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## THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVG, ON THURSDAY, 20TH FEBRUARY 2020:

CHA RMAK Thanks very much. Just before we start, we had a very long day yesterday and I have just seen the transcript, which is heavier, thicker than any one we have seen previously. I want to particularly thank Ms. Niamh Kelly here, who is our stenographer, and her colleague, Ms. Nuala Dalton, who also works in the stenography services and who produces the transcript for us each evening, so it is particularly apt to thank them. I have to thank everybody, but particularly the stenographers, so I just wanted to say a word of appreciation before we begin. Thanks very much. Now. MS. MEGRATH Good morning Chairman, the next witness is Assistant Commissioner Finbarr O'Brien, please. CHA RMAN Thank you. Good morning, commissioner. Thank you.

ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER FI NBARR O BRI EN, HAM NG BEEN SUORN, WAS DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY ME. MLGRATH, AS FOLLOVG:

THE WTNESS: Finbarr O'Brien.
MS. MEGRATH Good morning, commissioner. Chairman, the commissioner's statement is at page 13412 of the brief. Now, commissioner, just by way of background, I think you're currently attached to sligo Garda station, is that right?
A. No, it's actually Galway. There's been an amalgamation of regions, so I'm now in charge of what's called the northwestern region, but the regional headquarters. But at the time $I$ was in sligo.
2 Q. Oh, sorry, at the time you made your statement to the Tribunal, is that right?
A. That's correct.

3 Q. Okay. Now, I think we are trying to address a particular single issue really, which was the review of the Finn investigation that was carried out during the course of late 2017/2018, okay. Now, I think you were appointed by the executive director at HRPD to review that investigation on 8th January 2019, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

4 Q. I think we have a letter of Mr. Alan Mulligan, at page 11982 of the book, please. It should come up there. So I think this is where you were nominated. I think this arises in circumstances, we heard from commissioner Finn yesterday, whereby he had moved into the Eastern Region at this stage and as an investigator 10:34 he couldn't review himself effectively under the working policy, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

5 Q. Okay. He had moved in early January into that position, I think the 3rd January, he gave evidence yesterday, and this is how you came into the frame, isn't that right?
A. I believe so.

6 Q. Now, that letter from Mr. Mulligan says, it's addressed
to the Eastern Region, it says:
"It is the role of the appointing officer to informthe parties of the findings of the investigation, having satisfied thensel ves that all appropriate steps have been taken and that a thorough and impartial i nvestigation has been carried out. As Assistant Commissioner Finn was the investigator in this matter, it is not appropriate that he should undertake the role of the appointing officer.

To final ise this investigation l nomi nate Assi stant Cormissioner O Brien of the Northern Regi on to undertake the role of appointing officer in this i nst ance. "

And he then asks the Eastern Region to keep him informed of the outcome of the investigation and any developments in that matter. So I think that's, as I say, where you came into the frame on this issue, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

7 Q. Now can I ask you first, just generally, before we get into the specifics of what you did, you were appointed effectively then to do what has been called a review, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, under the policy.

8 Q. Okay. Now the policy document, we looked at it in a lot of detail yesterday. I just want you to look at
your own section. So if we can just look at 7868, which is the policy document, it will come up there. Now, if you go to 7893 , the bottom of the page, please, Mr. Kavanagh. So I am looking for 7893. Do you see
there, just at the bottom, commissioner, it says:
"Revi ew within 28 days."
A. That's correct.

9 Q. And:
"W thi n 28 days of the compl ai nt being recei ved, the di vi si onal of ficer/chi ef superintendent shall revi ew the investi gation of the compl aint. Where an
i nvesti gation has concl uded, they shall inf orm both parties in writing of the findings of the i nvesti gation, a copy of the investigation file will be sent then to the local assistant commissioner and assi stant commi ssi oner HRM "

As we heard yesterday, the references there to
divisional officers or chief superintendents, didn't really apply in Garda Keogh's case because it was a higher level appointee for the investigation purposes, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

10 Q. okay. So it talks about timeframes there, did you understand that any review you would carry out would be within that timeframe of 28 days?
A. Yes.

11 Q. Okay. It seems that you had two functions; that you shal1 review the investigation and then notify the parties of the outcome, effectively?
A. Yes.

12 Q. okay. Now, just talking about that review, if Mr. Kavanagh can just go forward to 7896, there's a formal process, a flow chart there. So it's 7896. And it talks there at number 8 , you see there at the bottom, I'm sorry it's not a great quality copy. I think number 8 is your section?
A. Yes.

13 Q. But, as I say, you were at assistant commissioner 1evel. You were going to issue the decision to the various interested parties. And it says there in the box:

## "Be satisfied of a thorough and impartial

 i nvestigation, issue copi es of the findi ngs and decision to both parties and to the local assistant commi ssi oner and to assi stant commissioner HRM within 28 days."I think that is repeated again because you mention it in your statement, I just want to open it, it's mentioned again a couple of pages later, at section 8.9 10:38 of the policy. That's 7899, Mr. Kavanagh. I think in your statement you specifically refer that this provision, you say -- section 8.9 , you say:
"It requires me to satisfy myself that all appropriate steps in the investigation have been undertaken, that a fair and impartial investigation has been carried out to make a determination based on the investigation and to communi cate the outcone and my decision to al parties."
A. I think it says thorough as opposed to fair, that's the only...
14 Q. Okay. That's right. The section itself says:
"On recei pt of the investigation file, the divisional officer/chi ef superintendent shall satisfy thensel ves that all appropriate steps have been taken, that a thorough and impartial investigation has been carried out. Both parties should be advi sed in writing of the out come and the further action that will be taken. Further action will be determined by whether the compl ai nt was uphel d or not."

Now, we know that Commissioner finn did not uphold the complaint, isn't that right?
A. His investigation, no. The investigation did not. okay. Can I just ask you, just in relation to your role, sometimes it looks straightforward but can I ask you this: Are you at the procedure? what do you consider yourself to be doing when you're carrying out this review?
A. Well, my view is that what I am doing is I am looking
at the findings. So, as I said, first of all I have to satisfy myself, as it says there, that all appropriate steps have been taken and that a thorough and impartial investigation. And then I will look at the conclusions drawn in respect of each of the allegations and then establish and satisfy myself that the conclusions are based on the evidence provided and that they are reasonable. Then I decide whether I agree with the conclusions or otherwise. That's what I see my role as.
"On the 18th January, I recei ved a compl ete copy of Assistant Commi ssioner Finn's investigation file, which consisted of three vol umes frominspector James MECarthy, regi onal inspector Mulingar Garda station."

So, Commissioner Finn said yesterday that literally he gives you everything, is that right?
A. He gives me the completed investigation file.

18 Q. So do you see every statement, every note, every enquiry that was made?
A. No. That would be -- that wouldn't be part of the investigation. It would be all of the relevant material that he has included in the investigation file.

19 Q. Okay. So you don't necessarily see working documents?
A. No.

20 Q. Okay. Okay. So, as you say, on the 18th January you received the file and you have clarified to the Chair what you were doing, which you say includes looking at the substantive findings and seeing whether you would accept or reject them, is that right?
A. That's correct, yeah.

21 Q. Okay. Now, one of the things then that you did -- if I could ask Mr. Kavanagh to open up a document that we were provided with, it's at 12025, if you could look at the top there please, Mr. Kavanagh. There's a handwritten note on my copy certainly. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

22 Q. Is that your writing?
A. That's correct.

23 Q. And you say:
"Recei ved by hand froml nspector MECarthy."

Is that right?
A. That's correct.
"On the 18/9 Fi nbarr O Brien."
A. Yes FOB, yeah.
okay, so you receive the material on the 18th and according to your statement you then carried out a review of that material on the 21st, a couple of days later, is that right?
A. Yes, I commenced the process on the 21st.
Q. I think this is the document upon which you made your notes, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, we won't go through it all. For example, if you go down to -- if Mr. Kavanagh can scroll down, you're underlining the document and you're initialling the paragraphs. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
okay. And if you can keep scrolling down please, Mr. Kavanagh. That's the introductory. We would have opened a lot of this yesterday with Commissioner Finn. If you can just keep going down please. And then just by way of example, at the end of that first section -actually, I might ask you to go to -- can I see what page you're on, Mr. Kavanagh, please? 12027. If you can go 13032, please. We can see the document is extensively underlined. Is that your modus operandi of
working and how you're reviewing it?
A. Yes, with investigation files. With a lot of correspondence I tend to underline and just make notes. okay. I'm sorry, Mr. Kavanagh, it's 12032. At the end of that first section, for example there, where there's findings that are made, you write "agreed Fi nbarr O' Bri en"?
A. Yes.

31
A. Well it's involving reading the covering report and moment, what level of interrogation is this involving? then I would have referred to a number of the documents that were appended to the file and then drawing on my own conclusions based on the evidence that was submitted on the file. If we keep ongoing down, there are some notes which appear -- as I say, it follows a situation where there's underlining and the marking of agreed and date, but, for example, if I could ask Mr. Kavanagh to open 12037. Actually, if you could open 13036. Yes, that
is perfect. One of the complaints made by Garda keogh related to what is termed here the Liam McHugh alleged complaint, all right?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

And if we go on to the next page, there are Post-Its on this page, are they your Post-Its?
A. Yes.
Q. "May have been" perhaps?
A. "Thi s compl ai nt may have been obvi at ed had the sergeant sought specific information from Garda Keogh prior to transmitting."
37 Q. okay. Now, what is that? Are these your thoughts?
A. Yes.
Q. Are these just observations?
A. Yes. So, in respect of that, the clarification I sought on that was the fact that somebody had made an allegation that Gardaí had misappropriated funds or basically stolen funds from them. So the concern I would have had was, had that element been finalised in respect of had that been investigated and had they come to a conclusion. Although it is part of Garda Keogh's complaint in respect of the bullying, the fact that he was asked that, $I$ had a concern to make sure that the
investigation, that aspect had been investigated. And then the other area there is my view obviously that the report that the sergeant forwarded should have probably addressed that with Garda Keogh prior to transmitting the report to the superintendent.
39 Q. Okay. So it would appear then that when you are looking at the findings, you are digging into them effectively, and you are considering from an investigative purposes, and I don't mean Commissioner Finn, you're sort of going one level below that and you 10:48 are saying, well, locally you're querying did $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}$ or z --
A. No, I am bringing my skills as an investigator into my deliberations on the file. So if there are matters that, say, for example, I feel are outstanding or matters that require clarification, I will send them back for clarification. So I am not investigating it, but $I$ am just drawing on the file as the file is presented to me.
But in fairness, I suppose one thing we sought to
clarify yesterday and again today is that this is a bullying and harassment investigation, but these comments, as I say, seem to be a level below that. They seem to be digging into local management responses and the mechanisms or what was or should have been done 10:48 correctly or not. Would you agree or disagree? You can agree or disagree with me?
A. No, I disagree with you, because the essence of Garda Keogh's complaint was that management, that specific
members of management had engaged in what I describe as intrusive supervision. And this was an example of where he cited as an example of the level of intrusive supervision. But the point I make there is that based on the report that was submitted to the superintendent, that I felt -- my view is that the role of the sergeant should have been to address that aspect, rather than just transmit it to the superintendent. So that would be my view.
41 Q. Okay. And we will come back to that in a moment because I think you write a specific letter, don't you?
A. I seek clarification, yes.

42 Q. okay. Now number 5 there, was the car tax issue. If you keep going forward, you're marking "agreed" on the findings. I think it's the same for the alleged 10:49 oppressive supervision issue. But if we can on down to number 8, which is:
"Garda A's access to firearmæ and the same shift pattern."

This is at 12042. Here we are. Can I just ask, are they question marks there in the corner?
A. They are, yeah.

43 Q. Okay, but you don't have any comment there. So can you 10:50 tell us why you were marking them with question marks?
A. I'11 just read them. Yeah, I suppose I was questioning as to what exactly was being alleged here. I mean, if you read:
"Garda Keogh alleges that Garda A called to the station on 5th May 2015 and took out a firearmfroma safe behi nd the public office."

That would be -- there would be a normal procedure in respect of the taking out of firearms, so I am questioning as to what is actually being alleged here.
"Garda Keogh rai sed this issue with Superintendent MEBrien on the 17th June. According to Superintendent MEBrien's notes while he, Garda Keogh, was concerned but not in a major way he stated that he was not in fear of Garda A attacking him"

So, I am just kind of questioning as to why this actually was alleged in the first place, or what was being alleged?
44 Q. It may suggest that you were in the dark about the connection between Garda Keogh and Garda A and what the
history was there; namely the protected disclosures issues, the criminal investigation. Were you in the dark? Did you know what the connection was between Garda Keogh and Garda A?
A. No, I wasn't aware. Because, as I said, it wasn't on 10:51 the file.
45 Q. okay. So you didn't know that protected disclosure had been made concerning this particular garda?
A. No.

46 Q. Okay. And again, we'11 look at your letters that you sent and again, as I say, we will revert to that issue. Now as we go on down you continue going through the 18 issues, you continue to mark as "agreed" but can we stop at issue 12, which is on 12047. So this is:
"Critique of investigation of robbery fromthe person i nci dent. "
A. Yes.

47 Q. If you go to the next page, I think that is one of your Post-Its as well. Can you have a look at that.
A. Yeah. "Where is the ori gi nal correspondence from Garda Keogh PID inci dent occurred on the 13/9/15."
48 Q. Can I ask you, and this is just to clarify because it is something that has come up here at the hearings, were you querying was there a Pulse record for this? what were you querying?
A. No, I wanted to have a look at what the Pulse record said.

49 Q. Okay, so you were looking for the Pulse record?
A. Yeah. We11, PID would indicate that there is already an existing Pulse record.
50 Q. What was your thought process behind that?
A. Well, I think if you look at the event, it was the case 10:52 of a robbery and obviously there were queries by the superintendent. So I would like to see what the original Pulse incident said in order for the superintendent to raise a query.

51 Q. Okay. Now again, that's issue number 12, and you agree with the next number of issues, but can I ask you then to come to page 12050 , which is issue number 14 , so it's 12050, yeah. So this is number 14:
"M x up regarding reporting of sick leave."

Okay? You go down through it and it's underlined, but on the next page you have another Post-It, if you can just -- "obtain copy of..." I think it's is
"Superintendent Al an Murray's report", is it?
A. Yes. I have a feeling that refers to the discipline, it $I$ ma be stuck in the wrong...
52 Q. Okay. This is the discipline for AWOL issues in July 2016, is that right?
A. Yes.

53 Q. And you're looking to obtain a copy of superintendent Alan Murray's report dated $11 / 11$, requested by Chief Superintendent wheatley?
A. Yes.

54 Q. I think that is where she requested the rationale for the imposition of penalty, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

55 Q. okay. As I say, we will come back to that. Now, again the intervening issues, you mark "agreed" on them all, but can I ask you to go to the next one, where you raise an issue, it's at 12054 . This is the denial of commendations issue. If you can just take the Chairman through your Post-Its there?
A. "Obtai $n$ a vi ew copy of file or correspondence whi ch sought the award to the members on $8 / 11 / 16$ arising from the rescue on the River Shannon in Athl one on $22 / 4 / 15$."

That relates to an allegation by Garda Keogh that I think his name was deliberately misspelt or misnamed in respect of an award. So what I wanted to do was to have a look at whether the error had occurred in sending up the commendation from within the district or whether the error had occurred outside of the district.
56 Q. Okay. On the next page, I think we are moving into the final issue that Commissioner Finn looked at, which is number 18 and the receipt of the Tribunal order by Garda Keogh, I think the Post-It seems to refer to that issue, is that right?
A. Yeah. "Copy of the correspondence sent to all personnel in Athl one district as a consequence of the order fromthe Discl osures Tribunal dated 20/2/17 and al so copy of the service of the Tribunal order on Garda Keogh on 21/3/17 and precise details of his absence from duty during the period."

57 Q. Okay. So I think they're the issues on which you had a query or that you were minded to interrogate a little bit further, is that right?
A. Yeah. On my reading of the file, yes.

58 Q. On your reading of the file, okay. Now, I am going to go to those questions, because you do write a letter but what I want to just ask you in the meantime is, we also in disclosure received some pages of the report
with notes on them. Just an example, at 7475, if you just keep going down, please. Do you see that writing there in blue?
A. Yeah.

59 Q. Now, I think initially when this material was provided it was thought that these were your handwritten notes and then subsequently we were told that they weren't?
A. Yes.

