13th March. Met Sergeant Haran at the request of I nspector Farrell. He brought up Garda Ni chol as Keogh and di scussed the broad outline. He i ndi cat ed. . ."

I take it that 'he' there is Sergeant Haran; is that right
A. Yes.

383 Q. " -- i ndi cated that he was in cont act for Garda Keogh and knew his mind and said he was returning to work et cetera. Sai d he wasn't di rectly invol ved in any of it. Asked hi m' -- is that you asked him?
A. Yes.

384 Q. "Asked himif there was a perception he was on one side
because of his role."
A. Yes.

385 Q. What did you mean by that?
A. So the context of the conversation, after we discussed the issue Sergeant Haran came up with, it turned to Garda Keogh and Sergeant Haran explained to me that he was almost the single point of contact for Garda Keogh at that point. And the position he found himself in with the issue that came about was troubling him. And I got the impression that he wanted to unburden himself from that job and I asked him the question because of the nature of the conversation and the way he was describing, I suppose, the huge support he had given to Garda Keogh for a long number of months, both on the phone day and night at various times. And I suppose his involvement with this new issue, I felt in talking to him, was something that he wanted to, I suppose, step back from it slightly in relation to Garda Keogh, so that he wouldn't be seen to be on one side or the other. And I got the impression that he was nervous of ${ }_{14: 33}$ that.
386 Q. That's what I am interested in; one side or the other?
A. Yes.

387 Q. Was there more than one side in Athlone?
A. Well, when I came in there --

388 Q. What is meant by that?
A. When I came in there, when I came in Garda keogh had made a complaint about Garda A. So there were some supporters of Garda $A$ and then there were supporters of

Garda Keogh. That's the way it was. It wasn't, I suppose, hugely prevalent, but there was an underlying tone there and I think it has been referred to in the evidence here, a particular sergeant had to be asked to desist in making comments, in the nature of that. So the ordinary rank and file, are you saying that they were divided in their support between Nick Keogh and Garda A?
A. Very few people were. Very few.

390 Q.
How many? who were? what does very few mean?
A. Well, I suppose people that may have worked with Garda A may have been, I suppose, you know, supportive of him and people who worked with Garda Keogh may have been supportive of him.
391 Q Garda Lyons?
A. I don't know what his mindset was.
Q. You can't help us on that?
A. No.

393 Q. The sergeants, were they divided?
A. I didn't hear sergeants say anything to me about that, no. No one actually said anything to me about it, it was sort of an anecdotal indication that came in a general way.
394 Q. Inspectors, were they divided?
A. No, they were not. The inspectors were, I suppose, very experienced, had dealt with this before I arrived there and were a very valuable asset to me in making the changes I felt were needed to be made.

395 Q. We then know that the support for Garda Keogh passed
from Sergeant Haran to Yvonne Martin. Did you see Sergeant Haran as just being too supportive of Nick Keogh?
A. Absolutely not. Sergeant Haran is a very honourable and decent man, who I suppose I worked very closely with as I went through my time in Athlone, particularly when he was appointed sergeant in charge. He was unflinching in his support for Garda Keogh and that has always remained the position, as far as I know.
Right. Very shortly after having arrived there, you arrived in March, by the 2nd April you had sent out this letter, which we will find at volume 1, page 187, to the sergeant in charge in Athlone, where you're informing him that -- have you got it?
A. Yes.
Q. You're informing him that you had allocated Sergeant Martin as the liaison person for Garda Keogh, to allow him to discuss any work related issues he may have, with a view to solving any issues that may arise. Now sergeant Martin wasn't known to Garda Keogh, was she?
A. No.
Q. And you record there that both Sergeant Martin and Garda Keogh had been informed of this workplace support?
A. Yes.
Q. Right. You then go on to say:
"Ser geant Mbyl an and in his absence Sergeant Haran will supervi se unit $C$, to whi ch Garda Keogh can attached. " Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. What was the need to say that?
A. That was the arrangement. Like I wanted to, I suppose, allow the people involved understand that this was an extra support, not to interfere with the present arrangements that were there around supervision. That this was just an additional measure to separate -- in my head, to try and separate welfare from work.
Q. This supervision of unit $C$ was because Garda Keogh was attached to it?
A. Oh absolutely not. The supervision for unit $C$ didn't change after I arrived from when before I arrived.
Q. "Both those sergeants should continue to supervise the member in the normal way in rel ation to any work out put 14:38 requi red. "
A. Yes.

404 Q. And so on. You then directed "Sergeant Mbyl an shoul d sit down with Garda Keogh and go through his notebook, Pulse, the DPP and crime files list, and ascertain if he requires hel $p$ with any ongoing cases."

Do you not think that was a bit humiliating?
A. No. This was a private minute to the sergeant
concerned. when someone acknowledges to you that they are in difficulty, just with a case like that, normally from my experience there may be more than one. And the objective of that was to ensure that Garda keogh didn't get into any further difficulties, that nothing would fall through the cracks. That was sort of supporting him, to ensure that nothing was going to cause trouble as he went on through time.
Did you at the first meeting say to him, well, look, what I'm going to do is, I'm also going to get Sergeant 14:39 Moylan to sit down with you to go through your notebook, Pulse, the DPP and crime files?
A. No, I didn't say that to him no.

406 Q. Why not?
A. Because I suppose after our meeting on the 26 th and after considering what he said to me, I felt it may be prudent to make sure that he was okay with everything, so as nothing would fall through the cracks that would cause him problems. That would be normal for me. I was always of a view that to try and prevent things happening was way better than trying to deal with them afterwards, where the circumstances of dealing with them would be way more traumatic for a member than trying to correct them at the start.
407 Q. He was a very experienced guard, wasn't he?
A. He was.

408 Q. And there had been no problem with him before, had there?
A. Not that I know of.

409 Q. And here you were saying to Sergeant Moylan, look, sit down and go through his notebook with him?
A. Yes, but it was in the context of him telling me that he was having difficulty with an harassment case.
410 Q. When Nick Keogh was cross-examined on Day 100, page
$14: 40$ 101, line 20, he denied that he told you that he was in difficulty in a harassment case, rather it was just a difficult case. what he said was:
"J ust for clarification, I never said l was in 14:40 difficulty."

Sorry, this is line 20. It's a transcript and it's Day 100, page 101, line 20.
A. Yes.

411 Q. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

412 Q. Just wait until it comes up on the screen, please. You have just gone past it, Mr. Kavanagh, there. Day 100, it's page 101, line 20. What Nicholas Keogh said:
"J ust for clarification, I never said I was in
difficulty with the harassment case, with that case. I sai d something al ong of lines of it was an awkward case because the person had previ ously made loads of these compl ai nts about the partner and every time withdrew them It wasn't that I needed hel pin it."

He wasn't saying that he needed help, he was just
saying it was a difficult case.
A. Yes. My own indicates that:
"He mentioned an assault, harassment case, he said he was negl ecting.
413 Q. He said he was what?
A. Neglecting.

414 Q. Neglecting?
A. Neglecting.

415 Q. Well he disputes that.
A. Well that's what I recorded and I suppose from looking at the Tribunal documents, it does appear that Sergeant Moylan had some -- did find some harassment case. I couldn't have known at that stage that that were the case, to write this down in my note, unless he said it to me.

416 Q. Just looking at that letter again that you sent out on the 2nd April to the sergeants and directing that Sergeant Moylan would sit down, go through his notebook, Pulse, the DPP and so on. It's at page 187. Did you ever do that in respect of any other guard in the station?
A. I can't recall ever doing it in relation to -- in Athlone. But then, no other guard came to me in the circumstances that Garda Keogh did. But I have had occasion to have sergeants check members, to make sure that they weren't getting into difficulty.
417 Q. Do you see how Nick Keogh can take this meaning your view of him was that he was a useless guard?
A. I can understand now how he may have developed that perception, you know, because things had happened to him prior to my arriving that may have formed a mindset in him that people were against him. But I never found that and I certain7y wasn't against him. You understand it now but it never occurred to you at the time, is that right?
A. No, it didn't. I felt this was a normal way to support someone. It was one of the things that was within my gift to do, to make sure that nothing fell through the cracks that he was dealing with that might cause issues for him.

419 Q. Are you really saying that it never occurred to you at the time that this was just humiliating?
A. No, and I had no intention of doing that. And, indeed, I left a copy of this document in an envelope in the post so that it would go to him in his pigeonhole privately. It reflects our discussion, you know, and what we had discussed on the 26th. I gave him a copy of it in a very open way. It wasn't that I was trying to keep this from him. I didn't see anything wrong with doing this. I felt it was a way to prevent anything further happening.

420 Q. Do you see it as micromanagement?
A. No, I see it as a prudent intervention.

421 Q. This is all in a very short timeframe, because you met for the first time on the 26th March and this is the 2nd April?
A. Yes. Well, this flowed from the conversation on the

26th March.
422 Q. And it wasn't done with anybody else in the station?
A. We11, I hadn't encountered anybody at that stage that had the difficulties Garda Keogh had. As I said during my evidence earlier, I did speak to one female member before that and I had to move her to a different unit to have a more strict supervisory regime, and that was, I think, on the 20th March.
423 Q. Let's move on to issue 6. Chairman, I will take these relatively shortly because Mr. Marrinan has gone through them very thoroughly.

CHA RMAN Indeed. I think that's one of the advantages of doing it this way.
MR. KELLY: Absolutely.
CHA RMAN Don't think there is any conclusion because of brevity. But I do think actually, and I may as well pay a compliment to team, I said it to them privately at lunchtime and I don't mind saying it publicly, that I think their questioning of witnesses in an exploratory fashion is a model of what a Tribunal is doing, as compared with our experience in courts. So they may as well take a bow in that regard, Mr. Kelly, and thank you for giving me the opportunity of mentioning that.
MR. KELLY: Yes. We11, I am not seeking to be obsequious but I've actually said the same myself. CHA RMAN Thank you very much. I am sure they appreciate it coming from you at least as much as they do it coming from me. Thank you very much. MR. KELLY: Motor tax, issue 6. We will look at your statement, Volume 8, page 2042. This is the first meeting on the 6th March -- the 26th March.
A. Yes.

425 Q. You remember we discussed this before.
A. Yes.

426 Q. I put it to you that it was a general meeting?
A. Yes.

427 Q. Your note, the primary objective of the meeting?
A. Yes.

428 Q. Can we clear this up, this was just a general meeting, it covered a whole range of issues?
A. Yes, but $I$ had a file left for me, as I've said previously, by my predecessor and I needed to deal with Garda Keogh's claims. That was the main purpose of the 14:48 meeting.
429 Q. The main purpose?
A. Yes.

430 Q. So:
"The primary objective of the meeting in as far as l was concerned was to di scuss with Garda Keogh the file left for me by my predecessor, Superintendent Noreen MEBrien, rel ating to financial clains Garda Keogh had made in 2014 for travelling expenses invol ving the use 14:48 of his personal jeep to travel to and from Gal way. "
A. Yes.

431 Q. That was the primary objective?
A. Yes.

432 financial code regulations and could not therefore be paid in those circumstances. She made me aware that Garda Keogh had been querying the nonpayment of his claims in writing, but that no one had spoken to him
A. Yes.
Q. After the 9th March but before the 19th March, you had asked that very same Inspector minnock to conduct inquiries about the tax situation --
A. Yes.

437 Q. -- of Nicholas Keogh's vehicles, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

438 Q. That meeting, we know, took place between you and him on the 26th March. What did Noreen McBrien say which had ignited that issue over the Nick Keogh car tax classification? Did she tell you that?
A. She told me that she had been informed by Detective Superintendent Mulcahy that Garda Keogh's private vehicle was not correctly taxed. She felt that his claims for travelling expenses were in breach of
A. She left this file with Inspector Minnock, yes.
Q. Right. So your first day is the 9th March?
A. Yes.
Q. The file by that stage is in the possession of Inspector Minnock?
about the matter.
439 Q. So did you query what this had got to do with Superintendent Mulcahy?
A. I didn't. A11 she said to me was Superintendent Mulcahy had told her about the car, that it wasn't correctly taxed and that was an impediment for her paying the claims because she felt she couldn't allow, I suppose, the State to compound what might be an offence by authorising claims, knowing that tax may not be correct. That was her problem. And I shared her view on that.

440 Q. So at that meeting in any event, the 26th March, you say you spoke about the car tax and you suggested that Nick Keogh should re-tax his vehicle as a private vehicle, pay the arrears and take a regulation 10 caution?
A. Yes.

441 Q. You say he agreed to that?
A. Yes.

442 Q. I am suggesting to you he didn't agree to having a regulation 10 caution at all?
A. We11, as far as I'm concerned he did. And it offered a complete solution, an all encompassing solution to close the matter out.

443 Q. I will just read you this, it's Volume 1, page 126. If $14: 51$ we have it on the screen now.
"I met himfor the first time--"

That is you, Superintendent Pat Murray.
"...for the first time on 26th March 2015, after being called into his office. He advised me that my two seater Land Rover van was taxed as commercial. He said 14:52 there was a problemwith my motor tax. My Land Rover van should be taxed, he clai med, as private or, as he put it, non-goods. He said had been down to the notor taxation of fice looking for decl arations --"

Just pausing there, you dispute that?
A. Yes.

444 Q. "-- about my mot or tax. I thought thi s was very odd. I poi nted out inter alia that the NCT authorities would not process my van as private, it had been tested commercially by the Department of Envi ronment, it had no backseats and was used for police duties and to carry dogs.

He then asked me about my sick leave. I said that I was suffering from work rel ated stress. My stress had to do with ongoing internal investi gation into Garda collusi on into criminal Garda operations from At hl one Garda Station. He sai d that 'you are under no stress' and he repeated this for emphasis. He said that he was 14:53 sending me to the chi ef medical officer if l woul dn't gi ve hi many ot her reason than work rel at ed stress for my sick leave."

Do you recall that?
A. Oh that's not a true reflection of the conversation.
Q. Well, since that is dealing with work related stress, I will come on to it later.
"He then sai d he was placing Sergeant Martin over re. Thi s would be the third sergeant now supervising me. He gave me no reason. "
A. I think the language being used "to pl ace Ser geant Martin over me" that's is not the context in which Sergeant Martin came into the picture.
Q. "He al so oddly asked me who my solicitor was."

Did you?
A. No. And I can't understand this, because I would have no reason to understand why Garda Keogh would even need a solicitor.

447 Q. He had made protected disclosures, hadn't he?
A. From my experience in dealing with members of An Garda Síochána who report wrongdoing, they wouldn't need a solicitor, the organisation would deal with it.

448 Q. Have you a lot of experience in that?
A. Well, I have been involved in different cases around the country where I ended up investigating issues where members have reported wrongdoing.
449 Q. And then he goes on to mention, I take it, a transfer. Garda Keogh's diary entry of that, $I$ think it's Volume 47, page 13304. Just focusing on the car tax. You will see it there, it should be coming up. 13304, and
it's the right-hand side. You see midway down:
"He then said --"

This is the diary entry for Thursday, 26th March 2015.
"He then said, there is a problemwith your car taxed as commercial and you're using it private. I told him I did it the same the tax last three years."
CHAD RMAN "Same way I ast few years."
MR. KELLY: "Same way last few years."

And that he wasn't the only one in the station. Do you remember that?
A. Yes, that's correct.

450 Q. If you would look, because you have agreed with me already that you had had Inspector Minnock get on to the tax office in offaly in advance of this meeting?
A. Yes.

451 Q. Now, the relevant e-mail is at I think page 2200. And
A. Yes.

452 Q. 19th March 2015. This is Aidan Minnock to Tara McGinley at the motor tax office.
"I would be obliged if you could provide me with the taxation di sc for vehicle -- "

It gives the number.
"--particul arly covering the period J une to Decenber 2014.

I understand the vehi cle is taxed as per our records. However, I aminterested in the class of tax - private or commercial. If taxed as a commercial vehicle, I will be looking for a copy of the signed decl aration that the vehi cle is a goods vehi cl e and would appreci ate a scanned copy of sane or otherwi se a copy in the post."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.

453 Q. So he is quite specific what he is looking for?
A. Yes.

454 Q. The statutory declaration?
A. Yes.

455 Q. Tara comes back:
"I have attached some scanned documents for you. One is a motor vehi cle tax renewal formthat was processed on 20th October 2014. The next document shows details on the vehicle and tax hi story.

Thi s is a goods van taxed as own goods but we have no decl aration attached to our formunfortunatel $y$."

What were you looking for the statutory declaration
for?
A. I didn't look for it at al1. I merely asked Inspector Minnock to establish with the tax office what the position was in relation to Garda Keogh's tax, whether it was goods or private.

456 Q. So Inspector Minnock is making this request at your request, your direction?
A. That's all I asked Inspector Minnock to do.

457 Q. He is quite specific that he wants a statutory declaration?
A. Yes, but I didn't mention declaration to him.

458 Q. Why would you need a statutory declaration?
A. I didn't look for it, I didn't need it.
Q. We11, I am suggesting that in all probability you did and you were looking for it and you were hoping, no doubt, that it would show that he had signed it as a goods vehicle?
A. No.
Q. And you would have him for a false statutory declaration?
A. No, I don't agree with that. Indeed, if that were my mindset, the form that came back contained a declaration that would have allowed me to do that, and I didn't even consider that.

