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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVB, ON MDNDAY, 27TH
JANUARY 2020:

ME. MEGRATH Good morning, Chairman. The first witness this morning is Superintendent Alan Murray. CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Thanks, Ms. McGrath.

## SUPERI NTENDENT ALAN MRRAY, HAM NG BEEN SVDRN, YAS DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY ME. MEGRATH, AS FOLLOVG:

THE WTNESS: Superintendent Alan Murray, Mullingar. CHAN RMAN Thanks very much. Good morning superintendent. Yes, Ms. McGrath, thank you.
1 Q. M. MEGRATH Now, good morning, superintendent.
A. Morning.

2 Q. Chairman, the superintendent's statement is at page 1775 of the books. I think, superintendent, at the moment you're attached to Mullingar Garda station, is that right?
A. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

3 Q. I think you may or may not be aware, but we're asking you to assist the Tribunal in relation to issue number 7, which is a disciplinary investigation in relation to the sick leave of Garda Keogh in July 2015. I think you might be aware of is that, is that right?
A. I am aware of that, Mr. Chairman.

4 Q. Now this was an investigation under I think regulation 14 of the Garda Síochána (Discipline) Regulations 2007, is that right?
A. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

5 Q. I think you were appointed as the deciding officer for this investigation by Chief Superintendent wheatley on 10th August 2015, isn't that correct?
A. That is correct.

6 Q. Now, in relation to the disciplinary regulations, if I could ask Mr. Kavanagh just to bring them up on the screen, they're at 7793, please, Mr. Kavanagh. If I could ask you to go to 7796. If you just move down to the end there. I think part 2 of the regulations deals 10:34 with less serious breaches of discipline, and that is the regulation 14 that applied to you, is that right?
A. That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

7 Q. Okay. Now, if we just move onto the next page, (3) there, so that's 14(3), these are the following disciplinary actions that are open to you when you carry out a regulation 14 investigation, is that right?
A. That is right.

8 Q. The first one is:
"A reduction of pay not exceeding 2 weeks' pay; repri mand; warni ng; caution, or; advi ce. "

Is that right
A. That is right.

9 Q. 14(4) says that if you are going to choose (3)(a), which is the reduction in pay, it cannot exceed the member's two weeks' pay, is that right?
A. That is right.

10 Q. And the amount deducted in any one week shall not exceed $10 \%$ of the weekly pay. So it's important that you are fully briefed in relation to what the correct pay for the member is, is that right?
A. That's correct.

11 Q. okay. Now, under subsection (6) there, and this is just for the sake of completeness for the Chairman, under (6), it outlines there on the third line, you can undertake any enquiries and adopt any procedures that you consider necessary, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

12 Q. With a view to establishing the facts of the matter under investigation and identifying or resolving any conflicts or differences that may come to light during the investigation?
A. That is correct.

13 Q. And then under subsection (7), you have the option of directing a member not below the rank of superintendent to undertake these enquiries, is that right?
A. That is right.

14 Q. okay. I think is that a fair summary of the procedures then that are followed for the purposes of the regulation 14 investigation?
A. It is, yes.

15 Q. We also know that under the regulations -- and just to summarise, I think there is a notice of interview, we wil1 come to that in a moment, then there is the interview. I think you make the decision and it's after that, that the report of the interview is
supplied to the member, is that right?
A. I forward the report of interview to the chief superintendent.
16 Q. Sorry, yes, to the chief superintendent. I think it's within 14 days of the interview, is that right?
A. Yeah. Yeah, and the chief superintendent will forward it to the member concerned. I do my file for the chief superintendent.
17 Q. okay. Then I think if Mr. Kavanagh goes forward to 7800, that's section 19 , I think this is the section which provides for the review of your decision, is that right?
A. That is correct. Section 18 and section 19, yes.

18 Q. And this is carried out by the appointing officer, and in your case that was Chief Superintendent Lorraine wheatley, isn't that right?
A. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

In particular, on the next page, subsection (5), it outlines the circumstances in which your decision could be reviewed, including, for example, if there was an issue in relation to the facts there, at subsection (c) or if there was an issue of proportionality, at subsection $E$, isn't 'that right. They are the types of circumstances where a decision may be reviewed by the chief superintendent?
A. That's right.
Q. That's just an overview of regulation 14. I think you were supplied with the documentation for the purposes of the Regulation 14 by the appointing officer, is that
right? So the material comes in to you with your appointment, is that right?
A. Yes. Whatever files the chief superintendent had, she would send to me along with the I.A. 11.
21 Q. Okay. In relation to Garda Keogh, we will come to that 10:38 specific material in a moment, but just again for the sake of completeness, just looking at Regulation 14, I think there is a $H Q$ Directive in relation to this procedure. If Mr. Kavanagh could open up page 8814 just for a moment. This was sent to the chief superintendent by Chief Superintendent Ward at Internal Affairs on 18th August 2015, and he is simply saying, in the second paragraph:
"It is noted that Superintendent Murray has been appointed as deci ding officer in this matter, who shoul d be gui ded by the terns of HQ di rective 159/08."

I think you would be familiar with $159 / 08$, is that right?
A. Yes.

22 Q. And 159/08 is in the book and it's at 11802. These are:
"Notes on di sci pl i nary procedures under the Garda Sí ochána (Di sci pl ine) Regul ations. "

If a Regulation 14 -- if I could Mr. Kavanagh to look at 11812 .

CHA RMAN 11812 or 11802.
MG. MEGRATH I think it's 11812.
CHA RMAN Thank you.

23 Q.
MS. MEGRATH The role of deciding officer there in relation to you, chief superintendent, it says:
"A deci ding must examine all the circumstances of the alleged breach and is under an obligation to establish the truth about a member's expl anation."

Isn't that right?
A. That's right.

24 Q. Subsection (2) refers to there, where new allegation materialises; subsection (3), and this is the provision of assistance in respect of members; and subsection (4) :
"Deci ding officers should make full use of Regul ation 14(7) to obtain assistance in the conducting of the i nvesti gation. "

That was where we opened earlier, where you could ask someone not below the rank of inspector to make enquiries for you, is that right?
A. That is correct.

25 Q. Now, in relation to the provision of a penalty, if you remember, one of the options available to you was a reduction in pay, and $I$ think this is dealt with in this HQ Directive 11816. If you just go on down there,
the imposition of a penalty there at subsection (4). Because I suppose I am concentrating on these because this was the option that was imposed in respect of Garda Keogh, isn't that right?
A. Sorry, can you repeat that?
A. Yes.
okay. And it says there at 4(a):
"Bef ore imposing a penalty, due regard must be given to the record of service, previ ous conduct and circunstances of the menber concerned and to any other rel evant matter and submissions may be recei ved from any person for that purpose and the mentber concerned and any ot her person accompanying the nember shall be gi ven an opportunity to make oral or, where appropriate, written submissions with regard to such matters."

Isn't that right?
A. That's right.
Q. Now, I think it also repeats there that it can't exceed the two weeks and we have referred to that earlier.

I think that's all I want to open there with regard to your founding documentation really for the investigation. Is that a fair summary of your role and the provisions that are applying when you are carrying
out this type of investigation?
A. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

29 Q. Okay. Now, as we mentioned earlier, you were appointed on 10th August 2015 and you received a number of documents from the chief superintendent. I just want to look at those, please. In particular, you got what is called a form 1.A.22, and this is at page 8811, Mr. Kavanagh, please. I think the Chairman has seen this before when Superintendent Pat Murray was giving his evidence. It outlines the detail of the superintendent, of Garda Keogh. In the middle there, that's a reflection really of section 14(3), which we opened, isn't it, the options that are available?
A. That's correct.

30 Q. So there's five options. Then, if you go on to the next page, "brief details of the act are":
"Having reported fit to return to duty at 10:00pm on 10th July 2015, failed to report for duty bet ween 11th and 14 th July 2015 and remai ned absent wi thout I eave
during the period without expl anation or answering phone calls to expl ai $n$ his whereabouts during that time."

So I think that was the form 1.A. 22 that you got, is that right?
A. That's correct.

31 Q. Now, you also then got a number of documents with this. If I could ask Mr. Kavanagh to look at 2221, please.

So that is 2221. okay. So, we understand from Chief Superintendent Murray's evidence that this was the letter that was provided with this form and this came from Superintendent Pat Murray at the time, it's dated 4th August 2015. If you look at this, superintendent, please. It has a number of tabs attached to it. Tab A -- and forgive me, Chairman, I know you have seen some of these before with Mr. Marrinan.

CHA RMAN It's all right, don't worry. seen throughout our evidence. That's for 9th July 2015. That's recording that he reported unfit for duty, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

Then the next one is tab B, 2223. I think you might have gone too fast, Mr. Kavanagh?
A. That's it there.

34 Q. This is resumption of duty and it's recording 10/7, is that right?
A. That's correct.

We know that he didn't report back for duty on that day and hence the investigation, isn't that right?
A. He reported back for duty but he never turned up for duty. Sorry, you are absolutely right. Now, the next
document is 2225, which is tab C. And again you're correct, in summarising, Garda nick Keogh, this is from Superintendent Murray:
"Unit C, reported fit for duty on 10th July 2015. However, he failed to report for duty on either Sat urday the 11 th Jul y , Sunday the $12 \mathrm{th} \mathrm{Jul} y$, Mbnday the 13th July and Tuesday 14th July 2015.

An expl anation by return is now requi red fromthe menber."

Isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

37 Q. Now, I think what I might do is finish with the tabs, but I want to go back to Superintendent Murray's letter for a moment. Tab D is 2227. This was the letter that the Chairman has seen. Garda Keogh is coming back to Sergeant Monaghan with the explanation. He says:
"With reference to overleaf, I made a mistake regarding the reporting unfit for duty. I thought l was still on sick these days. I apol ogi se for same. Sick cert attached. Forwarded for your information. "

I think that is stamped, the first date stamped on that is 21st July 2015.
A. That is correct.

38 Q. Now, we will come back to tab D in a moment, but tab E then is at 2228. If you can just keep going down, you will come to it, Mr. Kavanagh. There. And that's the sick cert that you would have seen, isn't that right?
A. That is correct.

39 Q. It's recording him as being medically unfit for work from 9th July to 15th July due to work related stress, isn't that right?
A. That is correct.

40 Q. And it's signed 16th July 2015. Now, tab $F$ is 2229. If you see there, there's a resumption of duty on 15/7/2015. You received that document as well. I think there's one more document I want to open. Actually, I will come back to another document in a moment. If we can just go back then to the letter that 10:47 the superintendent wrote, which, as I say, was at 2221. This is the one that you would have seen dated 4 th August 2015, enclosing these tabs. We have opened tab A, $\operatorname{tab} B$, $\operatorname{tab} C$, tabs $E$ and $F$. You see there that that it's recorded at paragraph 4, the last paragraph -- or the last sentence:
"He had no excuse for not returning Sergeant Mbyl an's calls."

The explanation from Garda Keogh, at paragraph 5, is described as "vague and unacceptable" and then at paragraph 6, it says:
"In order to create a defence to any possi ble breach of di scipline, the member submitted a retrospective medi cal certificate dated 16/7."

On the next page, again the Chairman has seen this:
"Having seen the menber's hi story of absence and his bl at ant di sregard for his responsi bilities to the or gani sation, whi ch appears to stemfromoveri ndul gence in al cohol, I respectfully recommend that the menber be 10:48 deal $t$ with under Regul ation 14."

As I say, that is the correspondence you received, is that right, superintendent?
A. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

41 Q. Okay. Now, can I ask you to look at -- can I ask you first, this is the material you receive, and do you rely very much on the material that you are provided with by the appointing officer? The material that we have just opened, how instrumental is that?
A. In this case I relied on it. I am open to carry out whatever inquiries I deem necessary, but in this investigation $I$ relied on that material. Can I ask you this: when we heard from Chief Superintendent Murray, we are aware that he kept diary entries and it's recorded in his diary, and perhaps just in fairness to you, we will just open the page at 2044. If you keep going down there, please, Mr. Kavanagh. This is the superintendent's record of the 15th Ju7y, which is the last day which is at issue. 10:49 There's a record there of a conversation with Garda Keogh, referencing alcohol, if you can see there in the middle of it, referencing a drink problem, you see that 1anguage?
A. I do, yes.

43 Q. Reference to drinking behaviour.
"Garda Keogh expressing a concern that Garda A and Garda bl ank might do hi mharm"

Would you have been aware or been made aware by any of your senior officers of any of this?
A. No. No, Mr. Chairman, no.

44 Q. If you just go on, there near the end:
"I asked for an expl anation as to why he di dn't answer Ser geant Mbyl an's call. He said he no credit."

Would you have been made aware of that formally by your appointing officer or senior officers?
A. No, no. There was no conversation on that.

45 Q. Okay. There was a reference there to Garda Keogh saying he had left a message for Sergeant Moylan on Facebook. Again, is that something that you knew about?
A. No, no.

46 Q. okay. On the next page, if you see there at page 9, in the middle of the page there -- no, in the middle of the paragraph, my mistake, Mr. Kavanagh. It's recorded 10:51 by the superintendent:
"I indi cated to him--"

If you can see where I am. It's in the middle of the paragraph, five lines down.
"I i ndi cated to hi m--"

That's to Garda Keogh
" -- that l woul d have to look for a case conference in rel ation to him with the chi ef medi cal office to see if hel $p$ could be provi ded to assist hi mto stop drinking. " ${ }^{10: 51}$

Would you have known about any of this background for Garda Keogh?
A. No, Mr. Chairman.

47 Q. okay. Can I ask you then, the next step in your procedure is that a notice of interview is to provided to the member in question, isn't that right?
A. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

48 Q. That is form 1.A.12, is that right?
A. That is correct.

49 Q. And it's at 8834. So at 8834, 24th August 2015, the notice of interview, and that's your document, is it "Al an Murray, superintendent"?
A. That's my document, "superintendent, At hl one" yes.

50 Q. You asked if the attached could be served on Garda Keogh personally. I think that happened a couple of days later, on 30th August there. The date is hard to read. But I think he was served with this documentation. Can I just ask you, on the next page,

8835, there's a record there of the rate of pay, 840.49, I mean I think this is instrumental from you purposes in the sense that you imposed a penalty and we know from the regulations it cannot exceed two weeks' pay. Where does this figure come from, superintendent?
A. At that time I got that from pay section, Garda pay section, Killarney.
51 Q. Okay, all right.
A. That's where I got it, by informed e-mail to Killarney.

52 Q. Okay. I think it's this notice of interview, if you look at the sections, details of interview, section в is "breaches of disci pline alleged" and we see there one is neglect of duty and one is discreditable conduct, or the next one is discreditable conduct. Again, the Chairman will be aware of these. If you go to 8838 , I think this is where it was recorded by yourself, the position of Garda Keogh. This is 8838. so the breach numbers there and you have in breach and fined for number 1 , that's neglect of duty, isn't it?
A. That is correct.

53 Q. And 2, not in breach, and you have nil, and the fine is $€ 300$, is that right?
A. That is correct.

54 Q. It's signed by both of you. So that interview took place on 18th September 2015, is that right?
A. That is correct.

55 Q. If we look at 8840, it's entitled there "report of interview with Garda Ni chol as Keogh". Can I just ask you, is this you taking his position or his evidence?

Is this a note that you took?
A. That is my note. Really at that stage I met Garda Keogh, he had indicated that he was pleading guilty to breach number 1.

56 Q. okay.

10:54

Then he explained the phone call to Sergeant McCormack. He accepts there, he said:
"I did get a phone call fromSergeant Cormac Mbylan. I di $d_{n}$ t del $i$ beratel $y$ not answer the phone to him l could have been asl eep, I was drinking heavily. At some my credit phone had run out, l coul dn't ring anybody. But l did send a message by Facebook to Ser geant Mbyl an. I acknow edged that I mi ssed his call but I had no credit at that stage. Superintendent drunk and I di d not remember phoni ng Ser geant MECormack and reporting fit for duty. It's not fair to say l had no excuse for not phoni ng Sergeant Mbyl an. Because of
the drink, no phone credit on my phone, l coul dn't phone and I di dn't thi nk of Facebook until somebody on my unit told me to use it and I did send a message to Sergeant Mbylan, telling himl had no phone credit on my phone. At that stage I knew what I had done."

Then he says in respect of the second breach, he was denying it. He said:
"I was under a lot of stress and I have attended doctor regul arly. Really l was sick for the days specified in doctor's cert. I was not fit for duty because of stress, anxi ety and the drink. I attended Dr. Bartlett regul arly. He knows my medical hi story and the stress I am under. I was not fit for work and Dr. Bartlett could see that when he exami ned me. I was so bad I had to go to the doctors and he issued me a cert."

So that is a memo then that was read over to Garda Keogh, is that right, and he signs it?
A. That is correct, Chairman.

58 Q. And you sign it?
A. That is correct.

59 Q. Can I ask you about this because it's just an issue that is arising in relation to Garda Keogh's evidence. He says that he asked for a copy of this particular memo and that he never got it. what is the procedure with regard to this memo of evidence that you take on the day, is that provided to the member or not?
A. If he had have asked me, yes. We were sitting at a table, he was opposite me. I took the memo. At no stage did he ask me for a copy of it. He signed it. If he had asked me for a copy of it, of course I would have given it to him.

60 Q. okay.
A. It's his statement like.

61 Q. And he didn't ask you for a copy of it?
A. No, definitely not.

62 Q. You record then, and it's all done on this really notice of interview form, you record your outcome and, as I say, you pointed out earlier that you recorded breach of number 1 and you fined $€ 300$, isn't that right?
A. That is correct, Chairman.

63 Q. Okay. Now, just staying with this date, I just have to ask you one thing, because it arose in the course of Superintendent Murray's evidence. We know from his evidence that you met Superintendent Murray after this interview and you told him that you had fined Garda Keogh € 300 ?
A. That's correct, yes.

64 Q. okay.
A. Sorry, no, that's not correct, I told him I fined him.

65 Q. okay.
A. At no stage would I have said how much I fined him. It was a simple conversation. I went up to Pat Murray's office. He was there. Are you going for a cup of coffee? Yeah. What are you down here for? I was down
with Nick Keogh and I fined him.
66 Q. Well, can I show you the diary entry of the chief superintendent, just to give you an opportunity to look at it, superintendent?
A. Yes.
Q. It's 12149.
"I net Superintendent Murray for I unch. Garda Keogh fined for € $€ 300$ for AhOL July."

It would suggest that on the day that he was aware that the $€ 300$ fine was imposed?
A. Yeah, that certainly suggests it, yeah. I don't honestly think I did, but maybe I did, maybe I told him I fined him $€ 300$ and that was it.

68 Q. Okay.
A. I can't dispute that.

69 Q. Can I just ask you, just again about a normal conversation in relation to this issue, would you have discussed the evidence of Garda Keogh or said, you know, what you saw was mitigation or what you saw was any difficulty for him, or why you chose to go down that route of option 1 of the reduction in pay?
A. No. No. For want of a better word, I think we had probably better things to discuss about. We were he was harping -- no, I withdraw the word harping, he was on to me continuously to me to transfer members from Mullingar to Athlone. He was badly stuck for
manpower. I was okay. You have to remember, Mr. Chairman, this was 2015, we had five years of cutbacks, both in resources and manpower and also budgets. Mullingar was lucky. I had maintained for the time I was there good resources. Superintendent Murray wasn't as lucky and he was continuously on looking for resources, would I consent to sending -the discipline didn't feature in the conversation at al1.
okay. So you didn't have any sort of detailed conversation?
A. No, no.

71 Q. Okay. And was it as simple as just saying, I just fined --
A. One line, that's it, yeah.

72 Q. Now, there is a report of the interview at -- actually, can I ask you to look at the document at 8841? It's called "report of interview, regul ation 18" and there is the record of your decision. It says:
"This report of intervi ew --"

If you can just go down.
"This report of intervi ew must be forwarded by to you 11:00 the menber concerned."

When you are talking about that, are you speaking about the document we're actually just looking at? Is that
what the member gets?
A. Yes.

73 Q. That's what the member gets?
A. Yeah, that's what I will send up to the chief, but she must forward this, it must be forwarded to the member concerned.

74 Q. But do you know the memo of evidence we just talked about a moment ago?
A. Yeah.

75 Q. Where does that go?
A. No, that goes to the chief.

76 Q. As well?
A. I do a complete file on it, covering report, statement.

77 Q. okay.
A. Include Garda Keogh's memo on it, the record of interview and it goes back up to the chief superintendent's office.

78 Q. Is it your understanding of the procedure that the report of interview, namely this document we're looking at plus the memo of the interview, goes to the member or is it just this document that goes to the member?
A. That is purely up to the chief's office.

CHA RMAN No, he is saying it goes to the chief superintendent and what happens after that --
MS. MtGRATH okay.
79 Q. CHA RMAN You send it to the chief superintendent.
A. Yeah.

80 Q. CHAN RMAN Is it out of your hands at that stage?
A. It is, yeah. I no longer have ownership of that
investigation file.
81 Q. CHA RMAR I understand.
A. I pass it to the chief superintendent.

CHA RMAN okay.
82 Q.
MS. MEGRATH So, when you're talking there about "this report of interview must be forwarded by you" that's a direction effectively, "must be forwarded by to you the member concerned"?
A. Yeah. I hate giving a direction to a chief but that's a preprinted form, so $I$ just sign that.

