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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVG, ON VEDNESDAY, 19TH FEBRUARY 2020:

CHA RMAN Now, good morning.
MS. MEGRATH Good morning, Chairman. The next witness 10:33 is Assistant Commissioner Michael Finn, please.

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Yes.

ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER M CHAEL FI NN, HAV NG BEEN SVDRN, MAS DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY ME. MEGRATH, AS FOLLOVG:

THE WTNESS: Michae1 Finn.
CHA RMAK Good morning, commissioner. Thank you very much.
MS. MEGRATH Good morning, commissioner. Chairman, the commissioner's statement is at page 4105 of the book. I think, commissioner, if you had a hard copy of the statement because we will actually go through it quite a bit this morning, so that might be useful, if you prefer that?
CHA RMAN Yes, I think that is probably convenient, just to have it with you in any case, even if are you comfortable looking at the screen.

2 Q.
ME. MEGRATH So it's 4105.
A. Yes, Chairman. I have it in front of me.

By way of background for the Chairman, I think you have been in the rank of assistant commissioner since 22nd November 2016, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

4 Q. I think prior to that you were in various roles in the south of the country, in the Cork division up until that point, is that right?
A. Predominantly, Chair. I started off my career in Cork city as a young garda, driving patrol cars, motorbikes. 10:35 I got promoted at a relatively young age, we'11 say, became a sergeant after seven years, went to the border for a while and then when I came back, I ended up, the only job available to me was an administrative role, so I ended up working as a superintendent's clerk, as they 10:35 called it back in those times, working with the superintendent. I was there for two or three years. Then a more operational roles came up in terms of the sergeant in charge of the station inside in that the city centre station. I'm sure you're familiar with the 10:35 term sergeant in charge.
5 Q. CHA RMAN I understand. We have heard a good dea1 about sergeant in charge here $I$ think.
A. I was in that posting for a number of years. After another seven years then I was promoted to inspector and at that time there was some restructuring going on in the organisation, Chair, and the regional assistant commissioners were set up. So I ended up as a young inspector going into that post, a new post, working with the assistant commissioner for the Southern Region. I was there for about six years. Went back out for a short while to some operational posting as an inspector. Got promoted to superintendent. Initially went down to a small district in west Cork, Bantry, a
sma11 number of staff. Then, after about a couple of months, I ended up coming into Bandon, which would have been divisional headquarters, big enough, about 150 staff I'd say, as a superintendent, we'11 say. Then I went back into the city as a superintendent, to Anglesea Street, which is city centre, 300 plus staff. I was there, got promoted after another seven years to chief superintendent. Went back down to west Cork was the chief superintendent for west Cork, about 350 staff in that division. Was there for a relatively short period of time, Chair. Went back into the city as the chief superintendent for Cork city, a big enough division, 700 staff, lots of personnel, lots of personne1 problems to go with it. And then I got promoted to assistant commissioner. I was based in headquarters initially, Chair, with also responsibility for the Northern Region at the time, the border region, and I also had responsibility for executive support and corporate services. So some of the issues, we'11 say, which we will be dealing with, did actually cross my bows, we'11 say, when I was in executive support Cork services. So in February two years ago I was -- an opportunity to go back to an operational posting in the southeast region, as it was then. That region has subsequently amalgamated with the old Eastern Region, so now I have, we'11 say, what was once AC Fanning's region, is all now my region, we'11 say.

CHA RMAN Thank you.
6 Q. MS. MEGRATH At the time you made your statement to
the Tribunal, you said you had responsibility for the Southeastern Region, which you have just been describing there. Is that the current position?
A. Oh, it was complicated at the time because I was only acting, we'11 say, because Assistant Commissioner Fanning was maybe on leave or whatever it was. But since then we have restructured. So I now have responsibility for the two regions or the one region, it's now called the Eastern Region. It's complicated.
7 Q.
Can I bring you back to the end of 2017 and into 2018. I think at the time you were the assistant commissioner of roads, policing and major event emergency management; is that right?
A. That's correct, I was based in headquarters then, Chairman.
8 Q. So that's, as you say, operating out of headquarters. I think you were appointed by Assistant Commissioner Fanning on 15th November 2017 to investigate a bullying and harassment claim by Garda Nicholas Keogh, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chair. He was the assistant commissioner in charge of the Eastern Region back then, where, we'll say, Garda Keogh is based.
9 Q. Now, I do want to look just briefly at the period prior to your appointment but not in too much detail. The
Chair has heard a lot of evidence in relation to that period already. But maybe if we just look at your letter of appointment first, at 4127 of the book please. Assistant commissioner, these will come up on
the screen and you can read from the screen or whatever you're more comfortable with?
A. I have it open here.
okay. So that's your appointment letter. As you see there, it's dated 15th November 2017 and it's from the Assistant Commissioner Fintan Fanning. Now, you had previously been nominated by the executive director at HRM, Mr. John Barrett, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chair. He nominated me but the actual formal appointment came from assistant commissioner Eastern Region, which was AC Fanning.

CHA RMAK okay.
11 Q. MG. MEGRATH Now, he tells you -- I mean, first of a11, before we go into the wording of the letter, you say in your statement that you were familiar with the official Garda policy document on dealing with these complaints, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair. look at the document in more detail. So when you received this nomination, it tells you:
"I wi sh to informyou that I have admitted a compl ai nt under the policy procedures harassment, sexual harassment and bullying."

That's the working document, isn't that right, we're talking about?
A. Yes, Chair.

13 Q. "Alleged agai nst nembers who are or were attached to the West meath di visi on by Garda Keogh, Athl one Garda Station. It is alleged that the members under mined his self-confidence, his professional ability and made i nappropriate inferences, etcetera, over a prol onged period. "

So in the letter of appointment this is what you are told is your brief effectively, is that right?
A. So to speak, Chair, but I didn't actually get any further documentation, I didn't get a copy of anything. A11 I got was the letter.
14 Q. You just got the letter, okay.
A. I wasn't sure, Chair, you know, did he want to make a new allegation, you know. I mean, as far as I was concerned I was going to meet him and, you know, take whatever complaint he wanted to make, yeah,
15 Q. We will do it step-by-step, commissioner?
A. Sorry, Chair, yeah.

16 Q. So on the 15th November, this is what you are told. You are told the complaint is being admitted. Now we will look at the policy document in a moment but again, this wouldn't be unusual when it comes to the point of appointing an investigator, that the complaint is already admitted, is that right?
A. I have often done this myself.

17 Q. So it has to be effectively admitted first before you come on board?
A. Correct, but it could have been orally. I mean, he mightn't have made a written document -- or complaint. He mightn't have committed it to writing. He might have made a complaint but not committed it to writing, we'11 say.
"On 9th November 2017 I corresponded with members compl ai ned of with the compl ai nant and outlined the process in accordance with policy 8.4 of the policy procedures har assment, sexual har assment and bullying."

Again, you are saying this is the only document you got from Assistant Commissioner Fanning, you didn't get these letters, the correspondence of the 9th November, is that right?
A. No, Chair, no, I didn't, no.

19 Q. Okay. Assistant Commissioner Fanning goes on to say:
"I recei ved correspondence from Garda Keogh dated 9th
Noventber 2017 as per pol icy 8. 4 of the pol icy procedures harassment, sexual harassment and bullying in whi ch Garda Keogh has stated that he did not accept medi ation and that he requi red the matter to be fully i nvest i gat ed. "

He goes on to say:
"On the 11th Novenber, I advi sed the five members that
the matter would be fully investigated. I have corresponded with the executive director HRPD on 10th Novenber 2017 in accordance with the policy."

Just again to confirm for the Chair, did you see at that stage the correspondence of the 10th or the 11th November?
A. No.
Q. No, you're just being told, is that right, that it happened?
A. Yeah, just being told, yeah.

21 Q. Okay.
A. But I did get a letter from Mr. Barrett saying that he had nominated me.
okay. The next page continues:
"On thi s date, 15th Novenber 2017, I met with Mr. John Barrett, executive di rector HRPD and he nomi nated you, in order for me to make the necessary appoi nt ment, as per policy.

I amther ef ore appoi nting you as the investigator in this matter.

Your attention is drawn to the timel ines in the policy. Garda Ni chol as Keogh can be contacted at....

All my communi cation with himhas been by post to this address.

I have al so commin cated notice of your appoi nt ment to all concerned parties."

So effectively the letter is giving you a synopsis of the background, referring to correspondence and informing you at what stage it is now at and how it has reached your point of appointment, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chairman. He is indicating that he wants a formal investigation, so to speak. So I knew where I was in that regard.

And maybe in that regard then, what we might do is look at the policy itself, if you don't mind, commissioner. Because, as I say, you say in your statement you knew -- you were familiar with this document, and it's at 7868 of the papers. You say that you had previous7y initiated and investigated complaint under these guidelines, is that right?
A. I had, Chair.

24 Q. Can I just ask you, what sort of numbers are we talking 10:44 about? You outlined a very extensive background there to the Chair at the outset and a lot of experience dealing with Garda personne1. So you say you had carried out these investigations before. Can you tel1 the Chair approximately, was that a large number of these investigations?
A. I wouldn't say a large number, Chair, but I would be familiar with it.
Q. But actual appointments as an investigator, how many
times before had that occurred?
A. Had I been appointed as the investigator?
A. Probably not the investigator too often, Chair, but I would have been the person who made the appointment. We'11 say, my chief or super, somebody probably would come to me with a complaint.
27 Q. CHA RMAN And would in some sense have supervising or receiving the report?
A. I would have been in, we'll say, the Assistant

Commissioner Fanning role in the past, as a chief or super, we'11 say, yeah. Chief probably more than likely.
CHA RMAN okay.
MS. MtGRATH If you just look at the document there that we have just asked to come up on the screen. This is the document under which you were appointed, at 7868. Even if you just look at the first table of contents there at 7869, it's setting out the legal context of the document. There's a policy statement.
And there's a definition then. You see there at section 3, 4 and 5 , the definition of harassment, sexual harassment and bullying and victimisation, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

At 7 then we will see -- and we will go into just a couple of these sections in more detail, but 7 sets out general roles and responsibilities and 8 sets out the procedures, isn't that right?
A. That's it, Chair. 8 is the main section, yeah.
A. Okay. Yes, I have it there, page 12. in rel ation to any of the di scriminatory conduct that could reasonably be regarded by an empl oyee as of fensive, humiliating or intimidating and incl udes spoken word, gestures or the production, di spl ay or circulation of written words, pi ctures or ot her material."

Isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. Now, you had been told by Assistant Commissioner Fanning that you were appointed under this policy document and it defines the various, as we say, there at 3, it defines what harassment is. If we look at 7877?
A. Sorry, Chairman, I'm not with you.
Q. So 7877 , page 7877 of the document there. We are going to stay on the policy document for a moment?
A. I have my copy of it open. What page are you referring 10:46 to that on the document itself?

CHA RMAN what chapter?
MG. MtGRATH 7877. It's chapter 3?
CHA RMAN Chapter 3 of the document.
Q. "Har assment is defined as any formof unwanted conduct

It sets out then the basis on -- it says:
"It has to be based on the rel ative characteristics of the person."

On the second last paragraph it says:
"It can be a single inci dent or repeated inappropriate behavi our."

Isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. Okay. It goes on to talk about bullying, we will just look at the definition of bullying at chapter 5. If you flick forward a few pages to 7881?
A. Yes, Chairman.
Q. And workplace bullying is: Repeated:
"Repeated i nappropriate behavi our, di rect or indirect, whet her verbal, physi cal or ot herwi se, conducted by one or more persons agai nst another or ot hers, at the pl ace of work and/ or in the course of empl oyment, whi ch could reasonabl y be regarded as undermining the indi vi dual's right to di gnity at work."

An isol ated inci dent of the behavi our described in this definition may be an affront to di gnity at work but as a once off incident is not consi dered to be bullying."

It also says there at paragraph 5.2 , it says:
"Bullying must be di stingui shed froma proper use of aut hority whi ch is necessary to achi eve policing
obj ectives. "

Is that right?
A. Yes, Chair, yeah.

37 Q. Then there's forms of bullying on the next page?
A. Yes, Chairman.

38 Q. And I think Garda Keogh's complaint, as we know very wel1 at this stage, came under some of these allegations. For example, and I just picking some of the bullet points, even if you look at the first one:
"Constantly ridiculing, humiliating or belittling a person in public or private."

Two-thirds of the way down it talks about:
"Consi stently and inappropriately finding fault with a person's work and using this as an excuse to humiliate the person rather than trying to i mprove performance."

Also the second last bullet point, for example:
"Repeated and wi thout cause unfair allocation of duties or by unfai rly excl udi ng members fromcertain duties."

I think we just know at this stage with respect to Garda Keogh, we all know the complaint quite well, his allegations came under some of those categories, is that right?
A. Correct, Chair, yeah, broadly speaking, we'11 say. These are examples, we'11 say.

CHA RMAN Yes.
ME. MEGRATH Now, chapter 7 there talks about -- this is 7884, it talks about "general roles and responsi bilities". And chapter 8, again if you keep flicking forward, please, at 7888. I just want to spend a little time on this chapter because it talks about the "Procedures for making and deal ing with compl ai nts of unacceptable behavi our". If you turn to paragraph 8.2 on the next page, because I think here we are getting into the meat really of how you were going to carry out your investigation. It talks about:
"Compl ai nts under this process can be dealt with through an informal or formal approach."

Then if you drop down to the third paragraph:
"A formal approach is where the compl ai nant makes a written compl ai nt to their di visional of ficer/chi ef superintendent and the matter is dealt with ei ther through medi ation or investigation with a view to achi eving a formal resol ution."

And in the box there, it says:
"It is recogni sed that circumstances may occasi onally exist, where, for good reasons, a member may feel that
thei $r$ compl ai nt cannot be pursued through the local I ine management structure. In such circumstances the compl ai nant may bring thei $r$ compl ai nt di rectly to the equal ity officer at Human Resource Management Garda Headquarters."

Effectively this is how Garda Keogh's complaint came through, isn't that right? It didn't come through what might be described as the normal local line management structures, is that right?
A. I am not a hundred percent sure of that, Chairman, to be honest with you. I mean, I got it from Assistant Commissioner Fanning, so the route of how it came to him, I couldn't -- I'm not exactly sure, to be honest with you, Chair. But I wouldn't -- I'm not -CHA RMAN No, I understand.
40 Q. M. MEGRATH Okay. If you flick forward to paragraph 8.4, I think this is a paragraph you subsequently mention in correspondence, at page 7892. It talks about the formal process. This is the formal process of resolving these allegations as opposed to the informal way. It says:
"If a compl ai nant opts to take the formal route they should report the matter to their di visional officer chi ef superintendent."

Flick down a few lines, it says:
"Al l complaints regardless of whet her made orally or in writing must be must be acted upon."

Then it says:
"Witten complaints must contai n..."

This is particularly:
"The details of a person or people agai nst whomthe complaint is bei ng made."

And I think this was certainly a provision which you focused on subsequently when you met Garda keogh, isn't that right?
A. Correct. That's kind of setting out for me, we'11 say, where am I going. It gives me the direction.
CHA RMAN yes.
A. You know.

41 Q. M. MEGRATH It talks about:
"Full details of the alleged act or acts constituting the behavi or complai ned of, incl udi ng dates, times and pl aces.

Alist of witnesses (if any);
details of whether the compl ai nant let their objections be known and;

Whether an informal resol ution was invoked in the past;

An indication of what would satisfactorily resol ve the compl aint, if the complai nant wi shed to offer such i ndi cation. "

Now, we will come back to that again when we look at your own documents and material, but it says that:
"The di visional officer/chi ef superintendent..."

And in the circumstances, for example, where there is a direct complaint to HRM:
". .. must acknow edge the complaint within five working days and notify the person complai ned of within the same timeframe. "

Now, is this really what Assistant Commissioner Fanning was doing? He had notified the members, he tells you
in his letter that he had notified the members of the complaint being made by Garda Keogh. So is it effectively in accordance with those provisions?
A. Yeah, that would be the procedure followed, Chair. If I got it, this is what I would have done in the past, you write out to the people.
42 Q. It says:
"This correspondence will say that there are two
options available in attempting to resol ve the compl ai nt, ei ther medi ation or investi gation. "

And you're also told in that appointment letter that in fact Garda Keogh was objecting to mediation, isn't that 10:52 right?
A. Hence we will end up going down the formal route, we'11 say.
43 Q. In the next paragraph it says:
"Both parties to the compl ai nt must respond to the di visional officer/chi ef superintendent's correspondence stating thei $r$ preferred method of resol uti on within five working days."

So, can we see there that the timeframe is quite tight. You have five days. Then you have five days. We know that, as I say, Garda Keogh came back that same day effectively and he told Assistant Commissioner Fanning that he was objecting to mediation; is that right?
A. They are the timeframes, Chair.

44 Q. okay.
A. That would be, I would say, dealing with a normal one, we'11 say, you know, I don't think -- we will get into it later on. Under normal circumstances that's what I would do, try write out and do it within the timeframe, yeah.

45 Q. I think we can move past the next two paragraphs because they deal with mediation.
A. Yes.

46 Q. And also on the top of the next page, it's just concluding the part about mediation. So now I am on page 7893, and I am really on the paragraph where it
says:
"Where there is an investi gation."

So now we are getting into the teeth of your role, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chairman.

47 Q. So it is up to you to -- it says:
"The investigator may facilitate referral to mediation if requested by both parties."

But that never happened here, isn't that right?
A. Actually it did. I did offer.

48 Q. I know that you spoke to them about it, but they didn't -- if requested?
A. Sorry, you're correct.

49
Q. $\quad$ II nvestigation will establish the facts."

So can we look at this in a little bit of detail, just to see exactly what your role is and what you are
"An investi gation will establish the facts or credi bility of the compl ai nt with due regard for the
provisions of fair procedures and natural justice."

So is that what you see yourself doing, and can we just talk in general terms for a moment, when you're an investigator under this policy.
A. Yes, Chair, I agree with that. That's what I -- I suppose we're all thought, you follow fair procedure and natural justice, would be the guiding principles in terms of how you do that. That's what I learned myself when I was doing personal management in college. Fair procedure and natural justice would be, I suppose, the basic underlying principle that you follow all the time, you know.
50 Q. And can I just ask you, commissioner, maybe you can help us here, the first sentence is a little bit odd in some ways, it doesn't say facts and credibility of the complaint it says "facts or credi bility", what really does that mean in real terms as to what you are doing? Are you assessing credibility or are you simply establishing the facts? How do you see what the investigation is?
A. You're looking at credibility, Chair.

51 Q. Sorry.
A. You're looking at the facts first, is it credible, you know what I mean, you would have to look at everything in the around. That would be my assessment.
52 Q. Okay. So the suitable investigator will be chosen and as we know you were the investigator that was appointed. If I can go halfway down the next paragraph
there, to the end of the sixth line, it says:
"The i nvestigation to be conducted thoroughl $y$, objectivel y with sensitivity, ut most confidentiality and with due respect for the rights of both the compl ai nant and the person compl ai ned of. The investigator will report their findi ngs within 28 days of the compl ai nt being recei ved at the di vi si onal of fice. "

Now, here we're back to the tight timeframes again, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

Now, this applied to Garda Keogh's complaint, isn't that right? Once you make a complaint or invoke the policy, the timeframes kick in, is that correct?
A. Yes, Chair. That applies to all, whether it is a simple complaint or, we'11 say, not a very complicated one. But, however, I would say like this was probably a complicated case. So there was no way we were going to get it done within 28 days. I think $I$ was flagging that.

54 Q. When Assistant Commissioner Fanning says in his letters, $I$ draw your attention to the timelines in the policy, is this effectively what is being high1ighted to you?
A. Correct. I would have said the same if I was appointing somebody, the guidelines. Guidelines, you should stay within them, where possible.

55
Q. Can I ask you to pop down to the last paragraph on that page, underlined "revi ew withi 28 days"? So you're to report your findings within 18 days, that's how you see it, 28 days --
A. Ideally, Chair, yes. Under normal circumstances I'd be asking someone to -- these are the guidelines, you should have them done in 28 days, to be fair, if you can.
Can I ask you just to clarify the last paragraph, it says:
"A revi ew wi thi n 28 days."

So, is this effectively, once you do your report, and this is now in the perfect world where all the time limits are met.
A. Yes.

57 Q. You do your report, report your findings within 28 days. It says:
"There is to be a revi ew."

And that's to be carried out within 28 days, is that how you read that?
A. I would report back to the person that appointed me, Commissioner Fanning within 28 days to say, here's my report, I've done it, yeah.
58 Q. So you would have anticipated, and I know this is not
how it worked out, but you would have anticipated going back within 28 days with your report and your investigation, where you have looked at facts and credibility?
A. Yeah.

59 Q. And then it would have been for Assistant Commissioner Fanning to carry out a review of that investigation within the 28 days and it says there "informboth parties in writing of the findings of the i nvesti gation"?
A. Yeah, I was working for him effectively.

60 Q. Now, as I said, we know that Garda Keogh's complaint was a little bit different in the sense that it was a complaint regarding high ranking officers. So therefore, the investigator, for example you, had to be of a higher rank for this particular complaint?
A. That would be normal, we'11 say, like you know, if it was a sergeant I'd appoint an inspector or if it was an inspector I'd appoint --
61 Q. I think that's is dealt with at the next page, at 7894, 10:58 where it says:
> "Some compl ai nts will be forwarded to the assi stant commi ssi oner. "

It says:
> "Where a person compl ai ned of is a di visional officer, the formal compl ai nt shall be forwarded to the local
assi stant commi ssi on who will appoint a suitable menber not bel ow the rank of assi stant commi ssi oner to i nvesti gate the compl ai nt."

So that is what happened in this case, isn't that right?
A. Exactly, Chair, that's what happened, yeah. down, commissioner. But on the next page, paragraph 8.5, it talks about extension to the time limits and here we get into the territory of Garda Keogh's situation, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

63 Q. Because there had to be extensive extensions; isn't that correct?
A. Well, I flagged at the outset, Chair, that there's no way we could do this within 28 days. I told everybody.

64 Q. It says:
"Extensions to the time limits outlined are acceptable once there is a clear justification and both the compl ai nant and the person compl ai ned of have i ndi cated that they have no objections to the extension. It is i mportant to maintain a record with reasons for the del ay in timelimits."

Now again, we will come to that in due course, $I$ can just say that, in the context of this case specific situation.
A. Yeah.

65 Q. Now, if we go forward again two pages, to paragraph 8.6 , so this is on $7897 ?$
A. I have it, Chair.

66 Q. So it says:

> "The i nvesti gat or should clearly indi cate to both parties that the i nvestigation must follow fair procedures and be mindful of the rights of both the compl ai nant and the person agai nst whom the compl ai nt has been made.

It is important that the investigating of ficer i ndi cates clearly to the compl ai nant or the person Compl ai ned of that they are not a counsellor. Where a compl ai nant or person compl ai ned of seeks counselling they should be di rected to an Empl oyee Assi stance Services Of ficer."

Is that right?
A. Yes.

67 Q. "Where a compl ai nt is not made in writing..."

It continues then in the next paragraph:
"You must seek a compl ai nt in writing before initiating the investi gation."

Now, as you said when we were looking at your
appointment letter, you at that stage were not notified that a complaint had been made in writing by Garda Keogh?
A. No.

68 Q. On the date of your appointment?
A. Correct.

69 Q. okay. So when you read it, you would have thought, well, the first thing I have to do is to get a complaint in writing at this stage?
A. Yeah. So I wrote to him, Chairman.

70 Q. Now the next one says:
" Di scussing the case.

The compl ai nant and the person compl ai ned of should be requested not to di scuss the case with any other party not connected with the investigation. "

The next paragraph:
"Both parties should be informed they have a right to be accompani ed or represented at interviews hel d during the investigation. The accompanying person must be a colleague, friend, family menber or staff association representative. It would not be appropriate for a person who is likely to be a witness to act as an accompanyi ng person."

And you say then, and again this is something that you
were quite concerned with later on.
"The person compl ai ned of will be advi sed in sufficient detail of the allegations made agai nst themand be gi ven a copy of the compl ai nant's written statement in 11:01 advance of the intervi ew. "

And again this was something that became quite important to you later on when you met Garda Keogh; is that right?
A. Yes, Chairman. Again keeping natural justice and fair procedures in mind.
71 Q. If I can then ask you to go to the next page, 7898, you talk about confidentiality. You talk about submitting the report and what you were doing. Again, can we look 11:01 at this one, because I was asking you about your role of establishing the facts and credibility. It says here:
"On compl etion of the investigation the investigat or 11:01 shall submit thei $r$ report to the di vi sional of ficer/chi ef superintendent."

But here we know you were submitting it to an assistant commissioner.
A. Yes.

72 Q. "The report shall incl ude the concl usi on with one of the following with clear justification for the sel ected opt i on. "

And the test you apply is the balance of probabilities?
A. That's correct, Chair, yeah.

73 Q. Either the complaint is upheld on the balance of probabilities or it's not upheld on the balance of probabilities, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chair yeah. So then again, sorry, we're nearly at the end of the policy there, if we can go to the next page, 7899.
This is the principle that you must observe as an investigator and it talks about impartiality. It says:
"During the course of the investigation the investigator will be impartial and will not indicate thei $r$ vi ews with regard to the credi bility or ot herwise 11:02 of the compl ai nt itself or the evi dence gi ven by the compl ai nant, the person agai nst whom the compl ai nt is made or any witness."

So it says you will not indicate your own with regard to the credibility or otherwise of the complaint or the evidence given by complainant, is that right?
A. Correct, Chair, yeah.
Q. And it says you will be:
"...ref used to be drawn into any specul ation of any party as to the likel y out come of the investigation. The investi gat or will mai nt ai $n$ a record of all interviews or meetings hel d during the course of the
i nvest i gation. "

Now, we're going to come to this in a little bit more detail. We have seen now in the policy the reference to interviews a couple of times, are interviews -- I was looking at the policy to see whether interviews with all the various personnel are mandatory or optiona1. Is the investigator obliged to sit down with everybody involved or not? Just generally with regard to the obligations under the policy.
A. I would say you would meet the person, tell them what it is, you know. But I think the guiding principle, from the way I look at it, Chair, is that you give them an opportunity to give their account and you give them an opportunity to give it in writing. I think that's the basic principle that $I$ was following here in relation to that Chair, yeah. But I think that's also the principle that's set out in the Code of Practice for bullying and harassment, which I suppose is underpinning this too, yeah.
76 Q. So when I talk about interviews, I suppose you might think of $a$ Q\&A type question in relation to the complaint?
A. Yeah.

77 Q. Is that something which is at your discretion, if can put it that way?
A. It's at my discretion, Chair, yeah. You can do that in writing too. You mightn't understand or if you weren't clear on something you could do that, yeah. Or you
could do that in writing too. I mean that correspondence could take place -- that clarification could take place in writing, it doesn't necessarily have to be a formal interview, you know.

## 78 Q. Okay.

A. It's not like a discipline investigation or a criminal investigation where you have to, you know... So, as you say, it's a matter for you to consider who you will sit down with or who it is necessary to sit down with or whether it's necessary to orally deal with 11:04 something or it can be dealt with in writing. So these are the kind of decisions you're making; is that right?
A. Yeah. The basic principle, chair, is that people understand, you know, and you give it to them and you give them the opportunity to respond in writing. I think they are the basic tenets of an investigation under the bullying and harassment investigation, which I suppose essentially is, you know, you are using tools to investigate I suppose employment or industrial relations type disputes as opposed to a criminal matter 11:05 or a discipline matter, we'11 say.
80 Q. Can I ask you to look at paragraph 8.11 on the next page: "Action where compl ai nt is not uphel d", and it talks about the notification. And I wonder have you already stepped out of the process as investigator when 11:05 this is happening?
A. Yeah.

81 Q. It talks there at paragraph 3:
"Where a compl ai nt is not uphel d, a di vi si onal officer/chi ef superintendent will ensure that the reputation and career prospects of both parties will be unaffected by either the making of the complaint or being the subject of a complaint. Every effort should be made to help restore the confidence of both parties."

Is that something that applies maybe to the appointing officer?
A. I would say appointing officer, yeah. That would be my role, if I was the chief, it would have been my role, we'11 say, if I was the appointing officer, yeah.
82 Q. I think the remainder of the policy then goes on to talk about the review and the appeals procedure?
A. Yes.

83 Q. If I could ask you to flick forward there, there's a summary of responsibilities at 7904, and again it talks about:
"All supervi sors, incl udi ng officers, investi gators, staff associ ations, di vi si onal chi ef superintendent."

It reiterates the obligations as investigator and it reiterates the timeframes there.

So again, I will just refer to this policy now from time to time when we are going through the situation with Garda Keogh.
A. Sure.
A. Chairman, just, that document is underpinned by this Code of Practice issue, bullying and harassment.
Q. CHA RMAN Say again.
A. That document -- our guidelines are underpinned by these guidelines, we'11 say, it's a Code of Practice.
Q. CHAL RMAN And the relationship. This is the policy?
A. Garda policy, yeah.

CHA RMAN Now we have a Code of Practice?
A. Which is broader, not just for the Guards, for everybody, we'11 say, across the broad employment sector, the HSA.
Q. CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
A. It's referenced at the start of this document, Chair. 11:07 CHA RMAN Very good.

ME. MEGRATH we will come back to that in due course.
CHA RMAN Okay, thank you very much.
MS. MEGRATH So again --
CHA RMAN Sorry, do you mind giving me the date of the 11:07 Code of Practice, if there is a date please, commissioner.
A. It's March 2007, Chair.

CHA RMAN Thank you.
A. And there's also a statutory instrument obviously that 11:07 underpins this as well too, you know. I think I have it with me, Chair, if it's of some use to it.

CHA RMAN We11, give me the reference to the statutory instrument, thank you very much.
A. I will, Chair, give you that too.
it's not jumping out at me as something we have in disclosure but we are going to look into it and we will come back and clarify that.

CHA RMAN I appreciate that. But I mean, if it's a statutory instrument, it's a statutory instrument, so we don't need to disclose it. It's presumed to be within the knowledge of everybody. And anyway, we can a11 look it up.
A. Apologies, Chair, if I jumped out of line here.

MS. MtGRATH Not at all.
CHA RMAN You feet free please, commissioner, to refer to it as you think fit and we will certainly be looking into that.
MS. MtGRATH If we can just then -- having looked at the framework that you are operating under effectively, Commissioner Finn, now you're appointed and 1et's start at the very beginning. One of the complaints that

Garda Keogh has before the Chair is he complains about the delay in this investigation getting started?
A. Oh yes.
Q.

Now, if we talk about the start, namely your appointment?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Now, can I just say that when he was giving his evidence to the Chair back before Christmas, he accepted that you did not appear to be responsible for this delay, okay? Can I ask you though just to look at 11:09 one or two of the documents, the Chair has seen them already. If we look at page 4791?
A. I don't have that.

101 Q. It's coming up on the screen. Ms. Doolin will give you anything you need in hard copy, commissioner?
A. I have it here, Chair.
Q. Okay. Now, this is a letter which I'm sure you have seen in the papers, which is, at this date, by the time of your appointment, is almost one year old. It's addressed to the Minister for Justice, the Commissioner 11:10 and Mr. Barrett and it says there:
"On behal f of Garda Ni chol as Keogh, pl ease note that Gar da Keogh her eby agai n i nvokes his rights under such har assment and bull ying policy.

Garda Keogh advi sed that he wi shes to make a statement of compl ai nt under the said pol icy as soon as practicable to a non- conflicted possi ble.

Pl ease advi se when and where he can further make such a statement of complaint as soon as possible."

Again, we are confirming for your evidence that you wouldn't have seen that letter at the time of your appointment?
A. No, Chair, I didn't see that.
okay. If we can look at another one which is around that time, 5835. It will come up on the screen. It's dated the following day, it says:
"I amdirected by the Commissi oner to acknow edge recei pt of your correspondence dated 15th Decenber 2016.

Garda Keogh's wi sh to make a statement of complaint under the bullying and harassment policy has been not ed.

Arrangements are now being made to have a suitable member to take Garda Keogh's stat ement."

We do know, and I am sure you know from the papers, that that statement was finalised with Chief
A. Yeah. I'm familiar with that, Chair.
Q. I think Chief Superintendent Scanlan in his statement confirms sending it on to the Eastern Region and I
think, if we can skip forward a number of months, because, as I say, Garda Keogh does not make an allegation against you in respect of this period of delay. But if we skip on a number of months, what I want to bring you to logically then is the correspondence that Assistant Commissioner Fanning referenced in his letter to you. This starts at 4875 of the book, where he writes a number of letters to people on 9th November 2017. I just want to open these to you because it's an argument Garda Keogh makes later 11:12 when you sit down with him on the 1st December, when you seek to clarify against whom he is making complaints. And one of his responses, both to the Chair and at the time, was that, well, Assistant Commissioner Fanning was in a position to write to these people and he did so on the 9th November. And you will see there, if you start at 4875, there is a letter to Superintendent Patrick Murray. Even if you just look at that paragraph, the first substantive paragraph:
"I wi sh to informyou that a complaint of unaccept able behavi our has been alleged agai nst you by Garda Keogh, Athl one Garda Station, on 27th March 2017, incl udi ng a six page typed statement, unsi gned and undated. It is alleged that you undermined his self-confidence, his prof essional ability and made inappropriate inferences et cet era. "

Then it goes on to say that it can be dealt with in two ways, mentioning mediation etcetera.

Now, he writes a similar letter, I'm sure you will be aware of this from the papers, so that's the letter to Superintendent Patrick Murray, he writes to Chief Superintendent Curran, he writes to Chief Superintendent wheatley, Superintendent McBrien and Inspector Nicholas Farrell. So would you be aware of that from the papers at this stage, Commissioner Finn, that he sent those letters?
A. I know it now, I do, yeah. I didn't know at the time, Chair, but I do know it now.

105 Q. He also wrote to Garda Keogh. He appoints you on the 15th November and then he writes to the same people again on the 15th November. Again, if we just look at an example of those 1etters. We will take the Superintendent Patrick Murray one again at 4891.
A. I have it.

106 Q. At 4891, he is again writing to the same people, the same five people, and he is saying:
"As you are aware, I have recei ved correspondence from Garda Keogh dated 9th Novenber 2017 under the policy, he does not accept mediation, he is looking for a full i nvesti gation. "

He is saying he has corresponded with Mr. John Barrett. On the 15th November he is confirming that you have
been appointed to investigate the matter.
A. Yes, Chairman.
Q. So one of Garda Keogh's, and we will come to it in a moment when we look at the 1st December, one of the points he makes is that well, Assistant Commissioner Fanning was quite clear in respect of whom the complaint was made against. Do you have anything to say in respect of that?
A. I don't know, Chair. I don't know what's -CHA RMAN You hadn't seen this letter?
A. No, Chair.

108 Q. MS. MEGRATH Do you bring it back to the point that you hadn't received the statement he made to Chief Superintendent Scanlan by that stage?
A. Yes, that's correct, Chair, I didn't have that statement he made.

109 Q. I think you were appointed on the 15th November but I think you became aware very quickly that this was a little bit more complicated than the normal investigation, because you have exhibited in your statement a letter from Chief Superintendent Lorraine Wheatley, which is 16th November 2017. If we can just open this, at 4166. This is coming in to you the day after your appointment.
A. Correct, Chair. I can recall that. I was kind of wondering, like it didn't make sense, it was out of sequence to me, because I was wondering why was she writing to me, because $I$ hadn't spoken to her at all. But I understand now why it happened, yeah.

CHA RMAN Yes.

110 Q.
Q. ME. MEGRATH In her letter there at 4166, she says in the third paragraph:
"There are a number of issues surrounding the admi ssi on of this compl ai nt whi ch cause me concern."

One of them, she says:
"In this instance it is clear that the compl aint referred to was first recei ved by assi stant commi ssi oner Eastern Regi on March 2017. Given the fact that this appoi nt ment is being made some ei ght months I ater, appears to be in direct contravention of the spirit and ethos of this policy."

So here she is telling you, we11, here's a red flag, there is a problem straightaway. Was this the first you were on notice of this?
A. Correct, Chair.

111 Q. Did it trigger any enquiries or letters or e-mails or investigations from you as to what's happening here, where's all this coming from?
A. I think I acknowledged it, Chair, just to be courteous, we'11 say, I acknowledged her correspondence. But I you know, it would be, I suppose, premature for me to be making any judgments or whatever in that case. It was an alert to me that, gosh, there was something else
going on here that I wasn't aware of.
112 Q.
But you were told the day after your appointment, here you have a chief superintendent telling you that a complaint was made by Garda Keogh eight months previously. Did you go looking for it at that point?
A. No, Chair. I was going to meet them. I mean, I didn't know what happened that particular complaint, you know. I didn't know was I going to be investigating the very same complaint. I suppose I had to meet Garda Keogh to find out, well, what did he want me to investigate. I understand from the letter here, we'11 say, that there was an issue, but I wasn't aware was that the same issue that I was going to be dealing with, shall we say. Because this was months later, we'11 say. I mean there's a lot of water under the bridge, so to speak, since then, Chair. So he could be making a totally different complaint to me. I wasn't aware -- sorry, I wasn't aware of all issues, we'11 say.
113 Q. But it trigger any enquiries by you to figure out, we11, what's happening here? what's the background? What's she talking about?
A. I suppose, Chair I wanted to -- I knew I was appointed and I think at this stage I had probably written to Garda Keogh, so I was waiting for him to -- my next move would be, my logical move would be, well, meet Garda Keogh first and find out we11 what does he want to say first, you know.

114 Q. I think you have written to Garda Keogh and I think you have put the contact details for your assistant, which
was Inspector Browne on that letter, isn't that right?
A. It probably was, Chair, I can't remember was --
Q. It's at page 4140. Now there's the wrong date on that 1etter?
A. Yeah.
Q. I think you subsequently corrected that it wasn't September but it was November. If you see there, it says the 16th -- can we go down please, Mr. Kavanagh?
A. I have it, Chair.

117 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. That's the 16th September. It should 11:19 say the 16th November.
A. Correct.

118 Q. CHA RMAK Okay. So the day after you were appointed.
A. Yeah. I wrote to him, yeah.

119 Q. MS. MEGRATH You said:
"Wbuld you like to meet with me in order to progress my i nvesti gation of the compl ai nt."