461 Q. What form was that?
A. The form RF100B, on page 2201. Garda Keogh makes a declaration at the very bottom of that. So I never intended treating Garda Keogh as a suspect in relation to any offence.
Q. Do you not think it is specifically seeking a statutory declaration, whether you asked for it or not?
A. I didn't ask for it, so, you know, it's very hard for me no comment on what Inspector Minnock's mindset was when did he that. But look, it gave us a complete picture in any event and that was good when it came to dealing with Garda Keogh because, in fairness to him, he readily admitted that he had been doing this for a number of years and he admitted the circumstances in which it came about, in an nocuous way, that he bought that jeep in that fashion and kept renewing the tax. That's what the file reflected as well.
Q. So this at this stage was an investigation into the tax status of Garda Keogh's vehicle?
A. A11 I wanted to do was establish the facts before I spoke to Garda Keogh, so I would have accurate and factual information to present to him if there was an issue.
Q. Would it not have been unusual for a superintendent and inspector to be conducting this fact-finding exercise?
A. The file was left for me. Superintendent McBrien had dealt with it in a very confidential fashion. I think before she gave it to Inspector Minnock, he didn't even know about it. I dealt with it in that same confidential fashion.
Now you say that you had this, we have been through this first meeting you had. Then on the 3rd April you say Nick Keogh approached you to show you his corrected car tax, is that right?
A. Yes.

466 Q. And you copied his documents?
A. Yes.

467 Q. Why did you do that?
A. Because I had a file which contained financial claims and they were going for quite some time, they had been there for quite some time. Those claims were subject to audit and when they would be paid it would become apparent that a time lapse had occurred. Someone may well query that. The finance officer was dealing with that. So, for completeness, I photocopied the documents he gave me to prove that he had corrected his tax and I attached them to the complete file and I sent it to the finance officer then with a minute on the front of it, to pay them, that $I$ had approved it.

468 Q. You gave him then the regulation 10 caution, didn't you?
A. Yes.

469 Q. Why was it necessary to give him any caution at all?
A. Because that, for me, was something that formed part of 15:02 the solution to this, to close it off completely, in a way that would never allow it to be unearthed or come against Garda Keogh again.

470 Q. And how would it come against Garda Keogh again?
A. Because no one could ever raise this as a disciplinary issue with him ever again.

471 Q. Why would they, if it had been sorted out --
A. I don't know.

472 Q. -- and you as a superintendent had attended to it. why
would somebody come raking over it in the future?
A. I have no idea.

473 Q. There was no idea for you to do it at all, was there?
A. It's normal for me to use regulation 10 to deal with what I consider minor issues, to mark that and to give advice and to allow someone understand that there is, I suppose, an impact from, you know, adverse behaviour in terms of how it impacts on the workplace and the values of the organisation and your role as someone who reports on the law and the values that you have to uphold in doing that.
. That's not true, entirely true, because the circumstances of that were as a result of a general allegation Garda Keogh made to me without being specific. And I discussed that with my inspectors and decided to deal with that in a certain way, leaving the sergeants to, I suppose, deal with whatever issues might come out of that, if any, and I didn't expect many. And that's the way it occurred. And I left it to Sergeant Moylan to deal with that when it happened. I never in any way wanted to expose Garda Keogh as the source of information for that and I never discussed it 15:04 with anyone other than Inspector Minnock and Inspector Farre11.
Q. I will put this and then we will move on: If Garda Madden's car tax affairs weren't in order, why, in the
interests of consistency, didn't you ensure that he too got a regulation 10 discipline?
A. When I left that to Sergeant Moylan, he had the same unfettered discretion under regulation 10 of the disciplinary regulations that $I$ had. I understand that 15:04 that Garda member's -- his case was slightly different, in that he had a part-time employment, where he felt that this type of tax might be applicable to him. So I can only -- I can't speak for Sergeant Moylan, but I can only consider that he may have taken that into account in his, I suppose, decision as to how to deal with it to a conclusion.

476 Q. In your note of the meeting that we're looking at, the 3rd April 2015, which is at page 2194, where you said that Nick Keogh ended the meeting in this way, by thank 15:05 you. "He thanked me leavi ng"?
A. Yes.

477 Q. So he was very thankful for all of this, was he?
A. That was a very open conversation after we dealt with the tax issue and we went into a lot of issues, you know, about Garda Keogh and his work and how we could help him and what we might do for him. And he seemed very happy when he was leaving, to me.
478 Q. Really?
A. Yeah.

479 Q. "He said earlier he realised the tax issue was left for me but felt others were getting at him

I put the ot her side of the argument to him"

What other side of the argument and what did you put to him?
A. As I've just explained, his claims couldn't be paid while this issue remained outstanding, it was inhibiting payment of the claims. There wasn't any sinister in it, it was a simple issue that had been alerted, had been left for me and we were dealing with it to conclusion now, and I was paying his claims.
480 Q.
So this man who had done all of this, thanked you, this is after you had reminded that him Sergeant Moylan and Sergeant Haran would be supervising his work?
A. That was very normal, discuss any case difficulties with him, yes, I was giving him advice, don't get any difficulty with cases, keep things moving along, keep the paperwork right, you know, because they're the issues that cause problems.
481 Q. We know that after this, you had sent out on the 22nd April that year, that letter, giving people in effect three months to -- it's page 184. Giving two months to get their stuff sorted in occasions of not having any valid tax, no valid insurance, no valid NCT test. It's page 184. No valid Driving Licences. Do you expect there would be many guards going about with no Driving Licences?
A. I didn't expect any.

482 Q. So why did you put it in?
A. Because I didn't know what Garda Keogh was saying to me and I couldn't take a chance, I couldn't unhear what he
had said.
483 Q. And you gave them two months effectively to sort it out?
A. I didn't give anyone two months to sort anything out. I asked that this would happen and be dealt with and dealt with in the manner that's outlined in the document. And I did that after careful consideration and consultation with my two inspectors. And I felt it was a very prudent way to handle the general allegation Garda Keogh had made, considering that everyone of the 100 or so staff was entitled to the presumption of innocence.
484 Q. This letter goes on the 22nd April and you are giving them:
"In order to allay any fears that exist, l wish to advi se that all menbers commencing 1st June 2015 I will have the necessary checks carried out as follows."

Is that not a two-month gap?
A. Absolutely. But this was a voluntary, I suppose, situation, where people were being asked to voluntarily present their vehicles and Driving Licence for inspection, in a voluntary way. There was no insinuation on my part, nor could $I$, in the absence of car, other than to ask them to present in a voluntary way. And not one person in the entire district complained about the manner in which this was done.

485 Q
Q. What I am not getting is this: Look, this is the 22 nd April, you've listed the four things, you say you would expect all your vehicles to be in order, why was it necessary to wait two months? It's a two month amnesty, isn't it?
A. It was going to take that much time to make the checks, to allow people to present. People wouldn't be all there on a certain day, different units and different shifts, and it was going to take the supervisors, you know, a bit of time to gather the information and make the checks and then certify to me. And I do understand that, you know, along with every other member, that Garda Keogh was also certified correct in this process.
Q. Did you have any legal basis for saying, well, look, as of the 26th April I expect you all by the 1st June to have your vehicles taxed, NCT'd and all the rest of it? Was there any legal basis for that?
A. Absolutely not, this was just a voluntary check on members' vehicles. If anyone had refused, well then there was very little I could do other than to perhaps arrange for them to be stopped in public place and check them in a formal manner like that. But there was no opposition to this and everyone very readily agreed to present their documents.
487 Q. How many people are we talking about here?
A. Oh, there were about 100 staff or so in the district I think at that time and maybe 75 members of An Garda Síochána or thereabouts, but $I$ can't be exactly specific.
A. I suppose people had to be asked and maybe their vehicles had to be inspected as well. You know, supervisors did that, presented -- some of them presented photocopies, others presented lists with details on it and some just certified. So I was happy to leave it to the supervisors and I have full
confidence in them and I have full confidence in their ethical ability to ensure that, you know, any member found wanting would be dealt with.
Q. This wasn't an afterthought to just cover up targeting earlier of Nick Keogh, was it?
A. Oh absolutely not. This came about as a result of what Garda Keogh told me and I couldn't unhear it. So just to recap. By the 26th March you had had your meeting with Nick Keogh. By the 3rd April you had disciplined him, you had raised the question of a transfer, you had directed three sergeants to oversee him and you had questioned the true reason for his sick leave. Was this not just targeting?
A. No. I utterly reject that.
Q. Sorry about that.

CHAN RMAN That's all right.
494 Q. MR. KELLY: I had no idea paper could make such noise.
I move on to another issue. This will probably take us up to the break, I think. Issue 7, absence without 1eave. This really deals with Sergeant Moylan's e-mail, which I think you produce at volume 8, page 2218. It's an e-mail from Cormac Moylan on the 14th July at 3:15 in the morning to Athlone. It is then forwarded to you by Olivia, is that Olivia Kelly?
A. Yes. Garda Kelly, she's the district clerk.

495 Q. At 9:05 the same morning. You then say that you phoned Nick Keogh on the 15th July, is that right?
A. Yes.

496 Q. And during the course of that phone call you discussed his drinking, his absence and not answering the phone to the sergeant that called; is that right?
A. Sorry, I didn't hear you properly.

497 Q. You discussed his drinking?
A. Yes.

498 Q. His absence from work?
A. Yes.

499 Q. His not answering his phone when called by the sergeant?
A. Yes.

500 Q. That's on page 2220?
A. Yes, I asked him why he didn't answer the sergeant.

501 Q. Yes. And you also asked him why he didn't return the call?
A. Yes. Well, he said he had no credit and put forward that argument, yes.
502 Q. of course, you would accept, wouldn't you, that if he had no credit he can't return a missed call?
A. Yes. But the point I was making, that it wouldn't allow you not accept a call.

But if you, for example, weren't in the same room as the phone, you weren't able to take the call?
A. Oh absolutely.

504 Q. So there is more than one -- it's a two-way street, isn't it?
A. Sorry, I don't understand the point you're making.
Q. There's not just one absolute view is there? The sergeant phoned Nick Keogh?
A. Yes.

506 Q. Nick Keogh didn't answer, you say that that's a criticism, he could have answered whether he had credit or not. That's right, isn't it?
A. Yeah. We11, yeah, the way he put it to me was, he didn't take the call because he had no credit and I said but sure, credit is not required to answer a call.

507 Q. Yeah. But you accept that credit -- I am suggesting to you that it was a missed call and what he was saying to you was he had no credit to return it?
A. Yes. Oh yes, absolutely.

Hence why he contacted him on Facebook?
A. Absolutely. My point was credit is not required to answer it so...

509 Q. So what's the big deal? what is the point?
A. I didn't make any deal about it. I just merely recorded what the conversation was but there is no deal. an absence from work?
A. This had been escalated to me by Sergeant Moylan and I felt it prudent, knowing Garda Keogh's history, to phone him to see where he was.
511 Q. Were you calling him to simply show that the matter was now with you, it was escalated and that was where it was going to say?
A. No, I was not.

512 Q. Would it not have been better to have got the sergeant to call him?
A. The sergeant had e-mailed me to say he had tried to call him. And that's what $I$ knew at the time when $I$ made the call.

513 Q. Yeah. But it was open to you to say to the sergeant, we11, look, try and give him a bell now?
A. Yes, but the sergeant sent me an e-mail in the middle of the night, I got to the next day and I phoned Garda Keogh the following day.

514 Q. Yes.
A. I felt the sergeant had escalated it to me and I was going to ring Garda Keogh to see where he was.
515 Q. So it didn't occur to you to get on to --
A. No.

516 Q. -- Cormac Moylan and say, well look, Cormac, could you give him a call now, it will look a bit heavy handed if

I'm calling him?
A. In hindsight and knowing this is the way -- the way this has turned out, that would have been a wise move on my part, but unfortunately $I$ felt he had escalated it to me, I felt it was my role then to make that call. 15:17 517 Q. What about letting the inspector do it, Inspector Minnock?
A. There would be no difficulty with that, but I got the e-mail and I made the cal1. I had spoken to Garda Keogh on the 26th March and the 3rd April, and I tried to contact him, I think, on the 21st April as well. There was no reason particularly why I did it other than I got the e-mail and I responded to that myself.
518 Q. Was it not just to show Nick Keogh -- to exert your authority over him?
A. No, absolutely not.

519 Q. This was man who was giving you a lot of problems, you wanted to show him who was boss?
A. There were no problems at that stage.

520 Q. You then spoke with him on the 14th July, it's at page 2220 , it's the one which is up on the screen. You phrase it in this way:
"Chal I enged hi m why he di dn't answer the ser geant trying to cont act hi mover absence wi thout leave weekend. "
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Sorry, this is the 15th, Mr. Kelly, isn't it?

MR. KELLY: The 14th.
CHA RMAN It says the 14th.
MR. KELLY: yes.
CHA RMAN But we know now it's the 15th.
MR. KELLY: You're absolutely right.
CHA RMAN Everybody is agreed -- okay, thank you.
MR. KELLY: It's the 15th. "Chal lenged hi m why he di dn't answer the sergeant trying to contact him"

What do you mean by challenged? what did you actually say to him?
A. My recollection is that I said, well why didn't you answer the sergeant's call?
522 Q. And you say his response was he had no credit?
A. Yes.

523 Q. But he told you he tried to contact him by Facebook?
A. He did tell me that, yes.

524 Q. well, isn't that saying to you, look, I wasn't ignoring him, I tried to get back to him on Facebook?
A. Yeah, I think the e-mail I had said calls, that the sergeant had tried to call him. I undertook it from the e-mail that he had tried a few times to call him. Do you recall Nick Keogh saying that he had tried to contact him on Facebook?
A. He did, he left some message on Facebook for Sergeant Moylan, yes, absolutely.
526 Q. where do I find that in this note?
A. No, that's not in the note.

527 Q. why is that?
A. I don't know, I didn't write it down, but he did say that, yeah. You were making absolutely no attempt, were you, at all to show any empathy with Garda Keogh?
A. Absolutely, I was. And look, I tried my best to ensure that he was passed to medical professionals, to work with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy to have welfare
in the background and to do whatever I could locally to support him in the workplace, which was limited.
533 Q. That note we've just looked, at page 2220, your note of the meeting on the 15th July.
A. Yes.

You see, you recall that Nick Keogh's account of the first meeting you had with him was that you had said to him, you're under no stress at all, and that's page 126 , it's not necessary to call it up.
A. Yes.
Q. You recall it, yes?
A. Yes.

537 Q. That's something you dispute?
A. Yes.
Q. But you also then in another meeting record a degree of scepticism about it?
A. No, the scepticism was about the excuse, not the stress.
539 Q. So I am putting to you that you never really accepted he was under work related stress at all?
A. I did. And on the 2 nd April I sent a report through the chief superintendent for the Human Resources department and the occupational health department, indicating work related stress.
540 Q. You see, this was the very first meeting, Nick Keogh's
recollection of it:
"He said, you're under no stress, and he repeated this for emphasis"
A. No, I did not say that.

15:23
So you would reject any suggestion that right from the start there was a degree of hostility by you?
A. Absolutely no hostility by me. I had never met Garda Keogh before.
542 Q. And you had asked him if he was doing any work at all?
A. That came up during the course of the conversation, was he doing any work.
543 Q. Yes. I put it to you fair and square, it was your view at that time that Nick Keogh was just a troublesome drunk and he was under no stress at all?
A. No, that's not true.

544 Q. You have been through your own diary, as I have, is there any mention at all of concern for Nick Keogh's welfare?
A. I don't know. Like, did I write down my thoughts?

545 Q. Yes.
A. No. The diaries are all more or less factually based.

546 Q. Or did you ever write down, well, I asked Nick how he was getting on and understood why he was under stress and pressure?
A. Yeah, I asked him about his welfare. I have a recollection of one of the notes saying that, I don't know if it's the 30th August or the 22nd October, but I have a recollection of it being in one of them.

I will return to that, but just whilst we are on the topic, if we look at page 3208. This is an e-mail exchange of 4th June 2016 with Lorraine wheatley. You will see it there. You say:
"Yes, it's a really funny question consi dering he is a whi stlebl ower and an i nvesti gation into the entire set of allegations he is making whi ch Garda Keogh says is causing hi mstress -- "
A. Yes.

548 Q. "-- was carried out by DC Ó Cual ái n. The reason he is prevented by the CMD from working is because of al cohol addi ction. "
A. Yes.

549 Q. That was your view, wasn't it?
A. My view was framed by correspondence I received on the 22nd January 2016, emanating from the chief medical officer, which indicated that he was off work because, as he described it, a long standing clinical condition. And I understood that, from my meeting with the CMO on the 9th December, to be alcohol related.
Q. "Don't know why Tony has copi ed in all those people ei ther."
A. Yes.

551 Q. What do you mean by that?
A. I don't know why, Chief Superintendent McLoughlin making the query of Chief Superintendent wheatley, decided to copy in other people into the e-mail.

552 Q. Just look at that first sentence again, have a look at
it:
"A really funny question consi dering he is a whi stlebl ower."

What do you mean by that?
A. I mean, this was a question generated by Chief Superintendent McLough1in in relation to an investigation for stress, which both I and Chief Superintendent wheatley felt that we had dealt with back on 20th May 2015. What you are trying to convey to the organisation, in a very clear way, was that we couldn't start or begin an investigation, in the circumstances that presented themselves, about Garda Keogh. And that's what I am referring to there.
553 Q. What's funny about it?
A. The question was funny considering that we had already explained our position, as it were, almost a year previously.
554 Q. Why are you bringing up this issue of he's a whistleblower, considering he is a whistleblower? This is at a time when Ms. McLough1in is trying to sort out the mess that occurred over the rate of pay, where he wasn't getting anything like the rate of pay he was entitled to?
A. Yes, this was in June 2016.

555 Q. Yes.
A. I suppose, like, at that stage Garda Keogh had been seen by the CMO, we'd had a case conference about him,
we had notified the human resource department that we weren't able to embark on any investigation and that it was bound up in the confidential reporter situation and we were also -- I was also at pains to set out the context of all that in the file $I$ sent up so as that -- ${ }_{\text {15:28 }}$ 556 Q. What difference does it make whether he's a whistleblower or not?
MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Chairman, I wonder could I make an observation.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. ḾCHEÁL OHGGN: The last two questions appear to have been put on a certain premise, which, I respectfully say, appears to be based upon an incomplete read of the e-mail. In other words, is the question is being asked having regard to that portion of the e-mail, where it says "consi dering he is a whi stlebl ower", because we can see from the document in front of us what it says, it's:
"Consi dering he is a whi stlebl ower and an investigation 15:28 into the entire set of allegations he is making, which Garda Keogh may say is causing hi mstress."