83 Q. Okay, but that direction, you're saying to us, applies only to this document in front of us?
A. This report of interview, yeah. what the chief superintendent sends, I do not know.
84 Q. So any additional documentation such as the memo may or 11:02 may not move to the member?
A. That's the chief's office, it's not...

85 Q. Okay. That is dated 24th September 2015 and I think on the next page is the substantive report that you drew up, is that right? Do you recognise it there?
A. I do, yes. That's correct, Chairman.
Q. Okay. You talk at page 8842 there, just a record of the facts that we know already now from your evidence and from other witnesses. Can I ask you to stop there just on the next page? You say:

[^0]Now, I think that's language which was in the superintendent's letter that we looked at, the reference to it being retrospective. what did you mean by that?
A. But it was. He called sick, had reported back for duty, hadn't turned up and then the Tuesday, whatever day it was, he then submitted a medical certificate to cover an absence where he was meant to be working. It was a retrospective medical certificate.
87 Q. Can I ask, by you using those words, were you attaching any significance to it or any kind of negative connotation, by using the word "retrospective"? Did you take a view on that?
A. I did, yes, and that was one of the breaches.

88 Q. CHA RMAN Yes, of course, that's what he was accused of?
A. Yeah.

89 Q. CHA RMAN That was one of the charges. I mean, you found him not guilty of it?
A. Correct.

90 Q. CHA RMAN But the charge, the allegation was, you said you were we11 and then you produced a certificate to say you weren't we11. That was the retrospective thing?
A. And he called to the doctor to get that.

CHA RMAN Yes.
91 Q. ME. MEGRATH Is that the sense in which you were using the word "retrospective"?
A. Yes.

92 Q. Okay. The rest of that page then is just recording facts, effectively. We have just gone through it. If you go to the next page, please, Mr. Kavanagh. And it's there on the fourth paragraph:
"Superintendent Murray recorded in writing the expl anation offered by Garda Keogh. In expl anation, Garda Keogh stated that he had been under work rel at ed stress and had been drinking heavily. He forgot that he had contacted Ser geant MECormack to report fit for duty. Garda Keogh stated that he had admitted his mistake to Superintendent P Murray and why he hadn't made it. Garda Keogh indi cated that he di d not underst and breach 2 and expl anation said Dr. Bartlett was his doctor and was familiar with his medical hi story. Garda Keogh had to go to his doctor on that date and his doctor was issued a certificate."

I think that's a summary of the memo his evidence, is that fair enough?
A. That's correct, Chairman.
Q. Then it records your outcome in the next paragraph. The mitigation there that you applied, you say:
"In mitigation, Garda Keogh stated that he had suffered 11:05 from work rel ated stress and was drinking heavily and when questi oned by Superi ntendent Murray he admitted hi s mistake."

So that's the mitigation you took into account, is that right?
A. That's correct.

94 Q. In respect of breach number 1, you fined him $€ 300$ and Garda keogh signed and dated signed the form 1.A.12? CHA RMAN I am guessing it's Internal Affairs 12, I.A. 12 rather than 1.A.12. I am just guessing, it's internal affairs?
A. That's correct, Chairman.
M. MtGRATH Thank you, Chairman. That is then the report of interview. Now, as we opened earlier the section in the regulations, the member then can apply to review the decision and Garda Keogh applied to review, isn't that right? Are you aware of that?
A. I'm aware of that, yes.

96 Q. He made an application to review, and this is at 8830 . Now 8830. He says:
"The grounds for review are: The decision is not justified having regard to the information given by me. "

I am not going to ask you to comment on that because I know it's the appointing officer --
A. I don't see that.

97 Q. But can I ask you this, I think, in fairness, I just want to give you an opportunity to comment on number 2 . не says:
"Part of the sanction rel ates to a phone call whi ch I recei ved from Superintendent Pat Murray."
which he states was on 14/7/2015.
"I believe this phone call was made on 2:08 on 15/ 7/ 2015 and is rel evant to my defence."

Can I ask you, did this ever come up with you when you -- it's not recorded on the memo of interview we opened. Did this issue come up at all on the date of the interview on the 18th September with you?
A. No. Guards are not obliged under legal compulsion to answer a phone call from a superintendent. It's called manners, and it's common decency and good manners to answer, they're not under any obligation to answer a phone cal1, disciplinary or other wise, from superintendent. It didn't cross my mind at a11.
98 Q. I suppose what I am asking you is: Does this ring a be11 with you? was it something mentioned to you by Garda Keogh?
A. No. Or did this drop out of the sky, is what I am asking you, when you read it here on the Notice of Appeal?
A. I don't read that, I don't think I seen that Notice of Appea1. I think I read this with the stenographer's report.
Q. But the issue, the issue of the phone call --
A. The issue, I knew nothing about it.
Q. CHA RMAN Did it come up as far as you can recall?
A. No.
Q. CHAN RMAN Because he pleaded guilty to number 1 and presumably the focus was on number 2 and on the penalty?
A. There wasn't too much focus on number 2 , to be honest with you, Chairman. Number 1 was primary offence. CHA RMAK okay.
Q.

MS. MEGRATH He goes on to mention there, he say:
"I would be obliged if a call log could be obtai ned regarding this."

Again, is this news to you? Had you any discussion with him or heard anything about that with Garda Keogh on the 18th when you sat down with him?
A. No, no.
Q. He says:
"I request a copy of the statement I made to
Superintendent Al an Murray for the purposes of I egal advi ce. "

Now, I think that's the memo we talked about?
A. Yeah.

105 Q. Okay. As you say, that's a matter for the chief superintendent appointing officer to deal with?
A. That's correct.
Q. okay.
A. If he had have asked me, I would have dealt with it. But I wasn't asked at any time.
Q. Now, I think at 8832, on 9th November 2015, so that is 8832, you're notified of the Notice of Appeal, the application for a review by the chief superintendent and she says:
"In order to fully consi der the appeal of Garda Keogh, I now requi re the following: A copy of the memo of i nt ervi ew st at ement nade by Gar da Keogh when i nt ervi ewed by you. "

So that suggests that at this stage she hadn't seen the memo of interview?
A. It certainly suggests that and I was conscious of it when I seen it, when I heard the memo didn't go.

Because I submitted my file in duplicate.
Q. And you think the memo was with your file?
A. Oh I'd be a hundred percent, yeah. It goes to HRM, Internal Affairs, they're pernickety enough as we11, if 11:09 it wasn't attached they would send it back.

109 Q. CHA RMAN The file you sent, you sent in duplicate, is that right?
A. Yes.

110 Q. CHA RMAN And one went to -- did you send the two to 11:09 the --
A. One to the chief's office.

CHA RMAN The chief superintendent?
A. The chief superintendent should send one up to Internal

Affairs.
112 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. Who will also go through it.

113 Q. CHAN RMAN You believe that your memo of interview was included in that?
A. I do, yes.

114 Q. M. MEGRATH Okay. Now, she goes on to say there in that middle paragraph?
"And I would asks request that you forward ne as rationale for appl yi ng a sanction of €300 agai nst Garda Keogh in respect of the first breach discipline as set out in forms Internal Affairs 12."
okay. So she asks for your rationale and you provide that on the next page, on 11th November 2015, which is 8833. So you refer there to her correspondence and you say:
"Pl ease find at tached copy of intervi ew statement made by Garda Keogh. Garda Keogh pleaded guilty."

That is just outlining what we already know. The fine. You outline your rationale. Now, can I just ask you just to look at that:
"Garda Keogh was absent without leave or expl anation for four days. In deci ding a fine l 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 $€ 300$, I took into account that Garda Keogh had a weekly pay of €840. 49, whi ch equates to €168 per day. I i mposed a fine of $€ 78$ per day that Garda Keogh was absent. I do not believe that Garda Keogh should gai n financially fromhis absence but l did not want to be harsh on him l believe the fine imposed was fai $r$ and just."

Now, do you just want to take the Chairman through that? Can I ask you, is the point of that, your main point, that you didn't wish him to gain financially from his absence for those days? That seems to be the import of your letter.
A. The main point is I didn't want to be harsh on him.

115 Q. CHA RMAN Like it or not, it's pretty clear what his thinking is. Like it or not, agree with it or don't agree with it, it's pretty clear what the rationale was?
A. Yeah. I was happy with it. I just did not want to be harsh with him.

116 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. At this stage we were having problems in Mullingar with guards having a pay cut, in negative equity, and I'm not a harsh man for discipline. But I understand the importance of discipline.

117 Q. MS. MtGRATH But I think the plain language there is that you didn't wish for him to gain financially, is that right?
A. That's right.

118 Q. okay. An issue that arose, and I just want to ask whether or not you were aware of this or not, simply for the purposes of assisting the Chairman. We are aware from Chief Superintendent Murray's evidence that he had written to the HRM in Navan on 28th August 2015, now this is prior to you interviewing Garda Keogh or anything, in relation to this issue of overpayment. If I can just show you the letter at page 2233. So, this is before you sit down with Garda Keogh at all. There's a letter to the Overpayment Department and it's 28th August 20158:
"The above named Garda Keogh was absent without I eave from 11th July 2015 to 14th July 2015 incl usi ve (SAMB updated). Pl ease recoup any over payment of wages from this empl oyee for the rel evant dates."

Now, would you have been aware or been made aware by any of your senior officers that this was something that was going to be pursued in respect of Garda Keogh and may be relevant to what you were going to do on the 18th September?
A. I was not aware of it, but it wasn't relevant to me either. They are two separate issues.
Okay. We11, if you had been aware that Garda Keogh was not going to be paid wages for the period he was off, then your rationale may not have arisen, if you understand what I am putting to you, superintendent?
A. I disagree. I did not want to be harsh on him, but I didn't want him to gain financially.
Q. okay. But can I ask you then, if the overpayment section were going to recoup any payment he got for those days, then he wouldn't gain financially. That's the logic of that?
A. It's the logic, but there is a lot of ifs there.

121 Q. okay.
A. First of all, I didn't know this was going off but HRM mightn't have taken. There was also the third sick form.

122 Q. There was the, sorry?
A. The third SR1.

123 Q. okay.
A. Which had been submitted, which showed that he resumed duty on the 15th.

124 Q. okay.
A. So they may have accepted that he be sick at that time, not absent without leave. I don't know what they did. We11, can I say that it was put, and I am paraphrasing 11:14 here, to Chief Superintendent Murray that this would effectively have been a double financial blow on Garda Keogh. The fine, plus also a recoupment of his wages. would you accept or reject that?
A. I was dealing with a man that had gone absent from duty 11:15 for four days. Resources are tight in Athlone at the best of times. Members on the unit, members on the station communicated with him, letting him know what happened, that he was absent without leave. He didn't
respond to that. Mr. Chairman, it is the easiest thing in the world for a guard to report sick. He makes a phone call, causes word to get to the member in charge. That's what we have to do. And that could have been done at any time when Garda Keogh was sick. Garda Keogh, by his own statement to me, knew that he was absent, that queries were being raised, but he did nothing to sort that out. So either way there was going to be a financial penalty, $I$ felt it was justified in this case.
126 Q. Can I ask you to look at a letter at 8825, please, superintendent? This is the response of the principal officer at HRM, Ms. Monica Carr. She goes back to the superintendent and she makes a number of enquiries about this issue of recoupment. And in particular, she 11:16 says:
"I amal so to enquire if consi deration has been gi ven to having this matter dealt with under the An Garda Sí ochána (Di sci pl ine) regul at i ons."

Now that might seem to suggest that it is either one or the other.
A. I think Ms. Carr will have to answer that. I did not see this letter, I did not know anything about this.
127 Q. okay. I suppose then just to tie down the evidence on this particular point for the Chairman, if you had known that an issue was bubbling along in the background about recouping wages, would you have

128 Q. CHA RMAN I understand?
A. So I believe I was more than fair --

129 Q. CHA RMAK I understand.
A. -- in my penalty.

130 Q. CHA RMAN But I mean, it seems to follow logically that if Garda Keogh's pay was removed, if he wasn't paid at al1 for the four days, and he had to pay the 300, that would be a double penalty in a sense, but it has nothing to do with you.
A. It has nothing to do with me.

131 Q. CHA RMAN At least as I see it, it has nothing to do
with you. That's exactly what Ms. Carr was on about, what's the story about the discipline? well, presumably Garda Keogh would have said, look, this is unfair, I'm being done twice.
A. And that would be up to Garda Keogh to say.
A. Yeah.

CHAN RMAN okay.
ME. MEGRATH Can I ask you, superintendent, just in relation to, as I say, it seems to be central for your role that you know about his wages and you had put in the figure for his pay, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

134 Q. Would you have known about his record of sick leave up to that point in time or the fact that he was gone on what's called a temporary remuneration rate? would you have known any of that, about how his pay was being affected?
A. No, Mr. Chairman.
Q. Okay. Can I just ask you then, just finally, in relation to the regulations as we saw and the HQ Directive, the full possession of the facts, I think it's your evidence that you weren't aware of this work related stress background or the case conferences issues that were arising or any of that when you were dealing with Garda Keogh in September, is that right?
A. On7y when he told me in his memo.

136
Q. Okay.
A. Yeah.

MS. MEGRATH Thank you, superintendent, I wonder if you could answer any questions.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Now, yes, Mr. Kelly.

SUPER NTENDENT ALAN MRRAY WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. 11:20 KELLY AS FOLLOVB:

137 Q. MR. KELLY: Good morning, chief superintendent?
A. Good morning.

138 Q. What you are saying, as I understand it, is, look, I have met with this guard, I listened to what he had got to say, pleaded guilty to one charge, not guilty to another, I accepted that, I found him not guilty of charge 2, I tried then to impose, as I saw it, the fairest possible penalty $I$ could; is that a fair summation?
A. That's a fair summation.

139 Q. As for any double financial impact it might have had, that formed no part of your thinking or reasoning?
A. That is correct.

140 Q. Someone else was recommending to the pay section of this sum should be recovered, had nothing to do with you?
A. That is correct.

141 Q. As you say fairly, you were trying to construct a situation where merely Garda Keogh didn't gain financially, but equally, he wasn't made hurt for it, is that right?
A. That's correct.

142 Q. One of the things I was wondering about with that -- by the way, I should say that the request for a note of the interview, that was made to Chief Superintendent wheatley, as I understand it, it wasn't being made to you, so we can leave that. No one is criticising you of that.
A. Thank you.

143 Q. But you made a note of what Garda Keogh had said to you. I have seen it in the papers, I think it's at -it's handwritten, it doesn't have to be called up, but 11:21 it is around about page 8847?
CHA RMAN 8840/1. That's the memo that Garda Keogh signed. That's the one you're talking about, Mr. Ke11y?
MR. KELLY: No, I am talking about -- look, I will hold 11:22 it up -- it's not actually crucial.
CHA RMAN No, but what is it, Mr. Kelly?
MR. KELLY: It's that one [INDICATING].
A. That's the memo of interview I recorded.

CHAN RMAN The memo of interview, yes.
MR. KELLY: I think it's at 8847 , 8848. I am simply saying that so it's on the transcript, so when people are looking at it later they know where it is. As far as you were concerned there was absolutely no reason
why Garda Keogh shouldn't have that memo, isn't that right?
A. If he had asked me, I would have certainly given it to him.

145 Q. Moreover, when you said, as I understood what you were saying, look, when I had finished this whole interview there was a file containing these documents we have been through and I submitted that, if I had understood, you correctly, you said in duplicate, is that right?
A. That's correct.

146 Q. Up to Chief Superintendent wheatley; is that correct?
A. Yes.

147 Q. And amongst that file would have been the document you've been taken through, together your memo of what Garda Keogh had said to you?
A. And the rest of the correspondence.

148 Q. Yes. Everything?
A. Yeah.

149 Q. So Chief Superintendent wheatley ought to have had that in the file?
A. That's correct.
Q. Because you put it in it a file and sent it up?
A. That's correct.

151 Q. I see. Just looking at one of the things here in the regulations, Regulation 10 , it's at Volume 27 , page 7797 , if that could be called up, Mr. Kavanagh. We're looking at -- you have been taken through Regulation 10 there and sub-regulation (14), where it identifies the circumstances and the fines re serious breaches of
discipline. This is what you were dealing with, superintendent, is that right?
A. That is correct, Chairman.

152 Q. Then sub-regulation (2), you appointment (3), and then the five possible sanctions you can impose, is that right?
A. That's right.

153 Q. Then I'm looking at this one, subsection (4):
"A reduction in pay under paragraph 3(a) shall not, in 11:24 respect of any breaches of discipline arising out of the same set of circunstances, exceeds 2 weeks' pay and the amount deducted in any one week shall not exceed $10 \%$ of weekl y pay. "

I was wondering how that fact remained with the penalty imposed?

154 Q. CHA RMAN The 300 isn't taken out in a particular week?
A. It's taken over gradually. Actually it's taken -- he doesn't pay tax on it.

155 Q. CHAN RMAN That's what I mean?
A. It means that --

156 Q. CHA RMAN No more than $10 \%$ a week. So you don't take the 300 or whatever it is out of one week?
A. In one sum.

157 Q. CHA RMAN Because that would be more than $10 \%$ ?
A. So he has to be left with $90 \%$ of his wages each week. CHA RMAN Yes, I understand.

CHA RMAN I am sorry, Mr. Kelly.
Q. MR. KELLY: I asked for an explanation, you have given it to me. You say that the 300 that I fined, that will be deducted from his wages, but not in one big go. It will be on a weekly basis, no more than $10 \%$ ?
A. Yeah. I think Killarney talk to the guard involved and they say, well, okay, when can we do this one.
160 Q. Yes. okay, I just wanted to ask you. One moment. If I am to ask you this, have you ever sought -- you have conducted these discipline hearings before, in the past, as I have understood you, is that right?
A. Yeah, yeah.

161 Q. Have you ever, as part of a sanction, directed that wages should be included?
A. No, it does not form part of the discipline aspect.

162 Q. Because there is no provision for it in there, is there?
A. No. I impose a penalty, it's totally separate.

163 Q. Have you yourself ever, when perhaps one of your members been disciplined, written off to Navan asking that the wages be reviewed?
A. I am lucky, that hasn't arisen in Mullingar district.

164 Q. Okay. Thank you very much.
A. But I would have had to, I would say.
A. I would have had to probably if it had have happened, but it hasn't happened.

CHA RMAN I'm sorry, I'm not following you.
A. I would have had to notify HRM about it.
Q. CHA RMAN Sorry?
A. If that happened, where I was in that case, where I had a guard that went sick or didn't turn up for four or five days.

167 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes.
A. I would have had to notify HRM about it.

168 Q. CHA RMAN Yes, you would notify HRM about it?
A. Yeah.

169 Q. CHA RMAN But there are two separate -- there is the disciplinary matter that you do and there is any other thing to do with HRM?
A. Yeah, when I say that, I say that as being the district officer, not being the deciding officer.
170 Q. CHA RMAN No, of course.
A. Yeah.

171 Q. CHA RMAN If you were the superintendent -- I know. The function of the superintendent as the district officer is different from the superintendent, if that's the way it works, as a deciding officer under discipline?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

CHA RMAN okay, thank you.

END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Now, who else wants to ask? where are we going? Yes, Mr. Dignam.
MR. DI GNAM Yes, Chairman, $I$ have a few questions $I$
want to cover with Superintendent Murray.
CHA RMAN Yes.

SUPERI NTENDENT ALAN MRRAY WAS EXAM NED BY MR. DI GNAM AS FOLLOME:

172 Q. MR. DI GNM Superintendent, I suppose just to put some of my questions in context, I think you're aware from having followed the proceedings that Garda keogh has indicated that he has no issue with how you conducted your business and makes no complaint about you, is that right?
A. So I understand, Chairman.

173 Q. Just for completeness sake, can I ask you, Superintendent Murray, did anybody at any stage seek to 11:28 involve themselves in your investigation or your inquiry or interfere or influence the outcome of it?
A. Definitely not, no. formulating specific charges, is that correct?
A. Yeah, I have to take responsibility for that, including the way how I did the second charge. It was totally me. I accept that.
175 Q. I accept that, Superintendent Murray, but the process
is that the deciding officer formulates a charge, isn't that correct?
A. It's my baby only.

176
Q. And that's what occurred in this case?
A. Yeah, yeah.
A. And returned that to the chief.

180 Q. Yes. So can we take it from that, that report on the 24th September accompanied the report of interview document on 8841 ?
A. Yes.
Q. So both of those would have gone to Chief Superintendent wheatley?
A. Yes.

182 Q. The appointing officer?
A. Yes.

183 Q. If I can just ask you to turn to the third page of your report, 24th September 2015, just page 8844 in the book. You will see at the very bottom of that page there's a paragraph beginning:
"Pl ease find attached..."

And then a number of items are listed. Number 1 and 2 are on that page, and over on to 8845 , and they run up to 11 items or documents.
A. That is correct.

184 Q. Can we take it from that, chief superintendent -sorry, superintendent, that they were attached to the report of interview document and this report when they were sent to Chief Superintendent wheatley?
A. That is correct.
Q. Can we take from the inclusion of item 10 on that list, the memo of interview with Garda Keogh, that that memo was sent to Chief Superintendent wheatley?
A. That is correct.