60 Q. Can you confirm that position?
A. They're not my writing.

61 Q. Do you know, do you recognise that handwriting? was it anyone who was assisting you?
A. No, I couldn't. No, it certainly wasn't anybody, because nobody -- nobody, only myself actually noted on the copy I had. So I can't assist you as to who.
62 Q. Okay. And did you have anybody assisting you? It was a very large investigation, that took 13 months. When you are doing this on the 21st January, does anyone assist you or do you have a team working on it or is it just literally yourself?
A. No, I do it myself.

63 Q. Okay. Now, after your review on the 21st, which we have seen your notes, you go on to write a letter the following day to Assistant Commissioner Finn, and that's at 5597, please. Okay. So this is your letter, ${ }^{0: 58}$ is that right?
A. Yes. Yeah.

64 Q. Okay. So in relation to issue number 4, Liam McHugh:
"Allegation that Li am MEHugh had been searched by a number of Gardaí (incl udi ng Garda Keogh) who sei zed money from Li am McHugh and the allegation was that the Gardaí kept and subsequently spent the money."

Is this your query then:
"Can you clarify if Garda Keogh was the only menber to submit a report on this matter or did Superintendent MEBrien engage with other mentbers to clarify the allegations that Gardaí kept and subsequently spent the money?"
A. That's my query, yes.

65 Q. Okay, that's your query. The next one is on issue 12:
"Critique of the investigation of the robbery.

When Superintendent Murray was carrying out his daily PAF he revi ewed the inci dent and was not satisfied with the contents of Garda Keogh's report and the amount of information it contai ned. "

And you refer to the appendix.
"Superintendent Muray was dissatisfied with the Iack of detail in the report and the lack of action that had been taken at the time the inci dent was reported, apart fromtaking the injured party to point out the scene where the inci dent was alleged to have taken place.

Garda Keogh submitted a subsequent report provi di ng additional information on the action taken on the ni ght in question. "

And then you ask:
"Could it be clarified if it was the Pulse narrative inci dent report PID 12207121, in whi ch Superintendent Murray referred to in his correspondence dated 13th October 2015 and, if so, I would appreci ate a copy."

How did you think that might assist you, looking for the copy of that?
A. Well, Superintendent Murray, like all superintendents, would review Pulse incidents the following day and based on the narrative of what is set out in the Pulse incident, he would then maybe have concerns as to whether or not the investigation was conducted in an efficient way. So that's really why. So I would look at it to see whether that was reasonable.
66 Q. Okay.
67 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, can I just ask, could you have just logged in and got the pulse? You had the number.
A. That's correct. But I would have preferred to have it 11:00 formally --
68 Q. CHAL RMAN So the more official way was to go through this, you were asking other queries as well, so this one, even though you could have done it yourself, and
everybody knows what you're at, is that right?
A. Exactly. So it's clear for everybody what the clarification is.

CHA RMAN Sorry, Ms. McGrath. Thank you very much.
69 Q. MS. MtGRATH Not at a11. Then at 14:
" $\mathrm{M} x$ - up regar ding reporting of f sick I eave.

Chi ef Superintendent Weatley conducted revi ew of the di sci pl ine investigation conducted by Superintendent

Murray, Mullingar, concerning breaches committed by
Garda Keogh at Athl one Garda Station. Chi ef
Superintendent Wheatley states that the deci si ons outlined in Superintendent Murray's report of the 11th Novenber 2017 appear to be logi cal, well thought out and caref ul ly consi dered and show an understanding of the concerns for member's wel fare and financi al ci rcumst ances."

And you look for a copy of that:
"I would appreci ate a copy of this report whi ch sets out the rational e for the deci si on-maki ng. "

Okay. And then on the denial of the commendations, you 11:01 refer to two incidents of 28th October 2014, 22nd September 2015. You say you note from the contents at appendix 20 from the Irish water Safety, annual national award ceremony in Dublin Castle on 8th

November 2016, that it mentions Nicholas Glennon, westmeath. So that is what you were trying to get to the bottom of there, is that right?
A. where the mistake occurred.

70 Q. And you would:
"...appreciate a copy of the original file that was forwarded to the di strict di vision on this matter so l can clarify the origins of the spelling mistake."

Okay. Now that letter addresses the Post-Its that we saw, that had you on the document.
A. Hm -hmm.

71 Q. One of the matters that is not there, if you remember, when we looked at issue number 8 , you had question marks next to the Garda A and firearms issue?
A. Mm-hmm.

72 Q. You don't ask a question about that. Why does that fall away or does it fall away?
A. well, because as I said, I just questioned the fact why 11:02 it was actually alleged, what was being -- what Garda Keogh was alleging. It wasn't something I needed clarification on.
73 Q. But what was the point of that exercise, I suppose I have to ask you? where did that lead you? How did you 11:02 resolve it in your own mind?
A. Well, you know, when you read a file, sometimes you make a little note. My note was I couldn't figure out what Garda Keogh was actually alleging in that. That
is what that was about.
74 Q. Okay. And how did you resolve it? I mean, you have to sign off --
A. I it resolved it on the basis of what Assistant Commissioner Finn, the conclusions he drew and I felt that the conclusions were appropriate and reasonable. So are you saying you had resolved it in your mind by the time you read the next paragraphs?
A. No, I am saying I resolved it by the time I drafted up the correspondence seeking clarification on the other matters.

76 Q. But they seem entirely different matters. So I just have to ask you how A could become B effectively?
A. Sorry?

77 Q. I have to ask you, you asked for clarification on totally different matters, getting specific responses on specific issues, but I am just asking you how you resolve your difficulty with number 8 ?
A. I resolved it by looking at, as I said, the file. I was satisfied that the conclusions that Assistant Commissioner Finn formulated on the basis of the investigation, $I$ was satisfied that they were reasonable and appropriate.

78 Q. okay. So, therefore, going back to what I said to you earlier, it seemed that, is it the case you read on a few paragraphs and you thought, I'm happy enough with that now?
A. I couldn't be precise, but by the time I was drafting up the correspondence and then I would also point to
the fact that they are ones where I put a Post-It, so they are more significant. This was one where I just put the question marks and my assessment of that is I just interpret what exactly Garda Keogh was actually alleging.

79 Q. Can I ask you, did you ever go back to anyone or seek to clarify with anybody the significance of Garda A?
A. No.

80 Q. To Garda Keogh?
A. No.

81 Q. So you signed off that finding and you weren't aware of any background or context, is that right?
A. No.

82 Q. Okay. So you write your letter of queries, as we have just seen, on $22 / 1 / 2019$. Now, we know that

Commissioner Finn, one of his assistants was an Inspector Kennedy, who looks into these matters for him. I opened up a document to the commissioner yesterday, which I would just like you to look at please for a moment, at 5639. Do you see the date there, 1st February 2019.
A. Yes.

83 Q. You see the four issues there that you had raised?
A. $\mathrm{Hm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

84 Q. He confirmed that this was a draft reply to your queries, do you see that? If you stay perhaps on the first page. So it's 1st February 2019, and it says:
"I refer to the above and your correspondence on 22nd

J anuary 2019. I have exami ned your queries and can report the following to clarify the issues raised."

There's the Liam McHugh. As I say, it appears to be the working document of one of Commissioner Finn's assistants and I will take this one by example, we don't need to go into all of them. It says:
"In respect of this issue I have liai sed directly with the district office in Athl one, the di visional of fice Mullingar. There is no documentati on to indi cate that any further enqui ries were conducted into the Li am MKHugh allegation. While Superintendent MEBrien requested D/ Superintendent Mul cahy to look into the matter, this was not done as it did not fall within the 11:06 remit of his investigation and the file was returned to Superintendent McBrien (copy of file attached). From this point it does not appear that any further enqui ries were conducted."

And it says:
"Note to AC Finn."

He confirmed yesterday this was a note to him:
"I would respectfully suggest that Superintendent MEBrien 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 Brien."

Okay? So I asked him was this their document effectively and their draft and he confirmed that it was. Now, I note that you received a response to your queries three days later. This was on the $4 / 2 / 2019$. This is 7369 of the book. So if we could look at that document. It's 7369. Sorry, I just want to find the correct version of that. I'm looking for -- I think you received a reply on the 4th February. If you just bear with me for a moment, commissioner, I will find the 4th February. Okay, sorry, I have given Mr. Kavanagh the wrong number. It's 5637, sorry. I just want to confirm what you actually got, because if you see there at the top, it isn't dated. Do you remember this the one you got? Because if Mr. Kavanagh goes to the next page, keep going, please, it says:
"M chael Fi nn, 4th February 2019. "

Can you just tell the Chairman, did you get the one we looked at previously? Because you do have some notes subsequently on the one dated the 1st February. I just want to clarify with you, did you receive the 1st February 2019 document we opened or is this the response that you received? Do you remember?
A. I presume it's this one, but I don't see any of my notes on the previous one.

85 Q. Well, it's just that there is also in disclosure a copy
of -- 12019, do you see this one?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

86
Q. This is 1st February 2019, this is the one that appears to have your notes on it?
A. Yeah.
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. Can you read that out? It doesn't seem to be dated?
A. Yeah. "Reference to the fact that the matter of the alleged theft of $€ 600$ was not investigated and Superintendent McBrien should be asked to expl ai $n$ but does not denote bullying ei ther indi vi dually or corpor at el y."

So the issue I have is in respect of the actual offence that was -- or the alleged offence that was disclosed in respect of the theft of money, that that matter should be clarified, not the allegation of bullying.
91 Q. Can I ask you, did you make that -- as I say, it doesn't have a date on it and in fairness and you may not remember, did you make it before or after you got the responses in from the Finn investigation?
A. I would -- I can't say precisely. My assessment would be I would have made it before I sent the query to Assistant Commissioner Finn.
92 Q. Okay. Now, one of the things -- if we can go back to that working document that had your initials on it there, the last document just on the screen. I will give Mr. Kavanagh the number of that. I think it's 12019. So you're initialling your responses. At that stage then are you satisfied that all your queries have been answered and are you satisfied that you can proceed then to complete your review? Is that the position?
A. Yes, in respect of the bullying.

93 Q. Okay. Now, this brings us then a couple of days later. And just looking at your statement. You say that -and this is at page 13412, in fairness, if we could just put it maybe up in front of you so you can look at 11:12 it. 13412. If we can go down to two-thirds of the way down, perhaps or even three quarters of the way down. Keep going, please. Stop around there. The 4th February, do you see that?
A. Yes. Commissioner Finn on the 4th February. That sentence:
"I recei ved the responses to my request for additional material and clarification fromAssistant Commissioner Fi nn on 4th February 2019."

But you're saying what you got was that letter, the draft typed 1etter of the --
A. I think there might have been some attachments as well. 11:12 The correspondences references. So it wasn't just the letter, $I$ think, you know, say, for example, the file in respect --
Q. I think you got Superintendent Murray's report of the 11th November, isn't that right?
A. Yes, and I think also the commendation, the correspondence that was sent up through the channels in respect of the commendation, the awards for bravery, where, as I said, Nicholas Glennon, I don't even -- as opposed to Garda Nicholas Keogh. So it wasn't just the 11:13 correspondence, there was other matters attached.
Q. Okay. And the attachments dealt with the individual issues, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

97 Q. You say
"I recei ved this additional material on the 5th February. "
A. The 4th I think.

98
Q. correspondence and affix my initials and the date 5/ 2/ 209 on some of the documents."

And that's what we saw there, wasn't it?
A. That's correct.

99 Q. You say:
"Having revi ewed the i nvesti gation file, incl uding the additional materials supplied, $I$ was satisfied that all 11:13 appropri ate steps had been undertaken by Assi stant Commi ssi oner Finn in his investigation into the al I egati ons of bullying by Garda Ni chol as Keogh. That Assi stant Commissioner Finn had conducted a thorough and impartial investigation and I agreed with Assistant 11:14 Commi ssi oner Finn's concl usi on that there was no evi dence to support the allegations of bullying agai nst any of the Gardaí referred to in Garda Keogh's compl ai nt."

So again just to clarify, whilst you're carrying out a review you're adopting his findings effectively, is that right?
A. Yes. Well, I am either accepting them or rejecting them. That's my role. So in this case I accepted his 11:14 findings.
100 Q. Okay. Now, what we have, you say:
"I communi cated my decision to all parties by official
correspondence dated 7th February 2019."

And you further notified the executive director of HRPD of your decision in correspondence on the same date as the parties were notified.
"This statement has been read over to me and I have made and initial ed one amendment therein."

Can I ask you about this: You wrote a number of letters on the 7th February. For example, you wrote to Chief Superintendent Curran, Superintendent Murray, Chief Superintendent wheatley, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

101 Q. As you say there, you wrote to HRPD and you also to Garda Keogh, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

102 Q. Can we just look at one of those letters, for example, 7374 , so that the Chairman can see the type of decisions that are you issuing. So this is 7374 . And this is the one by way of example to Chief Superintendent Curran. Do you recognise that one?
A. I do.

103 Q. If you look at 7384, it's signed and dated by you 7th February 2019, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. It's signed, yes, 7th February.

104 Q. Could you go back to the summary there, please, Mr. Kavanagh, just the previous page, just scroll up a little bit there, please. Do you see the summary?
A. Yes.
Q. You use the language, you say:
"My findings are that you fulfilled your obligations and conducted your duti es to ensure an account abl e and prof essi onal policing service was being del i vered to the public. Your actions are examples of a proactive management that ensured appropriate governance and supervi si on was mai nt ai ned to achi eve policing objectives and this could not be construed as ei ther bullying or harassment."

It continues in that:
"Furthermore, I found that your interaction with Garda Keogh was found to be both legitimate and proportionate consi dering some of the serious issues that you had rai sed and activel y managed by you."

That would certainly suggest that you, as the reviewer, 11:16 you are the decision-maker, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. You issued, as I say, a series of those letters, I have listed the names, but one of the things that was provided to us in disclosure that I would just like to 11:16 ask you about, is that you also seem to have written a letter on the same day to a Chief Superintendent Duff, do you remember that? If I could look at 13437. 13447. okay. If you scrol1 down through that. So
it's Chief Superintendent Duff, Mullingar.
"Compl aint of bullying and har assment made by Garda Keogh. "

Can we look at the second page first. Is that signed and dated by you, the 7th February?
A. Yes.
Q. okay. letters, isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Can I just ask you about this though? If you go to the previous page again, please, Mr. Kavanagh. So you refer in the second paragraph to the nomination by mr. Mulligan, you refer to 8.9 , which is the review section that we opened earlier?
A. Yeah.
Q. But you continue and say:
"However, there is one investigation whi ch bel i eve requi res further attention. On 9th June 2014 Superintendent MbBrien, Athlone, became aware of an allegation that Li am McHugh had been searched by a number of gardaí (i ncl udi ng Garda Keogh) who sei zed noney were Liam MEHugh and the allegation was that the Gardaí kept and subsequently spent the money."

And you continue. You say:
"This incident came to light as a result of information recei ved by Garda Ai dan Lyons, Athl one Garda Station.

Superintendent MEBrien asked Garda Keogh for a report on the natter. Garda Keogh in his response to Superintendent MEBrien on 27 th July 2014 stated that the only interaction that he had with Liam MEHugh was when he met himon the beat on 19th July 2014. Prior to that he had no contact or dealings with Mr. MEHugh in the previ ous three months.

An i nvestigation was initiated locally and Mr. McHugh was requested by D/ Garda Curley to make a witness statement regarding the alleged di scl osure to Garda Lyons, Li am MEHugh decl i ned to do so.

I amto enqui re what further investigation took place in Athl one regarding the allegations made by Li am MEHugh.

Report in due course, pl ease."

Can you just explain the background? You had already issued your decisions?
A. Yes.

110 Q. You're saying there is one investigation that requires further attention. Can you just tell the Chair why you wrote that letter and why you were raising these queries, notwithstanding the fact that effectively were
you functus officio at this stage, you had issued your decisions and the matter had finished?
A. No, this relates to the actual allegation by Liam white [sic]. So Liam white is after making an allegation.
111 Q. Liam McHugh?
A. Liam McHugh. Liam McHugh is after making an allegation that he was stopped by Gardaí and $€ 400$ was taken off him.