So, namely a complaint is being made and you want to progress your investigation. But there's no query there to him as to whether or not a complaint had already been made or what is Chief Superintendent Wheatley referring to when she talks about complaint eight months before. So this is just a straightforward 11:19 letter to Garda Keogh, is that right?
A. Correct.

120 Q. Okay. Now we do know that he does contact your assistant inspector. There is a letter here that she
writes to you, at 5741?
A. Yeah, I see that.

121 Q. That's on 28th November 2017. Now, she is telling you that she spoke to Garda Keogh this morning, he feels that there is no point in a meeting with you until you have read the documents first?
A. I understand, I am familiar, yes.

122 Q. I don't want to cut you short. Do you have it there?
A. I understand what you're talking about, yes.

123 Q.
"He feels a meeting would be a waste of time. He al so felt that because I was the contact person that the meeting was with you and I was just scheduling it. He sai d he made the statement in March to Chi ef Superintendent John Scanl an and gave hi msupporting documentation. He sai d John Scanl an gave it to Fintan and Fintan sent it on to John Barrett, so it should be with John Barrett. He said it would make no sense meeting with you until you' ve had a look at the documentation first. I think you need to write to the executive di rector HRPD for the statement and documents and I have sent you on a draft e-mail. Regards."

I think that's Inspector Browne, is it.
A. Correct, Chair, yeah. And that's what I did.

124 Q. So it's Garda Keogh who has made the contact and who is highlighting that you need to know the background of what's is happening here, is that right?
A. Yeah, that's fair, Chair.

125 Q. You do write that e-mail and we have the e-mail at page 4142, on the 28th November, at around lunchtime. So it's 4142. This is from you to John Barrett HRPD and you copy Mr. McLough1in. A couple of lines down in the e-mail, you say:
"Garda Keogh informed me that he gave me statement and supporting document to Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an in March 2015 and this was forwarded to the usual channel s in your office. He feels it would not be prudent to meet me until l have had an opportunity to read his statement and documentation."
A. That's correct, Chair.

126 Q. You requested that:
"Garda Keogh statement of compl ai nt and supporting documentation be forwarded directly to me so that l can progress this investi gation."

Can I ask you to stop there in the sense of, what is not there is a query from you as to how has this happened, how is there a complaint eight months ago and it's only getting to me now?
A. I suppose I wanted to read it first, Chair, and see.

127 Q. But if I just ask you, commissioner, just about the practicalities of how come I'm just seeing this now in November 2017? Can somebody give me a guide as to what happened, where it was?
A. I know he made that complaint, Chair. I suppose the
logic was, I had reached out to him and he said, okay, before you meet me you need to read this statement, you know. Now I didn't know was this statement going to be what I was going to be subsequently investigating but I went off and I got that statement, you know.
A. Now I didn't know if that statement was to do with bullying and harassment specifically or was that part of his other issues, we'll say, that he was pursuing at the time. So I suppose until I got it, Chair, I couldn't really put it in context or even until I met him I suppose couldn't put it in context as to, let him explain to me what it was, you know.
129 Q. I think if you just pop up the -- if Mr. Barnes can just go back up there, there's an e-mail, which is later on that day. we just know from the papers. At the top of the page. You go back and you say:
"May I have the appendi ces al so - which he authorised in his conversation today."

So you know there is a statement, you know there is appendices and are you asking for the appendices; is that right?
A. Correct. I think I actually physically got the statement first and I read it, I'm sure, but there wasn't appendices attached. But obviously in the statement he was alluding to appendices.
130 Q. CHAL RMAN Yes.
A. So I wrote back and said, can I have the appendices.
A. Correct, yeah.

MS. MEGRATH And did you get them?
A. I did, Chair, yeah.

133 Q. Did you get all of them or some of them?

134 Q. Because again, this is something that Garda Keogh focuses on?
A. I got the appendices but I wasn't sure, we'11 say, because I didn't get an appendix to the appendices, so it was difficult to follow.
135 Q. CHA RMAN I understand you. You got appendices, as far as you were concerned they were all the appendices but who knows whether they were or were not?
A. Correct, Chairman, yes.

136 Q. MG. MERATH Now can I just ask you, would you have taken the view at this stage, well, this is all really something I should have been provided with, I shouldn't have had to go looking for this? Did you think about 11:24 that at any stage? Did you ask that question to yourself or any superior?
A. I can't say I did, Chair. I might have thought about it but I can't say I did. I mean, my state of mind was: He asked me to read this, he said before I meet $\quad$ 11:24 him read this statement. So I felt I was complying with his request and that got it and read it and we were going to meet, you know. I think it was the Monday he communicated with me and by Friday we had the
meeting arranged. So I didn't -- I wasn't too surprised. But I mean -- maybe that's the wrong phraseology, Chair, but I was waiting, the next step logically for me would be to meet him.
137 Q. CHA RMAN was a meeting.
A. Yeah.

ME. MEGRATH You do say in your -- actually, just to finish off there, you have a diary entry of the 29th November, which is the following day, 5685. It's down the bottom of the page. I wonder if you can read it out, it's difficult to read there, Commissioner Fanning. It says:
"Ni chol as Keogh file. Spoke to..."
A. It says "spoke to hi m", Chair, but I don't think I spoke to him. I recall actually speaking, no, I think it was Inspector Browne spoke to him, but anyway "read file. Arrangement to meet himon Friday."

139 Q. okay. So did it mean that you were intending to speak to him having read the file?
A. Maybe so. I think it was Inspector Browne spoke to him, I don't think I spoke to him. I've read that since, Chair, and I was trying to make sense to it myself, you know. But anyway, I suppose it references the fact that $I$ got a statement that evening.

140 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. Because that was kind of like late evening work that I
would be doing outside my normal day's work, you know. So Nicholas Keogh file I was working on that evening. This is probably my own note in my diary, yeah. Met him -- or read the statement and I'm going to meet him Friday.
MG. MtGRATH you say in your statement, if we stop here, the 29th November, you say in your statement:
"I was not aware of the nature or content of his complaint."

This is when you were appointed. You say:
"I was unaware of the extent of prior invol vement with Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an. I was unaware of any interactions or correspondence he had with parties pertai ni ng to his complaint."

Can I just ask you for your views on that to the Chair. was that satisfactory?
A. Sorry, Chair, could you repeat that now, because I was distracted looking for it.

142 Q. Sorry, your statement there at page 4106?
A. Yeah.

143 Q. You outline in your statement to the Tribunal that when 11:26 you were appointed, and this is in the third paragraph down, if we stop there, Mr. Barnes. You said:
"I was not made aware of the nat ure or content of his
compl ai nt. "
A. Yeah.

144 Q. You said:
"I made contact with Garda Keogh to informhimthat I 11:26 was appoi nted and that I would meet hi mand take his compl ai nt. I was unaware of the extent of his prior i nvol vement with Chi ef Superintendent Scanlan. I was unaware of any ot her correspondence or interactions that he with other parties pertai ning to his compl ai nt."

And what I am asking you, your view, was that a satisfactory position for you to be in at that particular time, at the time of your appointment, given 11:27 the history, now that we see of the complexity of the matter?
A. To be honest, Chair, when I got the appointment initially I assumed this was a new matter, we'11 say, that was coming to me to investigate. Even though, we'11 say, I got the statement he made to Chief Superintendent Scanlan in March, like this was November, so I didn't know was it going to be the same set of circumstances. You know, I didn't know the history of it. So I knew he made that complaint in March, we'11 say, but as I said, I wasn't sure what was I going to investigate. was I investigating something totally new or was $I$ investigating that complaint? Because the correspondence $I$ had gotten up until then
wasn't clear to me or, you know, I wasn't aware of that, you know. As far as I was concerned, we'11 say, the meeting of the 1st December was going to be me meeting him to make his -- take his -- whatever, complaint he wanted to make.

145 Q. If we move on to the 1st December, we know that he is notified and you meet him at the Mullingar Park Hotel; isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chair, yeah.

146 Q. Now, those notes -- we will just spend a little bit of time on this meeting. Again, it's a complaint of Garda Keogh, he makes a number of complaints in respect of this particular meeting and we will go through them one-by-one. So it's at 4219, is where you will find the minutes of the meeting. Now, it says:
"Meeting on the bullying and har assment compl ai nt of Garda Keogh 13: 14 1st Decentor 2017 at Mullingar Park Hot el. "

It outlines the people who were present:
"Assi stant commi ssi oner M chael Finn. Chi ef superintendent Tom Myers."

We will see his name coming up.
A. Yeah.

147 Q. He was your main assistant, was he, in the investigation?
A. Yeah, the investigation team, Chair, that was the man, yeah.
Q. Inspector Annette Browne, whom we have seen reference to, Garda Keogh and Mr. Cullen, solicitor. Now you started off and you tell him you have been appointed. You're mentioning the date being wrong in the letter. That's the reference to September we talked about, is that right?
A. Correct, Chair.

149 Q. You said you are coming here with no prior knowledge.
"I have no hi story with this so l need verification on the rel evant documents. I have one statement and some appendi ces."
A. Chair, a small bit of clarification there. when I wrote to him, we'11 say, initially he didn't get my letter, you know. So within a week, when I hadn't heard back, I actually sent a letter to the regional office in Mullingar and asked them would they deliver it to him. Hence there was a bit of delay there between the two. Sorry, I don't meant to interrupt. 150 Q. Not at a11. I think, in fact, you changed the date to the 24th November, isn't that right?
A. Yeah. No but that was also the issue, he didn't get the first letter, we'11 say, because when I hadn't heard back from him I asked --

151 Q. CHAL RMAN There was some delay.
A. Correct.

152 Q. CHA RMAN That was nobody's fault.
A. Yeah.

153 Q. MG. MEGRATH Then he contacts Inspector Browne on the 28th; isn't that right?
A. Absolutely correct. Sorry, Chair, for interrupting.

CHA RMAK No, no, that's okay.
154 Q. MG. MEGRATH Can I just ask you generally about these letters, or sorry, these minutes we have in front of us. I think they were taken by Inspector Browne, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chair, yeah.
A. I brought her along because I thought I was going to be taking a statement of complaint from him, we'11 say, so I had Inspector Browne, I had Chief Superintendent Myers with me. But anyway, she started recording her 11:30 own notes of what happened on the day, yeah.

156 Q. Were these taken in longhand first and subsequently typed up, or were they typed up on site by Inspector Browne?
A. I'd say they were in longhand, Chair. I actually don't 11:30 recal1 observing her doing $t$, you know, she did it herself.

157 Q. If you go right through them, they are a couple of pages long, there's no signature or statement that they have been read over or signed or accepted or acknowledged by Garda Keogh, is that right?
A. That's correct.

158 Q. That is something he said in his evidence?
A. No, that's fair, Chair.
Q. Okay.
A. They were just our notes, we'11 say, of the meeting. CHA RMAK I know.
Q. ME. MEGRATH Now, one of the things he also says about these, he says that he couldn't stand by the notes. He 11:30 said:
"They were accurate in general overall."

He said at one point in his evidence. Then he went on to say:
"They were not fully accurate or verbatim"
would you accept that as a fair observation on them?
A. Well, it wasn't verbatim. We didn't have a stenographer there, you know, it's notes. I thought they were pretty good.
Q. One of the things he also said on Day 109 , the notes were not read out to him and not signed by him; is that 11:31 right?
A. That's fair, Chair, I mean it wasn't like we were doing a --
Q. CHAL RMAN It wasn't a criminal interview.
A. A criminal thing, yeah.

163 Q. CHA RMAN And it's not made by him.
A. No.

CHA RMAN I mean, you would read things back if he said it.
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN And you were confirming that these were his words. But it would be unusual, I think it would be unusual to read over minutes to somebody, I think.
A. As I say, it wasn't a criminal or discipline investigation. It was just our notes.
Q. MS. MtGRATH Sorry, I'm just clarifying as a matter of fact, he just says in his own direct evidence they weren't read out by him and they were not signed by him?
A. Correct.
Q. I think you accepted that is how the process worked?
A. I accept that.
Q. You said there just something at the beginning, you said you thought you would have been meeting him to take a statement of complaint because under the policy that would seem to be a normal procedure?
A. That's right.
Q. But it seems that you weren't taking a statement of complaint. Did you accept that he had made his
complaint? Do you accept that at that point?
A. But he gave me this documentation as this is my complaint, you know, what he gave me on the day, yeah.
Q. Okay. But I think what he gave you on the day was what you had received from HRPD, the statement coming via Chief Superintendent Scanlan; is that right?
A. Yeah, plus he added more onto it the day I met him, we'11 say.
Q. I think what he had, am I correct, he gave you the full
set of appendices, would that be right, and he also gave you an additional addendum?
A. To which addendum as I referred to it, yeah.

171 Q. And I think that addendum addressed, for example, the issue of delay in getting started?
A. Yeah.

172 Q. Is that right?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. And some further matters, which we will see?
A. Correct.

174 Q. Okay.
A. In essence, as I discovered, Chair, it was basically the same complaint that he made to Chief Super Scanlan in March, is what he was giving to me as his complaint that he wanted me to investigate, plus the two pages.
Q. Now, if we can just ask you to go on, there's a discussion there at the outset of mediation but really we get into the meat of it at page 4220. Now, Garda Keogh was taken through this in quite significant detail during his cross-examination, so I just want to ask you a couple of questions about this and some of his observations on it.
A. Hm -hmm.
Q. At the top of the page it seems to be that Mr. Cullen is telling you that the complaint was originally lost. It was made on 27th March 2017. It appears odd things happened to it and it went missing.
A. Yes.

177 Q. You say "who was the complaint made to."

He says:
"J ohn Scanl an, this is the same document gi ven to him but there is an addendum"

So he is saying what you have and what I am giving you now, that's the complaint and that was what was made to Chief Superintendent Scanlan?
A. Yeah. we're in agreement.
Q. And I think you ask him:
"The full contents of your compl ai nt in this?"

And he says:
"A. Yes.
Q. Are you submitting it now?
A. Yes, with the additional part."

I think the additional part is that addendum; is that right?
A. Correct, Chair, yeah.
Q. You say:
"Are you accepting I am neutral in this."

And Mr. Cullen says:
"I accept your bona fides."
Q.

He goes on then:
"I will have to go to all the parties and look at extensi ons of time, I'monly getting this today."

And I think that's what you had to do; isn't that right?
A. Correct, Chair, and I was kind of pointing out that I have to go to all the parties, which became a relevant piece as the conversation went on, yeah.
181 Q. okay. He says:
"Yes, and you need time to read this."

So there is no objection from the Keogh team at that stage in relation to an extension of time?
A. No, no. There is no issue at all, from my perspective, 11:34 we'11 say.
182 Q. Now, can I just ask you, and again, commissioner, I am just putting to you what Garda Keogh complains about. And one of the things he said on Day 104 , just before we get into it, he said on Day 104, at page 65 , he says 11:34 he was asked over and over again about the names and he said, at Day 114 , he said it was on obstructive meeting and that he was asked repeatedly who he was complaining about. So can we just bear that in mind when we just
look at --
A. I wouldn't agree with that at all, Chair, I didn't think it was a bit obstructive. I thought we had a good, cordial meeting. In fairness, I thought we got on well, you know. That is my version anyway.
Q. You recorded there:
"Who are you making the compl ai nts agai nst?"

And he says:
"Pat Murray superintendent and two chi ef in Mllingar, Mark Curran and Lorraine Wheatley. And there was a sergeant in the chi ef's office who may have been pulling their strings. I'mnot sure but your investigation will show this."

Then there is a question:
"You will have to tell me who you are making the compl ai nts agai nst."

Now, Garda Keogh argues, if you just look at the previous paragraph, I have indicated three people.
A. Yes.

184 Q. Now this is something that he felt very strongly about when he was giving his evidence.
A. I saw that chair, and I am more than willing to address this issue, Chair, yeah.

185

Q. Because you continue on the third line there, you say: okay. If you look at your last line there, you are saying:
"I need to know who the compl ai nts are bei ng made agai nst."

Mr. Cullen is recorded as saying:
"Yeah and he get on with most people. There may be ot hers but some are nore central."

So it doesn't seem to flow from the previous paragraph. So would that be indicating to the Chair that they're not verbatim or they are not full notes in the fullest sense, if I can put it that way?
A. No, I'd say in the context, Chair -- like, this is my perception, okay. I think Mr. Cullen and Garda Keogh had the statement, there was lots of people named in 11:37 it, you know, and I even refer back to I think some of the other correspondence or I saw correspondence between AC Fanning, we'11 say, and HRM about this, that it wasn't clear who exactly -- it wasn't clear, okay, clear to me anyway, who exactly he was referring to. Because I think I documented there was 25, I think I had in my note, Chair, 25 or 27 different people referenced in the statement. So I needed to know -- I think it was 25, Chair, if you include -- or 25 if you include higher echelons of Garda management plus senior 11:37 Garda management. I won't list out all the others, but I have 25 in my list here, Chair. But if you take it, examining a11 the people who are mentioned. So you can understand from my perspective, I need to know who.
187 Q. But it may be put to you that if you look at the middle 11:38 of the page, when he is asked that:

[^0]Plain English and plain English answer:
"Pat Murray chi ef superintendent, and two chi ef s in Mullingar, Mark Curran and Lorrai ne Wheatley."
A. Well, Chair, if you go back up to -- a few lines back up there, where he starts off, he says:
"Pat Murray chi ef superintendent, and two chi ef s in Mullingar and there a sergeant in the chi ef's office who maybe be pulling the strings of..."

I'm not clear that point is it just these people or the sergeant in the chief's office or who else, you know. so that's maybe why I was labouring the point;
188 Q. If we are to be a little bit forensic about it, commissioner, he is clear about three but the one that's vague is the sergeant in the chief's office?
A. At that point.

189 Q. Okay. And he goes on there near the end of the page: 11:38
"Pat Murray, that's is crystal clear. Mark Curran. Yes. I am not making a compl ai nt agai nst Noreen MEBrien and Lorrai ne Wheatley, I have an issue..."
A. Even at that point, we'11 say, he is saying, I'm not making a complaint against Lorraine wheatley, which I was happy at that point, you know, but then as we roll on, as we see later, Chair, she comes back into the equation. So, as you can understand, I am not clear,
you know, so I am trying to tease this out with him as we go along, who. Sorry, Chair, again for interrupting.
190 Q. Not at all, no, commissioner. And he says --
A. Because he says there "I have an issue with John Scanl an as well", like you know, so.
191 Q. In fairness, he says because the complaint went missing. And you know that that's a live issue?
A. Correct.

192 Q.
That that documentation had been floating around for some time and it only comes to you in November, so you know that that's an issue?
A. Yeah. But I don't know, you see, does he want to throw John Scanlan into the mix in terms of what he's asking me to do, in terms of does he perceive John Scanlan to be part of the whole bullying and harassment of him, we'11 say, Chair. So that's why I was labouring this bit, this part of our interview. But I think he had set out in the addendum he handed you at the meeting, his allegation or his issue with John Scanlan, isn't that right?
A. He did, yeah, and we did tease that out later on. But I am just saying, as the interview is going along, we'11 say, I am just putting things in context from my perspective, we'11 say.
194 Q. Now, you go on then in second last line and you say:

[^1]And he says:
"My mind is open to Mark Curran. I thought it was him because he was friends with Ai dan Glacken. I know it
is coming fromthe chi ef's office but lam not sure who 11:40 is doing it."

He was asked about that in cross-examination on Day 109 and he says that statement, my mind is open to Mark Curran, he says:
"That's if it was said."
A. Sorry.

CHAN RMAN Say that again.
195 Q.
MS. MEGRATH He says in his evidence on Day 109, on cross-examination, that sentence is put to him:
"My mind is open to Mark Curran."

And he says:
"Well that's if it was said."

CHA RMAN Sorry.
ME. MEGRATH That's if it was said.
CHA RMAN Oh that's if it was said. But is he saying it wasn't said?
M. MEGRATH We11, that is what I am asking, the recollection of the commissioner in relation to that.

Are you satisfied that that is an accurate or a verbatim account of what is said there in the last three lines?
A. I wouldn't disagree. I mean, I didn't write the minutes now, this is my secretary. But I'm not disputing it. That's my perception of it, we'11 say. But I think it articulates, Chair, for me anyway, at this point that it wasn't crystal clear who exactly he wanted to make a complaint against, you know. So that's why I laboured it a bit. Maybe he was
frustrated. I didn't getting the sense at the time that I was frustrating him to the extent he's talking about today, but anyway. We11, did you get the sense that he might have been confused or finding it difficult or frustrating?
A. Maybe he was, but a lot of the conversation was with his solicitor too, not necessarily with him, shall we say, because there was two of them in the room, we'11 say, yeah. frustration being expressed on the other side in relation to these questions being asked?
A. I genuinely didn't get that, Chair, no, I didn't get that sense of frustration, you know. Not frustration about this part, maybe frustration this thing was going 11:42 on so long, I suppose that was their frustration, that's the frustration $I$ sensed from their side, we'11 say.
198 Q. Okay. Can we go to the next page, page 4221. Now I
just need you to go again about three quarters of the way down the page, where it's coming to you?
A. Sorry, Chair, do you mind if I mention that --

199 Q. CHAD RMAN Yes, you are the witness, you are perfectly entitled to.
A. At the top of that page I say:
"My scope is limited to the policy."

CHAL RMAN Yes.
A. So here I am kind of flagging for them, look --

200 Q. CHA RMAK Go up to the top of the page, Philip, please.
A. "My scope is limited to the policy."

CHAN RMAN Mr. Cullen is recorded as saying that he can't pinpoint who as doing it, he can't always pinpoint, it's a matter for investigation and that's up to you. And you are saying I'm limited to the policy.
A. Correct. So I am saying he has to tell me who it is he 11:42 wants me to investigate.
Q. CHA RMAN So at that point there appears to be two views. One is, an investigation is going to take place which may throw up information about who is doing the bullying?
A. Yes.
Q. CHAl RMAN And you're saying, I'm limited to the policy.
A. Yeah.

203 Q. CHAN RMAN And your understanding of limited to the policy, correct me if I am wrong, your understanding of it was, I need to know who is being accused?
A. Correct. Now, he could have said the whole lot of them, which would have been fine, I'd have went off with that. If he said all 25 people he named, I'd have went down that road. But I just wanted to get some clarity from him because he was then including and excluding people. I just wasn't sure, Chair. Maybe I did labour it in hindsight but I wasn't doing it deliberately to frustrate him or anything like that.

204 Q. MS. MEGRATH Is there any legitimacy to the statement at the top of the page to the effect of "I can't al ways pi npoint who is doing it it's a matter for i nvesti gation and it's up to you". Is the policy a straitjacket application?
A. No.

205 Q. Is that a legitimate perhaps statement to make to you?
A. The door was open, Chair, you know, if at some stage I unearthed something and he came back and said, I think this should also be incorporated within the scope of what you are saying, because, you know, I have discovered that there was a document or something that led to point my investigation in another area which would be relevant to Garda Keogh. Because during this 11:44 whole exchange, Chair, I was saying to him, look, we need to take time. Look, if you want to take time out with your solicitor, do it, I'm not forcing you into, you know, saying it has to be only one or two, you tell
me how many, who it is.
206 Q. And I think that continues in the interview, if you go three quarters of the way down, where you say:
"I need to be clear about what I am doi ng."
A. Yeah.
Q. Mr. Cullen says:
"There's a lot of documents and it's in there."

You say:
"I into he had to know the peopl e."

He answers:
"Superintendent Pat Murray is one."

So, in fairness to Garda Keogh, I think he is consistent in that respect. That is the third time he has mentioned Superintendent Pat Murray.
A. Oh he was crystal clear I think, yeah.

209 Q. Then he goes on to say:
"I'm not sure about Mark Curran but my mind is open.

When he left Lorrai ne Wheatley cane and she's sound and that sergeant is there all the time and he is friends on Facebook with A."
A. Yeah.

210 Q. And you say:
"If it is the sergeant, but if l don't get a compl ai nt agai nst hi mthen $I$ won't be putting a compl ai nt agai nst hi m"

So I think if he was to say, well, you know, I can't necessarily pinpoint these people but you are saying if I don't make a complaint against them I can't pursue it. Is that a fair summary of what's happening now at this stage in the meeting?
A. We11, I want to know where I am starting off, we'11 say, you know, I mean, I am going to be leaving here today and going to certain people, we'11 say, so I wanted to know. I mean, I wasn't saying this is a guillotine here, you know, if you don't do it today
I'11 never again be back to you. I just wanted directions from his perspective, who was he pointing me towards.

211 Q. Okay. And so he says, this is Garda Keogh himself:
"I' m not sure who is responsible for the Mullingar thi ng. If you go to Mark and Lorrai ne and say they were busy and just si gned the document."

That suggests that there is a very much fuller conversation going on here in the background, if you go and say they were busy and you just signed the document. So it would suggest that these notes are not a full picture really of the full detailed conversations that were going on between all of you in the room.
A. I wouldn't say they stray too far from it either, Chair, do you know what I mean. To me it's kind of logic enough.

212 Q. Did you know what he was talking about or was he asked what he was talking about?
A. I think what he was trying to say there, Chair, that he could have -- we'11 say, when my investigation gets going, while he might think it's Mark Curran was doing something, he could discover, well, Mark is only signing, it's actually the guy in the chief's office who is really having a pop at him and, you know, he's using the chief. That's my interpretation of what he is saying there, chair.
213 Q. You say:
"I need to find out who you are saying is responsi ble so that I can put it to the people."

Mr. Cullen says:
"It's in the documents."

You say:
"You need to thi nk about it, you need to say who is doing this."

So again it's his argument, Commissioner Finn, that he is being asked over and over who he is making his complaint against and now we see the question multiple times at this stage. Would that be fair to say in respect of him?
A. Maybe from his perspective, Chair, he might have been taking it differently. From my perspective, I was just trying to get some clarity, like you know.
214 Q. And he goes on down there, in the first quarter of the page he says:
"Pat Murray, Mark Curran but my mind is left open to hi m"

```
He says:
```

"It is Pat Murray and Mark Curran."

Then you say:
"So you're not saying the sergeant here?"

And then he says:
"No, I don't have enough evi dence."

I think the meeting changes a little bit then, where you are talking about the addendum, and you say:
"There is stuff in the addendumthat is outside the bullying and harassment. If you feel that Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an comes under this. I believe you may have a complaint with the del ay with the investigation. This could be a different matter."

So can you just take the Chairman through that, how you saw it at that time?
A. The logic, where I was going there, Chair, bullying and harassment is repetitive behaviour against somebody. If, we'11 say, Chief Superintendent Scanlan didn't do something, then that would be a matter you would deal as a grievance, we'11 say. It wouldn't be appropriate --
215 Q
CHA RMAN It's not bullying and harassment?
A. Yes.

216 Q. CHA RMAN It's inefficiency or incompetence?
A. It's a once off thing, we'11 say.

217 Q. CHA RMAN Or delay or whatever it is.
A. And we have a grievance procedure that deals with, you know, something that's not captured within the bullying and harassment policy document. So I was kind of pointing, well, you know, if you are talking about a single item against a person, there is another
mechanism for dealing with that, it's called grievance, yeah, a grievance procedure.
MS. MEGRATH So would it be fair to say that when you met him in December you were taking the view, look, the issue of the delay and how we got there it's not for me, it has nothing to do with me, you will have to go elsewhere with that. Is that your view?
A. What I was trying to explain to him, Chair, if he wanted those matters dealt with, and I wasn't saying that I wouldn't take them from him there today, but it wouldn't be part of the investigation that Assistant Commissioner Fanning had appointed me to do. I undertook that I would take them from today, if he had other issues, and give them back to AC Fanning and let him progress those matters. But in terms of the bullying and harassment investigation that I was being appointed to do, I'd have to separate them, if that makes sense, Chair.
219 Q. So just to be clear, are you saying it wasn't something to do with you, that was somebody else's issue to resolve with Garda Keogh?
A. Yeah, it wasn't within, we'11 say, the terms of reference of my appointment by AC Fanning. AC Fanning appointed me to do literally the bullying and harassment, we'11 say. If new stuff came up today and there was reference to the criminal investigation, I was trying to explain to him, look, my appointment doesn't cover me for those but I will take them from you. I feel I would be obliged to do so, Chair. And I
will give them back to AC Fanning so that he could pursue them through another forum, we'11 say, with somebody else, if that was the case.
220 Q. I think you did subsequently involve yourself in the issue because you did look for explanations somewhat down the line, isn't that right, from AC Fanning?
A. I don't understand the question.

221 Q. In the sense of the issue with the delay, it literally almost kept coming back to haunt you?
A. Oh I did deal with, I did go back to AC Fanning with the delay, we'11 say, but, we'11 say the other matters, which I would call them grievance matters as opposed to part of my terms of reference of the bullying and harassment investigation, I separated them, we'11 say. So I went back to AC Fanning and said, look, he has raised some issues here about why, for example -- using this example, we'11 say, why Chief Superintendent Scanlan delayed, we'11 say, processing his complaint. Now I didn't know why at the time, I had no knowledge of that, but I am using that as example. So I'd go back to AC Fanning and say, look, he has raised some other issues here which appear to me to be outside the scope of my investigation, I am alerting you to it, you deal with it, you know, because it's not within my terms of reference.
222 Q. I think we will come to that in a moment in the correspondence.
A. Sorry.

223 Q. Mr. Cullen says:
"His original compl ai nt was lost and we're not sure who or where it happened."
You said:
"I will send the issue to AC Fanni ng and outline this
is a compl ai nt separate to the bullying and harassment compl ai nt."
And I think that's what you've just said to the Chair, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Garda Keogh tells you:
"No, it's all part of bullying. It's me that has to push thi ngs."
A. That is fair enough, Chair, and that was an opening for
him to say, well, I want to include Chief Superintendent Scanlan within your bullying and
harassment complaint, or investigation, we'11 say. Superintendent Scanlan within your bullying and
harassment complaint, or investigation, we'11 say.
Q.
Q. But there is no further follow on from you to clarify that with him; is that right?
A. Because he didn't ask me or his solicitor didn't say to me, I want you to include Chief Superintendent Scanlan 11:52 within your investigation, at any point.
Q. A11 right, but he does say no it's all part of bullying?
A. Garda Keogh said that on the day, he did, in fairness,

Chair, I'm not disputing that.
227 Q. You go on to say:
"I need to be clear whoml need to approach and i nvesti gate. Ri ght now the compl ai nt is agai nst Mark Curran and Pat Murray. Ni cky will need to tell me if he wants to put allegations to other persons or I won't go to other persons"
A. Well, I was probably addressing that to his solicitor, in order to say, look, he needs to tell me, yeah, because if they're not willing to scope then obviously I won't be going to them as part of my investigation as persons complained of as opposed to witnesses, we'11 say.

228 Q. So you say:
"I won't be going to ot her persons."

And then Garda Keogh says:
"If Mark Curran says it was someone el se."

Then you say:
"Then l will come back to you and we will take it from there."
"Throw in Lorrain Wheatley so. "

Do you remember that?
A. Yeah.

11:53
Now, this was put to Garda Keogh in some detail in his cross-examination and he says he doesn't remember saying that, on Day 109, page 129. what do you say to that? He says he doesn't remember saying "throw in Lorrai ne Wheatley so"?
A. He did have her in the equation earlier on, we'11 say. So, I don't know why he is disputing that now, Chair. I mean...
Would you accept that you've just a couple of lines previously said to him "You need to tell me if he wants 11:53 to put the allegations to other persons or l won't go to other persons"? would you accept that this was a response, if it was a response, to that a couple of lines up?
A. Sorry, Chair.
Q. of concern by Garda Keogh, that if I don't mention the name?
A. I think, Chair, I was only explaining, again I was telling him the process like, you know what I mean. I wil1 investigate whatever you tel1 me to, but you've got to be specific in terms of what you want me to investigate. That was the logic. But actually, Chair, if you go down to the next comment from me, it says, I'm saying to him:
"Are you happy with this? Do you want some time out?"

So I am telling himself and his solicitor, guys, look, I'm not putting any pressure here, if ye want to take some time out here, you know, that's fine. we were in mullingar hotel, I could have left the room and gave them the time out.
232 Q. And Mr. Cullen replies --
A. I thought I was being fair to him, Chair, yeah.

233 Q. He replies at the end of the page and says:
"I'mhappy that under bullying and harassment complaint that it is these three people but it may be el sewhere."

And you query on the next page:
"Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an, your new statement?"

And the answer is:
"Yes, we don't know where this is going and Cormi ssi oner Ó Cual ái n' s scope. "

You say:
"Bullying and harassment is different to grievance and under the definitions this would go under a different direction. Grievance is a one off thing."

## Garda Keogh says:

"I di dn't say John Scanl an di dn't do anything."

So there is quite a detailed discussion about this; whether or not the issue of John Scanlan is in or out of the bullying arena, because you say:
"Are you happy I report to AC Fanning that you have a gri evance that the compl ai nt di dn't go anywhere?"

Mr. Cullen replies:
"I don't bel ieve they are totally separate."

Then you say:
"I have to separate between bullying and har assment and gri evance and the next time we meet we have to confirm this."
A. Yes.

234 Q. So that issue seems to have been left open at that stage in the meeting?
A. Not quite actually, from my perspective, Chair.
Q. Well, is there something that is not reflected in the notes there?
A. Well, no, I'm just saying that in the context of -again, if you only had a once off interaction with

Chief Scan1an and his only issue was the fact, we'11 say, that he didn't send the claim or the statement on to AC Fanning fast enough, whatever it was, that wouldn't be in my mind a repetitive behaviour that would fall under the category of bullying. It would be 11:55 a single thing, which we would deal with under the grievance policy. And so, I undertook to give -- and I did subsequently post out to Garda Keogh a copy of the grievance procedure, so he would understand the difference between the bullying, repetitive behaviour and the single item which would be dealt with as a grievance. That's where I was at there, Chair, in relation to trying to explain it. would you accept, commissioner, that this issue in relation to Chief Superintendent Scanlan was not a straightforward issue in the sense of it was being made clear to you in the meeting that there was a delay. You knew there was. You had already had a letter from Chief Superintendent wheatley. So you knew there was something there in the background. What the Keogh team 11:56 are telling you, we don't know what happened to it.
A. That's fair enough.

237 Q. So it may be Chief Superintendent Scanlan, it may not, we don't know.
A. Yeah.

238 Q. Do you accept that that's fair enough from their perspective, whether he should be included or not in a list, because they don't know, is the answer?
A. And neither do $I$, to tell you the truth, at that stage,

Chair, because I'm only starting out. But I was just trying to explain to them, you know, if it was just a once off thing with Chief Superintendent Scanlan, that, you know, a grievance procedure might be a more appropriate mechanism. I wasn't excluding anything, 11:57 you know. I was just trying to explain the difference between the two.
239 Q. And I think Mr. Cullen says, a couple of lines down:
"You nay find when you talk to John Scanl an that this 11:57 is minor thing."

You continue:
"In the addendumthere may be grievances that we need
to call them out and be clear about them"

It's is accepted by the Keogh team:
"You will have to do that."

You say:
"Ni cky, you might need time. "

And Garda Keogh says:
"I have named three names, Pat Murray, Mark Curran and Lorrai ne Wheatley."

Can I ask you, by the end of that meeting --
A. Can I just ask you to go on to the next line actually.
Q. And you say:
"You need to thi nk about this. I am not limiting this. 11:57
A. That's the line $I$ was trying to say there.

Now, can I ask you, just at the end of that meeting, it was put to Garda Keogh when he was giving his evidence that at this meeting the words that were used were, and 11:58 I don't want to have the incorrect ones, is that he was waddling backwards and forwards. That is on Day 109, at page 116. So effectively he was all over the place effectively, it was put to Garda Keogh during his cross-examination. Can I ask you to comment on that? 11:58
A. Is he saying that about me?
Q. No, that Garda Keogh was. That he was waddling backwards and forwards. That's a quote from Day 109. Can I ask you to comment on Garda Keogh that day in the meeting? Was it the case that he was all over the 11:58 place? Were you finding it difficult?
A. Actually I thought he was referring to me when he said that, to tell you the truth.
Q. No.
A. No, I didn't have any problem with him at all. I mean, to be honestly fair, I actually thought it was a good meeting, Chair, I thought we got on fine. That was my perception, you know. I thought it was very cordial. It was relaxed in the context that $I$ wasn't trying to put him under any pressure, trying to be fair and reasonable. We got a location in a room where we could do this in privacy. And I thought I was just trying to do my best to explain to them where we were -- what I was setting out to do, what I was trying to embark on and trying to get some guidance as to where it would go, yeah. But actually, Chair, I too want to bring the last line of that page, while we're on it, Chair, I finished up by asking:
"Are you happy? I hope I am being fai $r$ and reasonable with you."
and Mr. Cullen -- they both said:
"yes."
244 Q. I think that goes to what you are saying there, of a fair and cordial meeting with Garda Keogh and his team that day?
A. That was my perception of it, Chair, yeah.

245 Q. He is saying there at the very end:
"I have named the three names, Pat Murray, Mark Curran and Lorrai ne Wheatley."

So, whilst it may have taken ins and outs and rounds and abouts to get there, at the end of the meeting, you say you were not limiting it but were you pretty satisfied there were at least those three names in the frame?
A. Yes, Chair, yeah. But I suppose my take was, look, that was your first meeting, I'm sure he would have to go away with his solicitor and reflect on it. I wasn't closing the door to anything on that day, look, could we meet again? I'11 read the statement and you go back and do your bit and we will meet again.

246 Q. There at the end of the page, when you say:
"I hope I am going fair and reasonable. Are you happy?"

He says:
"Yes. l'Il sign this."

Do you remember that and, as you say, you don't think he did sign it.
A. No. I don't think I asked him to sign it. I can't recall asking him to sign it. Maybe Inspector Browne did, $I$ don't recall.

247 Q. okay. Then at the top of the next page you say:

[^2]any point without the documentation."

Garda Keogh says and Mr. Cullen says:
"There shoul d be copi es around. "

It says:
"I nspector Browne I ft to make a photocopy of signed statement and returned."