186 Q. Now, you will be aware, I think, or you may be aware from following the proceedings that Garda Keogh, on Day 101, page 48, accepted that when he received documentation from the chief superintendent he did
receive a number of documents and says the memo of interview wasn't included.
A. I'm aware of that.

187 Q. But as far as you're concerned, when that was sent to the chief superintendent it included the memo?
A. Yes.

188 Q. Yes. Now, if I could then ask you to look at page 8844, which is the body of your report of the 24th September. You see the middle paragraph begins:
"Superintendent Murray recorded in writing the expl anati on offered by Garda Keogh. In expl anation, Garda Keogh stated that he had been under work rel ated stress and had been drinking heavily."

And he continues on:
"He forgot that he had contacted Sergeant MECormack to report fit for duty. Garda Keogh stated that he admitted his mistake to Superintendent P Murray and why 11:32 he had made it. Garda Keogh indi cated that he did not understand breach 2 and in explanation said Dr. Bartlett was his doctor and was familiar with the medical history. Garda Keogh had to go to his doctor on that date and his doctor issued the certificate."

Then if skip a paragraph, the next paragraph reads:
"In mitigation, Garda Keogh stated that he suffered
from work rel at ed stress, was drinking heavily and when questioned by Superintendent Murray he admitted his mi stake. "

Now, can we take it, can the Chairman take it that your 11:33 references to work related stress and alcohol dependency etcetera, came from your interview with Garda Keogh, is that right?
A. Solely.

Yes. And that's to be found at page 8846, which is the 11:33 typed version of the handwritten note of the interview. You see from that, Chairman, that the first main paragraph, it begins:
"I reported sick on $9 t h$ July 2015 to Garda Paul
Buckley. I am under a lot of work rel ated stress and I am out sick a lot si nce March 2015."

And then again, in the next paragraph:
"In respect of the second breach, I am denying this. As । have sai d, । amunder a lot of stress and । had attended the doctor regul arly."

They are the references to stress which informed your report and the references to work related stress in your report, is that right?
A. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

190 Q. So, it's obviously a matter for the chairman, but from
your point of view is it correct to say that you had regard and full account of what Garda Keogh told you during the interview?
A. Definitely. I think that can be seconded by how I treated the two other guards for doing the same thing really, except they were going to work one night and had worked one hour.
Q. So as a matter of fact, you were aware of Garda Keogh's account of the role that the stress played in the events on the 14th and 15th July?
A. I found him very decent to deal with, he was respectful, he was kind. I find him -- yeah, I liked him, I found him decent to deal with. I found him decent to deal with, so I wasn't going to be harsh with him.
192 Q. And that you specifically referenced his work related stress as a matter of mitigation, isn't that correct?
A. As included in the covering report.
Q. Yes. This report was sent to the chief superintendent, so the chief superintendent was aware of the fact that Garda Keogh had told you all of this in your interview and you had taken account of it, isn't that right?
A. It was in my report that was sent to the chief superintendent, $I$ had to assume that she got it.
194 Q. Can I just then ask you in conclusion, superintendent, in relation to the figure for pay that you had inserted on the original notification that had gone to Garda Keogh, I think it was $€ 840$ that had been filled in, and you got that from central pay in Killarney, is that
right?
A. That is correct.
Q. That document has to be served on the member, in this case Garda Keogh, at least 14 days before the interview, isn't that right?
A. Before the date of my interview with him, yes.
Q. Now, did Garda Keogh take any issue with that figure when you met him?
A. No. No.

197 Q. Could I ask you then just briefly to put your district officer hat on rather than your deciding officer, in the event that is member doesn't turn up for work, would you expect that member to be paid for that day?
A. No.

198 Q. Thanks.
A. But can I just add --

CHA RMAN If you want to say something, you are here to give your view, give your evidence, if you want to say anything, say anything.
A. Chairman, this was 2015. I appreciate I have said this, but as district officers we were under severe stress.
Q. CHA RMAN I understand.
A. As a district officer in mullingar, I had to have a minimum policing presence of four members working. If 11:36 only three turned up that night, I then required guards on overtime, which was going to cause me further problems when I next met the chief at our meetings. Over time was to be minded. We did not have the
resources.
Q. CHA RMAN I understand.
A. Athlone was in a worse state than I, I hate to admit that, but they were.
Q. CHA RMAN In other words, it was a critical thing, if somebody didn't show up for work, that was an important event?
A. I have to be able to go to bed at night thinking my guards are out.
Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. And if they are not working, it causes problems for me, the community, but also causes problems on the unit they are working on. Because guards are all watching each other, and if they see one guard getting off with not coming in for a few hours, they're going to expect it.
Q. CHAN RMAN I understand.
A. That was my feelings on it, Mr. Chairman.

204 Q. CHA RMAN So if somebody didn't show up for work, 1et's say, for a number of days.
A. Yeah.

205 Q. CHA RMAN Would you write to HRM about that?
A. I would, yes. Yes. But I'd also write to the chief superintendent in respect of discipline.
206 Q. CHAN RMAN Of course. So writing to the chief superintendent, there might be a disciplinary issue?
A. Yeah.
Q. CHA RMAN And there would also be a HRM issue?
A. Yeah.

CHA RMAN Okay. Very good. Anybody want to ask anything arising out of that?

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Very good. Any more questions from anybody? MS. O RORKE: I have no questions. CHA RMAN Now, Ms. McGrath, any questions. MS. MEGRATH Nothing arising.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much, superintendent.
THE WTNESS: Thanks.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, the next witness is CHIEF 11:38 Superintendent wheatley.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.

## CH EF SUPERI NTENDENT LORRA NE WFEATLEY, HAM NG BEEN SUDRN, WAS DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NESS, AS <br> FOLLOVG:

THE WTNESS: Chief Superintendent Lorraine Wheatley. CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Good morning, Chief Superintendent wheatley.
MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, Chief Superintendent wheatley's original statement to the Tribunal and its appendices are to be found in volume 11, from page 3153 onwards. And her statement to the Tribunal
investigators is to be found in volume 20, page 6076 onwards.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
208 Q. MR. MGGI NESS: Chief Superintendent wheatley, I think you joined An Garda Síochána in 1985 originally?
A. That's correct, yes.

209 Q. I think you were sent to Store Street at that stage?
A. Yes.

210 Q. Was that following your attestation?
A. That's right, yeah.

211 Q. So you have been in the force effectively almost 35 years.
A. 35 years.

212 Q. In 1987 you were assigned to community relations in Harcourt Square in Dublin, and then in 1989 you were assigned to the area office in Harcourt Square Dublin. what duties did you have there?
A. I was the clerk to the assistant commissioner, I worked in an office there. I was studying a degree in computer science at the time. So I was given task of developing sort of an IT solution, because he was interested in crime figures and that sort of stuff. That was one of my roles. But I was a clerk with various duties.
213 Q. Yes. 1990 you went to crime branch then in Garda Headquarters?
A. Yes.

214 Q. You spent two years there I think, would that be correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

From 1995 to 1997.
Q. I think you were then assigned to the finance directorate in Garda Headquarters subsequent to that?
A. Yeah. I think because I had completed a degree in computer science and there had been an issue with the underuse of the IT system up there, they asked me to come back, would I basically project manage sort of a new IT system.
219 Q. okay. I think you were promoted to inspector in the year 2000?
A. Yeah. I spent, I suppose, from then till to 2007, I spent three, I suppose grades in the finance directorate. I subsequently got another project to manage. So $I$ went through three ranks in finance directorate. I had a couple of years then when I was head of procurement for the organisation.

220 Q. Yes. I think you were promoted to superintendent in 2005 after 20 years service?
A. That's right, yeah.

221 Q. In 2007 you were assigned to Terenure Garda station, is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

222 Q. As the superintendent?
A. Yes.

223 Q. You stayed there for six years, is that correct?
A. Nearly six years, yeah.

224 Q. In 2013 you transferred to Donnybrook and you were there for two years, is that correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.

225 Q. Then in 2015, on promotion you were then assigned to the Westmeath division, that we are concerned about, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

226 Q. I think you were there for approximately 15 months, between early March 2015 until August of 2016?
A. That's correct, yes.

227 Q. I think you were then assigned to the Dublin metropolitan region west division for two years and since July 2018 you have been in charge of the Dublin metropolitan region south central division, based in Kevin Street?
A. Yes.

228 Q. The new headquarters there?
A. That's right, and I'm still there.

229 Q. That takes in quite an area of the south central city, isn't that right?
A. Yes, it does. It's Donnybrook, Irishtown, Pearse central city.
On transfer to Westmeath division, the divisional headquarters is in mullingar, of course, and there is a superintendent in each of the district offices, Athlone 11:42 and Mullingar?
A. That's correct, yes.
A. Yeah. I think, I suppose there had been very little promotion for a number of years and then two lists came out, a supers lists and a chiefs list came out together. So I people had been down the country for a long time. So I think there was about 60 moves at that time. There was a major reshuffle done in the context 11:43 of, I suppose, the two new lists that had been published.

234 Q. Yes. We11, as we know, Chief Superintendent Curran was 1eaving?
A. That's right.

Did you have a hand over briefing meeting with him?
A. I did, yeah. I went down to see Mark Curran and we had a conversation.
Q. Is it the practice that these things are done orally or
is there any set of papers or memoranda prepared in relation to issues?
A. There are hand over documents to do with finance and there's a template that's done there, that's usually prepared by the divisional clerk. I suppose this meeting, it's not done in that structured way. I suppose it has evolved, but you're not taking over -- I wasn't taking over, I suppose, Mark's job, I was taking over the division, if you like.
237 Q. Yes.
A. So you're taking over his practice, if you like. So you have access to the IT system, you have access to the management information, the financial information and then the files there's there, they're all available to you. So you don't go into detail of all the different files and all that sort of stuff, because they would present themselves as was required. So I suppose, in terms of -- there's certain matters you'd sort of just want to be flagged. You would flag -your office, I suppose really the clerk there was particularly good. So matters, let's say, that would be presenting over the weeks, the system, you know, produces them to you. So I suppose my -- I never worked in the country, I suppose I was ten years a super. So, I was a newly promoted super. So I suppose 11:45 the purpose of the visit was really I suppose for me to get a general sense of what it was like, you know, working in the country, being a chief. And the couple of new -- then there was a couple of particular issues
that Mark thought were important and we had a conversation about it. There was a couple of changes in relation to a number of sergeants that were taking place. I asked him about welfare. You don't go into the nitty gritty of the files and that, that's not, you 11:45 know, necessary.
Q. Yes.
A. Yeah. you did receive a call from the Commissioner at the time I think?
A. Yes.
Q. Was it informing you of your promotion?
A. Yeah, that was the practice then, that when you were getting your allocation the Commissioner would ring you 11:45 and say where you were going.
Q. Yes. And the Commissioner herself told you, you're going on promotion down to Westmeath?
A. Yes.

242 Q. And you will be taking over from Chief Superintendent Curran?
A. Yes.

243 Q. Was there any discussion of any of the issues that you would be facing down there?
A. She did say to me, you know, make sure you're fully briefed. There had been -- I'm sort of mindful that everything I say is a matter of public record. There had been -- I suppose, there were new arrangements being put in place in relation to another person that
had made a protected disclosure, really a change in role in that, and so, she just said, make sure you're fully aware of those changes. And actually, that was probably the nub of the conversation with Superintendent Murray.
okay. I mean, but did the Commissioner tell that a protected disclosures manager had been appointed or new procedures --
A. There was no arrangements in place. I think there was a liaison person appointed. There was actually a number of moves, people were moved, for a number of reasons. There was a move. People were getting different jobs and people were moving out of jobs. So, I suppose, there was new arrangements being put in place in respect of the roles that people were going to 11:47 play.
Q. Did you know Chief Superintendent McLoughlin?
A. Oh, I met Chief Superintendent McLoughlin, I knew that he had been given -- he had been liaising with him and I think I actually met Chief Superintendent McLoughlin 11:47 prior to even going down to westmeath.

246 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

247 Q. In what context was that?
A. It was in the context of, I suppose, giving me some bit 11:47 of a background in relation to, I suppose, the liaison person that had been appointed in the context of another person.

248 Q. Yes, I see. And did that discussion touch upon Garda

Keogh's position?
A. No.

249 Q. Had Commissioner o'Sullivan referred in any way to Garda Keogh?
A. No.

250 Q. Did she refer to any investigation that she had set in progress?
A. No.
Q. As a result of a protected disclosure --
A. No.

252 Q. -- made by Garda Keogh?
A. No.

253 Q. Were you aware prior to meeting Chief Superintendent Curran that Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin had been appointed to investigate allegations made in a protected disclosure?
A. I was aware that had been -- there was a protected disclosure in connection with Athlone. I don't think a morning went by when the whole issue of, I suppose, the whistleblowing, I suppose, issue wasn't on the radio or 11:48 wasn't on the news in that period. So I didn't know much about it but I had an awareness of it.
254 Q. Yes. But did you know that it related to alleged involvement of guards in connection with the drugs issue and that Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin had been appointed to investigate that?
A. I'm not certain that I knew that. I suppose it was a country matter and I'm not certain that I knew. I certainly was aware that in the public domain there was
a person who had made a protected disclosure, you know, that had raised issues and that it was being investigated. I didn't -- I suppose, it was down the country. I didn't have a huge knowledge of it really, no.
A. Yeah, I mean, the name was in the public domain, yes. 11:49 So I would have -- I did know, yes.

256 Q. Well, when you met with Chief Superintendent Curran, was there any discussion in relation to Garda Keogh?
A. We touched upon it, I would say. I was asking him really in the context of welfare, really, and if there was any issues. I mean, in terms of the investigation that was taking place, I had no role in that and, you know, I wasn't going to be required to be involved in it, so I mean I really had no interest in it. We all do investigations all the time and we don't discuss them with other people. So I had no role in it, no interest in it.

257 Q. Yes.
A. He did say that the previous superintendent, Noreen McBrien, who I had known, who was my inspector actually 11:50 in Terenure, that she had been dealing with him from a sort of, welfare point of view. I may have asked, had he got a welfare officer? That was really the extent of the conversation; that Superintendent McBrien had
been dealing with the welfare aspect of it.

Did you have any questions for Chief Superintendent Curran about Garda Keogh or did he tell you anything further about him?
A. No, he didn't. I suppose, you know, this was ten months in. The investigation was taking place over there and as happens all the time in divisions, there's investigations going on for different matters. I had no role, $I$ had no -- in it, and really, no, it wasn't -- the welfare piece was there. It wasn't something -- there was certainly no need for me to go and do anything, that I believed, you know, immediately. There was other people that were being moved around and it was important that I oversaw that that actually was followed through. But there was nothing -- there was no live issues that I believed or he believed that $I$ needed to address sort of any time soon. attention about any particular issue concerning Garda
A. No. No.

260 Q. Did you formally take over on the 9th March?
A. Yes.

261 Q. Did you have any meeting with the new Superintendent Murray who was in Athlone at that stage?
A. Yeah, I think I might have been in [inaudible] for a couple of days after that, but I would have met certainly after -- we would have had my PAF and would
have called the two supers in, you know, and we would have had a meeting, you know what I mean.
Q. Just in terms of the overall position, obviously the issue of whistleblowers had been topical in the press, in the Dáil and in the public mind, and the Commissioner who had taken over that had been seen publicly to be anxious to support whistleblowers, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

Did you think it appropriate or not to meet Garda Keogh 11:52 and personally speak to him?
A. No, I didn't. I didn't think at that time, you know, that -- I suppose we were ten months into it, the welfare piece was being looked at before I arrived. I didn't think there was actually a need, you know, to go 11:52 and meet him when I arrived in. I suppose you wouldn't -- I just didn't think that was actually necessary. I'd say I was sort of settling into the division. I didn't think it was certainly -- actually, you know, I didn't really think it was necessary, certainly initially. There was no particular reason. The thing was well established. The investigation was ongoing. There was no sort of immediate issues. And did I think -- actually, I really didn't think, I was taking it straight back, going forward and I suppose if 11:53 issues present, then I would deal with them.
264 Q. Yes.
A. But I didn't think, nor do I think now, that a connection at that stage was required. I suppose there
is three layers between me and Garda Keogh, of management.
Q. Yes.
A. So, I didn't really over think it. But certainly subsequently I would have been talking to both superintendents in relation to, I suppose, how are things going and that sort of stuff.
We will come to it in due course, but you did I think ultimately in May of 2016 call to Garda Keogh?
A. Yes, I did, yes.

267 Q. He was out on sick leave at the time. Was that the first time had you met him?
A. Yes, it was, yes.
Q. We will come to that in due course. In any event, Superintendent Murray reported to you on the 2nd April in a report. Perhaps we will just look at that, at page 6149, volume 20. This is the 2nd April. It is a two-page report. It refers to the utterings in Dáil Éireann in the first paragraph. It then refers to his transfer in the second paragraph and first meeting Garda Keogh on the 26th March. He says:

[^1]stress as a source of his absence. With that in mind, I have allocated a female sergeant who is new to the di strict to act as a point of contact for the nember to di scuss and if possi ble sol ve any workpl ace issues he may have in Athl one in order to allow himattend work nore frequently."

Presumably that meeting that Superintendent Murray had with him, you hadn't directed Superintendent Murray at that stage to conduct any investigation in relation to work related stress?
A. No, this was -- Superintendent Murray met with Garda Keogh.
Q. Yes.
A. I suppose prior to meeting him, he established that the 11:56 member had reported intermittently with work related stress.

270 Q. Yes.
A. So this was -- he subsequently sent a report up the line.

271 Q. Yes.
A. You know, and he high1ighted this to me, yeah.

272 Q. Obviously we will come to the provisions that are relevant in terms of the Code etcetera, but just -CHAL RMAN Mr. McGuinness, could I interrupt you for a 11:56 moment, please.

MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes, of course.
CHA RMAK I anticipate that you are going to be some time with Chief Superintendent wheatley.

MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN I am thinking of other witnesses who may wish to know where they stand.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN So, am I right that they are unlikely to be needed.

MR. MEGU NESS: I think certainly, Chairman, yes, I think it is appropriate to say that anticipate I will be dealing Chief Superintendent Wheatley's evidence for the whole of today and into tomorrow.
CHA RMAN okay. So that any other witnesses are perfectly free and more than welcome to stay but they're not under any obligation to do so and if they wish then they can keep in touch with the Tribunal.
But not before tomorrow for any other witnesses.
MR. MEGU NESS: Thank you, Chairman.
MR. MRPHY: Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Just so people will understand.
273 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Chief Superintendent wheatley, I am just trying to establish that had you not given
Superintendent Murray any instruction or direction to interview --
A. No.

274 Q. -- Garda Keogh in relation to work related stress or anything else?
A. No. Superintendent Murray in the course of, I suppose, his role there.
Q. Yes?
A. As, I suppose, issues came to attention, he was doing
his own work locally and arising out of that clearly he decided to meet with the member.
Q. Yes. He also goes on to 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 medi cal expertise can advi se other workpl ace supports whi ch may assist the member. The menber indi cated he had not attended the CMD previ ously. "

Then it goes on the next page:
"The menber had total of 184 sick days in the past four years. $48 \%$ of those occurred since J anuary 2014, with $52 \%$ occurring in early tours of duty. The menber has availed of 34 days annual leave from 1st March 2014 to 31st March 2015, with $92 \%$ of leave taken on early tours al one.

I believe both the member and the organi sation would benefit by referring himto the Occupational Health Service at this time.

Forwarded for your information please and for onward transmission. "

Now, I think you also received memos, we don't need to see them, I think, at this stage, that Superintendent

Murray sent you in relation to finalising an issue about Garda Keogh's car tax.
A. Yes.

I think just to deal with that. You had no involvement directly or otherwise in relation to that, other than being informed of the outcome of it?
A. That's correct.
A. Yeah.

281 Q.
"Even though there was a revenue of fence i nvol ved here, he was gi ven an opportunity to address the issue. The 11:59 matter dealt with as a min breach of di scipline. A minor breach of discipline does not go on a member's personal file. It was not within Superintendent Murray's gift to permit payment frompublic funds outside of financial regul ations. I believe this was a 11:59 very fair and bal anced intervention."
A. Yeah.

282 Q. Did Superintendent Murray tell you that he had had a conversation with Detective Superintendent Mulcahy and

Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin around this period of the 2nd or 3rd April, about utterances in the Dáil by Deputy wallace?
A. Yeah, he would have. He would have made me aware of it, yeah.

But did you understand that it was a grievance of Garda Keogh that this had been dealt with in this way?
A. I suppose I didn't, I didn't really have a view on it. I suppose in terms of -- my view was that the objective here was to pay Garda Keogh, you know what I mean. And 12:00 Superintendent Murray was trying to solve a problem and I suppose in terms of -- I suppose to backtrack.
284 Q. Yes?
A. I took a straight back line all the time in relation to things. of course I was alive to the context and what was going on in the public domain, and you have to separate that out and deal with -- I suppose deal with behaviours, as did Superintendent Murray. You know, was I aware of it? Yes, that that had happened. But my point of view, I was still of the view we have to be 12:01 impartial and we have to do the right thing for the right certainly. And certainly -- actually, to be honest with you, I am actually -- it astounds me that Garda Keogh could have any issue with this. Because, you know, this was the fairest intervention I believe. 12:01 You know, the claims were there and Superintendent Murray was trying to find a solution to solve -- you know in the -- we are public sector, I mean we work within guidelines and procedures. So we can't operate
outside those. So Superintendent Murray was given -corrected the issue, moved it on and then the claims were paid. And that was the objective here; was to ensure that Garda Keogh was paid.