112 Q. CHA RMAN I think it's is € 800 .
A. Sorry.

113 Q. CHA RMAN Not that that's is important.
A. Yes.

114 Q. CHA RMAN It appears to be six in some things. It's not important.
A. Yes.

115 Q. CHAN RMAN But he didn't have 600 or 800 , it's 800. Sorry.
A. So my concern is not in respect of the bullying aspects of it, it is in respect of the fact that a member of the public had made a serious allegation of inappropriate conduct in respect of members of the Garda Síochána. I wasn't satisfied that I had been given all of the information to satisfy me or to satisfy the chief superintendent there that this aspect had actually been investigated, not the bullying.
116 Q. MS. MEGRATH So you still had some discomfort, or did you, in respect of the Liam McHugh investigation?
A. I had discomfort in respect of, yes, whether an investigation had -- a full and thorough investigation
in respect of the missing money. So that's why I wrote to the chief.
117 Q. Okay. And you felt that you could extrapolate this out and separate it forensically from the bullying aspect of it, is that right?
A. I believe it was a separate matter. okay. You didn't wait for the response from Chief Superintendent Duff before issuing your decision letters, why was that?
A. Because it didn't have a bearing, that didn't have a bearing on the bullying. Because the allegation by Garda Keogh was that this was an example of an inappropriate and intrusive enquiry on him and supervision. That was his allegation. I wanted to find out had an investigation taken place in respect of 11:21 the allegation of monies gone missing.
119 Q. Do you not think you could have thrown more light on the issue that would have further informed your report?
A. No.

120 Q. I mean, you clearly raised issues on this but yet you were happy to make your findings before you had answers?
A. No, I would have seen it as separate.

121 Q. okay. Now there's a reply from Chief superintendent Duff on 11897. 11897. It comes in, in fact it's on7y 11:21 a couple of days later, on 11th February 2019.
A. Hm-hmm.

122 Q. So we see there the reference to the alleged facts. And the Chairman has seen all of this before. If we
continue down onto the next page, it's a repetition of Superintendent McBrien's and Detective Sergeant Curley's -- if can you stop please, Mr. Kavanagh, and how their efforts to address it. There's a reference to the fact that allegedly Mr. McHugh declined to make a statement. And it says there:
"Mr. MEHugh has not to date made a statement regarding the comments that he made to Garda Lyons in 2014.

Superintendent McBrien did speak to Garda Keogh about the matter on 23rd July 2014. Garda Keogh stated that he did meet Mr. McHugh while on the beat patrol on 19th July 2014 and they had a general conversation and that prior to that he had not spoken to Mr. MEHugh in three mont hs.

Frommy exam nation of this file, it would appear that no action occurred to facilitate the taking of a statement from Mr. McHugh since the summer of 2014."

Now you outlined the trigger for you writing to him and what it concerned or made you uneasy. would you accept that this response doesn't really answer your concerns?
A. No, I wouldn't. My view is that it's really a matter for the chief superintendent to satisfy himself that the appropriate steps -- because he's responsible, the superintendent is responsible for the investigation of crime in their locality. My issue was to alert him
that this probably hadn't been fully discharged. So if the chief superintendent writes back to me and is satisfied, then I am not responsible for the Eastern Region, that's his responsibility. He is a senior officer, he would be aware of the ramifications of the allegations and he has satisfied himself there in respect of that matter.
We11, you see, one of Garda Keogh's complaints in the bullying and harassment investigation, and this is very much paraphrasing it, but using your phrase, was that this issue was not fully discharged and if it had been fully discharged -- or the fact that it wasn't constituted as bullying and harassment of him and was part and parce1 of it all, that you couldn't really separate this issue out. And that's one of his
allegations and something that we are looking into here in the Tribunal. So, do you accept that this continued to bubble away, it's not fully resolved, but you issued your finding nonetheless?
A. No, I wouldn't accept that.

124 Q. Okay. Now, one of the things -- I am just almost finished, commissioner. One of the complaints that Garda Keogh made when he was giving evidence before Christmas, he said, for example, that he never met you, he never sat down with you. Can you respond to that?
A. That's correct.

125 Q. I take it that when you are carrying out a review, it's a paper review, you don't meet?
A. It's a review of the investigation file, that's
correct.
126 Q. I think you didn't meet anybody who was involved in it.
A. No.

127 Q. Is that right?
A. Yes. accordance with the timelines as set out in the policy and I think an examination the file and the manner in which I dealt with the file would indicate otherwise.
129 Q. Now, he does say at one point on Day 114 that he's not necessarily pointing a finger at you in many ways because he says the Finn investigation was so flawed that anything you could have done could not have salvaged the situation. what do you have to say to that?
A. I don't accept that.
A. I am aware of that, yes.

131 Q. okay. I think we will have other witnesses dealing with the appea1. I think effectively it had left your desk at that stage, is that right?
A. That's correct. I wonder if you could answer any questions.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHAN RMAN Yes, Mr. O'Brien, good morning.

## ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER FI NBARR O BRI EN MAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR O BRI EN, AS FQLONG:

133 Q. MR. O BRIEN Good morning, commissioner. If we could just go back first of all please just to review the Policy again and if we could have page 4205. If you just scroll down to paragraph 8.9, please. Ms. McGrath has taken you through this, assistant commissioner, but 11:27 we can see that, as part of your role under the Policy, you have to satisfy yourself that all appropriate steps have been taken and that a thorough and impartial investigation has been carried out, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

134 Q. So can I ask you, what steps exactly did you take when you received the file in this matter to satisfy yourself that there was an impartial investigation by Assistant Commissioner Finn?
A. We11, first of all, I would have looked at the file, $\quad$ 11:27 the substantive file, I read the file. I would draw on my experience of 38 years service as an investigator and somebody who reads files on a daily basis. And as I said to the -- as I communicated to all the parties,

I would have drawn on the other matters that I alluded to, which was the Garda Síochána Act of 2005, the Garda code of ethics and my own personal values. That's what I would have drawn on, and my expertise.
135 Q. Did you ever question Assistant Commissioner Finn, for example, as to whether he knew any of the parties involved in the complaint prior to taking up his investigation?
A. No.

Can I ask you, in terms of the persons involved in the investigation, so Garda Keogh, Chief Superintendent wheatley, Chief Superintendent Curran and Superintendent Murray, did you know any of those individuals prior to your involvement in the investigation?
A. I didn't know Garda Keogh, and to my knowledge I never encountered or worked with Garda Keogh. I was a superintendent in Longford for a short period of time. Chief Superintendent wheatley, I would know Chief Superintendent wheatley as I would know all other chief 11:28 superintendents within the organisation. I never worked with Chief Superintendent wheatley. She did actually succeed me as the district officer in Donnybrook, when I was promoted. Also, I would work with her on a project currently, which is the uniform project, of which she is the project manager and I am the project sponsor.
137 Q. Just in relation to that, when did that commence, if you can tell us please? Sorry, was that in train at
the time of the investigation or is that recent?
A. That's recent, it's part of the Commission on the future of policing. It's one of the recommendations in the Commission of future policing. So I was assigned that. So my belief is that it was subsequent to this.
Q. Would you have a rough date when it commenced?
A. I can't give you that. I mean, I can certainly enquire and get back to you, but I don't believe -- I don't believe it's prior to that.
In relation to Chief Superintendent Curran, would you know him?
A. Again, Chief Superintendent Curran, similar to Chief Superintendent wheatley, I would know. But the difference with Chief Superintendent Curran is that both of us are from the same part of the city and both of us attended the same school.

140 Q. I see. Do you know him outside of work? Do you socialise together?
A. No, we don't socialise together. That doesn't mean that I haven't on occasions been in his company at social events, but they are collective social events, they're not...
I see. In terms of Superintendent Murray?
A. Yes, Chief Superintendent Murray, again, I would know him, as I said, the same as I would know all officers of the rank. I never worked with Superintendent Murray directly but he was the regional traffic superintendent for the Western Region, for the former Western Region when I was the chief superintendent in Castlebar.
Q. I see. In that respect, did he have any reporting duties to you as a senior officer?
A. No. He would report to the assistant commissioner but not to me directly. But I would be at the regional meetings with the other chief superintendents and because he had regional responsibility, he would be at those meetings.
Q. I see. So I take it then as of January 2019, when you're appointed by Mr. Mulligan to carry out your function, you were satisfied that you had no conflict of interest with regard to the investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. In terms of your own experience in carrying out investigations of this sort, had you ever carried out, first of all, an investigation as the investigator under the bullying and harassment policy?
A. Yes. I reckon I probably carried out a dozen investigations, wel1 probably a dozen incidents in respect of which I am the investigator or cases where it has come to me for determination. So, yes.
Q. That is under the policy that we are currently looking at, that's under that?
A. Yes. The Policy. But I would also include the grievance procedure.
Q. If we could stick perhaps with the Policy that we're concerned with here. You carried out a dozen investigations or so?
A. As investigator. About eight I'd say.
Q. And the same, you're in the role of deciding officer?
A. Yeah, I'd say about four.

148 Q. I see. When you received the file, did it surprise you that there were no notes or minutes of interview contained in the papers of interviews, let's say, that Assistant Commissioner Finn had with the persons complained of? Because we know he met Chief Superintendent Curran, wheatley and Superintendent Murray? Did it surprise you at all that there were no contemporaneous notes of any of those meetings?
A. No.

149 Q. In the investigations that you had carried out, did you interview people?
A. No.

150 Q. I see. I think you write on the 4th February, if we could just have this letter, the content of it, sorry, 11:32 is at 7364. You raise four queries for the attention of Assistant Commissioner Finn. Ms. McGrath discussed the Liam McHugh issue with you a moment ago. If I could ask you to look at issue number 12 , which is the critique of the investigation from the robbery of the person. If you turn over the page, at the top there you say:
"Could it be clarified if it was the Pul se narrative inci dent report in whi ch Superintendent Murray referred 11:33 to in his correspondence of 13th October 2015 and if so, I would appreci ate a copy."

Did you receive a copy of that report from Assistant

Commissioner Finn or his team?
A. I believe so. I believe I did.
Q. If we just move forward to page 7369. I think you told us a few moments ago, this was the document that you were working from. It's the Finn document, it's dated the 1st February. If you look, sorry, at page 7370. The explanation given is:
"From examining the reports in this particular i nci dent, it appears that Superintendent Murray had cogni sance of the reports dated 13th September and 2nd October written by Garda Keogh and that they were available to himwen he wrote his report on 13 th Oct ober 2015."

I mean, that being the response, were you satisfied, the use of the word "appears"?
A. Well, I think if you continue on it says:
"These reports are within the original appended items. However, I have attached an indi vi dual copy of the compl eted i nvestigation file retai ned at Athl one for ease of reference. The original Pulse..."

So I would say the latter bit...that he it, isn't that correct?
A. Sorry, from examining the reports --

153 Q. The use of the word "appears", for example, it could
have said Superintendent Murray had the report. It doesn't say that. It says it appears. How are you satisfied that he had?
A. Well, I satisfied myself on the basis of the documents that they submitted to me, because my concern was what the actual Pulse narrative said and what the investigation file -- so was it reasonable for the superintendents to have concerns in respect of the conduct of the investigation at that stage.
I see. I think you wrote to each of the persons involved on 7th February 2019. If we could just look to your letter, please, to Garda Keogh, for example, and that's at page 7416. As you probably are aware, Garda Keogh is critical of the delay, in the time it took to investigate his complaint of bullying and harassment, are you aware of that?
A. I wasn't, but I have become aware in respect of -presently, yes, in respect of the examination.
155 Q. You were.
A. I became aware. But on the file, I don't have the recollection that anything, you know, that he referenced that specific issue in respect of the delay.
156 Q. When you received the file, as we know, in January 2019, was the initial delay between the month of march 2017 and November 2017 something that caught your attention?
A. Not particularly.

157 Q. I see.
A. I know it's outside the timeframe for the policy, but
my experience as an investigator is that it's is almost impossible to adhere to the timelines of the Policy.

158 Q. Not even that, we know Assistant Commissioner Finn was appointed on 15th November 2017, but the period that I am talking about is the time between which Garda Keogh makes his statement to Chief Superintendent Scanlan in March --
A. Yeah.

159 Q. -- and the appointment of Assistant Commissioner Finn in November. Did you consider that period of delay at al1 or did you require any explanation from anybody involved in the investigation as to how that occurred?
A. No, I didn't seek an explanation as to the delay. My opinion is that the delay is certainly unhelpful and probably was unfair to Garda Keogh, but also at the same time was equally unfair to Chief Superintendent Murray, Chief Superintendent wheatley and Chief Superintendent Curran. A11 parties which would have had a reasonable entitlement or a reasonable expectation that this matter would be expedited. But in answer, yes, but I didn't feel it actually disadvantaged any of the parties in terms of what the allegations were or what the evidence was adduced.
160 Q. We see that in his report, Assistant Commissioner Finn -- I will just get the page for you, it's at page -apologies Chairman. 555 -- just at the start of his report, he deals with the delay between the making of the complaint to Chief Superintendent Scanlan and his appointment. Sorry, Chairman.

CHA RMAN It's all right. This is the report. The Finn report, Mr. O'Brien?

MR. O BRI EN I apologise.
CHAI RMAN No, no, we will find it.
MR. O BRI EN It's 5523. You will see at the second paragraph there.

CHA RMAN Yes.
161 Q. MR. O BRIEN It says:
"While all the parties agreed to cooperate with the
i nvesti gation, they were di ssatisfied that the
investigation had taken such a long period of time to formally commence. "

Then it goes on to say did about
"... bet ween the date that Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an was tasked to take Garda Keogh's statement in March 2017 and 15th Novenber ' 17."

I think in your working papers this was something that you underlined?
A. Yeah, it was one of a number of things I would have underlined, yeah.
162 Q. You said to the Chairman earlier on in your evidence that you underline and you outline parts in pen where you consider them to be significant?
A. $\mathrm{Hm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

163 Q. So you obviously did consider the delay to be
significant if it's underlined, is that right?
A. Well, what I would have seen that, is that that was the explanation that was provided by Assistant Commissioner Finn in respect of the time it took to bring this -- to conclude this matter. So, you know, if you look at my report, $I$ would have underlined quite a number of things. So it's not just -- I haven't just high1ighted that. But, as I said, that's my explanation. Can I ask you, just in relation to the reports, sorry, and the paper file that you had, was it open to you, in 11:40 your view, from your experience and from your understanding of the Policy, for you to meet with Garda Keogh?
A. No, I don't believe so.

165 Q. I see. Did you fully understand and appreciate when you undertook the review the precise complaint that he was making against each of the officers, the senior officers?
A. Yes.

166 Q. In your own report, I noticed that you refer to
"corporate bullying". Can I just ask, the Policy itself doesn't give a definition of corporate bullying, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

167 Q. Can I ask you, why did then you, I suppose, move outside of the parameters of the Policy and use this definition of corporate bullying?
A. Because the investigators, Commissioner Finn had included it in his report. If we could move forward then, we know that your report 11:41 doesn't uphold any of the complaints of Garda Keogh, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

171 Q. Just to deal with Mr. Cullen, Garda Keogh's solicitor, appealed the findings of your report and I just want to 11:42 ask you a couple of questions just in relation to that. His letter is addressed to the executive director, it's at page 7446. It's dated 19th March 2019. It's a very detailed letter. It's 16 pages long. So I don't propose to open it in its entirety. But one of the
central grounds of appeal is that there was a delay in dealing with Garda Keogh's complaint of bullying and harassment and that your report fails to deal with that delay. Do you accept that?
A. No, I don't.

172 Q. He says also that your report is irrational. Would you accept that your report is irrational, that the conclusions that you came to were irrational?
A. No, I don't accept that.

173 Q. He also questions the use of what he says are, in his words are, stock phrases, that there was no evidence. So what he suggested to you is that you didn't properly interrogate the evidence before reaching your findings, do you accept that?
A. I don't accept that.
Q. So your conclusions essentially are based on Assistant Commissioner Finn's report?
A. His investigation file.

175 Q. Sorry, his investigation. I suppose if any of these 11:43 findings were found to be incorrect or flawed, then your report would also be the same?
A. No, I wouldn't accept that.

176 Q. Can we ask you then just to go back to the code. If we can turn to paragraph 8.11. Sorry, it's at page 4206. This relates to actions where a complaint is not upheld. So that is the situation that you're dealing with, you found that you have not upheld Garda Keogh's complaint. This puts a number of, I suppose, obligations on you as the deciding officer to take certain steps, doesn't it? For example, if you look at the third -- sorry, at the second paragraph, it says:
"The di visional officer/chi ef superintendent."

Or you in these circumstances.
"WII ensure that the compl ai nant is made aware that the bona fide compl aints, even if they are not uphel d,


will not be vi ewed as malicious."