So it's based upon two planks, not one. And I think that gives artificially and an unfairness to the way the questions are being put.
MR. KELLY: I'm entitled to -- I originally referred you to this because we were speaking about a suggestion I put to you that your view was that Garda Keogh's real
problem was just alcohol addiction.
CHA RMAN Yes, I don't think the question is
illegitimate or improper, Mr. O'Higgins. It seems to me that you can perfectly reasonably revert to the matter in examination of your client in due course. So, if Mr. Kelly picks one which of it to emphasise, so be it, you can draw attention to the other bit. But I don't think his questions amount to an invalid or a factually unbased thing. The e-mail speaks for itself. we can see that.
MR. MCHÉL O H GG NS: May it please you, chairman. CHAN RMN okay. So I don't propose to rule out. MR. KELLY: So right from your very first meeting, one of the points you are making is, Nick Keogh's alcohol addiction, yeah? so here we are in 2016, you're saying 15:30 in the e-mail "The reason he is prevented by the CMD from working is because of al cohol addiction." so that's still around over a year later?
A. Yes.

558 Q. That was your real view, wasn't it, that he was just a drunk?
A. No, absolutely not. He had a problem with alcohol. That's a fact. It was a clinical condition as described by the CMO and it was long standing.
559 Q. Just whilst I have this open, I will just ask it.
"Don't know why Tony has copi ed in all these people either. M ght be one to sort out on the phone."

What do you mean by that?
A. I meant that Chief Superintendent wheatley -- I think that was the second or third e-mail she had received and it was causing her concern and she forwarded it to me. I was saying to her, maybe pick up the phone and see what does he really mean by this or does he not understand what we have tried to do already.
560 Q. What, was it to have a conversation that wouldn't be suitable for e-mail or what?
A. No, absolutely not.

561 Q. Why would you want to sort it out on the phone?
A. The issue in relation to the efforts we had made and what was troubling Chief Superintendent McLough1in was an investigation into the causes of work related stress.
Q. So there was nothing more sinister than that?
A. Absolutely not.

563 Q. "All very strange"?
A. Yes.

564 Q. And then you say:
"A lack of communi cations is a maj or stumbling bl ock. Don't get me started! "
A. Yes.

565 Q. What did you mean by "Don't get me started."?
A. Because Chief Superintendent McLough1in and I had felt we had made exhaustive efforts to try and have Garda Keogh taken care of by the medical experts that within the Garda organisation. And we seemed to be getting
mixed messages, you know, and it's as if they didn't seem to understand what we were trying to do. That's what I meant by that.
566 Q.
Did you mean, look, I am just fed up with this man, don't get me started on him?
A. No. He had been out of the workplace for a number of months then and I hadn't seen him.

567 Q. On this one, if we look at the next page, it's 2221. This is a report of 4 th August 2015, sent by you, I think, to Lorraine wheatley; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. You're setting out there -- you go through it and you say at point 6:
"In order to create a defence to an imossible breach
of discipline, the member submitted a retrospective medi cal certificate dated 16th July 2015."
A. Yes.
Q. "This 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 leave on the $15 \mathrm{th} \mathrm{Jul} y$ for a second time."
A. Yes.
Q. A very cynical view on your part, isn't there?
A. Not in my view.

571 Q. In order to create a defence to any possible charge. You wouldn't agree with my description that that's cynical?
A. No, I wouldn't.

572

Well, you would normally get a medical certificate after you have been ill, wouldn't you?
A. When you go to the doctor.
Q. Yes. So what did you mean by this?
A. I meant the retrospective aspect of it, in that it was covering dates which seemed to predate the date of examination.
Q. So what, the doctor was doing something bent, was he?
A. I didn't say anything about the doctor. I merely pointed out the fact to the chief superintendent.
577 Q. I just don't follow that. You're saying, look, this is 15:34 an attempt, he knows that there going to be discipline coming and this is an attempt for him to put up some sort of a defence, giving himself a bit of cover?
A. You know, to take that in consideration with the report he had already submitted, that he was trying to explain 15:35 it as a mistake.
Q. But you say that's not a cynical view on your part?
A. No, absolutely not.

Right. So this led to this event, this absence without leave led to two charges against Nick Keogh, isn't that 15:35 right? Neglect of duty and discreditable conduct?
A. Superintendent Alan Murray was appointed to carry out an independent and impartial inquiry by the chief superintendent under the discipline regulations.

580 Q. That's right.
A. I had no involvement in that.

581 Q. So you then go and serve the regulation 12 charges on Nick Keogh on Sunday, the 13th August?
A. Yes.

582 Q. At nine o'clock in the evening?
A. At the request of Superintendent Murray, yes.
Q. And we know that Nick Keogh at the hearing admitted charge number 1 and denied, he was not guilty, to charge number 2 ?
A. Yes.

584 Q. Superintendent Alan Murray recorded his explanation in writing for the penalty imposed, didn't he?
A. I'm sure he did.

585 Q. Well, we might as well look at it. I think you will 15:36 find it in volume 7, 1776. Have you got it?
A. Yes.

586 Q. In the middle or just over half way down the page, the paragraph begins:
"I recorded in writing the expl anation offered by Garda Keogh and this was si gned by Garda Keogh. In expl anati on Garda Keogh stated that he had been under work rel ated stress and had been drinking heavily. He forgot that he had contacted Ser geant MECormac to report fit for duty. Garda Keogh stated that he had admitted his mistake to Superintendent Pat Murray and why he had made it. Garda Keogh indi cated that he di d not understand breach 2 and in expl anation said doctor

Bartlett was his doctor and was familiar with his medical history. Garda Keogh had to go to his doctor on that date and his doctor issued the certificate. On termination of the interview, $I$, as deciding officer, found that Garda Keogh was in breach in respect of breach number 1 and not in breach in respect of breach number 2."
Do you see that?
A. Yes.

587 Q. "In mitigation, Garda Keogh stated that he suffered from work rel ated stress and was drinking heavily. In respect of breach number 1, I fined Garda Keogh € 300 . Garda Keogh si gned and dated formlal2.

I compl eted IAl3 with the record of intervi ew and forwarded the file for the appointing officer, Chi ef Superintendent Weatley.

In correspondence dated the 9th Novenber, Chi ef
Superintendent Wheatley informed me that Garda Keogh had made an application for a revi ew of my decision and Chi ef Superintendent Wheat ley requested my rationale, my vi ews and observations. I forwarded themto her in a report dated 11th March 2015."

We will go on to the next one.
"I had fined Garda Keogh €300 and my rational e was:

Garda Keogh was absent without leave or expl anation for four days. In deci ding the fine, I took into account that he had no previ ous di sci plinary breaches and that he had pleaded guilty to the breach. In imposing a fine of $€ 300$, 1 took into account that Garda Keogh had a weekly pay of €840. 49, whi ch equated to $€ 168$ per day. I i mposed a fine of $€ 75$ per day that Garda Keogh was absent. I did not believe that Garda Keogh should gain financially fromhis absence but I did not want to be harsh on him"

## Do you see that?

A. Yes.

588 Q. "I believe that my fine was fair and just."
A. Yes.

589 Q. So can we agree on this: That when sentencing, the other Superintendent, Murray, took the view that he didn't believe Garda Keogh should gain financially from his absence?
A. That's what he said, yeah.

590 Q. We11, you don't doubt him, do you?
A. Absolutely not, no. He sets out his rationale there.

591 Q. Yes. He also told him, and the superintendent doesn't appear to have doubted it at all, that he had been to his doctor and had got a medical certificate?
A. Yes.

592 Q. Do you accept that?
A. Absolutely. The medical cert was attached to the file I sent to the chief superintendent.

593 Q. This is the one you referred to as retrospective?

594 Q. Chairman, I am about to move onto another topic, I wonder whether -- I doubt if I would be able to get it finished before four. It may be perhaps better when 15:41 everybody is fresher in the morning.
CHA RMAN If you think that's a convenient thing.
MR. KELLY: Yes.
CHA RMAN I have to say, I think that it's quite a detailed examination between counsel for the Tribunal and analysis, so I think $I$ have no problem, certainly for myself, and actually just this afternoon it happens to suit me. Anyway, thank you very much.
MR. KELLY: I am making progress. I am not going to be as long as I thought I was going to be.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much, Mr. Kelly, that's most helpful, to let me know that. Very good. So we will say 10:30 in the morning then. Just give me a chance to close up here. Thanks very much.
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:21 } \\ & \quad \text { arranged }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { assistant [5] - } \\ 45: 3,46: 6,48: 26, \end{gathered}$ | attend [1]-15:5 <br> attendance [2] - | 110:27 <br> awkward [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 26,16: 28, \\ & 17: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:13, 25:19 } \\ & \text { board }[1]-29: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| ```51:4 arrangement [1]``` | $49: 4,53: 20$ <br> Assistant | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 62:20, 67:1 } \\ & \text { attendant }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 105:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { behalf [2]-61:7, } \\ & 80: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { body [1] - 13:10 } \\ & \text { boss [3] - 83:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
| - 103:9 <br> arrangements | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 14,58: 1, \\ & 76: 22,76: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 58:22 } \\ & \text { attended } 6] \end{aligned}$ | B | $\begin{aligned} & \text { behaved [1] - } \\ & 83: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $83: 28,128: 18$ bottom [7] - |
| $[4]-44: 28,70: 12$ | 83:22, 84:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:21, 17:26, } \\ & \text { 21:14. } 51: 9 . \end{aligned}$ |  | behaviour [2] - | $8: 12,8: 13,39: 3$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 84:20, 103:12 } \\ \text { arranging [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ASSISTANT[5] - } \\ & 3: 5,3: 6,3: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 14,51: 9 \\ & 66: 27,118: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $-62: 23,131: 1$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 119:7, } 130: 13 \\ \text { belatedly }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 28,67: 3 \\ & 114: 21,116: 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| 99:8 arrears [1] - | $3: 18,3: 20$ <br> assisting [8] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { attention [5] - } \\ & \text { 29:28, 38:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { backseats [1] - } \\ & \text { 112:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:10 } \\ & \text { belief [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { bought [1] - } \\ & \text { 117:10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 111:15 | $7: 20,10: 26,12: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 7,74: 21, \\ & 136: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ballinasloe [1] - } \\ & \text { 14:22 } \end{aligned}$ | 24:27, 25:9, 26:3, | bound [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { arresting [1] } \\ & 12: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 6,19: 15 \\ & 19: 29,20: 5 \end{aligned}$ | attitude [1] - | bank [1] - 31:2 <br> banks [1] - | 79:5 <br> believes [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:3 } \\ & \text { bow [1] - 108:22 } \end{aligned}$ |
| arrived [10] - | $26: 27$ | 38:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { banks [1] - } \\ & 26: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $22: 1,31: 26,72: 4$ | box [4] - 17:20, |
| 14:17, 14:26, <br> 44:15, 83:23 | associated [1] - | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { attracted } \\ 85: 21 \end{array}$ | Barrett [3] - | bell [1] - 127:19 | $43: 5,62: 8,63: 24$ |
| 84:19, 101:26, | $27$ | audit [3] - 10:14, | 58:16, 73:19, | bells [1] - 16:21 belonging [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { branch [2] - } \\ 53: 4,69: 17 \end{gathered}$ |
| 102:10, 102:11, | $47: 3$ | $10: 20,118: 8$ | $74: 9$ | 42:18 | bravery [1] - |
| 103:18 | $\mathbf{A T}_{[1]}-143: 22$ | audited [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { barriers [1] - } \\ & 85: 19 \end{aligned}$ | beneficial [1] - | $31: 19$ |
| arriving [2] - $84: 16,107.3$ | ATHLONE [1] - | 10:24 | Bartlett [1] - | 94:28 | breach [9] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 84:16, 107:3 } \\ & \text { artificially }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $3: 32$ <br> Athlone [36] - | August [12] - 6:17, 7:27, 8:15, | $141: 1$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { benefit [3] - } \\ 51: 18,54: 8 \text {, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:25, 138:15, } \\ & \text { 140:29, 141:5, } \end{aligned}$ |


| 141:6, 141:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 19,91: 6 \\ & 91: 21,91: 22, \\ & 110: 20,111: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { causes [3] - } \\ & 54: 21,55: 22, \\ & 137: 14 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 92:16, 104:22, } \\ & \text { 106:25, 110:27, } \\ & \text { 117:9, 119:16, } \\ & \text { 134:14 } \\ & \text { cited }[1]-69: 11 \\ & \text { civil }[1]-25: 14 \\ & \text { claimed }[3]- \\ & 69: 14,91: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```142:4 breaches [1] - 142:3 break [3] - 79:11, 79:26, 125:5 breakdown [1] -``` |  |  | 75:22, 75:24, | $91: 11,91: 13$ |  |
|  | 110:20, 111.5 | 137:14 | $77: 27,78: 3,$ | checking [4] |  |
|  | 114:7, 117:29, | 14:5, 46:10, | 78:11, 79:4 | 92:1, 92:9 |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 119: 29,122: 27 \\ \text { care }[3]-55: 19 \\ 57: 5,137: 28 \end{gathered}$ | 55:10, 56:23, | 79:12, 79:25 | checks [3] |  |
|  |  | 59:9, 133:9 | 80:4, 108:12 | 122:18, 123:6, |  |
|  |  | 135:22, 137:4 | 108:15, 108:27 | 123:1 |  |
| 85:19 | career [3] | caution [5] - | 114:10, 125:2 | cheek [1] - 14:19 | 112:7 |
| brevity [1] - | 25:29, 67:13 | 87:7, 111:16, | 128:28, 129:2 | CHIEF ${ }_{[17]}-3: 3$, | claims [19]- |
| 108:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 26 \\ & \text { careful }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:21, 118:16, } \\ & \text { 118:19 } \end{aligned}$ | 129:4, 129:6, | 3:3, 3:4, 3:6, 3:8, | 42:4, 54:3, 54:18, |
| BRIAN [2] |  |  | 135:10, 136:2 | 3:11, 3:13, 3:14, | 89:15, 91:7, |
|  | 122:7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { cc'd }_{[1]}-77: 1 \\ \text { CCTV }[8]-15: 2, \\ 15: 3,17: 1,35: 5, \end{gathered}$ | 136:12, 143:7, | 3:14, 3:17, 3:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91:11, 92:8, 94:6, } \\ & \text { 109:15, 109:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Brian [1] - 19:4 } \\ & \text { bridge [1] - 33:6 } \\ & \text { briefly [5] - 7:24, } \end{aligned}$ | CARR [1] - 3:15 carried [12] - |  | $143: 9,143: 16$ | $3: 19,3: 21,3: 27$ |  |
|  | $8: 19,15: 3,15: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 3,17: 1,35: 5 \\ & 35: 21,36: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $6: 9,6: 14,6: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 3,6: 4,80: 6 \\ & \text { chief }[41]-6: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:25, 110:29, } \\ & \text { 111:7, 111:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 33:16, 74:29, | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 29,46: 5,53: 2, \\ & 54: 2,58: 4,59: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 37:15, 41:7 | 16:20, 23:24, | 9:15, 25:17, | 118:5, 118:7, |
| $77: 24,79: 6$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 84:28 } \\ & \text { centre }[3]-20: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 29,33: 15 \\ & 33: 21,34: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 18,29: 21, \\ & 40: 28.41: 8 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:4, 121:6, } \\ & 121: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| $25: 1,41: 8,124: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:11 } \\ & \text { carry }[4]-18: 23, \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 26,35: 1,36: 8 \\ & 36: 20,41: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:18, 47:29, } \\ & \text { 49:1, 49:27, } \end{aligned}$ | Clare [1] - 68:29 |
| 134:20 | 40:7, 112:18, | $\begin{gathered} \text { centre [3]-20:9, } \\ \text { 20:20, 20:25 } \\ \text { ceremony [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | 62:4, 64:20, 74:8, | 50:29, 51:4 | 105:10, 105:22 |
| broad [5] | 139:27 <br> carrying [5] - | 31:22 | 74:17, 74:24, | 51:23, 52:22 | class [1]-115:6 |
| 13:12, 13:14 |  | cert [1] - 142:28 <br> certain [10] - | $76: 20,77: 22$, $77: 24,79: 2,90: 8$, | 53:12, 54:29, | classification |
| 17:2, 82:11, | 12:21, 40:21, |  | 77:24, 79:2, 90:8, | 55:27, 55:29, | [3]-20:27, 50:11, |
| 99:18 | $\begin{gathered} 60: 6,61: 6,62: 28 \\ \text { case }[38]-7: 11, \end{gathered}$ | $9: 8,14: 15,14: 28$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97:12, 108:9, } \\ & \text { 135:8, 136:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 5,56: 10, \\ & 71: 26,72: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $110: 21$ |
| 14:25 | $7: 13,7: 16,9: 10$ | 86:10, 119:19, | 143:3 | 73:7, 76:29, 77:2, | 71:20, 71:21 |
| bullying [1] - | $20: 6,20: 14,21: 1$ | 123:8, 124:6, | challenged [3] | 77:10, 77:28 | clear [10] - |
| 64:1 | 22:1, 22:8, 30:1,$32: 6,32: 9,45: 13$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:12 } \\ & \text { certainly }[7] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 128:24, 129:7, | 78:13, 78:23, | 17:25, 40:17, |
| bundle |  |  | 129:10 | 78:24, 78:25, | 54:23, 55:5, 57:3, |
| 91:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 6,32: 9,45: 13 \\ & 45: 15,46: 27 \end{aligned}$ |  | chance [2] - | 80:9, 94:15, 95:4, | 69:26, 75:10, |
| BY [7] - 3:26, | 58:18, 58:24, |  | 121:29, 143:18 | 112:26, 131:26, | 88:16, 109:11, |
| 3:30, 4:5, 5:5, | 66:27, 71:28, | $107: 5,143: 11$ | change [3]68:19, 81:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:17, 139:14, } \\ & \text { 139:28. 142:29 } \end{aligned}$ | $134: 12$ |
| 5:6, 6:5, 80:7 | $74: 1,74: 16$ | certificate $[7]$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:19, 81:22, } \\ & 103: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 139:28, 142:29 <br> Chief [23]-53:8, | clearer [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { bypass [1] - } \\ & 70: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 74: 19,90: 16, \\ & 94: 11,104: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 138:17, 138:19, } \\ & \text { 139:1, 139:3 } \end{aligned}$ | 103:18 changed [1] - | Chief [23]-53:8, $57: 19,58: 8,59: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 19 \\ & \text { clear } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 105:4, 105:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:1, 139:3, } \\ & \text { 139:5, 141:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 72:29 } \\ & \text { changes [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | 60:9, 60:26, | 15:11, 54:11 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 105: 8,105: 23 \\ & 105: 24,106: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:25 } \\ & \text { certificates }[4] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | changes [2] - | 67:27, 68:8, | clerk [3] - 65:16, |
|  | 106:4, 106:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { certificates [4] - } \\ & 53: 5,53: 17 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | character [2] | $70: 29,72: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 68: 17,125: 11 \\ & \text { client }[1]-136: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| CAGNEY [1] - | 106:15, 120:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 5,53: 17 \\ & 58: 20,65: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 25:28, 80:25 | 74:11, 133:26, | clinical [2] - |
| $3: 17$ | $\begin{gathered} 121: 13,134: 29 \\ \text { cases [4] - } \end{gathered}$ | certification [1] | charge [7] 15.26, 87:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:27, 134:7, } \\ & \text { 134:9, 137:2, } \end{aligned}$ | 133:19, 136:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { cajoling [1] - } \\ & 31: 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & -50: 14 \\ & \quad \text { certified }[3]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:26, 87:15, } \\ & \text { 102:7. 102:13. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 134:9, 137:2, } \\ & \text { 137:13, 137:26, } \end{aligned}$ | close [4]-93:7, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 31: 3 \\ & \text { cannot [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | 69:10, 103:26, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:7, 102:13, } \\ & \text { 138:26, 140:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:13, 137:26, } \\ & \text { 141:17, 141:20, } \end{aligned}$ | 111:24, 118:21, |
| $53: 29,91: 9$ | catalyst [1] - | 58:21, 123:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 138: 26,140: 9 \\ & 140: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 141:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 143:19 } \\ & \text { close-up [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| capacity [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 56:19 } \\ & \text { catching }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 124:14 certify [1] - | charges [3] 63:29, 139:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { chose [1] - } \\ & 39: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 93:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:23 } \\ & \text { captured }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | ```catching [1] - 33:4``` | $\begin{aligned} & 123: 11 \\ & \text { certifying }[3] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:29, 139:25, } \\ & \text { 140:3 } \end{aligned}$ | 39:21 <br> Ciaran [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { closely [1] - } \\ & \text { 102:5 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 50:4 | 33:4 categorisation | 46:28, 47:5, | CHARLTON ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ - | 30:24 | closing [1] - |
| car [29]-8:6, | $\begin{gathered} {[2]-50: 24,73: 10} \\ \text { categorised }[1]- \end{gathered}$ | 47:12 | 4:5 | Circuit [2] | 56:18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14: 29,33: 20, \\ & 34: 19,34: 24, \end{aligned}$ |  | CHAIRMAN ${ }^{[45]}$ | chart [2] - 10:9, | $8: 25,21: 4$ | clothes [2]-8:6, |
| $34: 28,35: 7,$ | $71: 16$ <br> category [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & -6: 7,6: 15,64: 28, \\ & 65: 2,70: 16, \end{aligned}$ | check [8] - 91:6, | [21]-11:1, 16:4, | $10: 25$ |
| 35:19, 35:22, | 73:2 | 70:18, 70:20, | 91:7, 91:20, | 28:3, 40:9, 50:20, | $9: 25,10: 10$ |
| 35:26, 36:25, |  | 70:25, 70:28, | 91:21, 106:26, | 53:29, 57:13, | CMO [27] - 46:7, |
| 36:27, 36:28, | caused [3]- | 71:4, 72:6, 72:10, | 123:18, 123:22, | 60:7, 73:23, | $46: 23,46: 25$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 40: 18,40: 19, \\ & 88: 1,90: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 27,44: 8 \text {, } \\ & 81: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 72:13, 74:14 | $124: 5$ | 73:27, 90:20, | $47: 4,47: 13,48: 8$ |
|  |  | 74:18, 74:25, | checked [4] - |  | $48: 24,51: 9$ |