Yes. You saw nothing either unusual or improper in what Superintendent Murray had done and was consistent with the regulations?
A. I actually thought he was quite lenient really. And you know, I know we all use the term, you know, he was disciplined, or $I$ know we probably say it ourselves sometimes, but actually the definition in the discipline regulations, at Regulation 10 it says -there's nothing in these regulations that prevents any -- you know, any supervisor from dealing with matters by way of informal resolution. So this was an informal resolution, as to how Superintendent Murray dealt with this. That's the least intervention. I know it was captured on the form and that probably gives level of formalisation to things.
286 Q. Yes.
A. But like, we are a big organisation, forms are for efficiency and consistency. It captures stuff, I suppose. You know, there is nothing divisive here or underhand. In terms of what my view was, Garda Keogh was given the opportunity to get the tax right, it's public money, when you sign for your claims you are certifying that everything is in order. You know, we were trying to -- Pat Murray was trying to, you know, pay Garda Keogh. Like we are all audited down the
road. And so, when everything was right, then the doors were free for Superintendent Murray to pay the claims. Now, I know, was it necessary to go the next extra step, to do the -- you know, to do the informal resolution? I believe it was. I think, you know, it just records it. It doesn't go on the personal file. But we are a public sector organisation, we're a big organisation. Advice was given. And this is the form we use to capture the advice. And that was -- and the fact, you know, you can be audited down the road and I suppose the fact it was connected with, I suppose, a revenue issue, I would have thought it was an appropriate, professional way to deal with the thing in a minor way.
287 Q. Okay. We have seen obviously that it gave rise to an instruction issued by Superintendent Murray in relation to the inspection of other members' compliance?
A. Yes.

288 Q. Was that something that you were consulted about or that you would have had a problem with in any way?
A. No. I wasn't consulted about that, that was a matter for local management. okay. In the context of the report from Superintendent Murray in which he refers to the issue of work related stress by Garda keogh, did you see it as your function or duty to initiate an inquiry into that, as to what was causing it at that point in time?
A. I mean, in Superintendent Murray's report he indicated he was reticent to deal with it, because of the fact
that Garda Keogh -- Garda Keogh's position was, he had made a protected disclosure, he was dealing with the people in Galway. And to be honest with you, that's completely understandable, that he didn't want to operate outside that, I suppose, bubble. And, you know, because this was unusual, if you like, or new, we referred it up the line to say that, you know, the reason -- when the person reports sick, when a person is absent, absent with work related stress, you know, the instruction is, you have to investigate to establish what is the cause of that stress. Garda Keogh clearly, and very understandably, you know, said he was stressed because all matters around to do with the protected disclosure and wasn't to go any further. I suppose that was quite understandable.
A. And so, my view was that, you know, if you want the complaint you can't go forward. I believed that that's -- you know, that's as far as we could bring it. But I felt that was enough. We were given a context, we were given -- then the next step in this is for the CMO to make a clinical, $I$ suppose, determination.
291 Q. We will come to that, indeed. Perhaps it is a convenient point to look at just the Management of Sickness Absence Directive 139/10, was issued on 1st December 2010 by the assistant commissioner for the Eastern Region, Commissioner Fanning, I think who I think it was at that time. That is to be found at page 8202, which is in volume 28. At the bottom of the page
there at 8202, it obviously refers to the Chief Medical officer, as we've referred to. It says:
"The CMD advi ses the Garda Cormi ssi oner on menber's medical fitness for policing duties. In forming a medi cal opi ni on, the CMD takes into account all medi cal information available at the time. When the CMD advi ses that a member is fit for full/light/restricted police duties, the nember will resume duty immediately on bei ng notified of the same by the menber's district of ficer/superint endent. "

Then it goes on to consider what happens when he is considered fit for duty. But in terms of work related stress, if we go to page 8204 , this is under the general heading "i nj ury on duty cl assification". The first paragraph says:
"Where there is any doubt that an injury on duty occurred, di visional officer should refer to the matter to the assistant commi ssi oner HRM who will seek advi ces of the CMD. The CMD will take into account all rel evant inf ormation in arriving at his/her advi ces."

Now, do I take it that when you saw Superintendent classification of an injury on duty as such?
A. We11, I suppose that's not within my gift, to make that determination.
A. So in line with the policy, as soon as Superintendent Murray became aware from the certificates and I suppose -- you know, the certificates and from the conversation with Garda Keogh, you know, as is right.
A. At the earliest he reported it up the line, you know, and Garda Keogh was reluctant to sort of go into the ins and outs of it.
297 Q. Yes. We will come to it in due course obviously, but just looking at this, the last paragraph there, it

[^2]Were there is a doubt that the member's si ckness is due to ordi nary ill ness or an injury on duty, the member's absence will be treated as ordinary ill ness pending a decision on the classification of the injury and in particul ar the CMD s advice."

Now, it doesn't sort of consign that decision to the CMO as such?
A. We11, it does actually.
A. In terms of psychological injuries, I mean -- I suppose maybe I will just explain this. As a chief superintendent you can issue what's called an 1137, which is basically saying, I'm happy that my member has been injured on duty, it's not due to willful neglect, you know, of the member. Like in my busy division or after a weekend you might have a couple of punches and a couple of -- you know, maybe someone kicked or something like that, and the person reports it up the line to me and I look at it and the sergeant supports it by sort of a report. So, based on what's rented to me, I am saying, yeah, clearly this happened, clearly they had the injury. And that is within my gift, to issue an 1137, which is saying, this is an issue on duty.
A. In relation to stress or psychological issues, I mean a subsequent directive came out that where we are precluded from issuing -- I am precluded from issuing
an 1137 in respect of work related stress. That there is a whole process around that.
300 Q. That wasn't issued at the time, isn't that correct?
A. Well, it wasn't within my gift to issue that.

301 Q. Well, you're talking about a later directive, isn' that correct?
A. Yeah, after this. This is ten years old.

302 Q. Yes.
A. The one that was --

303 Q. I understand but this is what was applicable at the time?
A. No.

304 Q. In 2015?
A. No, I don't -- sorry, I have the number there. There's a --
Q. Perhaps we will come to that?
A. Yeah.

306 Q. I was just going to ask you about the next paragraph, the next page "investigation", because it says:
"Where a menber reports non-effective for duty as a result of an injury on duty or work rel ated stress, a thorough investigation shall be carried out immediately and the out cone reported to assi stant commi ssi oner HRM for the attention of the CMD. The menber concerned
shall be advi sed of the empl oyee assi stance scheme, peer support and any ot her support deemed necessary. Local management shall address the issues causing the menber's stress."

Now, is it your view that this was not applicable at the time?
A. No, I'm not saying that. What I am saying is, it was always the position that you had to establish the cause 12:12 of a member's stress, you know what I mean. And I suppose even now, if there's anything unusual you refer it up to HRM. But for simple, straightforward injuries on duty, I have authority to issue an 1137. If it had been the case then and if there was a subsequent sort of clarification around it, if a person reports sick with work related stress, if a person is absent with work related stress, you know, the local management have to establish the source of that stress and then notify the CMO.

307 Q. Yes. I am just posing the question in a very direct way now: On receipt of Superintendent Murray's report, did you not, in fact, conceive it as your responsibility at that stage to investigate the work related stress and the causes of it and report on that up?
A. Garda Keogh made it very clear, crystal clear, that he wasn't willing to -- because -- and it's very understandable, because he was dealing with the Galway investigation team and, indeed, they were looking after 12:13 his welfare as well at that time, he made it crystal clear that he wasn't going to go into any more detail. I suppose the whole thing were inextricably linked, the stress and the investigation. So this was unusual, I
suppose. And I suppose the whole protected disclosures issue was unusual as well. So I was saying, listen, I brought it up, I said, this is as far as I can bring it really. He is saying it's connected with that. I mean he wasn't going to say what it because he made it, was it because people reacted to him. So his position was quite clear, which is very understandable. So I was saying, look, this is what he has given us, this is the context, and bring it no further.
Was it not clear to you that it doesn't appear to have been the case that Garda Keogh was informed that this interview on the 26th March was an interview into his work related stress and the causes of it and that it would or might have consequences for the classification of his sickness absence and therefore possible ramifications for his pay. I mean, he wasn't informed of those things, is that not clear?
A. There's a whole process around getting an injury on duty categorisation, classification for work related stress. It's actually quite -- you have to establish the cause of the stress, the CMO does an assessment and in my experience when you refer a person, that the CMO has a view and he might send him to independent specialist, HRM have a role in it, the executive directors has a role in it and there can be -- there's a whole -- there's many variables in the equation.

309 Q. Yes.
A. So of itself -- in terms of -- I mean Garda Keogh reported sick with work related stress. Of itself, I
mean, there's not an automatic entitlement that that would turn into injury on duty.
310 Q. Yes.
A. There is a whole layer of stuff there. When he report with work related stress, Superintendent Murray didn't go into that conversation with him at that time.

311 Q. Yes.
A. I sent it up the line.
Q. Yes.
A. I said, I am sending it to HRM, and we were saying, we can't bring this any further. He was also at that time under the care of HRM, I suppose the welfare person.
313 Q. Perhaps we will deal with it sequentially. You received a letter back from Mr. Mulligan, the director of HR on 14th April 2015. If we could look at page
6166. Because Superintendent Murray had reported up the period of absences, this triggered then the reaction of headquarters and you received that, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

314 Q. You wrote back on the 27th April, if we look at 6142. In particular, you were looking to have an expedition of the review by the CMO at that point in time?
A. Yes.

315 Q. Is that correct? The reason that you were seeking that $12: 17$ was the report referred to in the letter which Superintendent Murray sent to you on the 21st April, at page 6143, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

316 Q. That ultimately seems to have led to the instruction at page 6144. That's again from Mr. Mulligan to you:
"Re sick report.

It is noted that the above mentioned member's absence from 20th April 2015 to 25th April 2015 was stress rel at ed. "

And those certificates had been sent in by Garda Keogh for that period?
A. Yes.

317 Q. And were further sent on up, is that correct?
A. Yes.

318 Q. It says:

[^3]This branch requires a full report, referral formand medi cal certificates in accordance with Garda Code 11. 34 rel ating to the above named member's absence. "

Did you is see that as casting the responsibility on you, it says "you shoul d now intervi ew thi s member"? You knew that Superintendent Murray had been, as it were, unable in his meeting with Garda Keogh on the

26th March to delve into the issue, did you see this as casting the duty on you as the divisional officer?
A. I didn't actually, no. That correspondence would have gone down to Superintendent Murray and, you know, the position was, I mean, Garda Keogh had made his position clear, that he wasn't -- you know, that he couldn't go into -- this was connected with the protected disclosure, that he wasn't in a position, you know, to go into any more detail.

319 Q. Yes.
A. And we had to accept that, you know.

320 Q. Yes. But if we look at Superintendent Murray's report, you sought the report that the branch wanted there, isn't that right?
A. Yes, yes.

321 Q. If we look at Superintendent Murray's report to you then of the 20th May, that commences at 6146; isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

322 Q. If we just look at that report. He refers to your correspondence of the 12th May and that of HR people development dated 7th May.
"In addition, I attach a copy of my correspondence to you dated 2nd April."

That was the original sick report, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

323 Q. "As I indi cated, Gar da Keogh is providing information
under the Garda reporting regul ations. When I met the nember on 26th March 2015, I discussed his work absences incl uding the fact that his medi cal certificates were indicating he was suffering from work rel ated stress. The member was qui ck to poi nt out that he was a confidential reporter and had certain protections in that role. He indi cated that the assi stant commissi oner Western Regi on was investigating reports and allegations that he has made to the confidential recipient. Outside of disclosing that the 12:21 member was reticent to di scuss the work rel ated stress he indi cates he is suffering from rel ying instead on the protections he has in the confidential reporting I egi sl ation.

In these circumstances, I cannot further expl ore the situation with the member. I am aware anecdotally that a full investigation is being carried out into the member's cl ai n\$ of corruption and mal practice. I have no further information in rel ation to that
i nvestigation. I understand that the member is engaging with the wel fare service via the investigation he is invol ved in. I did, however, advi se hi mof its benefit to him

I attach your responsi bility of the 12th May, correspondence from HR and Peopl e Devel opment 7th May, my report of the 2nd April, referral formCMD dated 2nd April 2015, menber's medi cal certificates."

Now, just in the light of that, did you pick up that Superintendent Murray hadn't gone back to the member to further discuss the issue?
A. I did, yeah. I think he had made it very clear, Garda Keogh had made it very clear and it was very understandable, that we -- that he wasn't going to -he wasn't going to discuss this.
324 Q. Yes.
A. So we sent that back up the line then.

325 Q. Obviously he is reiterating his position that he can't explore it further, but in the context of the instruction to you of the 7th may, did you not think maybe that you should intervene and try and do what the superintendent had been unable to do, to explore it with the member?
A. I didn't think there was any point doing that.
Q. Okay.
A. I mean, he had made his position clear in relation to -- that he -- that, you know, he was in another context at the moment.

327 Q. Okay.
A. So I believed that it wouldn't have been even -- and you need -- to start any investigation, people have to, you know, make an allegation and be specific. And actually, I really felt that it may have even been perceived as heavy handed. We were saying, this is as far as we can bring this.
328 Q. Yes.
A. And in light of -- I suppose it quite unusual or I suppose our new context and his position --
Q. Yes.
A. -- you know, we were saying, listen, we don't think we can bring this any further here. You know, and I suppose when you reflect on it, realistically it's because it was so late.
I mean, I don't want to overlook and I probably shouldn't have passed by it in terms of chronology, you had instructed the superintendent on the 12th May to arrange an interview with the member. If you look at page 6148. So this is what went down to the superintendent after you got Mr. Mulligan's letter of the 7th May. You then received back the superintendent's report. So, I mean, it was clear beyond doubt that he had not done what you had, as it were, instructed him to do?
A. We11, I think in his professional opinion he had met with Garda Keogh in March.
331 Q. Yes. You knew that?
A. Yeah.

332 Q. There was no point in saying to him, send me your note again of what happened on the 6th March. You clearly envisaged an interview with Garda Keogh to establish the stress. He didn't do it and I am not criticising him in any way at all, but from the point of view of coming back to you, you knew that and you knew that he was telling you he couldn't establish the source, and then I am suggesting that you should have realised it
was your duty to do it then before reporting further?
A. I believed -- I believed that his position was very clear. You know, I think, as I reiterate, restate, you know, it was -- you know, he was dealing with this other matter, it was connected, he was giving specifics. We were saying, I don't think we can take this any further at this stage.
333 Q. Okay. Superintendent Murray had sent the material up. Perhaps we will just look at that, Volume 33, 9392. Do you recall seeing that at the time that he had sent it up?
A. Yes.

334 Q. If we scrol1 down. He gives all the details required on the form there. If we just keep going. It goes on to the next page then as well. It says:
"I confirml have contacted the member and advi sed the nember of this referral to the Garda Occupational Heal th Service and its purpose."

You had seen that as one of the tranches of correspondence of the 2nd April, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

335 Q. You reported in any event then, if we go back to page 6145, up to Human Resources by letter dated 26th May
2015. As far as you were concerned, it would seem then it was a matter for headquarters to try and progress the matter and review Garda Keogh's position?
A. Yeah. I suppose just to come back to the -- the
purpose of investigating it is to establish the source of the member's stress. We did establish that it was connected -- surrounding all of those matters. The nuances of that he wasn't prepared to go into, which was absolutely understandable. So the source of his stress, I suppose in a macro sense had been established and we could, I didn't believe -- we respected his position and we could bring it no further. And in terms of -- I mean, basically a person can report sick with work related stress, it may not be anything to do with the job, but the fact whether a person is medically stressed is a decision for someone else.

336 Q. Yes.
A. It's for the CMO, or whoever he refers the person to.

337 Q. Yes. In any event, Superintendent Murray reported to you further on the 28th May. If we look at page 9449 in Volume 33. You were aware then of the issue. Did you receive any report back from the CMO's office to your office about any review?
A. Not from the May -- not -- we didn't get -- my recollection is we didn't get advices back. You know, sometimes when you send -- we didn't get advices back in May.
338 Q. Yes.
A. After the May one.

339 Q. Yes.
A. I suppose in the interim period, I suppose we sent -not in the interim, subsequently we sent I suppose another request up for it to be reviewed. No. And I
suppose when you send -- when you send a person to the CMO, you're saying, you know, is this person fit to work or are they not or under what -- you know, he may give advices about the hours they work or who they are working with and that. So when we referred him up, the 12:29 CMO made his advices. So there was no -- they weren't coming back to us saying, yes, this member is stressed. It's evident, I suppose, it's important, that the CMO at that point deemed him fit to work.
340 Q. Yes. Well, you did pursue the issue of a conference. I think you wrote up to HR again in July, on the 24th July, if we look at page 6163. I think the cause, it would seem, was Superintendent Murray's report referred to there, which relates to the July absences --
A. Yes.

341 Q. -- that led to the discipline. But you're reporting it up for a different purpose really. The second paragraph:
"The district officer Athl one has requested a case
conference to be called in respect of Garda Keogh to di scuss Garda Keogh's persistent absence through ill ness. It is evi dent fromthe report of Superintendent Murray that Garda Keogh has si gni ficant personal difficulties which exacer bate his propensity to avail of sick leave.

The most recent absence without leave hi ghl ights issues whi ch must be addressed i mmedi ately. Accordingly, I
agree with Superintendent Murray's recommendation that a case conference be called in respect of Garda Keogh to discuss his frequent periods of absence.

Forwarded for your information pl ease."

Do you recollect getting a reply to that at that time or subsequently?
A. My recollection is we had to -- Superintendent Murray had to sort of follow up in October to sort of -- I suppose push the issue, really.

342 Q. Yes. We know a case conference was held on the 9th December of that year.
A. That's right.

343 Q. Did you know of any particular reason why it had taken that period of time?
A. The CMO will give their own evidence here. Like, they're not a hospital.

344 Q. Yes.
A. Do you know what I mean. They don't treat people. You 12:32 send a person -- the whole idea of the occupational health I suppose is to keep people in work and they assess whether a person is fit to work or, I suppose, they refer them to other people. So I suppose they can speak -- you know, in terms of -- I suppose we were
looking for a reference point as to the person's fitness to work.

345 Q. Yes.
A. I suppose, the person themselves has to take
responsibility to go and get treated.
346 Q. Yes.
A. You know, that wouldn't be a responsibility of our organisation.
Q. He did?
A. -- he saw him on the 18th, and it was after Christmas actually, it was January, when we got the advices down that he had deemed him unfit for duty.

351 Q. Yes. Perhaps we will look at that, at page 6172. This 12:33 is Ms. Carr reporting down to you; isn't that correct?
A. Yes, yes.

352 Q. okay. Did you know of any issue that had arisen about any conflict at that stage between how Garda Keogh's
absences were being recorded on SAMS?
A. No, I didn't. No, I wasn't aware of that.
okay. But certainly from your point of view, you knew that insofar as certificates had been sent in by his doctor, they were all recording the same reason, as work related stress?
A. In terms of the first time I became aware, and Garda Keogh himself raised it with me, in relation to how his certs were being recorded on the local SAMS system, when I spoke to him in May 2016. But I suppose just in 12:35 terms of -- Garda Keogh, I suppose, was pay affected at that stage, because new sickness regulations had come in. So the policy was, when a person is -- you know, when a person who has reported sick is pay affected, to prevent overpayment the policy is that the cert would be communicated up the line. So the information contained on the cert was communicated right up the line.

354 Q. Yes. You do make the observation at page 6116, in relation to the doctor, perhaps we will just look at that, if we can?

CHA RMAN I'm sorry, what page was that, Mr. McGuinness.

MR. MGGI NESS: 6616.
CHA RMAN 6116.
MR. MEGU NESS: 6116, I beg your pardon.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. I am sorry to be slow.
355 Q. MR. MGGI NESS: You're asked a question about the issue of what he was being certified as there. The
question at line 621 is:
"I have been asked in the context of the above extract to comment on the veracity or otherwise of the allegations as they refer to me."

12:36

This is about the misrecording.
"A. Garda Keogh was removed by the CMD on 18th Decenber 2015. The CMD then i ssued advi ces stating Garda Keogh was unfit for duty. He qualified this by stating that if the member's own doctor deemed himfit for duty, we were requi red to bring that to his attention for further consideration. No other matters in rel ation to Garda Keogh were al erted to us by the CMD at that time, incl uding how he was recorded on the SAMS system"

Is that something that you would have expected to be told about?
A. Yeah. Well, the СМо -- when people go and see the СМо and they raise issues with him, you know, when the advices come back, they would raise that, I would expect they would raise that. It wouldn't be -- that's a regular thing, you know, where people might go up and 12:37 they might want to work different hours or they might feel there is an issue, they would write back and advise that perhaps we should look at this or perhaps we should look at that or perhaps we should look at
that. So in my experience where people have raised issues with the cmo, you know, absolutely he would write down to us and say the member has brought this to his attention, can you have a look at it. But that
wasn't the case in this case. the meeting of the 9th December, perhaps we will just look at those, at 6165. Did you receive these minutes at the time or would that be normal practice?
A. No, it wouldn't be normal practice. approach would be taken or did you discuss it with him at all?
A. Yeah. We would have spoken about it, yes. And we had concerns about Garda Keogh at that time and we would have spoke. It would have come up. It certainly would 12:39 have come up in conversations.