This is why there is a little bit of confusion surrounding this. Do you remember that?
A. Yeah, we'11 say, he gave me his statement plus the two-page addendum, so effectively this was, from my perspective, his statement of complaint. So I signed it on the bottom, you know, to say look, okay, here's the statement, here's the date. I don't have it in front of me here now but I think if you bring up the document it will show we both signed it on the date as being here, this is the formal complaint, you sign it, I sign it, it's dated. You know, that's my understanding of it.
248 Q. okay. I think you were asking was there anything else and he mentioned just the issue in relation to the disciplinary investigation. You may not have connected the dots there. But it is referencing a statement to Superintendent Lacey, he says:
"I don't know who is in charge of the investigation, l have written to find out, I don't know."

And you said:
"I'Il see if l can find out."

He says:
"Good. Wbuld it have been someone who retired."

He says:
"I thi nk it was Jack Nol an."

So he just raises that issue with you at the end. And I think it didn't get raised as an issue again.

Now, I think it is his evidence that he only met you once and that was the one occasion, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chair.

249 Q. We will come to correspondence where you do offer to meet him subsequently to sit down with him, is that right?
A. Absolutely, Chair.
Q. But I think it never happened?
A. It didn't happen, even though I did, I think, I counted up nine or ten times where I did offer to meet him, Chair.

251

And on the --
CHA RMAN I thought December.
MS. MEGRATH Sorry, December. 1st December, sorry, 2017. I think, as you say, it was, I will just get his name correctly, Chief Superintendent Tom Myers was assisting you and we know and we have seen in the papers that he drew up a job sheet effectively for the investigation, is that right?
A. Yeah. We met subsequently, Chair.

253 Q.
It was quite a detailed job sheet. It's at 4234. I think you didn't simply confine the jobs sheet to the issue of Pat Murray, Mark Curran and Lorraine wheatley. I think you looked into a number of issues in respect of a number of the officers, is that right, on the jobs sheet. Issues arising in respect of Noreen McBrien?
A. We met first, it was a sort of original brain dump to put everything in the mix and see, you know -- I recal1, we'11 say, going back to my own office and going through his statement, kind of breaking down the different components to it and seeing who was involved going go. It was kind of, I suppose, a brain dumping initially as to where we were going go, yeah.
254 Q. Okay. Now, at this stage then you also send out the
grievance document to Garda Keogh, isn't that right, around this time?
A. Yes.
Q. As you had undertaken to do so at the meeting. Now, you also write a letter to the assistant commissioner of Eastern Region, Assistant Commissioner Fanning. If we look at this for a moment, at 4251.
A. Yes, Chair, I have it here.
Q. And at 4251 you say:
"With reference to the above, at a meeting with Garda Keogh in Mullingar he hi ghl ighted a number of matters that I consider to be outside of the scope of the matters that I aminvestigating. These matters are set out in the attached addendumthat Garda Keogh provi ded to me on 1st December 2017."

So the synopsis of the matters that you considered to be outside your scope are:
"1. Del ay in investi gating hi s compl ai nt made under the pol i cy gui del i nes to Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an on 2nd March 2017 and the circumstances surrounding the di scovery of the del ay.
2. Sergeant Gui nan checked his car on Pul se on 5th May 12:04 2017.
3. Hi s compl ai nt in rel ation to an incident on 21st December 2015 i nvol ving a motor car whi ch had an incorrect time inserted.
4. He is currently incorrectly recorded and marked sick.
5. He has not been informed of who is investigating his complaint in rel ation to Garda collusion in the drugs trade in the midlands."

Now, I think they were taken from the addendum effectively that he gave you that day?
A. Yeah.

Is that right?
A. That's my understanding.

258 Q. You say:
"At this point in time it would appear that matters
incl uded in this addendumare outside the scope of my
appoi nt ment I wi sh to be dealt with under the grievance
procedure. I have expl ai ned to Garda Keogh and his solicitor, Mr. Cullen, that these matters are currently outside the scope of my appointment."

That is dated 4th December 2017
A. Yes, Chairman.

259 Q. Now, you get a response, by e-mail I think, from Assistant Commissioner Fanning, at 4278, if we could just look at that. This is a couple of days later, on ${ }^{12: 05}$ the 7th December. He says:

[^3]Can you see where I am? Just go down please.
A. I have it, thank you, 4278, yeah.
Q. He says:
"Give me a shout.

I don't want to open the attachment."

That was the letter I think.
A. Yes.
Q. "If there is a revi ew l'll have to come to it with clean hands."

Because at that stage he's the appointing officer and will have to do the review under the policy.
A. Yes.

262 Q. "I've had no role whatsoever on the grievance
procedure, it would be up to Garda Keogh to utilise the policy if he wi shes. I've set out in the code and I'm not aware of any procedure to transfer it across from 12:06 B\&H to a grievances process.

I am of the view that if there is an issue about the pol icy, then you can going to HRPD, as HRPD who owns and monitors the policy. My role is very narrowin the 12:06 process.

My sense is that you investigate all the issues Garda Keogh raises. I'm not sure you can arbitrarily
det er mi ne somet hi ng is not bullying et cetera and then progress to determine it is a grievance procedure.
Si milarly, if there is some criminal allegation then it has to be visited. My sense is you are investigating on the basis of the contents of Garda Keogh's issues and then deci de whet her the conduct amounts to bullying, har assment or victimisation etcetera or if it fails to meet the criteria.

Once you are fini shed then you sent the parties your out put et cet era.

If any parties are dissatisfied, then they can ask me revi ew the files. For that reason I don't want any prior invol vement."

Now, You actually reply back a couple of minutes later, at 8:15, which is just above that, stil1 on 4278.
A. Yeah.

263 Q. You come back, you say:
"I have no probl em with B\&H stuff but the probl emthat the new stuff that he brought to the table is not in $B \& H$.

I can onl y take this to JBin HRMif you think that I am on the wrong road but I sense that I am correct as I am onl y doing B\&H and this is additional stuff outside the scope of that."

So, you know, the lack of clarity in the meeting on the 1st December around this issue has now translated into a letter which you're sending to the assistant commissioner, your appointing officer, but it is put back on your desk effectively; is that right
A. So to speak, yeah.
A. Yes.

268 Q. Because it does come up a little later where you are asking for a timeline later on in your investigation of the delay. So if we just stay with the correspondence for a moment and around this time. We're still in very
early December. You get a letter from John Gerard Cullen on the 5th December, this is four days after your meeting. It's at page 390 of the book. If we just look at the headings, the Chairman has seen this letter before. He talks about the fragmentation of the 12:08 documenting of the complaint. I think that is effectively a complaint by him that you didn't have all the material on the day you met him?
A. That's right.

269 Q. You knew that he was unhappy about that, did you?
A. Yeah, I did, yeah. Yeah. while I had a lot of material, I suppose the material wasn't -- what I had wasn't suitable because it didn't have the indexation to it, we'll say, so I couldn't make full sense of it, chair, yeah.
270 Q. He talks about -- the next page, Mr. Barnes, if --there is the fragmentation of the documentation issue, he talks about procedural fragmentation?
A. Yes.

271 Q. It being lost and having no answers and nobody has ever 12:09 explained what happened. Do you accept that Garda Keogh's position was that at the time, nobody had gone back to him? He seemed unaware to you as to where it had gone for the previous eight months. would you accept that as a bona fide issue on his part?
A. I think in fairness to him, it was, Chair, yeah. You know, he made the complaint I suppose in, whatever it was, March and here am I in December, you know, November/December. So I think it is probably fair, they had some -- they that he had a complaint in relation to that. Assistant Commissioner Finn was his concept of scopi ng. "

Now he was quite critical. There's quite a lot of criticism of this in the letter. What do you have to say about that to the Chairman?
A. I was slightly taken aback, Chair, I suppose, when I got it. I thought -- I thought I was doing a good job trying to explain to him where I was going in the meeting on the day, but he obviously didn't share my view on it, you know. But then again, I suppose you have to maybe look at it from his perspective. He didn't -- he wasn't aware of the gap between John Scanlan taking the statement and it coming to me. And I suppose he didn't understand why, when I arrived the first day to meet him, that I didn't have John Scanlan's statement and all the appendices. He didn't understand, I suppose, where I was coming from and maybe I didn't understand where he was coming from. But you could understand why he had this state of mind to some extent, Chair. But I did think he was being a little bit hard on me, so to speak.
273 Q. He clarifies there and talks about Superintendent Murray there in the last two paragraphs in some detail?
A. Yes, Chair. And he only named Superintendent Murray, which caused me a little bit of alarm at the time, you know. Because I suppose I had come away from the meeting thinking he has named three people and I am looking for clarity and all $I$ hear in this correspondence is Superintendent Murray. So I think I write back to him saying, who exactly are we clarifying that you are making a complaint against here.
274 Q. Well, if we go on to the next page, he mentions Superintendent Murray again. He says in the second paragraph:
"Pl ease note that subject to the foregoing reservations, Garda Keogh is gl ad that his compl ai nt has now finally been redi scovered and is looking forward to the adj udi cation on Superintendent Murray in particular."

It says:
"When the Tri bunal of investi gation under Assi stant Commissi oner Finn gets the opportunity to read the entire document and take account of the compl ai nt agai nst Superintendent Murray, Garda Keogh is available through his sol icitor to answer any questions rel ating to the bullying, harassment and victimisation by Superintendent Murray."

So, you are quite right, there's a number of references
there to Superintendent Murray.
A. Yeah. That caused me a bit of alarm now, Chair, when I read that, you know, I was saying, does he just think it's Superintendent Murray. So that's is why I went back to him, Chair.
Q. You say, for example, at number 3:
"I liai sed with your client in advance of the meeting
on 1st December 2017 to ascertain the nature of his compl ai nt. "
A. Yeah, that was the bit about he telling me to get John Scanlan's statement, you know.
277 Q. But he is proactive about it, would you accept that? He is the one who is phoning Inspector Browne and saying there is a complaint here?
A. We11, he did that in response to my letter, saying, look, I want to meet you, take a complaint. And he was saying well, before you come to see me, you should really read this letter or this statement, so I went off and got it, yeah.
278 Q. You say at 4:
"Your client requested that I read the statement that he made on 27th March 2017 before I meet him Which I did.
5. I was not in possessi on of the appendi ces that he referred to in his statement."

I think you confirmed now in your evidence and clarified you had some of the appendices but not all of them; is that right?
A. Yes, correct, Chair.
what did you mean by any third party?
A. Well, I mean it wasn't his solicitor, we'11 say. I wanted to hear from him, tell me, you know, you're the complainant, I need to meet you.
Q. You say at the top of the next page:
"I have consi dered the document । recei ved on 1st Decenber 2017 to your client's complaint."

Is that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

281 Q. You say:
"। undertook to meet your client again when I had time to read and study the 19 page narrative and 14 vol umi nous appendi ces and two page addendum
9. I expl ai ned to your client that I was not aware fromreading his statement the exact nature of the persons that he was alleging were the subject of his compl ai nt. "

You go on to talk about the scope. At number 11.
"I expl ai ned to your client that my appoint ment was to i nvesti gate the allegations of bullying and harassment 12:14 and if any matters are outsi de the scope it is not within my current terms of reference to investigate such matters."

At 12 you talk about the grievance issue. 13, you gave 12:14 him a copy of the policy. Can I ask you to look at 15:
"Your client named three persons that he stated were the persons that were responsi ble for bullying and harassing him The three persons are, Superintendent 12:14 Pat Murray, Chi ef Superintendent Mark Curran and Chi ef Superintendent Lorrai ne Wheatley."

So again, I think you're accepting there that you were clear at the end of the meeting on the 1st December who 12:14 was at issue in relation to the --
A. Yeah, but the alarm came from his letter of the 5th December, where he just named Superintendent Pat Murray. If you understand, Chair, what I'm on about here. The previous matter you brought up to me there. saying that he has named three people. You don't in fact refer to the Murray issue in this letter, isn't that right?
A. No, but that's the context. I mean that's the very same day I wrote back to him, to say, look, you just wrote to me on the 5 th December and you spoke about Superintendent Murray only, which caused me some alarm, I suppose, because I left the meeting on the 1st December thinking it's three people, here yet in his written correspondence he doesn't make any reference to it. So I just wanted to clarify that point again, Chair.

283 Q. At number 19 you talk about the scoping, you say:
"It was in the context of establishing identity of persons that your client was making allegations of bullying and harassment."

You indicated in your investigation that you would be fair to all parties, you would adhere to the principles of natural justice and fair procedures for all. But you say in number 21:
"I have forwarded a copy of your letter to the Garda commi ssi oner, as there are matters cont ai ned therein that are currently outside the scope of my i nvesti gation. "

Is that consider?
A. Yes, Chair.

284 Q. To the Garda --
A. That's why I think, Chair, we're missing a little piece
there between my correspondence with Assistant Commissioner Fanning, that either he took, undertook to do something or there is another piece missing I think there from the chief.
A. That I am flagging the bits that I felt were outside the scope of bullying and harassment.
Q. Just to be very precise, commissioner, you flag them to Assistant Commissioner Fanning?
A. Yes.

287 Q. Who puts them back in your court firmly?
A. Yes.
Q. But you are saying in this letter that you have forwarded a copy of the letter of the 5 th December to the Garda Commissioner. Is that an error?
A. I'd say it's an error, Chair. My understanding is that either AC Fanning told me or -- I'm being unfair to him now. But my understanding that it did go subsequently to either John Barrett or it went up some place along the line anyway. I'm sure if I go rooting, I will find some piece of correspondence to make that link, you know.

289 Q. Again, just to be very clear, did you, because you are saying you forwarded a letter to the Garda Commissioner?
A. No, I didn't, Chair, that's wrong, I didn't do that.
Q. Okay. To your knowledge were these issues ever brought to the attention past Assistant Commissioner Fanning?
A. That the bit, Chair, I think I'm missing. There's a
piece of correspondence missing here, you know. well, from you, can I just ask you?
A. oh, I can't recall did I write to, we'11 say, John Barrett or did AC Fanning say he wrote to J Barrett. But I have a funny feeling I have some piece of correspondence there, Chair.
Q. okay, we can certainly look into that.
A. Yeah.
Q. We just haven't seen in the papers. So on the next page then you confirm you have not been invited to any meetings between the acting Garda Commissioner and the chef administrative officer in relation to Garda Keogh.
A. Yeah. That's in the context of some of the stuff that was in the addendum to the statement that he provided, we'11 say.
And if he is alleging criminal matters, he must articulate those matters clearly.
A. Yeah. Again, I was trying to explain, look, there's reference here to stuff that -- I think there was mention of corporate criminality. Actually, that was the phrase, yeah. There was a mention of corporate criminality. This wasn't -- I suppose corporate bullying now. This was a phrase his solicitor mentioned to me, corporate criminality. I never heard of corporate criminality, Chair. So that's why I sent it back to him, you know, if you're alleging corporate criminality, that's outside my scope anyway.
295 Q. Well, can I ask you now, Commissioner Finn, because at this point there is a very complex factual matrix
falling into place here, in the sense that Garda Keogh is somebody who was coming from a protected disclosures background, there had been an extensive criminal investigation and --
A. No, I wasn't really privy to that. I didn't know about ${ }_{12: 18}$ that, to be honest, Chair.
Q. Did you know had all his background, his contextual background in this regard?
A. I wouldn't have any great knowledge of it, chair. It wasn't in my region, so it was really hitting my radar. 12:18 some correspondence relating to Garda Keogh did cross my boughs at one stage when I was acting for Assistant Commissioner Fanning, he was away, but that's a separate matter.
297 Q. But certainly in the complaint that you got and in that 12:18 extensive statement to Chief Superintendent Scanlan, this issue is dropping into the picture relatively frequently, the issue of the ó Cualáin investigation, the issue of the complaint he made as a protected disclosure. To what extent were you briefed on that, 12:19 did you know about it, could you put any of these complaints in a factual context?
A. Not really, Chair, no.

298 Q. okay. You finish your letter and you say:
"In the light of the extensive correspondence provi ded by your complaint, I wish to meet with himearly next week to further clarify the issues, incl udi ng the statement of complaint provided to me on 1st Decenber
2017."

Now, as you have said to the Chairman, this didn't actually happen subsequently, isn't that right?
A. No, and this is one of examples of where -- I said,

12:19 look, I'm prepared to meet your client, yeah, because I took exception to the fact that he said in his direct evidence that there was no second meeting, as if I did nothing, like you know. That wasn't my take on it.

299 Q. He comes back to you, Mr. Cullen comes back to you on 13/12/2017. This is at page 396 of the book?
A. Yeah.
Q. Now he is referring to your letter, which was actually the 5 th but received on the 7th December I think, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. He's referring to the 25 points in your letter?
A. Yeah.

302 Q. He is referencing again there, in the third paragraph, that there in fact there had been numerous references in a complaint to Superintendent Pat Murray and to two other persons. So in one way it's similar to the letter of the 5th. And on the next page again. He is talking about the extracts from the complaint that make specific reference to Pat Murray?
A. Yeah.

303 Q. And he says, in the middle of the page:

[^4]was bei ng compl ai ned about?"

Is that a legitimate question for him to ask?
A. No. I think we have gone through that ad nauseam, Chair. It was very unclear. Even, I would call reading other correspondence, before this ever got to me, that people weren't sure (a) is this something that should be dealt with under bullying and harassment, or (b), who exactly was included. Because, as I said, there were 25 different people named in it.
304 Q. He goes on to say:
"It is submitted, furthernore, that not withstanding the written complaint made, there is neither in your letter nor at the meeting any attempt to engage with any of the detail and/ or the text of the complaint made agai nst Superintendent Pat Murray, Chi ef Superintendent Mark Curran or Chi ef Superintendent Weatley. Why?"
A. Because that was just my first meeting with him, Chair.

305 Q. I think it's one of his complaints to this day that you didn't engage with him in respect of the detail or text of his complaint?
A. At ten different times, Chair, if I am not mistaken, I wrote him looking to have a second meeting. He didn't take it up.
306 Q. I think what became an issue between the two of you effectively then, is at the top of the next page of the letter, where there is a request to have the meetings electronically recorded from then on, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chair, yeah, yeah.

307 Q. It was noted there at the start of your evidence, when we were talking about the minutes that we looked at, that they didn't appear to be a complete or verbatim
record. He says in that page, he says:
"Given that a note was being taken by your assistant, it would appear appropriate that an objective effort mi ght be made at the next..."

CHA RMAN I can't see that, Ms. McGrath.
MS. MEGRATH Sorry. I have gone ahead. Sorry, Mr. Barnes, I'm on the top of the next page. CHAN RMAN what page?
MS. MEGRATH 399. The top of the next page. He says: 12:22
"We respectfully suggest that in future when we are meeting that perhaps the meeting mi ght be el ectroni cally recorded in order that there is an obj ective reference to such meetings and in light of
what happened to Sergeant McCabe in Mullingar. Gi ven that a note was being taken by your assi stant, it would appear appropriate that an objective record might be made at the next meeting in circunstances where there have been so many red herrings together with a failure 12:23 to investigate any of the details and/or text of the Gar da Keogh's compl ai nt in accordance with the of ficial and publ ished Garda procedures and fair procedures."

So, what do you say to that request by Garda Keogh? think you didn't reject it out of hand, I think you asked for advice in relation to this. You asked Ms. Hassett, is that right?
A. Correct, Chair, in the context this never happened to me before, that somebody would look to have, you know, like a stenographer present to do a bullying and harassment investigation interview. So I was saying, look, it's outside our norm. So, I said, look, I won't exclude it, I'11 go off and ask our own HR people can we do that. I had never heard of it. But I mean, I was slightly unhappy, Chair, with his reference to, you know, Sergeant McCabe in Mullingar, as if like I was trying to do something untoward here in terms of -that I was trying to be --
CHAL RMAN Yes, it's an accusation.
A. Yeah.
Q. ME. MEGRATH I think you go on to look into it but effectively that issue rumbles on between the two of you?
A. It does, yeah.

309 Q. Is that right?
A. At the end of the day, Chair, I said to him, look, I'm not going to -- there's no provision for us to do this, I'm not going to do it. If you want to record me, fine, I've no problem with that, you know. At the end of the day, let's agree whatever the minutes are, we will sign them agree them, if that's the case, I have no problem with that, you know. But I didn't -- we
didn't have the mechanism in An Garda Síochána, to say, look, you're like a prisoner, bring you in here, you know, put on the cameras. we had no provision for that, chair.
Can I ask you, we are now on the 13th December, so I am 12:24 sorry this is going a little bit slowly, but can I ask you to look at -- we just mentioned there a moment ago that Chief Superintendent Myers was your assistant and he drew up a job sheet. We have an e-mail here that I would like to ask you about from Chief Superintendent Myers to you, at page 4263?
A. Yeah.
Q.

It's around the time of the first letter from mr. Cullen, it's the 5th December. Now, we know, having checked, I think the date and time at the top ${ }_{\text {12:24 }}$ you can just ignore because that's just a printout date?
A. I have it here, Chairman.
Q. The date of the e-mail is $5 / 12$ at $12: 03$, that is clear from page 4262 of the book. Anyway, can we just look 12:25 at the e-mail? He says:
"A few observations fromthe file."

So he is looking at the statement of complaint to Chief 12:25 Superintendent Scanlan, is that right?
A. I can only assume that, Chairman, I couldn't clarify that.

313 Q. He says:
> "They set out to and clarify, they.

Seni or managers, clarify who."

So it the case that there is still confusion or lack of clarity at this stage, even though we have seen a number of letters.
A. Yes.

We've referenced the three people that are at issue?
A. This is the 5th December, the same day that he wrote to me with just Superintendent Murray on the
correspondence. But I would say, to be fair to Chief Superintendent Myers, that this was probably in
response to our meeting on the 1st, you know, and the statement that day, yeah.

315 Q. He says there at number 5:
"J udge MEMahon re mini i nvesti gations."

This is coming from Garda Keogh's complaints. It says:
"J udge McMahon not running the Gar daí."

Is this Chief Superintendent Myers' observation?
A. Obviously, yes, Chair, not mine anyway.

316 Q. He says:
'Ils Ol ivia O' Neill Garda Keogh's source. He emphasi ses
she spont aneously and wi thout..."
A. I suppose getting back to Judge McMahon, we'11 say, just to put that in context, I mean he is the confidential recipient, we'11 say, he's the conduit, so 12:26 to speak, and it isn't for him for telling the commissioner to be -- you know, that's not his role, I suppose, and I don't think --
CHA RMAN Sorry, that's a reference to Garda Keogh's citation of Judge McMahon, when he quoted Judge McMahon as saying that you couldn't have mini investigations?
A. Exactly.

318 Q. CHAN RMAN Or a number, a multiplicity of investigations.
A. Yes.

319 Q. CHA RMAN That was Garda Keogh's response to people in Ath1one wishing to investigate things and he referred to and cited Judge McMahon as condemning that as being found the Morris Tribunal report?
A. Yes.

320 Q. CHA RMAN Rightly or wrongly, that's the evidence about that. But I take it this is the chief superintendent looking through the materials supplied?
A. On the 1st.

321 Q. CHAN RMAN By Mr. Cullen and Garda Keogh? 12:27
A. Correct.

322 Q. CHA RMAN And he is making notes. Am I understanding that correctly?
A. That's correct, Chair, that's my interpretation of it.

323
Q. MG. MEGRATH I think what I just want to ask you there, for example, if you look at 11 and 12:
"A thorough investigation of car insurance issues."

Now This was about the motor tax issue and he says:
"Not our role."
A. Yeah.
Q.
"Strict supervision by three sergeants. May well be justified."

Is that an element of prejudgement of the issues that have come in to your investigation, commissioner?
A. It's his note, Chair, it's not mine, like you know.
Q. He says at number 15 , for example:
"Sharing of shifts with Garda A. Garda Keogh could have taken up the offer of transfer."

Again, this is looking at the substantive issues.
A. I think that's probably the issue that came up from his complaint, you know, this thing with the gun, you know, he's saying that Garda A came in.
327 Q. What I want to ask you about is this, if you even go to

16:
"Wtness writing their own statements."

He says:
"Not good practice."
A. Yes.
Q. "Super being oppressi ve/irrational. Strong governance perhaps under 6.8 for both theft at Mblloy s and robbery fromthe person."
A. Yes.

329 Q. The reason I'm asking you about this is because my understanding of the policy that you go to the persons complained about from a bullying and harassment perspective and you get their side of the story. This seems a little bit different. This seems to be an analysis of the actual complaint and whether the underlying facts of the complaints themselves stand up at all, even without going to the other people?
A. I'd say it's just probably his assessment of -- you know, he read the statement and they were probably his initial comments having read it, like you know, without having any investigation done at all, like you know.
330 Q. He says under annual, for example:
"He admitted the breach reaffirmed by Chi ef Superintendent Wheatley after appeal.
20. Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an's file missing."

He decides:
"Unsat i sf act ory."
A. I assume he's referring to the delay, they were themselves, as in the facts underlying the individual complaints and whether they stand up at all, even before you have spoken to anybody?
A. I wouldn't say that. That wouldn't be my reading of it, Chair. I think he just read the statement and this is his initial comment from reading it, you know. But like that was before we ever started the investigation. That was...

332 Q. Now, as you say, you had notified people that you had been appointed, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chair.

333 Q. If we look at this stage -- and, as I say, I'm sorry we are going a little bit slowly. You remember you got that letter in from 13/12 from John Gerard Cullen. You reply back on the 15 th, at 4287 . And you say to him in 12:30 the second paragraph:
"I would like you to confirmthat all of the material that your client wi shes to provide is included in the
correspondence that he gave to me on 1st December 2017 and your subsequent e-nail of 5th Decenber 2017.

As requested in my letter of 7th December 2017, I wi sh to meet your client again to clarify the matters that rai sed in my correspondence of that date. Thi s meeting will al so provide your client with an opportunity to add and provi de clarity to his statement and appendices as the entire content of this material was not in my possession in advance of our meeting on 1st Decenber 2017.

Wile your correspondence of 13th December 2017 i ndi cates clearly that Superintendent Murray is the subj ect of your client's compl ai nt, his statement makes reference to a number of ot her menbers of An Garda Sí ochána.

On 1st December 2017 your client specifically named the following members as being the subject of his compl ai nt: Chi ef Superintendent Mark Curran, Chi ef Superintendent Lorrai ne Wheatley and Superintendent Pat Murray."

So this is going to the issue you talked about earlier, 12:31 that his letters were concentrating on Superintendent Murray?
A. Yeah.

334 Q. And you say:
"However, in your client's statement you refer to other members but did not confirmif compl ai nts were being made agai nst these persons when clarification was sought by me on 7th December 2017.

It is for the purpose of seeking clarification that l have sought to meet your client again as outlined in my correspondence of 7th Decenber 2017.

I would appreciate if your client would meet with me or i ndi cate in writing if persons ot her than the members outlined above are the subject of his compl ai nt of bull ying and harassment."

Isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

335 Q. okay. Now, that is a letter back on the 15th to Mr. Cullen and on the 15th December you are writing to a number of people, you are writing actually to Chief Superintendent Mark Curran, Superintendent Pat Murray and Chief Superintendent Lorraine wheatley. Can I just ask you, we won't look at them all, but 4291, for example, is the letter to Chief Superintendent Mark Curran. You refer to the letter where you told him you 12:32 were appointed?
A. Yes.

336 Q. You te11 him on the 1st December you met with Garda Keogh, you sought additional clarification and
correspondence:
"Garda Keogh has confirmed to me that you are one of the people that he is alleging was invol ved in his complaint. I now wi sh to meet with you to put to you the compl ai nt put by Garda Keogh.

Pl ease note that I have advi sed Assi stant Commi ssi oner Fanning that I will not have been in the position to compl ete the investigation within the timeframe set out in the gui delines for working together but l will make every effort to compl ete the investigation as expeditiously as possible."

So, you say you want to meet him, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair, yeah.

337 Q. You also send the same letter to Chief Superintendent wheatley and you send it to Superintendent Pat Murray, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chair.

338 Q. So at this stage the investigation is effectively clearly on the road, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

339 Q. When you talk to these other people.
A. Yeah.

340 Q. When he comes back to you -- I think later on in the month, on the 21st December, John Gerard Cullen comes back to you in relation to this issue. 4324. I am sorry I am opening so much correspondence but I just
think in fairness to you, to make it clear what was happening between the two of you and the offers to meet or what was going on. So it's at 4324.
A. I have it here now.

341 Q. He is talking there at the bottom of that last paragraph and he is effectively -- we won't go into it too much detail, but he is confirming it's Superintendent Pat Murray, Mark Curran and Lorraine wheatley, isn't that right, named in the complaint?
A. Yes.

342 Q. On the next page, the last paragraph again, is the reference to electronic recording, that you might nominate dates after the holiday period for a further meeting, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

343 Q. So effectively you are both getting nowhere on the issue at this stage. It's still a live issue between you with, meeting again or the electronic recording issue, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, Chair.

344 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, what do you say to that?
A. I'm agreeing, Chair.

345 Q. CHA RMAN with?
A. I'm agreeing that we're still communicating to arrange the meeting and resolve the issues about recording or how it was going to be conducted, shall we say.
346 Q. M. MtGRATH Can I ask you at this stage to look at a document --
A. After the holidays.

347 Q. -- you mention in your statement. Because at this stage you had written to the three individuals but Superintendent Murray came back to you on the 20th December and he raised concerns about the legality of the investigation while the civil proceedings were ongoing, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chair.

348 Q. I think this is the first time then this issue is starting to raise its head?
A. Yes.

349 Q. Of possible further delay. You acknowledge his correspondence but you say in your statement:
"I remai ned unsi ght ed of the legal issues he was referring to."
A. That's correct.
Q. We know that at this particular time there were civil proceedings issued by Garda Keogh?
A. If you bring up that, sorry, what page are you on there?
351 Q. This is on your statement at page 4110.
352 Q. CHA RMAN It's page 6 of your statement.
A. Fine. Thank you, Chair.

353 Q. MS. MEGRATH It's that paragraph there.
"On 20th December 2017, Superintendent Murray rai sed issues concerning the legal ity of my investigation."
A. Yes, I am with you now.

354 Q. "Hi ghl ighting the fact that civil proceedi ngs mirrored
and inexorably linked were before the Hi gh Court since Novenber 2016. I acknow edged Superintendent Murray's correspondence and advi sed himthat I remai ned unsi ghted of the legal issues as they were in the incl uded in my material that I had received."
A. Yes, Chair.

355 Q. You forward his correspondence to Joe Nugent CAO, and advised him that:
"...it was unsi ghted material, that would suggest the process that l have embarked on was going to appear as links to other matters bef ore the courts at the times."

Now, I think this again bubbled along for quite some time, isn't that right?
A. Yeah. I suppose they raised this issue -- or Superintendent Murray raised the issue about, you know, the legality of what $I$ was doing, was it going to be ultra vires, bearing in mind -- so I decided I would go off and get some legal advice on that matter.
356 Q. You speak to Superintendent Murray the following day. There's a note of this conversation in Superintendent Murray's documentation that he has provided to us in audio files. Page 12309, please, if we could just have that?
A. In audio files?

357 Q. We11, these are files that were kept by Superintendent Murray. Now you may have seen these in the papers. But he records having spoken to you?

MR. MRPHY: Chairman, I wonder if my Friend could establish, she used the word audio but I think it's in a note.
M. MEGRATH It is a note from audio file, sorry, my Friend is correct.
CHA RMAN I don't know what an audio file is.
A. Recording of audio.

CHAI RMAN I know what the words mean. Could you clarify that, Ms. McGrath.
M. MtGRATH well, if we could open the page maybe, 12305.

CHA RMAN Yes. Anyway, it's Superintendent Murray's note.
A. That's correct.

MR. MRPHY: yes.
CHA RMAN oh, it's a transcript, okay.
M. MtGRATH So, it says transcript of audio notes from bullying file. These were maintained by Superintendent Murray.
A. I didn't know he was recording me, Chair.

MR MRPH: Chairman --
M. MEGRATH We11, it's not a recording, it's his note that he makes afterwards, I understand.
CHAI RMAN He presumably dictated a note after.
A. Sorry, Chair.

358 Q. CHAI RMAN Or at least he may have dictated a note afterwards?

MS. MtGRATH Dictated notes, exactly CHA RMAN It's actually simply his note.
A. Sorry, I was confused, Chair.
Q. CHA RMAN No, no, you're entitled to be confused. I was confused. But I think for the moment we will assume that that is the case,?
A. He may have, okay, I'm with you now. CHA RMAN Un1ess directed, that's the default. okay.
Q. MG. MEGATH For example, just so we stay in context, because, as I say, these are all in the brief from page 12305 onwards. Sorry, Mr. Barnes, can you go back please just to the cover page that I asked you to open, 12:39 12305. So if you go down there to the next page, the 14th December, we have already gone past this date but there was:
"Call from M Finn. Answered. With chi ef in my office bef ore policing Commíssion meeting, soltold himl coul dn't tal k."

So you see that he is just making notes of contact between the two of you?
A. Okay, Chair, yeah.
Q. He says on the 15th, on the next day, for example:
"Recei ved e-mail from AC Finn with attachment requesting meeting."

That is the document, the letter we saw.
A. okay.

362 Q. He says on the 20th:
"I replied by e-mail setting out my position."
A. Yes.

363 Q. So that was the legal issue that we saw, the letter of
the 20th December?
A. Yes, Chair.

364 Q. Then he says you replied to him on the 21st, which you have also recorded in your statement. That was where you said you were unsighted about the legal issues.
A. Yeah.

365 Q. Now here is his note from the 22/12:
"Phoned hi mat 15: 56 for 23 mi nutes and 39 seconds. Di scussed the various linked issues with him He said he was unaware of civil case, my promotion issues and that another AC had ref used the appoi nt ment. Becare concerned at all of this."

Do you remember this phone cal1?
A. No, Chair.

366 Q. "Al so he said he was not aware we had all recei ved Garda Keogh's material. Expl ai ned Iegal issues to him and PA views as outlined by H Hall to me today and he said he would contact Joe Nugent and Kate Mul hearns re I egal issues. He sai d he could look at my 338-page issues through the organi sation and J Nugent. I offered to meet himas early as possible. He said he was off with a bad back."
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That's you, I think, isn't it?
A. That's me, Chair, yeah.

367 Q. "And would be back in the new year. I offered to drive to Cork if necessary. Sent hime-mail then as he requested setting out the legal issues."

Do you remember that at a11? That you were offering to look at his 338-page civil file document?
A. I would disagree with that in the context that as
things rolled on, we'11 say, he didn't want to share that -- I wouldn't say he didn't want to, he had difficulty sharing that document with me in terms of his legal advice or that was my understanding anyway, Chair, yeah.
368 Q. Can we be just very clear on this, commissioner, is it the fact that the phone call occurred but you don't remember it, or you're saying you don't think this phone call ever happened?
A. I don't remember it, chair. It could have happened. I 12:41 honest to God have no recollection of it, yeah.

369 Q. I think the issues there are quite serious and clear because you knew there was a legal issue arising on an issue of ultra vires. Are you sure, it's your evidence to the Chairman that you don't remember this discussion 12:41 and a discussion of perhaps looking at the civil proceedings?
A. No.
Q. Is it something you might have offered to do?
A. which bit?

371 Q. That you would look at the civil proceedings, his 338-page document on the civil proceedings?
A. Well if it was helping me with my enquiry, I'd probably would be delighted to get it, Chair, yeah.
Q. But as you say, did that ever happen?
A. No.
A. No, Chair no. I mean I was looking for it, but I didn't get it, you know.

374 Q. Now, that takes us up to the 22nd December and it is a long phone call, 23 minutes, 39 seconds, you'd accept that?
A. Absolutely, Chair, yeah.

375 Q. Is it surprising that you don't remember the cal1? 12:42
A. Now, Chair, I have to confess, I was in bed with my back at that stage, you know. I think I might have taken a bit too much medication, because when I went initially to the doctor, we'11 say, he put me on medication for the back. Sorry, a small bit of history 12:43 here.

376 Q. CHA RMAK Take your time.
A. I had a back operation, Chair.

377 Q. CHAN RMAN There's no problem.
A. I had a serious back operation going back when I was a 12:43 young guard, we'11 say, and I ended up working in administration for a file. Anyway, every now and again it does act up on me. And it did act up on me around this time because I remember I was scheduled to chair a
meeting about my divisional policing model, which was a project I was leading out on, and I couldn't do it because my back went into seizure. So $I$ was home in cork.

378 Q.
CHA RMAN We're talking about the 20th and so on of December?
A. Yeah. Those few days, yeah.

379 Q. CHA RMAN So were you in bed at home?
A. I think I was, Chair, yeah.

380 Q
CHA RMAN Were you doing this on the e-mail from home?
A. Correct.

381 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. If it was a phone cal1, Chair, probably maybe a phone cal1 over, you know, over the -- I mean obviously I took the phone call. I recal1, and my wife will verify this, 1 took medication initially, we'11 say, you know, and then I went back to my doctor because it wasn't working, and he gave me stronger medication. I think it was overlapping, you know.
382 Q. CHAN RMAN okay.
A. My wife still refers back to this time. I'm a bit embarrassed, Chair.

CHAN RMAN okay.
383 Q. ME. MEGRATH Now, I think --
A. I'm a bit embarrassed because actually she says I was 12:44 out for a few days because of my medication. Sorry, Chair. More embarrassing than anything.

384 Q. MS. MEGRATH Not at all, commissioner.
A. But actually, if this phone call happened at this time,
it could be a logical explanation why I can't remember, yeah.
Now, you say you were -- it records that you became concerned with all of that information that you were getting and I think we do know that, as you said in your statement, you had written off to Joe Nugent about this issue in any event?
A. Yeah, I do remember, Chair, we'11 say, he raising the issue about he had a concern himself, we'11 say, that there was civil proceedings, you know, giving stuff to me, would it be a conflict, because obviously whatever he gave to me I was going to be giving to Garda Keogh.
A. So I think he had an issue with that. So I knew that, we'11 say, at this point in time.
CHA RMAN okay.
387 Q. ME. MtGRATH Can I ask you then, what happens next, and you will be glad to know we move into January of 2018, on the 2nd January 2018, I think it might have been yourself or it might have been chief
Superintendent Myers took a statement from Chief Superintendent Scan7an to get the background of the taking of the statement and the timeframe?
A. That was myself. That was me, Chair, yeah.