| 51:29, 52:8, | 24:9, 24:21, | 117:5, 118:13 | conditions [2] - | [1]-32:15 | contributed [1] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55:13, 58:12, | 24:24, 24:26, | completed [10] - | 31:1, 31:15 | considered [5] - | 95:7 |
| 59:10, 61:24, | 24:27, 25:1, | 9:15, 21:8, 30:14, | condoned [1] - | 22:3, 22:6, 31:18, | controversies |
| 62:1, 63:6, 66:28, | 28:21 | 31:10, 44:18, | 93:9 | $41: 11,94: 27$ | [2] - 11:14, 86:3 |
| 71:26, 97:1, 97:8, | commending [2] | 45:1, 48:5, 48:10, | conduct [3] - | considering [10] | controversy [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 98:1, 98:7, } \\ & \text { 133:12. 133:20. } \end{aligned}$ | $-27: 14,27: 26$ | $49: 28,141: 16$ | 71:13, 110:13, | - 27:12, 39:22, | $-85: 21$ |
| 134:29, 136:16, | 90:22, 91:27, | 36:20, 73:17, | conducted [4] - | 122:10, 133:6, | 143:7 |
| 136:24 | 117:4 | 93:12, 118:21 | 34:4, 57:24, 59:2, | 134:3, 134:17, | conversation |
| CMO's [2] - | comments [1] - | completeness | 61:1 | 134:21, 135:16 | [17]-20:9, 32:22, |
| 58:14, 58:25 | 101:5 | [3]-73:16, 75:25, | conducting [1] - | Considering [1] | 54:11, 55:20, |
| CO [1]-4:1 | commercial [4] - | 118:11 | 117:20 | - 135:20 | 60:24, 61:23, |
| coast [1] - 26:15 | 112:5, 114:8, | completing [1] - | conference [4] - | consistency [1] | 96:25, 96:28, |
| code [1] - | 115:7 | 28:29 | 58:15, 66:27, | - 120:1 | 97:6, 100:4, |
| 110:26 | commercially | completion [1] - | 94:11, 134:29 | conspiratorial | 100:12, 107:29, |
| Code [3] - 44:21, | [1] - 112:16 | 44:29 | confidence [6] - | [1]-21:28 | 113:2, 120:19, |
| 53:5, 82:13 | COMMISSIONE | complex [1] - | 47:4, 85:22, | constantly [1] - | 127:2, 132:11, |
| Cogavin [2] - | $\mathbf{R}$ [8]-3:2, 3:5, | 47:7 | 85:25, 85:29, | 86:1 | 137:8 |
| 12:1, 16:27 | 3:6, 3:7, 3:7, 3:8, | compliment [1] - | 124:16 | constraints [1] - | convey [1] - |
| Cogavin/Divilly | 3:18, 3:20 | 108:17 | confidential [12] | 55:25 | 134:11 |
| [1] - 12:26 | commissioner | complying [1] - | - 53:19, 53:22, | construed [1] - | conveyed [1] - |
| coincidence [1] | [5] - 45:3, 46:6, | 54:12 | 53:26, 60:19, | 41:4 | 14:22 |
| - 39:9 | 48:26, 49:4, | component [1] - | 61:13, 63:20, | consult [1] - | convicted [1] - |
| coincidentally | 53:21 | 55:16 | 66:24, 82:21, | 47:5 | 8:24 |
| [1] - 68:25 | Commissioner | compound [1] - | 84:12, 117:22, | consultation [2] | convictions [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { coincides [1] - } \\ & 25: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[7]-56: 14,58: 1,} \\ & 61: 7,76: 22, \end{aligned}$ | 111:8 | $117: 25,135: 3$ <br> confidentiality | - 48:24, 122:8 | 22:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:11 } \\ & \text { collected [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 7,76: 22, \\ & 76: 28,83: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { comprehend }{ }_{[1]} \\ & -60: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { [2] }-48: 3,82: 25$ | contact [16] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cooperate [2] - } \\ & \text { 34:17, 98:4 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $14: 23$ | $84: 10$ <br> commitm | compromised <br> [1] - $39 \cdot 28$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { confined [2] - } \\ 22: 16,56: 11 \end{gathered}$ | 85:7, 87:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cooperation [1] } \\ & -98: 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| $93: 8,112: 23$ | $-31: 15$ | computer [2] 68:15, 68:16 | confirm [4]34.23, 58.4 | 89:4, 99:24, | coordinated [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Column [1] - } \\ & 94: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $8: 16,36: 1,81: 19$ | 68:15, 68:16 | $34: 23,58: 4$ 64:14 | 100:7, 128:11, | - 8:20 |
| 94:17 <br> comfort [1] - 7:5 | 8:16, 36:1, 81:19 common [8] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { concentrate [1] } \\ & -27: 28 \end{aligned}$ | confirmed [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 128: 25,129: 8 \\ & 129: 16,129: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { copied [4] - } \\ 59: 12,118: 2, \end{array}$ |
| comfortable [1] | 8:17, 21:22, | concern [6] - | 69:16 | contacted [5] - | 133:22, 136:27 |
| - 14:23 | $21: 25,48: 7,48: 8 \text {, }$ | 7:2, 81:29, 130:4, | confronted [1] - | 15:4, 64:14, | copies [1] - |
| coming [9] - | 52:6, 52:7, 52:19 | 131:7, 132:18, 137:4 | 25:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:29, 126:26, } \\ & 140: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 110:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:19, 90:1, } \\ & 95: 16,95: 26, \end{aligned}$ | communicate [1] - 60:4 | $\begin{gathered} 137: 4 \\ \text { cono } \end{gathered}$ | CONNAUGHT [1] - 3:32 | 140:25 contacting | $\begin{array}{r} \text { coping [5] - } \\ 47: 21,48: 12, \end{array}$ |
| 95:29, 108:28, | communicatio | 6:13, 17:3, 38:19, | connection [1] - | 28:9, 64:2 | 48:13, 63:1 |
| 108:29, 113:29, | n [3] - 59:14, | 38:22, 38:25, | 55:8 | contacts [1] - | COPPINGER ${ }_{[1]}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:17 } \\ & \text { command [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $69: 29,84: 17$ <br> communicatio | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 7,55: 15, \\ & 62: 17,67: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONNELLAN } \\ & \text { [2] - 3:30, 3:30 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87:2 } \\ & \text { contained [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -3: 4 \\ & \quad \text { copy }[9]-42: 3, \end{aligned}$ |
| $63: 11,82: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ns [3] - 56:6, } \\ & 56: 11.137: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 82:26, 98:11, } \\ & \text { 104:1, 109:22 } \end{aligned}$ | Connolly [1] $30 \cdot 25$ | $116: 22,118: 5$ content [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 13,57: 19 \\ & 107: 16,107: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} -30: 26 \\ \text { comme } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { community }[3] \text { - } \\ & 7: 3,7: 5,7: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 111:22 <br> conce | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CONOR [1] - } \\ & 3: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 83:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 115: 8,115: 10 \\ & 133: 28 \end{aligned}$ |
| $-122: 17$ | compared [2] - | 33:17, 74:29, | consensus [1] - | 55:3, 63:18, | Cormac [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { commendation } \\ & \text { [12]-22:3, 25:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:17, 108:21 } \\ & \text { complained [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 77:13 <br> concerns [7] - | $77: 5$ <br> consequence | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:21, 79:7, 96:4, } \\ & \text { 100:4, 105:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 125:8, 127:28 } \\ \text { correct }[14] \text { - } \end{array}$ |
| 26:7, 28:29, 29:4, | 122:29 | $6: 16,16: 6,18: 22$ 19:6. 23:7. 23:15. | [1] - 67:12 | $113: 10,135: 5$ | 13:28, 14:9, |
| 32:11, 32:12, | - 68:13, 83:20 | $73: 9$ | 27:9, 28:16, | 19:29, 97:27, | 25:20, 31:25, |
| 33:8, 33:10 | complaint [4] - | conclusion [5] - | 116:24, 119:5, | 103:19 | $34: 26,36: 8$ |
| commendation | 47:10, 67:29, | 41:9, 70:22, | 120:10 | CONTINUED ${ }_{[1]}$ | 39:19, 45:18, |
| s [18] - 6:11, 7:17, | 74:29, 100:28 | 108:15, 120:12, | consideration | -6:4 | 104:24, 111:10, |
| 21:2, 21:5, 21:11, | complaints [2] - | 121:9 | [6] - 32:25, 39:1, | continued [2] - | $114: 15,123: 13$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21: 16,22: 3 \\ & 22: 10.22: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $41: 16,105: 26$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { condition [4] - } \\ 17 \cdot 1-17 \cdot 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 21,61: 25 \\ & 122: 7.139: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $26: 1,69: 10$ | corrected [2] - <br> 117.28, 118:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 22: 10,22: 13 \\ & 22: 16,23: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { complete [4] - } \\ 42: 28,111: 23, \end{gathered}$ | $133: 19,136: 23$ | considerations | 49:18 | corrections [1] - |