358 Q. The first observation relates to:
"Through management rel aying that there are serious concerns over the member's obvi ous misuse of al cohol whi ch is adversely affecting his ability to do his job and his physical presentation, hi gh level of short term sickness absences and record. The EAS officer observation is that menber needs to deci de for himel f
that he needs hel $p$ and make a concerted effort to access services to address the issue.

Management suggesting in the medi umtolong-term support would be gi ven for a transfer out of Athl one in 12:39 vi ew of events that had transpired there, if it is consi dered to be beneficial for the menber's sustai ned well being and effectiveness after he would have come through an appropriate treatment programme. "

Was the issue of a transfer or a potential transfer in circumstances one that was discussed between you and Superintendent Murray?
A. No. No.

359 Q. Okay. In the context of the ó Cualáin investigation, were any concerns brought to your attention about tension in the station between members under investigation or their presence there or Garda Keogh's presence?
A. No.
Q. And in relation to the issue of Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin conducting interviews in the station at any stage, was that brought to your attention?
A. Well that had stopped after I arrived, that had stopped.
361 Q. You weren't aware of any concerns --
A. No.

362 Q. -- after you came into your position?
A. No.
A. Yes.
Q. And I think that's technically correct, in terms of the recording. If we just go down to the next page. Sorry, if we go back, back up. And sorry, back up to the top there. If we just stop at the top of that page. In relation to the issue of classification he says there:
"It is my understanding that the acceptance and cl assification of a period of absence as work rel ated stress by Garda HRPD absence section is not excl usi vel y based on the inf ormation provi ded in medi cal certification submitted by the nember. It invol ves HRPD absence section and local management ascertai ning the work rel ated factors or stressors being reported by the menber. I understand that it is the practice of HRPD Absence Section to record absences as ordi nary ill ness prior to work rel ated circumstances being est abl i shed. "

So he seems to be expressing the view that you do need to establish those circumstances before an issue of classification can be addressed. would you agree with
that?
A. Well, I think it goes beyond. Circumstances are one aspect of it, but the fact that a person is clinically stressed as well, would have to come together. You know, there's three real -- I suppose the way I look at 12:43 it: HRM have a view, the clinical obviously issue is clearly important, that a person has that injury, if you like, and then the circumstances around it. So my understanding of the process is that the three pieces come together. Like in some cases the issue can be quite simple and the CMO can make a determination, send an person to an external expert. He makes a clinical determination that a person is actually stressed. And you know, if it's no one's fault, you know, you can be stressed but the job may have caused it, the job could be stressing you but there has to be, I suppose -- so there's a number of factors in coming to this occupational classification, you know, when a person is clinically being diagnosed as being stressed and it can be attributed to what's happened in the workplace.
365 Q. But you certainly regard it as his function to come to a decision, is that right?
A. I think to get -- I think in terms of the end game objective here was I suppose to put Garda Keogh in the space where he was getting -- he was getting
occupational injury. You know, it's not linear, as I say, the process. The CMO could -- you know, he can give his own evidence, could make a determination in relation to the stress piece, HRM could have a view and
then in terms of we're saying, well, this is really the context, we feel this has happened here. So, you know, people come together then and make a decision. You know, that's how it comes together. I suppose the fact we had -- given the context, we had brought it so far, I don't believe any -- I don't believe the cmo for one minute wouldn't make his own determination in the absence of not having a full investigation. That's not my understanding of how the system works.
Yes. I mean, I suppose I am just asking you to look at it from the position of the смо. He hasn't been given anything really, other than the standard form of a referral with the certified certs and other information accompanying it. But he hasn't actually got any actual information beyond that, or had he, to your knowledge?
A. We11, the reality of it is, and I suppose, you know, what Garda Keogh was going through in this context -367 Q. Yes.
A. -- clearly was challenging, you know, he had made a protected disclosure, it was in the public domain.
Like I said, I'm not a medical person. But from a reasonable person's point of view, you could see that this wouldn't be easy. And you know, I don't know to what degree -- I mean, I referred -- sent him up, I don't know what the clinical, I suppose, precise -- and nor should I, view that the CMO took in relation to the member. He deemed him fit actually in May. You know, I don't -- the cause, let's say, the nuances and the actual pieces of what actual interactions or behaviours
before or during the investigation, or people around him, Garda Keogh wasn't going to go into all that with us and that was absolutely understandable. But I don't believe -- in my opinion, if the CMO is of the view, that I can't make any determination here because you haven't given me enough information, that would have been referenced back.
368 Q. Yes. Just going forward in time then to May 2016, I think you had occasion to visit Garda Keogh, was it the 16th May or 17th May?
A. 16th. The 17th.

369 Q. You describe that in your statement originally made to the Tribunal, at page 3145. If we perhaps just look at that. You're quoting a portion of Garda Keogh's statement there.
"Chi ef Superintendent Wheatley arrived at my house with Sergeant Paddy Gui nan at 12:30 and asked woul d I go back to work. She said she had a conversation with me about work rel ated stress on that date. Those words were never used. "

You go on to say:
"I was al ways mindful that supports were in pl ace for Garda Keogh, especially si nce he had been deemed unfit for duty by the CMD in Decenber 2015. I regul arly linked in with his assi gned welfare officer, Garda M chael Qui nn, to see how he was doi ng."

And you attach a record of these contacts.
"I intended to visit Garda Keogh, whi ch I mentioned to Garda Qui nn in a phone conversation in April. However, 12:48 when carrying out inspections in the Athl one sub- di strict on 16th May 2016, I heard Mck VAllace TD on the radio. He was tal king about his concerns with Garda Keogh. I was with my di vi si onal clerk at the time, he knew Garda Keogh. I deci ded I would call to 12:49 see him During the visit we had a cup of tea, had a general conversation, how he felt about being out of work. My recollection was that he di d not want to ret urn to work until matters were finalised. Garda Keogh brought up the issue of his pay and the recording 12:49 of his absences on the Si ckness Absence Management System He stated being made aware his absences were bei ng incorrectly recorded. He stated that instead of work rel ated stress being recorded, his absences were being recorded as flu/viral. I made a note of this.

This was the first time l heard of this. I made enquiries in rel ation to the recording of his absences on SAMS. The matter was expl ai ned and rectified within a week. I advi sed executive di rector HRM of the visit.

It should be noted there is no mention of this visit by Garda Keogh in his compl ai nt under Garda Sí ochána on har assment, sexual harassment and bullying in the wor kpl ace. "

Firstly there, was that the first occasion upon which any complaint was brought to your attention about the recording of his illnesses?
A. Yes.

12:50

371 Q. Could you just explain the context in which -- or describe the meeting in relation to that issue?
A. I was dropping in to how he was. I was conscious, it just triggered, I suppose, in terms of what was being said in the Dái 1 about how he was feeling. And, I suppose I had been sort of testing the water with the welfare person, would a visit be welcome. I suppose up until April he had been under the care of the people in Galway. That's the way it just worked. we dropped in. Just really it was a safe and welfare check, I suppose. 12:51 we had a chat. I asked him -- I suppose the new pay regulations, I suppose, had a huge effect on Garda Keogh. I suppose it was unfortunate that they came into place at the time he had made the protected disclosure, because up until then members could go sick $12: 51$ or six months every year and not be pay affected, but these regulations were really harsh because you could only go sick for three months in a year --three months in a four-year period and it wasn't sort of from that
day, it was retrospective. So I suppose from -- and indeed, lots of members -- every day he went sick, you know, coincided with our time as well, he was pay affected. So this was very difficult.

I mean, I asked him how is he fixed for a few bob, was he okay for money. He gave me the two amounts, I think he was getting, it might be social welfare, another amount. At that stage his pay had gone probably from -- you get half pay for three months and then you go on what is auld TRR, which is basically pension rate of pay. And so, he said -- my recollection is he said he was okay for money. And then he brought the issue up of it being misrecorded on the system, that he should have been down as stress and not flu/viral. I said, God, I'll have a look at that.

So, you know, he's right in a sense we didn't have a big conversation about investigation or anything like that, but he brought the issue up of him not being recorded as stress, you know, stress. And that was his issue. So the take away from that was, you know, I did a few enquiries on the system and he was going to see the CMO, actually the doctor, on the 19th. The take away I took from that, I wrote up then, and his view then was he was very sort of anxious that he would -that he was certified as being stressed and that's the reason he was out. Then, when I wrote to the CMO, I referenced the visit, or HRM, and you know, I outlined
in my report that he said he wasn't going to come back to work, you know, when everything was all over he would come back. And I stated in it, because I suppose he was very much of the view that he was stressed, I said, when he returned to work, after he returned to work that I would commence an investigation into work related stress. Because clearly that was something we were never going to be able to do until the whole thing was all over.

372 Q. Yes. We11, just a number of points arise from your answer there. You made reference to the regulations, they were the Public Service Management (Sick Leave) Regulations of 2014?
A. Yes.

373 Q. They had been applying to his absences since they had come into force?
A. Yes.

374 Q. The TRR period of absences, that had kicked in, as Superintendent Murray had reported back to you, as from Apri1 2015?
A. Yes. It drops again then.
Q. Yes. Depending on the amount of absences, isn't that correct, and the period?
A. It depends on your service as well.
Q. Yes.
A. You get three months at half -- you know, at full pay and then you go on halfway and then you go on TRR. Now, I know, I suppose, it has evolved slightly, but if you had very little service, Garda Keogh had 15 years
service, it's quite a drop. You're on your pension rate, but if you have only put 15 years into your pension, clearly it's quite a drop. That's topped up by social welfare as well.
377 Q. Okay. So it gets reduced down to pension rate of pay really.
A. Yes.

378 Q. As it had been under the old remuneration regulations, is that right?
A. Yes, just particular --

379 Q. Yes. You made a note in any event in your diary, perhaps we will look at that before lunch, page 3201? CHA RMAN Sorry.
MR. MEGI NESS: Page 3201.
CHAL RMAN Thanks very much.
380 Q. MR. MEGM NESS: You have noted there in relation to the 17th:
"Garda Nick Keogh visit notes. Not keen to return to work. I nvestigation stressful. Not drinki ng much at
present. Payment 188 pl us 110 . Sick classification not down as work rel ated stress. I undertook to revi ew. "

Then there is other comments. Then it says:
"Do report up, clarify SAME, arrange case conference."

So that was your take away from the meeting.
A. I think, yes, I was very -- when I -- I think Garda Keogh had been deemed unfit from the December, and then this was April, and clearly I wouldn't be privy to what sort of interventions other than the support welfare was available. But when I met Garda Keogh, like that, very pleasant, very agreeable manner of person I found him. He talked a little bit about his drinking and I actually just found it quite upsetting, because, you know, he has his own house, car, I felt he was very disconnected really. And so, that was a concern for me. So actually, what I did the next day is, I rang -he had seen the doctor on the 19th.
381 Q. Yes.
A. So on the 20th I phoned Dr. Quigley, because I did have concerns and I felt we had to do something. Now, Dr. Quigley, clearly that was his assessment as well. But that was the take away there in connection with that. Dr. Quigley told me on the phone that the conference would be organised with the executive director HRM and local management and that he was dealing with his doctor, $I$ think, at that stage or something like that. They were examining something. So that happened. But the take away for me was that we needed something more here because he needed -- and as I said, on the 20th I had a conversation with Dr. Quigley in relation to that.

In relation to the SAMS piece, it's something I said I would have a look at as well.

382 Q. Yes. What did you do then?
A. What I did was, I mean -- and I suppose I wasn't aware until I suppose now, Garda Keogh had met with Chief Superintendent Tony McLough1in on the 20th May and he had raised the same issue with him. So I said I would have a look at it. I think it was probably the Monday or whatever I had a look at the system. Like I said, I am familiar with the system, I logged into it and I could see then that he was down as flu/viral and not work related stress. The SAMS system is a really simple system. It's a small, little database, really a very simple system, with a couple of screens. So there's not a lot of detail in it. So I rang Pat, I rang Superintendent Murray and I said, you know, can you check SAMS there because, I said, Garda Keogh is down as "flu/ viral" and not down as "work rel ated stress". Now, Superintendent Murray I don't think had gone into SAMS before, so he wasn't really sure how to get into it, so I talked him through it on the system. 383 Q. Yes.
A. As it transpired, Chief Superintendent McLough1in was making enquiries at the same time as well. When I looked at the screen it was "flu/viral" and I spoke to Superintendent Murray about it and I think he contacted Olivia o'Neill [sic], or Olivia, the clerk, and she advised him that she had received instruction from HRM to change the classification. The reason why I couldn't see it on the screen was because it runs overnight and it's on7y reflected on the screen the
next day.
Q. The next day, yes?
A. I suppose there's two lines of enquiries and it took a couple of days. That's is that.
Q. Chief Superintendent McLoughlin describes in his statement the contacts with Garda Keogh on the 20th and 23rd May?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have any contact with Chief Superintendent McLough1in at that point in time or was it a little bit 13:00 1ater?
A. I know he says -- and maybe we did have a conversation.
Q. Yes.
A. I can't -- if he says we did, we did, but in relation to the classification, but $I$ can't be sure. what I do know is that it is a task I said I would undertake and I would check the conversation.

388 Q. Yes.
A. Whether I checked it after he had a conversation with me or of my own volition, it happened at the same time, 13:00 I really can't be certain.
Q. Yes?
A. But I think Chief Superintendent McLough1in is of the view we had a conversation about it. So I suppose essentially the thing was sorted. Chief Superintendent 13:00 McLough1in had the authority to, I suppose, give that instruction to us.

CHA RMAN I think we will call a halt to it there. Thanks very much. Very good.

## THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED FOR LUNCH AND RESUMED AS

 FOLLOVS:MR. MEGI NESS: Good afternoon, chief superintendent. We had got to the middle of May 2016. You had been out to visit Garda Keogh. I just want to be clear how you viewed that meeting in terms of the consequences. The issue of his pay was an issue he raised?
A. I don't know whether he raised it or I asked him how was he fixed financially, do you know what I mean. Yes. You certainly understood that he had and was being affected by the TRR issue?
A. Yes, absolutely.

392 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

393 Q. And you knew obviously yourself that it something were to be classified as an injury on duty, that that would get him -- properly certified as such, would get him onto a full rate?
A. Yes.
Q. You refer to the Code there, 11.37, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

395 Q. That's a certificate that issues by you?
A. That's right.

396 Q. Isn't that right? So, is it correct to say, as you do in your statement, that it's really the CMO who decides the classification that's recorded and then consequences of the classification. The CMO only gives advices really, wasn't making that decision.
A. I suppose it's useful to reference a page there, I suppose there was a subsequent sort of instruction to each divisional officer in respect of work related stress.
Q. Yes.
A. It is 3167.

398 Q. Yes.
A. Or 3197, sorry.

399
Q. 3167.
A. I probably have the wrong reference there.

400 Q. Yes. That is Assistant Commissioner Fanning's letter to you?
A. Essentially -- maybe I will it out, will I?

401 Q. Yes, if you have it there?
A. Yes, I do.

402 Q. What date is that, just to be clear?
A. I have no date on it. CHAN RMAN This is 3167. that right.
A. Yes. This is an instruction that came out from the executive director in relation to work related stress.

404 Q. Yes.
A. It has been disclosed.

405 Q. What date is that now?
A. I don't have a date on it.

406 Q. okay.
CHA RMAN You better tell us a bit more about it
before -- we can forget Commissioner Fanning's 9th November.
A. Yeah, do.

407 Q. CHA RMAN That's okay, there's no problem about that. So the document, chief superintendent, that you referring to, who does it come from?
A. It comes from the executive director of HRM.
Q. CHA RMAN who is Mr. Mulligan?
A. Mr. Barrett, at the time.

409 Q. CHA RMAN Mr. Barrett, okay. How did it come to you? Te11 us something more about it. why is it relevant, why do you think it is relevant?
A. Because I suppose it clarifies -- I suppose it clarifies that a divisional officer cannot make -cannot issue an 11.37 adjudication in their own right for a work related stress issue.

410 Q. CHA RMAK I see. In normal circumstances, if I am understanding, where the chief superintendent in the area, i.e. the divisional officer, is satisfied that the injury or condition is work caused, caused by work, let's say, the chief superintendent can issue an 11.37, is that correct?
A. Yeah. I suppose and where there is any doubt or you have any -- you refer it up the line.
411 Q. CHA RMAN Let's assume there's no doubt?
A. Yes.

412 Q. CHA RMAN Somebody has been attacked on duty?
A. Yes.

413 Q. CHA RMAN Has been stricken and he's in hospital, has
come out on crutches and blah, blah, blah, gradually made a recovery but is still being certified, the chief superintendent can clearly say this is 11.37 , I have no doubt about it, no problems?
A. Yes.

414 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. But you're drawing a distinction between that and someone where there is more complication about it, is that right?
A. Yes.

415 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. I suppose specifically I suppose it's work related stress, the executive, you know, issued a clarification around that matter.

416 Q. CHA RMAN And this clarification was issued and you think this clarification was issued at some time that is relevant to the issues that we're discussing?
A. Yes.

417 Q. CHA RMAN And in due course we will be able to find out the exact date?
A. Yes.

418 Q. CHAN RMAN And circumstances?
A. Yes.

419 Q. CHA RMAN Is that it?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Okay. Thanks very much. So it is from Mr. Barrett. okay, what does he say?

420 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: would you like to read that just to be clear?
A. Yes.
"Re certificates 11. 37. Where a menber is certified unfit for work by their GP due to work rel ated stress, the di visional of ficer should conduct an investigation into the cause of the stress. The investigation report should be submitted to the head of HR di rector, who should provi de thei $r$ report to the CMD for consi deration in order to performappropriate clinical advices. The head of HR di rector may seek the advi ces of the office of the Garda Chi ef Medi cal Officer in determining the category of the occupational i njury/ill ness. The HR di rector may commi ssi on additional investigations and reports as it deems necessary. The di visi onal of ficer should not consi der issuing an 11. 37 until investigations, incl uding appeals, regarding the matter have been fully compl et ed......the minutes should be read in conj unction with 11. 37."
421 Q. Now, you did refer to this earlier this morning and I thought you had agreed with me that that came out subsequent to the events that we are talking about in 2016, am I wrong in that?
A. No. My understanding is that $159 / 10$ is a directive that came out in 2010.

422 Q. Yes.
A. You know. It's my understanding that when it came to work related stress, because of the complexities around it, I suppose, the view was that, you know, we shouldn't issue one in relation to that matter, $I$
suppose based on our own evaluation. I mean, as I said, if a person gets a kick and they report it, I am comfortable that he has -- you know, based on his own medical doctor's report, a report from his doctor.
423 Q. Yes.
A. But I suppose as an organisation, I suppose as things evolve and mental health issues, it's really complex. I suppose, when issuing an 11.37 , I suppose a person is on the full pay then, you know.
Q. Yes.
A. So my understanding was that I wasn't qualified to make a determination around work related stress. It's a complex issue, it's a serious issue.
425 Q. Yes.
A. So that it was sort of -- like, I know from having conversations with the CMO in relation to other people, you know, that he has to make the determination, he has to link it to the actual, I suppose, issues that arose locally and he also refers it back to HRM. Because it's complex.
426 Q. Can I just take it in two stages?
A. Mm-hmm.

427 Q. Obviously the first stage envisaged in that letter is that a doctor's certificate, from the member's own doctor, comes in saying work related stress?
A. Yes.
Q. Obviously you wouldn't be entitled to issue an 11.37 yourself simply on foot of that?
A. No.

429 Q. What is to happen next is an investigation into it.
A. Yes.
Q. Following which there is a referral up to the CMO, there may be further consultations and advices and then the CMO could give his advice. That doesn't deal with the situation, it seems to me, perhaps I am wrong, doesn't deal with the situation where the CMO has seisin of it and certifies or offers advices that it's related to work related stress and is an injury in work. Does it not then go back to you to properly issue the 11.37 at that stage?
A. That's my precise point, really, that that wasn't his view, that it didn't come back that I should issue an 11.37 for a psychological injury.

431 Q. CHA RMAN Chief superintendent, could I ask you this?
A. Yes.

432 Q. CHA RMAN Leaving aside what memos or notes were in effect or not in effect, what did you understand had to happen before Garda Keogh got an 11.37 and was on full pay? what did you understand had to happen?
A. Yes, I suppose, I mean, we had to establish the cause. And you know, the causes at a high level was established. when -- in my experience, in terms of clinical, I suppose, assessment, that this person is indeed suffering from stress, you have to have that piece in any case. In my experience when people are referred up in this regard, sometimes the CMO might say, you're not stressed actually, you're stressed but you're not stressed enough to stay off work. In most
cases the CMO -- I don't think he makes a determination on his own, I mean he can speak to that, that he maybe sends a person to an independent consultant or whatever he does, I suppose that's a matter for his office. But he will make a determination. We have cases where it could like be a conversation or something quite minor that happens to a person.
CHA RMAN Could I stop you for one second?
A. Yes.