177 Q. But the Policy, I suppose, puts an obligation on you to go one step further and I suggest to you that you failed to take that step informing Garda Keogh?
A. That's what the Policy says, no I didn't, I didn't discharge that aspect of the Policy. But I would point out in mitigation the fact that it was something that was assigned to me in the absence of the then assistant commissioner.

178 Q. I have no further questions, Chairman.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

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

MR. DI GNM Thank you, Chairman.

ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER FI NBARR 0 BRI EN WAS EXAM NED BY

## MR. DI GNAM AS FQLLOME:

179 Q. MR. DI GNMM Assistant commissioner, I just want to cover a few areas with you in general terms rather than getting into the details that have been covered by Ms. McGrath and Mr. O'Brien. If I could just -firstly, I think you were appointed in January 2019, is that right, by Mr. Mulligan, who was the acting head of Human Resources, Executive Director of Human Resources at that time?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

180 Q. You received papers on 18th January 2019 and you covered the steps, the detailed steps that you took. Can the Chair take it that you carefully considered the papers when you received them?
A. Yes, Chair, I did.

181 Q. On foot of that consideration, you send out the queries to Assistant Commissioner Finn?
A. That's correct.

182 Q. And received the replies to those. Now, during that process, at any stage during your process did anybody try to influence you on how you should determine the issue or try to intervene or interfere with your process?
A. No, Chairman.

183 Q. Now, you're aware that the matter, that your process subsequent to that, the Finn investigation was sent to an independent person who was required by his professional code to act independently and objectively,
you're aware of that?
A. I'm aware of that.

184 Q. But had you no role or involvement?
A. No.

185 Q. In that procedure or in that review?
A. No, Chair.

186 Q. Now, we know that was on foot of the Notice of Appeal, which Mr. O'brien has just mentioned, which was submitted by Mr. Cullen on behalf of Garda Keogh. Did you see that at the time or have you seen it subsequently in preparation for this Tribunal?
A. No, I haven't seen it.

187 Q. You haven't seen it at all?
A. No.

188 Q. One of the points, Mr. O'Brien has covered this with you, but one of the points that was raised in that Notice of Appeal was the question of time. Now, it was put to you by Mr. O'Brien that delay was raised, I am recasting it slightly, the point that was raised was in relation to the question of time, okay, and two points were raised in relation to time. The first is that there was --
A. Sorry.

189 Q. The first was that there was a delay in the earlier stages before you became involved?

CHA RMAN March to November.
190 Q. MR. DI GNMM Well, two periods. The March to November and I'11 come back to that. And then the actual time it took for the investigation to be conducted by

Assistant Commissioner Finn. And Garda Keogh has complained about those two periods of delay. Now, when the Notice of Appeal was submitted, he made a complaint about you acting too quickly. Now, can we take it from your earlier answers to both Ms. McGrath and Mr. O'Brien and, indeed, to myself, that while you acted quickly, you gave this matter careful consideration.
A. Oh yes. I acted within the timelines provided under the Policy, but I certainly gave it very detailed consideration.

191 Q. Now, Garda Keogh, through Mr. Cullen --
CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Dignam.
MR DIGNM Not at all.
192 Q. CHA RMAN Can I just clarify, when did you submit your $11: 49$ report? I am sure I have it, but can you just give me the date.
A. It would have been the 7th February when I communicated to all of the parties.
193 Q. CHAI RMAN The 7th February. So the end of the process 11:49 was the 7th February. I just don't have it in my chronology?
A. Yes.

194 Q. CHA RMAN And I will put it in, the 7th February. Thank you very much. Sorry, Mr. Dignam.
MR. DI GNMM Not at all.
CHAI RMAK I see the point now.
195 Q.
MR. DI GNAM Just to take up on the Chairman's point, the bullying and harassment policy itself provided for
a 28 day period, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

196 Q. For the completion of your stage of the work?
A. Yes.

197 Q. And you received the papers on the 18th January?
A. Yes.

198 Q. And can we take it that you were working to that deadline, the 28 day deadline?
A. I was. But I was conscious that I was appointed I think on the 7th January, so it's kind of -- that's the 11:50 deadline.

199 Q. You were on the edge of the timeline as it was?
A. Yeah, give or take a day or so.

200 Q. Can I put to you, because it was a very clear statement, an allegation against you in the appeal 11:50 which was submitted on behalf of Garda Keogh by Mr. Cullen, at page 7447. The Notice of Appea1. I suppose just by way of introduction, you ended up having to deal with this because Assistant Commissioner Fanning wasn't in work, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, he was absent from work. Indisposed.

201 Q. This landed on your desk because you had to fill in essentially for Assistant Commissioner Fanning?
A. Correct, in this particular matter.

202 Q. Now, the allegation is made against you, and I think it 11:51 should be put clearly to you, assistant commissioner, is that:
"Assi stant Commissioner O Brien produced this inchoate
deci si on in accel er ated and record time compared to slow process up to that point before AC Fanni ng was rei nstated or coul d come back."

I read that, and perhaps Mr. O'Brien will correct me if I am wrong, but I read that as an allegation that you deliberately fast tracked your process so that it would reach conclusion before Assistant Commissioner Fanning would come back?
A. I totally reject that.

203 Q. Now, you were asked about the period of delay from March 2017 to November 2017, this was long before you became involved. You had no involvement in the process at that stage. I am not sure how much you can say about that period of delay, but you have expressed the view that it was unhelpful and probably unfair to Garda Keogh, Chief Superintendent wheatley, Chief Superintendent Curran and Superintendent Murray. I am not sure whether you have been following the Tribunal proceedings in any great detail, assistant commissioner, but you may or may not be aware that on Day 109, on page 106 of the transcript, Garda Keogh, who Mr. O'Brien is asking questions on behalf, in relation to that period of delay, said that he can understand about the delay between March 2017 and November 2017, but at the time he didn't know why there was that delay. Were you aware of that?
A. No, I wasn't actually, no.

204 Q. So that is Day 109, page 106, 1ine 23. The passage
commences on line 3.
CHA RMAN 109, page what, Mr. Dignam?
MR. DI GNAM 109, page 106, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Thank you. And line?
MR. DI GNAM It begins line 3.
CHAN RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. DI GNAM The answer given by Garda Keogh, which I just read out is line 27.
CHAN RMAN We have gone away.
MR. DI GNAM Sorry, I am over complicating this,
Chairman.
CHA RMAN No, hold on a second, let's just get the reference first of al1. Day 106.
MR. DI GNAM Day 109, page 106.
CHA RMAN I'm sorry. Day 109, page 106. Day $109 . \quad 11: 54$ Can we have Day 109 and page 106. I'm so sorry. It's straight in front of me. Sorry. Now, Mr. Dignam. Sorry, your question is?
205 Q. MR. DI GNMM Assistant commissioner, there is a question asked by Mr. Murphy of Garda Keogh and that 11:54 leads to Mr. Murphy saying:
"So ultimatel y this is an expl anation that was gi ven and read in conj unction with the last document we saw, that's to say Inspector McCarthy's chronol ogy, I have to suggest to you that what that shows, that's the chronol ogy at page 14078 onwards, what that shows is that a lot of detailed consi deration was taking place and there were complicated matters that requi red to be
attended to, but during that period of time you're not accusing Assi stant Commi ssi oner Fanni ng of targeting you in any way?
A. No.
Q. I have to suggest to you that that del ay, such as it was, is not something that could be regarded as targeting you in any way?
A. Judge, just to clarify, again it's similar only on the opposite si de of things to what -- I only, again from reading the vol umes, can understand about the del ay. At the timel di dn't know."

And then over the page:
"Q. Sure. Is it fair to say, Garda Keogh, that this ${ }^{11: 55}$ is one example that with the benefit of hindsight you can see that there was good reason thi ngs took time? A. Yes. The same as with the break, it was on the ot her si de of the coi $n$, but, yeah. "

Now, they're not matters that you were familiar with at the time. You didn't even know, and still don't know, because I didn't read out the details, as to what's going on between March and November 2017, but the question was put to you on the basis that Garda Keogh 11:55 appears to still be complaining about that.
CHA RMAN Mr. Dignam, may I politely ask, if he knows nothing about it, what, with all respect to the assistant commissioner, what is the value of any answer
he gives? If he said, I think it's insane, I think it's right. He knows nothing about it.

MR. DI GNAM I take --
CHA RMAN what is the principle of witnesses? we call witnesses to testify as to facts. If they are experts they give their opinion on established facts. This is a witness to fact. He's no the giving an expert opinion and he knows nothing about this. As if I didn't know that 14078 gives a chronology by Inspector McCarthy and that Garda Keogh was asked about it and that he has exonerated Assistant Commissioner Fanning on more than one occasion. And what's more, a lot of other witnesses have had their attention drawn to this. I have it, Mr. Dignam, I can assure you. I'm sorry. MR. DI GNMM No, no, I take that point, Chairman. CHA RMAN Forgive, Mr. Dignam. I get impatient, I'm sorry.

MR. DI GNAM Not at a11. I take that point. And I know the Chair has it but I just wanted to correct the position, because the question was put --
CHA RMAN I know, this witness, I was going to say this unfortunate witness, if he doesn't mind me saying it, this unfortunate witness has nothing to say about it. He said, I did this, maybe I was right, maybe I was wrong, maybe the criticisms levelled are correct or not. That is one of the things we're here to find out. MR. DI GNAM Yes.

CHA RMAK Did he disparage Garda Keogh by the way he did his work. We know where we are going on that one.

But he doesn't know anything about these other matters. MR. DI GNAM May it please you, Chairman. CHA RMAN A11 that takes longer, Mr. Dignam, than letting you proceed and ignoring it. Forgive me.
MR. DI GNAM Not at a11, Chair.
Turning then, assistant commissioner, you were asked about your notes and your Post-Its on the document that had been sent to you by Mr. McCarthy. You have given an answer to it, but can the Chair take it, that they are essentially your thoughts as you're working your way through your reading of the investigation file and of the correspondence?
A. That's correct, Chair.

207 Q. Can I take it that you make a note to yourself and that on occasion you revisit it and you say we11, actually, I now understand what that's about?
A. Yeah.

208 Q. And then the question marks rather than the Post-Its, they're in the same species; they're your working notes or you're working your way through the file?
A. Yes, I reflect and revisit.
Q. To turn then to page 5969 , this is a supplemental statement or a statement of Garda Keogh of 23rd April 2019. You'11 see, assistant commissioner, that this is a very clear statement that is prepared for this Tribunal as to Garda Keogh's case against you and Assistant Commissioner Finn. I am going to deal with the case against you. What he says in relation to you is that he believes the outcome of this investigation
as comprised by Assistant Commissioner Finbarr O'Brien -- sorry, I better start at the beginning:
"I hereby decl are the statement is true to the best of my know edge and bel ief. With reference to item number

18 on the list of items for consi deration by the Tri bunal, entitled compl ai nts by Garda Keogh in rel ation to the bullying and har assment investigation carried out by Assi stant Commissioner Finn. I believe the outcome of this investigation as comprised by
Assi stant Commissioner Fi nbarr O Brien constitutes a failure to uphol d my rights and entitlements as a Garda of ficer in that, there is no acknow edgment whatsoever of the correctness of my compl ai nts and having been I ongl y har assed by Garda officers, whi ch has arisen si nce I made may protected disclosures in May/J une 2014. "

Now, do you accept that your review constituted a failure to uphold Garda Keogh's rights and entitlements on the grounds that he set out there?
A. No, I wouldn't accept that, Chair.

210 Q. He goes on then and makes the case that it has been confirmed in his opinion:
"...that the O Brien report and the investigation conducted by Assistant Commi ssi oner Finn amounted to a conscious and del i berate failure to protect re from harassment and bullying within the force by reason of
the concl usi ons recei ved by Assistant Commissioner Fi nn as furni shed to me and set out at item number 5 of the letter dated 10th Novenber 2018."

Now insofar as Garda Keogh says that you consciously and deliberately failed to protect him from harassment and bullying, what do you say about that?
A. I don't accept that, Chair.

If we can then just finally --
CHA RMAN Mr. Dignam, sorry, before you leave that, would you mind just reminding us of item 5 of the 10th November 2018? So the assistant commissioner can actually address the specific point.
MR. DI GNAM Certainly.
CHA RMAN You may want to go on to something else and come back to that.
MR DIGNM I might do that.
CHA RMAN It's hanging in the air as far as I'm concerned. I probably know it, I've probably seen it, but at this moment it's not in my head.
MR. DI GNMM I will do that, Chairman. You might give me one moment and I will come back to it.
CHAL RMAN Thanks very much.
212 Q. MR. DI GNMM If I can then just ask you to go back to the Notice of Appeal, assistant commissioner, which is at page 5969 .
CHAI RMAN Yes. Sorry, 5969 was Garda Keogh's --
MR. DI GNMM -- appeal, which led to the peer review.
CHA RMAN I thought that was the statement we have
just been looking at of the 23rd April.
MR. DI GNAM I'm sorry.
CHAN RMAN You're now going --
MR. DI GNAM I gave the wrong --
CHAN RMAN It's all right. Maybe I confused you.
12:02
You're now going to the appeal put in by Mr. Cullen, which is a lengthy document, on Garda Keogh's behalf.
MR DIGNM Yes.
MR. OBRIEN 7447, Chairman.
CHAI RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. DI GNM The appeal is 7447 and the statement is 5969.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. 7447. Now, you want to refer to that.

213 Q.
MR. DI GNMM Yes. Now, I am not going to take you
through the detail of that, assistant commissioner. But I want to put to you the general complaint that's made by Garda Keogh through Mr. Cullen in relation to your report and your review. You've already dealt with the question of you having fast tracked it in order to get it done before Assistant Commissioner Fanning came back, but the general complaint that is made in relation to your work, and this is the fourth paragraph in the Notice of Appeal, is that:
"It is an irrational, opaque report, wanting in neutrality, that disgui ses the el ephant-in-the-room i nadequacy into the (still unconcl uded) investigation into police drug pedalling in Athlone. It is
i mpossible to di stingui sh in such report facts from matters that are reported as facts. It is further i mpossible - in such report - to di stingui sh AC Finn findings fromAC O Brien's determinations or to know whet her the representations contai ned in the report are 12:03 bei ng attributed to any particular witness and/ or are factual findings and/ or determinations. It proceeds by a partial suppression of the totality of the specific factual matrices in the complaint, by elision. It i gnores and/ or avoi ds specificity of the complaints, where they do no advance any def ence for the superintendent or where they appear to invol ve the investigation into police/pedalling. The report is full of logical fallacies, platitudi nous, evasive and partial. It is marked by a reliance on anecdotal evi dence. It evi nces a want of any forensic empirical investigation. Its propositions appear to be compounds of indi scriminate medl eys of unattributed witness testimony, mission statements, remarks from Superintendent Murray where the strains of AC Finn and AC O Brien, al so lurk indi scriminately, sometimes lyrically, beneath its di ssonant di scursive surfaces"

CHA RMAN Apart from that, he thinks it's great!
214 Q. MR. DIGMM Assistant commissioner, that is the general complaint made and obviously further detail is given. Your report was reviewed by Mr. de Bruir -CHA RMAN Can I just stop you for one moment? MR. DI GNM of course.

CHA RMAN Do you follow what I am trying to get at?
A. Yes.

218 Q. CHA RMAN I'm not sure I am very clear about the -- I know if the High Court makes this finding and it comes to us in the Court of Appeal or it used to come, now we know findings of fact are for the judge, was there evidence, was there a basis for it and so on?
A. Yes.

219 Q. CHA RMAN But I am not entirely clear on the review that you are doing. Do you understand what I am puzzled about?
A. Yeah.

220 Q. CHAN RMAN It seems to me that Mr. Cullen is drawing attention to that here?
A. Yeah. My belief is that $I$ am free to come to a
conclusion in respect of any or all of the conclusions by the investigating officer and agree or disagree. So I can, if I do disagree, as I say, seek clarification, get clarification and say, and that clarifies the matter for me. But I can also determine that notwithstanding what you say, I believe that bullying took place in this matter or that. So I am free, my belief is I am free to make that independent decision. CHA RMAN okay. And the way you would do that, if I am understanding, please confirm or disagree with this, 12:06 you would look at the paragraphs or section of the report, would you look at the statements that you had? Because this is a paper process.
A. Yes.

222 Q. CHA RMAN This is a paper process.
A. Yes.

223 Q. CHA RMAN what does Garda Keogh say? what does Superintendent Murray say? Whoever does whoever it is, say. So have you a number of documents?
A. Yes.