388 Q. Okay. So at this stage you were jumping into the previously about grievances, were you jumping into the issue about the issue of delay, is that why you met Chief Superintendent Scan7an?
A. I thought it was much later actually when I met Chief Superintendent Scanlan. I don't think I met him in January, no.
389 Q.
We11, $I$ think he gives a date in his statement of the 2nd -- sorry, you are correct, it's 2nd February 2018. So it was February when you met him. Would you accept that?
A. I can find it, Chair.
Q. CHA RMAN Yes. You can find it if necessary.
A. Yeah. I can't actually remember the date.

391 Q. CHA RMAN Anyway, it didn't happen in January?
A. I'm pretty sure of that, yeah, yeah.
Q. MS. MEGRATH But you do remember taking a statement from him about the issue of the delay and the taking of his statement?
A. Oh, I did. I met him in his office, Chair, yeah. And in fairness, he actually typed it up there and then that day, you know, his secretary did.
393 Q. Can ask you, if Mr. Barnes could just bring up your statement at page 411, in the middle of it. At this stage you were writing, you see there, the 3rd January, all the personne1 that you wrote to?
A. Yes, Chair, yeah, yeah. Now, I think you clarify in the letter, and I am just taking a sample one, you say:
"Wile no specific allegation has been made agai nst you at this stage, you are mentioned in the statement of compl ai nt in respect of Garda Keogh's interactions."

> Is that right?
A. Yeah. I was trying to put it in context and maybe I suppose to allay some of their concerns.
Q. CHAN RMAN Yes.
A. They weren't necessarily named as somebody who he was complaining about.

MS. MEGRATH You say in the letter, this is the standard cover letter to these people, you say:
"As a result, it is necessary for a member of my i nvesti gation teamto intervi ew you in respect of the compl ai nt."
A. Yeah.

ME. MLGRATH In particular, you see number 7 there, Inspector Nicholas Farre11. I think you had a lot of correspondence with his solicitors, Reddy Charlton, because he was concerned we11, was a complaint being
made against me or not?
A. That's correct, Chair, yeah, yeah.

400 Q. I think by the end of January you wrote in explicit terms, particularly on 25th January 2018, to his solicitors and said you are not one of the persons against which he is making a complaint; is that right?
A. I didn't know, Chair, that AC Fanning had wrote to him and told him that you are one of the people, you know, that has been named, you know. Obviously I was confusing him then and writing him and saying, well you're not one of the people named.

CHA RMAN I think we will take a break there and we will continue after lunch.

MS. MEGRATH Thank you, commissioner.
CHA RMAN Okay, thanks very much. Two o'clock. Thank 12:47 you.

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

 FOLLOMS:CHAN RMAN Thank you very much.
401 Q. ME. MEGRATH Thank you, commissioner. Commissioner, I wonder if we can look at your statement in the book. It's page 8 of your statement internally, so that is 4112?
A. Yes, Chair.

402 Q. Just before lunch I had mentioned that in early January you had written to all of the other 1isted people and you had asked them for any comments and said that your
investigators would be in touch with them. So we're in early January at this stage. If we just look at your statement for a while, it might speed things up a little bit, if I try and use it a little bit more. So on page 4112 , at the top of the page. we mentioned earlier how Inspector Farrell had been seeking confirmation as to whether was in the frame and we know by the end of the month there were a couple of letters but you confirmed that he was not.
A. Yes.

403 Q. But if we just look at the second paragraph. So as early as 8th January 2018, you say in your statement:
"With the benefit of legal advice, I learned that the ci vil proceedi ngs were not a bar tol proceeding with my bullying and harassment investigation."
okay?
A. I'm not with you there.

404 Q. Sorry, we're in the second paragraph there.
A. Sorry, my apologies.

405 Q. Okay. So as early -- because if you remember, just before lunch we were talking about how this had arisen, particularly with Superintendent Murray, who had drawn this issue of the legal proceedings to your attention and we had talked about that phone call etcetera. So now you had gone and, as you said, you had notified joe Nugent, the CAO?
A. Yeah.

406 Q. And here you have the 8th January, you have legal advice coming back to you. Now do you refer to an appendices there, but it's redacted for legal professional privilege?
A. Yes, Chair.

407 Q. So there's no point in opening the document. But you confirm that proceedings were not a bar. So what you do then, in your statement you say:
"On 10th J anuary 2018 I wrote to Chi ef Superintendent Mark Curran, Chi ef Superintendent Lorraine Wheatley and Superintendent Pat Murray to informthemthat I had sought legal advice in rel ation to my investigation. I inf ormed themthat the fact that Garda Keogh had instigated legal proceedings was not a bar to the Garda 14:02 Commissioner ensuring that a proper investigation was conducted under the bullying and harassment policy."
okay?
A. Yes, Chair.

408 Q. Now, another thing happens on the 10th January, you get a further letter from Mr. Cullen. He is confirming that -- you remember you had asked him, had you given me everything you wanted to give me?
A. Yes, yes.

409 Q. He confirms he has. He confirms the identities of the Garda members against whom he was making the complaint. And he again raised the issue of electronic recording of future meetings in the light of what happened to

Sergeant McCabe in Mullingar?
A. Yes, Chair.

410 Q. So move on to the next day there in your statement, on 11th January 2018. This is where you e-mail Chief Superintendent wheatley and copy the letter you wrote on the 10th January to inform her that I had sought legal advice in relation to the investigative process. And again repeating that it wasn't a bar to you going ahead, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

411 Q. Now, on the 11th January, that day again, you then -Joe Nugent comes back to you requesting a brief of what had you been appointed to investigate. I think he was coming to you, he had received a request from Ms. Hall at the Policing Authority and he wanted some sort of an 14:03 indicative timeline for you as to what you were doing, isn't that right?
A. I think so.

412 Q. We will deal with that in probably more detail when you're recalled on issue number 20. But staying with
the 11th January, you reached out around this time to both Chief Superintendent Curran and Superintendent Murray. If I could just ask you to open page 5956 of the book. So at 5956, if you can just -- so it's 5956, it's from you, the 11th January, the date we're on, to 14:04 Mark Curran, untitled. If you go to the next page, just keep scrolling down please, Mr. Kavanagh. It says "talk to me". Can you just tell the Chairman about that e-mail? Was Chief Superintendent Curran not
coming back to you or what was this about? what did you want him to talk to you about?
A. I'd imagine, chair, about making -- arranging to meet him, yeah.
413 Q. It's phrased in an odd way, maybe. You can accept or reject that. But you say "talk to me". Do you see where I am?
A. I do, yeah. Yeah. It's in response to my letter of the 10th or is it e-mailing to him my letter of the 10th?

414 Q. Did you fee1 that he wasn't coming back to you at this stage or what was the instigation for it?
A. I can't recall, Chair, to be honest with you.

415 Q. okay. It's quite informal in the way it's phrased?
A. Yeah.

416 Q. Would you accept that?
A. It is, Chair. I suppose I knew him anyway. He was in headquarters when I was in headquarters. So I suppose would I have known Mark Curran. I don't think I would have known the others, but I would have known him because he worked in the Commissioner's office when I was in HQ.
417 Q. okay. So you knew him personally and professionally, is it?
A. Well, I suppose of all parties, he's the person, we'11 say, I would have known to speak to, we'11 say. I mean, I wouldn't have had much engagement with Chief Wheatley prior to this or Superintendent Murray. But, as I say, he was in the Commissioner's office probably
when I was in HQ. So, you know, we would have -- our paths would crossed, so to speak. He would be around the same vintage as myself too, Chair. We were probably on some promotion list $I$ think at one stage. But I can't recal1, I can't put that in context, Chair. 14:06 CHAN RMAN okay.

418 Q. MS. MtGRATH Okay. I think on the same date, on the 11th January, you also reached out to Superintendent Pat Murray. If I could ask Mr. Kavanagh to open up -this is a document you have seen already, I just want to open a different page of it, so 12305, please. This is the transcript of audio notes from the bullying file, which we looked at earlier. Again to clarify, these are Superintendent Murray's notes. If I can ask Mr. Kavanagh to go to 12311.
"Call from M Finn."

This is the 11th January, do you see that?
A. Yes.
"He said he sent me an e-mail. I said he hadn't but he sai d he thought he did but he might not have. Sai d it was a courtesy to call me to tell me K Ruane said
[blank]. He said he would send me the advi ce in an e-mail and could l talk to Ken myself."

Is that the confirmation that legal proceedings were
not a bar?
A. That is my interpretation of it, yeah, without seeing it.
Q. Do you remember this phone call?
A. No, I don't, to be honest with you. I mean, I wouldn't 14:07 dispute -- it makes sense in the context of -- I probably told him -- oh he rang me I think, did he?
Q. And what about the next part --
A. I rang him I think, sorry. I am reading it as I rang him, sorry, Chair.
Q. He is saying that you called him?
A. I probably did in the context of, I got the e-mail from Ken Ruane saying look, you know, give me the clearance to go ahead to do the thing.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MS. MEGRATH If you look at the next part, and again, we will be coming back to this on issue 20 , but while it's open there:
"He said --" and this is you.
A. Yes.
Q. "He sai d he knew my promotion situation and wanted to do it qui ckly."

Does that ring a bell to you?
A. Yeah, I think that was in the context of I think he wanted for me to do my investigation quickly because I think -- this is my understanding of it now, we'11 say, that the Policing Authority were probably holding up
his --
CHA RMAN I think we better leave that one.
MS. MEGRATH okay.
CHA RMAK Because the right people aren't here and we wil1 get confused. I appreciate, Ms. McGrath.

MS. MtGRATH okay.
CHA RMAK we are going to deal with that separately as issue 20. Thank you.

THE WTNESS: okay.
ME. MLGRATH okay. Thank you Chair.
CHAN RMAN As I say, it's just probably more convenient.
425 Q. MS. MEGRATH okay. Staying with your statement please, at 4112, going down to the last two paragraphs. It says:
"On 17th January 2018 I wrote to Chi ef Superintendent Curran, informing hi mthat I had sought Iegal advice and that my investigation could proceed. I provided hi mwith a copy of Garda Keogh's compl ai nt as it
pertai ned to himand l al so sought his consent to extend the time for the investigation of the compl ai nt."
A. Yes, Chair.

426 Q. Now, this looks like it could have been the second
could proceed, that you had your legal advice. would that be right? It looks like you had also done it earlier on the 10th January, is that right?
A. If I saw appendix 39, maybe if you can --
Q. Yes, sure. Appendix 39 is at 4549. So you say:
"Pl ease find attached a copy of the compl ai nt by Garda Keogh as pertains to yourself. I met himon 1st December 2017. I sought legal advi ce."
A. Sorry, 4549.
Q. 4549. Can we go to the stop of that please, Mr. Kavanagh. So that is Chief Superintendent Curran of Ballymun. Do you have it there, commissioner?
A. I do now, sorry, Chair. I have it now. Yes, Chair.
Q. At this stage you're telling him the various facts of meeting Garda Keogh, the legal advice issue?
A. Yes.
Q. That you outlined it to him already on the 10th

January. You are providing him with an opportunity to respond to the issues raised by Garda Keogh.
"If you have questions or queries in rel ation to any of the issues, please revert."

The issue of the timeframes. Now, can I ask you, one of the things which wasn't evident from the material that we received was whether you ever met Mark Curran face-to-face.
A. I did, yeah.

431 Q. Or have any class of an interview with him?
A. It's in my diary $I$ think, Chair, if I am not mistaken.

432 Q. For the 17th January?
A. Yeah, I think the 17th January I met Mark Curran, yeah. Let me check, sorry. Mark Curran, the 17th January, yeah.
Q. At 5694.
A. He actually came to me in my office, Chair, in HQ, I think it was in the evening time. I was over in, we'11 say, the bureau block and I think he was working, I'm not sure was he in Ballymun or was he still in the Commissioner's office. Anyway, but I do recall him coming to my office, Chair.
Q. You record there:
"Mark Curran - copy of materials."

Do you see that?
A. Can you give me the page again?
Q. Was that a face-to-face meeting?
A. Yes, Chair, yeah.

437 Q. Okay. Do you remember, was it -- do you have any notes of the meeting or did you keep a note?
A. No, Chair. I gave him the actual version of complaint that pertained to him. Now I didn't give everybody the full complaint.

438 Q. CHAI RMAN Yes.
A. I condensed it down and said look, here's some aspects. 439 Q. CHA RMAN Here's the bit that relates to you.
A. Correct, Chair.

MS. MEGRATH Do you note that anywhere, what was put to him, does he make a response orally to you?
A. Not on the night, Chair. It was to give him an opportunity. Look, I'm only giving it to him on the day, look, here's the allegation, you go off and prepare your submission for me. So, I think it wouldn't appear -- and we will come to it, because we did ask you specifically in correspondence there in the last two months to clarify this.
A. Yeah.

442 Q. It doesn't seem to be the practice, are notes kept of these meetings?
A. No, Chair. I gave him the documentation and I said look, this is the allegation, it's all contained in this documentation pack that $I$ am giving you here. This is what you have to respond to. I'm giving you an opportunity to go away, consider it, get legal advice if you want to and come back to me with a written response.
You also record in your statement, again if we can go back to 4112 ?
A. I have my statement over here, if that's okay, to help speed it up.
CHA RMAK Page 8.
444 Q. MS. MEGRATH We're at the bottom, the 17th January. So you write to Chief Superintendent Mark Curran, you write to Chief Superintendent wheatley and you write to Superintendent Murray on that day?
A. Yeah.

445 Q. And at that stage you are again confirming there's no legal bar in proceeding, isn't that right?
A. Correct, yeah.

446 Q. Now, on the 17th January, I just want to keep this issue running in the background because I think it's something that is important to you. Just in the third last paragraph there, you acknowledge Mr. Cullen's correspondence of 17th January 2018:
"I enqui red if he had acqui red any additional information as a result of his FO and data protection enqui ries and I al so advi sed hi mthat I sought I egal advi ce with regard to the el ectronic recording of future meetings."
A. Yes.

447 Q. So again we see that bubbling along, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. Now, if you go on to the next page of your statement, please, commissioner?
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. You have an entry there for 18th January 2018, do you see that there?
A. Yes, I do, yeah.

450 Q. This is on your statement?
A. Yes.

451 Q. You say:
"Superintendent Patrick Murray wrote to Mr. Ken Ruane,

Head of Legal Affairs, referring to my correspondence to hi mof 10th J anuary 2018 seeking I egal advice and opi ni on in rel ation to the issues raised. "
A. Yes, Chair.

452 Q. So there is no issue about that. But that is the only entry you have on your statement with regard to the 18th January. But I notice in your notes, if we can bring it up on the screen, it might be quicker for you to see it, at 5740 . So 5740 , it will have to be rotated there. I think these are your own notes?
A. Yes, Chair.

453 Q. You say there on the 18th January, you say:
"Met with Superintendent Murray."

Do you see that?
CHAI RMAN Yes.
A. Yeah.

454 Q. MG. MEGRATH Could you read that out, the rest of the sentence there, when you get a chance?
A. It says:
"18th January, met with Superintendent Murray and gave himthe portion of the compl ai nt that pertains to him"
455 Q. Okay. Then you have your diary entry, at 5695. Your 14:15 diary entry is coming up there, for the same date. CHA RMAN Sorry, we have to do a bit of mechanical here. It's in the worst position for Mr. Kavanagh.

456 Q. MS. MEGRATH So this is the 18th January. I think,
did you travel to Athlone to meet him?
A. That's correct, Chair.

457 Q. Okay. You met with P Murray. In fact, if you want to read out those paragraphs, it's probably easier for you?
A. I have my original diary here, Chairman.

458 Q. CHA RMAN Thank you.
A. "Travel to Athl one. Meeting with P Mrray and gave him documents to go through the allegation. PM to consider his position and to get legal advice in relation to ci vil proceedi ngs that are pending. Superintendent Myers to get update for his...."

That's kind of separate, that's not relating to Pat Murray, that's only just a minute to myself, a note to myself
459 Q. M. MEGRATH Okay. So Superintendent Murray is telling you there and you are recording that he is going to get legal advice in relation to the civil proceedings that are pending. Now you had obtained legal advice from Mr. Ruane, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

460 Q. And you had told the various parties that it wasn't a bar to proceeding with your investigation?
A. Yes.

461 Q. So he was aware of that at the time, is that right?
A. And I think my recollection, Chair, was that I went to Ken Ruane, who is our head of legal, and I said, Ken, give me some advice here. He came back to me and I
gave it to Pat, but I said to Pat, you probably need to go to Ken Ruane to get your advice as opposed to my advice.

462 Q. CHA RMAK As far as you were concerned the question had been raised as to whether you were entitled to proceed with the bullying and harassment investigation.
A. Yeah.

463 Q. CHA RMAN You sought advice and got your clearance?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN It didn't mean that Superintendent Murray was bound by that, he could go to somebody else and say wel1, I am going to challenge that, or whatever it was?
A. Yeah. That's correct, Chair. And I think he probably had other issues in relation to what he could disclose to me etcetera.

CHA RMAN whatever.
465 Q. M. MEGRATH We11, can I just stay on the 18th January please, commissioner, because again, for the record, with regards to that meeting with Superintendent Murray, did you keep any further notes?
A. No, Chair, no.

466 Q. Or recording of that?
A. No.

467 Q. Okay. Now, we know that Superintendent Murray has kept some notes in respect of this. And again, it's the audio transcript type files that you have seen.
A. Yes, Chair.

MR. MRPHY: Sorry, Chairman, I raised this point before lunch, my friend keeps on saying that these are
audio tapes, and in fact it's dictation, that has been clarified, I would ask that she correct the record.

MS. MEGRATH They are dictation notes.
CHA RMAN They are Superintendent Murray's notes of the meeting.

MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN We did clear it but I don't think Ms. McGrath is loading it with some significance, Mr. Murphy. I think we're all aware that it looks like
-- our understanding is that Superintendent Murray
dictated some notes.
MR. MRPHY: That's is fine.
CHA RMAN And then got them typed. Typed them up himself or got them typed up himself. So maybe it's a bit misleading, Ms. McGrath, to talk about audio notes, 14:18 it does suggest that he reached for the tapes like Mr. Butterfield in the white House, he discovered the tapes that were there but then nobody is old enough to remember my reference. Anyway, to discover the tapes. MS. MEGRATH I'm not seeking to mislead, Chairman, I'm 14:19 using the title Superintendent Murray had on the document.

CHA RMAN I understand. Don't worry, Ms. McGrath, we understand exactly what the situation is. Mr. Murphy is perhaps being a little sensitive on the topic, but that's the situation. They're Superintendent Murray's notes.

MR. MRPHY: Thank you, Chairman.
MS. MtGRATH I am obliged to my Friend.

CHA RMAN And that's not a criticism of you, Ms. McGrath.

MS. MEGRATH Thank you.
CHA RMAK I think we all understand exactly what the situation is, or at least $I$ understand what the situation is.

468 Q. MБ. MEGRATH Thank you, Chair. Can I ask if page 12418 could be opened.
A. 12418 ?

469 Q. 12418.
CHA RMAN Superintendent Murray's note.
A. Yes, Chair.

470 Q. MS. MEGRATH His note. Now at 12418, you will see this is a note he made on the 20th. So this is two days later. I am not going to open all this because a 14:20 certain amount of this will be dealt with on issue 20 , but if I could ask you to go down, say, to the first quarter of the page:
"I told himof my four and a hal feeting with M Finn on Thursday."

Do you see that?
A. I do, yes, Chair.

471 Q. "On 18/ $1 / 18$ and that MFinn's view is that all is 14:20 okay."

Can I just ask you about that? First of all, was it a four and a half hour meeting with Superintendent Murray that day?
A. It could have been. It was at his home actually.

472 Q. Pardon?
A. It was actually at his home.

473 Q. It was at his home. okay.
A. It was nearer to Athlone I think than I going to the station.

474 Q. okay. As you say, you don't have a record of the meeting of the four and a half hours, is that right?
A. No, Chair, no.

475 Q. And he records it as saying:
"M Finn's view is that all is okay."

Do you know what he might have meant by that?
A. No, Chair, no.

476 Q. Can I just ask you then, he has a further note of the day in question and again it's notes dictated. I am not going to call it anything in particular. If you just look at 12313, please?
A. I have it open here, Chair.

477 Q. He says:
"Meeting AC Finn 18/ $1 / 18$ went through bel ow with him"
A. Yes.

478 Q. He talks about several files?

[^5]compl ai nt to Tribunal and O i vi a and si ckness et cet er a. "

So that would seem to reflect that there was a very detailed discussion of the complaint that he had given to Chief Superintendent Scanlan?
A. I'd say that's a reflection of what I actually gave him, because on that date I gave him the documentation that pertained to him, I'd say. Like I done to chief Curran when I met him on the day, you know, I segmented 14:21 the -- and that's the bit related to him, I'd say.

479 Q. He says "I went through the bel ow with him" and that's the first paragraph, do you remember that?
A. Definitely not, Chair, I didn't go through file.

480 Q. okay. He also says --
A. I told him like what was in the -- the content of the search. Now we didn't go through it as in line-by-1ine, give an explanation for everything, like you know.
481 Q. We11, what about he says --
A. That's not my recollection.

CHA RMAK okay.
482 Q. MS. MEGRATH Okay. One of the other matters is the second paragraph, he calls it a civil file. They're broken up and we have seen them in disclosure. This is 14:22 a civil file, it seems, that Superintendent Murray kept in relation to the civil proceedings. Did he go through that with you?
A. No, Chair, but I knew he had it because he had his big,
thick file there, which I suppose I wanted to get hold of, you know. But he had some legal difficulty in terms of giving it to me.
483 Q. He has a bullying file there, do you see that? That's the next one.
A. Yes.

484 Q. Did he go through this with you. He says:
"My letter to cormi ssioner. Extra exhi bits and file I got from Fanning telling what I got. Did Fanning give himstuff frommy file? Media since Septenber and my pronotion. "

Again, I'm sorry, I don't want to go into issue 20 , but he then talks about the promotion file. He records there:
"Garda A file. [Blank] info and my suspension of him Fanning visit trying to create chaos."

## Etcetera.

"Leaki ng to media and Wallace. How if Fanni ng's motivation. Greene file, info for himto see."

Now, this seems like an extremely broad ranging conversation with Superintendent Murray, one might say going beyond the boundaries of a bullying and harassment complaint. Do you remember this, the
content here? Does it ring any bells for you?
A. I don't specifically, chair. We were there for a long time, I suppose, you know, it was a cordial enough, we'11 say he made me tea, we sat down talking about his family, etcetera, you know. I didn't really know the guy before then. So I suppose he was kind of introducing himself to me and telling me. But the purpose of my meeting, like, wasn't to get a response from him there and then, I was only giving him the papers. So that was our first time meeting. I'm sure he probably articulated his views or whatever. I wasn't making any notes, so it wasn't pertinent, it wasn't going to be his response to the allegation. I'm sure he might have protested his innocence or whatever, but I didn't make any notes of it. It wasn't a pertinent, as I said, part of the investigation as such, other than I physically giving him the documentation and saying, here you are, I've served you now today, you go off, get your advice, come back to me with your response. Yeah.
485 Q. As I say, we will be dealing with this in more detail at issue 20, but do you accept or reject this record of the meeting on that date as being accurate or inaccurate, or can you say?
A. It's not my record anyway of the meeting, we'11 say, 14:24 for one. I mean, I did meet him. It could have lasted four and a half hours, I didn't time it, we'11 say? CHA RMAN Did you have a meal, do you remember? was it lunchtime, morning time or afternoon, do you
remember?
A. I'd say it was probably before lunchtime and I'd say he gave me a cup of tea, Chair. It was that kind of -pleasantries.
CHAN RMAN Yes. a meeting such as that without recording any notes or records of the conversation? Do you have a view on that?
A. Well, as I say, Chair, I wasn't looking for his response there and then, you know. I mean it wasn't going to be -- he was going to have another occasion to give me his formal response to the allegations, yeah. 488 Q. Now, if you just go to 12378. This is a record of a conversation Superintendent Murray was having with Joe Nugent. I want to be careful here in the sense of you're quite removed from this, this is not a conversation you're involved in, but midway down, just there, just at the end of the screen:
"Tol d hi m M Fi nn vi ew and assur ance."

Now that's the second time Superintendent Murray refers to -- he said "all will be okay" in one record and assurance from you in another record. Can you tell the 14:26 Chairman what that might be referring to?
A. I've no idea. Unless it's in the context that I was going to do this as fast as I possibly could, you know, maybe he had some -- obviously he wanted me to do this
quickly. I suppose it was in his interest that I would get this finished quickly because it was holding up his promotion. But I can't think of any other...
489 Q. I have to put it to you, commissioner, would it have been an assurance in relation to the outcome?
A. No, Chair. I hadn't even started. I was only starting giving my documents at that stage.
490 Q. Now, if we again go back to your statement and hopefully we can move along a little quicker. Again going back to page 4113. 4113. So we are moving on from the 18th January. I notice there is no reference in your statement to that meeting, which was very extensive. Is that simply an omission, commissioner, there?
A. That's an omission, Chair, because I think I wrote it into my own notes since that I hadn't put it in, yeah.
491 Q. Okay. You say a couple of paragraphs down:
"On 23rd January 2018 I met with Chi ef Superintendent Wheatley in Garda Headquarters to discuss the material that I provided to her and hear her concerns in rel ation to the investi gation. "
A. Correct.

492 Q. Can you tell the Chair a little bit about that meeting?
A. If I recall, Chair, that was in the evening time, I met ${ }_{14: 27}$ her in the evening time, I think she came up there at HQ, up in the officers Club, because I was staying there, I would say, you know, or I think maybe just a private meeting room, you know, I use one of the
conference rooms downstairs. So I met her there in the evening. A similar type experience, you know, met her, gave her the documentation, listened to her. I knew, we'11 say, she was upset about, you know, (a) she being involved in it, (b) the fact that this was going on so long, you know. And again, I wasn't looking for a response from her there and then. It was a case of giving her documentation and saying look, these are the allegations, you know, you need to go off and get your advice, whatever the case may be.
493 Q. And again, just for the record, and I don't wish to be difficult, commissioner, but there are no notes on the disclosure files of that meeting?
A. No. That's correct.

494 Q. Is that right?
A. Yeah.

495 Q. Okay. Now if we stay with your statement there at page 4113, we see responses coming in. We see
Sergeant Yvonne Martin comes back to you on the 25th January, as does Inspector Nicholas Farrell, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

496 Q. On the 26th January there's reference there to assistant commissioner of the Eastern Region requesting an update on the current status of the investigation; do you see that?
A. Yes, Chair.

497 Q. I think this is the first of a number of requests for an update that come in over he next couple of months;
isn't that right?
A. Correct, Chair. I think the office is set up that we send out a reminder every four weeks.
498 Q. On the 29th January you go back to Mr. Cullen. You say
you have sought legal advice in respect of the
electronic recording of meetings, there was no provision in the policy document for this or for a stenographer and you inform him of that, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

499 Q. Mr. Barrett comes back to you on the 6th February and he also says that there's no provision for a stenographer, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

500 Q. But he says that minutes could be agreed, that's at the 14:29 top of the next page?
A. Yeah, correct.

501 Q. Around this time, and I checked it at lunch there, this is around the time, the 2nd February, when you meet Chief Superintendent Scan1an and you ask him about the --
A. Statement, yeah.

502 Q. You get a statement from him in relation to the delay issue; isn't that right?
A. It could be, I haven't seen that statement yet now, but 14:29 if that's the date on it, $I$ wouldn't dispute it.

503 Q. Okay. We're now in early February. On the 7th February, on the next page, this is where Chief Superintendent Lorraine wheatley comes back with her
substantive response to you in writing, is that right?
A. She was back very quickly, chair, with her response, yeah.
504 Q. Now, you do a summary there. And rather than opening the document or the submissions, which would take some time?
A. Yes.
Q. She stated she was satisfied that the breaches of discipline preferred were adequate having cognisance of al1 the of the prevailing circumstances.

So She was dealing with that discipline in relation to the AWOL issue in that July, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

506 Q. In 2015. She continues on near the end there of the paragraph, she said she was satisfied her dealings with Garda Keogh were appropriate, fair and considerate. Chief Superintendent wheatley refuted the assertion that Garda Keogh was treated differently by her because he had made a protected disclosure. Isn't that right?
A. Yes.

507 Q. Now, on 12th February 2018 you wrote to Mr. Cullen, proposing that you would record the minutes of the meeting and that we would agree the minutes and circulate them as an agreed document afterwards?
A. That's correct, Chair.

508 Q. You follow that up with a reminder later in the month; isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair. So here I was, Chair, offering to meet him
again.
CHAL RMAN Yes.
509 Q. MS. MEGRATH Okay. As I say, you did that during February. Now here, the next paragraph, you see Assistant Commissioner Fanning coming back looking for an update, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

510 Q. The following day, Sergeant Yvonne Martin comes back with her responses?
A. Yes.

511 Q. And refutes in the entirety the allegations and complaint made by Garda Keogh that may have some connection to her, isn't that right?
A. Correct, yes, Chair.

512 Q. On the same day you get another letter from Assistant Commissioner Fanning looking for an update. Now, we are starting to see these coming in pretty quickly. There's no immediate reply to Assistant Commissioner Fanning at that stage. Is there any particular reason for that?
A. I suppose, Chair, these are coming out from his office, which is now my office, on a monthly basis. But I would meet him at the SLT, at our senior leadership meeting, you know, and I'd tell him what the update was, you know.
513 Q. You probably what?
A. I would meet him at our senior leadership meetings, you know, our monthly meetings are more frequent, Chair. So I would kind of give him an update.
Q. Now, at the bottom of the page we see the substantive response coming in from Inspector Nicholas Farrell, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

515 Q. He again refutes the assertions by Garda Keogh in their entirety, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, Chair.

516 Q. So moving onto the next page, this is your reminder to Mr. Cullen?
A. Yes, Chair.

517 Q. Requesting dates when you can meet. And you proposing again that you would agree the minutes and circulate them, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

518 Q. On the 26th February. Now, in the interim then, at the 14:32 end of February, you still see Superintendent Murray there. The issue of legal advice is still going on, it seems, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chair, yes.

519 Q. With regard to the civil proceedings. Now during early 14:32 March we see a lot of responses coming in there?
A. Yes, Chair.

520 Q. The sergeants.
A. Mm-hmm.

521 Q. And down as far as Inspector Yvonne Martin. Can I ask 14:32 you, if we go down to the 26th March there, the third last paragraph?
A. Yes.

522 Q. Sorry, I skipped too far down. On the 6th March you
have Mr. Cullen, there in the middle of the page. He comes back?
A. Correct.
A. Mm-hmm.

524 Q. He wants you to specify precisely what you propose to talk about on the next occasion.
"He sought confirmation that I had actually read the compl ai nt to Garda Keogh and requi red confirmation that the meetings woul d be el ectroni cally recorded."
A. Yes.
Q. Did you consider at that stage that trust had effectively broken down between you and the Keogh team at that stage?
A. I hadn't -- I hadn't considered it, I suppose.

526 Q. If we just look at the letter, sorry, Commissioner, 4749 , if might be easier there?
A. Yeah.

527 Q. So he says:
"We note that you request clarification on unspecified matters. I should be gratef ul if you might advi se what precisel y these matters are.

There has been an i nor di nate unexpl ai ned del ay in deal ing with thi s compl ai nt and with the rel at ed substantive matters."

So at this stage we're now on 6th March and had you been put in place on the 15th November, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

528 Q. He goes on to say:
"You will note that at the last meeting it was necessary for us to deal with very el ementary questions about Garda Keogh's written complaint. You asked repeatedly, for example, who the complaints were agai nst in circunstances where the written complaint made this abundantly clear. It was al so clear that the written complaint had been torn into various bits and pi eces and bits of it had been di scarded and that the remai nder was literally all over the place on your desk.

You then raised a series of tangental questions in correspondence, which implied that you had neither read the written complaint nor any interest in investigating the case. You ref used to have the meetings el ectronically recorded and you proposed instead to take written mintes only. Such a written record would onl $y$ serve to better hi de the obf uscation, del ay and di sgui se the absurdity of the performance.

It is in those circunstances that we should be gratef ul if you might now specify precisely what you propose to tal $k$ about on the next occasion, confirmthat you have
actually read the written compl ai nt of Garda Keogh and further confirmthat the meetings will be el ectroni cally recorded. "

What do you say about that letter to the Chair? It's a 14:35 particular stance that is now being taken by the Keogh team.
A. It is, Chair.
Q. And it's clear.
A. It's pretty evident, I suppose, and the letter of contents speaks for itself and that's it, you know.
Q. Did it cause you concern, commissioner?
A. It didn't upset me. I left it go over my head, Chair, I suppose. You know, I thought it was a bit of -making something -- I didn't mean to be disrespectful in the context of, yeah, he was entitled to raise that this was going on for a while like, yeah, but I thought it was a bit disrespectful in some sense, parts of it, like you know.
CHA RMAN Indeed.
A. The way he described what I did, like you know. But I didn't get too upset about it.

532 Q. ME. MEGRATH Well, in the sense did you realise he was upset?
CHAN RMAN Upset?
A. It doesn't sound like he's upset from the --

533 Q. MG. MEGRATH We11, not upset, but frustrated with the process?

CHA RMAN Well it speaks for itself, Ms. McGrath. I
mean the letter says what it says. Those words are there. What interpretation we put on them is another day's work. I mean, it's pretty clear, whatever else you say about it.
M. MtGATH I think you go back to him, that's the 6th March and I just want to stay with the correspondence in your statement. It's a month before you reply. But can we just go back --
A. I took some time out there, Chair, in the start of that month, I think it was on holidays after the 6th March to the 13th March, something like that.
535 Q. Okay. Then if we go back to your statement at page 4115. There in the middle of the page was the reference to the letter of the 6th March. You have responses coming in from Sergeant Patrick Nyland?
A. Yes.

536 Q. Sergeant Moylan, Yvonne Martin?
A. Yes.

537 Q. You have Superintendent Murray on the 26th March:
"...requesting that he be provided with Iegal advice bef ore he responds to my investigation.

Do you see that there, the third last paragraph?
A. Sorry, yeah. I asked Ken Ruane, yeah. Because I
was -- I suppose I was maybe a little concerned, whatever, that I had asked Ken Ruane -- or I asked Pat Murray to talk to Ken Ruane to get legal advice for himself and I wasn't sure or I got the impression maybe
that Pat Murray hadn't got that legal advice back from Ken Ruane. That is my interpretation what I was saying here.

538 Q. I think when you get this you write to Ken Ruane and you have an e-mail here at 4359. Now there's no legal professional privilege here, you're just asking a question. 4359. It's an e-mail of the same day, the 26th March?
A. Yes.

539 Q. Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

540 Q. You say:
"Ken, is Pat Murray awaiting something fromus in rel ation to the Ni chol as Keogh investigation. I thought we answered his query at an early stage!"

Was that your view, that you thought this issue was resolved or why was this still bubbling along?
A. Well I had asked, we'11 say, or I told Pat Murray,
look, you go off and get your own legal advice from Ken Ruane. I had got my legal advice and I wasn't sure that Ken Ruane had got that legal -- or that Pat Murray had -- or that Ken Ruane had gone back to Pat Murray, we'11 say, with that legal advice. That's what 14:38 I was asking Ken there. Because I didn't know was that maybe delaying Pat Murray's response to my investigation, we'11 say.
541 Q. We11, if I can just ask you to look at an e-mail which
appears to have triggered this, which is an e-mail of the 23rd March from you to Superintendent Murray and it's at page 4360. It'11 come up on the screen there, just at the bottom of the screen. 4360. If you look at 4360?
A. I will just get the hard copy.

542 Q. Actually what has just been scrolled there is --
A. I have it here.

543 Q. -- Superintendent Murray -- sorry, at the bottom of page 4360, you are writing to Superintendent Murray, so 14:39 it's from Michae1 Finn, 23rd March, 15:25 and if you look?
A. Oh, yeah, I wrote to Pat Murray saying:
"Are you in a position to provide a response to my request?"

544 Q. Yes. If Mr. Kavanagh can just catch up with you there on the screen?
A. The 23rd March.

545 Q. Just scroll down please. That's right.
A. 4360. The bottom of page 4360.

546 Q. Yes. Quite right, you are saying:
"Are you in a position to provide a response to the time and I'mgoing to press next weekend."

Can you tell the Chair what you meant by that, in the
sense that it's 23 rd March at this point and you have no responses in from either Superintendent Murray or Chief Superintendent Curran at that point. What did you mean by you're going to press next weekend
A. I think I was giving him a gentle nudge here to say, look, can you come back to me, you know.
547 Q. Okay. You accept that you didn't have substantive responses in from the two officers at that point?
A. I had a lot of the witnesses in though at that stage, you know, yeah. And he came back to me saying unfortunately the organisation has not corresponded to our correspondence to date. So that is why I e-mailed Ken Ruane and said, Ken, is Pat Murray waiting from something from you here.
548 Q. Just looking at the live feed there, you say, I had a lot of witnesses in at that stage, you know.
A. Yeah.

549 Q. But would you accept that you didn't have the reply, the substantive replies from two of the main players in the issue; isn't that right?
A. Yes. I had Lorraine wheatley's in but I didn't have himself and Mark Curran, or probably Aidan Minnock as we11, I think I was waiting for him.
550 Q. Well, you seem to give the gentle nudge, as you are calling it, to Chief Superintendent Curran. If I just can ask you to look at 5946. At 5946, if you go down to the bottom of the page there, please, Mr. Kavanagh. Again, it's from you to Mark Curran on the 23rd March. You say:
"I have most of my data in at this point in time, lam goi ng to press next weekend."

So it's very similar.
A. Yes.

551 Q. He comes back to you two days later, on the 25th March, and we are moving up, if we move up the screen. We are on 5946?
A. I have it here.

552 Q. If we go to the middle of the page, please, Mr. Kavanagh. Two days later he comes back, he says:
"Hi Mck. l'll have it for you on Tuesday. Still waiting on DM to get back to me but will give to you regardl ess. Mark. "

You reply that same day and you say:
"Roger. Thanks, Mark. I amstarting writing my report thi s week!"