| 106:27, 121:15, | $68: 4,83: 18$ | distributed [1] - | $28: 26,29: 8$ | 32:7 | e-mails [1] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 128:8, 130:5 | discreditable [1] | 81:28 | 29:11, 37:20, | driving [2] - | 114:21 |
| DIGNAM [1] - | - 139:26 | district [15] | 40:1, 48:8, 52:12, | 33:19, 38:3 | EAMON [1] - |
| 3:24 | discrete [1] - | 42:2, 44:28, | 52:16, 66:17, | Driving [3] - | 3:10 |
| directed [3] - | 98:28 | 45:13, 45:17, | 76:16, 78:19, | 121:23, 121:24, | early [6] - 14:2, |
| 75:21, 103:23, | discretion [1] - | 46:14, 46:15, | 80:19, 91:1, 91:8, | 122:23 | 15:28, 22:9, |
| 124:26 | 120:4 | 46:22, 48:22, | 108:2, 121:10, | dropped [1] - | 58:15, 58:24, |
| directing [2] - | iscuss [23] - | 49:17, 50:1, | 122:29 | 20:4 | 69:6 |
| 68:19, 106:18 | 46:24, 47:17, | 56:22, 68:17, | doubt [6] - | drove [1] - 36:6 | effect [1] - |
| direction [4] - | 48:12, 51:27, | 122:28, 123:26, | 17:20, 24:14, | drowning [1] - | 121:19 |
| 14:28, 32:21, | 53:24, 54:14, | 125:11 | 78:21, 116:16, | 28:11 | effective [2] - |
| 70:5, 116:7 | 54:22, 54:25, | divided [3] - | 142:21, 143:4 | drunk [4] - | 46:3, 49:14 |
| directions [1] - | 56:25, 58:18, | 101:7, 101:19, | doubted [1] - | 80:29, 81:4, | effectively [1] - |
| 37:19 | 58:23, 58:26, | 101:24 | 142:24 | 132:15, 136:21 | 122:2 |
| Directive [1] - | 60:17, 60:20, | Divilly [3] - | down [41]-7:9, | DUBLIN [2] - | effectiveness |
| 45:28 | 63:17, 69:12 | 16:27, 17:28, | $8: 12,9: 4,11: 13$ | $3: 28,4: 6$ | $[1]-94: 29$ |
| $69: 9,99: 26$ | 88:3, 102:18, |  | 18:8, 19:13, | due [3] - | effects [1] - 81:7 |
| DIRECTLY [2] - | 109:22, 121:13, | 60:21, 84:16 | 19:15, 20:5, | during [4] - | 47:21, 48:13 |
| 5:5, 6:5 | 131:8 | divisional [4] | 24:18, 29:12, | 90:15, 108:4, | efforts [4] - |
| DIRECTLY- | discussed [24] - | 29:2, 45:2, 45:15, | 31:3, 39:9, 41:25, | 125:15, 132:11 | 60:15, 63:1, |
| EXAMINED [2] - | 13:16, 28:18, | 65:16 | 43:22, 44:22, | duties [6] - | 137:12, 137:27 |
| 5:5, 6:5 | 42:3, 47:19, | DOCKERY [1] - | 45:7, 49:9, 50:28, | 18:23, 37:5, | Egan [4] - 68:29, |
| director [3] - | 47:27, 48:10, | 4:3 | 53:13, 60:29, | 62:28, 82:20, | 69:3, 69:9, 69:16 |
| 51:22, 60:10, | 53:15, 56:1, 88:2, | doctor [14]- | 64:11, 66:6, 67:3, | $87: 18,112: 17$ | $\operatorname{EGAN}_{[1]}-3: 25$ |
| 71:27 | 89:15, 95:6, | $47: 12,58: 14$ | 68:27, 76:23, | $\text { duty }[16]-13: 18 \text {, }$ | eight [2] - 12:5, |
| DIRECTOR ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 95:10, 96:4, | 58:21, 67:7, 69:9, | 85:10, 91:16, | $40: 11,41: 27$ | $67: 3$ |
| $3: 13$ <br> directorate [1] - 68:29 | 96:25, 97:25, | 138:20, 139:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 11,103: 24 \\ & 104: 11,105: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $44: 25,46: 3,46: 4$ | either [9]-8:22, |
|  | 98:13, 99:18, 100:4, 107:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:12, 139:13, } \\ & \text { 140:29. 141:1. } \end{aligned}$ | 106:15, 106:19, | 46:26, 47:18, | 28:9, 28:16, |
| 68:29 <br> DIRECTORATE | 109:5, 119:18, | 141:2, 141:3, | 112:8, 114:1, | 52:2, 58:12, 64:25, 65:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:24, 32:24, } \\ & \text { 59:12, 77:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\text { [1] }-3: 15$ <br> disadvantage | 119:25, 125:15, | 142:25 | 130:1, 132:20, | 69:7, 72:1, | 133:23, 136:28 |
|  | 125:19 | doctors [2] - | 132:23, 140:18 | 139:26, 140:26 | elderly [4] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-74: 6} \\ & \text { disagree [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | discussing [1] - 87:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:28, 47:6 } \\ & \text { document }[13] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Downey [2] - } \\ & \text { 67:20, } 98: 3 \end{aligned}$ | Dáil [1] - 56:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 18,7: 6,8: 18 \\ & 21: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| 38:18 | discussion [13] $-18: 12,27: 11$ | 11:20, 55:6, 63:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DOWNEY [2] - } \\ & 3: 15,3: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $E$ | electronic [1] - |
| disciplinary [4] - | $27: 16,48: 2$ | $66: 17,70: 25,$ | downstream [1] |  | electronically |
| 63:28, 118:25, |  |  |  | 13:1, 13:8, 13:10 | [1] - 10:24 |
| 120:5, 142:3 | $90: 6,98: 24,99: 8$ | $122: 7,135: 17$ | 103:25, 104:12 | 16:21, 16:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { element }[1] \text { - } \\ & 81 \cdot 2 ? \end{aligned}$ |
| 93:23, 97:20 | $107: 18,130: 20$ | documentation | 106:20 | 17:4, 17:5, 17:18, | 81:22 emails [1] |
| 97:27, 98:14, | discussions [1] | [1]-41:19 | Dr [2]-50:7, | 17:20, 17:21, | $17: 10$ |
| 120:2, 138:16, | - 68:11 | documents [13] | 72:2 | 18:4, 18:12, 57:17, 57:29, | emanating [1] - |
| $139: 16,139: 29$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { disease [5] - } \\ 42: 27.43: 5 \end{gathered}$ | - 70:14, 71:3, | DR [1] - 3:11 | 57:17, 57:29, $58: 8,58: 19$ | $133: 17$ |
| disciplined [2] - | 42:27, 43:5, | 72:13, 73:25, | $\begin{gathered} \text { draw [2] - 29:28, } \\ 126 \cdot 7 \end{gathered}$ | $59: 17,65: 15$ | embark [1] - |
| $98: 5,124: 25$ | $44: 8$ | 74:9, 76:10, $106: 12,115: 2$ | 136:7 draw | 67:19, 67:21, | 135:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { disclosing }[1] \text { - } \\ & 53: 23 \end{aligned}$ | disk [1] - 93:22 | 118:2, 118:12, | $42: 12$ | 69:3, 89:21, | EMMA [1] - 3:26 |
| disclosure [5] - | dismissed [2] - | 119:13, 123:24, | drawn [1] - | 89:26, 89:28, | $130: 26$ |
| 75:1, 81:14, 83:5, | $38: 13,59: 20$ | $124: 9$ | $74: 21$ | 114:20, 125:7, | emphasis [4] - |
| 84:3, 86:19 | $90: 8,112: 11$ | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{dogs}[1] \\ 112: 18 \end{gathered}$ | $67: 14,125: 16$ | 125:8, 127:20, | 49:20, 81:26, |
| disclosures [8] - | $131: 17$ | domain [1] | 125:19, 130:9, | 128:9, 128:13, | 112:25, 132:4 <br> emphasise [1] - |
| 83:13, 86:7, | disputes [1] - | 98:20 | $140: 24,141: 12$ | 129:20, 129:22, | emphasise [1] - $136: 6$ |
| 90:15, 90:26, | 106:10 | DONAL [2]-3:7, | drive [1] - 37:20 | 133:2, 133:28, <br> 135:14, 135:16, | employee [5] - |
| 113:18, 130:10 | distance [2] - | $3: 24$ | Drive [1] - 7:29 | 136:9, 136:16, | $46: 8,57: 6,61: 9$ |
| Disclosures [2] | 35:26, 36:6 | done [22]-9:15, | driven [1] - 36:5 | $137: 3,137: 9$ | 62:17, 70:26 |
| - 76:14, 76:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { distressed [1] - } \\ & 30: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:20, 19:22, } \\ & \text { 19:24, 28:13, } \end{aligned}$ | driver [4]-8:18, 14:15, 14:17 | e-mailed [1] - | employment [1] |
| discovered [2] - | 30:28 | 19:24, 28:13, | 14:15, 14:17, | 127:15 | - 120:7 |


| empowerment | 33:17, 36:15, 90:9, 93:15, | 101:4, 108:5, | exist [1] - 122:16 | $F$ | 67:24, 98:10, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| encompassing | 99:11, 113:27, | exactly [2] - | 119:21, 121:23 |  | 111:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-111: 23} \\ & \text { encounter } \end{aligned}$ | 114:5 | 86:8, 123:28 <br> EXAMINATION | $\begin{aligned} & 121: 26,123: 3 \\ & 123: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { face }[3]-14: 19, \\ 75: 29,86: 25 \end{gathered}$ | Farrell [2] - |
| - 81:17, 108:3 | $42: 13,107: 16$ | [1] - 79:23 | Expenditure [1] | Facebook [5] 126.26. 129.16 | FARRELL [1] - |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { end [4] - 45:3 } \\ 64: 11,70: 20, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { environment [2] } \\ & -47: 23,48: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { examination } \\ {[10]-8: 8,15: 1 \text {, }} \end{gathered}$ | expenses [2] - | 129:19, 129:24, | fashion [7] - |
| 79:12 | Environment [1] | 75:11, 77:7, 77:8, | 109:25, 110:25 | 129:25 | 19:2, 29:7, 39:21, |
| END [1] - 79:23 | $-112: 16$ envisag | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 28,136: 5 \\ & 139: 11,143: 2 \end{aligned}$ | experience [8] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { faced }[2] \text { - } \\ 73: 23,92: 17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:20, 117:11, } \\ & \text { 117:22, 117:25 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 113:24, 120:15 | $\begin{array}{r} 13: 4,13: 8,13: 11 \\ \text { EPW1 [2] - 21:7, } \end{array}$ | 143:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 81:20, 95:24, } \\ & 104: 3,108: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { facilitate [1] - } \\ & 65: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fast }[1]-38: 3 \\ & \text { fear }[5]-85: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { endorsed [1] - } \\ & \text { 29:7 } \end{aligned}$ | $27: 9$ | $105: 5,138: 20$ | 113:19, 113:22 | fact [18] - 9:5, | 85:16, 85:27, |
| engage [2] - | EPW1s [1] - | EXAMINED [4] - | experienced [2] | 18:29, 23:12, | 85:28, 85:29 |
| 97:18, 98:9 | 28:27 | $5: 5,5: 6,6: 5,80: 6$ | - 101:26, 104:25 | 26:28, 29:11, | fears [2] - |
| engaged [2] - | equated [1] - | examining [1] - | experiencing [2] | 36:17, 36:18, | 122:16, 130:21 |
| 6:25, 98:15 | 142:6 | $75: 10$ | $-62: 27,68: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40:21, 53:16, } \\ & 59: 23,60: 9, \end{aligned}$ | feasted [1] - |
| engaging [3] - | erased [2] | example [1] - | expert [4]-47:9, | 59:23, 60:9, 75:13, 75:18, | 95:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 54:6, 95:24, } \\ & 124: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7: 12,23: 2 \\ \text { error [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | 126:7 exceed | $55: 19,57: 5,60: 2$ <br> expertise [2] - | 89:15, 97:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { February [1] - } \\ & 37: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| enjoyment [1] - | escalated | $62: 12$ | $51: 6,55: 14$ | 117:20, 136:23, | fed [2] - 23:7, |
| 63:28 | $\begin{aligned} & 127: 6,127: 10, \\ & 127: 24,128: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { exceeded [1] - } \\ & 71: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { experts [1] - } \\ & \text { 137:28 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:14 } \\ & \text { fact-finding }[2] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 138:4 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { enquiries [11] - } \\ \text { 9:28, 15:2, 15:5, } \end{array}$ | 127:24, 128:4 escaped [1] | exceeding [1] - | 137:28 explain [2]- | $40: 21,117: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { feet }[1]-31: 2 \\ & \text { fell }[1]-107: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| 16:26, 16:28, | 18:13 | 65:22 | 57:11, 139:20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { factor }[3]- \\ 22: 23.32: 15 \end{gathered}$ | felt [29]-23:1, |
| 16:29, 34:22, | escort [1] - | excellent [3] - | explained [6] - | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 23,32: 15, \\ & 32: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 54:25, 54:29, |
| 61:4, 61:14, | 26:23 | 27:14, 28:6, | 27:19, 73:5, 94:5, | 32:20 <br> factors [2] - | $55: 13,56: 3,60: 6$ |
| 76:23, 84:29 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { essence [1] - } \\ & 76.11 \end{aligned}$ | 29:29 | 100:6, 121:4, | $50: 16,50: 26$ | 63:20, 63:23, |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { enquiry [3] - } \\ \text { 42:10, } 56: 18, \end{array}$ | 76:11 <br> establish [7] | exception [1] - <br> 77:13 | 134:18 explaining [3] - | facts [2] - 92:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 85: 22,85: 25, \\ & 87: 29,100: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| 61:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 29,36: 4 \\ & 52: 29,60: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { excess }[2]- \\ 49: 17,69: 22 \end{array}$ | $74: 12,76: 25$ | 117:15 <br> factual [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:28, 104:16, } \\ & \text { 107:8, 107:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 39:6, 46:22, | 61:4, 116:3, | exchange [1] | 77:3 ${ }^{\text {explanation }[7] ~-~}$ | 117:17 | 110:24, 111:7, |
| 49:14, 82:25, | 117:15 | 133:3 | 40:11, 40:16, | factually [2] - | 120:7, 120:27, |
| 91:1, 91:8, 104:4, | established [3] - | exclude [3] | 140:12, 140:21, | 132:22, 136:9 | 122:8, 127:7, |
| 104:7, 120:1, | 35:3, 50:20, 61:8 | 35:21, 36:16, | 140:23, 140:29, | $\begin{gathered} \text { failings [1] - } \\ 11: 13 \end{gathered}$ | 127:24, 128:4, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 124:17, 130:27 } \\ \text { ensured }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { etcetera [6] - } \\ 42: 2,64: 2,93: 10, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 20 \\ & \text { exclusively }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $142: 1$ exploratory [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:13 } \\ & \text { fair }[3]-86: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:5, 130:7, } \\ & \text { 130:13, 134:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 31: 16 \\ \text { entered }[1] \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 15,97: 16, \\ & 99: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $50: 12$ <br> excuse [3] | 108:20 <br> explore [4] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { 132:13, 142:14 } \\ \text { fairly }[4]-72: 7, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:26 } \\ & \text { female }[3] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 33:26 | ethical [1] - | 75:23, 88:19, | 50:26, 53:29, | 72:16, 73:27, | $30: 28,31: 2$ |
| entering [2] - <br> 39:26, 39:28 | $124: 17$ evenin | 131:21 <br> EXEC | $54: 20,78: 24$ explored [2] | 75:10 <br> fairness [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:5 } \\ & \text { few [8] - 23:27, } \end{aligned}$ |
| entire [4]-59:7, | 9:17, 35:12, | $-3: 13$ | $72: 16,76: 8$ | 76:9, 117:7 | 83:6, 101:9, |
| 122:28, 133:7, | 39:22, 140:6 | executive [2] - | expose [1] - | fall [3] - 78:3, <br> 104:6, 104:18 | 101:10, 114:10, <br> 114:11, 129:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:21 } \\ & \text { entirely [5] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { event [5] - } \\ 29: 24,72: 18, \end{gathered}$ | 60:10, 71:27 <br> exercise [3] - | 119:24 <br> expressing [2] - | 104:6, 104:18 <br> false [1] - 116:19 <br> familiar [3] - | 114:11, 129:22 field [1] - 57:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7: 15,38: 18,70: 4 \\ & 73: 29,119: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:12, 117:6, } \\ & 139: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 21,77: 6, \\ & 117: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $130: 3,131: 7$ extent [3] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { familiar [3] - } \\ 20: 21,37: 16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { file }[28]-9: 14, \\ 9: 20,10: 1,10: 9, \end{gathered}$ |
| entitled [3] - <br> 122.11, 134.25 | events [2] - <br> 12:15, 94:27 | exert [1] - | 59:20, 61:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:1 } \\ & \text { family [2] - 15:3, } \end{aligned}$ | 11:8, 11:15, <br> 37:25, 41:6 |
| $135: 27$ | 12:15, 94:27 <br> eventually [2] - | exhaustive [1] - | extra [1] - | 26:24 <br> Fanning [3] - | 42:15, 42:16, 64:1, 90:1, 99:11 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { entries [2] - } \\ \text { 10:19, } 91: 13 \end{array}$ | 21:4, 69:28 | 137:27 | 103:11 | $58: 1,76: 22$ | 99:13, 101:6, |
| entry [17] - 7:24, | $6: 12,18: 21$ | 10:25 | 35:27 | 76:28 | 109:13, 109:22, |
| 10:26, 10:28, | 21:18, 38:10, | exhibits [6] - | eyes [1] - 41:1 | fantastic [1] - | 110:6, 110:9, |
| 11:18, 23:4, 24:1, | $38: 14,48: 2,73: 8$ | 9:26, 10:9, 10:11, |  | $41: 9$ | 117:12, 117:21, |
| 24:2, 26:10, | 78:29, 79:13, | 11:6, 12:16, |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { far [8] - 24:25, } \\ 55: 15.57 \cdot 2 \end{gathered}$ | 118:5, 118:13, |