434 Q. CHAN RMAN I'm sorry to interrupt.
A. Yes.

435 Q. CHA RMAN But we have a situation where Garda Keogh's GP was certifying him as work related stress. So far we know what the situation was. what did you think had to happen?
A. Well, what I thought, when you send a person up, even for another reason that you have a doubt about, let's say, the CMO will make a clinical determination and he'd say, this person is injured, either psychologically or otherwise, whatever process he goes through.

CHA RMAN You thought it should go to the CMO; is that right?
A. I'm compelled to send it to the CMO.

438 Q. CHA RMAN Okay, you're compelled. Your understanding was that you were obliged to refer the matter to the

CMO?
A. It's always been the case where something is not -well, other than a simple -- you know, I suppose --
439 Q. CHA RMAN I absolutely understand. Nothing I am saying is suggesting that it's simple or that there was 14:14 anything wrong?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN Nothing I am indicating or implying, I just want to get to know what your understanding was as to what had to happen?
A. My understanding was that you make the referral.

441 Q. CHA RMAN You refer to the CMO?
A. Through -- via the executive director of HRM.

442 Q. CHAI RMAN Absolutely. But one way or the other, directly or indirectly, you said this man has to be seen or should be seen by the CMO?
A. Yes.

443 Q. CHA RMAN That was your understanding of the process?
A. Yes.

444 Q. CHA RMAN And the CMO would examine the patient, the man, the person, in this case Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.

445 Q. CHA RMAN And would issue a diagnosis?
A. Yes.

446 Q. CHAI RMAN Advices.
A. Advices, yeah.

447 Q. CHA RMAN And what advice would you be expecting from him? Either yes, it is work related stress, or, no, it is not work related stress. Is that what you would
expect him to do?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. CHA RMAN okay. If he said, yes, it is work related stress, no problem, you have your justification, your rationale, I should say, for 11.37 , is that correct?
A. Yes. What he has to say is that this is linked to the workplace.
Q. CHA RMAN of course.
A. You know, you could be stressed for external, I suppose, reasons.
450 Q. CHA RMAN But if he says, yes, this man is under stress and it's related to his work, related, caused, whatever words are used.
A. Yes.

451 Q. CHA RMAN If he says, yeah, that's it.
A. You issue a 11.37.

452 Q. CHA RMAK You issue. And if he says something that indicates not agreement with that, you don't issue an 11.37, is that the position?
A. No. Yes.

453 Q. CHAN RMAN
CHA RMAN okay. I am sorry, thanks for clarifying that.

454 Q. MR. MEGU NNESS: So it would seem then on the basis of principle that the CMO is relied upon for an assessment 14:15 and advices following which the Gardaí make the decision as to classification?
A. Yes. I suppose if you are dealing with a medical issue.
A. I can understand, because obviously it's complex that he's out.

460 Q. Yes.
A. That he may have had the view or someone may have advised him that when you're out with work related stress you're entitled to occupational injury. He clearly took that, understood that. So the conversation -- and I was -- you know, it was a drop in cal1.
A. A cup of tea. But it wasn't even in my mind that this was the issue. The issue here -- because I suppose I understood that there wasn't an automatic thing. But
my take away from the meeting was that it was really important to Garda Keogh that, you know, his doctor had certified him with work related stress. That's important in our organisation, to have full sight of that. Indeed, they had, but they weren't relying on the SAMS. when he became aware that the SAMS was incorrect, this was important to him.

462 Q. Yes.
A. What I took away from that was, and that's when I wrote up to HRM, that, you know, he's saying he is stressed and this is connected with the whole investigation and that when this is all over, when he returns to work, I will then commence an investigation into work related stress, because that's his position, or revisit it, if you like.

463 Q. Yes. Obviously you spoke to Superintendent Murray, as you have told us, and we know Olivia Kelly spoke to Clare Egan I think and the entry was changed?
A. Yes.

464 Q. Were you told that it had been changed to mental health?
A. Yes, I think it was, yeah, yeah.

465 Q. okay. Did you make any enquiry or was there any discussion with Superintendent Murray as to whether that would affect his pay in any way, or was it just fixing the classification issue?
A. It was just fixing the classification. I am very familiar, I have an IT background, I am very familiar with the system, I'm familiar with the policy.
Q. Yes.
A. So it was never a question in my head or my mind that this was going to, you know, put him into occupational injury.
467 Q. You do in your statement express a very clear view that 14:18 an ordinary illness categorisation puts you -- it's a presumptive classification unless it's displaced really by a different occupational injury diagnosis, isn't that right?
A. Yeah, and I suppose the other one is -- I suppose it's not relevant here, but critical illness is one that clearly you wouldn't adjudicate on. The CMO has to -there is a whole protocol around that, the CMO is the one that says to me, this is critical illness. There's different rules around critical illness as well.
468 Q. In any event, you did write up on the 17th, if we look at page 3203, to the executive director HR: The second paragraph:
"I have al so on today's date visited the nember at his home to enquire into his wel fare and welling. I enquired as to the probability of himreturning to work in the fut ure and was advi sed by Garda Keogh that his current absence is attri butable to work rel ated stress arising from his invol vement in investi gations being progressed outsi de the West meath di vision. Garda Keogh intimated that he would not be returning to until these matters had been concl uded as these matters were exacer bating his condition.

Garda Keogh stated that he would be attending the schedul ed appoi nt ment..."

Etcetera, etcetera. Then the final sentence is of some 14:19 significance:
"Upon Garda Keogh's resumption to duty, I will ensure that a full investigation is conducted to establish the source of the member's alleged work rel ated stress and if same can be attributed to his absence."

In a sense you had made some head road yourself down that, because he had told you that the investigation was exacerbating his condition. Did you know anything more about the investigation at that point in time?
A. No, he didn't really discuss it with me.

469 Q. I think the day after you received then a letter from the Commissioner's office, if we look at page 6175. This came from Superintendent Frank walsh, whom you probably knew, on the 18th May. You are asked by the Commissioner to do some enquiries into Garda Keogh and his current status.
"This office has been informed that the file submitted by DC, SCM to the DPP has been returned with a di rection of no prosecution. A di sci plinary i nvesti gation under AC Nol an is ongoi ng.

In terns of his current position and welfare, the Commissioner asked me to touch base with you to get an up-to- date report. This should cover, inter alia: Current status, contacts with Garda management, work position, discipline issues, complaints, welfare supports offered/recei ved, any other issues rel evant.

Please treat as urgent."

I think you put that in train and you got reports from Superintendent Murray, at page 6182, dated the 19th May. He address a number of the issues there. You, I think, prepared a report then and you replied to Superintendent Walsh's letter on the 24th May, if we go to 6176. That's a four-page report with an appendices. Just touching on a couple of issues there. There is a reference to olivia o'Neill, you had no involvement in that whatsoever at any stage obviously?
A. No, Superintendent Murray had spoken to her about it.

470 Q. Nor the Liam McHugh issue?
A. No.

471 Q. You make reference to Inspector Minnock, this is at the top of page 6178, having visited him on the 24th?
A. Yes.

472 Q. Had you received a report from Inspector minnock about 14:23 the call to the house?
A. Probably not at that stage.

473 Q. Yes.
A. I mean this information would have been -- it was
pulled together, I suppose, in conjunction with the divisional clerk and he was getting information in, in relation to that. Now I had -- so, in terms of -Garda Keogh came back in to, I suppose, our world when Galway had completed their job and I suppose also following from my meeting locally, a decision was mad to appoint a new person to be the liaison person. That was only a couple of days later. So it may have been a phone call, I don't know if there was a report or not, commencing the --
474 Q. That was Inspector Minnock's first visit to him, and we have seen his note at page 782 to 783 of his notes, where he details comments made against the Commissioner. Were you informed of that at that point in time, do you remember?
A. I don't know. I'm not sure.

475 Q. In any event you, addressed each of the headings there and you concluded on page 6179 that you're satisfied that the welfare of Garda Keogh is being attended to within the division at every level.
"He has been referred to the Chi ef Medical Officer for revi ew and the advi ces of the Chi ef Medical Officer indi cated the menber is unfit to attend for work or for regul ar policing duties at present. Garda Keogh has informed me he is not anxi ous to return to work until all matters he has reported under the confidential reporting mechani smare concl uded in their entirety.

While Garda Keogh remai ns absent through ill ness, there will be ongoing communi cation fromlnspector Mnock, Athl one, and upon his resumption to duty the necessary supports to facilitate a return to work will be put in pl ace. "

Now, there doesn't appear to be any mention of the classification issue.
A. Yeah, and it's not actually, and I don't think it's in a subsequent report that I did.

476 Q. Is there any reason why?
A. Yeah. I suppose, I probably didn't think it was -- I suppose it had been corrected and I think because nothing turned on it and it may be that mightn't have been even addressed at that stage, so there was no particular reason why it was excluded. I suppose, and it's only my sense, $I$ think it was in and around the same -- this request came in on the 18th and we would be pulling the thing together then. My recollection is, this is the night I phoned Pat, I had checked it, and could I have not checked it at that stage or could I have checked it and not thought that it was relevant, I really can't distinguish that in my head, to be honest with you. So it wasn't something that was being left out to be refused or anything like that, it was something that I must have believed wasn't relevant.

477 Q. Yes.
A. Because nothing turned on it.

478 Q. Okay. But certainly as I understand it, nothing
further had changed in relation to Garda Keogh's pay, the classification from "flu/viral " to "mental heal th" hadn't affected his pay, so he was still in his view sort of being adversely affected by, as he saw, the classification?
A. Yes.

479 Q. All right. At the time you wrote this letter, had you consulted with Chief McLoughlin at all, or do you recall?
A. Not at that stage, no.

480 Q. We know obviously Chief McLoughlin met Garda Keogh on the 3rd June. But I think he then e-mailed you on the 4th June?
A. That's right.

481 Q. If we look at page 3206, we can see an e-mail there asking if an investigation was carried out into the work related stress and the outcome of it?
A. Yes.
Q. There was also an enquiry from Assistant Commissioner Fanning as to whether it was the CMO that had him out, isn't that right?
A. Well, I think the comment -- they e-mail would have gone to a number of number of people. I think Assistant Commissioner Fanning commented "is it the CMO that has him out?" oh yeah. You know.
483 Q. We've previously seen some e-mails from Chief McLoughlin to Monica Carr and Mr. Nugent in and around this period?
A. Yes.

484
Q. I would just like your observations on them, as to whether you were being made aware of any of the discussion?
A. No, I wasn't. That whole conversation around the pay. 485 Q. Yes.
A. We weren't privy to that.

486 Q. It's just that it's in the period immediately preceding the conference, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, with the timeframe, the conference was in July.

487 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

488 Q. Chief McLough1in seemed to be taking a very clear view that the member shouldn't be on reduced pay until it was proved there wasn't a causal link between the reasons for absence and work related stress, and there was a change of mindset required there. Ms. Carr was giving advice in the way that we have seen?
A. No.

489 Q. You weren't privy to any of that?
A. No.

490 Q. Do you think it surprising, perhaps, that being the chief of the division you weren't being asked for your opinion on those matters, particularly where you hadn't been able to find out the causes of stress?
A. I think it might have been useful to bring us all Like I said, it's only in the disclosure that we see that conversation. But I suppose ultimately pay, it's a matter for HRM and I suppose pay is underpinned by
regulations and I suppose public money.
491 Q. Yes.
A. So it wasn't within anyone's gift, I suppose, to operate outside those. But the whole issue, I have no authority to instruct killarney to pay people or otherwise. So that's a matter for HRM.

492 Q. Yes. You sent Chief McLoughlin's enquiry on to Superintendent Murray I think?
A. Yes.

493 Q. He seems to have asked or queried whether he, Chief McLoughlin, hadn't got the CMO letter. There is a reply from him to you, if we look at page 3209. If we just look at that, his question, just going down the page slightly, he said:
"Di dn't get the CMD letter."

## You say:

"I agree. Bit smart. WII write to himon Monday."

Then he replies:
"It's a really funny question considering he is a whi stlebl ower and an investigation into the entire set of allegations he is making, whi ch Garda Keogh may say was causing himstress, was carried out by DC Ó Cual ái n. "

Did you understand that Superintendent Murray seemed to think that ó Cualáin had some investigative function in related to the stress, or was it just in related to the allegations?
A. My interpretation of that was, and I suppose we had written up, we had sort of written up on two occasions and then I had written up on the 17th may to HRM to say -- you know, initially we wrote up, you know, the first referral and said he could bring -- you know, that this is the context but we couldn't bring it any further. And then we sort of restated that. When I had visited Garda Keogh -- I suppose when I visited Garda Keogh, I think in May, he was very strongly of the view that I'm out with work related stress, I have a doctor's cert for work related stress, it should be on the system as that, I am out with stress. And so, I wrote then to HRM and said that this is his position, you know, and that, you know, when this is all -- when everything is bottomed out, then I will advance it. So, I can't -Tony may not have seen that when he wrote this e-mail.
494 Q. Yes. Well, you wrote your letter up on the 8th June then.
A. Yes.

495 Q. A couple of days after this exchange, dealing directly with the issue that Chief superintendent McLoughlin had raised. If we look at that, it's at 6169 to 6171?
A. I mean, there had been, I suppose, a trail of correspondence up and down, so I felt it would be useful to pull everything together, in light, I
suppose, of the request in the e-mail, I asked him in quite clear terms to be clear and to point out, are you asking us that we need to do this.
Yes. It's a three-page letter. I am not going to obviously read it. But you refer in the second paragraph to the alleged work related stress, Superintendent Murray's meeting on the 26th March, the events of may ' 15 and the reports that were sent up that we have seen already. And then, at the bottom of 6170, you say:
"Despite a number of enquiries with Garda Keogh to establish the source of his alleged work rel ated stress, the menber is continuously correl ated his invol vement as confidential reporter to his absence of alleged work rel ated stress."

Now, the number of enquiries, I take it you are relying principally on Superintendent Murray's meeting with him on 26th March '15 and your own meeting?
A. Yes.

497 Q. Which was a recent one, obviously.
A. I think, you know, in my professional opinion it wouldn't have been appropriate, Garda Keogh had, you know, clearly, when I took up the position, that he couldn't go into this in too much detail.

498 Q. Yes.
A. Certainly we weren't going to -- we couldn't roll out a team to start an investigation, we didn't have a
complaint.
499 Q. Yes.
A. I suppose this was all very new, and I think realistically even as an investigator myself, that they were so inextricably linked, as alleged, that realistically the whole -- you know, you had to come out the other end of it, you know.

500 Q. Yes.
A. The other piece of the jigsaw is, you know, obviously the conversation between Garda Keogh and the CMO is a matter for him, his evidence, you know, I don't know what determination the CMO made about the nature of his illness, but it certain7y wasn't flagged down to ourselves that this person is actually clinically, you know, distressed.
Q. Yes.
A. But I mean, from my point of view we had brought it so far.

502 Q. Yes.
A. You know.

503 Q. Just looking at the top of page 6171, eight lines down there, it's saying:
"Wile I am not in recei pt of the advi ces of the Chi ef Medical Officer following the member's revi ew at
Occupati onal Heal th Servi ce on the 19th May 2016, I have cont acted the Chi ef Medi cal Officer on today's date and I am advi sed that his previ ous advi ce in respect of Garda Keogh remai $n$ the same. The Chi ef

Medi cal Officer al so outlined that should the member be deened to be determined fit to ret urn to policing duties by his own redical practitioner. But any return to work would only be permitted following a revi ew at Occupati onal Health Service. I expl ai ned to the Chi ef Medi cal Officer l was eager to have a case conference in respect of Garda Keogh and was advi sed that same is bei $n g$ arranged by his office."

So that was a new development then, was it?
A. Yeah, clearly the medical assessment was that we needed to bring people together now, you know, to look at Garda Keogh's case.
504 Q. Just going back to the previous year, you obviously took the step of phoning at this time, but is there any 14:37 reason why you chose or maybe just didn't decide to phone earlier the previous year? was there some added urgency, do you think, at this time?
A. Yes, there was some added urgency. I mean, I suppose we all have our roles to play in the organisation.

505 Q. Yes.
A. When you make a referral to the CMO and he deems a person fit for duty, he's back on my team, I suppose, then really and there was no -- and I suppose, just to reference the view, the comments in the notes, you know, the conference, that he had deteriorated since May. So clearly, the CMO or whoever reviewed him was of the view that he was fit to work. So, you know, I mean we all have our roles and we all have our
expertise and at that time he was intermittently out with work related stress. His doctor had seemed him fit on many occasions to return to work.
506 Q. Yes.
A. So that's the space we were in.

14:38
507 Q. In the final two paragraphs of this letter, if we just look at them, you're addressing very directly Chief mcLoughlin's concerns here?
A. Yes.

508 Q. "Garda Keogh has never intimated that there were any inci dents whi ch occurred in the workplace in Athl one Garda Station whi ch were causing his alleged work rel ated stress. Garda Keogh has never made any report which warranted investigation in accordance with the Garda Sí ochána grievance procedure or the Garda policy for dealing with harassment, sexual harassment and bullying in the workplace. Indeed, all possible supports to facilitate a return to work by Garda Keogh have been put in place by the district management team in Athlone and his welfare has been prioritised through 14:39 ongoing enquiries to ensure the menber is aware and availing of empl oyee assi stance service.

In vi ew of the foregoing, it has not been possible to conduct a full investigation into Garda Keogh's absence 14:39 through alleged work rel ated stress, nor do l believe will any further or specificinformation be provided by Garda Keogh whi ch would enable the further investigation of this claim However, to be clear and
to avoi d any doubt, l amto enquire if there is any requi rement to further investigate Garda Keogh' s absence through alleged work rel ated stress. In the event that the further investigation of this matter is war ranted, I woul d recommend that permission be granted 14:39 to appoi nt an inspector outside the West meath di vi si on to conduct the same."

Now, that last suggestion, why did you include that as the final word, as it were, in the letter?
A. I suppose, I mean, we had brought it to a level, he wasn't -- Garda Keogh -- you know, to a level. I suppose we had said, you know, on two occasions that we addressed it and we couldn't advance it. when I saw him he obviously raised the issue now that he was medically certified by his own doctor as stressed. I took the view that, yeah, when this is all over, when he's back in work we can advance this. I suppose in response to Chief Superintendent McLough1in's e-mails, you know, asking the question, I suppose my view was, do you want us to push this at this stage, notwithstanding I suppose the complexities around the issue. And so, just I suppose by way of sort of -- my view was, well, if you are going to go ahead with this it probably would be better to have someone else do it outside of the division. I sent a subsequent reminder I think six weeks later.

509 Q. Yes.
A. In relation to that meeting.

510 Q. Were you getting any sense that Garda Keogh regarded management within the division as being a difficulty for him or that he had complaints against Superintendent Murray or grievances, whether real or imagined? Is there any sense that that was in your mind when you are writing this?
A. Well, I suppose this issue -- I mean, Garda Keogh -- I suppose the issue, the substantive issue, I'm not going to go into it, is connected with Athlone, do you know what I mean, and it was being investigated elsewhere. I just thought it would be a level of independence. I could have appointed an inspector to it in the division as we11. I just thought it might be better to have it outside the division.
511 Q. okay. I mean, obviously in the context of your reply to the Commissioner, through Superintendent walsh, you had drawn attention to the disciplinary issues that had arisen.
A. Yes.

512 Q. The reference to the other files and the reference to him being confined to indoor duties?
A. Yes.

513 Q. Did it cross your mind that part of the stress from Garda Keogh's perspective would be the local management and how he was being treated?
A. My understanding is that I think Garda Keogh met Chief Superintendent Murray on a small number of occasions.

514 Q. Yes.
A. Did it cross my mind? I suppose even if it did cross
my mind, the issue here was in terms of how could this be explored? He had made his position quite clear and, I suppose, absolutely. I think even -- even really -so I was saying, you're saying to do this, how far do you want us to go with this? And honestly, and I have thought so much about this, if we were saying we can only bring it so far --
Q. Yes?
A. -- if the CMO had come back to ourselves and said, this member is suffering from stress, he is medically stressed, it's connected with the workplace, would that have triggered us off to do it maybe with more urgency? But he made his position clear. We were looking for guidance from HRM and my view was, when the person is back to work, this whole thing is over, I think it would be very difficult for Garda Keogh to talk about the stress elements of it if it's all tied up with the protected disclosures. And that was his position all the time. If he had written up a complaint or if he had said a particular issue, that this was causing him stress, indeed, that could have been investigated.

516 Q. Yes. As it turns out obviously, to date no investigation has ever yet commenced?
A. No, I sent a reminder six weeks later. I suppose I moved on. But there has never been investigated, as I ${ }_{\text {14:44 }}$ am aware.
517 Q. Yes. The conference then took place on the 12th July. we have notes of that at page 6167, which you probably didn't see at the time?
A. No.

518 Q. But you have seen them obvious7y in this context. Do they fairly represent the mood of the meeting, if I can put it that way?
A. They do substantially. I was surprised when I saw them, the local management observations. I suppose we didn't have actions arising out of it, because that was a matter for HRM, but I am still surprised at local management observations. I suppose if you look at the minutes, sometimes minutes are about actions afterwards.