224 Q. CHA RMAN Maybe a number of other ones as we11 from witnesses?
A. Yes.
Q. CHAL RMAN You put them together and you're free to say, no, I don't think that follows?
A. Yes. Yes. And I would review the accompanying appendices and documents that accompany the investigation.

226 Q
Q. CHA RMAN So if there is a Pulse report or some other
kind of report, or whatever it was, you're free to read it?
A. Yes.

CHAN RMAN Okay, thank you very much. Now, sorry, Mr. Dignam. I think that is actually raised, it's a point raised by Mr. Cullen.

MR. DI GNAM Yes.
CHAN RMAN It is middle of that paragraph.
MR. DI GNAM Rather than ask you to comment on the totality of that paragraph, because there is obviously a lot in it, there are a number of, if I might put it, positive allegations made against you in that paragraph. The first is that your report is irrational, do you accept that?
A. I wouldn't accept that.

228 Q. The next is that it is wanting in neutrality?
A. I wouldn't accept that.

229 Q. The third is that it disguises what he describes as inadequacy in the investigation into police pedalling in Athlone. Were you involved in disguising anything?
A. No.
Q. The next is halfway down the paragraph, where it's alleged that it proceeds by a partial suppression of the totality of specific factual matrices, were you involved in suppressing --
CHA RMAN If you understand what that means, you might be able to agree or disagree with it.

231 Q. MR. DI GNMM If I put it in general terms, did you approach this with a view or with an intent or an
objective of suppressing anyone?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. It goes on to say that it is full of logical fallacies and platitudinous, they are complaints about the outcome, but it says it is evasive and partial, which comes back to wanting in neutrality point. Do you accept that it was wanting in neutrality or that you approached this in a partial manner?
A. No, I don't accept either of those positions, no, I don't accept that.

CHA RMAN Mr. Cullen waxes a bit lyrical himself here at times in this paragraph.
MR. DI GNMM The 1etter of the 10th November --
CHA RMAN If you don't want to, I am sure you can leave it to Ms. McGrath, if she wants to.
MR. DI GNAM No, I think we have found it.
CHA RMAN And are you happy to refer to that? You don't have to if you don't want to, it's a matter for you entirely.
MR. DI GNMM There is a letter of the 10th November --
CHA RMAK It's just that Garda Keogh said, I protest about this report and here is a specific example.

MR. DI GNAM Yes.
CHA RMAN I don't have it in mind as to what the specific example is.
MR. DI GNAM Yes. There is a letter of the 10th November from Mr. Cullen, on page 360.

CHA RMAN Thank you. 360. Is there an item 5 in it. MR. DI GNAM There is.

CHA RMAN Very good. We11, let's go to 360 and see what item 5 is.

MR. DI GNAM Item 5 is on page 362. Sorry, it's to Mr. Cullen. Sorry, I said it's from Mr. Cullen. It is a letter from Assistant Commissioner Finn to

Mr. Cullen. Well, we have the date.
MR. DI GNAM It's on page 362.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
MR. DI GNAM Or 360 it begins and goes over onto
page --
CHA RMAN Yes this is 10th November.
MR. DI GNAM Sorry for the confusion, Chairman. The actual page in the booklet is 13817.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. DI GNMM That I am referring to.
CHA RMAN 13817. Thank you very much. We will get that up.
MR. DI GNAM The relevant reference to item 5 is on page 13819. It's probably more a matter for Mr. O'Brien to confirm that this is what is being referred to by Garda Keogh in his statement. CHA RMAK I understand.

MR. DI GNMM But that seems to be the document. CHA RMAN But for the moment we will work on the assumption that the reference made by Garda Keogh -- I mean, it's a matter of simply telling me in due course, we don't have to clarify it this second, but that's item 5. Okay, thank you very much. That's the matter that is cited by Garda Keogh as being an instance of
the unsatisfactoriness, unfairness, whatever, disrespect of rights that he cites in his document. MR. DI GNMM Yes. And in fact it's in the second part of the statement:
"It is linked to the conscious and deliberate failure to mitigate rights."

Rather than the earlier complaint, which is...
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
$12: 12$

CHA RMAN Very good. Now anybody else want to ask questions?

MR. FERRY: Yes, Chairman, I have a couple of short questions in relation to the representation of
superintendent Noreen McBrien
CHA RMAN Certain7y.

ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER FI NBARR O BRI EN WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. FERRY, AS FOLLOVG:

MR. FERRY: Assistant commissioner, just in relation to your evidence to the Tribunal, you were appointed under the Policy that dealt with the investigation of the complaint made by Garda Keogh and you noted this morning that under that you were to investigate and communicate with the parties. I think the policy at 8.9 was referred to, to deal with the conclusion of the investigation. And just, in relation to Superintendent McBrien, an issue arose yesterday afternoon, you may recall a question my colleague, Mr. Carroll, there was just a concern that Superintendent McBrien has had since, and I think it originates from the time of your involvement in the case, that in circumstances where Garda Keogh had informed Assistant Commissioner Finn that his complaint of bullying and harassment was only in relation to three identified members, who are all now chief superintendents. However, in relation to your involvement, Superintendent McBrien appeared to be brought back into the equation. In the papers before the Tribunal, on 7th February 2019, you wrote to a number of people, indicating the outcome of your part of the matter?
A. Yes.
Q. The papers don't seem to be before the Tribunal, but my client also received a letter or a report from you dated 7th February 2019. I think a 13-page document.
A. $\mathrm{Hm}-\mathrm{hmm}$. From that point on it appears that she was also being communicated to in relation to the outcome of the investigation and that would seem to be under part 8.9 of the Policy, it says that, you know, that both parties should be advised in writing of the outcome and further action. So she has a concern that from that point on it did progress into a review and appeal process and reviewed by a barrister and then Deputy Commissioner John Twomey communicated with the parties. If I can just, in relation to the documents before the Tribunal at, $I$ think it's at volume -- just for ease of 12:16 yourself, assistant commissioner, at volume 46, page 13125, is a report that is sent out by Deputy Commissioner John Twomey. This report is basically informing parties that the complaint of unacceptable behaviour is now being moved on to an appeal stage and that he is appointing a member of the Bar to conduct an audit. You will see, and I appreciate this isn't your document, but all of a sudden there's five, $I$ think there's five named individuals and they include Superintendent McBrien.

So, it's a long winded way of getting to a question, but how did Superintendent McBrien come back into the equation at the review and appeal stages in
circumstances where Garda keogh from the outset had informed Assistant Commissioner Finn that he had no issue at all with Superintendent McBrien?
A. Yes, it's a good point. My own view is that for completeness, all of the parties, and whilst there was no allegations against Superintendent McBrien, she was included in a number of the matters that were under investigation. So for completeness, I felt that it would be appropriate that she be notified. There certainly wasn't any intention to bring her into a complaint again. But I think the same thing with Inspector Farrell as we11, I wrote to Inspector Farre11 as well. So that was the purpose.
237 Q. I suppose in reply to that, there were I think maybe up 25 officers that had been sort of identified either directly or indirectly by Garda Keogh, but here expressly narrowed it down to only three. So while I appreciate what you are saying, apart from what you've said, if you didn't write the same letter to 25 , why would Superintendent McBrien be included?
A. No, Superintendent MCBrien is slightly different in the sense that the first two allegations, she, as the superintendent, had a direct involvement in the sense of communicating, I think one was to do with the CHIS policy and the other one was to do with a Pulse entry.
A. Possibly is, but I just recall --

239 Q. CHA RMAN I think it's olivia o'Neill and Liam McHugh, she was also the superintendent for those. There's no
allegation. Mr. Ferry, you can be reassured. I mean it may be that, what would we say, ex-abundanti cautela they sent off to everyone in sight, or everyone who might have had any involvement. But I don't think anybody in this room thinks there is any allegation against Superintendent McBrien. I think everybody, from Garda Keogh, over on one side, everybody on that side, and if I were to produce a report that said Superintendent McBrien was be responsible for this, that or the other, it would be instantly condemned by the High Court, and rightly condemned.

MR. FERRY: It's on7y in the context, Chairman -CHA RMAN She may be entitled to feel a bit aggrieved that she got this letters, but that's not this witness's --

MR. FERRY: Yes, but it's only in this context that -and they witnesses that will follow this morning, including Deputy Commissioner John Twomey. It appears that the independent reviewer, the barrister, and it may also appear that Deputy Commissioner Twomey were of the view, and I would say an incorrect view, that Superintendent McBrien was the subject of --
CHA RMAR Deputy Commissioner Twomey will be here within minutes, am I right? He is the next. So, Mr. Ferry, do not fear, you will have sample opportunity.

MR. FERRY: But I think this witness has clarified. CHA RMAN As far as he is concerned. Thank you very
much.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

ME. GLEESON Chairman.
CHAL RMAN Yes, Ms. Gleeson.
MS. GLEESON I had some similar questions on behalf of Inspector Farrel1 but I think it has all been covered in that regard.

CHA RMAN I think so. And maybe you would equally
like to ask Deputy Commissioner Twomey a question, as to how did your client get into the picture at all. ME. GLEESON Yes, Chair, but just very briefly in relation to this particular witness.
CHA RMAN Speak a bit closer to the microphone Ms. G1eeson, so that we can all hear you.

## ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER FI NBARR O BRI EN WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MS. GLEESON, AS FOLLOVS:

240 Q. MS. GEESON In relation to yourself, commissioner, you wrote to Inspector Farrell together with the other parties, the three named parties, the subject-matter of the investigation, and also Superintendent McBrien. I think that's at page 3443. And I think, I suppose you wrote to them as a matter of course, is that right?
A. Yes. It was just, as I said, they were -- they had been referenced in it for a significant feature, so I felt it important to write to them and communicate and
clarify.
CHA RMAN Inspector Farrell did feature.
A. Yes.

242 Q. CHA RMAN In dispatches, so to speak.
A. Yes.

243 Q. CHAN RMAN He had some role. His statement was considered.
A. Yes.

MS. GLEESON And I suppose just in relation to your colleague, Assistant Commissioner Finn, who obviously conducted the investigation, a similar question was put to him yesterday evening and he said the only reasons they were written to, Superintendent McBrien and Inspector Farrell, at the conclusion of the investigation was because they were included in the original letter sent by Assistant Commissioner Fanning? CHA RMAN Yes.

245 Q. MG. G_EESON That that was his view. It wasn't that they may have had a particular involvement?
A. No.

246 Q. It was more that simply their names were on the originating letter and for that reason they were included in the correspondence that led to the investigation?
A. Yes, and just to finalise the matters.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Mr. O'Brien, did I see
you wanting to --
MR. O BRI EN Chair, I just wish to clarify an issue. I just need to take one further instruction. CHA RMAN That's okay. Turn on your microphone,

Mr. O'brien, so we can hear you.

MR. O BRI EN It's misbehaving.
CHAN RMAN Do you want to check something. MR. O BRI EN Yes.

CHA RMAN So you want an opportunity, just for a moment, to come back. Well, will I ask Ms. McGrath to continue and then at the very end we can -- is that all right with you, Ms. McGrath? Have you any questions. MS. MEGRATH I think an issue that is floating around is that letter of the 10th November.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MS. MEGRATH I had in my papers, at page 511 -CHA RMAN Your microphone has gone off as wel1.

ME. MEGRATH Sorry. I had noted that that reference in the additional statement.

CHAN RMAN Yes, Garda Keogh's additional statement.
ME. MEGRATH From Garda Keogh, I had written on my notes that it was to be found at page 5111 in Volume 17. It's exactly the same letter but it's just appearing in a different place that Mr. Dignam has opened.

CHA RMAN Thank you. So just in case we're getting confused, we will just note that it's also at 5111; is that correct.

MS. MEGRATH So, unless Mr. O'brien, wants to leave
that matter over, we can look it again later.
MR. O BRIEN If we could please and I will clarify with my solicitor.
CHA RMAN Certainly. Mr. O'brien, it strikes me that it is not something that we need to bring back the assistant commissioner about. We can clarify it among ourselves and in the unlikely event that we have to have evidence, then we will arrange for that. Are you happy with that?
MR. O BRI EN Certainly.
CHA RMAN So there is no pressure on you. But look, I'm sorry for causing all this trouble, but when I saw the reference I couldn't locate in my mind, I couldn't think, what is that reference to item 5. And clearly Garda Keogh was being quite specific about it.
MR O BRIEN Yes.
CHA RMAK So now I think I understand what he is talking about. But please clarify as appropriate. okay. Thanks very much.
MR. OBRIEN Yes, Chairman.
CHA RMN: You can come back to it at any convenient time. Now, Ms. McGrath.
M. MEGRATH There is nothing arising from my side.

MR. DI GNAM I didn't realise Ms. Gleeson and Mr. Ferry had questions for the assistant commissioner, but that 12:24 issue they raised in relation to Inspector Farrell and Superintendent McBrien.
CHA RMAN Indeed.
MR. DI GNMM And the letters being sent at the outset,
they are be found at 1352.
CHA RMAN And we heard that yesterday.
MR. DI GNAM And 66 --
CHA RMAN In relation to Assistant Commissioner Finn. Because the question was, look it's kind of not very nice to get letters like this. Anyway, there it is. MR. DI GNMM Page 1352, at page 662, is where those letters are to be found.

CHA RMAN Okay, thank you very much. You are free to go and we will proceed.
THE WTNESS: Thank you, Chair.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MR. MARR NAN Chairman, the next witness is Deputy Commissioner John Twomey.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.

## DEPUTY COMM SSI ONER J OHN TVOMEY, HAM NG BEEN SVORN, WAS DI RECTLY EXAM NED BY MR. MARRI NAN, AS FOLLOVS:

THE WTNESS: Deputy Commissioner John Twomey. CHA RMAN Good morning, commissioner, thank you very much. Or good afternoon. Thank you very much.
247 Q. MR. MARR NAN The commissioner's statement is to be
found at page 14671 of the material. Just before we deal with that, deputy commissioner, you have been mentioned in dispatches in relation to the appointment of Assistant Commissioner McMahon but you haven't dealt
with it in your statement. If we could just deal with that first of all. We know that initially Assistant Commissioner Kieran Kenny, on 26th June 2015, had appointed Assistant Commissioner Jack Nolan to conduct a disciplinary investigation in relation to Garda A and 12:26 three other gardaí, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

248 Q. He retired. Then if we could have page 16442 up on the screen. You held the role as deputy commissioner in Policing and Security at Garda Headquarters, a role 12:27 that you still hold, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

249 Q. And you held that role on the 12th May. We can see here a letter that you wrote to Assistant Commissioner McMahon, where you say:
"You are hereby appoi nted pursuant to section 23 of the Garda Sí ochána di sci pline regul ations 2007 to i nvestigate the allegations as per the attached form 1A31S in respect of."

Then you name the parties. You then go on:
"Attached report on behalf of Assistant Commissioner Nol an recently retired is al so attached for your information. Additional documentation in this matter is held at the office of assistant commissioner, Dublin netropolitan region."

If we could just, if Mr. Kavanagh could have up on the screen 16458 of the material. If we can scroll down there. We see that on 12th June 2017 Assistant Commissioner McMahon is writing back and expressing a concern that she had. In the second paragraph she says:
"It is noted that Assistant Commissioner Nol an was appointed as investigating officer by Assistant Commissioner Kenny on the 26th June in accordance with regul ation 23 of Garda Sí ochána regul ations 2007. The report of Garda Adrian Cooke of 8th April 2017 details that an investigation team was established and extensive investigations have been undertaken to date comprising of in excess of 120 j obs.

In consi deration of the extensi ve work conducted to date, it may be that an investigating officer substitution was envi saged to continue with the work commenced by then Assistant Cormi ssioner Nol an. A new i nvestigating officer appoi nt ment will require the work conduct ed to date to be di sregarded.

Cl arification is sought on this matter and subject to your consideration, I can proceed with the existing i nvesti gation to bring this matter to a concl usi on at the earliest possible opportunity."

So that matter was drawn to your attention and you
respond on 30th August of 2017. If we look at the paragraph there:
"I amto advi se for the purpose of clarification that you are to take over the investi gation pursuant to the Garda Sí ochána di sci pl ine regul ations arising fromthe above referenced report origi nally commenced by Assi stant Commi ssi oner Nol an, now retired, to compl et i on.

Advi se in course of your recommendation in respect of . . ."

Then you outline the personnel.
"As advi sed previ ously, it is understood that a substantial vol ure of documentation has been gathered in the course of the investigation by Assi stant Commi ssi oner Nol an, which is retai ned in the office of the assi stant commissioner, Dubl in metropolitan regi on. "

Was it always your intention that this should be taken over by Assistant Commissioner McMahon as opposed to be a new investigation?
A. It was always my intention that it was to be taken over. It was not a new investigation.