| 142:28 | $\text { FLYNN }_{[1]}-3: 19$ | forms [4] - | 83:29, 84:16, | 69:3, 69:6, 69:8, | 130:16, 130:26, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| files [2] - 103:25, | focus [2] | 44:27, 44:29, | 109:26 | 69:9, 69:11 | 133:8, |
| 104:12 | 40:25, 40:27 | 77:5 | gap [1] - 122:20 | 69:13, 69:18, | 134:14, 134:28, |
| filing [1] - 44:29 | focused [1] - | fortnightly [1] - | garage [3] - | 69:20, 69:21, | 135:22, 135:29, |
| filled [1] - 62:2 | 81:27 | 49:27 | 34:22, 35:3, | 70:1, 70:11, | 137:27, 137:29, |
| final [1] - 63:24 | focusing [ | forward [7] - | 40:18 | 70:15, 71:2, 71:6, | 140:21, 140:22, |
| finally [1] - | 113:28 | 28:20, 46:27 | GARDA [5] - 3:2, | 71:27, 72:18, | 140:23, 140:26, |
| 74:28 | follow [2]-26:6, | 52:9, 55:6, 57:15, | 3:10, 3:11, 3:12, | 73:5, 73:9, 73:19, | 140:28, 141:2, |
| nance [3] - | 139:15 | 70:3, 126:1 | 3:21 | 74:2, 74:9, 75:1, | 141:5, 141:11, |
| 91:10, 118:10, | followed [2] - | forwarded [8] | Garda [277] - | 75:6, 75:11, | 141:13, 141:14, |
| 118:14 | 9:6, 21:21 | 15:8, 29:7, 48:25, | 7:8, 8:22, 8:28, | 75:21, 76:8, 76:9, | 141:21, 141:29, |
| financial [3] - | following [8] - | 57:18, 125:10, | 9:11, 9:17, 10:16, | 76:15, 76:19, | 142:1, 142:5, |
| 109:24, 110:26, | 12:26, 17:9, | 137:4, 141:17, | 10:25, 11:25, | 76:21, 77:1, | 142:7, 142:8, |
| 118:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:10, 31:22, } \\ & 38: 24,51: 27, \end{aligned}$ | $141: 24$ <br> four | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:28, 12:25, } \\ & \text { 15:1, 15:4, 15:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 11,79: 17, \\ & 80: 11,80: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:18 } \\ & \text { garda }[8]-7: 20, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 38:24, 5:27, | 21:25 | $15: 20,16: 8,$ | 80:15, 80:20, | 11:27, 12:1, 12:2, |
| fine [4]-142:2, | follows [1] - | $53: 13,60: 13$ | 16:16, 16:23, | 82:13, 83:7, | 26:27, 84:16, |
| 142:5, 142:7, | 122:18 | 65:22, 69:22, | 16:27, 17:28, | 83:19, 83:20, | $96: 16$ |
| 142:14 | FOLLOWS [4] - | 123:2, 142:2, | 18:2, 18:8, 18:14, | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 21,84: 11, \\ & 84: 15,88: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { gardaí } 5]-12: 3 \text {, } \\ 12 \cdot 5-10 \cdot 6-10 \cdot 29 \end{array}$ |
| fined [2] | 6:1, 6:5, 80:2 | 143:5 | 18:22, 18:25, | 84:15, 88:16, | 12:5, 12:6, 19:29, |
| $141: 13,141: 29$ | 80:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { four-year [1] } \\ & \text { 69:22 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:28, 19:1, 19:3, } \\ & \text { 19:9, 19:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 11,90: 17, \\ & 90: 23,91: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 82:1 <br> Gardaí |
| $\begin{aligned} & 143: 5 \\ & \text { FINN }{ }_{[1]}-3: 5 \\ & \text { first }[46]-6: 16, \\ & \text { 11:19, } 12: 7,17: 6, \\ & 21: 23,33: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 35:5, 35:21 footprint [2] 10:14, 10:22 | fourth [2]-61:1, | 19:14, 19:19, | 91:20, 91:22, | 14:14, 14:17, |
|  |  | $87: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 27,23: 12, \\ & 24: 1,25: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91:25, 92:11, } \\ & \text { 92:17, 93:8, 95:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 1,25: 14,26: 5, \\ & 26: 19,26: 26, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { framed [1] } \\ & 133: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $25: 12,25: 16$ | 95:11, 95:23, | 34:4, 34:12, |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { FOR [4] - 3:2, } \\ 3: 30,4: 1,80: 1 \\ \text { force }[2]-17: 27, \end{gathered}$ | 133:16 <br> frequent [1] - | 26:17, 26:23, | 96:3, 96:5, 96:16, | 34:17, 34:27 |
| 38:18, 39:7, |  | 62:12 | 26:26, 27:21 | 96:19, 96:23, | gather [1] - |
| 43:28, 53:12, | 81:18 | fresher [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 28,28: 4 \\ & 28: 23,30: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 4,97: 5,97: 6, \\ & 98: 8,98: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $123: 10$ |
| $54: 27,56: 22$, $60: 24,66: 4$, | fore [1] - 27:21 forgetting [1] - | 143:6 | $30: 24,30: 25$ | 98:26, 99:17, | general [8] - 15:7, 36:13, |
| $60: 24,66: 4$, $67: 22,67: 24$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 99:16 } \\ & \text { front }[4]-44: 15, \end{aligned}$ | 30:26, 31:6, | $99: 24,100: 6,$ | 87:26, 101:23, |
| 67:22, $72.24,76: 20$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 79:18 } \\ & \text { forgive }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |  | $31: 23,31: 26$ | 100:7, 100:14, | 109:7, 109:11, |
| 77:29, 80:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 72:15 } \\ & \text { forgot }[1]- \\ & \text { 140:25 } \\ & \text { form }[31]-21: 7 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | 91:22, 118 | 32:24, 33:10, | 100:18, 100:27, | 119:16, 122:9 |
| 82:8, 83:28, 84:9, |  | 135:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 17,33: 26, \\ & 34: 6.36: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 101:1, 101:8, | generated [2] - <br> 77:1, 134:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 85: 6,87: 3,87: 24 \\ & 88: 2,92: 3,92: 19 \end{aligned}$ |  | 23:15 | $37: 9,38: 8,38: 13$ | 101:11, 101:13, | generic [2]- |
| 92:23, 93:3, | 28:29, 29:14, | fulfil [1]-82:12 <br> full [10] - 53:1 | $38: 24,38: 29,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:15, 101:29, } \\ & \text { 102:8, 102:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $52: 6,52: 19$ |
| 93:13, 93:14, | 29:16, 30:14, | full [10] - 53:1, | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 7,39: 13 \\ & 39: 25,40: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:8, 102:17, } \\ & \text { 102:20, 102:27, } \end{aligned}$ | gentleman [1] - |
| 94:3, 97:10, $104 \cdot 9,107 \cdot 27$ | 31:9, 33:23, | $53: 4,54: 2,60: 9$ | $40: 11,40: 12$ | 103:4, 103:15, | 6:24 <br> geographical |
| 109:2, 110:7, | $42: 28,43: 2$, $43: 10,43: 20$ | 92:11, 98:27, | $40: 15,40: 22$ | 103:24, 104:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { geographical [2] } \\ & -37: 16,37: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 111:28, 112:3, |  | $124: 15,124: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 25,41: 2,41: 5 \\ & 41: 16,42: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:25, 108:4, } \\ & \text { 109:15, 109:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\operatorname{GERRY}_{[1] ~-~}^{\text {- }}$ |
| $117: 27,131: 11$, $131: 29,133: 29$, | 44:19, 44:26, | fully [1] - 76:26 functional [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:16, 42:3, } \\ & \text { 42:20, 42:26, } \end{aligned}$ | 109:24, 110:23, | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 3: 11 \\ \text { gift }[2]-61: 28, \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:13 } \\ & \text { firstly [1] - 46:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 5,49: 26, \\ & 49: 28,53: 4,62: 2, \\ & 64: 22,74: 3,90: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 66:24 } \\ & \text { funny }[5]-59: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 43:4, 44:7, 44:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:28, } 112: 22, \\ & 112.23 \quad 112.24 \end{aligned}$ | 107:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { firstly [1] }-46: 24 \\ & \text { fit }[2]-88: 23, \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { funny }[5]-59: 6, \\ & 133: 6,134: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $50: 12,51: 5$ | 113:16, 113:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GISC [2]-40:10, } \\ & 40: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 140:26 <br> fitness | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:22, 74:3, 90:7, } \\ & \text { 115:22, 115:27, } \end{aligned}$ | 134:16, 134:17 | 54:13, 55:3, | 113:27, 116:4, | given [8]-25:7, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:22, 115:27, } \\ & \text { 116:22, 116:25, } \end{aligned}$ | furnished [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 21,56: 25, \\ & 58: 3,58: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:26, 116:28, } \\ & \text { 117:7, 117:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $28: 3,28: 4,70: 11$ |
| $46: 26, ~ 47: 18$, $47: 19,47: 20$, | $116: 26,141: 14$ <br> formal [5] - | 73:6 | 58:16, 58:20, | 117:16, 118:23, | 79:15, 94:26, <br> 100:13, 110:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 47: 19,47: 20 \\ & 52: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $27: 17,28: 17$ |  | $59: 8,60: 2,60: 24$ | 118:24, 119:13, | gleaned [1] - |
| FITZWILLIAM [1] $-4: 5$ | 28:20, 84:17, | G | 60:27, 61:4, 61:8, | 119:17, 119:24, | 10:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-4: 5} \\ & \text { five }[3]-35: 25, \end{aligned}$ | formed [3] - | gain [2]-142:8, | $62: 20,63: 1$ | 120:21, 121:28, | Gleenon [1] - |
| $35: 26,87: 1$ | $12: 8,107: 3$ |  | 63:21, 64:15 | 122:10, 123:13, | GLEESON ${ }^{[1]}$ - |
| flowed [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:8, 107:3, } \\ & 118: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 142:18 | 66:5, 66:9, 66:12, | 123:27, 124:2, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:29 } \\ & \text { flu [1] - } 68: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { former [2] - } \\ 83: 21,84: 9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Galway [5] - } \\ 70: 22,83: 26, \end{array}$ | 66:19, 67:1, 67:9, | $25$ | Glennon [1] - |
|  |  |  | $68: 4,68: 12,69: 1$ | 127:25, 128:9, | 11:28 |




|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18:22, 18:28, | 116:26, 116:28, | 111:9, 127:7, | 69:20, 69:21, | 70:13, 102:17 |  |
| 19:1, 19:9, 19:14, | 117:7, 117:16, | 128:2 | 77:4, 77:9, 78:14, | LIAM [1] - 3:18 | 50:3, 94:25 |
| 19:19, 22:27, | 117:28, 118:23, | knowledge [10] - | 78:22, 87:15, | Licence [1] - | Longford [1] - |
| 25:16, 26:26, | 118:24, 119:12, | 9:11, 9:17, 9:19, | 112:20, 112:28, | 122:23 | 8:25 |
| 27:21, 27:29, | 119:17, 119:24, | 21:28, 66:5, | 124:15, 124:28, | Licences [2] - | longstanding |
| 28:4, 30:23, | 120:15, 120:21, | 71:25, 73:24, | 125:6, 128:25, | 121:23, 121:25 | [1] - 39:22 |
| 31:23, 31:26, | 121:28, 122:10, | 74:26, 76:26, | 130:6, 138:21, | life [2]-19:27, | look [50]-7:24, |
| 32:24, 33:17, | 123:13, 124:20, | 85:4 | 139:25, 142:1 | 30:3 | 8:10, 8:11, 10:1, |
| 33:26, 34:6, | 124:22, 124:24, | known [4] - | leaves [2] - | light [4]-40:17, | 11:18, 16:22, |
| 36:21, 37:4, 38:8, | 125:13, 126:14, | 39:22, 83:27, | 10:14, 10:22 | 58:19, 58:22, | 24:1, 24:9, 24:16, |
| 38:13, 38:24, | 126:16, 127:22, | 102:20, 106:14 | leaving [5] - | 65:21 | 26:10, 36:10, |
| 38:29, 40:10, | 127:25, 128:10, | knows [3] - | 35:14, 78:1, | likely [2] - 17:21, | 37:22, 41:6, |
| 40:11, 40:15, | 128:14, 129:23, | 76:13, 96:24, | 119:19, 120:16, | 138:19 | 43:12, 43:22, |
| 40:23, 40:25, | 130:4, 130:26, | 139:16 | 120:23 | limited [4] - | 45:11, 46:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:2, 41:5, 41:16, } \\ & 42: 3,42: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:7, 132:9, } \\ & \text { 132:14, 133:8 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { led [6]-11:14, } \\ & 30: 1.32: 16 . \end{aligned}$ | 10:8, 15:25, | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 8,78: 18,84: 4, \\ & 87: 24.90: 23 . \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 42: 3,42: 21, \\ & 42: 26,43: 4,44: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:14, 133:8, } \\ & \text { 134:15, 134:28, } \end{aligned}$ | L | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 1,32: 16 \\ & 56: 19,139: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 61: 28,131: 2 \\ \text { line }[13]-7: 8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87:24, 90:23, } \\ & \text { 92:22, 93:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $47: 28,51: 5$ $54: 13,55: 3,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:22, 137:28, } \\ & \text { 139:25, 140:4, } \end{aligned}$ | labouring [1] - | 139:25 | $12: 23,21: 7,40: 2$ | 94:8, 94:17, 97:7, |
| $55: 21,56: 25$ |  | $75: 7$ | left [24] - 19:7, | 60:13, 66:18, | $97: 22,99: 11$ |
| 58:3, 58:12, | $140: 23,140: 2$ | laceration [1] - | 34:19, 34:24, | 76:23, 85:10, | 104:9, 105:1, |
| 58:16, 59:8, 60:2, | 140:28, 141:2, | 14:20 | 36:17, 42:16, |  | $116: 2,116: 13$ |
| 60:24, 60:27, | 141:5, 141:11, | lack [7]-37:11, | 63:23, 78:5, | 139:2 | 117:5, 123:1, |
| 61:8, 61:20, | 141:13, 141:14, | 38:12, 39:11, | 78:28, 79:10, | lines [6]-27:10, | 123:14, 127:19, |
| 62:20, 63:16, | 141:21, 141:29, | 39:18, 59:14, | 94:5, 107:16, | 45:11, 53:13, | 127:28, 127:29, |
| 63:22, 66:5, 66:9, | 142:1, 142:5, | 85:28, 137:22 | 109:13, 109:23, | 67:3, 91:16, | 129:18, 130:27, |
| 66:12, 66:19, | 142:7, 142:8, | lacked [1] - | 110:4, 110:6, | 105:24 | 133:2, 133:29, |
| 67:9, 67:28, 68:4, | 142:18 | 85:25 | 117:21, 119:14, | list [3]-50:2, | 138:4, 138:8, |
| 68:12, 69:6, | Keogh's [43] - | lady [14]-23:25, | 119:22, 120:3, | 97:10, 103:25 | 139:15, 140:15 |
| 69:13, 70:1, | 8:22, 8:29, 9:11, | 24:5, 24:28, | 120:26, 121:8, | listed [2] - | looked [4] - |
| 70:11, 70:15, | 18:14, 18:26, | 26:16, 26:18, | 129:25 | 26:26, 123:2 | 18:17, 19:2, |
| 71:2, 71:6, 72:18, | 24:1, 31:6, 37:9, | 26:20, 26:21, | legal [3] - 76:21, | listen [1] - 57:9 | $96: 29,131: 3$ |
| 73:19, 75:1, 75:6, | 39:7, 50:8, 58:20, | 27:23, 28:11, | $123: 14,123: 17$ | lists [2] - 12:3, | looking [14] - |
| 75:11, 76:8, 76:9, | 61:4, 67:13, 69:1, <br> $69: 4,69 \cdot 9,69 \cdot 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 2,36: 5,36: 29 \\ & 38: 23,41: 9 \end{aligned}$ | legislation [2] - | 124:13 | 11:5, 13:22, |
| $77: 1,78: 11$ | 69:18, 69:21, | Land [2]-112:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:27, 69:15 } \\ & \text { legitimate [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | LITTLE $_{[1]}-3: 28$ loads [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 28,43: 7,86: 1, \\ & 96: 7,106: 11, \end{aligned}$ |
| 79:17, 80:11, | 73:9, 74:3, 74:9, | 112:6 | 78:15, 78:20 | $105: 25$ | 106:17, 112:9, |
| 80:14, 80:16, | $76: 21,90: 9$ | language ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\text { length [1] }-31: 3$ | local [14]-15:3, | 115:8, 115:15, |
| 83:2, 83:20, | 90:12, 91:12, | 113:9 | less [2] - 30:18, | 39:25, 45:29, | 115:29, 116:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 84: 11,86: 29, \\ & 88: 16,89: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91:18, 92:23, } \\ & \text { 93:15, 95:7, } \end{aligned}$ | lapse [1] - 118:9 | 132:22 | 46:10, 49:12, | $120: 13$ |
| 88:16, $92: 19,95: 11$, | 98:26, 109:15, | last [10]-12:23, | letter [15] - | $50: 15,50: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lorraine [8] - } \\ & \text { 57:20, 57:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 95:23, 96:3, 96:6, | 110:16, 110:23, | 23:27, 40:2, | 29:20, 30:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 51:26, 72:4, } \\ & 94: 21,95: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $58: 3,58: 9,59: 3$ |
| 96:16, 96:19, | 113:27, 116:4, | 45:11, 51:14, | 42:20, 50:29, | 95:16, 95:27, | 67:27, 133:3, |
| 96:24, 97:6, 98:8, | 117:14, 127:7, | 92:27, 114:9, | 51:21, 52:18, | $96: 1$ | 138:10 |
| 98:24, 99:18, | 131:10, 131:29, | 114:10, 114:11, | 52:19, 74:9, | locally [3] - | LORRAINE [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 99: 24,100: 6 \\ & \text { 100:7, 100:14, } \end{aligned}$ | 132:18, 135:29, $136: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:11 } \\ & \text { late [2]-6:26 } \end{aligned}$ | 76:21, 102:12, | 59:25, 60:15, | 3:4 |
| 100:18, 100:27, | kept [2] - 11:11, | 73:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:17, 121:19, } \\ & 122: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $131: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LUNCH [1] - } \\ & 80: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 101:1, 101:7, | 117:11 | law [1] - 119:10 | letting [1] - | 30:28 | lunchtime [1] - |
| 101:13, 101:29, | KEVIN [1] - 3:14 | leadership [1] - | 128:6 | located [2] - | 108:18 |
| 102•17 | key [1] - 81:19 | 81:28 | level [4]-7:5, | $30: 2,31: 1$ | LYONS [1]-4:3 |
| 102:17, 102:20, | kick [1] - 13:28 | leading [2] - | 49:17, 71:28, | Iocation [7] - | Lyons [1] - |
| 102:27, 103:4, 103:15, 103:24, | KIERAN ${ }_{\text {[1] - }}$ - 3:20 | 16:23, 22:12 | 88:16 | 14:16, 14:18, | 101:15 |
| 104:4, 105:5, | KIRWAN [1] - | $76: 20,85: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { levelled [1] - } \\ & 77: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:24, 14:25, } \\ & \text { 15:7. 26:12. } \end{aligned}$ | M |
| 105:20, 106:25, | 3:13 | least [1] - 108:28 | ise [1] - 71:2 | 30:26 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:22, 109:24, } \\ & \text { 110:20, 110:28, } \end{aligned}$ | knife [1] - 14:26 knowing [5] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { leave [21] - } \\ 41: 17,42: 23, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { liaising [1] - } \\ & 69: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { locations [3] - } \\ 35: 27,37: 17 \text {, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Madden [1] - } \\ & \text { 119:13 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Madden's [1] - | management's | 102:26, 113:6, | 133:26, 134:8, | medium [1] - | 60:17, 62:27, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 119:29 | [2] - 94:21, 95:13 | $113: 10,113: 11$ | 134:22, 137:13, | 94:25 | $64: 2,64: 14$ |
| mail [42]-13:1, | managements | Mary [1] - 30:24 | 137:26 | meet [3]-46:23, | $64: 15,65: 22,$ |
| 13:8, 13:10, | [1] - 50:15 | material [10] - | $\mathrm{McLYNN}^{\text {[1] }}$ - | 48:23, 51:27 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:23, 80:18, } \\ & \text { 103:20. 104:23. } \end{aligned}$ |
| 16:21, 16:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { manifest [1] - } \\ & 85: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 17,19: 6, \\ & 24: 17.29: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 3:31 | meeting [68] - | 103:20, 104:23, <br> 108:5, 123:12 |
| 17:4, 17:5, 17:18, 17:20, 17:21, | 85:16 manifested [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:17, 29:20, } \\ & 37: 7,50: 6,64: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MCMAHON [1] - } \\ & 3: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:27, 14:8, 14:9, } \\ & \text { 16:28, 17:14, } \end{aligned}$ | 124:17, 130:5, |
| 18:4, 18:12, | 81:12 | 65:1, 65:14, 70:2 | MCPARTLIN ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ | 17:19, 17:23, | 138:16 |
| 57:17, 57:29, | manner [9] - | materials [3] - | - $3: 20$ | 18:5, 18:7, 18:12, | member's [17] - |
| 58:8, 58:19, | 39:4, 40:1, 40:9, | 11:19, 60:11, | mean [18]-7:11, | 27:1, 48:4, 48:25, | 46:11, 47:5, |
| 59:17, 65:15, | 68:13, 68:20, | 62:1 | 70:10, 71:20, | 49:1, 49:24, | 47:11, 47:18, |
| 67:19, 67:21, | 78:20, 122:6, | MATT ${ }_{[1]}$ - 3:19 | 76:12, 79:18, | 54:27, 61:19, | 47:24, 48:16, |
| 69:3, 89:21, | 122:29, 123:22 | matter [27] - | 86:17, 97:29, | 67:12, 67:18, | 51:26, 52:1, |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { non-medical } \\ & -47: 17,47: 23 \end{aligned}$ |  | obsequious [1] | 113:12 | 8:18, 9:16, 9:18, | 76:19, 119:29, |
| $\begin{aligned} & -47: 17,47: 23, \\ & 48: 15,52: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 22,7: 2,9: 8 \\ & 13: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -108: 26 \\ & \text { observati } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { OF [3] - 3:2, } \\ 3: 15.79: 23 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:26, 16:14, } \\ & 20: 6,21: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:16, 123:3, } \\ & 124: 5,138: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| 63:26 <br> none [1] noneth | November [7] - | - 37:9, 39:10, | Offaly [1] - <br> 114:18 | 21:21, 21:23, | 138:26 |
|  | $8: 25,25: 7,31: 23$, $38 \cdot 19,39 \cdot 8$ | $40: 13,135: 9$ | 114:18 | 21:25, 21:27, | ordinary [7] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & -130: 12 \\ & \text { nonpayment [1] } \\ & -110: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $96: 14,141: 20$ | $-38: 12,94: 21$ | $6: 19,6: 21,16: 10$ | 24:28, 28:28, | 69:4, 69:19, |
|  | NUGENT [2] - <br> $3.14,3.21$ | 95:14, 141:24 | 17:23, 18:15, | 32:21, 33:3, | 71:21, 82:1, |
| $-110: 28$ <br> Noreen [4] - |  | observing [1] - | 36:1, 111:9, | 39:23, 39:24, | 101:6 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Noreen [4] - } \\ \text { 82:7, 109:23, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 14,3: 21 \\ & \text { number }[28]- \\ & 8 \cdot 16 \quad 12 \cdot 4 \quad 21 \cdot 1 \end{aligned}$ | 93:7 | 116:29 | $39: 27,41: 4,55: 1,$ | organisation |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { 110:3, 110:19 } \\ \text { normal [16] - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 16,12: 4,21: 1 \\ & \text { 21:10, 21:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { obsession [1] - } \\ & 80: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { offered [2] - } \\ \text { 111:22, 140:21 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 13,86: 8, \\ & \text { 87:14, 90:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[12]-39: 23,} \\ & 49: 12,51: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { normal }_{[16]} \text { - } \\ \text { 11:1, 12:15, } \end{gathered}$ | 27:15, 32:29, | obstacles [2] | offering [1] - | 91:13, 95:20, | 71:17, 86:15, |
| 16:20, 20:27, | 39:19, 41:15, | 47:23, 48:15 | 92:10 | $96: 10,97: 4,99: 5,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 23,98: 10, \\ & \text { 98:18 } 113 \cdot 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:7, 66:2, 77:25, } \\ & 90: 17,91: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $42: 9,70: 19,75: 2$ | obtain [1] - 89:1 | OFFICE ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 29,100: 19, \\ & 100: 22 . \quad 100: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 18,113: 21, \\ & \text { 119:9, 134:12, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 90:17, 91:19, } \\ & \text { 91:24, 92:14, } \\ & \text { 103:20, 104:19, } \\ & \text { 107:8, 119:4, } \end{aligned}$ | 76:13, 85:21, | $78: 4$ | office [12] | 101:21, 104:3, | 137:29 |
|  | 95:5, 95:11, | obviously [4] - | 42:13, 58:14, | 107:9, 108:5, | organisational |
| 107:8, 119:4, | 100:14, 102:23, | $15: 16,25: 28$ | 58:26, 89:18, | 108:12, 110:29, | [1] - 34:2 |
| $121: 13$ normally [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:29, 117:9, } \\ & \text { 138:6, 140:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 37:3, 54:10 } \\ & \text { occasion [5] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:21, 90:2, 94:4, } \\ & 112: 4,112: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:13, 115:21, } \\ & \text { 118:25, 122:28, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { orientated [1] - } \\ & \text { 81:27 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:2, 139:5 } \\ & \text { note }[15]-24: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $140: 10,141: 6$ | 35:16, 66:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 114: 18,114: 24, \\ & 116: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:10, 126:13, } \\ & \text { 128:21, 132:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { originally [1] - } \\ & \text { 135:27 } \end{aligned}$ |
| note [15]-24:7, $41: 23,42: 24,$ | 141:7, 141:13 numerical [1] - | 91:19, 106:26, 131:7 | OFFICER [2] | 132:29, 135:24, | ORLA [1] - 3:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 47: 27,65: 9,74: 8, \\ & 99: 11,99: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $50: 5$ $\text { NYLAND }{ }_{[1] ~-~}^{-}$ | occasional [1] - | $3: 11,3: 14$ | 136:6, 136:13, | OSMOND [1] - |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NYLAND }_{[1]}- \\ & \text { 3:19 } \\ & \text { NÓIRÍN }{ }_{[1] ~-~ 3: 7 ~}^{l} \end{aligned}$ | 91:21 | officer [24] - | 136:28, 138:8, | 3:27 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 99:11, } 99: 13 \\ & \text { 106:15, 109:9, } \\ & \text { 120:13, 129:27, } \end{aligned}$ |  | occasioned [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 26,10: 11, \\ & 44: 28,45: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 141:27, 143:1 ongoing [3] - | otherwise [3] - $38: 11,74: 4,$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 120:13, 129:27, } \\ \text { 129:28, 131:3 } \\ \text { notebook [5] - } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $45: 13,45: 1$ | 88:4, 103:26, | 115:10 |
|  | O | 121:21 | 46:14, 46:15, | 112:22 | ought [4] - 11:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 36: 15,103: 24, \\ & \text { 104:12, 105:2, } \end{aligned}$ |  | Occupational | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 18,46: 22 \\ & 47: 29,49: 2,51: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { open [11] - 36:9, } \\ 37: 25,49: 29, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 14,19: 19, \\ & 32: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| 106:20 | o'clock [2] - | $51: 18,64: 15$ | 56:22, 71:26, | 65:17, 68:15, | outburst [1] - |
| noted [1] - 52:25 | O'HIGGINS [5] - | occupational [5] | $\begin{aligned} & 91: 10,94: 15, \\ & 95: 4,112: 26, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 81:25, 95:10, } \\ & \text { 107:20, 120:19 } \end{aligned}$ | 56:20 |
| 18:20, 35:7, 42:3, | 3:23, 79:2, 135:8, $135: 11,136: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & -49: 7,64: 25, \\ & 65: 10,71: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 118:10, 118:14, | 127:18, 136:25 | 31:16, 46:6, 58:6 |
| 42:6, 42:8, 42:10, | O'Higgins [5] - | 131:27 | 133:18, 141:4, | opened [4] - | outline [2] - |
| 42:12, 42:14, |  | occur [2] - | 141:17 | $50: 28,63: 7,72: 2,$ | $65: 27,99: 18$ |
| 42:17, 46:27, | 78:16, 78:17, | 38:28, 127:26 | officers [3] - $45: 1,45: 15$ | 74:12 | outlined [4] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48:18, 110:4, } \\ & 132: 27 \end{aligned}$ |  | occurred [23] - 6:17, 11:21, |  | $78: 1$ | $76: 26,122: 6$ |