519 Q. Yes.
A. Which you can see.

520 Q. Yes.
A. But certainly, essentially everything else, this was the conversation, we were -- it was all about getting support and help for Garda Keogh.
521 Q. Yes. I think Garda Quinn made it clear that his view had been and it was expressed to Inspector Minnock and others, that Garda Keogh would want to deal with the obviously the alcohol side of it, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

522 Q. And had expressed a willingness to do so?
A. Yes.

523 Q. You were there obviously, can you recollect how you expressed any local management concerns there, whether they are recorded there or not?
A. We11, I am conscious, you know, I was very much of the view -- that's when I went to see him and I spoke to
the doctor. I was very much of the view that we needed to help this person. I understand there's limits in the medical aid, I suppose they'11 only pay for treatment once or -- so, there is an issue that he may not need it.
A. They won't give it to you a second time.

525 Q. Yes.
A. So my position was, and I don't want to be unkind, that, you know, from the conversations I was having, had had a brief conversation with Garda Keogh, you know, he spoke, that he was drinking, he was continuing to drink, he was drinking on his own. I think he may have said he used to drink in the woods or something like that, I have a clear recollection of that. So my view was that we needed to help this person.
526 Q. You were supportive of the proposition?
A. Absolutely.

527 Q. Was there any voice or anyone who didn't favour this at the meeting?
A. No. There was full support here for Garda Keogh. This was about -- this was a man, as I saw, a young man and, you know, there seemed to be an element of chaos and, you know, I suppose drink was a factor. I am not obviously a medical person or a psychologist, but I mean, I am in the Guards 35 years, I have a good understanding of life, my view was, you know what, you're out -- I know he was under his doctor and they were linking in, I just thought, you know, we need to
get this sorted. I suppose unfortunately, I do understand addiction. I believe get the money and try and let him get treatment and that. I mean, I wasn't the only voice, that was the voice -- and the executive director, Superintendent Murray, Chief Superintendent McLough1in, and indeed everyone around the table, and the medical people there, we were -- you know, we have to look after our people and our job was to support Garda Keogh, I suppose, get back on his feet again.

528 Q. Yes. We've seen that the doctor reported as of 21st July 2016 that Garda Keogh was an inpatient. If we could look at that briefly, 9722. It's addressed by the doctor to Mr . Barrett. He refers to a minute and case conference there.
"I have recei ved rel evant update in respect of the above menber's clini cal management and progress. Based on the information now available to me, I offer opi ni on as follows.

1. The nember has now accessed and commenced
appropriate inpatient care for a longstanding and establ ished clini cal condition, whi ch has been a clinical basis for his current absence.
2. The members agreed that the case conference should continue to be confidentially supported by the Garda Empl oyee Assi stant Service as well as recei ve the support of his seni or local management in order to foster a successful and sustai ned return to well being and event ual effectiveness.
3. Insof ar as it is reasonably practicable, the member should be facilitated in respect of the costs of the treat ment programme so that this does not become an obstacle or barrier to achi eving a successful return to well being. This is wi thout prej udice to the issues that form background in the case.
4. The nenber is currently temporarily unfit to return to work and to undertake policing duties. Further revi ew at this service will be necessary at such time as the clinical updates indicate that returning to work 14:49 is knew feasible. Arrangements shall be communi cated accordingly.

Thank you for facilitating the necessary communi cations. "

I think you then receive a report from the CMO, was it? I'm sorry, from the executive director, is that correct? If you go to page 6173, from Ms. Carr on behalf of the HR director. 6173
A. Yes.

529 Q. Points 1 to 4 are repeated there. There was then a question:
"Pl ease inf ormthe mentber accordingly and ensure they
are notified of the confidential supports (e.g. peer support, empl oyee assi stance scheme) available to Garda nembers and to avail of same if required.

He shoul d ensure the provi si ons of code 1139 are strictly adhered to. Please ensure that all si ckness absences are recorded on SAMS. "

So that was to preserve the reporting and collation of medical certificates entries on SAMS, etcetera, etcetera, isn't that right?
A. Yes. And at this point $I$ would have gone on transfer, I transferred in early August but...
530 Q. That's what I was going to ask you. Did you see the letter of the 12th August that Ms. Carr sent?
A. I don't think so.

531 Q. Addressed to you?
A. I wouldn't have. It would have went -- it goes to the division. I transferred on the 9th August.

532 Q. Yes. It's at 9727?
A. I do see it there, yeah.

533 Q. 9727. Sorry, the 12th August there, 6173?
A. Yes.

534 Q. You were gone from there?
A. I was, yes.

535 Q. 6173. You had 1eft the division then?
A. Transferred.

536 Q. So you had no further dealings then in any context in relation to the management issues then arising at any stage?
A. No,.

537 Q. We can pass on from that. Just going back to a slightly different issue: As part of your reporting
upwards in response to Superintendent Frank Walsh on 24th May 2016, you included a schedule relating to the Pulse entry created by Garda Keogh, isn't that correct?
A. That's right, yeah.

538 Q. Just in terms of sequence, you had previously reported on that, if we go to page 6184, isn't that correct?
A. Yeah.

539 Q. That's a letter of 19th August 2015, addressed to the assistant commissioner, Eastern Region?
A. Yes.

540 Q. Commissioner Fanning, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

541 Q. You recite in the first paragraph:
"I am now vi ewing this file for the first time."
A. Yes.

542 Q. "I have been advi sed that the matter was being addressed through assi stant commissi oner Crime and Security and that further clarification had been sought as there was an absence of a clear policy to deal with this matter."

You then detail a number of facts there, which we don't need to go through, they're facts we have heard about so far. Under the heading "stakehol ders", you say:
"Chi ef superintendent, West meath, di strict office, Athl one. Intelligence created by a nember in Athl one and invol ves a possi ble front to the right to dignity
at work of Garda A as the intelligence is visible to al। Garda menbers."

That's obviously in the light of your knowledge of the complaint that Garda A had made, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

543 Q. The other stakeholders:
"Assistant commi ssi oner, organi sation devel opment and strategic planning responsibility for data protection i ssues within An Garda Sí ochána. Previ ous correspondence fromthis office concl uded there was no breach of the Data Protection Act as the information had not been di sseminated outside the organi sation.

Assistant commissioner, Crime and Security, responsibility for criminal intelligence on Pulse."

And then you're offering a view on the current situation as you saw it at that point in time. Firstly:
"It remains unclear if there is a source for the intel li gence created.

No further enquiry can be progressed in respect of the source within this di vision until such time as Assi stant Commissioner Ó Cual ái $n$ concl udes his enqui ry.

What breaches exi sts in each instance:

1. If there is no source.
2. If there is a source.
3. If there is a credi ble source.

Is the breach criminal, di scipline civil.

Responsibility for the investigation process owner.

Obl igations to compl ai nant (Garda A under the Data Protection Act - must be some enqui ry or facts est abl i shed).

I have on this date requested the district officer, At hl one, Superintendent Murray to speak with Garda to outline the difficulties in progressing his complaint pendi ng the outcome of enquiry of Assistant Commi ssi oner Ó Cual ái n. I have requested the di strict officer Athl one to advi se Garda A of the welfare supports available to himand to informhimthat his complaint is still the subject of attention.

I have brought the contents of this report to the attention of Superintendent Murray and di scussed with himthe matters requiring clarification and attention as outlined above.

I understand that Assistant Cormíssioner Ó Cual ái n's i nvestigation has been ongoing since this item of
intel ligence was created. In light of the current situation reflected above, it does not appear to be possi ble to progress the compl ai nt of Garda A or to gi ve consi deration to any breach of discipline in respect of the creation of this item of intelligence at 14:56 this time.

For war ded for your information."

And you cc'd that to Superintendent Murray. Now, I suppose that could be described as a where are we now, as of August '15. Did you cause enquiries to have been made later with Garda $A$ as to whether he wished to proceed further with a complaint or to have any action taken?
A. It refers to -- I am referring to correspondence that obviously emanated assistant commissioner, Eastern Region, in relation to the matter. It might have been -- I don't see, I haven't got it here, but I think this could have been -- it could have been in the system and 14:56 it came down as an update or a reminder, but I didn't cause any enquiries in relation to the matter, I was responding to --
544 Q. Just following on from that, is it the case then that as of the time you left, you had taken, other than the report we will come to in a moment now, May, you had taken no further step yourself to progress this issue in any way?
A. No. No.

545 Q. A11 right. Just the final line of that letter seems to obviously clearly envisage the possibility of breach of discipline being raised in respect of the creation of it by Garda Keogh, is that right?
A. Yes.

546 Q. Obviously that would be dependent, presumably, on an investigation finding a number of different facts which would warrant a breach?
A. I suppose the member had made a complaint.

547 Q. Yes.
A. And I suppose because of the complexity, you know, I suppose the sensitivity around the whole issue, I suppose we weren't aware either that -- in my view, let's just park this until we come out the end of the other thing, of investigation. That I didn't think it was -- so that's the position I took. And that was it, I mean, I think all the way up the line people -- no one was making -- people -- the decision was made not to take this off the system or whatever. So it went right up to the top of the organisation.
548 Q. Yes.
A. So I think my -- I set out what triggered this, it probably came up through the filing system and, I suppose, because of the foregoing, I took -- in my opinion, that $I$ just said, let's get to -- this is not the time to push this. Let's, you know --

549 Q. Yes.
A. Let's wait until other matters have bottomed out and then we can visit that.

550 Q. The Tribunal has seen a lot of differing views expressed over the differing periods of time, but it would appear that no action was taken in relation to the actual entry, which is still there?
A. That's right, yeah, that's my understanding.

A That's my understanding, yes.
Q. In your report up to the Commissioner in May 2016, you do attach an appendix which deals with this Pulse issue 14:59 also. Was that put in as sort of another relevant file?
A. We11, I suppose it was relevant and, you know, the office and ourselves were pulling this together. So I suppose it was clearly the creation of a Pulse entry and, I suppose, those issues, it was all connected really.
553 Q. Right, okay. Could we just turn then to the disciplinary investigation in July, that commenced in July 2015. We saw before lunch, in a letter or a report to you of the 19th July, that Superintendent Murray, when reporting on the sickness absences, made reference a possible disciplinary reference as well, isn't that right?
A. That's right, yeah.

554 Q. I think that came to you, if we look at page 8807 in Volume 31. That's a report which concludes after the six paragraphs set out therein. Do you recall getting that?
A. Yeah.

555 Q. Okay. There is a slightly different version of it at page 2221, if we could just ask you to comment on that.
A. The other version?

556 Q. Yes.
A. Including the recommendation?

557 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

558 Q. They're both signed and dated and if I am correct, they do appear to have been sent, is that right?
A. Well, my understanding and certainly what followed through, is that -- and what actually ended up in Internal Affairs, the piece I received and it's stamped there, was the one with the recommendation.
559 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

560 Q. I was wondering, did the first version come to your office and was it sent back perhaps because it didn't have a recommendation in it?
A. No. No. I am very clear about that, yeah.

561 Q. Okay. You wrote to Internal Affairs then and informed them of that, if we look at page 8810.
A. I have it here.

562 Q. That's the standard form, is it?
A. It is, yeah.

563 Q. 10th August?
A. When you make an appointment under discipline regulations, you notify Internal Affairs.
564 Q. Yes. At page 8812, you specify the brief details not
as a charge but the matter to be enquired into, is that right?
A. Yes. The policy is really to have the whole thing quite general.
Q. Yes.
A. The deciding officer will decide on the breaches. You know, he defines them. So you keep it quite general really, look into all the circumstances here.
566 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

567 Q. So it was entirely Superintendent Alan Murray's decision as to how he was to break it down --
A. Yes.
Q. -- into any alleged breaches of discipline --
A. Yes.

569 Q. -- if he thought there was grounds for preferring any --
A. Yes.

570 Q. -- isn't that right?
A. Yes.

571 Q. I don't think we need to go through any of the formal letters to and forth. I think you were reminded by Internal Affairs, at page 8814, that the deciding officer should provide reasons in writing for the outcome determined?
A. Yes.
Q. That's following a Supreme Court case there referred to in the second last paragraph.
A. Yes.

573
A. Like once you're in work you get your full pay, regardless of your history of sickness.

578 Q. Yes. The notification to the overpayments section from Superintendent Murray at 8815 , is that something that
would have been sent to you as well?
A. No, this was a financial -- I suppose this came from the finance office.
579 Q. Yes.
A. This was an instruction. And the whole object of this was to prevent people being overpaid. We had people that owed thousands and we had to claw it back. So for them to be sort of ahead of themselves. Once people were out sick and were within that category, we were obliged to put them on notice so that people were -you don't not get paid, you just get paid at a lower rate.
Q. Yes. You got notification from Ms. Carr, if we look at page 8816, that in respect of this particular period, it had tipped Garda Keogh, as it were, over the edge?
A. Yes.

581 Q. There in the first line, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So obviously that's something you knew then when you were coming to do the review?
A. Yes.

583 Q. At page 8821, on the 8th October, you wrote informing Chief Superintendent Murray, Internal Affairs, that the discipline enquiry had been concluded and that you had forwarded a notice to be served on Garda Keogh?
A. Yes.

584 Q. You sent, also on the 8th October, notification to Superintendent Murray of the result of the outcome of the decision-making process, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

585 Q. Conveying the fine in respect of the first breach and not in breach on the second one. You then wrote to Garda Keogh, if we turn to page 8826. Sorry, this was the notice that Garda Keogh signed acknowledging the receipt of the report of the appointing officer?
A. Yes.
Q. At this stage did you understand that the report of the appointing officer included Garda Keogh's own statement or did you address that issue?
A. Yes. Well, I suppose, I did a report to the appointing officer. The deciding officer sends up his report of the interview and the two go up together. The report that Superintendent Alan Murray sent up, the memo of interview was attached to it. That was my
understanding. And these were all to be served on Garda Keogh.
587 Q. Yes. Well in any event, you got a notice of application for a review to you, which is at page 8830, isn't that correct? we see there, if we go down the page, the handwritten, he was requesting a call log for a phone call and then a copy of the statement that he made to Superintendent Murray. You replied I think by letter dated the 9th November to him, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

588 Q. You do address the issue of the call by questioning its relevance. You don't seem to address the issue of the request for the statement?
A. No, I don't. I don't. I think when the two -- when, I
suppose, his appeal came in, his application for appeal came in, I suppose it may have been taken on face value and I may not have kept a copy of it, but I felt -- you know, I sent it back to him, I was saying, you're not guilty on one, you've pleaded guilty on the second, why are you appealing this, and if you have any other information you can offer. I got the information back from Superintendent Alan Murray in relation to the rationale --

589 Q. Yes.
A. -- because your review is not a rehearing, I was confining it to that.
590 Q. Yes.
A. I didn't reference it. I mean, I had no reason not to give this to Garda Keogh, this was something he had in the sense that it was his information, it was his account, so I had no reason not to disadvantage him by not giving it to him.

591 Q. Yes.
A. Certainly it was my understanding he got the memo of the interview.

592 Q. Okay.
A. I didn't reference it when I wrote back to him. whether that was a conscious thing or not, I don't know.

593 Q. Well, you do appear to have had it in your mind when you wrote on the same day to Superintendent Murray, Alan Murray, at page 8832, where you are asking for his views and observations in respect of the appeal but you
are also asking him for a copy of the memo of the interview?
A. Yes.

594 Q. So it may be that you had it in your mind. You may have considered that you didn't have it or that you should get it for him, or for you as well?
A. Yes, I mean I -- I mean, certain7y, yeah.
Q. Superintendent Murray replies on the 11th, explaining his rationale. I don't think we need to really look at that. The interview with Garda Keogh is included in the papers here. Do you recall reading that at the time when you were doing your review?
A. I do, yes. Garda Keogh, in his sort of -- when he replied back, he essentially, I suppose, reiterated essentially the same information.
596 Q. Yes. You send notice of the outcome up to Internal Affairs and you had notice sent to Garda Keogh, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

597 Q. He had written in on the 2nd November in relation to
A. Yes.
Q. That's at page 8854, isn't that correct? And you received that before you made a decision on your review?
A. Yes.

599 Q. Your decision then is 8852, where you notify Superintendent Patrick Murray of it there?
A. Yes.

600 Q. You require that the form I.A. 16 be served on him?
A. Yes.

601 Q. Which conveyed the decision of the outcome of the review under the regulations. I think that ended the disciplinary matter, except in a formal sense, there were various outcomes put on files and on your file and Internal Affairs?
A. Yes. You communicate that up to Internal Affairs. Internal Affairs then liaise with HRM and they actually deal with the matter of applying the penalty. Now, I am aware that certainly when Garda Keogh was on TRR they didn't apply the penalty. They just put it in abeyance.
602 Q. Okay. Now, you have been the subject of a complaint in relation to bullying and harassment and targeting and discrediting arising out of your involvement and behaviour and decision-making in relation to this process. What would you like to say to the Tribunal in answer to that?
A. In November 2017 I got an e-mail, it was a Saturday, from Assistant Commissioner Fanning, notifying me that I was being investigated under the bullying and harassment policy. That was the first time in my service, $I$ have to say. The allegation was inappropriate interference $I$ think, undermining a person's self-confidence. I was astounded, absolutely. I couldn't see how any reasonable person could derive those allegations from the facts at hand, you know. Very disappointing. I mean, clearly I am a public



603 Q. You were, I think, notified by Assistant Commissioner Fanning in November of 2017?
A. Yes.

604 Q. That a statement had been made in March 2017 and an addendum to the statement in which you were accused of bullying?
A. Yes.

605 Q. I think you made a protest in the delay in notifying
you of that?
A. Yes.

606 Q. Assistant Commissioner Fanning, as we have seen, proceeded to enquire from Garda Keogh whether he was prepared to opt for mediation for whether he was ruling 15:17 out mediation. I think that having been done, you got a similar letter, which $I$ think meant that it was going to be enquired into by an officer appointed to enquire into that?
A. That's right.

607 Q. And Assistant Commissioner Finn?
A. Finn.

608 Q. As you know, was appointed to enquire into that. I am sure you have seen Assistant Commissioner Finn's notes of an interview that he had with Garda Keogh, I think in the presence of a solicitor, where you are nominated as one of the three officers and you are made the object of the accusation. You have seen that note, haven't you?
A. I have, yes.

609 Q. You were given the opportunity to reply and I think you sent in a reply, is it at page 8876 ? I think this is dated, is this dated in June, this one? Am I wrong about that? If we just go back up to the top of the page. Sorry, February?
A. February, yes.

610 Q. The 7th February, yes.
CHA RMAN I'm sorry, what number is this, Mr. McGuinness?

MR. MEGU NESS: This is 8876.
CHA RMAN I'm sorry, I just didn't hear that, thank you.
611 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: I think Assistant Commissioner Finn had previously written to you suggesting that he would meet you to make you aware of the allegations?
A. Yes.

612 Q. Did you obtain a copy of the statement made by Garda Keogh or an extract from it at that stage?
A. I think when we -- like we certainly got it by e-mail.
A. I think we had it before.

614 Q. Yes.
A. I think I had it. Yeah, I think it came with the e-mail.

615 Q. Did you meet with Assistant Commissioner Finn or some of his other investigators at this point?
A. No, I told Assistant Commissioner Finn that I would deal with him directly.
616 Q. Yes.
A. That was my preferred choice.

617 Q. So you did so on the basis of preparing your own response?
A. Yes.

618 Q. Is that right? okay. Is this the response and the only response that you put in?
A. Yes.

619 Q. Okay. If we scroll down there. You reviewed your original investigation file into the breaches of
discipline?
A. Yes.

620 Q. If we go on to the next page, you describe the process there?
A. Yes.

621 Q. Is there anything you would like to add to that?
A. In terms of the discipline?

622 Q. Yes, or any other comment?
A. Yes. I mean, my --

CHAN RMAN I'm sorry, forgive me for being stupid because I missed it a moment ago, the date of this is February?
MR. MEGU NESS: 7th February 2018.
CHAI RMAN That's what I thought, thank you. Sorry about that.
A. Sorry, maybe you might repeat the question.

623 Q. MR. MEGI NESS: I was just asking you, is there anything else you would like to add or any further comment you want to make in relation to the response that you had included here to Assistant commissioner Finn?
A. No.

624 Q. okay. If we go further down the page. That was the only matter you responded to there, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

625 Q. Insofar as the issue of misrecording Garda Keogh's sick record or sickness classification, did you have any hand, act or role, direct or indirect, in how it was recorded, either initially or subsequently?
A. No.
Q. Apart from the correction you have told us about?
A. No.

627 Q. Okay. In terms of taking any action relating to his pay in order to disadvantage him, did you take any step 15:21 in that regard?
A. No, I don't -- I don't have the authority to make -you know, to instruct the payment or otherwise for Garda Keogh.
Yes. I think you were informed of the ultimate outcome 15:21 of the consideration of Assistant Commissioner Finn's investigation by Assistant Commissioner O'Brien. If we could look at page 3150.
A. Sorry, yes.