250 Q. Yes.
251 Q. CHA RMAN She was to continue.
A. Yes, exactly.

252 Q. MR. MARR NAN Now we had some evidence from Assistant Commissioner Sheehan, who thought that there may be a fault in relation to this. It was one of the matters that he relied on in relation to not establishing a board of inquiry. what's your view in relation to his view, as it were, that this was a flawed procedure?
A. Well, I think there was clarification in the minute that you have just outlined there, that it was to be taken over. So I think any confusion was clarified at a later stage. So I think when it came to the decision that Assistant Commissioner Sheehan had to make, I think it was -- from my perspective, from August of 2017 it was clear to all involved that it was a continuation of the original investigation.
We11, that would appear to make sense, because Assistant Commissioner Nolan had been appointed at that stage --
A. That's correct.
Q. And there had already been an investigation. And you were quite happy that that investigation should continue under Assistant Commissioner McMahon's direction?

CHA RMAN Direction.
A. That's correct.

256 Q. MR. MARR NAN Now, if we could then go just to your statement at page 14671 of the material. You note
there:
"Under the HR policy Assistant Commissioner Finn of the south Eastern Regi on was appoi nted by Assi stant Commissioner Fi nn of the Eastern Regi on on 15th Noventber of 2017 to investigate the complaints made by Gar da Keogh. "

Then you note:
"In the absence of Assistant Cormi ssi oner Fanning, the investigation file compl eted by Assistant Commissioner Finn was consi dered by Assistant Commissioner O Brien."

I think at that stage Assistant Commissioner Fanning had been suspended; is that right?
A. That's correct.

257 Q. Yes.
"On completion of that investigation, none of Garda
Keogh's complaints were upheld and all parties concerned were notified on 7th February 2019 by Assi stant Commissioner OBrien."
we have heard his evidence in relation to that. You then note:
"On 19th March 2017, Garda Keogh, through his I egal representative, applied in writing to appeal Assistant

Cormíssi oner Fi nn' s findi ngs. "

And you note:
"In accordance with the Garda Sí ochána Policy dealing with bullying in the workplace, in correspondence dated 2nd April 2019 the acting executive director Humen Resource and Peopl e Devel opment..."

Who was the acting director at that stage?
A. That was Mr. Alan Mulligan.

258 Q. Yes. Requested that you deal with this appeal and provide a review under paragraph 8(12) of the Policy.
"The Policy provides a rechanismavailable to the
person conducting an appeal to engage an independent expert to carry out an audit of an investigation. "

You then go on and note:
"To allow me consider the matter Mr. Rory de Bruir, barrister at Iaw, was engaged to carry out an audit of the investi gation. "

Just dealing with that, the letter, including the
grounds or a letter of appeal, as it were, that was sent by Mr. Cullen, if we could have page 7446 up on the screen. This is dated 19th March 2019, it's addressed to the executive director Human Resources,
who I think may have been John Barrett at that time, was it? Or had Alan Mulligan taken over as THE acting director?
A. I think Mr. Mulligan had taken over at that stage.

259 Q. Yes. It's addressed to the Commissioner himself and also to Assistant Commissioner Fanning. It says:
"We refer to the above and encl ose herewith the appeal agai nst the determination by Assi stant Commi ssi oner Fi nbarr O' Brien of the compl ai nt by Garda Keogh dated 7th February 2019.

We should be gratef ul if you now determine the within appeal."

Then, on the following page, 7447 , we have the appeal document, if I can put it that way. It goes to 7462. I don't intend to open it. But he sets out a number of grounds of appeal or grievances in relation to the report or the determination of Assistant Commissioner o'brien, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

260 Q. If we could just look at the -- because it seems to have become an issue, at the third paragraph:
"Fi ndi ngs were apparently made by Assi stant
Commi ssi oner Finn on 31st December 2018. Such findi ngs were then to be exami ned by Assi stant Commi ssi oner Fanni ng, who was the nat ural judge in the
ci rcumstances. Assi stant Commi ssi oner Fanni ng was, however, curi ously suspended on 2nd J anuary 2019. Hi s suspensi on was subsequently apparently acknow edged to be unl awf ul. The effect of his temporary suspension, however, was that the findings of AC Finn were then assi gned to another judge, namely AC O Brien, who produced this inchoate decision in accel erated and record time, compared to its slow progress up to that poi nt, before AC Fanning was reinstated or could cone back. "

Could we perhaps have 7463 up on the screen. This is a letter from Assistant Commissioner Fanning dated 22nd March of 2019 to the executive director HRPD. And he notes:
"I have recei ved the attached appeal from Garda Ni chol as Keogh, Athl one Garda Station, submitted on his behal f by John Gerard Cullen. "

Then he sets out the background. Then in the third paragraph, he says:
"The Pol icy provi des that the assi stant commi ssi oner for the regi on to exercise this function. "
which is the appeal function.

[^0]has been concl uded by an assistant cormissioner. The position is there is no provision in the Policy. I recommend that sone external person, e.g. seni or counsel, conduct a revi ewin its totality. There can be engagement with the nenbers concerned and any reasonable request be factored into the process, but ultimately the responsi bility rests with the employer as to the investigation.

I ask that I am not part of any deci si on-making on the basis of percei ved bi as. I have noted the comments at paragraph 3 on page 1 of the appeal. Assistant commissioner Eastern Regi on has al so initiated di sci pline agai nst Garda Keogh pursuant to the Garda Sí ochána di sci pline regul ations as well as [REDACTED].

I await your directions."

Was this letter drawn to your attention in around about that time?
A. I don't have a recollection of reading that letter.

261 Q. Yes. The suggestion, obviously he is asking -- there are two issues. First of all he's saying he's at assistant commissioner level and he would be effectively dealing with an appeal from somebody at the 12:39 same rank, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

262 Q. That's the first problem. Second of all, he says there is a perceived bias and he wished to be excused. And
the third issue is that he is recommending that the matter be reviewed by an independent external senior counsel, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

263 Q. Now, you also set out in your statement that you thought that you would utilise the provision in paragraph 8.12 of the policy and ask for a review mechanism externally, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
was that totally independent or was it after consultation perhaps with Mr. Mulligan?
A. No, totally independent. It was a decision that I made following my appointment by Mr. Mulligan.
Q. CHAL RMAN Was Mr. Mulligan the executive director of HRPD at the time?

MR. MARI NAN Yes.
A. He was the acting executive director and he was the person who appointed me to conduct the appeal.
Q. CHA RMAN I follow. And this is a letter that said private and confidential, so I don't know what
influence that might have on whether it was circulated or not.
A. But it's not addressed to me.

CHAN RMAN It's not addressed to you and you're not wear of having read it. okay.
A. No.
Q. CHA RMAN That might possibly be a reason why it wouldn't have gone to you. who knows.
269 Q. MR. MARRINAN But in any event if we could have page

13121 up on the screen, this is a letter from Mr. Mulligan dated 2nd April of 2012 to you. We needn't go through it all. He sets out in the first paragraph the background. And then if we go to the following page, at 13122, in the second paragraph there 12:41 he says:
"As the appoi nting officer was at assi stant commi ssi oner rank, the appropriate rank to process the appeal under paragraph 8. 12 of the Policy is a deputy commissioner. The Policy provides for an independent expert to be engaged to audit the investigation file. That person may be a member of the legal profession or a former rights commissi oner with extensi ve experi ence in the area of empl oyment I aw."

CHA RMAN Yes.
270 Q. MR. MARRINAN "I n making the final determination on the appeal, the assi stant commissi oner will consi der the views of the expert. "
271 Q. CHA RMAN So it's still your decision.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN But you have regard to the views of the expert. okay.
A. That's correct.

272 Q. MR. MARR NAN Then we see there, he has attached the following documentation, which was a copy of the entire investigation file, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. .

273
Q. A copy of the notification of the finding to the parties and a copy of Garda Keogh's grounds of appeal. Then there is some correspondence that goes back that is irrelevant, concerning a nomination of the independent person and who it ought to be. If we could 12:42 then have page 13125 up on the screen. This is a 1etter from you dated 8th May 2012 and it's to Chief Superintendent Curran, Chief Superintendent wheatley, Chief Superintendent Murray and Superintendent McBrien and also Inspector Farre11. It's a complaint of unacceptable behaviour under the Garda Síochána HRM policy.

An issue has arisen here as to the notification of Superintendent McBrien and Inspector Farrell and why they were notified of the appeal process. Can you clear that up for us?
A. Well, in the correspondence $I$ received from the acting executive director from HRM, the policy owner, he outlines to me that there are five people in the -- he names the five people.
Q. Yes.
A. That I have to conduct the appeal for. So it's in that context that I follow on from the correspondence that I have received and in the order of completeness, I fee1 I take my instructions and direction from the appointment and that's what that letter is, appointment. Now I am aware that those people had been corresponded with the original investigation file and
in the decisions made by Assistant Commissioner o'brien.
Q. And then if we have page 13127 up on the screen. on the same date you write a letter to Garda Keogh. If you scroll over, Mr. Kavanagh, to page 13128. You note:
"Given the commitments in my role and responsibility as deputy commissioner Policing and Security and as an external independent expert has been asked to conduct an audit of the investigation, it will not be possible to provide my findings within the stipulated timeframe and thereforel seek your approval for an extension to the specified timeframe. I assure you that every effort will be made by me to complete the appeal as expeditiously as possible. I will keep you informed of any del ays going forward. "

I don't think any of the parties raised any issues in relation to the timeframe, isn't that right?
A. That's right.
Q. Then we have, at page 13129, your letter to Mr. de Bruir. At page 13130 you ask him to confirm his availability to conduct this audit in accordance with the policy document.
"If you have any queries or wish to di scuss the matter further, please do not hesitate to contact my office on the inf or mation provi ded. "

Now, Mr. de Bruir was sent a copy of all the material, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

277 Q. When you ask him to do an audit, what was it that you were actually asking him to do?
A. Well, it's an independent audit of the investigation, to have a look at it in the context of the issues that were raised, the investigation that was conducted and the decisions that were made as a consequence. To do an audit of that entire process, to assist me ultimately in coming to a decision and to deal with the review and the issues that were raised. Obviously Mr . de Bruir had sight of the issues that were raised in the appeal also.

278 Q. Why did you think that it was appropriate in this case that you get someone externally to review the file?
A. Well, $I$ felt it's a very serious matter and I wanted to give it the seriousness that the issue deserved. I wanted it to be a fair and impartial consideration and I wanted it to be seen as such. I felt that the facility and the Policy enabled that assistance to provide that independent audit, that independent expert advice to me in doing my work and I felt it was appropriate to do that in this case.

279 Q. Now, I think that Mr. de Bruir conducted his review expeditiously. If we can have page 13224 up on the screen. On 5th June of 2019 he comes back, that's the following month. He notes in his letter to you:
"Encl osed audit report of the investigation as conducted by Assistant Commissioner Finn into the 18 poi nts of complaint as made by Garda Keogh in March 2017. "

So this was a review of the investigation that had been conducted by Assistant Commissioner Finn and didn't touch on the findings by Assistant Commissioner o'brien, is that right?
A. It considered all of the facts, I think, that were available to Mr. de Bruir.
Q. All right. He then says:
"I have paid cogni sance to the grounds of appeal."

Then he makes a comment in relation to that. But I think that effectively he went through the letter of Mr. Cullen and dealt with it on the basis of isolating what the ground of appeal was and dealt with it on the basis of looking at the investigation, the findings of the investigation and the grounds of appeal in his report, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

281 Q. If we then go on to page 13225:
"I believe that my report covers such questions as posed without having to spill out every such question and address it separatel $y$.

The investi gation addressed each poi nt of compl ai nt separatel $y$ and in the order as listed.

The compl ai nts can al so be looked at froma different perspective and in the rel evant timeframe in which they rel ate. I have commented in part on this. It is not within my remit to supplement the investigation but to eval uate the investigation itself."

And that was his remit, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

282 Q. Then he sets out his report extensively, it appears at 13138. It is headed "audit of investigation". He deals with the chronology of the complaint. And then on the following page, 13139, Garda Keogh's complaint of bullying and harassment. And then 13140, he isolates the 18 separate incidents or points cited by Garda Keogh that were listed in the documentation. And then at 13141, he identifies the Garda officers who were named in the above complaints. He sets those out. Then he sets out to deal with each of the complaints 1 to 18. As I say, the manner in which he did that we will see at 13144. He deals with complaint number 1 and he deals with it on the basis of analysing the investigation and the findings. Then if we go over the page, 13145, he deals with the grounds of appea1. He goes through each of the complaints in a similar way; isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

283 Q. And ultimately expressed his view at the conclusion of the report. If we could have page 13222 up on the screen. At 25.1 he says:
"I have sought to address the rel evant points of appeal that can be di scerned in the appeal submission and were not specifically addressed point by point, l believe are encompassed within the reasons for the findings and concl usi ons of Assi stant Commissi oner Finn. The findi ngs and concl usi ons are logi cal, rational and are based on the reports and responses provided by the Gardaí, ser geants, inspectors, superintendents who worked with and/ or supervised and/ or interacted with Garda Keogh during the period May 2014 to Decenber 2015 answer any of the points of appeal not specifically addressed. Seventeen compl ai nts rel ate to this peri od. "

He then goes on to say:

[^1]does not cone within the ni ne characteristics.

The definition of penalisation in section 3 of the Protected Disclosures Act 2014, incl udes harassment in relation to a person who makes a protected di sclosure. 12:54 Garda Keogh's complaints can be said to have been addressed and investigated as if the specified characteristics incl uded persons who make their protected di scl osures. Assi stant Commissioner Fi nn did i nvestigate the complaints of harassment and did not find any instance of inappropriate behaviour on the part of the named officers.

Chapter 5 of the bookl et Wbrking Together to Create a Positive Wbrking Environment outlines forns of bullying, the list is not exhaustive. There is the allegation of opressive supervision and the allegation of irrational scrutiny and a minute criticismof i nvestigation work.
25. These were not borne out in the reports and responses provi ded by the Gardaí, sergeants, inspectors, superintendents who worked with and/ or supervised or interacted with Garda Keogh during the period of May 2014 to Decentber 2015. Reports har assed. "

Then finally he says:
"A comprehensive investi gation was carried out in
rel ation to all complaints as made by Garda Keogh and the findings of Assistant Commissioner Finn I eading to the decision of Assistant Commissioner O Brien arose froma thorough, fair and impartial investigation."

And it is signed by Mr. de Bruir, dated the 4th June of 2019. That was his view but that didn't determine the appeal, because that was then a factor that you had to take into account in making a decision; is that right?
A. That's correct.

284 Q. And what documentation did you then review in relation to arriving at your decision?
A. I looked at the investigation file as submitted by Assistant Commissioner Finn, along with the appendices, I looked at the report and the decisions of Assistant Commissioner o'brien, I looked at the grounds of appeal as submitted on behalf Garda Keogh, and I looked at the report as submitted to me by Mr. de Bruir. So I considered all of those and $I$ considered them in the context of what I had been asked to do, was to do an audit of the investigation in the context of the complaints that had been made.
285 Q. Then, on page 13233 of the materials, please. This is a letter to Mr. Mulligan, dated 11th July 2019:
"We are requested by your office in a minute dated 25th April 2019 to consider an appeal by Garda Keogh agai nst
the decision of Assistant Commissioner OBrien in the above matter. I now return complete file together with copy of notification of $m$ decision to all parties concer ned.

You will be aware that as part of the appeal process l engaged an independent expert to conduct an audit and attach his compl ete report to the file. Having considered all the documentation made available to me by your office together with the comprehensi ve report fromthe independent expert, the investigation was carried out in a thorough, fair and impartial manner and on that basis I do not uphol d the complaints of bul I ying made by Garda Keogh agai nst the main personnel."

Your decision was communicated to the parties, at 13234 , on 11th July of 2019. You write to Chief Superintendent Curran, Chief superintendent wheatley and again to Superintendent McBrien and Inspector Farrell and also Chief Superintendent Murray. In that, at page 13235, if I can high7ight this passage:
"I concur with the findings of Assi stant Commi ssioner Finn and subsequent deci si ons by Assi stant Commi ssioner 12:58 $\mathrm{O}^{\prime} \mathrm{Bri}$ en that each of ficer fulfilled their obligations and conducted thei $r$ duties to ensure an account able and prof essi onal pol icing servi ce was being del i vered within their area of responsibility. The actions taken
equate to proactive management ensuring appropriate governance and supervision to achi eve policing obj ectives, which I do not believe can be construed as either bullying or harassment."