| output [1] - | 105:20, 106:20, | 101:29, 130:28 | 19:27, 23:8, | photocopied [1] | position [20]- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 103:20 | 109:2, 111:25, | passing [1] | 23:19, 99:5, | - 118:11 | 14:28, 26:6, 28:5, |
| outset [2] - | 113:28, 114:20, | 70:23 | 99:29, 107:2 | photocopies [1] | 54:20, 54:23, |
| $13: 26,75: 5$ | 116:26, 120:14, | past [3] - 32:17, | perfect [2]-76:3 | $-124: 13$ | 54:24, 55:11, $57: 10.58: 25 .$ |
| $14: 24,48: 29$ | 125:7, 125:26, | 12: | 136: | 128:22 | 71:6, 76:12, 77:3, |
| 49:5, 53:23, 56:6 | 128:20, 131:3, | 140:27 | perform [1] | pick [1] - 137: | 78:8, 79:3, 79:19, |
| tstanding | 131:12, 133:2 | atently [1] | 26:5 | cks [1] - 136:6 | 98:25, 100:8, |
| - 121:5 | 138:8, 140:18 | 93:7 | performance [5] | picture [3] | 102:9, 116:4, |
| vercome [2] - | paid [5] - 56:29, | patient [2] | - 47:21, 48:12 | 79:14, 113:11 | 134:18 |
| 47:21, 48:13 | 69:23, 110:27 | 26:22 | 63:28, 81:8, | 117:6 | positive [5] - |
| overcoming [1] | 118:8, 121:4 | PATRICK ${ }_{\text {[4] }}$ | 81:13 | piece [2] - 9:25, | 31:16, 36:24, |
| $\begin{gathered} -60: 4 \\ \text { overr } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pains [2] - 95:5, } \\ & 135: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $3: 3,5: 3,6: 4,80: 6$ <br> pattern [1] - | performing [1] - $62: 20$ | $10: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 86: 15,86: 18, \\ & 95: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| $55: 16$ | palpable [2] - | 49:18 |  | 107:17 | positively [1] - |
| oversee [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 85: 12,85: 16 \\ & \text { paper }[1]-125: 3 \\ & \text { papers }[3]- \end{aligned}$ | PAUL [1] - 3:30 | $\begin{gathered} \text { perhaps [12] - } \\ \text { 13:15, 16:18, } \end{gathered}$ | place [12] - 14:2, | 95:8 <br> possession [1] - |
| 124:26 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:11 } \\ & \text { pay [16] - 66:3, } \\ & 68: 2,70: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $54: 28,55: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 27,38: 28, \\ & 49: 15,61: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $110: 9$ |
| 61:25, 87:29 | $\begin{gathered} \text { papers [3] - } \\ 41: 7,87: 1,87: 15 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 18,58: 24, \\ & 80: 27,84: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $69: 6,70: 12$,$85: 13,97.4$ | possibility [2] - |
| own [6]-18:20, | paperwork [1] - |  |  |  | 35:22, 36:16 |
| 58:20, 78:27, | 121:16paragraph [11] - | $70: 29,72: 10$,$73: 20,73: 22$, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 123:20, 143:5 } \\ \text { period }[7] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $123: 21$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { possible [12] - } \\ 7: 4,7: 13,33: 23, \end{gathered}$ |
| 106:2, 115:26, |  |  |  |  |  |
| $132: 17$ | 40:2, 44:5, 44:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 74: 7,87: 29,89: 9 \\ & 108: 17,111: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { period [7] - } \\ \text { 22:17, 22:22, } \end{gathered}$ | PLACE [1] - 4:5 | $33: 24,38: 1,38: 2$ |
| owned [1] - | 51:15, 53:13, |  | 50:11, 65:23, | placed [6] - | 38:7, 38:8, 39:6, |
| 66:26 | 60:12, 61:1 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:22, 115:2, } \\ & 130: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 26:21, 37:5 | 67:12, 81:28, |
| owner [1] - 8:19 | 92:27, 94:23, | 134:24, 142:6 |  | $54: 17,64: 9$ | possibly [4] - |
|  | pardon [5] | 111:7, 121:9 payment [3] | periods [2] - | places [1] - 82:4 <br> placing [1] - |  |
|  | 13:13, 27:4, |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 65:19, } 88: 23 \\ \text { person }[13]- \end{gathered}$ |  | 59:28 |
|  | 57:16, 64:29 | 61:24, 65:21, | 16:14, 17:27, | 113:6 | post |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { PAF }_{[14]}-12: 27, \\ 14: 8,14: 9,17: 14, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:1 } \\ & \text { parking }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:6 } \\ & \text { peer [2] - 46:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 3,20: 4,21: 25, \\ & 27: 22,33: 4, \end{aligned}$ | planks [1] | potentially [2] - |
| 17:16, 17:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91:22 } \\ & \text { part [13] - 12:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:10 } \\ & \text { PEGGY }{ }_{[1]}-4: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 22,33: 4 \\ & 36: 29,70: 14 \end{aligned}$ | plead [1] - 30:14 | $\begin{gathered} 56: 28,75: 9 \\ \text { practice }[6]- \end{gathered}$ |
| 18:12, 20:28, |  | PEGGY [1] - 4:4 penalty [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 20,102: 17 \\ & \text { 105:25, 122:28 } \end{aligned}$ | pleaded [1] - |  |
| 27:1, 27:9, 49:24 | 55:18, 79:10, | 140:13 | Personal [1] - | point [16]-9:7, | 90:18, 91:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PAGE }[1]-5: 2 \\ & \text { page }[72]-7: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85: 5,97: 10 \\ & 118: 20,120: \end{aligned}$ | pending [1] - | 25: |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91:24, 92:14 } \\ & \text { pre [2]-34:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 7:25, 8:2, 8:12, | 122:25, 128:4 | PEOPLE [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:26 } \\ & \text { personally }[4] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $71: 5,78: 16$ | $34: 25$ <br> pre-NCT ${ }^{[2]}$ - |
| $11: 19,12: 4$, $12.22,12.29$ | 138:24, 139:22 |  |  | 78:28, 80:23, |  |
| $12: 22,12: 29$, $19: 6,20 \cdot 9,24 \cdot 1$ | part-time [1] - |  | 39:24, 39:26, | 100:7, 100:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 34:20, 34:25 } \\ & \text { preconceived } \end{aligned}$ |
| 19:6, 20:9, 24:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:7 } \\ & \text { participants } \end{aligned}$ | 12:8, 12:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87:22, } 87: 23 \\ & \text { personnel [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $126: 5,126: 1$ |  |
| 24:17, 26:11, |  | 12:15, 12:21,23:12, 51:23, |  | 126:27, 126:29, | $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-54: 28} \\ & \text { predate [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 29:19, 30:11, | - 67:7 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 21,32: 9 \\ & \text { perspective }[1 \end{aligned}$ | 138:13 pointed [5] - |  |
| $37: 3,37: 6,42: 1 \text { ! }$ |  | 57:7, 59:12, |  |  | 139:10 |
| 44:22, 44:23, | 17:2, 22:28, | 59:24, 75:8, | 67:8 | 66:23, 75:12, | predecessor [3] $-82: 7,109: 14$, |
| 45:7, 46:16, 50:6, 50:27, 50:29, | $27: 28,34: 6$, $101: 4$ | 81:19, 85:20, | PETER [1] - 3:13 | 93:25, 112:14, | $\begin{aligned} & -82: 7,109: 14 \\ & \text { 109:23 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 51:14, 51:21, | 101:4 <br> particularly $[5$ | 85:22, 85:23, | phone [16] 26:15, 28:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:14 } \\ & \text { points [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:23 } \\ & \text { premise [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 52:21, 57:15, | 6:13, 7:6, 102:6, | $101: 9,101: 1$ | 59:13, 66:8 | 136:14 police [3] - 28:6, | 135:12 premises [1] - |
| 57:17, 57:29, 59.2 60:29, 22.1 | 115:2, 128:12 | 101:13, 103:10, | 66:11, 68:18, |  |  |
| 64:21, 82:22, | parties $[1]-$$84: 28$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:4, 121:19, } \\ & \text { 122:22, 123:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 100:15, 125:15, | 31:28, 112:17 | 35:14 |
| 84:5, 85:10, |  | 122:22, 123:7, | 125:16, 125:23 | policing [3] - | prescribed [4] - |
| 87:26, 90:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:26 } \\ & \text { party [3] - 11:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 124:8, 124:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:8, 127:8, } \\ & \text { 131:8, 136:28 } \end{aligned}$ | 46:26, 52:2, | 42:27, 43:5, $43: 24,44: 7$ |
| 91:3, 92:22, $92 \cdot 25 \quad 93 \cdot 18$ |  | 133:22, 133:28, | $137: 5,137: 11$ | 86:21 <br> policy [3]-21:7, | presence [3] - |
|  | 28:10, $86: 23$pass [3] - 74:21, | 136:27 | phoned [6] | 28:27, 39:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 10,39: 11, \\ & 130: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| 97:22, 99:6, |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 66:12, 68:9, } \\ & \text { 87:11, 125:12, } \\ & \text { 126:14, 127:21 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { poor }{ }_{[1]}-81: 6 \\ & \text { portion }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 135:15 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 99:12, 102:12, | 90:10, 97:5 | $142: 6,142: 7$ <br> perception [6] - |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { present [8] - } \\ 8: 26,24: 20 \end{gathered}$ |
| $105: 5,105: 14$ | passed [2] - |  |  |  |  |