So again, can I just put it to you, commissioner, that Garda Keogh, looking at this exchange, would think, how could you either start or even be thinking about writing your report when you had no reply from either Chief Superintendent Curran or Superintendent Murray at that stage?
A. I was trying to give them a nudge along, to say come
on.
553 Q. Si are you saying there's nothing in this, there's nothing to see here?
A. From the Tribunal's --

554 Q. In the statements there, I'm writing my report next week?
A. Oh no, Chair. I mean, it might have been ambitious to think I would be doing it next week. But as it transpired I was overly ambitious, Chairman. This is, look, a nudge to try and get him to come on, guys, look, I want to get this thing done, you know. They've had it for a while.
555 Q. If I was to say it suggests an element of prejudgement in moving on with the report without responses, what would you say to that?
A. Ah no, Chair, no. I mean I did get advice later on from John Barrett saying, look, if people aren't cooperating with you, you should still go out and finish it. But that was some time later. But anyway, I wasn't in that space here, Chair, yeah. I think, look, I was trying to get a nudge here, get them moving along, yeah, put on a little bit of pressure.
556 Q. Can I say to you, just at around this time, the following day in fact, on the 25th March, there is a letter that is in disclosure at page 4755, that 1 just wanted to ask you about. 4755. This is a letter from Assistant Commissioner Fanning's office to John Gerard Cullen. He is writing to John Gerard Cullen and he is saying in the second paragraph:
"Assistant cormissioner Eastern Regi on further directs me to informyou that he is now in recei pt of a report from Assi stant Commi ssi oner Mchael Finn, who is appointed under the bullying policy and that he antici pates to have the matter concl uded bef ore the end of April 2018."

Can you explain that, where that might have come from?
A. I probably told AC Fanning at one of our SLT meetings, look, I hope to have this done by the end of April, 1ike you know.

557 Q. But he says "he is in recei pt of a report fromyou" is that an error?
A. It might have been a verbal, probably, I would say, I $\quad$ 14:44 met him -- we'd meet up at our senior leadership meetings.
558 Q. But you say it might have been a verbal report?
A. I might have told him, I'd say.

559 Q. Okay. So that's not a substantive report in relation 14:44 to the investigation in any event?
A. I don't think I have a record of that, to be honest with you.
560 Q. If we move along, staying in March, when we talked earlier about the grievance issue and the delay issue 14:45 and the Chief Superintendent Scanlan issue, we start coming back to it now around the 30th March. If I could ask Mr. Kavanagh to open up 4765. At 4765, there is an e-mail there at the very end where you are
writing to Assistant Commissioner Fanning on 30th March 2018.
A. Yes.

561 Q. You say:
"J ust to assist me finish off the Nicky Keogh i nvesti gation. "

So you are talking about finishing off the investigation there on the 30th March. what did you mean by that?
A. We11, I am hoping, Chair, to have it done by the end of April, as I said, so, you know, trying to work on it to get it moving together. I think we had a meeting, it's missing actually from my notes, but $I$ think at the end of March, Chair, we had a meeting of, we'11 say, my team, yeah, where I suppose we did a recap of where we are and trying to get it moving, yeah. I think I have a diary note of it, maybe, or something like that. 30th March, of where we got together, our team.
562 Q. Okay. And there was a discussion about moving it to conclusion, was there, at that stage?
A. Well, trying to move on the investigation, Chair.

563 Q. Okay. Well, let's continue with the e-mail.
A. And that was probably an outstanding issue from my
question, how were you going to finish off the Nicky Keogh investigation when you were still awaiting substantive responses?
A. Well, I obviously couldn't.

565 Q. Would that be a cause of concern, to see that?
14:47
A. But sure I couldn't finish it off, Chair, unless I got Pat Murray and Mark Curran back.
Q. If we stay with the e-mail, it says:
"He makes reference to the del ay in investigating his original complaint made to John Scanlan. I took a statement fromJohn Scanl an and he confirmed that he took the statement last March and sent it on to you. Can you gi ve me something in rel ation to the route that it took from Scanl an until I was appointed last Novenber. "
A. Yes.

567 Q. Can I ask you, commissioner, it's now the 30th March and is this the first time you're asking for that to be clarified with the assistant commissioner?
A. I was trying to get a formal response to see where did it go. I mean, I didn't know the full route but it was obviously -- you know, we had our own get together assessing where we are, it was, I suppose, jumping out to say, look, we are going to have to address the issue 14:47 between John Scanlan's statement in March and it coming to me in November.

568 Q. Okay. So are you accepting at this stage that the delay issue was firmly in your corner, as it were, that
you had to deal with it?
A. Well, I couldn't ignore it, Chair. I felt I would have to address it in some way in my report, we'11 say, yeah.
569 Q. If you just look at the reply up above, we won't go through it in too much detail because, as I say, we have been through the sequencing of this issue, yesterday particularly with Chief Superintendent McLough1in, but there's a reply back to you from Fintan Fanning and it is giving you a summary of the route that you asked for, okay?
A. Yeah.
Q. He says in the last paragraph:
"You can feel free to contact Inspector MECarthy to cl arify any admin issue."

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

571 Q. In fact, if Mr. Kavanagh scrol1s forward to 4770?
A. He did come back to me, Chair, Inspector McCarthy did.
Q. He came back. You got quite a detailed response, isn't it?
A. Absolutely Chair, yeah.

573 Q. From Inspector McCarthy in that e-mail?
A. Yeah.

574 Q. If you scroll down through it for the next couple of pages, there's no need to read it all, but if Mr. Kavanagh can keep going?



Q. If you sat down with him?
A. Chair, I suppose, you know, it would have been useful to me to get, I suppose, a better understanding of his insights in terms of all of the issues that he brought to the table, we'11 say, you know.
579 Q. But would it be fair to say that this information that came to you stayed with you in the sense that it never made its way to Garda Keogh, is that right?
A. That's fair. That's correct, Chair, yeah.

580 Q. Either in writing or by sitting down?
A. I never sat down with him, Chair. I am sure it would have been very useful, Chair, if I did sit down, I think it would have been beneficial for both of us to have a that conversation, we'11 say.
581 Q. Did you consider the option of in writing notifying him of the position?
A. When you say the position? We11, this information that you now have outlining the route of the complaint?
A. I didn't, Chair, no. I suppose this was very useful to 14:51 me, because it gave me better understanding of how we got to where we are today. But it wasn't really relevant in the context of, you know, the people I was investigating, you know, Mark Curran, Pat Murray or Lorraine wheatley, because they weren't really I suppose -- it wasn't their fault, I suppose, whatever issues arose, yeah.

583 Q. So then to be clear, did you see it as someone else's job to translate this information to him? If he was complaining about the delay.
A. Yeah.
Q. Did you see it as someone else's role to inform him of the position?
A. Yeah, well, I suppose he had legitimate grievances, I was saying at the outset and I was saying, look, if you 14:51 want to pursue a grievance about the fact that it didn't go from $A$ to $B$, you know, you should pursue that maybe as a separate issue, we'11 say, yeah.
585 Q. Was he getting direction from you in this regard at
this point? You ask for the information, it comes in to you and it stays with you, that's your evidence.
A. That's it, Chair, yeah, yeah.

586 Q. Now, if you go back to your statement because, as I say, this is the end of March, this is the information you had asked for, you received. So at 4116 of your statement, again I just want to pick out one or two things. On 5th April 2018, this is you acknowledging the correspondence undated from Mr. Cullen. This was the letter where, as we were saying, in stark terms he was saying, what do you want to talk to me about the next time or can you clarify that?
A. Yes.

587 Q. You come back to him and you say:
"I informed himthat I had no difficulty if he wi shed to el ectroni cally record any meeting that takes place with his client. I al so informed himthat I would not be recording the meeting. I informed himthat I would take minutes fromthe meeting and that I would have no difficulty sharing with himor agreei ng the mintes bef ore the meeting concl uded."

Now, from looking at your statement and from the correspondence that's where that issue finished?
A. Yes, Chair.

588 Q. Would that be right?
A. I think so, chair, until I wrote on the 12th June or the next time I wrote to him, yeah. When I gave him
al1 the statements, $I$ was saying, look, here's the statement I have taken, do you want to meet with me, I am prepared to sit down. I wrote on the 12th, I wrote again a few days later, a second time, asking him did you get my letter, look, do you want to meet. Because I assumed that when I gave him all that material that he would be keen to meet me.

CHAL RMAN Yes.

589 Q.
MS. MEGRATH So that was really the end of your exchange of correspondence on the issue and Mr. Cullen doesn't come back to you and there isn't a sit down with Garda Keogh ultimately?
A. No. We11, he does come back to me at a later stage, a11 right, yeah.
Q. okay.
A. We reengage in September, we'11 say, after he has opportunity to go off and get his advice and all that, yeah.
591 Q. okay. Now, staying with your statement there, moving on down through April, you have responses coming in again?
A. Yes.
Q. Superintendent Minnock, you have Garda A, Superintendent McBrien. And here we have, on 17th Apri1 2018, Chief Superintendent Curran coming back
A. Yes, Chair.

593 Q. Did you have any view on -- one of the complaints that Garda Keogh makes is that this investigation was
supposed to be done in 28 days and he's complaining about the length of time. He says, in fact, I accept it couldn't have been done in the 28 -day timeframe but it took too long, that it was an unreasonable period, is really his view. So you have, back on effectively the 15th December, notified Chief Superintendent Curran of the position and here we have his response in April. Did you have a view on how long that took or the delay in coming back to you?
A. I wanted to give them an opportunity, we'11 say, to go off and get their legal advice in terms of what was going on, we'11 say. I suppose I just had to be conscious -- or I was conscious of the fact that they needed to be careful too, I suppose, because whatever was going to come to me was going to go to Garda Keogh and, we'11 say, may be used in another forum at another date. So I thought it was reasonable that I would allow them sufficient time, Chair, to go off and get whatever advice they wanted to get under the circumstances. I mean, if it was a normal bullying and 14:55 harassment, you know, where two guys are maybe not getting on together, the sergeant is bullying the guard or something like that, you know, you would have that done in 28 days probably easily enough, you know, unless people were being litigious, I think to be fair 14:55 to everyone, or probably getting more litigious? But back in the day when this was written, I'm sure, 2007, removing a bullying and harassment complaint probably wouldn't take as long. You would get it done easily
enough. Especially, we'11 say, if you only had one or two parties involved, bring them into a room, have a conversation with them. You know, it would be easier to have interaction. Plus, you're probably talking about something that happened in more recent times as opposed to this, you are actually talking about something that is going back probably two or three years for some of them. So, you know, you'd have to allow them go off, get their papers, you know, look at their files. It wasn't that simple, we'll say, you know. So I suppose I was being a bit more lenient or consider in that context, Chair, yeah. But I mean, I would have preferred to had that done faster too, chair, yeah.
594 Q. We already said that chief superintendent wheatley had come back two months earlier effectively, on the 7th February?
A. Yeah.

595 Q. And here is Chief Superintendent Curran coming back to you on the 17th April. And I just want to be clear about this, he hadn't raised a legal advice issue after you confirmed the position to him?
A. No.

596 Q. Way back at the start of January.
A. That was Superintendent Murray that had the legal issue, we'11 say.

597 Q. So Chief Superintendent Curran, you're saying you're providing time to get legal advice etcetera, that didn't apply to Chief Superintendent Curran, is that
right?
A. Oh it would apply. He was equally entitled to go off and get legal advice, we'11 say, in relation to his issues. We'11 say, in comparison to Chief Superintendent Wheatley's issues, he had a lot more stuff to deal with, I suppose. She had a pretty narrow focus, I suppose, in terms of there was the one discipline complaint really.
598 Q.
We see that it's over a month later, there at the end of the page, on 29th May 2018, when Superintendent Murray comes back with his substantive response, is that right?
A. That's right, Chair, yeah.

599 Q. And again, did you have a view on how long that took Superintendent Murray?
A. I did, Chair. I suppose I was just cognisant of the fact that he was writing to me/the organisation saying, look, I was looking for legal advice, you still haven't come back to me. Was that in March or whatever day that was. So I suppose to be fair to him, you know, I gave him that bit extra, because of -- he didn't -- he had to get his legal advice, we'11 say.
600 Q. Did you express or feel any frustration, because we know from your statement on 8th January 2018 you had received legal advice from Mr. Ruane?
A. Yeah.

601 Q. That the civil proceedings were not a bar to proceeding. And on the 10th January you had notified Superintendent Murray. So from the 10th January that
was your position. And as you said in one of your e-mails, $I$ thought $I$ sorted this out earlier. So did you feel any sense of frustration at the delay or did you fee1 it was unsatisfactory that it was now the 29th May that material was coming in?
A. Well, to be fair now, I wasn't happy. I'd prefer to have it done earlier. But I suppose you had to be reasonable and to be fair to all the parties. I mean, it was a complex enough situation and there was going to be implications, especially Superintendent Murray, because as $I$ understood it, he was named in civil proceedings, we'11 say, and normally civil proceedings are against the State, but not only was it against the State but he was actually a named party, as I understood it, Chair.
CHA RMAN That is correct.
602 Q. ME. MEGRATH Now, you outline at the top of your -- if we go on to the next page there, Mr. Kavanagh, please. I think this is just repeating, in the second paragraph there, the evidence you've just given to the chair, that you wanted to give these witnesses time to get their own legal advice effectively?
A. Yes, Chair, yeah. The 7th June.

603 Q. okay. Now, we're now on the -- sorry, I will just make sure $I$ have the right date, we're on the 29th May?
A. The 29th May, correct.

604 Q. Moving into early June, you have assistant commissioner of Eastern Region looking for an update?
A. Yeah.

605
Q. The 12th June, you have Mr. Cullen looking for an update?
A. No, I wrote -- well, maybe -- anyway, I wrote to him, I think. The 13th, sorry, you're right.
606 Q. Yes, he is coming into you on the 12th June?
A. Yeah.

607 Q. You acknowledge receipt of this on the 12th June and you do so in an e-mail. And you say:
"I have a sizable vol ume of documentation that I wanted 14:59 to give his client."
A. Yes.
Q. "And afford an opportunity to respond to."
A. Yeah.

609 Q. "And I al so enqui red of Mr. Cullen if they wi shed for their client to meet with me to address some of the matters in the documentation."
A. Correct.
Q. You provide that document on the 13th June, the following day, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. Now, effectively with regard to -- that's where things stand?
A. I followed it up on the 19th, I send him another 1etter.

612 Q. Okay. Effectively then not much happens in the interim then, you have the -- he acknowledges receipt, do you see there, on the 4th July?
A. Yes, yeah. And, we'11 say, he undertook to revert once
counsel and Garda Keogh had an opportunity to pursue -so I was giving him some time then, Chair, yeah.
613 Q. Exactly. He doesn't come back to you effectively until the 6th September; is that right?
A. That's correct, Chair, yeah.

614 Q. So does that account for the period then between June and September effectively?
A. Yes, Chair, it was resting with him, so to speak.

615 Q. okay. If you look on the next page, the 6th --
A. September.

616 Q. -- September. He comes back to you with additional queries?
A. Yes, Chair.

617 Q. These queries, you record there, pertained to:
"Comments made by Superintendent Murray in relation to Garda Keogh's addi ctive substances dependencies, Chi ef Superintendent Wheatley's revi ew of Superintendent Al an Murray di scipline investigation, a reference made by Paddy Gui nan solicitors to di scl osure made by the compl ai nant, Garda Keogh, that he was arrested for drink driving. A query in rel ation to Gary White's e-mail in rel ation to check on Garda Keogh's car. A query in rel ation to Inspector Drea's statement and clarity sought on who investigated the inci dent and a query in rel ation to the recording of Garda Keogh's absence on duty due to illness.

Now, I've just read those out because I think
effectively those queries necessitated you to go out to several people.
A. Yes.

618 Q. Is that right?
A. That's correct.

619 Q. Which you did and you recorded there in your statement throughout September, isn't that right?
A. Correct, yes, Chair.

620 Q. And you get the responses back?
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. Effectively early October, is that right?
A. 5th October, I think, yeah, back with most of the material.

622 Q. Now during this process, while this was going on, on the 4th November you get a letter $I$ think from Assistant Commissioner Fanning, and it's at 4722. You will be glad to know we are just near the end of all of the correspondence, commissioner.
A. It's okay.

623 Q. He is referring there, he says:
"I refer to above and previ ous correspondence fromthis of fice."

And he is giving a series of dates. Those dates, just
from looking back at your statement, were when he was requesting an update.
A. Yeah.

624 Q. Do you remember we have seen that in your statement?
A. Yes, Chair.

CHA RMAN Yes, that's right.
Q. M. MtGRATH He says:
"This investi gation has now been ongoing for in excess of 12 mont hs and l would appreci ate if the matter could be brought to a concl usi on forthwith."

Do you see that?
A. 4722 , is it?
Q. Yes, 4722.
A. Yes. Yeah.

627 Q. Is that Assistant Commissioner Fanning saying this needs to be --
A. Yes, it is, yeah.

628 Q. And you do produce -- you get your -- I think it's after that date you still have some information coming in from Chief Superintendent Myers. I think you have to go back to Mr. Cullen with the responses, isn't that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.

629 Q. I think ultimately that brings us down then throughout November and in fairness, you do set out some movement of correspondence in November and December?
A. Yes.

630 Q. And your report is the 20th December and you submit the file by hand, you said, to the office of the assistant commissioner of the Eastern Region; is that right?
A. That's correct, Chair. Just, for the record, Chair, I
was on an interview board there for six weeks I think in October/November, the same time as Assistant Commissioner McMahon, there was three boards sitting in parallel, I was on one, she was on another one. So I suppose that might have --
631 Q. CHAD RNAN Other things were going on.
A. Correct, yeah, yeah.

632 Q. CHAN RMAN Besides this investigation.
A. Yeah.

633 Q.
CHA RNAN Including a six-week period of interviews.
A. Correct, yeah, and that kind of fills that gap there between, we'11 say --
CHA RMAN That was in october.
A. October, November, yeah, correct, Chair.

634 Q. CHAN RMN September, october, did you say?
A. September, October.

635 Q. CHA RMAN Okay.
A. I started on the interview board on the 25th September. It was over a six-week period. Now, my board might have broken for a week in between.
Q. CHA RMAN Yes, I understand.
A. But I think we were finished up, according to my notes here, on the 2nd November, it was the last day of my interview board, yeah.
637 Q. M. MEGATH 2nd of?
A. November.

CHA RMAN November.
638 Q. M. MEGRATH November. Now, as you say there, the report went into the assistant commissioner on the 20th

December. Now, Garda Keogh says the following. And I just want to give you an opportunity to respond to them, Commissioner Finn. when he was asked about the Finn investigation in his direct-evidence, he went so far on Day 99 to say the that the Finn investigation was a joke and he rejects the investigation in its entirety. And one of the things he complains about specifically was the length of time it took. I am going to put these to you so you can answer. And we will talk about your report separately in a moment. But this is just on the process that we have just gone through in some detail. So, on Day 110 he accepted that it could not have been done within the normal timeframe of 28 days but he says 13 months was an unreasonable period. what do you have to say to that?
A. Certainly, Chair, it took a lot longer than I envisaged the first day. But I think if you go back through it like, there were circumstances that were outside of my control in the context that, we'11 say, I had a load of people, we'11 say, go off and get their legal advice. I think they were entitled to that, to be fair to them. There was a period then of three months when I was actually resting with Mr. Cullen, where he was going off, going out to counsel, getting their legal advice. Then he comes back, we'11 say, with a number of initial 15:05 queries, which took some time to assemble, because again, you were talking about like the sick file, for example, like that was pretty big documentation, which is going back for a considerable period, historical
records. So like trying to get them all together takes time, you know, trying to find them, track them down, see where they are. There was another investigation there about this alleged driving thing, you know. Assembling that information, chair, took a good bit of time, I'd day. So I wouldn't say all of the delay was -- I don't blame myself for all the delay. But it did certainly take a lot longer than $I$ would expected, Chair. I think it's not unreasonable to say somebody would be unhappy that it took so long, yeah.
639 Q. M. MEGRATH Can I ask you, from the complainant's perspective was that a satisfactory period of time from his perspective? I think we have been hearing about your view on the others being given an opportunity and time to get legal advice?
A. I think I was fair to everybody, Chair. I mean, I gave him three months effectively during the middle of it there to go off and get his advice and his counsel. He came back with additional queries, which I pursued, which effectively I would say I pursued on his behalf. I tried to bottom them out. Then, you know, I suppose the challenge for me then was to go off and write the report when I assembled all the material. So I think I was trying to be fair and reasonable to everybody, you know, live within the principles of natural justice and 15:07 fair procedure, to all sides, Chair, you know.
640 Q. One of the other procedural complaints he makes, and it was at Day 114 when Mr. Patrick O'brien was cross-examining him, he says:
"I was never tol d to have meetings."

That you or Commissioner Finn's had. And he says:
"I was never gi ven mi nutes of intervi ews."

This is why during the course of today I was asking did you keep a minute of that or did you have a record of that meeting etcetera. Because there is a letter from the Tribunal to the CSSO after Garda Keogh gave evidence seeking to clarify this point.
A. Yeah.

641 Q. You might recall this.
A. I have it here in front of me.

642 Q. We got a response from An Garda Síochána and it's at page 15214.
A. I have it here.

CHA RMAN Yes.
A. I have it here.

CHA RMAN Thank you.
643 Q. M. MEGRATH This is confirming that whilst there were meetings with witnesses and whilst both you and the investigation team engaged directly, the words that are used "engaged directly with a number of witnesses" it
is confirmed on page 15215 that there were no interview notes or other notes from your dealings with these members. Now this is something that Garda Keogh is critical about. what do you have to say to that?
A. What we did, Chair, is that we met people, we gave them the allegations that were against them or the relevant portions that pertained to them and we said, look, there it is, you go off, prepare your response and come back to us. Now, it wasn't a case of, well, we sat down and kind of interrogated them and said there and then. You know, to be fair to people. Because, as I said earlier on, whatever was going to be said here could have implications for them at a future date, at another venue, another location. So I felt it be unreasonable and maybe unfair for me to try and say, look, you have to do it here now straightaway. You know, I allow people go off and come back to us with a written response. And having a written response was, I suppose, the best for me, Chair, because at least I could go back with it, here's the formal response from the parties that I interviewed, so there was no dispute about what was said, you know.
644 Q. Well, just in relation to that, just even the last line that you said or the implications for the future, should that not have indicated that notes should have been kept and records should have been kept in writing of these interactions with the various members?
A. But there was nothing of evidential value, I suppose, that emanated from them. It was a case, here, I am giving you the documentation, you go off and prepare a response and come back to me.
645 Q. CHA RMAK Did you intend this to be an entirely written process?
A. Yes, Chair.

646 Q. CHA RMAN In other words, you come to me with the material for the purpose of making sure I have it?
A. Yeah.

647 Q. CHA RMAN And then I come back with a written

```
        response?
```

A. Correct.
Q. CHA RMAN Is that the way this was done?
A. Yeah, Chair, yeah. So there is no dispute then afterwards, give people an opportunity, let them get their legal advice if they have to get legal advice.

649 Q. CHA RMAN So you don't talk to them at that stage and say, what's the story here, or $X$ says that and $Y$ says that and what do you say. You don't get into an interrogation?
A. No, no. Give them an opportunity to go off and get their advice, yeah.
650 Q. CHA RMAN So rightly or wrongly, that was the process?
A. Correct, Chairman, yeah. And that's not, I think, in keeping with the Code of Practice, which I referred to earlier on and going back to statutory instruments saying, look, natural justice, you allow people -- you make them aware of what the accusation is and you give a response to come back to you in writing.
CHA RMAN okay.
651 Q. M. MEGRATH There seems to be an error there on the recording of the answer, that's not, I think, in keeping with the Code of Practice. Did you mean to say that is in keeping with the code practice?

CHA RMAN No, it wouldn't be in keeping with the Code of Practice to interrogate people when you deliver the papers to them. Is that what you are saying?
A. Well, I'm saying in the context of code of Practice, that the code of Practice would say --

CHA RMAN Just one second.
A. Sorry, Chair.

652 Q. CHAD RMAN A moment ago.
A. Go on, Chair, yeah.

653 Q. CHA RMAN we had this conversation about this being a written process?
A. Yes, Chair.

654 Q. CHA RMAN And we also covered a question -- I don't mean to be rude, I am just trying to clarify, we also covered a question where, would you question somebody and say, A says this and B says no, and you said no?
A. Correct, yeah.

655 Q. CHA RMN And you said the process is that you give it and give them a chance?
A. Yeah.

656 Q. CHAI RMAN You went on to say, that wouldn't be in keeping with the Code of Practice. By which I understand you to mean that questioning people in those circumstances, when you deliver the papers, would not in your view be in keeping with the code of practice. Is that a correct --
A. No, that wasn't what I meant, if that's what I said. I said it would be in keeping with the code of Practice.
657 Q. CHAN RMAN very good. The way you did it, would be in
keeping, was in keeping with the Code of Practice?
A. Yeah, correct.

CHA RMAN okay. So thank you, Ms. McGrath, you are perfectly right. There was a misunderstanding.
ME. MEGRATH okay. It suggests a level of informality 15:12 in the engagement, the oral engagement with the parties; is that right?
A. I think it was very formal, Chair. I mean, here's the documentation, I want you to give me a formal response to this. I mean, the procedure is set out, Chair. We 15:12 have to follow the procedure.

659 Q. I think when we looked -- at the very, very beginning of your evidence this morning, when we looked at the policy, you accepted that you were establishing facts and credibility. Now, I think your evidence to the Chair there a moment saying is that you anticipated this investigation or saw this investigation as primarily a written process?
A. Well, that's what I did, yeah.
okay. So, were you satisfied you were assessing credibility from looking at documents without oral meetings or hearings or interactions or interviews?
A. Well people had the opportunity to challenge the credibility of the evidence that was produced to them.
661 Q. But is it your evidence that you were assessing credibility but through a written process?
A. Yeah. Well, you were hearing everybody's version of how they perceived the matters to be, we'11 say, yeah.

662 Q. Now, can I just look at your report itself? This
report is at page 5521 of our documents. Now, I think we would be here another day if we went through every line of this report. So I just want to ask you a couple of questions about it. Now, Garda Keogh, in his evidence, took the position on Day 104, he says:
> "The Finn i nvesti gation shoul d not have reached the concl usi on that it di d."

He said on Day 104:
"It was an exercise in circling of the wagons."

And he also says that:
"Some of the evi dence was downpl ayed or i gnored."

So that is his view of the report and he rejects the report in its entirety. So you're aware of that?
A. Yes, Chair. Yeah.

663 Q. He made a further statement to the Tribunal, which is at 5969 and he said:
"The investi gation conducted by Assi stant Commi ssi oner Finn amounted to a consci ous and del i berate failure to protect me frombullying and harassment within the force and by reasons of the concl usi ons reached by Assi stant Commi ssi oner Finn."

So that is the view he takes of this report. I think you would be aware of that?
A. Sorry, Chairman, just to catch up.

CHA RMAN Just a moment. Ms. Doolin is just giving you the bit where he says it's conscious and deliberate. Very good. Yes, Ms. McGrath.

MS. MEGRATH Sorry, I was just reading out what Garda Keogh's charge to this Tribunal is in respect of this report. I can repeat them if you like, commissioner?
A. I am just reading them.

CHA RMAN okay.
665 Q. ME. MEGRATH okay.
A. Okay.

CHA RMAN Yes.
666 Q. MS. MEGRATH So effectively, as I said, on Day 104, 15:15 from page 80 onwards of the transcript, he says the following, and I am going to summarise them to you. He says that the Finn investigation ignored parts of his evidence and downplayed other parts; that there was nothing to see here; that it was a circling of the wagons; he also says at page 90 you should not have reached the conclusions that you did. So, he says the conclusions that were reached on the findings were incorrect. He also says, as you saw there in the additional statement, he sees it as an exercise in bullying and harassment of him by the force. Now, just to give you an opportunity to comment on that?
A. I refute that, Chair. I disagree with that. CHA RMAN I thought you might.

667 Q. M. MEGRATH And in respect of the report itself, which I have asked Mr. Kavanagh -- 5521. Now, the findings are set out individually and I am not going to take you through each one, but I think the findings speak for themselves. If you remember, the standard you applied was the balance of probabilities, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. I think you did not uphold his complaint in any respect on the balance of probabilities?
A. That's correct, yes, Chair.

669 Q. Okay. If I can ask you maybe just to look at the introduction to the report, because I just want to ask you one or two questions about that.
A. Yes.

670 Q. You outline on the first page, this is at 5521, you give details of your appointment, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

671 Q. At the top of the next page, this is the issue about where you were going to get a copy of his statement?
A. Yes.

672 Q. You talk about meeting with him on the 1st December?
A. That's correct.

673 Q. And the next paragraph, you told him that you would investigate whatever matters he wanted to include in his complaint?
A. Yes, Chair, yeah.

CHA RMAN I think we have al1 this, Ms. McGrath, wel1 and truly.

674 Q. MG. MEGRATH Sorry. Therefore then, takes you through the 1st December, the clarification of the members that complaints had been made against. Sorry, what I want to concentrate on is 5523, the next page. And you say there in the first paragraph:
"On the 15th December Assi stant Commi ssi oner Finn wrote to each of the persons named by Garda Keogh, informing them that they had been appoi nted."
we have seen that:
"Fromthe outset of the investigation all of the parties invol ved expressed concern and di ssatisfaction with the timeframes in whi ch the compl ai nt was being i nvesti gated. They al so expressed di ssatisfaction that the bullying and harassment process was being used to compromise the ci vil proceedings whi ch were running in parallel with the bullying and harassment complaint."

And is this what was -- who did this come from, that particular complaint?
A. Superintendent Murray.

675 Q. And this was his concern, that if you proceeded with your investigation it would compromise the civil proceedings, is that right?
A. Compromise his position anyway, Chair. I think he felt he would be compromised because -- or he was concerned he might be compromised because any material he would
have to give to me would be given over to Garda Keogh, we'11 say, and I suppose he was concerned that would it have legal implications for him or disclosing documentation -- I think he was concerned that it might have implications for the State side of it too if he was giving documentation over to me which I was going to be giving over to Garda Keogh. That's my understanding of it, chair, now.
676 Q. And this was coming from Superintendent Murray, is that right?
A. Yeah.

677 Q. Effectively. It goes on to say:
"Wile all the parties agreed to cooperate with the investi gation, they were dissatisfied that the investigation had taken such a long period of time to formally commence, gi ven the length of time bet ween the date that Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an was tasked to take Garda Keogh's statement in March 2017 and 15th Decenber..."

When you're appointed, okay?
A. Yes, Chair.

678 Q. "Garda Keogh al so made reference to the fact that he first raised this issue in 2016."
A. Yes, Chair.

679 Q. And that's it. Is that right? Is that the on7y reference in your report, it would seem to be, in relation to the delay issue in commencement?
A. Sorry, I don't fully understand that question.
Q. Is that your paragraph dealing with that complaint by Garda Keogh, in particular about the delay in commencement?
A. I am just highlighting it there, Chair, that he was not 15:20 happy with the fact that the delay -- or all the parties involved had issues about the delay, Chair, yeah.
Q. But is that your substantive response in the report to the issue?
A. Yes, Chair. This is my report on the bullying and harassment?
Q. CHA RMAN I am understanding the distinction you are making and the point you are making.
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN But counsel is asking you, is that the only reference?
A. That is, Chair.

CHA RMAN And the implication in Ms. McGrath's questions is that there is something wrong with that, that's the implication, that you should have had more of a description of the thing. I am not saying I agree with that but that seems to me to be the implication of Ms. McGrath's question. What do you say to that?
A. I thought it was adequate in terms of describing the intro of the issues, we'11 say.
Q. CHA RMAN I understand.
A. I could have gone into it more, Chairman.
Q. CHAN RMAN I am understanding the distinction you make
about grievance about that and so on, and whether that is right or wrong, people will debate in due course and maybe you will be asked about that, I just don't want to express any view about that?
A. I know. I suppose I was putting context in my report, saying, look, leading into it, there is background to this and this is the background to it, that people aren't happy about the delay.
MS. MtGRATH Perhaps I could cut to the chase and say that if you were Garda keogh and you were reading this, you would be none the wiser effectively as to where his complaint was between end of 2016, 2017. Would you accept that?
A. That'd be fair enough, Chair, yeah.
"Parties expressing concern in rel ation to the length of time that it all took."

And the issue of civil proceedings and legal advice is summarised there. And then you go on to say:
> "Garda Keogh rai sed 18 specific points in his statement of complaint."

You say:
"Not all the matters rel ate to the three menbers nominated by Garda Keogh in his statement of complaint.

However, for compl et eness each of the issues rai sed by Garda Keogh have been addressed in this report."
A. Yes, Chair yeah.

689 Q. So you didn't confine it to Superintendent Murray, Chief Superintendent Curran or Chief Superintendent Wheatley, is that right? You took a broad approach to dealing with all issues in his complaint, is that right?
A. In fairness, I think he raised the 18 issues, I think it is appropriate that $I$ would make some reference, or reference them in response back, Chairman, as best I could.

I think if you skip on through your report and, as I say, I'm not going to through the findings but you do say about Garda Keogh's statement, at 5525, there at the very bottom?
A. Yes.

691 Q. You say:
"In his opi ni on, following the making of a protected di scl osure he encountered har assment, vi ctimisation and penal i sation. "

So were you alive to the fact that these complaints were being made in a very particular context for him?
A. Sorry?

692 Q. With the background of -- you say there "protected disclosure issues" that it was following the making of the protected disclosures?
A. Yes.

693 Q. So was that a particular contextual issue for you, that you looked at the complaints against that background?
A. Yeah. I mean he outlined that in his statement. I think it was the start of his own statement, we'll say. 694 Q. Now, as we say, the rest of your report goes on in some detail to go through each individual finding and in fact we have a schedule of issues here for the Tribunal and you see that the schedule of issues is very similar to the issues you looked at, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

695 Q. For example, when Garda Keogh rejected the conclusions of your report he was asked in blunt terms, well, which conclusions do you disagree with. I think one of the ones he isolated was the Liam McHugh analysis, do you remember that?
A. Yes, Chair.

696 Q. Do you have any view on that, in the approach that you took to that issue?
A. Well, I have a view in the context, Chair, in June, we'11 say, $I$ gave him all the statements, we'11 say, which included an unredacted one, which showed that Garda Lyons was the person who had made the -- had spoke to Superintendent McBrien, we'11 say. And if I am correct in saying this, Chair, in August, when he made statement to the Tribunal -- not the Tribunal -maybe the Tribunal -- he made a statement in August, we'11 say, he referred to that, which I wouldn't have sight until 1ater. But in September, when he wrote,
when his solicitor wrote back to me, he made no reference to that, which, you know, I would take it, if that was such an issue, why didn't he come back to me and say, McHugh, why didn't you follow that up a bit further, because I now know it was Garda Lyons and all the issues that flow from that. So I have to say, I was surprised, Chair, that he didn't.
697 Q. I think on oral evidence, here at the Tribunal, there's been some movement, bits and pieces here and there in relation to the individual complaints, isn't that right, in the evidence and you will have seen that?
A. I'm not sure exactly what you mean.

698 Q. Well, for example, in looking at the Liam McHugh issue and who said what and who did what?
A. oh yeah, yeah.

699 Q. There's been some movement in the evidence, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

700 Q. From the date of your report?
A. Yes, Chair.

701 Q. Okay. Now, as I say, your conclusion was to the effect that there was no bullying and harassment here in respect of Garda Keogh, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chair, yeah.

702 Q. Did you take a view of what the senior officers were doing? what was your view of what they were doing in their dealings with Garda Keogh?
A. I'm not quite sure what you mean by that.
Q. Well, I suppose to clarify that, I think you say in
respect of a lot of your findings --
A. Oh, in the context that they were doing their job.

704 Q. Yes.
A. We'11 say, that this was part of their role and responsibility, like you know, they were superintendents, chief superintendents in the Guards and you would expect them to be making some of the queries they were asking, we'11 say, yeah.
Q. And is that how you saw it?
A. Yes, Chair.

706 Q. One of the things I want to ask you about, just to deal again with something Garda Keogh mentioned in his evidence. You talked about, that you would look at his complaint in the context of bullying and corporate bullying, did you see that?
A. Yes, Chair.

707 Q. Garda Keogh says that, for example -- I will just find the day he said, on Day 109. He said he didn't know what this was about and he didn't really understand it. was that ever explained to him, examining it in the corporate context?
A. No, Chair, no.

708 Q. Can you te11 the Chairman what you saw as the difference between the two and why you looked at it under both?
A. I think, Chair, when I was looking at -- when I was getting to my report, writing stage, you know, I wanted to, for myself, so I would have the best possible understanding of what bullying and harassment meant,
you know, I went looking myself to see, you know, was my interpretation the best, the most appropriate one. So I did my own legal research, we'11 say, and I looked at a Supreme Court judgment there, so obviously I took that, because I felt that was from the highest court. I was using that as my barometer, my yardstick to say, look, you know, I should have a broader perspective on bullying and harassment maybe than what our own guidance would suggest to you, so $I$ used that as a yardstick, Chair.
709 Q. Now, we talked about further issues -CHA RMAN That's not Ruffley.
A. I wouldn't have had that discussion with, you know, we'11 say, Mr. Cullen at the outset when we were staring off obviously.
710 Q. CHA RMAN It's not Ruffley, no.
A. No, but it's --

711 Q. CHA RMAN No, that's all right, I am sorry, I was thinking of a different one.
A. I looked at that one too, chair. It is Ruffley v. The Board of Managenent at St. Anne's school, that's the one.

CHA RMAN There you are. A Court of Appeal decision, which I was familiar, because I was one of the judgments. But the Supreme Court went into a lot of detail, actually gave very helpful advice then on the subject.
A. Yeah.

712 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. So you looked at that. I just
wondered, it struck me that might be the case.
A. You're right.

713 Q. CHA RMAN Anyway, tell us about the corporate bullying then that Ms. McGrath was asking you about, where did that come from?
A. I felt, Chair, that we should look at it not just in the individual, looking at the individuals, that I should look at the collective approach to see did -and when I looked at it, all of the parties, did I -would I have considered it to be corporate bullying, yeah. So I took that into consideration in writing my report.

714 Q. CHA RMAN In other words, a sort of collective?
A. Yes, Chair.

CHA RMAN Whatever about the individual persons, that ${ }_{15: 28}$ was there a collective in some way?
A. That's it, Chair.

CHA RMAK okay.
716 Q. MS. MEGRATH Now, we're finishing up, commissioner, just in relation to, you submitted your report and as we saw from the policy earlier today, there is a provision for a review of the report, isn't that right?
A. Yeah. Effectively, Chair, I was reporting back to the assistant commissioner of Eastern Region.
717 Q. CHAl RMAN Yes.
A. Who appointed me.