On the same day you write to Garda Keogh, it's at page 13236 of the material. It sets out the history of it. Then if we go to page 13237, it says:
"I concur with the findings of Assistant Commissioner Finn and subsequent deci si ons by Assistant Commi ssi oner O Brien that each officer fulfilled their obligations and conducted their duties to ensure an accountable and professional policing service was being del ivered within their area of responsibility. The actions taken ${ }_{12: 59}$ equate to proactive management, ensuring appropriate governance and supervision to achi eve policing objectives, which I do not believe can be construed as either bullying or harassment.

Havi ng consi dered in depth all documentation available to me in this matter, l am of the firmbelief that a comprehensi ve investigation was carried out and the findings resulted froma thorough, fair and impartial i nvestigation and accordingly l can find no corroborative evi dence in support of the compl ai nts and I amunable to uphol d any complaint of bullying made by you agai nst the named personnel."

Could I just ask you about that? I mean, there is no requirement of finding corroborative evidence. A decision is based on the balance of probabilities, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Yes. But did you regard it as a requirement that in some form that there should be some independent evidence of the person making the complaint that supported his allegation?
A. Well, I found that on the balance of probabilities, that I had to consider everything that was in front of me and I did need some evidence in support of it. And I needed -- I needed -- I suppose if I come at it from the other way, in doing the review, I found that there was no evidence that any of the actions taken could be construed as either bullying or harassment. And I was focused on the behaviours of the people that were involved and the evidence and the information that $I$ had in front of me in the context of the investigation files and reports.

287 Q. It may we11 be that are you not using corroboration in the strict legal sense?
A. Correct.
the findings of Assistant Commissioner Finn and the decision of Assistant Commissioner o'brien, were there occasions when you reviewed the evidence where you were happy to make a decision, if it had to be made, in favour of Garda Keogh, even though there wasn't evidence outside his assertion to support that?
A. I was happy based on the information and the evidence that $I$ had in front of me.
A. That there was nothing where I could believe anything could be construed to be either bullying or harassment. 291 Q. Thank you very much.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Now, have you some significant time, Mr. O'Brien. I don't want to rush you at all. If it is merely a matter of a few questions, no problem, we will try to dispose of the deputy commissioner. MR. O BRI EN It won't be long.

CHA RMAK So should we carry on and then break for lunch. Is that convenient? Are you happy with that, deputy commissioner.
THE WTNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAK okay.

## ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER FI NBARR O BRI EN WAS

CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. O BRI EN, AS FOLLOMS:

292 Q. MR. O BRIEN Just a couple of questions, deputy commissioner. Just in relation to the work that you carried out on the investigation and the audit, as you described it. Do you have any working papers where you 13:03 considered the issues that Garda Keogh had raised and formed your own view in relation to those?
A. Well, the working papers $I$ have are the documentation that I have referred to earlier on, in terms of what was provided me by the acting executive director of HRM 13:03 and the report of Mr . de Bruir. I think I have outlined the documents that $I$ used in coming to my determination. appendices, you have the o'brien report, the grounds of appeal and the de Bruir report, but you yourself didn't make any notes with your own views on any of the issues raised by Garda Keogh; is that right?
A. That's correct.

So you relied entirely, as it were, on the findings, $I$ suppose, of Mr. de Bruir, or was it Mr. de Bruir, in reaching your decision not to uphold any of Garda Keogh's complaints?
A. I relied on all of the documentation that $I$ had before me, which was the investigation file of Assistant Commissioner Finn, the decisions reached by Assistant Commissioner O'Brien, the appeals as submitted on behalf of Garda Keogh and the report of Mr. de Bruir. So I used all of those documentation in coming to my
determination.
Q. I see. I know you communicated your decision to Garda Keogh on 11th July 2019. If we just have that, it's at page 13236. I am just wondering, in this letter, it doesn't set out any reasons for your decision, would you accept that, as to how you arrived at your decision. You merely state that you're concurring with the findings of Assistant Commissioner Finn and subsequent decisions?
A. I think it sets out that I conduct the -- that I have been asked to do the appeal and in concluding the appeal, this is my decisions. investigation of Assistant Commissioner Finn complied with the Policy first of all? what exercise did you carry out?
A. We11, I considered in reading the file and the documentation that $I$ had in front of me, that's how I considered it and I was particularly -- I compared that with the Policy document, that is the organisation's policy. So in completing the work that I was tasked to do, $I$ examined the investigation file.

297 Q. For example, you fully understood the complaint that Garda Keogh was making against the senior officers, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

298 Q. When you received the file and the appeal document that Mr. Cullen had sent in, I take it you understood the appeal that Garda Keogh was making against the decision
of both the Finn and O'Brien investigations?
A. Yes, that's correct. Yes. I had the appeal as submitted by Mr. Cullen on behalf of Garda Keogh. Would you accept that one of the grounds of appeal that Mr. Cullen raised and one of the issues that Garda Keogh has with this is the delay from the time he made his complaint to Chief Superintendent Scanlan in March 2017, up to the appointment of Assistant Commissioner Finn to investigate in November 2017? Do you accept that that is an issue that Garda Keogh has?
A. Well, I might accept that that's an issue that has, however --

MR. MRPHY: I beg your pardon, Chairman, can I raise one point? The question is being asked on the basis that Garda Keogh is maintaining a complaint about the period March to November. Also, as the Chairman has noted earlier, that was expressly obviated by his evidence in the passage that was sought to be opened by Mr. Dignam.
CHA RMAN He has given that evidence, Mr. Murphy.
MR. MRPHY: Yes. Our concern is that it would appear from the questions, that notwithstanding his evidence, Garda Keogh is still through counsel trying to make the same submission.
CHA RMAN Yes. what do you say, Mr. O'Brien.
MR. O BRI EN I am simply looking at the process.
CHAI RMAN I understand.
MR. O BRI EN At the time.
CHA RMAN At the time when the investigation was
proceeding.
MR. O BRI EN Yes.
CHA RMAN whatever about the evidence and its significance give at this inquiry, there was a question being maintained of the delay.

MR. O BRI EN Yes.
CHA RNAN Isn't that really what are you saying?
MR. O BRI EN Exactly. Consistently.
CHA RMAN And I mean, there is no doubt that there was such a thing and the significant of Garda Keogh's
answers will in due course have to be evaluated, isn't that right? Do you understand, deputy commissioner? Just to explain where we are. Mr. Murphy draws attention to answers given by Garda Keogh in evidence, which on the face of them would appear to exonerate Assistant Commissioner Fanning and all his associates so to speak, I don't mean that offensively in any way, but all his colleagues, either Garda or non-Garda, in a delay between the 27 th March, when Garda Keogh made a statement to Chief Superintendent Scanlan, and the 15th November, when Assistant Commissioner Finn was appointed. However, Mr. O'Brien is saying, look here, at the time of which we are speaking, and Mr. Cullen's correspondence confirmed it, there was an issue about delay. Now I am sorry to make a big song and dance about that, but that's the context of where we are. Is that right?

300 Q. MR. O BRI EN Exactly. what I am asking, deputy commissioner, is, you don't address that delay and
neither does Mr. de Bruir, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct, we don't address the delay, that's correct.

I notice that you sent your decision by post to Mr. Cullen. It's at page 13239. And to Garda Keogh, as we just outlined. Is there some reason why you didn't enclose Mr. de Bruir's audit or Mr. de Bruir's report which set out the reasoning behind your decision, to either Garda Keogh or to Mr. Cullen in that?
A. No. I think I communicated my decision, which is what I think is appropriate in the case. would it not have been fair to Garda Keogh, given that you were relying, I suppose, on the review or the audit carried out by Mr. de Bruir, that he would have sight of the underpinning reasons for your decision?
A. I was relying on many things, not just the report of Mr. de Bruir. I think the requirement is that I communicate my decision and that's what I did on that

I don't have any further questions.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much, Mr. O'Brien.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Now, anybody else into the picture? I know the questions they're going to ask you.

## DEPUTY COMM SSI ONER J OHN TVDMEY WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. FERRY, AS FOLLOVG:

MR. FERRY: Deputy Commissioner Twomey, on behalf of Superintendent McBrien, the only question $I$ have is, were you --
CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Ferry, you're for Superintendent McBrien.
MR. FERRY: Yes.
CHA RMAN So Mr. Ferry wants to ask, yes, Mr. Ferry.
MR. FERRY: You communicated to her in relation to conducting an appeal and appointing Mr. de Bruir and then you also communicated to her in July 2019 both the outcome of your decision. And my question is: From your perspective, being deputy commissioner, were you of the view that Superintendent McBrien had been the subject of a complaint of unacceptable behaviour by Garda Keogh?
A. No. It was clear in the documentation that Superintendent McBrien was not named in it. However, it was in the correspondence that $I$ had received from the executive director of HRM and it's in that context I corresponded.
306 Q. Thank you, deputy commissioner.

307 Q. CHA RMAN So that was the only reason?
A. Yes.

308 Q. CHAL RMAN You got materials with these names?
A. Correct.

309 Q. CHA RMAN And you notified. Does that answer your question, Ms. Gleeson?
M. GLEESON If I might very briefly. CHA RMAN Yes, of course, there's no problem.

## DEPUTY COMM SSI ONER J OHN TVDMEY WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY <br> MS. GLEESON AS FOLLOMG:

MS. GLEESON Just put the letter dated 18th april 2019, that's at 16361, the previously received draft letter at --
CHA RMAN Is your microphone on or are you too far away from it, Ms. Gleeson, because I am straining a tiny bit. What's the number of the page.
M5. GLEESON Sorry, it's 16361 is the letter dated 18th April.
CHA RMAN 16361.
ME. GLEESON That's right.
CHA RMAN 16 -- hold on a second. Blood sugar is low. wait now. We will all get this. 16361.
ME. GLEESON That's right.
CHA RMAN Thank you. Now, 8th May 2019.
ME. GEESON '18.
CHA RMAN Deputy Commissioner Twomey's letter. what do you want to ask about that, Ms. Gleeson.
M. GLEESON Just to say that was a letter received by Inspector Farrell and I suppose while you say that he wasn't named as somebody who had been involved in unacceptable behaviour, I suppose, despite the previous correspondence from Assistant Commissioner Fanning, which was 9th November 2017, 6455, and I know you're aware of the intervening correspondence, obviously Mr. Cullen on behalf of Garda Keogh made it abundantly clear that there was no cause of action against Inspector Farrell and your colleague Assistant Commissioner Finn wrote to Inspector Farrell on 25th January 2018, stating that certainly no cause of action against him. Also, your colleague, Assistant Commissioner o'brien, then wrote to Inspector Farrell, 7th February 2019, saying matter finalised. And in fact, in that letter, that's at 7443, Assistant Commissioner o'brien referred to the meeting in the Mullingar Park Hotel, 1st December 2017, where again Garda Keogh confirmed that there was no cause of action against Inspector Farrel1. You can understand then while he is receiving your correspondence -CHA RMAN You think he is entitled to be a little bit alarmed.

## Mb. GLEESON Yes.

310 Q.
CHA RMAN Even though apparently he is not being accused. That does seem to be a reasonable point. Sorry, do you think that is a reasonable point of view for Inspector Farre11 and Superintendent McBrien, to say, everybody says I'm not involved but why am I
getting this correspondence?
A. I think it is not unreasonable. But in the context of the task that I was assigned, I felt it necessary to close it off and I felt this was the most appropriate way to do that.

CHA RMAN okay.
311 Q. M. GLEESON Deputy commissioner, was that essentially because obviously there was an originating letter from Assistant Commissioner Fanning stating these are the five people in respect of whom we are going to make -there's going to be an investigation. Obviously in the meantime there was an investigation, it was clear that there was no cause of action against Inspector Farrel1 but because his name was on the originating documentation, as it were, he was then included in your 13:16 work and your correspondence.

312 Q. CHA RMAN If I understand, what you did was based on what the executive director sent to you.
A. My appointment.

313 Q. CHA RMAN So we have to look upstream of the executive 13:16 director to find the cause of it. But it is accepted that it is a reasonable or a not unreasonable apprehension on the part of the officers concerned, why they were getting the correspondence.
Mb. GLEESON Yes.
CHA RMAN That seems to be the situation. You're happy with that.
A. Yes.

END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHAN RMAN Mr. Murphy.
MR. MRPHY: Yes, Chairman, very briefly.

## DEPUTY COMM SSI ONER J OHN TVOMEY WAS THEN EXAM NED BY MR. MRPHY, AS FOLLOMS:

```
314 Q. MR. MRPHY: Could I ask you to be shown document 7446
please? This is a letter that has been referred to I think in your evidence this morning, it's a letter from Mr. Cullen dated 19th March 2019. If you just turn over please to the next page, which is 7446, and it's a letter addressed to the commissioner Harris and then also to AC Fintan Fanning. Do you see that?
A. That's correct, yes.
315 Q. Yes. And then turning over to the next page, page 7447. First of all, could I ask you to look at the third paragraph, it begins with the word "findings", do you see that?
A. Yes.
316 Q. It says:
"Such findings were then to be examined by AC Fanning, who was the natural judge in the circumstances."
First of all, can I ask you to confirm for your evidence this morning that in fact AC Fanning agreed with you and suggested that he should not be the
```

natural judge in this case?
A. That would be correct, yes.

317 Q. You detailed how subsequently, and I will come back to the letter in a moment, that you had a discussion with him or wrote to him and you both agreed that it would be inappropriate?
A. I think that correspondence was probably maybe with the executive director of HRM.
Q. Yes.
A. I was not in contact with Assistant Commissioner Fanning.

319 Q. Yes, I see. But in terms of the communications that were shown to you this morning, here.
A. Correct. That is correct, yes.

320 Q. And then secondly, there's a reference to AC Fanning being suspended on 2nd January 2019, his suspension was subsequently apparently acknowledged to be un1awfu1. I think that is also incorrect. There has been no judicial ruling or acceptance --
CHA RMAN Mr. Murphy, I don't think we should be
getting into this. Somebody is going to say that I am going to have to look at another question that I can see and I just want to steer away from that.

MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHAN RMAN The fact is he was there or he wasn't there, 13:18 he was available or he wasn't.
MR. MRPHY: Yes.
CHA RMAN I think we should leave it at that.
MR. MRPHY: Very good, Chairman

CHA RMAN Counse1 for Assistant Commissioner Fanning, Mr. O'Connor is there, Mr. O'Connor is going to be worrying about whether he should be intervening or not and I am going to reassure him that he doesn't need to be intervening.

MR. MRPHY: Chair, I am not seeking to cast any aspersions.

CHA RMAN I understand.
MR. MRPHY: The point I'm trying to make for the purpose of clarification, Chairman, is that in this paragraph there's a suggestion that somehow but for the actions --

CHA RMAN That's right.
MR. MRPHY: whereas in fact the reality is that
Assistant Commissioner Fanning himself agreed that he shouldn't be. That's the point I wished to make, Chairman.

CHA RMAN okay.
321 Q. MR. MRPH: If I could ask you to be shown 7463, please. This is the letter that you were shown this morning. If you scroll down. In fact, I think that that letter was opened to you this morning. Can you agree with me that that confirms that in fact the recommendation to appoint the external came from Assistant Commissioner Fanning.
A. That's correct.

322 Q. You felt that was a wise course of action yourself?
A. That's correct.

323 Q. CHA RMAN But he didn't know about that. As it
happens, we discover that was his idea but independently the deputy commissioner had decided that was a good idea, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

MR. MRPH: so there is no discord on that basis.
A. That's correct.
Q. I think also in that context, Assistant Commissioner Fanning would have had a lot of experience with the HR related supervision in An Garda Síochána and would know the Policy very well?
A. That's correct.

326 Q. So you would have viewed it from the same angle, that this was a prudent step, to secure an independent person's assistance in this particular stage of the process?
A. Absolutely.

327 Q. Then finally, if you can confirm to us that you examined the documentation that you outlined this morning, that is to say the file, the grounds of appeal, the o'brien report, the de Bruir report, all the information that you were in a position to study, evaluate and come to your decision.
A. That's correct.

328 Q. Thank you.

END OF EXAM NATI ON

MR. MARRI NAN I am sorry, Chairman, just one point that I overlooked.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.