| 66:13, 67:1 | reflection | 53:1, 53:18 | relationship | 40:13, 46 | 79:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 67:18, 67:24, | 44:12, 113:2 | 53:24, 54:16, | - 47:22, 63:10, | 46:29, 49:5, 49:6, | solve [1] - |
| 68:1, 68:14, 69:4, | reflects [4] | 54:18, 54:20, | 83:22, 83:24 | 53:4, 55:1, 56:13, | 63:1 |
| 69:20, 71:11, | 23:5, 80:20, 82:4, | 55:4, 55:7, 57:23, | relationships [1] | 60:28, 63:2, 63:4, | resort [1] - 92:9 |
| 74:3, 85:2, 95:29, | 107:18 | 58:3, 58:6, 59:18, | - 48:14 | 63:5, 63:7, 63:11, | Resource [1] - |
| 106:11, 127:2, | Reform [1] - | 60:16, 62:25, | relatively [1] - | 63:14, 63:19, | 98:3 |
| 140:12, 140:21 | 73:21 | 65:11, 71:14, | 108:10 | 64:6, 64:7, 64:8, | Ou |
| recording [4] - | reforming [1] - | 71:29, 73:3, 88:8, | relevant [9] - | 64:10, 65:6, | 95:9, 98:19, |
| 44:23, 66:25, | 81:22 | 88:11, 102:18, | 20:15, 41:20 | 65:27, 66:10, | 135:1 |
| 68:20, 94:19 | refused [3] | 112:21, 112:27, | 46:27, 46:29, | 70:6, 73:6, 76:24, | Resources [2] - |
| records [4] - | 34:9, 38:9, | 113:3, 130:9, | 63:9, 69:15, 70:5, | 76:27, 93:24, | 51:23, 131:26 |
| 18:20, 48:3, | 123:19 | 131:24, 131:28, | 76:17, 114:20 | 113:20, 131:25, | RESOURCES |
| 115:5, 131:6 | regard [10] - | 133:21, 137:14, | reliance [2] - | 138:9, 138:21, | [1]-3:15 |
| recovery [1] - | 19:20, 80:21, | 140:24, 141:12 | 60:23, 64:9 | 139:19, 140:26, | respect [15] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:1 } \\ & \text { rectified }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 84:29, 86:11, | relates [3] - | relieving [1] - | 141:25 | 25:13, 30:15, |
|  | 86:15, 94:3, | 66:25, 75:13, | 55:21 | reported [12] - | 44:27, 45:1, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:28 } \\ & \text { recurring }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 98:26, 108:22, | $75: 18$ | reluctance [1] | 11:22, 14:23, | 58:16, 58:23, |
| 49:24 | $130: 21,135: 15$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { relating [2] - } \\ 53: 6,109: 24 \end{gathered}$ | 88:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:6, 50:17, } \\ & \text { 60:19, 63:2, 63:9, } \end{aligned}$ | 58:26, 65:19, |
| REDDY ${ }_{[1]}-4: 5$ reduced [2] - | 54:11 | relation [90] - | 60:17 | 66:16, 66:19, | 4:27, 106:21 |
|  | regarding [1] - | 7:8, 7:25, 8:20, | relying [1] - | 83:7, 113:25 | 141:5, 141:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:2, 89:10 } \\ & \text { reduction }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $37: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:29, 10:19 } \\ & \text { 10:20, 11:16 } \end{aligned}$ | 53:25 | $\begin{gathered} \text { reporter [3] - } \\ 53: 19,63: 20, \end{gathered}$ | $141: 13$ |
| $41: 17$ <br> reentered [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:7 } \\ & \text { Region [1] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 4,13: 18 \\ & 14: 15,15: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 102:9, } 121: 5 \\ \text { remains [1] - } \end{array}$ | 135:3 reporting [6] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { 40:20, 135:13 } \\ \text { respond }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:6 } \\ & \text { Reese [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:21 } \\ & \text { regional } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:14, 18:22, } \\ & \text { 19:25, 19:26, } \end{aligned}$ | 33:10 remembe | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:27, 53:26, } \\ & \text { 60:19, 62:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:11 } \\ & \text { responded }[2] \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30:25 } \\ & \text { refer [5] - 9:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:17 } \\ & \text { regional/ } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:15, 21:22, } \\ & \text { 22:5, 22:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 24,27: 6,27: 7, \\ & 27: 10,32: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 80: 19,88: 23 \\ \text { reports [9] - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 10,128: 13 \\ & \text { responders }[1]- \end{aligned}$ |
|  | branch [1] - 45:3 | 22:27, 23:18, | 39:1, 66:7, 68:14 | $46: 27,47: 3,52: 9$ | 12:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:23 } \\ & \text { reference [5] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { regulation [10] - } \\ & \text { 69:21, 87:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:22, 26:10, } \\ & 27: 16,27: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 8,109: 5, \\ & 114: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 21,57: 27 \\ & 58: 3,65: 6,74: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { response [4] - } \\ & \text { 17:3, 60:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14: 14,43: 1,50: 8, \\ & 75: 9,82: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 93:23, 111:15, | 27:25, 28:27, | reminded [1] - | 119:10 | $129: 14,130: 13$ |
|  | 111:21, 118:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 21,31: 26, \\ & 32: 6,32: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $121: 11$ | representative <br> s [1]-76:22 | responsibilitie |
| 46:18, 48:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 119: 4,120: 2 \\ & 120: 4,140: \end{aligned}$ | 33:14, 33:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { remove [1] - } \\ & \text { 19:22 } \end{aligned}$ | reputation [2] | $\mathbf{s} \text { [2] - 55:22, }$ |
| 48:10, 53:4, | 120:4, 140:3 <br> regulations [5] - | $35: 18,36: 21,$ | 19:22 <br> removed [13] | $25: 29,80: 26$ | 82:12 responsible [2] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 61: 29,62: 2,62: 7 \\ & 64: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 58:5, 66:1, | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 2,38: 17 \\ & 38: 29.40: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 7:15, 7:18, 7:19, | request [5] - | 71:10, 86:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:15 } \\ & \text { referred [13] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 110: 26,120: 5, \\ & 139: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 29,40: 22, \\ & 41: 13,41: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 21,8: 5,18: 2 \\ & 19: 9,20: 2,20: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48:8, 99:16, } \\ & \text { 116:6, 116:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rest }[5]-12: 3 \text {, } \\ & 15: 6,15: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| 20:8, 22:26, | rehabilitation | 42:10, 42:15, | 22:1, 22:9, 26:19, | 140:7 | 44:25, 123:16 |
| 44:11, 46:23,$46: 25,47: 8$, | [1] - 69:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 5,46: 1,50: 23 \\ & 54: 4,54: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $31: 4$ | requested [2] - <br> 88.25 141.23 | result [9] - 9:28, |
|  | rehabilitative [1] | 54:15, 54:17, | remuneration | $\begin{array}{r} 88: 25,141: 23 \\ \text { required } 88]- \end{array}$ | $35: 2,37: 14$ |
| 51:29, 52:7, | - 49:21 | $56: 7,56: 14$ | $\text { [2] }-65: 21,69: 24$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { required [8] - } \\ 36: 2,43: 7,44: 16, \end{gathered}$ | $42: 28,46: 4,69: 2$ |
|  | reignite [1] - | $56: 28,59: 17,$ | renewal [1] - | 36:2, 43:7, 44:16, $49: 21.65: 20$ | 90:26, 119:16, |
| 143:1 referring [8] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 96:26 } \\ & \text { reinfo } \end{aligned}$ | $60: 4,63: 19,66: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:22 } \\ & \text { renew } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:21, 65:20, } \\ & \text { 103:21, 126:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:21 } \\ & \text { results [2] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { referring [8] - } \\ \text { 43:10, 43:20, } \end{gathered}$ | 59:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 11,66: 19, \\ & 67: 29,69: 27, \end{aligned}$ | 117:11 | 126:27 <br> requires [3] - | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 46:29, 81:26 } \\ \text { RESUMED } \end{array}$ |
| 44:3, 51:18, | 73:22 | 70:1, 70:3, 71:14, | $112: 25,132:$ | 40:10, 53:4, | 6:1, 80:1 |
| 60:23, 96:23, | reject [2] | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 25,72: 5,73: 8, \\ & 73: 9,73: 15,74: 6, \end{aligned}$ | replied [1] - 93:4 | 103:26 | reticent [1] - |
| $\begin{gathered} 97: 5,134: 15 \\ \text { refers }[7] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 124:29, } 132: 6 \\ \text { relate [1] - } 42: \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 9,73: 15,7 \\ & 74: 23,74: 29, \end{aligned}$ | reply [1] - 76:29 <br> report [51] - | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Rescue [2] - } \\ 30: 12,30: 15 \end{array}$ | $53: 24$ <br> RETIRED ${ }_{[7]}$ |
| 29:22, 42:23, | related [43] - | 75:6, 77:15, $77 \cdot 16 \quad 77 \cdot 17$ | 13:1, 13:2, 13:3, | rescue [1] - | $3: 5,3: 6,3: 7,3: 7,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 46: 16,53: 8,58: 1 \\ & 64: 8,65: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 43:1, 43:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 16,77: 17, \\ & 77: 22.80: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 13:6, 13:11, | $24: 29$ | $3: 11,3: 12,3: 13$ |
| reflect [1] - | $43: 28,44: 11,$ | $90: 16,92: 4,92: 6,$ | 13:20, 13:22, | rescued [1] - $24 \cdot 28$ | retirement ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
|  | 45:23, 45:26, | 100:18, 103:20, | 13:24, 29:17, | 24:28 | 6:25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48:19 } \\ & \text { reflected [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | 46:4, 50:11, | 106:23, 116:4, | 33:29, 36:15, | research [1] - 76.24 | retrospective |
|  | 50:16, 50:19, | 116:28, 134:8, | 37:2, 37:5, 37:28, |  | [5] - 138:16, |
| 98:2, 117:12 | 50:24, 52:26, | 137:12 | 39:8, 39:25, | reserve [1] - | 139:1, 139:9, |



| 107:26 | 121:7 | 125:18, 126:12, | stage [19]-14:2, | 100:18 | stumbling [2] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| short-term [2] - | simply [2] - | $128: 28,139: 4$ | 15:27, 16:8, | still [2]-95:3, | $59: 14,137: 22$ |
| $50: 4,62: 12$ | 19:10, 127:9 | sort [18] - 13:11, | 16:22, 18:1, | $136: 18$ | style [1] - 81:24 |
|  |  |  |  | stole [1]-14 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 37: 4,102: 10 \\ & 108: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 18,44: 15, \\ & 100: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 79:6, 79:27, |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { stolen [1] - } \\ 11 \cdot 23 \end{gathered}$ | $\text { 2, } 78 \text { : }$ |
| 108:10 shoulders [1] - | 100:7 <br> sinister [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 6,79: 27, \\ & 85: 23,86: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 17,77: 19, \\ & 78: 7,86: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:23 } \\ & \text { stop [1] }-67: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 78:16, 118:7 subjected [1] - |
| $86: 1$ | $121: 7,137: 16$ $\text { SINÉAD }_{[1]-4}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 10,101: 22, \\ & 104: 6,122: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:14, 108:3, } \\ & \text { 110:9, 117:13 } \end{aligned}$ | stopped [1] - | 17:27 |
| 49:29, 89:28, | sit [4] - 103:24, | 122:4, 134:22, | 128:19, 134:28 | storage [1] - | 78:6, 78:20, |
| 89:29, 116:16, | 104:11, 105:1, | 136:28, 137:11, | stages [1] - | 11:9 | 78:28 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:28, 127:9, } \\ & \text { 128:14, 128:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 106:19 } \\ \text { sitting } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:18 } \\ & \text { sorted [2] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:11 } \\ & \text { standing } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { strand [1] - } \\ & 26: 19 \end{aligned}$ | submissions [2] <br> - 75:8, 75:18 |
| $130: 26$ showed [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:4 } \\ & \text { situation [12] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 118:27, 121:21 } \\ \text { sought [3] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:19, 136:24 } \\ & \text { start }[7]-13: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { strange }[2]- \\ 59: 13,137: 18 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { submit [1] - 29:1 } \\ & \text { submitted [3] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 89:29, 93:22, | 25:2, 32:19, | 68:24, 72:21, | 63:18, 79:28, | STREET [2] - | 50:14, 138:16, |
| 94:4 | 35:23, 54:1, | 73:20 | 98:29, 104:24, | 3:28, 3:32 | 139:20 |
| shown [1]-22:5 | 55:14, 83:10, | Sound [1] - | 132:7, 134:13 | street [1] - | submitting [1] - |
| shows [1] - | 85:14, 86:19, | 72:15 | started [4] - | 126:10 | 29:1 |
| $115: 23$ | 110:14, 122:22, | source [7] - <br> 11:8, 11:15 | 59:15, 137:23, | stress [59] - | subsequently |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { shutting [1] - } \\ & 79: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 124:7, 135:3 <br> six [1] - 35:25 | 11:8, 11:15, $52: 29,60: 15$ | 137:25, 138:5 STATE [1] - 3 | 43:1, 43:18, | $\text { [1] }-31: 1$ |
| sick [23] - 41:17, | skills [3] - 47:21, | 69:12, 92:5, | State [1] - 111:8 | $45: 26,46: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { substantive [1] - } \\ & 83: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 42:23, 50:3, 50:4, | 48:12, 48:13 | 119:25 | state [1]-9:23 | 46:11, 50:12, | suffered [2] - |
| 56:29, 58:3, 65:6, | slash [2] - 14:19 | spaces [1] - | statement [26]- | 50:24, 52:26, | 42:26, 141:11 |
| 66:3, 67:10, | slight [1] - 32:24 | 91:22 | 7:15, 8:11, 9:9, | 52:29, 53:18, | suffering [4] - |
| 67:17, 67:23, | slightly [2] - | speaking [4]- | 9:13, 9:19, 9:29, | 53:24, 54:16, | 44:8, 53:17, |
| 68:6, 68:20, | 100:18, 120:6 | 27:11, 39:1, | 15:19, 18:13, | 54:18, 54:21, | 53:25, 112:21 |
| 69:20, 69:21, | Smith [1] - 19:4 | 124:1, 135:28 | 18:19, 19:3, 19:4, | 54:26, 55:5, 55:7, | sufficient [1] - |
| 71:7, 88:6, 89:10, | SMITH ${ }_{[1]}-3: 21$ | speaks [1] - | 34:10, 34:15, | 55:11, 55:15, | 71:23 |
| 112:20, 112:28, | so.. [2]-126:28, | 136:9 | 35:2, 36:21, 38:9, | 55:23, 56:24, | sufficiently [1] - |
| 124:27, 138:21 sickness [8] - | $130: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { specialised [1] - } \\ & 57: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 11,39: 14, \\ & 39: 15,50: 8,72: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 23,58: 4,58: 6, \\ & 58: 21,59: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $47: 7$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { sickness [8] - } \\ & \text { 45:9, 49:14, } \end{aligned}$ | sole [1] - 26:8 | 57:11 <br> specialist ${ }^{11]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 15,50: 8,72: 2, \\ & 82: 8,85: 7,90: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 58:21, 59:9, | suggest [2] - |
| 62:12, 66:1, 69:2, | 74:10, 76:2 | 46:28 | 96:12, 109:2 | 60:16, 65:11, | suggested [2] - |
| 69:5, 69:18, | 113:12, 113:17, | specific [6] - | states [2]-50:8, | 69:10, 69:13, | 53:1, 111:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97:15 } \\ & \text { side }[10]-45: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 113:21 SOLICITOR'S | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 6,96: 2 \\ & 115: 15,116: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63: 16 \\ & \text { stating } 2] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 14,71: 29 \\ & 73: 3,88: 8,88: 10 \end{aligned}$ | suggesting [10] |
| 78:21, 99:5, | SOLICITOR'S [1]-3:27 | 119:18, 123:29 | $8: 28,26: 16$ | 88:11, 88:16, | $\begin{aligned} & -40: 28,41: 7, \\ & 92: 13,94: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| 99:29, 100:19, | SOLICITORS ${ }_{[1]}$ | specifically [2] - | station [13] - | 112:21, 112:27, | 95:26, 97:1, |
| 100:22, 100:24, | $-4: 5$ | $91: 18,117: 1$ | 23:13, 39:25, | 113:3, 130:9, | 98:21, 111:20, |
| 114:1, 120:29, | solution [6] - | specificity [1] - | 40:12, 80:18, | 131:12, 131:22, | 116:14, 126:22 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 121: 2 \\ \text { sighted }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 20,96: 5 \\ & 111: 23,118: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 92:6 } \\ & \text { speculati } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 19,86: 5, \\ & 86: 23,91: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:24, 131:28, } \\ & \text { 132:3, 132:15, } \end{aligned}$ | suggestion [6] - |
| 36:25 | solving [1] - | $92: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 106: 22,108: 2 \\ & 114: 13,130: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:24, 133:9, } \\ & \text { 134:9, 135:22, } \end{aligned}$ | 95:26, 96:2, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { sighting [2] - } \\ 33: 18,35: 25 \end{gathered}$ | 102:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { speed [1] - } \\ & 31: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $130: 17$ | $137: 15,140: 24$ | $132: 6,135: 28$ |
| sign [2] - 43:7, | 20:2, 40:29, 41:6, | spoken [3] | Station [3] | 141:12 | $19: 22,95: 16$ |
| 71:28 | 65:6, 68:19, | 28:4, 110:29, | 16:8, 30:26, | stress' [1] - | suit [1] - 143:13 |
| signature [1] - | 86:20, 104:1, | 128:9 | 112:24 | 112:24 | suitability [1] - |
| $\begin{array}{r} 44: 16 \\ \text { sign } \end{array}$ | 107:9, 118:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { square [1] - } \\ & \text { 132:13 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { status [2] - } \\ 90: 19,117: 14 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stressors [1] - } \\ & 50: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $58: 17$ |
| 39:15, 64:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:6, 119:9 } \\ & \text { soon [1] }-12: 9 \end{aligned}$ | SR1 [2] - 64:22, | statutory | strict [1] - 108:7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { suitable [2] - } \\ 67: 15,137: 9 \end{gathered}$ |
| 115:8, 116:16, | sorry [17]-10:2, | 65:10 | 39:14, 90:3, 90:6, | strictest [1] - | summarised [1] |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 140:22, 141:14 } \\ \text { significant }[1]- \end{gathered}$ | 10:3, 13:10, | $\begin{gathered} \text { stabbed [2] - } \\ 6: 18,7: 29 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:17, 115:29, } \\ & \text { 116:9, 116:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 47:4 } \\ & \text { strike [1] }-76: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $-31: 11$ |
| $87: 1$ | 36:28, 57:16, 64:26, 64:27, | 6:18, 7:29 stabbing [1] - | 116:19, 117:1 | structure [1] - | summary [3] - |
| similar [2] - 9:6, | 64:29, 65:13, | 8:5 | stealing [1] - | 13:29 | 48:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:14 } \\ & \text { simple }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 14,72: 15 \\ & 105: 13,125: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { staff [3] - 82:2, } \\ 122: 11,123: 26 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:26 } \\ & \text { step }[2]-55: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stuck }[1]-18: 27 \\ & \text { stuff [1] - 121:21 } \end{aligned}$ | Sunday [1] - <br> 140:4 |






[^0]:    "Ni ght taxi man stabbed at Bl oonfiel d Drive."