718 Q. MG. MEGRATH Okay. Now however, the appointing office was assistant commissioner Eastern Region but on 3rd January 2019, you took over responsibility for the

Eastern Region; isn't that right?
A. I had interim responsibility then.
Q. CHAL RMAN Yes.
A. So effectively I was reporting back to myself, which obviously made no sense.

MS. MEGRATH So you couldn't review yourself effective1y?
A. Correct.

721 Q. Then I think that it was at that point that Assistant Commissioner O'Brien of the Northern region was put in place by Alan Mulligan to undertake the role of the appointing officer and do the review?
A. That's right.

722
Q. Isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chair.

723 Q. I just want to ask you because it is something I would like to clarify with Assistant Commissioner O'Brien as well, but he came back with some queries to your team, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

724 Q. During the review. Can I just ask you about a document, to see if it is your document. Perhaps if you look at 12019. He came back with queries and I wil1 go through this in more detail with Assistant Commissioner O'Brien, but he came back with a series of 15:30 queries. You see these notes "note to AC Finn" do you see that?
A. Bear with me.
Q. This is on, for example, the Liam McHugh issue. We
will deal with that in more detail, as I say, with the next witness. But it says:
"Note to AC Finn: I woul d respectfully suggest that Superintendent McBrien should be asked to directly respond to this particular query in order that a definitive response can be gi ven to Assi stant Commi ssi oner O Br ien. "

Is that Chief Superintendent Myers writing that note?
Is that a note to you? Do you remember this document?
A. I'm just looking at it here, Chair. I think it could be from one of my team but not necessarily Chief Superintendent Myers.
726 Q. But it's a note to you?
A. Yeah.
Q. And so, you considered this?
A. Well I passed it on to Assistant Commissioner o'brien for his team, yeah.
728 Q. Okay. So that's a draft document coming, that we are looking at and dealing with the queries that had been raised, but that's not the final response --
A. Oh yeah.
Q. -- to Assistant Commissioner o'Brien?
A. Correct. I think, if my memory serves me correct, Chair, I did contact Superintendent O'Brien to see did she have any additional materials than what she had already given to me, and she didn't.
730 Q. okay. Then you responded to those queries?
A. Yes.

731 Q. As I said, we can deal with this with the assistant commissioner, but you responded to the queries and he proceeded on with his review; is that right?
A. Correct, yeah.

15:31
So I think had you no further dealings, after you dealt with the queries you had no further dealing with this investigation, is that right? okay.
CHAN RMAN That's right? That was the end of your involvement?
A. That was the end of my involvement.

CHA RMAN After answering the queries?
A. Yeah.
Q. CHA RMAN Thank you.
A. It was over to Assistant Commissioner O'Brien then to take the matter from there.

MS. MEGRATH Thank you, commissioner. I wonder if you would answer any questions, please. CHA RMAN Thank you. Yes, Mr. O'Brien.

ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER M CHAEL FI NN WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR 0 BRI EN, AS FOLLOVS:

736 Q. MR. O BRIEN Commissioner, if we could just go back to your statement, at page 4108 please. I think you told us earlier on this afternoon and you said in your statement here that you have a wealth and knowledge of experience investigating complaints of bullying and harassment, that's is important to establish at the
outset against whom the complaint is being made; isn't that correct.
A. That's correct.

737 Q. You said to the Chairman when you were asked, just in relation to your own experience, that you had investigated complaints under this policy before, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

And did I understand you to say that you had been the appointing officer, I think you described it as being in the Fanning role?
A. Yeah.

739 Q. As opposed to the role of investigator, is that right?
A. Correct.

740 Q. Can I just ask you then, in terms of the amount of these complaints that you have dealt with in your career in the investigator role, how many times had you performed that role under the policy prior to the investigation of this complaint?
A. I'm not a hundred percent sure, chair, but I would say probably less than ten. I wouldn't have been doing them very frequently.
741 Q. So you had some experience, it's fair to say?
A. Yes, Chair.

742 Q. In your previous investigations did you perform the role in the same manner that you performed the investigation in this. So I suppose largely a people-based investigation?
A. No, Chair, no I think any of the ones I did in the past
were much simpler, you know. A dispute between two staff members, we'11 say, you know. It wouldn't be as complex.
When you say much simpler, now I know obviously there are a large amount of issues within this investigation?
A. Fewer parties, we'11 say. Like you might be talking about two members, a dispute between a sergeant and a guard, something like that, you know.
744 Q. I see.
A. Yeah.

745 Q. If you can just turn please to the policy document itself please. If Mr. Kavanagh could turn to page 4199. Again, just to move through this quickly. It confirms that the investigation that you're carrying out was to establish facts, isn't that right, you will see there in the middle of the page "the investigation will establish facts"?
A. What page?
Q. Sorry, 4199?
A. I have the document itself here. Are you on page 20 or 15:34 21 of that document, it's down at the bottom corner.

747 Q. 28 on the 1eft-hand side.
A. Thank you. This will speed it up, Chair. I have it here, Chair, yeah.
748 Q. So your role is to establish facts and credibility of the complaint with due regard to the provisions of fair procedure and natural justice; isn't that correct?
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. Natural justice, in fact -- so if you move forward to
the next page, so 4200, it deals with the sensitivity of the complaint and it says:
"With respect to carrying out an investigation, the di visional officer shall give due consideration to the sensitivity of the complaint and ensure that the investigating officer behave appropriately with due regard to the established tenets of fair procedure and natural justice in the circumstances."

> Isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

750 Q. So as we move through the policy document and if you turn to internal page 32, it's 4203?
A. Yeah.

751 Q. I think the spirit and the ethos of the policy essentially is that you would abide by the principles of fair procedures and natural justice, you would remain impartial, would you accept that?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

752 Q. That in doing so, that the investigation wouldn't be biased against any party?
A. Yeah.

753 Q. It wouldn't be predetermined?
A. Correct.

754 Q. Isn't that correct?
A. Yeah.

755 Q. If you look to 8.6 please, it just says:

Yeah.
Q. I see. And if you just move down two paragraphs there, in relation to discussing the case, it says:
"The compl ai nant and the person compl ai ned of should be requested not to di scuss the case with any other party not connected with the investigation. This does not precl ude di scussing the case with one's staff
representatives, medical practitioner or any other professi onal or family member or nomi nated friend or col I eague. "

Isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

759 Q. Are you satisfied that you abided by that provision?
A. As best I possible could, Chair, yeah.

760 Q. And again then if you move down to the bottom of the
page, that the complainant will be provided with a copy of the statement of the person against whom the complaint is being made and given an opportunity to comment on the statement?
A. Yes, Chair.

761 Q. I think you did afford Garda Keogh an opportunity to do that?
A. Yes, Chair.

762 Q. Again, if you turn over the page, you're carrying out your investigation and the results are premised on the balance of probabilities, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, Chair.

763 Q. If we could just turn again over the page to internal page 34 , and at 8.8 thee you wil1 see it says:
"The investigat or must avoid di scussing the case with any person, whet her within or outside of the workplace, ot her than those to whom they must speak in the course of the investi gation. "

And then it deals particularly with impartiality and it says:
"During the course of the investigation, the i nvestigat or will be impartial and will not indicate their vi ews with regard to credi bility or ot herwi se of the compl ai nt itself or the evi dence gi ven by the compl ai nant, the person agai nst whom the compl ai nt is made or any witnesses."

And are you satisfied that you complied with that part of the policy?
A. I believe that I did, Chair, yeah.

764 Q. I see. And again, on the next, just moving down to the 15:38 next paragraph:
"The investigator will refuse to be drawn into any specul ation."

CHA RMAN Mr. O'Brien, can I just ask you, obvious7y I am assuming you're going to be a few minutes.
MR. O BRI EN Yes.
CHA RMAN That's all right. I propose to take what they call in wimbledon a comfort stop at this moment.
That will make me better able to concentrate on your questions. There's no problem with that and there's no great hurry. I hope we can finish with the assistant commissioner this afternoon, I am hoping that will be the case. If it means sitting on a little bit, that's not a problem. But anyway, we will take a tiny break for about five minutes. Okay, thanks very much.

THE HEARI NG THEN AD ORNED BRI EFLY AND RESUMED, AS

## FOLLOVS:

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Now, Mr. O'Brien. Thanks very much.
MR. O BRI EN Just to indicate, you had mentioned
before we broke up that it may be possible to finish the cross-examination today.
CHAL RMAN If possible, yes.
MR. O BRI EN $I$ anticipate that it will take a little
bit of time, just in ease of the witness.
15:43
CHAN RMAN Certainly, well let's just --
MR. O BRI EN I wanted to indicate that.
CHA RMAN wait now. without any pressure, Mr. O'brien, you're entitled to cross-examine. So there is no problem about that. How long do you need? MR. O BRI EN I think it will take 45 minutes certainly or an hour.
CHA RMAN okay. Let's assume that's an hour. Mr. Murphy, have you much in the way of cross-examination?
MR MRPH: I will be brief, Chairman.
CHAN RMAN very good.
MR. MRPH: I could finish in perhaps ten or 15
minutes.
CHA RMAN Very good. We11, what do you think? Are you happy to carry on?

THE WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN We11, look, we will carry on, Mr. O'brien. We will proceed to the end. Take as long as you like, and if that takes an hour or more than an hour, then so 15:44 be it, okay.
765 Q. MR. O BRI EN Assistant commissioner, just before we paused there, we were looking at paragraph 8.8 of the policy and we were looking to the second part of that,
which states as follows:
"The investi gat or will ref use to be drawn into any specul ation with any party as to the likel y out come of the investi gation and the investigator will mai ntain a 15:45 record of all intervi ews or meetings hel d during the i nvest i gation. "

Are you satisfied that you complied with that part of the policy?
A. Insofar as anything of a substantial nature I recorded it. But I mean, as I explained to the Chair earlier on, the process $I$ did is that $I$ met the people, I gave them what, we'11 say, the allegations were, the substance were, and I gave them an opportunity to go away and come back to me in writing. So it wasn't like sitting down and asking them, give me an answer to A, give me an answer to $B, I$ didn't do that, we'11 say.
766 Q. Well, just on that note, I think the Chairman asked you a question, which was whether you intended for the investigation to be an entirely written process and I think you answered in the affirmative, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

767 Q. That's what you said?
A. I didn't, yeah.

768 Q. If I could ask you to turn over to page 4208, please. So it's internal page 37 of your booklet there.
A. Yes.

769 Q. You see at the bottom of that page that there's a -sorry it's 4202, internal page 31?
A. 31.

770 Q. It's 4202. This is a flowchart?
A. I have it here.

771 Q. If you look, that's the flowchart of the formal
process. If we could scroll down to the bottom part of that please. On the left-hand side there you will see number 6, it's slightly blacked out and it's the actions to be taken by the investigating member. In the middle of that, you will see under the heading "Acti vity":
"I nt er vi ews compl ai nant, per son compl ai ned of and any witness to the inci dent."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.

772 Q. So I suggest to you therefore that the policy dictates that this can't be a purely paper based investigation and that it puts an obligation on you to investigate and to meet with these parties, would you accept that?
A. I wouldn't say that, Chair. I mean if it was, say, a matter where the parties involved hadn't made a written statement, then I think I would be obliged to, you know, meet them and find out from them, well, give me an account of it. And then you'd be talking about writing your notes of interviews, then I'd think I'd be obliged to do that if I had that type of scenario, you
know. But here it was slightly different in the context, it was different in the context that I actually had the written statement. So everything was there in writing for me.

I see. I asked you a few moments in particular about impartiality, which is provided for under section 8.8. would you accept that being impartial, I suppose, is not having any prior dealings with a person either that has made a complaint or, indeed, one of the parties against whom the complaint is being made?
A. I wouldn't say that these guidelines are as rigid as, for example, Chair, our discipline regulations, where it sets out in regulation, discipline regulations, we'11 say, which are described often as that, you must do A, B and C, and you can't have any prior
involvement. I don't think our document here --
774 Q. Let's put it more simply than that. To carry a fair and impartial investigation into an allegation of bullying and harassment, is it fair to say that it would be best practice at the very least for you not to know personally or have any dealings with any of the individuals involved in the complaint?
A. I wouldn't say that no, no.
Q. You think it's fair to know some individuals. I just don't understand?
A. If I was in a work setting, Chair, and if I was talking to employees, sure I'd know all the employees. You couldn't be coming with totally clean hands, you would have to know them, we'll say, you know. You couldn't
remove yourself totally and say, oh, I have to bring out some chief superintendent from outside to deal with industrial relation, you know, type of scenario. I don't think it would make sense to me, Chair. That's my opinion. That's only my opinion, Chair. Within an organisation the size of An Garda Síochána, for example, you wouldn't know all of the employees?
A. No.

777 Q.
In this case, I think you told the Chairman earlier on that you knew chief superintendent Mark Curran; is that 15:49 right?
A. Yeah, professionally. I mean, I would have known who he was in the Commissioner's office, we'11 say. I was in a different block, I was over in the bureau block, as they call it, he was in the central block where the Commissioner is. So we didn't go out socialising or anything like that, we'11 say, you know, I just knew him professionally.
778 Q. Just to understand your answer in terms of, let's say, how you might find a conflict of interest on your part as the investigator. How far do you believe you would have to -- sorry, how well do you believe you would have to know somebody or have had dealings with them before you would say, in fact I am conflicted in this, I can't investigate it impartially?
A. It's hard to answer. I suppose it's speculating in one sense but I can if you want me to be speculative. I mean, if I had dealt with the person previously in a similar type scenario and maybe, you know, I'd lean one
way or the other, that I would say, look, maybe prefer to get someone else to deal with it. There was certainly no question of that here, Chair. I knew the guy. It wasn't that we were buddies or anything like that, we'11 say, you know what I mean. I knew him, he was in the chief -- I suppose we would know each other going up through our careers. I'm sure, as I said, we were on some promotion list at some time. We were never on the same promotion course. But I mean, I knew who he was but I had no relationship. Unlike the other 15:50 two, we'11 say, who had probably minuscule or any relationship.
779 Q. I am conscious obviously that the next issue that I am going to touch on is for the next part of the Tribunal's hearings. But just purely in terms of impartiality, you have actually dealt with Superintendent Murray before, in terms of signing a clearance form, isn't that right?
A. Oh yes, sorry. Chair, I will explain that one. It's very simple to explain. I was, we'11 say, attached to HQ, we were in what I call the bureau block, okay. So I was assistant commissioner for policing. You also the executive director for HRPD and you had the assistant commissioner for governance and accountability. And occasionally, we'11 say, something urgent would have to be done, signed by assistant commissioner, and they would come over to me, because they knew I had been there a long time, I suppose, look, will you sign that for us. That was purely the
case with that particular case with Superintendent Murray's promotion, like you know. It wasn't my side of the house, it was something I was doing for somebody else, yeah.
780 Q. Again, I am not going to get into the promotion issue?
A. Yeah.

781 Q. But I think you signed that form in September of 2017, is that right? If we turn to page 12460. Again, I am dealing with this purely on the basis of impartiality coming into the investigation?
A. Yes.

782 Q. So that's a clearance form, if I can say it correctly?
A. Yes. I think, Chair, this was probably relatively new to us, that, you know, the Policing Authority were coming to us.

783 Q. CHA RMAN Yes, I understand.
A. I'd say even the staff within the section.

784 Q. CHA RMAN I understand.
A. Governance and accountability, you know, I think they didn't realise that it shouldn't have been coming from me, I should have just reported back to the Commissioner's office and they should have got onto the Policing Authority. But anyway, it was one of a few I think that signed that day, Chair.
CHAI RMAN Yes.
785 Q. MR. O BRIEN I see. Having signed that document, when you were appointed by Assistant Commissioner Fanning to carry out this investigation, did you not question your ability to remain impartial at that point?
A. I have actually no doubt whatsoever, Chair, that I have no fathom of -- or partiality towards Superintendent Murray in that regard.
786 Q. If we could move forward then please to your meeting on 1st December 2017. And this is with Garda Keogh, Mr. Cullen, solicitor, and it was attended by Chief Superintendent Myers. It's at page 4219 of the papers.
A. 4219?

787
Q. Yes. It's Volume 40.
A. I have that.

788 Q. I know we have been through this in detail.
A. Yes.

789 Q. If you turn to page 4220, please. I think again touching on the fair procedures point, you have asked Mr. Cullen and Garda Keogh to accept that you were neutral coming into the investigation, isn't that correct? I think Mr. Cullen accepted your bona fides, isn't that right?
A. He did, yeah, in fairness, yeah.

790 Q. I have to suggest to you that it was made clear to you by Garda Keogh and his solicitor at this meeting precisely who he was complaining about. Will you accept that?
A. No.

791 Q. We11, if you look there at page 4220:
"Who are you making compl ai nts agai nst?

Gar da Keogh: Pat Murray superintendent, two chi ef s in


Mullingar. Mark Curran and Lorraine Weatley."

CHA RMAN Yes.
A. If we go back to the first bit you referred to there.

794 Q. MR. O BRI EN Yes.
A. Where it says -- if you go a few lines up from that, he mentions a sergeant in the chief's office in --

795 Q. CHA RMAN That's right.
A. Yeah.

796 Q. MR. O BRIEN He does. And he says, again he says:
"Pat Murray, Mark Curran --"
A. Indeed, there actually is another line there where he says:
"There may be others."

CHA RMAN The investigation will show it, yes.
797 Q. MR. O BRIEN I see. what I'm suggesting to you is, at the end of that meeting it is clear to you, should be clear to you the persons against whom Garda Keogh is complaining about. Do you accept that?
A. I wasn't. Chair, I wasn't obviously. I mean, I wasn't myself fully satisfied, may be the best way to describe
it, that I knew, and I wouldn't be fully satisfied that he knew himself maybe who he was making the complaint against.
You dealt with this a little bit earlier on, but in his evidence, Garda Keogh, again it's at Day 114, page 66, he describes the meeting as being an obstructive meeting more than anything else, on your part?
A. That wasn't certainly my take at all, Chair, I object to that.

799 Q. At this stage you had read his statement, isn't that right?
A. Yeah. And, Chair, I think if I go to the end of the second last page of the minutes of that, at the bottom of it I ask him:
"Are you happy? I hope I am being fair and reasonable" and he says:

> "Yes."

So...
800 Q. Okay.
A. I left thinking that he was happy with what we had done, Chair, that I was being fair and reasonable.
801 Q. But again, that is Inspector Brown's note of the
A. Yes.
Q. It's not a stenographer's note?
A. You're right in that regard. Chair, he's right, that's
a fact.
803 Q. If we move on then to the 4th December, at page 4234, this is the list of jobs that Chief superintendent Myers created. I think if we just look through that very briefly. At page 4234, for example, one of the items relates to Chief Superintendent Curran. It's allocated to you, I suppose, as a task. And that there is no correspondence from Chief Superintendent Curran to this on the file. Garda Keogh requests clarification in respect of the HQ circular but no advice received. So that was one of the things that you had undertaken to do and to investigate?
A. I would describe this as a sort of a brain dumping, , where we set out all the jobs. But like this was at the very early stage of the investigation. You don't know the full history or the full circumstances. So I can't recal1 now. Every job here was -- we'11 say this was what we had intended to do before we actually started out doing what we were doing. So as the investigation moved forward, Chair, things kind of came 15:58 to us in a slightly different way. It wasn't a case of like we had a jobs book here and you were doing like a murder investigation, doing 1 to 10 or whatever, like and we go back and forth.
804 Q. I see. At the end of the tasks, I suppose, again other 15:58 things that are allocated to you. So page 4241, I suppose is the general complaint of bullying and harassment against Chief Superintendent Curran and Superintendent Murray?
A. Yeah.

805 Q. Do I take it that you were dealing with those particular individuals in the context of this investigation?
A. Correct, Chair, I was, yeah, yeah, I dealt with them, 15:58 yeah.

806 Q. I think if we just turn over then to page 4227 , and this is a letter that you received from Mr. Cullen, solicitor, on 5th December 2012. Again, I want to just raise a couple of issues with you in relation to this. 15:59 If we move to page 4228, please. You will see under the title, the paragraph procedural fragmentation?
A. Yes, Chair.

807 Q. Mr. Cullen indicates to you that this complaint is lost for a period seven or eight months.
A. Yes.

808 Q. He says:
"Why was the compl ai nt misl aid and what were the ci rcumstances of the redi scovery?"

Did you ever answer Mr. Cullen's query in that regard?
A. I don't think I did, Chair, no, no.

809 Q. Why was that?
A. It wasn't deliberate. I suppose, issue with me, Chair, 15:59 you know. I can't honestly recall now, I mean, why I didn't do it. I mean, I suppose he asked me lots of questions, Chair, in that minute. I mean, did I go fragment each one and ask him -- go back to it, you
know.
810 Q. I see.
A. I suppose I mean, I was doing the investigation in its totality. I didn't think that was -- maybe I should have responded, Chair, it was negligent on my behalf I didn't. I didn't mean to be offensive to him or anything like that.
811 Q. Well, I think we know that you weren't appointed until 15th November 2017, and we know that Garda Keogh made a statement to Chief Superintendent Scanlon in March?
A. Yes.

812 Q. So would you accept that it is certain on Garda Keogh's behalf and it was put to you by his solicitor at this stage that he was concerned about the delay and he required an explanation for that delay?
A. Yes. We11, I was saying to him earlier on, we'11 say, when I met him, you know, if Chief Superintendent Scanlan, we'11 say, for example, if he was the person he was saying was responsible for the delay, just -and I'm not saying he did now -- we'11 say, if he was
responsible, we'11 say, and this was -- and he had an issue with that, we'11 say, I was trying to say -- I was saying to him, clearly, look, if you have a grievance then you should pursue that as a grievance. That doesn't really come within the realm of what I was 16:01 being tasked to do here in terms of the bullying and harassment complaint, to be honest. Because I mean, I took up the ball from, I suppose, the 1st December, when I met him, or the 15th November when I was
appointed and I met him and took the investigation from there. I wasn't looking back at the historical aspect of it, because he didn't name Chief Superintendent Scanlan or anybody else as the persons responsible for, you know -- he didn't name them in the bullying -- in the context of my investigation he didn't name them out, we'11 say, that they did anything, they were doing anything wrong. So I didn't proceed, follow them, we'11 say, you know.
813 Q. I understand that, but I suppose the point that Garda Keogh had a difficulty and the concern that Garda Keogh had at that stage was, this was a bullying and harassment complaint which he had made in March 2017 and there was no explanation. You're now appointed the investigator and there was no explanation whatsoever given to him or no comfort given to him as to where his complaint lay for that period of time between March and November, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct. But I didn't that was my role, Chair. I mean, I think I just picked up the ball from when I was appointed, you know.

814 Q. Just to move forward. I mean, Mr. Cullen also raised some other concerns on Garda Keogh's behalf. He was concerned about the role that Mr. Nugent had in calling a -- sorry, in relation to meetings that Mr. Nugent had 16:02 called?
A. Yeah.

815 Q. And this reference to a scoping exercise?
A. Yeah.
Q. I mean, did you ever deal with that concern?
A. No, but I suppose I did unearth it in the context of the correspondence that I got from Assistant Commissioner Fanning, which kind of outlined the history before it came to me, you know. But I didn't go back to him, I didn't ask him about it, Mr. Cullen, we'11 say, yeah.
817 Q. Finally, you will see there Mr. Cullen was concerned and he sets out with the title of conceptual fragmentation there.
A. Hm -hmm.

818 Q. He says as follows:
"The compl ai nt, for the avoi dance of doubt, must on the contrary be processed in the accordance with the
standard bullying and har assment grievance procedures and in accordance with fair procedures and any attempt at further fragmentation using concepts such as scoping are inconsi stent with any uni formappl ication of standard procedures in this case."

So, what I am suggesting to you is that Mr. Cullen was pointing out to you at this stage, you are the investigator, you must investigate this complaint within the bullying and harassment procedure, isn't
A. Absolutely. And I went to some considerable length to find out from him, who is it that you're making complaint against.

819 Q. If we move to page 4265 please. Not to go over it again, but you don't -- so this is your response to Mr. Cullen.
A. Yeah.

820 Q. It deals with the 21 points.
A. Yeah.

821 Q. It refers to his correspondence on the 5th December. I think this letter is from the same date?
A. Yeah.

822 Q. But again, you don't deal with the delay issue in this letter, sure you don't?
A. Sorry, I don't understand the question.

823 Q. In this letter, where you deal with the 21 points?
A. Yeah.

824 Q. It doesn't deal with the delay from March to November? 16:04
A. No.

825 Q. okay. Notwithstanding the fact that that had been raised in the previous correspondence from Mr. Cullen?
A. I mean, this issue came up at the start and I was saying, look, I am doing bullying and harassment, a bullying and harassment complaint, $I$ am doing it within these guidelines, you know. And I tried to explained to him, I think I went to some length to explain to him, if you have other issues, you know, they're not within the remit of the appointment that I got from AC Fanning, so, you know, you need to take them away and deal with them elsewhere. And I gave him a copy of the grievance procedures that I thought explained that. So I thought I went to some length to explain that to him,
yeah.
826 Q. Just moving forward through the points in the letter. I think you undertake, at number 8, to meet with Garda Keogh again when you had time to really study the narrative and the appendices, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

827 Q. But in fact you never met Garda Keogh after 1st December 2017?
A. That's a fact, yeah, yeah.

828 Q. I see.
A. Not my fault though, but that's a fact, yeah.

829 Q. It's clear also from paragraph 15 that at this point, on the 5th December, that the persons complained of are Superintendent Murray, Chief Superintendent Curran and Chief Superintendent wheatley, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair.

830 Q. At that point, having studied the papers that you were provided with by Garda Keogh and the appendices, you were obviously satisfied then that you understood the entirety of his complaint, were you?
A. Well, I think I had a good understanding of his complaint, yeah.

831 Q. If you broke it down to the three persons complained of, did you understand the entirety of the complaint he was making against Chief Superintendent Curran?
A. Yes, I think did, yeah.

832 Q. Without the need to clarify in person with Garda Keogh any further information?
A. I think it would have been -- I think it would have
been helpful for both of us if we did have conversation. You know, at the outset it would have been easier for me, Chair, because I would have had a better understanding of all his issues. Now I did, I think, find out what all the issues were, but I had to go through a laborious process to do it. But I think if I sat down with him, if I sat down with him in the context, Chair, that, you know, bullying and harassment is -- we are here trying to resolve an industrial relations, work relations complaint type of scenario. I think it would have been very beneficial for me to sit down with him and have dialogue through it.
Because I suppose I could have shown him other people's perspectives on his complaint, which might have helped him understand, we'11 say, you know, when you stand back and look at the whole scenario in the round, you know, where the super was coming from, where the chief superintendent was coming from. We're not going to go into all the details, but I mean, some of the stuff we'11 say, or the work that Pat Murray was doing when he came to Athlone, we'11 say, as a new superintendent, that was in parallel, Chair, with work that I was doing on a national basis to say in response to the, let's say, the Garda Inspectorate's report on crime, you know, where we were being called out by the Commission, by Garda Inspectorate, by -- in the wake of Bailieboro, the name won't come to me there, Chair, but there was another Commission, all those issues in relation to the Gardaí, how we managed crime and stuff like that, you
know, we were introducing best practices. Where I came from in Cork, you know, I think we had pretty good practices there in terms of, you know, we had our daily meetings, we had a process for managing crime, we had crime folders and all that stuff. So we were -- I will say I part of a team nationally who was trying to promote that we should be bringing in these practises in every district and division in the country. So I suppose I would have understood and explained to him, look, this isn't Pat Murray here trying to do this, arriving as a new superintendent in Athlone, he is doing this as part of a national campaign, where we are working at this at a corporate level, trying to improve the standards of files, investigations and all these crime files and daily meetings with PAFs, all that as part of the Garda organisation process. Not Superintendent Murray just picking on Garda Keogh down in Athlone. So I think if I had those conversation with him, I could have put things in context for him and explained to him, maybe he wouldn't have felt the way he felt, we'11 say, that he was being treated, you know. But that's my opinion, Chair.
833 Q. I see. So we can take it that your position on the ground then is that you proceeded on the basis that you did understand the complaint because you didn't meet with Garda Keogh then. Simply put, isn't that the case?
A. I mean, I didn't meet him any more. I would have liked to but he didn't accept my --

834 Q. Can I ask you to turn to page 4263, please? This is the observations of Chief Superintendent Myers, who is a member of your team.
A. Yes.

835 Q. You accepted I think a few moments ago that one of the central principles of, I suppose, fair procedures would be that the complaint would be investigated fairly and wouldn't be the subject of prejudgement, isn't that right?
A. Correct, yeah.
Q. I see. When you received a -- you received this list from Chief Superintendent Myers, isn't that correct?
A. That's right.

837 Q. And you read it?
A. Yeah, I read it, yeah.

838 Q. Can I ask you to look at number 4, please?
A. Hm -hmm.

839 Q. That says as follows in relation to specific intelligence from source:
"Chi ef Superintendent Curran and Inspector Farrell correct according to CHI S pol icy."

That seems like a determination.
A. I wouldn't say that.

840 Q. Would you accept that?
A. No. In fact, Chief Superintendent Myers, Chair, was a controller, a CHIS controller himself in an earlier iteration of his career, so he would have had good
insight into that. I'd say he was offering his opinion from that.

841 Q. I know it's a preliminary observation?
A. Yeah.

842 Q. But you haven't met with Chief Superintendent Curran, 16:10 the person to whom this issue relates, isn't that correct?
A. Correct.

843 Q. At that stage?
A. Yeah.

844 Q. And this is, I suggest to you, a statement in relation to the CHIS policy, giving a view one way or another, isn't it?
A. Well, I suppose it was his view and I suppose he would have been a CHIS controller, so he probably was -- he was a CHIS controller himself in the past.
Q. CHAI RMAN I understand.
A. So he probably had some knowledge of this. Anyway, they're his notes, they're not mine, okay.
846 Q. MR. OBRIEN If we move to number 11, it deals with:
"thorough investigation of car insurance issues not our role."
A. Mm-hmm.

847 Q. Now, when I asked you a few moments ago about whether you understood the complaint that was being made by Garda Keogh in relation to Superintendent Murray, for example, you said that you did?
A. Yeah.

848 Q. But one of issues that Garda Keogh complained about was the issue of the manner that Superintendent Murray dealt with the car tax issue, isn't that right?
A. Yes, correct.

849 Q. Well then clearly he is giving that as an example of bullying or harassment, isn't that correct?
A. Garda Keogh?

850 Q. Garda Keogh.
A. Yes, he is.

851 Q. Within this complaint to you?
A. Yeah.

852 Q. Well then how can it not be your role to investigate it?
A. I didn't say that.

853 Q. We11 that's the view of Chief Superintendent Myers? 16:11
A. But he's not investigating, I'm investigating.

854 Q. But he is part of your team, isn't he?
A. Oh, I know, but he's entitled to say whatever he wants, you know, I'm the boss, it's my investigation, yeah.
855 Q. Okay. So you didn't share that view. You were happy that it was to be investigated?
A. Absolutely, yeah, Chair.

856 Q. I see. If we move down then to number 20, we will see:
"Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an's file missing.
Unsat i sf act ory."

Did you have any conversation with Chief Superintendent Myers about issue number 20 there?
A. No. I don't recal1. I don't recall specifically. I mean, he sent me an e-mail one day, this was his observations. I never sat down with him and went through it all, to say, we'11 go through this. I mean, it was just his -- I suppose, as I said to you earlier on, Chair, he probably read the statement as well too and it was his view, I suppose had a quick, cursory look. But I mean, that's his view, as he's entitled to. He's a member of the team but ultimately it's my responsibility, it's my investigation and I have to be accountable for it.

857 Q. Just to move forward then, just to deal with each of the individual complaints. So if we can first of all deal with Chief Superintendent Curran, please.
A. Yeah.

858 Q. I think you write to him on 15th December 2017 and a copy of that letter is at page 4291.
A. Yeah, I have it here.

859 Q. I am not sure if you have a copy of that letter?
A. 4291, yeah.

860 Q. It just says:
"I now wi sh to meet with you to put to you the compl ai nt made by Garda Keogh. "
A. Yes.

861 Q. So that envisages you, I suppose, sitting down and discussing -- the use of the words "put to you the compl ai nt made by Garda Keogh", discussing exactly what Garda Keogh is complaining about Chief Superintendent

Curran, isn't that correct? That's what your letter says that you want to do?
A. I would agree with that, yeah.

862 Q. And did you do that?
A. No, no.
officer by a member of An Garda Síochána, surely it is incumbent upon you to put that complaint rigorously to the member complained of?
A. I gave him the full content that was pertinent to him, we'11 say, yeah. So he knew exactly what the

866 Q. But again, and we go back to the policy about dealing with the credibility and finding facts, in order for you to reach that point surely you have to rigorously
put the complaint to the person and hear what they say?
A. I think it was put pretty comprehensively by Garda Keogh, to be fair. I mean, it wasn't a case where I met him and he didn't have -Leaving aside Garda Keogh for a moment?
A. Yeah.

868 Q. We're talking about you as the investigator understanding the complaint and putting it to the person complained of?
A. Sure.

869 Q. In your capacity as investigator?
A. Yes.

870 Q. Isn't that what you should have done?
A. When I was explaining to the chair earlier on, if I was investigating a complaint where I didn't have it in
writing and I had to sit down with the parties involved, yes, I would of course make comprehensive notes because there would be no other documentation. But here, I actually had volumes, you know, volumes of material here that, in fairness to Garda Keogh, went in 16:15 great detail to set it out. So I felt, in fairness to Chief Superintendent Curran, look, here you are, it's set out in great detail what the allegations are here, over to you now to come back and give your response, we'11 say.

871 Q. Just on that, just on that point, I wonder could we turn to page 10369 p1ease. 10369. Just to give you an opportunity. Have you got that page?
A. Yeah.

872 Q. This is, I think, a job list again. I think it was created by Inspector Browne?
A. Yes.

873 Q. Chief Superintendent Myers, is that right?
A. That's right.

874 Q. If you look at 24 , assistant commissioner, it says:
"I nterview and put al legations to Chi ef Superintendent Curran, general allegation of harassment, exclusion, vi ctimisation and penal isation agai nst the hi gher echel ons of Garda management."

Okay, so we know that that wasn't done.
A. I don't accept that now.

875 Q. Did you put the allegations to the chief?
A. Yes. It was there in writing, I gave it to him.

876 Q. Number 26:
"Ask Chi ef Superintendent Curran if he was aware of the internal i nvestigation being conducted by Commissioner Ó Cual ái n. "

What was that about?
A. This document here, Chair, was prepared by I think Inspector Browne in advance of our get together on the 1st January, we'11 say. So I think she had got through documentation over the Christmas period and she came up with a lot of these, we'11 say. I put the allegations to -- the route I took, Chair, was slightly different
to what was suggested here, as I described today, where I gave them the documentation, I said, look, here it is, you come back to me with your written response. which is actually, chair -- I mentioned this earlier on, it's in keeping with the code of Practice because --

877 Q. We can move down through them. I don't intend to go through each one, assistant commissioner. But for example, if you turn over the page, it says at number 100 :
"Garda Keogh was concerned about Garda A working the same shifts as him He felt it was an orchestrated attempt to induce fear in himor leave himin a position where he would opt for a transfer. Was this working arrangement consi dered by Chi ef Superintendent Curran?"

I mean, are you satisfied, this is a job that's identified under a job list, matters for consideration by the investigation, are you satisfied that in the investigation that was answered by Chief Superintendent Curran?
A. I'm satisfied, Chair, because it wasn't a matter for Chief Superintendent Curran, as it transpired it was a matter for Superintendent McBrien and Superintendent Murray. They were the superintendents, they were responsible for it. And, indeed I think, if my recollection serves me, that Superintendent McBrien
actually spoke to him and reassured her --
878 Q. CHAN RMN No, but specifically Mr. o'brien's question is, was this done?
A. Oh, yeah, I didn't -- no.

879 Q. CHA RMAK And you say no, it wasn't
A. No.
Q.

CHA RMAN Not only that, but you think it was inappropriate. But this is Inspector Browne's initial job list?
A. Yes, before we met up at all.

881 Q. CHA RMAK Before you had met with your team, Chief Superintendent Myers?
A. Yes. She brought this to our meeting I think the first day.
CHA RMAN okay.
882 Q. MR. O BRIEN If we move forward then to page 10375.
You will see that there is a list of tasks pertaining to, I suppose, queries in relation to Garda Keogh himself. Sorry, if you turn over the page. So it commences at number 9 on the top, the top left. If you look at, for example, number 82 , this is in relation to the sick report of Garda Keogh.
A. What number was that?

883 Q. Sorry, 10376. Number 82 on the left-hand side?
A. Yes.

884 Q. You see there it says:
"2nd April 2015, his sick report dated the 2nd April was left in his pi geonhole - not sure what the issue is
here. "
A. Yes.
A. I wrote it on the back of my file cover which I had at
A. Yes, Chair, yeah.
Q. Why do you not refer to that meeting in your statement to the Tribunal?
A. Well, I think I wrote to him, I gave him -- I actually met him the same day that I say in my statement here I wrote to him. I actually met him, he called into the office for it.
Q. You don't make any reference though to the meeting, is there some reason for that?
A. Actually it's in my notes that disclosed, Chair.
Q. But it's not in your statement, is it?
A. No. In the statement I say I wrote to him, but I actually met him that day, yeah.
Q. Okay. So can you tell us why you didn't make reference to the fact that you had a meeting?
A. Yeah. Actually, Chair, I wrote it here on the back of my file cover.

## CHA RMAN Sorry, say it again.

the time.
"17th January, met with Mark Curran and gave himpart of the compl ai nt that pertai ned to him

That's dated 17th January 2018.
CHA RMAN okay.
892 Q. MR. O BRI EN I think Chief Superintendent Curran responded to you on the 17th April, that is his substantive response, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chair, yeah.

893 Q. That's at page 4549. In circumstances where Chief Superintendent Curran wasn't taking legal advice, why was he allowed a period of four months to respond to the complaint?
A. I don't know, Chair, whether he did or did not get 1egal advice.