629 Q. I think this conveys the correspondence from the 15:22 executive director of the 8th January?
A. Yes.

630 Q. Whereby he was nominated to complete the issue. I think that recites different matters there. The concluding paragraph on the next page then details this issue concerning the misreporting of sick leave and the disciplinary inquiry. On the third page it presents the findings there in relation to you. Do you have any comment to make upon the fairness of the process that Assistant Commissioner Finn engaged in or Assistant Commissioner O'Brien?
A. No. I mean, I did push to have the matter expedited. I know from doing these investigations myself, they can be quite protracted and that's sometimes no one's
fault, it goes through a sort of iterative process. But I was very anxious to have this matter finalised. I had come to the end of my service and, you know, opportunities that can present, they would have been lot on me, because, you know, this investigation was hanging over me. So I was very anxious that it would progress. But, you know, the investigation of itself, I mean it probably took longer than I would have liked, but I suppose that can just happen, for a variety of reasons.

631 Q. Yes. Have you any evidence to give of any targeting or discrediting of Garda Keogh by virtue of his having made a protected disclosure?
A. Absolutely not. I mean, I have -- I mean people bring things to people's attention all the time and, you know, there may be investigations kick off. Garda Keogh had made a protected disclosure and I had no -- I don't believe I was the subject of it. I am very clear in my mind, I mean, I am very proud of being a member of An Garda Síochána and, you know, I deal -- I chase -- my job is to make decisions and to do things right. Honesty is my most important value. It is really important to me I am honest with myself in how I deal with people and how I go about my business. I mean, I just think it's, I won't say absurd, it's probably too strong a word. Like what possible motivation could I have had? A newly appointed chief going down to the country, I didn't discredit -- no way -- my objective was to police the division, to keep
people safe, bring my team with him. And I had a lovely -- the team were lovely in the division and I think we did a lovely job. I suppose I like welfare, I like supporting people, it's one of the things I do. I just think -- I just find it's hard to credit how anyone could think that I would go out and set my sights on an individual. I absolutely respect people that stand up and are counted, I think it's very admirable. I understand when people take a position and that's fine. I am really clear in my mind, I always have, I worked everywhere, 35 years in the Guards, in the roughest place, the best place, I deal with behaviours, I don't judge people. And absolutely, how could I do that to another person and what reason could I possibly have? Discredit? I didn't disbelieve Garda Keogh. We didn't say that what he was saying wasn't true. I'm not talking about the substantive investigation, in terms of the interactions that I had with him. Absolutely, I actually think at every juncture under my stewardship, indeed, I suppose, lots of stuff were initiated by Superintendent Murray, at every juncture we made decisions, we sort of referenced Garda Keogh to the relevant supports. We had a welfare service in place. There was nothing -- you know, we were trying to steer the ship, to do the job. People, we support people, our confidential support service, they're there to do that. We have a job to do as well. you have to do the business and sometimes you have to deal with people under certain processes, it happens
al1 the time. I just object strongly, what reason could I have? How could I do that? I think it's evident that supports were in place. I know it was a difficult time. There wasn't a policy, there isn't a policy now about a person that makes a protected disclosure, wasn't pay affected, that wasn't something within my control. And I just -- you know, I have a big interest in welfare and one of the initiatives that I run, you know, that were embraced down in westmeath, indeed I carried to my two divisions, is that my little 15:27 things campaign, which is about mental health and it's about wellbeing and $I$ have carried that through in all the divisions I am in. I have 900 staff now, I had 700 staff in my previous division. I have never in all -I have dealt with people, you know, before the courts, 15:27 people that you're letting go, and I have never had any issue in all my service. So $I$ reject it, absolutely.
632 Q. A couple of matters to he1p me conclude my examination of you. In relation to the Ó Cualáin investigation, you weren't ever asked to provide a statement for that. 15:28
A. No.
Q. You had no involvement with it good, bad or indifferent, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

634 Q. Were you ever contacted by the Ó Cualáin team in any respect in relation to Garda Keogh?
A. No.

635 Q. Okay. Insofar as your appointment to the division, the Westmeath division, and Superintendent Murray's
appointment, had they anything to do with -- or were they intended in any way to influence the view of Garda Keogh and his protected disclosure in any negative way?
A. I can't see how that can be deduced. I mean, it's common practice that your first posting when you get promoted to chief superintendent, you go down the country. They're easier. You mightn't think that but they're not as probably busy as Dublin divisions. Superintendent Murray had been looking for a transfer for a long time. I suppose $I$ was number three on the chief's list, so I probably --

636 Q. CHA RMAN I think what Mr. McGuinness is referencing, you're probably aware, is a suggestion or an allegation that Superintendent Murray might have been put in place in order to get him?
A. Yeah, okay.

637 Q. CHA RMAN I mean that's what Garda Keogh has said?
A. Yeah.

638 Q. CHA RMAN In some shape or form?
A. okay.

639 Q. CHA RMAN I hope I am not misrepresenting him.
A. No, I'm sorry.

640 Q. CHA RMAN He says, look, he was uncomfortable and I think that's what Mr. McGuinness is referencing?
A. Sorry.

CHA RMAN Is that right, Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGI NESS: Yes, I suppose I should have put it more clearly.
A. I suppose the view you have is depending on where
you're standing. In that event, I can't second guess Garda Keogh's view. I just think it's incredulous, you know. To be honest with you, only listening to the evidence over the last couple of weeks, and people use different terms, so I'm not going to read too much into 15:30 it, but he referred to both us as the fresh dogs coming, you know, and that's the view he had. But I think it's absolute -- I mean, my view, you know, there was other complex issues going on at the same time and I remember meeting the superintendents and my language was, let's keep a straight back, let's move the business forward, you know what, I never look back, I always look forward. It was a nice division, Westmeath. I mean, there was nothing covert about any of my interventions or subversive. There was a full line of sight all the way up the line. So, I just think it doesn't make any sense that he -- it doesn't make sense that that would be the case. In fact, I think this -- I suppose, sorry, I'm going on a bit much. In fact, I think the -- you know, I always think, you know, you have to have everyone on the pitch to reach your goals and you have to bring -- you can't let someone just sit there and not be part of your team. And I believe that, you know, we were energetic, we were enthusiastic, but you know, there was never -even the safeguards, I mean the safeguards were put in place to guide and support Garda Keogh. There was never any -- I don't think there's any evidence that we didn't want -- he wanted back on the team, back part of
it. And he was supported in doing that. You know, I just struggle. As I said, as chief you have to deal with standards and behaviours and part of your role is dealing with discipline. You know, you have a duty to the public. But just in relation to the disciplines, I 15:31 was very clear that, you know, you have to deal with the behaviours. But equally, I didn't want to enable the behaviour. That wasn't lost on my mind either. So absolutely, I can't -- it's illogical to me, it doesn't make sense. How could -- I just don't understand how he can even deduce that.

CHA RMAN okay.
641 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: You have presumably worked with many superintendents, both under them, at the same level and then with you over them as a chief superintendent, you
were asked by the Tribunal investigators to describe Superintendent Murray's leadership and management style from your experience and I think you provided an answer to that at page 6105, which is page 30 of your interview with the investigators. You describe him in the following way:
"He has a huge capacity to deal with complex issues and bring matters to a conclusion. He brought a lot of change to Athl one in terms of restructuring. His
di strict flourished under his stewardship. He moved the business forward in a positive and constructive way. He is very highly regarded in the community. I was hugel y i mpressed by his know edge of I aw,

I egi slation and procedures. He is very committed to hi s job and was a huge support to me. He is competent, capable and sensitive to various situations and very support to his teamin terns of devel opment and
wel fare. "

I presume that's your opinion of him today, is that correct?
A. Absolutely. Yes.

642 Q. The Tribunal has heard, from the evidence obviously, that from his arrival there was a significant sort of number of issues which appear to arise that he dealt with, in relation to Garda Keogh, the car tax, the expenses, the Regulation 10 discipline, the interaction with the CMO, the issue of the classification of his sickness and the later disciplinary inquiries and the crime files. Do any of those issues, including obviously the confining of him to indoor duties, do any of those issues, having considered them, affect this view that you have expressed here?
A. In terms of the car tax, I suppose I have given my view on that. Absolutely, he was very lenient, that's my view. The chief superintendent is the person who is responsible for dealing with discipline in her division or his division. It's not a matter for a superintendent. If matters are brought to my
attention, $I$ am ob1iged to enquire into them. I, on my consideration of the file in relation to $I$ suppose the AWOL, I was firmly of the view that this was a matter
that I needed to enquire into. You know, no one said that Garda Keogh wasn't telling the truth, he was quite honest, but the issue at hand, in my opinion, merited an inquiry. I believe superintendent -- doing nothing is not an option. You know, you can't turn a blind eye. Was it lost, I suppose, on us all that there was a glare out there in the public domain, but we're impartial, we're independent. You know, people get into lots of bother from time to time. We support them through the bother, if you like, but we can't erase it. 15:35 So we have to deal with that. We have to think of -and it's all about -- I always think, you know, discipline is about learning and it's about -- just marks it and it's about moving on.
But Garda Keogh has obviously given in evidence that shortly after that meeting he went to Deputy wallace and there were a number of comments made in public then relating to Superintendent Murray thereafter, including some which related to his promotion. You had no involvement in promotion process in relation to Superintendent Murray at all, isn't that correct?
A. Well, I suppose in terms of involvement, when I was there, in 2006 actually, just I suppose in terms of the dates, May, there was a lot happening May actually. on the 25 th May the list came out for chief superintendents.
644 Q. Yes, in '16?
A. '16. The old system, I suppose, and under the old system you would certainly write a recommendation, the
board pick the superintendents and I don't know how much weight goes on at that -- but certainly I would have endorsed his competence. But, I mean, I don't -I wasn't picked by him, the board pick him.
645 Q. Obviously the later dealings or interaction of Garda 15:36 headquarters with the Policing Authority had nothing to do with you, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
okay. obviously you had no involvement in Assistant Commissioner McMahon's disciplinary investigation in relation to other members?
A. No.

MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, that concludes my examination of the witness.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. MEGU NNESS: I had earlier represented to you and the others that I would probably take the whole day.
CHA RMAN Yes, that's not a problem.
MR. MEGU NNESS: I had told my friends that they were unlikely to be required.
CHA RMAN I was going to ask. Mr. Kelly, there is no question, you're under the assumption that you would be 15:37 cross-examining tomorrow, that stands un1ess you would like to get started today. So that's fine. I think it's probably not satisfactory, unless you ask me to do it, to ask anybody else do they want to cross-examine.

I think you really should go first, or your side. Is that reasonable, Mr. Kelly? If you were happy to do it, I will ask Mr. Murphy and any of the other counsel if they want to cross-examine at this point. But I am comfortable either way, it doesn't matter, it's been a 15:37 long enough day and I am quite happy to abandon affairs here.
MR. KELLY: okay.
CHA RMAN So that is probably the best thing to do.
MR. KELLY: Yes, that's fine.
CHA RMAN A11 right. Thank you very much.
MR. KELLY: I don't, in fact, have an issue with anybody else going first, but looking at the time. So I think it's a sensible course.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much. I take it we can assure 15:38 the chief superintendent that she will be finished tomorrow.
MR. KELLY: Yes, I think we can.
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHAN RMAN Okay. Thanks very much. So we will see you 15:38 tomorrow and tomorrow will be your 1ast day. Thank you very much.
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |




| roles [4]-56:23, | SCM [1] - 122:26 | send [18] - 10:4, | 39:13, 39:14, 57:2, | 105:21, 150:9, 151:9, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $62: 15,132: 20,132: 29$ | screen [4]-7:8, | 21:23, 22:3, 26:4, | 57:6, 68:2, 78:20 | $159: 26,160: 21$ |
| roll [1] - 130:28 | 107:23, 107:28 | $26: 26,33: 21,33: 25,$ | sergeants [1] - 61:3 | Sick [1] - 104:12 |
| roughest [1] - | 107:29 | 33:29, 81:23, 87:22 | serious [4]-7:11 | sickness [10] - 78:1, |
| $\begin{gathered} 162: 12 \\ \text { route } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { screens [1] - 107:12 } \\ & \text { scroll }[2]-88: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:22, 90:1, 91:21, } \\ & 98: 11,116: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 43:29, } 95: 24,114: 13 \\ \text { servant }[1]-156: 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 81:15, 93:12, 95:28, } \\ & \text { 141:2, 147:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| les [1] - 121: | 158:2 | 116:27, 154:16 | served [7] - 19:25 | 150:20, 150:27, |
| ruling [1] - 157:5 | SEAN [4]-1:12, 2:2, | sending [2]-25:7, | 19:28, 39:4, 53:3, | 159:27, 167:16 |
| run [3]-21:22, | 2:22, 3:17 | 82:10 | $151: 25,152: 16,155: 1$ | Sickness [2] - 75:25, |
| $49: 14,163: 9$ | SEANAD ${ }_{[1]}-1: 5$ <br> second [14]-10:13, | $\begin{gathered} \text { sends }[4]-27: 14, \\ 116: 3,116: 23,152: 12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Service [6]-70:23, } \\ & \text { 88:19, 104:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:16 } \\ & \text { side }[2]-137: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| RYAN [2] - 1:12, 2:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 7,47: 23,51: 21 \\ & 67: 20,90: 17,116: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { senior }[4]-18: 8, \\ 18: 16,36: 20,139: 27 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 131:26, 132:5, 139:26 } \\ \text { service }[13]-12: 12, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 170:1 } \\ & \text { sight [2] - 120:4, } \end{aligned}$ |
| S | 121:17, 130:5, 138:7, | sense [16] - 20:3, $28: 27,39: 26,60: 27$ | 57:29, 85:22, 104:24, | 165:16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { safe [2]-102:20, } \\ & 162: 1 \\ & \text { safeguards [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:1 } \\ & \text { seconded }[1]-52: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 89:6, 103:18, 122:13 | :22, 140:9 | sign [3]-22:22, |
|  |  | 125:17, 135:1, 135:5, | 155:24, 161:3, | $27: 10,73: 26$ |
|  | section [17] - 9:10, | $155: 5,165: 17$ | 163:17 | $20: 24,23: 3,30: 5,$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 13,13: 12,20: 6 \\ & 20: 7,20: 11,30: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 165:18, 166:10 | Services [1] - 1:24 | 42:18, 148:9, 152:5 |
|  |  | sensible [1] - 170:14 | SERVICES [1] - 1:29 | significance [2] - |
|  | $37: 4,41: 26,48: 8 \text {, }$ | sensitive [1] - 167:3 | services [1] - 96:2 | 28:11, 122:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SAMS [15]-36:15, } \\ & \text { 93:1, 93:9, 94:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:15, 150:28 } \\ & \text { Section [1] - } 97: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 146:12 | 60:1, 63:6, 128:25, | $90: 24,16$ |
|  |  | sent [36] - 10:10 | 146:22, 147:28, | significantly [1] - |
|  | sections [1] - 20:11 | 33:22, 43:22, 49:20, | $150: 15,162: 6$ | 150:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:15, 107:18, } \\ & \text { 119:7, 120:6, 141:3, } \end{aligned}$ | sector [2] - 72:28, | 49:24, 50:4, 52:19, | settling [1] - 66:18 | signs [1] - 22:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:7, 120:6, 141:3, } \\ & \text { 141:6 } \end{aligned}$ | 74:7 | 52:23, 56:7, 68:19, | severe [1] - 53:21 | similar [1] - 157:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:6 } \\ & \text { sanction [3] - 31:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Security [2]-142:19, } \\ & \text { 143:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 1,82: 8,82: 27, \\ & \text { 83:10, 83:13, 86:10, } \end{aligned}$ | sexual [2]-101:28, | simple [8]-23:27, 25:13, 80:8, 98:11 |
| $34: 11,45: 14$ sanctions [1] - 44:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 143:16 } \\ & \text { see }[46]-16: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 88:8, 88:10, 89:27, | shall [8]-8:1, 12:16, | 107:11, 107:12, |
| sanctions [1] - 44:5 <br> SANDRA [1] - 4:6 | 16:14, 17:27, 17:28 | 89:28, 93:4, 99:24 | 44:10, 44:13, 79:23, | 117:3, 117:5 |
| SANDRA [1] - 4:6 <br> sat [1] - 32:16 <br> satisfactory ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 23,19: 1,19: 9 \\ & 20: 12,22: 16,30: 25 \\ & 38: 25,39: 29,43: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $13$ | $79$ | simply [4]-10:12, |
|  |  | 148:10, 148:18, | SHANKEY [1] - 3:21 | SINÉAD [1] - 4:7 |
| satisfactory [1] -169:28 | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 25,39: 29,43: 24, \\ & 48: 8,49: 8,50: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 151:1, 151:27, | SHANKEY-SMIT | SINéAD [1] - 2:7 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 8,49: 8,50: 9 \\ & 51: 12,54: 14,59: 27 \end{aligned}$ | 152:14, 153:4, | [1] - 3:21 | sit [2] - 36:10, 165:23 |
|  | 62:29, 70:29, 74:25, | 154:17, 157:22 | SHANNON ${ }_{[1]}-2: 13$ | sitting [1] - 23:1 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 62:29, 70:29, 74:25, } \\ & \text { 83:26, 84:1, 94:21, } \end{aligned}$ | sentence [2]-16:16, | shape [1] - 164:19 | situation [8]-42:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:18 } \\ & \text { Saturday }[2]-15: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 95:11, 99:22, 100:29, | 122:5 | SHEAHAN ${ }_{[1]}-3: 18$ | 85:17, 115:6, 115:7, |
|  | 101:11, 103:23, | separate [5] - 36:25, | SHELLEY ${ }_{[1]}-3: 25$ | 116:12, 116:14, |
| SAVAGE [1] - 3:16 saw [14]-24:21, | 107:9, 107:28,111:17, 126:15, | $45: 19,46: 10,48: 13$ | ship [1] - 162:25 | 143:20, 145:2 |
|  |  | 72:17 | SHIP [1] - 3:28 | situations [1] - 167:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 40: 23,41: 19,73: 5 \\ & 76: 25,92: 19,92: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 111:17, 126:15, 127:27, 136:29, | September [9] - | short [1] - 95:27 | six [6] - 58:7, 58:8, |
| 126:4, 134:14, 137:5, | $127: 27,136: 29$, $137: 13,137: 29$, | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 25,27: 18,31: 12, \\ & 36 \cdot 2340 \cdot 2848 \cdot 18 \end{aligned}$ | shortly [1] - 168:16 | 102:26, 134:27, |
| 126:4, 134:14, 137:5, 138:22, 143:20, | 141:10, 141:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 23,40: 28,48: 18, \\ & 48: 27,49: 7,50: 9 \end{aligned}$ | show [4]-24:2, 36:9, | 136:24, 147:28 |
| 147:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:19, 152:20, } \\ & \text { 155:27, 156:7, 164:4, } \end{aligned}$ | sequence [1] - 142:5 | 54:6, 54:19 | skip [1] - 50:27 |
| SC [11] - 2:6, 2:7, | 155:27, 156:7, 164:4, 170:20 | sequentially [1] - | showed [1] - 37:15 <br> sic [1]-107:25 | sky [1] - 31:23 slightly [4]-10 |
| 2:10, 2:16, 2:21, 2:28, | seeing [1] - 88:10 | 82:13 | sick [36] - 6:24, | $128: 14,141: 29,148: 2$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3: 23,3: 23,3: 24,4: 6, \\ & 4: 7 \end{aligned}$ | seek [3] - 47:15, | Sergeant [13] | $15: 19,15: 28,21: 9$ | slow [1] - 93:27 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 76:21, } 113: 9 \\ & \text { seeking }[1]-82: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 15:15, 16:18, 18:13, | $21: 12,22: 11,28: 5$ | small [2] - 107:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SCANLAN }_{[1]}-3: 8 \\ & \text { schedule }[1]-142: 2 \\ & \text { scheduled }[1]- \end{aligned}$ |  | 18:19, 21:16, 21:19, | $37: 10,37: 18,38: 2$ | 135:27 |
|  | seem [5]-38:22, | 21:24, 21:27, 21:29, | 38:5, 40:16, 46:4, | smart [1] - 128:20 |
|  | 88:26, 90:13, 118:24, | $22: 4,29: 10,50: 18$ | 51:15, 51:17, 67:11, | SMITH ${ }_{[1]}-3: 21$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:3 } \\ & \text { scheme [2] - 79:26, } \end{aligned}$ | $152: 27$ | 100:18 <br> SERGEANT [5] - | $67: 24,70: 14,75: 8$ | SMITHFIELD [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:27 } \\ & \text { science }[2]-56: 20, \\ & 57: 16 \end{aligned}$ | ```seisin [1] - 115:8 self [1] - 155:26 self-confidence [1] - 155:26``` |  | 77:10, 80:11, 81:29, | $2: 24,4: 12$ |
|  |  | $4: 6$ | 83:4, 84:27, 89:9, | social [2]-103:8, 105:4 |
|  |  | sergeant [7] - 39:9, | 102:28, 103:2, | 105:4 ${ }^{\text {SOLE }}$ [1]-2:2 |







[^0]:    "Garda Keogh submitted a retrospective medi cal certificate."

[^1]:    "One of the issues that arose in my di scussion with him was his sick absences, which appeared to be occurring frequently and in a haphazard fashi on. While Garda Keogh was reticent to di scuss any issues he may have with me, I nonethel ess felt it prudent to put an arrangement in place in Athl one to support himin the work envi ronment as he is indicating work rel ated

[^2]:    "Ordi nary ill ness/i nj ury on duty.

[^3]:    "You should now intervi ew this member in order to establish the source of the nember's stress and if it is bei ng suggested as work rel ated, a full investigation should be carried out.