894 Q. Isn't that an inordinate amount of time to allow Chief Superintendent Curran to respond?
A. To get legal advice?

895 Q. But he wasn't taking legal advice.
A. I don't know that.

896 Q. Well did he write to you to say that he was?
A. No.

897 Q. So do we take it then that it's your assumption that he 16:22 was?
A. A number of parties, Chair, a large number of parties had gone off for legal advice. I thought it was fair to him that be able to get legal advice too.

898

899
Q. I accept that.
A. He was a substantial -- he was a main -- he was one of the principals, Chair.
Q. Chief Superintendent Curran wasn't one of those parties, was he?
A. I don't know that.
Q. Well, you know from the correspondence of each of the other individuals, don't you, that they are looking for an opportunity to take legal advice?
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. That either they wrote to you or their solicitors wrote to you, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.
Q. Chief Superintendent Curran wasn't one of those?
A. Neither did, we'11 say -- if you look at the
correspondence that I got from Superintendent Murray, it didn't come from his solicitor, but he got legal advice. I assumed that Chief Superintendent Curran did the same thing, that he went off and got his legal advice.
Q. I'm not asking you about Superintendent Murray, assistant commissioner, I'm asking you in relation to Chief Superintendent Curran and your dealings with him?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's a simple question: He wasn't looking for an opportunity for time to take legal advice, was he?
A. Chair, I assumed he got legal advice.
Q. You assumed. I see. So that being the case, will you accept that it was an inordinate amount of time to give

Chief Superintendent Curran an opportunity to deal with this complaint, it's nearly four months?
A. I wouldn't say that no, chair. I mean, he was entitled to get legal advice the same as Superintendent Murray was. I didn't think it was inordinate under the circumstances. I didn't press him as to why, I mean... Can we move then to deal with your dealings with Chief Superintendent wheatley? we know that Chief Superintendent wheatley took issue herself with the delay that the investigation took initially. So Chief Superintendent wheatley was concerned that she wasn't informed in a timely fashion that a complaint of bullying and harassment had been made against her, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

907 Q. I think she outlined that to you?
A. Yeah. To be fair, Chair, she was not happy.
Q. She was concerned about that, wasn't she?
A. She was, Chair, yeah.

909 Q. And you met with Chief Superintendent wheatley on the 23rd January, isn't that correct? I think your diary confirms at page 5698. You have been through this with Ms. McGrath.
A. Yeah, 23rd January. Correct. In Garda Headquarters, yeah. I recall it. I recall the meeting, Chair.
910 Q. If we could have the transcript for Day 113, please, at page 75. Ms. Mulligan asked Chief Superintendent wheatley just about the meeting that you had. It was just the two of you in the office, is that correct?
A. That's correct, yeah.

911 Q. I see. And do I take it that you adopted a similar approach with Chief Superintendent Curran, in putting the complaint to Chief Superintendent wheatley you merely gave her the complaint of Garda Keogh?
A. That is putting the complaint to her in my book.

912 Q. What did you discuss with Chief Superintendent wheatley about it?
A. I'm saying here's the complaint against you that Garda Keogh has made, it's set out in the attached documentation, it's there in clarity, we will say, it is there in detail, I'd like you to consider it and come back to me with a written response.
913 Q. Why did you not keep any notes of that meeting?
A. I don't think there was anything that I would consider to note obliged to note. I met her. I gave her the documentation. It was a service of documentation meeting, so to speak, Chair, on her. I already told her that I was going to do it, so here's my opportunity to meet her in person and say here's the documentation, 16:26 here's the pack in relation to you, give you an opportunity to respond to it.

914 Q. I mean, the policy envisages that you would keep a record of interviews, is that right?
A. Yeah.

915 Q. So are you breaching the policy, I suggest to you then?
A. No, Chair. I think I have explained.

CHA RMAN He says that wasn't an interview. MR. O BRI EN: If we can turn then --

MR. KELLY: Well, Chairman, with respect, he did say that that was his idea of what an interview was in this case.

CHA RMAN We11, I think it's not an interview. But somebody may suggest to me that it is an interview and ought to have been recorded. That may be a legitimate suggestion. But my position, as I understand it, is, if somebody goes along with a bundle of documents and says there they are, I would like to give you an opportunity to come back to me in writing, I don't think there's any need to write that down. Because it's a fact that's happening. It's not an exchange where anything matters what anybody says, but that's not a decision. I depend on the evidence and the submissions for that. But you may as well know, you may as well know that's what I think. And rightly or wrongly, whether it was correct or not to do it that way that's what the assistant commissioner says he did.
A. I did.

CHA RMAN AS I say, rightly or wrongly. That is a matter for debate, discussion evidence whatever.
916 Q. MR O BRI EN Just moving forward then to deal with Superintendent Murray. You meet with Superintendent Murray on the 18th January 2018.
A. That's correct, Chair, yeah.

917 Q. And in terms of, I suppose, going back to what I was asking you again about impartiality in dealing with this investigation, just, you said to the Chairman earlier on that it was a cordial meeting at

Superintendent Murray's house, you had tea and you were chatting with his family?
A. No, not with his family. About his family.

918 Q. About his family. Sorry.
919 Q
A. Yes.

920 Q. CHAL RMAN One on one.
A. Yes.

921 Q. CHA RMAN For four and a half hours.
A. Yeah.

922 Q. CHA RMAN He says four and a half hours and you don't quarrel with that, if $I$ understand.
A. Yeah, I didn't time it.

923 Q. CHA RMAN He tends to record times?
A. Yeah, very good.

924 Q. CHA RMAN It was a substantial length of time?
A. Yeah, I was there for a good while, Chair. It was a pleasant kind of -- it was an informal thing.
Q.

MR. O BRI EN: Superintendent Murray has a note of the meeting, it's at page 2897. So you are there to
discuss Garda Keogh's bullying and harassment complaint as we know.
A. To hand over the documentation.

926 Q. Yes.
A. Similar to what I did with Chief Curran.

927 Q. I see. It says as follows:

[^6]Is that your recollection of the meeting?
A. No, Chair. No, no. Definitely not.
Q. So Superintendent Murray is incorrect in his recollection?
A. Didn't go through it. I knew he had this big document, Chair. It was of interest to me, I would have loved to have got a hold of it, but he said he couldn't give it to me but he had it, like, you know.
Again just in terms of impartiality if I could ask you to turn to page 2896, please. Superintendent Murray makes a second note --
A. Yeah.

930 Q. -- in relation to a meeting, it's at that same meeting, he says:
"Met M Finn at 11: 00 to 3: 15 . Went over all the docurents I had. He i ndi cated that PA needed assurance and that seeing my inf ormation he was willing to provi de that. He gave me Garda Keogh's compl aint. I
had that al ready."

In relation to the assurance, was that assurance in relation to the outcome of this investigation; that Superintendent Murray had nothing to worry about
A. Chair, I was only starting out my investigation that day.
931 Q. If you were there, though, to deal with a bullying and
harassment complaint or to hand over documents, as you say, and you are impartial, why are you having any conversation at all about any other issues?
A. I think his concern was about delay. I mean, he was keen that I would complete this quickly because I think 16:30 he felt that it was holding up his promotion for the policing Authority.
932 Q. I see. But just the use of the word "assurance" there --
A. Yes.

933 Q. -- suggests that you were moving on, you would move this on to the benefit of Superintendent Murray?
A. Well, I wasn't going to delay. I mean I was, he was keen that I would get my investigation done, I was saying, yeah, look, I'm keen to get it done too. I'm 16:31 not going to delay it deliberately to cause him difficulty or as the case may be.
934 Q. I mean, in circumstances where you are there as an impartial person, can I suggest to you that that was not fair to Garda Keogh as the complainant, that you're 16:31 having any conversation outside of the bullying and harassment investigation with Superintendent Murray?
A. Chair, like, when you meet someone the first day to serve, this is my first time meeting him, I mean the human nature is they are going to, I suppose, try and offload their frustration, whatever it is, about the process. Whether that frustration is about the delay, whether the frustration is about their promotion being held up, they do articulate stuff like that, but that
wasn't the purpose of my meeting them. My purpose was to serve the documentation on them and to let them go away and come back. Regardless of what they said to me on the day, it was of no material fact to my investigation. It was their response in writing it was ${ }^{16: 32}$ going to be what I was going to take into consideration.
Q. Well, it's interesting that you note that you discuss the bullying and harassment piece, but at the same time you don't note that --
A. I didn't note anything.

937 Q. Well sorry, if you just look to your diary entry, it says you met -- page 5695 , it says as follows:
"Meet with Pat Murray and gi ve hi mocument and go
through allegations."
A. Yeah.

938 Q. Is that not the same thing?
A. I don't understand. I mean, I met him. I gave him --

939 Q. The allegations presumably are the bullying and harassment allegations, is that right?
A. Garda Keogh's statement, yeah.
Q. Is there any reason why your diary entry for that date doesn't record any conversation about that issue?
A. I didn't make any note of it because there was nothing, 16:32 we'11 say, of, to use the term, evidential value to me in terms of my investigation.
Q. Yes. So you note that.
A. That's what I did. I met him. I gave him the
documentation in relation to --
941 Q. You also note on the same day:
"PM to consider this position and get legal advice in rel ation to the civil proceedi ngs that are pending."
A. Yeah.

942 Q. So, you were aware of that then obviously?
A. Well, that was an issue for him, we'11 say, Chair, in terms of...

Then you go on to say that you spoke to Chief Superintendent Myers and so on?
A. That is separate.

944 Q. But absent from that is any record of the fact that you had a discussion about the Policing Authority. why is that?
A. I don't think it was relevant to my investigation. It wasn't of any evidential value to my investigation.
945 Q. Is it because you shouldn't have been discussing it with him?
A. But sure, look, no more than the civil thing. It was
an issue for him, in terms of the civil issue was holding up, the civil action, he was saying to me, well, he couldn't cooperate with me or give me the stuff he wanted to give me because he had to get legal advice in relation to that. That was part of his, I suppose, frustration in terms of having the conversation with him. Equally he had this concern about, that he wasn't getting promoted because the Policing Authority had held it up and my investigation
was going to be holding him up, so he was anxious, he was keen, I'd say, to tell me look, would you get your investigation done as quick as you and I said yeah, look, I'11 do it as quick as I can but...
946 Q. If we move forward then in the process, you receive Superintendent Murray's response on the 29th May and in June you send the copies in accordance with the policy of all the statements that you collected and the reports on to Mr. Cullen. I had think there is a delay between June and September in Mr. Cullen reverting to you, isn't that the case?
A. Yeah. He wanted to get advice from counsel, yes.

947 Q. And when he does -- I see. When Mr. Cullen reverts to you, he raises a number of issues and comments that he has on the statements that he has received, isn't that right?
A. Correct.

948 Q. And I think you forward, did you forward that on to, for example, Chief Superintendent wheatley and to Superintendent Murray?
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. If we could just look to page 5012, please. I think you write to Chief Superintendent wheatley by e-mail on the 6th September. And if you just scroll to the top of that page, please, Mr. Kavanagh. If you just stop there please. And Chief Superintendent wheatley responds to you in the following circumstances -sorry, in the following terms:
"Mck, I have provi ded you with the discipline file and the appeal and the rationale provided by the deciding officer."
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

950 Q. So it is quite an unequivocal response I suppose?
A. Yes.

I suppose, is there a lack of formality there, assistant commissioner, just in relation to the manner in which you are being addressed?
A. I think it was a bit of frustration more than anything. I think it was a bit of frustration on her behalf that I was going back looking for more and she was saying, look, I've already given you the stuff, like, you know. I am not sure, Chair, where she was at that point in time as a chief superintendent. If she was now in South Central I probably would have had more interaction with her because her division, that South Central division was one of the areas where I was doing the pilot of our new model of policing, and it is
divisional structure. I think she took over from Chief Frank Clerkin, actually. So she might have been in there at that particular time. So I suppose I would probably have had more interaction with her as a consequence of she moving into South Central.
952 Q. I think you wrote then as we11 to Superintendent Murray. If we look to the bottom of page 5014. And Mr . Cullen raised an issue where he says -- it's at the bottom of the page.
A. Yeah.

953 Q. If we pause there please. It says:
"1. Re the letter of Chi ef Superintendent Pat Murray dated 29/5/18 whi ch states in the second last paragraph 16:37 ' hi s addi ctive substances dependenci es', what does Chi ef Superintendent Murray mean by this?"

I think you forwarded that on to Chief Superintendent Murray. And if you look at page 5033, you don't -- if you just look, this is Superintendent Murray's reply to you.
A. Yeah.

954 Q. He doesn't actually address what he means, does he? Are you satisfied that you understood what he meant?
A. Yes.

955 Q. You were? Without any further need for investigation?
A. Yeah. But I was prepared to move on without him. If he didn't come back to me, Chair, I was at the stage where I am moving on anyway.
956 Q. When you write back to Mr. Cullen then, if we turn to page 5112, and if you look to number 2, and it says:
"Letter of chi ef superintendent."

It's in the middle of the page there, if we pause there please.
"Chi ef Superintendent Murray is referring to the 3
Q. We11, if you look to page 4673 , please, this is the response of Superintendent Murray of the 29th May, I don't think he actually refers to alcohol under 2 at all or indeed --
A. No, Chair. I picked up that from, certainly either from the CMO's, documentation $I$ got from the CMO or... I couldn't be specific now, Chair, but I knew that anyway.
Q. So you didn't get it from Superintendent Murray himself, you got it from a review of the files?
A. Review of the files, yeah. Keogh to deal with his al cohol addi ction."

I mean, where did you take at that from?
A. From his report and from the reports I got from Dr. Oghuvbu and other parties. My interpretation, Chair, was that Superintendent Murray had taken some proactive steps to get a case conference to deal with the fact that Garda Keogh was having work related issues. I think the most appropriate channel for him was to refer him on to our own medical people, the CMO, and have a case conference to see, look, what can we do collectively to help him. referring to the medical and welfare report provided to Garda Keogh to deal with his alcohol addiction?
A. Yeah.
Q. Just moving on to deal, you delivered your report on
medi cal and wel fare support that was provi ded to Garda
the 20th December 2018, we've been to that, it's at page 5221?
A. Yes, Chair.

961 Q. Just in terms of writing this report, did you write this report yourself or did Inspector Kennedy write the 16:41 report and you finalised it? How did that work?
A. No. No, Chair. I did the first draft of it, we'll say. Actually I think $I$ started it in August. It was a quiet month. I remember spending a few days, we'11 say a weekend at it I think, Friday to a Monday. It might have been a bank holiday weekend or whatever. I started drafting it, we'11 say. And I gave him I think that draft at our meeting in October or November and then we started on our final report then.
962 Q. I think that again there's no explanation for the delay 16:41 from March to November in that report, isn't that correct, as to where Garda Keogh's complaint was?
A. Correct, yeah.

How is that fair to Garda Keogh, that that is not explained to him in the context of this investigation?
A. I didn't see it as being --
Q. I suggest to you it is unfair to Garda Keogh?
A. I didn't see it as being, we'll say, a role for me. I dealt with, I suppose, what I was charged to do by AC Fanning, which was to do with bullying and harassment against the people that Garda Keogh named.

965 Q. In the findings that you made I think the expression of words used is that there's no evidence to support the complaint of Garda Keogh, isn't that correct?
Q. Just moving forward then, we know that Assistant Commissioner o'brien was the deciding officer in this case?
A. Yes.

969 Q. Would you accept that if the findings in your investigation -- I suppose his review is a paper review, isn't that right, as provided for under the policy?
A. I think I gave him all the material I collected.

970 Q. Exactly. He doesn't interview witnesses and so on?
A. I don't think he did.

971 Q. He didn't?
A. I can't speak for him. I'm sure --

972 Q. Then the independent audit that was conducted by isn't that right?
A. Correct.

973 Q. Would you accept, therefore, that if any of the
findings made in your report, for example, were incorrect that the knock on effect would be that Assistant Commissioner o'brien's report and that of Mr. de Bruir would also be incorrect?
A. No. I mean, I presume whoever -- I can't speak for them, Chair, but whoever would come after me would look at the report in its entirety, not just my findings. They'd have to read the entire documentation and come to their own conclusion. I don't think they would just be going by what I found. But that is not a matter -- ${ }_{\text {18:44 }}$ I suppose that is a matter for those witness themselves, Chair.
Q.

Can I ask you, when Garda Keogh was asked about the investigation that you carried out, at Day 104, page 81, and Ms. McGrath referred to this earlier on, he described it as an exercise in circling the wagons. And I suggest to you that that is what occurred in the context of your investigation?
A. No.
Q. That it was a circling of the wagons in favour of the senior officers, do you accept that?
A. No, Chair. I think that was his perception of what happened there.
Q. To discredit Garda Keogh.

CHAN RMAN Say again.
MR. O BRI EN That it was a circling of the wagons in favour of the senior officers to discredit Garda Keogh. CHA RMAN In fairness, Mr. o'brien, wouldn't you have to have some evidence of that? I mean, that's Garda

Keogh's opinion, his contention, but if that stands as a bald allegation -- I can tell you at some point I will be saying, if that's the case I would like reference to evidence.

MR. O BRI EN Very good. I wonder could we have 16222 please.

CHA RMAN I mean, as I understand it, that is a suggestion that this is a fraudulent report. That he set out simply to cover up, circling the wagons to cover up and protect senior officers who were -- that's 16:45 what I am understanding circling the wagons to mean, i.e. and this is a fraud. That is what I am understanding that to mean.
MR. OBRI EN Essentially my question --
CHA RMAN I don't want to be unfair to you, but you may as well know, if you say this is an exercise in circling the wagons, it is to protect these people and you are covering up.
MR. O BRI EN I suppose what I am saying is that, I am suggesting to you that the investigation was prejudged and predetermined.

CHAN RMAN So he had made up his mind beforehand -MR. O BRIEN Yes.

CHA RMAN -- I am going to clear these guys come what may.
MR. O BRIEN That's what I am suggesting. If we look to page --
A. Do you want to give me an opportunity to refute that, Chair?

CHA RMAN I understand.
A. I'm not agreeing with that. I totally disagree with that.

CHA RMAN Now, Mr. O'brien, you want to refer to some specific point.

MR. O BRI EN Could we have Volume 57, page 16222? CHA RMAN Yes.

977 Q. MR. O BRIEN This again is a note of Superintendent Murray. And I appreciate that it's Superintendent Murray's note. And it's from Saturday, 13th January
2018. So that's shortly before you meet him on the 18th. And it deals with a conversation that you have. And it says as follows, $I$ will just ask you to comment on it in a moment:
"I text M Finn re his request for a meeting."

First of al1, do you recal1 speaking to Superintendent Murray on the 13th January 2018 by phone?
A. I can't recall specifically having a conversation with him, Chair, but I wouldn't dispute that I did. He says I rang him. I didn't. I think in the context of we arranging the meeting that was going to take place on the Thursday --
CHA RMAK okay.
A. -- to serve the papers on him.

978 Q. MR. O BRIEN It says as follows:
"He replied at 12:57 asking if I was free to talk.
rang himat 12:58 for 5 mintes and 55 seconds. " Do you recall that?
A. No.

979 Q. He says that you spoke about --
A. Not specifically.

980 Q. -- Chief Superintendent Healy who examined the entire situation. And he attributes this to you, he says:
"He now knows of the meticulous files and records and notes I have. He said he knew nothing of the corrections I made in Athl one and was now bei ng puni shed for doing so."

Did you say that to Superintendent Murray?
A. No, Chair. And I think if I was to put that in context, Chair: On the week before this I got a substantial volume of material from Superintendent McBrien, where she gave me the material that she had given to Chief Superintendent Fergus Healy, we'11 say,
who was doing the material for the civil action, we'11 say. I rang Chief Superintendent Healy to say, listen, have you got this material? He said, yeah, he has. So he confirmed what she gave me was correct, we'11 say. And he also said look, yeah, by the way, you know, Superintendent Pat Murray has an even bigger, larger volume of material in relation to that material. I think Superintendent Murray already told me that in terms of an e-mail, that he had this 338-page volume of
material. So that was the context, which I think -- if that was said.
Q. Again he attributes the next sentence to you.
"He spoke of Chi ef Superintendent Myer's reception from 16:48 peopl e accused he spoke to and his vi ew of the et hi cal cal ibre of people accused. "

So it is a quite detailed note, would you accept that?
A. It's a detailed note, but I wouldn't necessarily agree with it, Chair.
"I expl ai ned the situation in Athl one, how Chi ef Superintendent Wheatley and I work cl osel y to make corrections with fairness to everyone in a very caref ul way being aware of the sensitivities invol ved. I told
hi mof the cal ibre of the other people accused and thei r frustration and annoyance at this contrived situation. He said he understood."
A. I don't agree with that, Chair. I mean, I wouldn't have said that to him.

983 Q. "He confirmed that CS Curran, Wheatley and I were the ones Garda Keogh was accusing primarily."

Then he says:
"AC Finn of fered a view that Garda Keogh and his sol icitor were only looking for money in a ci vil cl ai m"
A. I dispute that. I wouldn't have said that, Chair. I
mean, that would be very unprofessional and unethical of me to say something like that. I might have said I knew, because they had a civil action, but I wouldn't have expressed a view. That is a very derogatory comment to make, Chair. I think it would be highly inappropriate and unprofessional for me to say something like that.

CHAL RMAN okay.
984 Q.
MR. OBRIEN And just finally he says that --
A. Chair, sorry go on.

CHA RMAN Go on.
A. You finish off. I will come back.

985 Q. MR. O BRIEN It is Superintendent Murray's own view --
A. I would say, Chair --

CHA RMAN Go on. Hold on. Speak.
A. I am just looking here, he says it's a Saturday morning, okay?
Q. CHAL RMAN Yes.
A. So I am thinking of putting the context of this, if he rang me on a Saturday, if I rang him Saturday morning, if this played out the way it did, my normal routine, okay, Chair, on a Saturday morning is I go to Kerry. I am originally from Kerry. My family is down there.
CHA RMAN Okay, take your time.
A. My brother passed away Christmas Day.

CHAN RMAN okay.
A. We were going down to --

CHA RMAN Take it easy now, just --
A. We were organising a month's mind mass. It would make
A. Now, where I live in Kerry, Chair, where I come from, it's at the side of the mountain, telephone reception would be poor. So if I had a conversation with Superintendent Murray it's quite possible - this is my perspective, chair - that you're in and out of coverage. If you walk around the house, we'11 say, you 16:51 know, you wouldn't get the full conversation of something. So it's quite possible that Superintendent Murray picked up my conversation wrong or got a bit of it or I responded to something that he said. Because I wouldn't have said the things that he is attributing to $16: 51$ me here in this note. I can guarantee you, assure you of that, chair.

MR. O BRI EN Can I just come back one page then, to 16221? Again this is a note of Superintendent Murray. Again it is volume 57. If I can just -- and this isn't 16:51 related to you directly. Were you aware that Superintendent Murray had met with Chief Superintendent Myers and the inspector on the 11th January 2018 ?
A. Yes, I'm aware of that, yeah.

989 Q. You were aware of that?
A. That was when they called to the station. They were meeting some of the witnesses and I think they bumped into him, is my understanding, yeah.

990 Q. Indeed he says he had no prior knowledge of them

calling to the station?
A. Yeah. I didn't write to them. I didn't write to him. I wrote to the witnesses to say these people would be coming. I didn't tell Superintendent Murray they would be coming.
"Emphasi sed that M Finn is honest and ethical and would make sure that everything was done right so that there was nothing to worry about. Spoke about an extra pip on my shoul der."

Can you assist us with what that might mean? I suggest to you that it means --
A. I would like to think that he said I was honest and ethical. I take a bit of comfort in that, Chair. But I'm not sure what the rest of it means.
Q. The use of the words, and again I know that this is Superintendent Murray's note, "that there was nothing to worry about" --
A. Yes. That I am honest and ethical.
Q. -- I suggest to you that that is in relation to the investigation as a whole?
A. I wouldn't agree with that, Chair, no.

994 Q. Finally, I suggest to you on behalf of Garda Keogh that the investigation was not, was not impartial.
A. No, I disagree with that, Chair.
Q. I say that, I suggest to you it wasn't carried out in
accordance with fair procedures, and I suggest to you that the investigation was carried out in a manner that was discrediting to Garda Keogh.
A. I disagree with that, Chair.

MR. O BRI EN No further questions, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Now Mr. Murphy. MR. MRPHY: Thank you.

## ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER M CHAEL FI NN WAS THEN EXAM NED

 BY MR MRPHY AS FOLLOVS:996 Q. MR. MRPHY: Assistant Commissioner Finn, can I ask you to be shown document, please, 10478? This is a document you've seen before, this is the memorandum from Inspector McCarthy on behalf --
A. Oh yeah.

997 Q. -- of Assistant Commissioner Fanning explaining the delay between March and November 2017?
A. Yes.
Q. You are now familiar with this document, is that correct?
A. I am, Chair.
Q. You have been asked questions about why in December 2017 you didn't bring this information to the attention of Garda Keogh's solicitor, do you recall those questions?
A. I do, Chairman.
Q. Can you confirm that in fact you didn't receive the information until April of 2018?
A. That's a fact, Chair, yeah.

11001
Q. Was this information supplied to you as a result of a query raised by you with AC Fanning?
A. Yes, Chair. I asked AC Fanning to explain to me, so that I could incorporate it maybe into my report as to what the delay was.
Q. So in that situation would it have been possible for you to reply in December or even up to that date in April in relation to your recommendation?
A. That's a fact. Yeah, that's a fact, Chair.
Q. I think in relation to Garda Keogh being asked lots of questions about the alleged unfairness of this not being made known to Garda Keogh, and I know you have not been here for all of the evidence, but I wonder if we could bring up please on the screen, Day 111, at page 160?
A. Page 160?
Q. Yes, please. And it's line 3, question 681. At this point I think Garda Keogh --
A. Sorry, the page?
Q. At this point I think Garda Keogh admitted that he accepted the evidence.
"Have you no criticismof Assistant Commi ssi oner Fanni ng' s stewardship of manaing the file bet ween that date in March 2017 and Novenber 2017?"

Were you aware of that from your review of the transcripts in this case?
A. Sorry, Chair, I had the wrong page. I am with you now.

11006 Q. Page 160. Do you see it is line 3 onwards. Garda Keogh accepts, down at line 14 , that he has no criticism of Assistant Commissioner Fanning's stewardship of managing the file between that date and November 2017, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. You see his answer at line 14 ?
A. At line 7?
Q. At line 14.
A. Yeah.
Q. You see that he accepts --
A. Yes.
Q. -- he has no criticism to make of Assistant Commissioner Fanning?
A. I am with you, yeah.
Q. You have been asked a large number of questions today about that period of delay, but would you agree with me that this transcript confirms that he has now, in the light of this information provided to the Tribunal, accepts that he has no criticism of that period of time?
A. Correct, Chairman. That is what he would appear to be saying, yeah.
Q. And can I ask you then to turn back to page 158 , please? And if I can draw your attention please to the $16: 57$ middle of the page and in particular line 11. Could I just ask you to confirm, were you present when this evidence was given, where Garda Keogh accepted that he would have been visited by Inspector McCarthy on behalf
of Assistant Commissioner Fanning roughly five times in 2017?
A. I wasn't present when that was given, Chair, but I am reading it here.
Q. Yes. Do you see from line 18 onwards there's reference 16:58 to:
"He gave me correspondence --"

That is Inspector McCarthy.
"-- in rel ation to the bullying and harassment thing, because there was conf usi on in rel ation to it. Two superintendents were appoi nted. I still di dn't really know what was going on. Any letters he gave me would be in the documentation."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I see that, Chair. Yeah.

1014 Q. Very simply, were you aware of that line of
A. No.
Q. -- in 2017?
A. No, Chair.
Q. If I can ask you to move forward, please, to the his solicitor. I wonder if you could be shown, please, a document that has been referred to earlier at page 4220. First of al1, can I ask you to confirm that on
this page there's reference to your introduction and you say at the top of the page:
"Are you accepting I amneutral in this?"
A. Yes.
Q. And Mr. Cullen says:
"I accept your bona fides."
A. Correct.
Q. You have been asked a number of questions about this particular discussion and if I ask you just to move towards the middle of the page, would you agree with me that when the answer was given:
"Who are making compl ai nts agai nst?"

Garda Keogh replied:
"Pat Murray, superintendent
Two chi efs in Mullingar. Mark Curran and Lorraine
Wheatley. And there was a sergeant in the chi ef's office who may have been pulling their strings, l'mnot sure but your investigation will show this."
A. Yes.
Q. Is that your recollection of what Garda Keogh said?
A. Yes, Chair. Yeah.
Q. And looking down two further lines, Mr. Cullen, did Mr. Cullen then say and is it your recollection he said:
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"There may be ot hers but some are more central."
A. Correct. Yes, Chair.
Q. In the light of that intervention did you believe that there was some uncertainty about exactly who was the subject-matter of the complaints?
A. Exactly, Chair. I think that is fair as to why I was not clear at the end of the day who he was exactly making a complaint against, which was crucial to my investigation.
Q. Would you please look several lines further down, Garda Keogh is recorded as saying:
"Pat Murray, that is crystal clear.
Mark Curran, yes."

Then he said:
"I am not making a compl ai nt agai nst Noreen MzBri en and Lorrai ne Wheatley."
A. Correct, Chair, yeah.
Q. So at that stage he was not making a complaint against Lorraine wheatley?
A. Yes, that is my position. That is why I was surprised later on when he put her back into the equation. And is it your evidence that he then went on to say:

[^7]A. Correct, Chair.
Q. Did that cause you to have a concern as to whether Mr. John Scanlan was going to be the subject of a complaint?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Then when you asked him specifically in the next question about Pat Murray and Mark Curran, his answer is:
"My mind is open to Mark Curran. I thought it was him 17:01 because he was friends with Ai dan Glacken. I knowit is coming fromthe chi ef's office, l'm not sure who was doing it."
A. Correct, Chair.
Q. So by that stage in the conversation did you still
think there was some uncertainty about --
A. Absolutely. I had a doubt then whether Mark Curran was supposed to be a part of my investigation.
Q. And was that because of the things that were said to you --
A. Correct.
Q. -- by Garda Keogh and his solicitor?
A. Correct, Chair.
Q. Just turning to the top of the next page, 4221 please, Mr. Cullen again intervened, and is it your evidence that this is what he said to you in substance:

[^8]A. Correct.
Q. So did you take it from that, that it was not entirely clear who was the subject of the investigation?
A. That was my opinion at the time, Chair.
Q. Yes. And can I ask you then to turn down to the end of the page, and the third last entry, you said:
"I need to know the peopl e."

And Garda Keogh is recorded as saying:
"Superintendent Pat Murray is one. I'm not sure about Mark Curran, but my mind is open. "
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. Did you take that as reflecting a lack of certainty on the part of Garda Keogh as to who he was accusing?
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. And then he goes on to say:
"When he I eft Lorrai ne Wheatley came and she's sound."

Did you understand that to mean that he was saying that Lorraine wheatley was --
A. Correct, yeah.
Q. -- a good person?
A. Especially in the context of what he said about her previously, you know.
Q. At the end he said:

9
"I' m not sure who is responsi ble for the Mullingar thing. "

Do you see that?
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. And again over the top of the page, 4222, you say:
Q. And do you see in the middle of the page you put the question:
"So you're not saying the sergeant here?"
A. Yeah.
Q. Was this the sergeant who he referred to earlier but
A. Correct, yeah.
Q. And did Garda Keogh then say to you:
A. Yes.
Q. So did that reflect your understanding that Garda Keogh at that time knew that before he made the complaint he had to have some evidence?
A. Correct.
Q. And in fact he didn't make a complaint against the unnamed sergeant thereafter, is that right?
A. No, Chair, he didn't, no.
Q. Then can I ask you to move down, where you say:
"I need to be clear who l need to approach and i nvesti gate. Ri ght now the compl ai nt is agai nst Pat Murray and Mark Curran. Ni ck will need to tell me if he wants me to put allegations to other persons or l won't go to those persons."
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. Does that reflect your understanding at that part of the conversation?
A. Yes, Chair. And I was trying to make things as clear as possible to him and, you know, be articulate about it.

CHA RMAN okay.
Q. MR. MRPH: Is it your evidence that Garda Keogh then said:
"Throw in Lorrai ne Wheatley so."
A. Correct.
Q. Were you surprised that he said it in such a casual and
throwaway fashion?
A. I did, yes, Chair. To be fair to Ms. Wheatley.
Q. Mr. Cullen, at the very last sentence on the page Mr. Cullen says:
"I amhappy with the bullying and har assment compl ai nt that it is these three people but it may be el sewhere."
A. Yes.
Q. Did you take it from that intervention that Mr. Cullen was suggesting that it might be more people?
A. Correct, Chair. And that's why I wrote back to him afterwards to say, look, is there somebody else you want to put into this? Give me clarity here.
Q. And in terms of the meeting itself, did Mr. Cullen speak a lot at the meeting?
A. I think I probably did a lot -- most of my dialogue was probably with him, we'11 say, interspersed with Garda Keogh jumping in, yeah. So I was happy, Chair, that at least Garda Keogh had the presence of a solicitor to give him legal advice. That I wasn't trying to catch him on the hop on his own, we'11 say.
Q. Moving forward from that meeting, you have been asked questions about your first meetings with Chief Superintendent Curran, Superintendent Murray and Superintendent wheatley?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you confirm, that insofar as they spoke to you about the need for a speedy investigation they were anxious that it would not be delayed?
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A. I think they were, Chair. That is a fair comment, Chair, yeah.
Q. And in terms of Chief Superintendent wheatley, I think you have indicated that she was -- was she annoyed or upset that this complaint was brought to her attention?
A. I think she was upset, Chair, from the outset. Like, I mean, she was upset the night $I$ met her up in the Garda Officers' Club anyway.
Q. Yes. And was Superintendent Murray upset also?
A. He was, Chair, yeah. I would say he was stressed by the whole thing, yeah.
Q. And just to put that in context, I wonder if you can be shown, please, page 670 of the materials?
CHA RMAN Have you seen this before? This is the High Court action.
A. No.

CHA RMAN I know about it, Mr. Murphy.
MR. MRPHY: Thank you. I was going to put to the witness that he hadn't seen it at the time. I think this --

CHA RMAR I mean, does it matter what he thinks about it?

MR. MRPHY: Just one question on fact, Chairman. It may just assist the Tribunal.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MRPHY: Can I ask you, at the bottom, this is the personal injury summons, and you will see at the top of it that Patrick Murray is named as a defendant.
A. Yes.
Q. So is that an unusual thing for members of An Garda Síochána to be named personally?
A. It was, Chair.

CHA RMAN He actually said that earlier.
A. Yeah.

17:06
CHA RMAN That is a matter of comment, if you like. I think we would all know, but the assistant commissioner actually said that.
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
A. I did, Chair.
Q. I think that was the position on the 13th April 2017 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- but by the time you met with Superintendent Murray you knew that he was the subject of an application to PIAB. Was he stressed by that, by the fact that he was 17:06 now being sued individually?
A. I think he was, Chair, yeah. It upset him. I could see that. I could tell that from his demeanour.
Q. And insofar as there is any reference to files or litigation files, did his concerns in that regard stem from the fact that he was a named defendant in civil proceedings?
A. I think that is a fair comment, Chair, yeah. That is why I felt it was appropriate that he would get separate legal advice from Ken Ruane rather than my advice, Chairman, shall we say.
Q. And were you also aware of the fact that at the time he was seeking independent advice separately from An Garda Síochána?
A. Yeah, I was aware of that, Chairman.
Q. And insofar as that was the case, was that also a concern he expressed to you?
A. Yes, Chair. It was, yeah.
Q. And insofar as the litigation was concerned, were you 17:07 concerned that the litigation was a claim for damages?
A. Correct, Chair.
Q. For money?
A. Yeah.
Q. And insofar as the position was concerned, what did you 17:07 see your function as being in that early meeting with him, with Chief Superintendent Curran and with Superintendent wheatley?
A. To give them the accusation or the charge against them, so to speak, Chair, that was set out from Garda Keogh 17:07 when I met him and took a statement, yeah.
Q. It's been suggested to you by Mr. O'Brien that you approached this in a manner which is designed to cover up or to conceal or that you were guilty of prejudgement with a view to targeting Garda Keogh, what 17:08 is your response to that allegation?
A. I reject that, chair. I totally refute that, yeah.
Q. And in terms of the length of time it took to carry out the report, can you indicate to the Chairman how you tried to operate in the course of those months to finalise the task? Were you conscious of the delay factor?
A. I was, Chair. I was trying to speed along, some of the examples there, $I$ was trying to nudge them along gently
to give me a response, you know. I suppose I followed up as best I can, bearing in mind, chair, that this was only one of many jobs that $I$ had to do in my day-to-day work as an assistant commissioner in charge of a region. And you always have other tasks, which I have noted them here, Chair, I don't think I need to go through them all.
Q. In relation to a question I asked you a moment ago, I think I may have asked you incorrectly. "Were you concerned about the fact that there was a claimfor danmges?" what I meant to ask you was: were you aware there was a claim for damages?
A. I was aware, yes.
Q. In terms of the approach towards the investigation, you have indicated to the Chairman you were aware of the obligation to be fair to all persons involved. It has been specifically put to you that it was unfair of you not to provide Garda Keogh with the information, for example, about delay in March to November 2017?
A. Yeah.
Q. What is your response to that?
A. I didn't think that was within my remit, Chair, such to, you know, provide that information to him, you know.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MRPHY: And finally, insofar as your own work was concerned can I ask you, did you do anything deliberately or otherwise to discredit or target Garda Keogh by your actions in conducting this investigation?
A. Absolutely not, Chair.

MR. MRPHY: Thank you.
CHA RMAN Anyone else?
MR. CARROL: I wonder, Chairman, could I just clarify one matter on behalf of Superintendent McBrien? CHAN RMAN Yes, of course.

## ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER M CHAEL FI NN UAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. CARROLL AS FOLLOVG:

Q. MR. CARROLL: Assistant Commissioner Finn, I will
short-circuit it given the time of the hour. Just in relation to matters to clarify it, when you undertook your investigation, in terms of Superintendent McBrien there was no allegation of harassment or bullying and that became clear when you had your meeting with Mr. Keogh in December 2017, is that correct?
A. That's correct, Chair.
Q. I think you then proceeded upon your investigation as you outlined to the Tribunal today, culminating in your report?
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. And again that report focused on looking at the allegations in relation to the three named officers --
A. Mm-hmm.
Q. -- officers Curran, Wheatley and Murray --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and making conclusions therein. Now to short-circuit matters, a number of things happened then in terms of Assistant Commissioner O'Brien dealing with

291078 Q.
matters and then ultimately a review by a barrister, Mr. de Bruir. And I suppose one way I can short-circuit it is this, there's one document I am going to ask the Tribuna1 to put up, it's 13126. 13126. This may short-circuit the questions I have. Yes. Can you go to the top of that page? If you go up a bit further. To the top of that page. Top of that 1etter. Can you stop there? The position, this is what I want to ask you, one question really about, the position seems to have altered and my client, Superintendent McBrien, at this point, when matters were progressing, received this letter on the 8th May which listed Chief Superintendent Curran, Chief Superintendent wheatley, Chief Superintendent Murray, Superintendent McBrien and Inspector Farrell. It then goes on to talk about the complaint. It then goes on to talk about the appeal being taken and Mr. de Bruir being assigned and effectively that being carried out under those procedures. So the question I have for you is this: In the time you did your report and completed 17:13 it, which was an investigation into Chief Superintendent Curran, officers wheatley and -CHA RMAN I'm taking your promise there is a question coming, Mr. Carroll.
MR. CARROLL: There is. I am trying to short-circuit it.

CHA RMAN That's not the way it looks here. what is the question? Is Superintendent McBrien in the clear? MR. CARROLL: Things move on, where it would appear

Superintendent McBrien is now lumped back in, if I can use that phrase --
A. Yes.
Q. -- with the three people you investigated into, and including Inspector Farrell, in circumstances where there was no allegation of harassment and bullying and what I am asking you is --

CHA RMAN Is that correct.
Q. MR. CARROLL: -- that's correct first of all, what is your knowledge of that, I suppose?
A. By way of explanation, even though it's not relevant to me per se, my understanding is, because these five people were named originally, were written to originally by Assistant Commissioner Fanning, I think for completeness --
Q. CHA RMAK On7y because they had been written to originally.
A. Correct.
Q. CHAN RMAN But am I right in thinking --
A. And for clarity for them.
Q. CHA RMAN -- and Mr. Carrol1 wants to establish, that at no point in your investigation was there a claim or allegation made against Superintendent Noreen McBrien?
A. Garda Keogh made no complaint against Superintendent McBrien.
Q. MR. CARROLL: But as well as that, there was no complaint made, there was no finding in relation to you --
A. Oh no.
-- because they weren't under investigation, neither Superintendent MCBrien nor Inspector Farrell were under investigation and yet they end up effectively -CHA RMAN But he didn't write this letter, Mr. Carroll. You can complain to Deputy Commissioner Twomey when we get to him.
MR. CARROL: But I wanted to --
CHAl RMAN But she's in clear, as matters stand at the moment --
MR. CARROLL: very well.
CHA RMAN -- Superintendent MCBrien, and this witness has nothing to say against Superintendent McBrien. okay. Now.
MR. CARROL: Thank you.
CHA RMAN Ms. McGrath.
M. Gleeson Sorry, my apologies, Chairman. CHAL RMAN I am sorry, Ms. Gleeson, yes. Who are you for Ms. Gleeson, remind me?
MG. GLEESON Inspector Farre11, Sergeant Lyons and -CHA RMAN Right. The same applies to Inspector 17:15 Farre11 as to Superintendent -- the same, a shorter form, as they say in Key and Elvaston.
Mb. GLEESON That is very helpful.
CHA RMAN So you can take it that you are in the same boat. Thank you very much. Inspector Farre11, the 17:15 same position.
M. GLEESON Thank you very much, chair. If you don't mind, I realise it is very late -CHAD RNAN Sure, yeah, yeah.

## ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER M CHAEL FI NN WAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MS. GLEESON AS FOLLOVB:

Yes.
Q. Insofar as you could?
A. Mm-hmm, yes.
Q. The Liam McHugh issue?
A. Yes.
Q. I represent Sergeant Lyons, as you know, but I suppose my question is: Under the heading "Findi ngs" there, if we can scroll down slightly, I suppose what you found, having looked at the materials yourself, commissioner, is that Sergeant Lyons received this intelligence in good faith. That is his e-mail which the report would suggest on numerous occasions, I don't propose to refer to it specifically, but that that was received by him in good faith. I suppose that is obviously your
A. That was my understanding, Chairman.
Q. Yes. And you very helpfully just outlined that during the course of your investigation you gave an unredacted
A. That's correct, Chair.
Q. And I suppose on the 13th June of 2018, I don't propose to refer specifically to that letter but you wrote to Mr. Cullen, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you gave him lots of materials that you had assimilated thus far in your investigation?
A. Which included the material which identified Sergeant Lyons as being the person who raised the issue.
Q. Yes. And for the purpose of the record, that's at 4903. And Mr. Cullen, no criticism, took some time, I suppose, to consider that and get advice and take instructions I presume?
A. Correct.
Q. And he then wrote back to you on the 6th September 2018?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's at 4998. And I suppose, can you confirm, assistant commissioner, and obviously the material is there for us to see it, nowhere in that correspondence does it say that he is concerned that this particular complaint in relation to Mr. McHugh or I suppose the -I'm calling it a complaint, it's actually Garda Keogh's complaint, as it were, in relation to that issue, but he doesn't say that he is concerned that that had been fabricated?
A. That's correct, Chair.
Q. It doesn't say that, and also that Sergeant Lyons was
requested to get involved in this issue, that he was put up to it, as it were?
A. That's correct, Chair. That wasn't brought to my attention.

Thank you. And then just finally in relation to -- I represent Inspector Baker, Sergeant Moylan, Sergeant Monaghan and Sergeant Martin as well. Now I know that you wrote to them in the course of your investigation and Ms. McGrath has referred to that letter. That's dated 3rd January of 2018. The one referring to Sergeant Moylan is at 4374 and no need to go over that in too much detail, Ms. McGrath has already covered it. But essentially you write to them and you say, well, there's no specific complaint made against you?
A. Yes.
Q. But there is:
"You have interacted with Garda Keogh and you are mentioned in his statement of compl ai nt in respect of Garda Keogh's interactions... and you may be i nt er vi ewed. "

Isn't that what was relayed to them --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- in that correspondence?
A. That's correct.
Q. And I know that obviously each and every one of those officers obviously responded and I believe that there was nothing outstanding and that their response was
satisfactory to you, you didn't require any further information after that, is that right?
A. They all did respond, Chair, in fairness, yeah.
Q. I suppose the involvement of the sergeants was in relation to alleged denial of over time, alleged micro supervision, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chair.
Q. And perhaps the denial of commendations as well?
A. Yes, Chair.
Q. I suppose they're the issues that the sergeants were sort of directly in a position to provide information or assistance to you in relation to those matters?
A. Correct. But there was no complaint against them, chair.
CHAN RMAN very good.
ME. GLEESON There was no complaint made against them, but I suppose as far as they're concerned obviously they got that letter and I suppose it was only within the context of this Tribunal that, for example, I suppose as far as they were concerned that that was -that there may be an allegation of wrongdoing on their behalf, and I suppose you may not be aware of this but in, for example, their statements to the Tribunal they had to deal with each and every one of those issues.
CHA RMAN But this is not a question for this witness, 17:20 Ms. Gleeson. This is a submission or a comment. And maybe you're right and maybe you're wrong, but receiving a letter is not exactly a disaster even now. okay. Thank you very much. Now, Ms. McGrath.

## ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER M CHAEL FI NN WAS THEN

 RE- EXAM NED BY MS. MEGRATH AS FOLLOVG:Ms. Gleeson raised there. The material that you're working with in the investigation, is this material that you source independently, you or your investigators, or is this the material you get from the various parties you write to? As in, what material, for example -- she raised the issue of Mr. McHugh and Garda Lyons, are you working off the material that's provided by, for example, the appendices to Chief Superintendent Curran's submissions, the appendices that you get in from Superintendent Murray, is that material you work off or does your team go off and source this independently?
A. Oh, they go off as well, chair. I mean, if there is something referred to, like a document, they would go off and look for the document as well to support it, if there was a piece of document missing or whatever the case may be.
Q. Just coming out of that then, you got the submissions, we know, from the officers. February, April and May, the three main submissions came in. Other than Garda Keogh raising queries and going back looking for some further material, were queries raised by you or your team on those submissions? Did you go back to any of those three officers with queries on their submissions or interrogations or checking?
A. My recollection, Chair, only when Assistant Commissioner O'Brien came back to me and raised some queries did $I$ go back to follow up on some of the queries, we'11 say.
Q. And then, I'm sorry to keep you, but just one very last 17:22 thing, $I$ just want to be crystal clear on this, page 16222, which is the entry for the 13th January 2018 that was opened to you. It was your evidence, and it wil1 come up there, it was your evidence that you don't think you would have said what is attributed to you in 17:22 that record. Do you see that record there? This is the Saturday morning phone call.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Have you got that in front of you? Yes.
Q. MS. MEGRATH Do you accept or reject that there was a 17:23 phone call?
A. Oh, I accept there was a phone cal1, Chair. We were arranging the meeting for the following week I'd say.
Q. Okay. And then --
A. He was probably telling me where to go. I didn't know. 17:23
Q. Okay. So there was a phone call and you accept that. But do you reject in its entirety the note of the phone call or are you only rejecting some of it?
A. Well, there's some parts that I would hopefully reject straightaway.
Q. Can we clarify what they are because I think this is important?
A. Yeah.
Q. If you look, he said -- this is you --
A. Where I have greatest exception with, Chair, is the line where it says:
"AC Fanni ng offered a vi ew that Garda Keogh and his sol icitor were looking for money in a civil claim"

I reject -- I never said that, Chair. I might have said I knew that they were looking for money. And that's what I was saying, I was putting this in the context of, if I was down in Kerry on a Saturday morning, he was ringing me, you know. He could have been picked up a bit of the conversation, I could have picked up a bit of the conversation. Sorry, Chair. CHAN RMAN I appreciate that. If you stop for one second. What Ms. McGrath is going to do is going to go 17:23 through the various bits of the thing --
A. Yeah.
Q. CHA RMAN -- and see is there any part of it that you agree with.
A. Sorry, Chairman.
Q. CHA RMAN I appreciate your own all point is --
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN -- you did not -- this does not represent -your point is, this does not represent a dismissal of the complaint as of January 2018. That is your overal1 17:24 point.
A. Yes.
Q. CHAN RMAN Ms. McGrath wants to ask you a number of specific questions. And if she hadn't asked you them, I would be asking you them.
A. Right.
Q. ME. MEGRATH Thank you. The second line. We will try and do this as quickly as possible:
"He said he spoke to CS F Healy who examined the entire situation re mirrored ci vil cl ai mbetween January and August 2017."

Is that correct or incorrect? It is attributed to you. 17:24
A. That is incorrect. I don't think I said that. As I explained to you earlier on, Chair, I was aware -CHA RMAN Hold on. Go slowly, Ms. McGrath.
A. I was aware of the fact that chief superintendent Healy had done something. I became aware of that the week before when I got the substantial submission --
Q. CHA RMAN In relation to the civil action?
A. Correct.
Q. CHA RMAN Is that correct?
A. Yeah. Because we'11 say Superintendent Noreen McBrien had given me a large volume of material the previous week --
Q. CHA RMAN I follow, yes.
A. -- which was very helpful to me, and I spoke to Chief Superintendent Healy to say is this factual, that material.
Q. CHA RMAN so it is correct to say, yes, I did speak to Chief Superintendent Healy?
A. Yeah, I wouldn't dispute that. I wouldn't have a
problem.
Q. CHA RMAN You wouldn't quarrel with that?
A. No, Chair.

MS. MtGRATH okay.
Q. CHA RMAN And that the topic was the civil claim?
A. Correct.

CHA RMAN okay, thank you.
Q. M. MtGRATH okay. So you accept there was a conversation with CS F Healy and you are saying you didn't tell this, you don't recall saying this to Superintendent Murray?
A. When you say "saying this" what do you mean?
Q. Well, he is recording you as telling him in this conversation that you had spoken to CS Healy?
A. I wouldn't dispute, Chair, if I did say that to him, I 17:25 wouldn't have a dispute. I wouldn't dispute that.
Q. CHA RMAN I understand that. And he wouldn't know it unless you had said it, presumably.
A. Correct.

MS. MEGRATH "He said he knows of the meticul ous files 17:25 and records and notes that I have."

Is this you? Did you say this? Or could he possibly be talking about CS Healy but --
A. I could have said it --

CHA RMAN No, he is referring to -- sorry, he is referring to Assistant Commissioner Finn. He is referring to the phone call, he says --

MR. KELLY: Chairman, with respect, I think it might be
better if the witness were allowed to answer.
CHA RMAN Fair point. Except that's rather helpful to your point. It's clearly not Chief Superintendent Healy he was speaking --
MS. MEGRATH we just need to clarify, Chairman. CHAI RMAN But, point taken.
Q. MS. MEGRATH So, did you say to Superintendent Murray in this phone call that you know he keeps meticulous files and records and notes?
A. I can't recall saying those words to him. I wouldn't 17:26 dispute it, Chair, in the context, and maybe for myself --
Q. I'm sorry, commissioner, I think maybe if you say yes, no or maybe $I$ said it.
CHA RMAN I think he's entitled to answer the way he 17:26 wants to. And Mr. Kelly is right: The witness and only the witness will answer the question.

MS. MtGRATH okay.
A. I am saying that I wouldn't dispute it in the context that Chief Superintendent Healy told me that Pat Murray 17:27 had a large volume of material which he had given Chief Superintendent Healy --
CHA RMAN okay.
A. -- for his civil case. That is my answer.
Q. MS. MEGRATH okay.
"He said he knew now of the corrections I made in At hl one and was now being puni shed for doing so."

Did you say that to him?
A. I have no recollection, Chair. I don't think I would have said that.
Q. okay.
"He spoke of CS T Myers' reception frompeople accused he spoke to and his vi ew --"
which again looks like you.
"-- his view of the ethical calibre of the people accused. "

Did you say both of those things to him in that telephone call?
A. No, Chair. But I would take that piece as being referring to Chief Superintendent Myers' view of the ethical calibre of the people he spoke to. But I know that Chief Superintendent Myers had been in Athlone we'11 say earlier on that week and he met -- you know, he served the papers on the people that were the witnesses and in fairness to him, I think he said to me, you know, that they got a good reception when they went there. Nobody wasn't prepared not to engage with them, they didn't get any hostility or negativity when 17:28 they approached people. That would have been my perception of what he said. okay. But I think at the start of that answer you said you didn't say this to chief superintendent?
A. I don't recall it saying it to him, yeah.
Q. "I expl ai ned the situation in Athl one, how Chi ef Superintendent Wheatley and l work closel y to make corrections with fairness to everyone in a very caref ul way of being aware of the sensitivities invol ved."

Do you recal1 Superintendent Murray saying that to you?
A. I don't recall, Chair, but I wouldn't have an issue with -- you know, he probably did say it to me.
Q. "I told himof the calibre of other people accused and thei $r$ frustration and annoyance at this contrived situation."

Did he say that to you?
A. He may have, chair.
Q. okay.
A. I didn't take any notes of it.
Q. He records you as saying you understood, is that correct?
A. I don't recal1, Chair, if I said -- I didn't make these 17:29 notes, these are a conversation -- I'm trying to recall. I wouldn't dispute any issue, I wouldn't have any -- I may have said it, yeah.
Q. Did you say you understood? It's a very direct --
A. I don't know is the answer so, if you are looking for a 17:29 direct answer. I don't know.
Q. okay.
A. I can't recall specifically.
Q. He says that you "confirmed that CS Curran, Wheatley
and I were the ones Garda Keogh says he is accusing primarily." Did you say that?
A. I can't recall, but $I$ wouldn't have a difficulty if he said I said that, that's a fact I think, yeah.
okay. And we know with the final sentence that you say 17:29 you didn't say the final sentence, is that right?
A. Correct, yes, Chair.
Q. Okay. Thank you commissioner.

CHAN RMAN Thank you very much.
THE WTNESS: Thank you, Chair. CHA RMAN You're free to go until the next time, isn't that right?
M. MEGRATH That's right.

CHA RMAN Because the assistant commissioner is relevant to issue number 20 , which we will do in due course. Thank you very much.
MG. MtGRATH Thank you, commissioner.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

CHA RMAN Very good.

## THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED UNTI L THURSDAY, 20TH FEBRUARY 2020 AT 10: 30AM
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|  |  |  | 49:11, 50:18, 59:17, | 141:21, 145:18 |
| 117:7, 151:8, |  |  |  | 146:2, 148:8, 151:22,151:25, 152:14, |
| 251:1, 287:11 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 227:22, 229:18, } \\ & \text { 254:28, 268:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $73: 5,73: 18,99: 21$ |  |
|  |  | 287:10, 290:5, | $105: 5,105: 10$ | 152:24, 152:25, |
| 77:2 |  |  | 105:23, 151:5, | 154:11, 156:23, |
| 181:1, 226:2 |  | 290:10, 290:26, 291:2 <br> raises [4]-89:16, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:23, 168:22, } \\ & \text { 174:17, 181:14, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $93: 29,95: 15,253: 14$ | 202:19, 226:25, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 275:14 } \\ & \text { pursuing }[1]-49: 9 \\ & \text { push }[1]-78: 17 \\ & \text { put }[58]-34: 26, \end{aligned}$ | 181:22, 181:24, | raising [2] - 128:8, | $\begin{gathered} 230: 4,270: 14,283: 9 \\ \text { realm [1] - } 226: 25 \end{gathered}$ | 183:29, 187:9, 215:6, |
|  |  | ```290:25 rang [9] - 137:7, 137:9, 261:22, 262:1,``` |  | 251:9, 252:13, |
|  |  |  | reason [5] - 94:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 287:11, 291:11 } \\ & \text { recorded }[15]-62: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 262:22, 264:20, 265:3 |  |  |
| 45:29, 49:11, 49:12, |  | ranging [1] - 150:26 |  |  |
| 64.7, $64.25,67.16$ $73: 24,79: 7,80: 6$ |  | rank [3] - 6:27, |  |  |
| , |  | $28: 16,29: 2$ |  |  |
| 86:6, 90:22, 95:5, |  | ranking [1] - 28:14 |  |  |
|  |  | rather [4]-18:19, |  |  |


| recording [17] - | 189:20, 200:28, | REGISTRAR ${ }_{[1]}$ - $2: 5$ | relations [3]-35:20, | $162: 8,165: 18$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56:15, 119:12, | 222:9, 259:15, | regulation [1] - | 231:10 | 166:18, 166:26, |
| 119:18, 119:25, | $270: 28,275: 25$ | $217: 13$ | Relations [1] - 38:8 | 171:5, 171:9, 255:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:7, 122:20, } \\ & \text { 122:22. 133:28 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 288:9, 290:18 } \\ \text { referrina } \end{gathered}$ | regulations [2] | relationship [3] - | 268:7 |
| 142:14, 144:18, | 16:10, 46:24, 64:15, | 217:12, 217:13 <br> reiterates [2] - | relative [1] - 16:28 | $20: 25,26: 7,27: 3$ |
| 145:22, 152:7, 155:6, | 85:27, 106:13, | 36:25 | relatively [4] - 7:6, | 27:14, 27:18, 27:25, |
| 174:19, 181:26, | 106:17, 115:5 | reject [8] - 109:2 | 8:10, 105:17, 220:13 | 27:26, 27:28, 28:2, |
| 189:27, 294:13 | 120:15, 143:1, | 135:6, 151:22, | relaxed [1] - 86:5 | 32:15, 32:21, 32:27, |
| records [11] - | 152:26, 182:20, | 280:22, 291:15, | relayed [1] - 288:23 | 82:10, 112:19, |
| 121:29, 128:3, | 255:29, 256:26, | 291:22, 291:24, 292:7 | relevant [8]-55:13, | 166:20, 166:26, |
| 148:11, 150:15, | 288:10, 294:26, | rejected [1] - 200:12 | 61:12, 70:25, 173:13, | 167:5, 167:14, 168:3, |
| 152:8, 186:1, 188:22, | 294:27, 294:28, | rejecting [1] - 291:23 | 188:2, 252:16, | 168:13, 168:18, |
| 262:10, 294:21, | 296:17 | rejects [2] - 185:6, | 284:11, 298:15 | 168:20, 169:28, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 295:9, 297:18 } \\ & \text { red }[2]-44: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { refers }[4]-127: 21, \\ 152: 23,229: 7,256: 16 \end{gathered}$ | 192:18 | remain [2] - 210:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 171: 3,183: 26 \\ & 184: 29,185: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| 108:25 | reflect [4]-87:9, | related [5] - 149:11, | remainder [2] - | 186:23, 191:29, |
| redacted [1] - 133:3 | 149:4, 276:3, 276:18 | 159:27, 237:13, | 36:14, 160:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 192:1, 192:3, 192:18, } \\ & 192: 19.193: 193: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| REDDY [1] - 4:8 <br> Reddy [1] - 130:28 | reflected [1] - 82:26 reflecting [1] - | 256:9, 265:21 | remained [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 192:19, 193:1, 193:9, } \\ & \text { 194:1, 194:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { rediscovered [1] - } \\ & 0.15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 274:16 } \\ & \text { reflection [1] - 149:7 } \end{aligned}$ | 224:6, 234:6 | remember [32] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 196:28, 197:9, } \\ & \text { 197:11, 198:5, 199:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 98:15 <br> rediscovery [1] - | reflection [1] - 149:7 <br> refuse [2]-213:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { relating [3] - 98:25, } \\ & 105: 11,144: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 2,80: 4,80: 7,80: 9 \\ & 87: 22,88: 13,115: 23, \end{aligned}$ | 199:13, 200:6, <br> 200:13, 201:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 225:20 } \\ & \text { reengage }[1] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 215:3 } \\ & \text { refused }[3]-33: 26, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { relation [80] - 9:26, } \\ \text { 16:17, 34:17, 34:22, } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:19, 125:8, } \\ & \text { 125:18, 125:20, } \end{aligned}$ | 202:27, 204:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 175:16 } \\ & \text { refer } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 124: 16,160: 21 \\ & \text { refute }[3]-193: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 19,67: 29,68: 22, \\ & 83: 13,83: 15,88: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 125:25, 126:15, } \\ & 126: 29,128: 1,1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 204:20, 204:22, } \\ & \text { 231:24, 241:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 38:23, 64:11, 101:28, | $260: 28,280: 22$ | 91:27, 92:4, 95:21, | 129:10, 129:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 241:28, 242:6, 256:5, } \\ & \text { 256:26, 256:29, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:2, 117:25, 133:2, } \\ & \text { 182:22, 242:12, } \end{aligned}$ | refuted [1] - 156:18 <br> refutes [2]-157:11, | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 2,101: 21,104: 12, \\ & 109: 3,118: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:22, 133:23, } \\ & \text { 137:4, 140:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $257: 4,257: 5,257: 6$ |
| 256:11, 258:4, 258:8, | 158:5 | 133:13, 134:7, | 146:19, 149:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 257:14, 257:16, } \\ & 259: 1.259: 3.259: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 261:4, 286:23, 287:4 } \\ \text { reference }[39]-34: 4, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { regard [21] - 14:11, } \\ \text { 14:12, 24:29, 33:15, } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:19, 143:3, } \\ & \text { 144:10, 144:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:29, 151:28, } \\ & \text { 152:1, 182:29, 194:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 259:1, 259:3, 259:7 } \\ & \text { 260:8, 268:4, 280:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $37: 28,55: 3,55: 7$ | $33: 20,34: 9,105: 8$ | 145:14, 149:27, | $\begin{aligned} & 152: 1,182: 29,194: 5, \\ & 200: 16,206: 11,257: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 282:20, 282:22, |
| 76:23, 76:26, 77:13, | 142:14, 143:6, | 153:5, 153:22, | remind [1] - 285:18 | 283:20, 286:5, 286:8, |
| 77:25, 91:11, 101:7, | 158:20, 173:29, | 155:23, 156:12, | reminder [3] - 155:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 286:22 } \\ & \text { reported [1] - 220:21 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:7, 104:19, } \\ & \text { 106:25, 108:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 180:22, 209:26, } \\ & 210: 8,212: 26,2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 163:15, 168:20, } \\ & \text { 170:14, 178:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $156: 27,158: 8$ | reported [1] - 220:21 reporting [2] - |
| 109:12, 112:9, | 223:29, 225:22, | 181:16, 181:22 | $229: 25,281: 22$ | 204:23, 205:4 |
| 116:16, 119:12, | $279: 20,286: 8,286: 10$ | 181:23, 181:24, | remove [1] - 218:1 | reports [2]-253:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 130: 18,146: 19, \\ & 153 \cdot 11 \quad 154 \cdot 23 \end{aligned}$ | regarded [2] - 16:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:26, 188:19, } \\ & \text { 196:29, 198:17, } \end{aligned}$ | removed [1] - 152:17 | represent [4] - |
| 162:14, 170:10, | 17:19 |  | removing [1] - | 286:17, 288:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:14, 170:10, } \\ & \text { 181:19, 196:24, } \end{aligned}$ | regarding [1] - 28:14 <br> regardless [3]-21:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 201:10, 204:20, } \\ & \text { 208:5, 211:15, 218:3, } \end{aligned}$ | 176:28 | $\begin{aligned} & 286: 17,288: 6, \\ & 292: 23,292: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| 196:28, 197:17, | 166:16, 251:3 | 225:10, 227:25, | 193:9 | representative ${ }^{[1]}$ - |
| 198:15, 199:10, | regards [2]-47:22, | 231:28, 233:18, | repeated [3] - 17:4, | 31:25 |
| 199:11, 201:2, | 145:19 | 234:11, 234:27, | $17: 13,18: 23$ | representatives [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 227:28, 242:18, } \\ & \text { 242:24, 260:4, 270:5, } \end{aligned}$ | Region [17] - 7:26, | 241:18, 241:21, <br> 244:22, 246.21 | Repeated [1] - 17:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 211:21 } \\ & \text { represented [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 242:24, 260:4, 270:5, 271:1, 279:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 17,8: 25,9: 2,9: 9, \\ & 9: 22.10: 11.40: 29 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 244:22, 246:21, } \\ & \text { 249:14, 249:23, } \end{aligned}$ | repeatedly [2] - | 31:22 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { referenced [4] - } \\ 37: 15,41: 7,64: 18, \end{gathered}$ | 44:12, 91:6, 154:24, | $\begin{aligned} & 249: 24,252: 1,252: 5, \\ & 252: 25,254: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 61:28, 160:10 repeating [2] - 134:8, | reputation [1] - 36:3 <br> request [8]-50:27, |
| $111: 10$ <br> references [3] - | 183:28, 204:24, <br> 204:28, $205 \cdot 1$ | 262:27, 266:23, <br> 268:8, 268:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:19 } \\ & \text { repetitive }[3]-75: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:28, 109:1, } \\ & \text { 134:14, 159:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $51: 26,98: 29,106: 20$ referencing [2] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { 204:28, 205:1 } \\ \text { region }[9]-8: 17, \\ 8: 24,8: 27,9: 8 \end{gathered}$ | 270:12, 270:13, 281:8, 282:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 83:4, 83:10 } \\ & \text { replied [4] - 124:2, } \end{aligned}$ | 164:16, 164:26, <br> 261:16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88:27, 106:19 } \\ & \text { referral }[1]-24: 14 \\ & \text { referred }[12]-44: 11, \\ & \text { 59:3, 99:29, 112:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:10, 205:10, 281:5 } \\ & \text { regional }[2]-7: 22, \\ & \text { 55:18 } \\ & \text { regions }[1]-9: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 282:23, 284:27, } \\ & \text { 287:23, 287:25, } \\ & \text { 288:5, 289:5, 289:12, } \\ & 293: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { replies [4] - 81:9, } \\ \text { 81:11, 82:13, 165:19 } \\ \text { reply [12] - 94:17, } \\ 99: 6,115: 25,157: 18, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { requested [9] - } \\ & \text { 24:15, 24:20, 31:16, } \\ & 48: 14,99: 25,116: 4, \\ & 125: 6,211: 18,288: 1 \end{aligned}$ |



| 27:3, 34:6, 40:8, | segmented [1] - | 184:18, 200:29, | seven [4]-7:7, 7:20, | signed [12] - 56:25, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 41:17, 46:7, 47:2, | 149:10 | 220:7, 253:10, | 8:7, 225:15 | 57:20, 58:9, 72:28, |
| 48:24, 53:16, 54:26, | seizure [1] - 127:3 | 253:24, 287:16 | several [3]-148:26, | 73:3, 88:9, 88:16, |
| 59:9, 65:28, 66:13, | ected [1] - 32:28 | sequence [1] - 43:27 | 182:2, 272:11 | 88:20, 219:26, 220:7, |
| 74:8, 89:6, 90:22, | self [2]-11:5, 41:26 | sequencing [1] - | sexual [4] - 10:25, | 220:24, 220:26 |
| 93:1, 95:24, 99:20, | self-confidence [2] - | 171:7 | 12:11, 12:22, 15:23 | significance [1] - |
| 108:11, 123:19, $129.21,130: 26$, | 11:5, 41:26 | sergeant [19]-7:7, | shall [8] - 28:29, | 146:8 |
| 129:21, 130:26, | send [10] - 78:7 | 7:14, 7:16, 7:18, | 32:21, 32:27, 45:13, | significant [1] - |
| $135: 6,136: 19$, $140 \cdot 15,140 \cdot 18$, | 83:2, 85:7, 90:29 | 28:18, 62:14, 65:10, | 68:17, 119:26, 210:5, | 59:19 |
| 140:15, 140:18, | 118:17, 118:18, | 65:14, 65:18, 72:2, | 279:26 | signing [2]-73:17, |
| $142: 17,142: 23$, $143 \cdot 9,143: 16$, | 136:26, 155:3, | 72:7, 74:26, 176:22, | SHANE $_{[1]}-3: 23$ | 219:17 |
| 143 | 180:24, 253:7 | 209:7, 222:1 | SHANKEY [1] - 3:22 | similar [8] - 42:4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 147:13, 147:23 } \\ & 150: 4,150: 24 \end{aligned}$ | sending [2] - 40:29, | $\begin{aligned} & 271: 21,275: 23, \\ & 275: 25,276: 8 \end{aligned}$ | SHANKEY-SMITH [1]-3.22 | 106:22, 154:2, 166:5, |
| 154:18, 154:26, | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 95:4 } \\ \text { senior [10] - 64:20, } \end{array}$ | SERGEANT [5] | [1] - 3:22 <br> SHANNON [1] - 2:13 | $248: 25$ |
| 157:4, 157:17, 158:1, | 111:4, 157:23, | $3: 13,3: 20,4: 6,4: 6$, | share [3] - 97:15 | similarly [1] - 94:3 |
| 158:16, 158:21, | 157:27, 168:16 | 4:7 | 125:11, 235:20 | simple [4]-26:18, |
| 162:24, 163:10, | 201:25, 237:20 | Sergeant [18] | sharing [3]-113:22, | 177:10, 219:20, |
| 167:3, 170:5, 170:21, | 259:21, 259:27 | 91:25, 108:21, | 125:13, 174:21 | 244:25 |
| 172:13, 173:18, | 260:10 | 109:13, 134:1 | SHEAHAN ${ }_{[1]}-3: 19$ | simpler [2]-209:1, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 173:22, 178:9, } \\ & \text { 180:28, 183:9, } \end{aligned}$ | sense [30]-15:8, | 154:19, 157:8, | sheet [5] - 90:12, | 209:4 |
| 193:20, 200:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 13,43: 26,47: 18 \\ & 48: 20.51: 25,64: 7 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 162: 15,162: 17 \\ & 285: 19,286: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 15,90: 16,90: 20, \\ & 110: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { simply [8]-25:19, } \\ & 90: 16,122: 29, \end{aligned}$ |
| 202:15, 203:1, 204:8, | 68:11, 68:14, 68:20, | 286:17, 286:21, | SHELLEY [1] - 3:25 | 153:13, 217:17, |
| 205:22, 205:26, | 68:24, 76:18, 77:8, | 287:9, 287:29, 288:6, | shifts [2]-113:22, | 232:26, 260:9, 270:20 |
| 205:27, 206:26, | 83:16, 93:28, 94:4, | 288:7, 288:11 | $240: 13$ | single [4]-17:4, |
| 209:9, 209:16, | 94:27, 96:14, 105:1, | sergeants [4] | SHIP ${ }_{[1]}-3: 28$ | 75:29, 83:6, 83:11 |
| 211:14, 212:14, | 137:6, 152:16, | 113:14, 158:23, | short [8]-7:27, 8:10, | SINÉAD [1] - 4:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 213:5, 216:1, 216:8, } \\ & \text { 216:11, 216:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $161: 18,161: 23$, $165 \cdot 1,172 \cdot 26,179 \cdot 3$ | 289:4, 289:10 | 47:8, 282:11, 282:28, | SINéAD [1] - 2:8 |
| 217:5, 220:26, | 165:1, 172:26, 179:3, 205:5, 218:4, 218:27, | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { series [3] - 160:18 } \\ \text { 182:25, 205:25 } \end{array}$ | $283: 3,283: 5,283: 25$ | sit [10] - 34:8, 35:9, |
| 222:24, 224:25, | $265: 1$ | serious [2] - 125:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { short-circuit [5] - } \\ & \text { 282:11, 282:28, } \end{aligned}$ | 175:3, 175:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 225: 11,226: 2,228: 8 \\ & 230: 10,232: 23 \end{aligned}$ | sensed [1] - 68:27 | $126: 25$ | $283: 3,283: 5,283: 25$ | 231:12, 238:16 |
| 233:11, 235:23, | 146:25 | $250: 24,251: 2,261: 26$ | shortly [1] - 261:11 | site [1] - 56:18 <br> sitting [6] - 95: |
| 241:17, 241:26, <br> 244:28, 246:2 | sensitivities [2] | served [2] - 151:18, | shoulder [1] - 266:12 | 172:29, 184:3, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 244: 28,246: 2, \\ & 248: 26,250: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $263: 15,297: 5$ | 296:21 | shout [1] - 93:5 | 213:20, 215:17, |
| 253:13, 256:12, | sensitivity [3] 210:1, 210:6 | $240: 29$ | show [4]-62:16, | 236:26 |
| 257:21, 257:23, | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s e n }}[10]-42: 11,$ | service [1] - 246:17 | showed [1] - 200:22 | 29:12, 29:29, 36:28, |
| $270: 5,270: 18$ | $47: 17,47: 22,55: 18$ | SERVICES [1] - 1:29 | shown [4] - 231:13, | 137:22, 146:24, |
| 270:19, 275:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 10,104: 25,125: 5 \\ & \text { 136:23, 170:13, 236:2 } \end{aligned}$ | services [2]-8:19, $8: 22$ | 267:12, 270:27, | 146:26, 147:5, 147:6, |
| 275:20, 278:27, | sentence [7] - 25:15, | Services [2] - 1:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 278:13 } \\ & \text { si }[1]-16 \end{aligned}$ | 263:18, 268:6, 293:7, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 279: 18,280: 11 \\ & 287: 21,291: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 67:16, 143:20, 263:3, | 30:18 | SI [1] - 38:6 | 297:2, 297:12 |
| $292:$ | 277:3, 298:5, 298:6 | set [20]-7:23, 34:18, | ck [5] - 92:2 | six [5] - 7:26, 41:25, |
| seeing [4] - 48:26, | separate [11] - 76:1 <br> $78: 8,82 \cdot 15,82 \cdot 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 24,59: 1,66: 19 \\ & 91: 14,93: 19,111: \end{aligned}$ | 185:27, 241:22, | 184:1, 184:10, 184:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 90:25, 137:2, 249:19 } \\ & \text { seek [2] - 30:26, } \end{aligned}$ | 85:9, 105:14, 115:8, | 118:10, 155:2, <br> 183:23, 191:10 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 241:28, } 242: 6 \\ \text { sickness [1] - 149:1 } \end{array}$ | 184:10, 184:19 |
| 41:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:14, 173:28, } \\ & 252: 12.279: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 183:23, 191:10, } \\ & \text { 194:3, 224:14, } \end{aligned}$ | side [9] - 68:21, | sixth [1] - 26:1 |
| seeking [6] - 117:7, | 252:12, 279:25 <br> separated [1] - 77:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 194: 3,224: 14, \\ & 237: 11,238: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $68: 27,114: 16,196: 5$ | sizable [1] - 180:10 <br> size [1] - 218:6 |
| 132:6, 143:2, 146:20, | separately [3] - | 238:23, 246:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 209:22, 216:8, 220:2, } \\ & 241: 24,265: 6 \end{aligned}$ | skip [3] - 41:1, 41:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 187:12, 279:28 } \\ & \text { seeks }[1]-30: 16 \\ & \text { seem [6] - 58:17, } \end{aligned}$ | 138:7, 185:10, 279:28 <br> September [18] - | $\begin{aligned} & 260: 9,280: 15 \\ & \text { sets }[5]-15: 27, \\ & 15: 28,16: 26,217: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sides [1] - 186:26 } \\ & \text { sight [1] - 200:29 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 199:13 } \\ & \text { skipped }[1]-158: 29 \end{aligned}$ |
| 64:4, 141:12, 149:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 7,46: 10,55: 7 \\ & \text { 150:11, 175:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $15: 28,16: 26,217: 13$ 228:9 | sign [8] - 87:20, | slightly [7] - 97:12, 109.12, 216.9, 217.1 |
| 165:24, 196:28 | 181:4, 181:7, 181:10, | setting [6] - 15:19, | $87: 23,87: 24,87: 25$, $88 \cdot 21,88 \cdot 22,109 \cdot 28$, | 224:21, 239:29, |
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[^3]:    "I don't want to open the attachment."

[^4]:    "Why there was there no awareness at the meeting of who

[^5]:    "Garda Keogh file. Notes and origi nal exhi bits and files re trailer and ME. B allegations in Tullamore and

[^6]:    "We went through his compl ai nts and my 338-page document and di scussed all."

[^7]:    "I have an issue with John Scanl an because the compl ai nt went missing."

[^8]:    "Garda Keogh is compl ai ni ng about adverse treat ment but he can't al ways pi nooi nt who is doing it. It's a