## DEPUTY COMM SSI ONER J OHN TVDMEY WAS THEN RE-EXAM NED BY MR. MARR NAN AS FOLLOMS:

329 Q. MR. MARR NAN If we could have page 16473 up on the screen. This is coming back to the disciplinary investigation conducted by Assistant Commissioner McMahon. She gave evidence to us in relation to this. I opened this letter to her.

CHA RMAN Yes.
330 Q. MR. MARRI NAN That was sent by Inspector Noonan on her behalf. And it concerns a complaint that Garda Keogh has in relation to the fact that he wasn't notified who had taken over the disciplinary investigation?
CHA RMAK oh yes.
331 Q. MR. MARR NAN From Assistant Commissioner Jack Nolan. You will see there in the second paragraph, this is addressed to you, dated 25th September 2017:
"Cl arification is sought as to whet her the members concerned, i ncl uding the compl ai nant and those rembers compl ai ned of, have been formally notified that Assi stant Commi ssi oner McMahon has been nomi nat ed to take over to compl etion the investigation. "

We don't seem to have any follow up documentation in relation to that. Do you recall this letter coming to you in relation to this concern that she had?
A. I don't specifically remember the documentation. 332 Q. Yes.
A. But I am aware that those members that were involved and those members that were complained of were corresponded to by me at a later stage. Following on from this letter the members that were mentioned in the discipline, $I$ notified them.
333 Q. CHAL RMAN The people who were being investigated.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN But the assistant commissioner obvious7y envisaged that Garda Keogh would also be notified. It doesn't appear he was notified, is that right?
A. It doesn't, it doesn't. However, in a discipline investigation, it's slightly different to a bullying and harassment investigation or some other forum like that. The genesis of the discipline investigation is the findings of the Ó Cualáin report. So that would have been the information and the evidence that he brought to the table and he would have -- based on his findings, he would make a recommendation that on the information that $I$ have gathered during the course of the investigation, there should be a discipline investigation. And that would be the commencement of the proceedings. So there wouldn't be a single complainant as such.
MR. MARR NAN So there was a decision made in relation to this and a decision was made not to notified Garda Keogh, as perhaps has been suggested there by Assistant Commissioner McMahon?
A. Well, the decision that was taken was to write to the members complained of.
Q. CHA RMAN Yes. Was there a decision taken, as far as you know, not to write to Garda Keogh, or did it just happen that way?
A. I would suggest it probably just happened that way, Judge.

337 Q. CHA RMAN I mean that's one of his complaints, that Assistant Commissioner Nolan came and retired, he says he didn't know what was happening after that and certainly that would appear to be the case. okay. very good.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thank you very much, deputy commissioner, and you're free to go now. I again thank everybody, including Ms. Kelly, for once again putting in an extra stint to facilitate the work and to facilitate the deputy commissioner. Okay. Thank you very much. What 13:24 time is it? 2:30, all right, thank you very much.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

## THE HEARI NG AD ORNED FOR LUNCH

THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVB, AFTER LUNCH

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, the next witness is the Former Assistant Commissioner Nolan.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. OBRIEN I just want to clarify in relation to the 14:31 issue that arose before lunch.

CHA RMAN Yes. You can come on up, Mr. Nolan, thanks very much.
MR. OBRI EN Just to confirm that Mr. Dignam was
correct, it is page 5111 in relation to the number 5
issue that you asked me to --
CHA RMAN we were right. Sit down there for a moment. We were right in thinking that that was the reference that he was making. okay.
MR. O BRIEN That's right. Just to formally clarify that.

CHA RMAN It was the Inspector Drea matter. Okay, thank you very much.

MR. O BRIEN Thanks, Mr. O'brien. Now.

RETI RED ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER JACK NOLAN, HAV NG BEEN SUDRN, WAS DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NESS, AS FOLLO/5:

THE WTNESS: Jack Nolan. Retired assistant commissioner.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
338 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: I am going to refer to you as
assistant commissioner, if you don't mind, because it
relates to your period as such. I think you retired from An Garda Síochána on 20th April 2017?
A. That's correct, Chairman.
Q. After nearly 40 years service?
A. Just about 40 years.

340 Q. Could you give a brief outline of your career up to the date of your retirement?
A. Okay. I joined An Garda Síochána in 1977, was based in Cork city. Moved from there to the Laois-Offaly division. Was in several stations there. Promoted to sergeant. Went to Clones in County Monaghan. Back to Laois-Offaly for a while. Promoted inspector and went to Garda Headquarters, where I served in a number of branches in Garda Headquarters, change management, which was in the IT section at that time, the office of deputy commissioner strategic resource management. Then I was promoted superintendent. I was seconded to the UK police for a while. Then I was the chief superintendent in the Garda college. Then I was promoted assistant commissioner and served in the western Region, the Southern Region for a short while, the Southeastern Region. During those periods I retained responsibilities for organisational development and strategic planning branch in Garda Headquarters and then I took over the DMR and the several of those portfolios $I$ held at the same time during 2015, '16, '17.
341 Q. I think you retired then, as we have said, in April

2017, while you were assistant commissioner for the DMR?
A. That's correct.

342 Q. But at the time we're primarily concerned with, I think you were the assistant commissioner for the
Southeastern Region when you were appointed to do a disciplinary inquiry?
A. That's correct, Chairman

We will come to that in a moment. In your statement, which is to be found in the Tribunal papers at volume 14, page 4103, you draw attention first of all to the statement made about you by Garda Keogh, which is page 5 of his statement furnished to the Tribunal originally, it's page 120 of our books. We don't need to look at it. You have set it out there accurately insofar as it relates to you. I think he sets out there a suggestion that you had been the subject of criticism in a published report of a commission of inquiry?
A. That's correct, Chairman. I was the Garda liaison officer to Judge Fennelly's Commission. while I was never the subject of any adverse commentary, I was significantly praised by Judge Fennelly for the role I performed while a liaison officer to that Commission, in conjunction with my colleagues of that time,

Maje1la Armstrong. So that suggestion that I was adversely commented upon or criticised is totally inaccurate.

344 Q. CHA RMAN Totally inaccurate?
Q. CHA RMAN You say it's quite the opposite.
A. Exact opposite, Chairman.

346 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: You have included a quotation from the 14:36 report there in your statement, is that right?
A. I did, indeed, Chair.

Can I ask you, did you have any knowledge of Garda Keogh when you were appointed to conduct the discipline inquiry?
A. I had no knowledge of Garda Keogh. I never met Garda Keogh.
Q. And in terms of the inquiry, I think you were appointed to inquire into the conduct of four members at the time?
A. That's correct, Chairman. I would have been appointed by Assistant Commissioner Kieran Kenny, who was from the Northern Region and who was acting in the role, at administrative functions associated with the office of the deputy commissioner in relation to Internal Affairs 14:37 and discipline.

349 Q. Yes.
A. Hence he being the appointing the officer as delegated by the Garda Commissioner. So he appointed me to conduct the disciplinary investigation on 25th June 2015.

350 Q. Perhaps we will just look at the letter of appointment, at page 16439, which is volume 15. There is reference there to four IA31 forms. He signs it obvious7y as
assistant commissioner for the deputy.
A. Yes, Chairman, I have those in front of me now, yes. Now, one of the matters that Garda Keogh has given evidence about, the complaint really, that you were appointed and they knew you were going to retire. Now did you retire at the normal age?
A. Yes. I retired on the last day of my service, according to the statutory age limit. I would have been 60 on the following day.
All right. In any event, as of the 25th June you had some 22 months of service ahead of you?
A. I had, indeed, Chairman. Yes.

353 Q. If we go to the next page, 16440?
A. Yes.

354 Q. This is the IA31 form in relation to Garda A?
A. Yes, indeed, Chairman.

355 Q. On top of the brief details of the act or conduct alleged, you were appointed to investigate the matters set out there?
A. That's correct.

356 Q. They're not specified breaches of discipline in the way that they are formulated. They are indicative of the conduct that you are required to inquire into?
A. That's correct, Judge, yes.

357 Q. You don't and weren't presented with, as it were, fully 14:39 fledged alleged breaches of discipline?
A. That's correct.

358 Q. They appear later in the process?
A. That's correct.

359 Q. Following upon the establishment of a board of inquiry, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. That's at the end of the investigative process, when a recommendation is made by the investigating officer.
Q. Yes. Now, I think that's all you received at that time, isn't that right? You received nothing with that, in terms of a file or any documents, statements or exhibits?
A. That's correct, Chairman.
Q. Yes. Well, we will come to that in due course, but what I am going to do is, perhaps counter intuitive, I am going to jump forward to the end of your tenure. Obviously those in headquarters, HRM, Internal Affairs, knew that you were actually going to retire in and around the period just before you did retire, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. You would get a notification that your tenure in the organisation was about to expire.
363 Q. Yes. Could we look at page 16434? Perhaps if we go to 16431, I beg your pardon.
A. okay.
Q. This is from Chief Superintendent Nyland to the assistant commissioner, Northern Region. It records there that you were appointed to investigate the matter and it says:
"In rel ation to Assistant Commissioner Nol an' s di sci pline investigation, as Assistant Commi ssioner Nol an is due to retire shortly fromAn Garda Sí ochána, he should be replaced as investigating officer in this matter to allow for a handover period before his retirement. Every effort should be made prior to Assistant Commissioner Nol an's retirement for any evi dence gathered to date in his investigation to be provi ded to the new officer."

Now, did you see any difficulty from your point of view as being replaced at that point in time?
A. I did not see any difficulty. I assumed that that would be the normal course of events, that the investigation would continue under a new investigating officer.

365 Q. Yes. Now, Chief Superintendent Nyland had referred to your report in a letter dated 16434. This is a letter from the chief superintendent to the assistant
commissioner. You have been asked, I think, by letter of the 4th April, at an earlier date obviously, to provide a report on the extent of your discipline investigation to date. I think Garda Adrian Cooke was
part of your team at that point in time?
A. That would be correct, Chairman.
Q. He said:
"Pl ease find attached report of Garda Adrian Cooke,
$14: 44$ regi onal organi sed crime investigation unit, dated 11th April 2017, whi ch was forwarded to deputy commi ssi oner Governance and Strategy on 3rd April 2017 by assistant commi ssi oner DMR.

Garda Cooke reports that at the time of his report there have been five conferences hel d at Dungarvan Garda station, chai red by Superintendent Lacey, with the most recent being 9th March 2017.

It is reported that a lengthy desktop revi ew of over 100 wi tness statements have been conducted and jobs have been issued where appropriate. A substantial body of work has been compl eted. A large number of witnesses, both civilian and Garda have yet to be approached about their origi nal statements made to the criminal investigation. Arrangements have been put in pl ace by the investi gation teamto interview approxi matel y 20 Garda witnesses and as many civilian witnesses in rel ation to their original statements.

It is reported that the investigation team consi sting of Superintendent M chael Lacey, Inspector Seamus Maher, Detecti ve Ser geant Shea Keevans, Sergeant Thomas
and Garda Adri an Cooke and D/ Garda Conor Breslin..."

There is a reference then to the suspension of Garda A. Then there is an issue then about your retirement and your replacement there. Garda Cooke's report is at page 16448, if we just perhaps look at that. You're familiar with this, I take it? Or you were at the time, I'm sure. It's dated the 8th Apri1.
A. It's directed to Superintendent Lacey.

367 Q. Yes.
A. I am not quite sure that $I$ saw this report before.
Q. Yes.
A. I would most likely be familiar with most of the contents.
369 Q. Yes.
370 Q. CHA RMAK This is a report of the progress of the Nolan report?
A. Yes.

371 Q. CHA RMAN of the Nolan investigation, I should say.
A. Yes.

372 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: This was your investigation at the time, obviously?
A. Yes, indeed.

373 Q. The matters are summarised there:
"Si nce 26th October 2016 there have been five conferences hel d at Dungarvan Garda station, chai red by Superintendent Lacey with the most recent being 9th March 2017."

Then it says:
"In order to streamine the matters under
i nvesti gation, three jobs books contai ning in excess of 120 j ob sheets have now been opened and address matters i ndi vi dually as follows..."

And then it describes the progress there. But was that the first conference held in the context of the disciplinary inquiry, October 2016?
A. That would be -- that's quite possible, that that was the first working conference as such.
374 Q. Yes. We will come back to the reasons for that, but we have seen from our papers, just to show you an example of Assistant Commissioner McMahon's view about an issue that is of potentially some relevance, that is the discipline inquiry being in abeyance. If we look at document 16465 , of the same book.
A. Yes, I have that.

375 Q. What happened when she had taken over the investigation was, that a statement had been obtained from Ms. B, which she referred on to the ó Cualáin inquiry as of February 2018. And she expresses the view here, in the second paragraph:

[^2]A. Okay. This would be after I have retired.
Q. Yes.
A. So I wouldn't be familiar with that particular aspect.

377 Q. Yes. She repeats that in other letters. But was your investigation in abeyance from the date that you were appointed until October 2016 ?
A. No, Judge. I sought the background information, the copies of witness statements and the investigation file in order that $I$ could familiarise myself, brief myself and also to bring an investigation team up to speed with the context and the background to the investigation. I never actually put or never sought to put the investigation into an abeyance. Indeed, at one stage I sought advice from our Internal Affairs or legal section, $I$ am not quite sure which it was at the time but $I$ am sure there is a record of it.

378 Q. Yes. We have Assistant Commissioner McMahon's completed investigation report, in which she gives a summary of matters relating to your period in that position?
A. Yes.
Q. Could I ask you to look at that? It's in Volume 42, commencing at page 11870. If we just start down at the bottom of that page, paragraph 3.1, it notes your appointment, it notes that you signed the IA32, which is the notice to the member concerned there that this relates to. And it appears from paragraph 3.3 that was signed on the 22nd July. There's an issue there about whether it should have contained eight or nine
allegations. But that was served on the garda and we will come back to him in a moment. But at paragraph 4.1, if we turn onto the next page, 11871, it says:
"A full copy of this investigation file which preci pitated this di sci pline inquiry was requested from the then Assistant Cormissi oner Donal Ó Cual ái n ."

Can you just help us as to the date that you first saw that?
A. It would have been very early in the investigation. The exact date, I can't recall right now, but if you can show me a document, I would...
Q. It goes into a little more specifics in terms of dates and we will come to those in due course. But it is a fact that you sought that?
A. I did indeed seek the investigation file, background information, copies of statements.
381 Q. Yes. At paragraph 4.2 it says:
"Certain concerns were rai sed by the then Assistant Commissioner Donal Ó Cual ái $n$ in respect of the provision of the complete investigation file and following on fromthose concerns there was a protracted period of time when legal advi ce was sought from Ken Ruane, head of Legal Affairs in respect of the issue."

Was that advice that you sought or that Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin sought?
A. It is my understanding that Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin sought that advice.
A. Yes.
Q. Did you see him as having a function in it?
A. The HRM section, Internal Affairs, department 6 within the HRM section and the executive director of HRM would be the head of that section. That's most likely why I wrote there. It would be pretty normal in an investigation that a copy of the file could be obtained via the HRM/Internal Affairs section.
Q. Yes. Perhaps you may or may not have been aware that the file had been completed at that time. Had you any knowledge of the progress of the investigation?
A. I didn't know whether the file was complete or not. I worked on the assumption that there would be material available, seeing as the request for an appointment to investigate disciplinary matters had been made.
386 Q. Yes. You seem to have written on the same date to Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin, if point number -no, sorry, you were writing also to Assistant Commissioner Kenny, is that right?
A. Assistant Commissioner Kenny would have been the
Q. Yes.
A. He was in the Northern Region, whether he was acting in the Western Region on that particular date, I'm not sure. i nqui ry and suggests a meeting is convened to di scuss the matter, whi ch is hel d at Garda HQ on 10th August 2015. "

Is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes. I certainly met with the then Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin in Garda Headquarters.

389 Q. Yes. We don't appear to have a note of that meeting from any source. Can you help us as to how that meeting progressed and what the outcome was?
A. Yes. My recollection of that meeting was, myself and Chief Superintendent Dominic Hayes attended and AC Ó Cualáin and I believe it was Superintendent Matt Nyland from the Internal Affairs section at that time.
A. We had a discussion about the investigation. And it was concluded that on7y witness statements would be made available.

391 Q. What was the rationale for that, if I could ask?
A. The rationale was, to the best of my recollection now, that the criminal investigation was still in progress and as such no file would have been forwarded to the DPP at that stage. So only the witness statements that were then available would be made available.
Q. Yes. But was it your expectation they would be made available to you immediately or as soon as may be?
A. Well, certainly as soon as they were available I would have expected them, yes.

393 Q
There is a reference to this issue of abeyance in a text sent to Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin by somebody else, as an issue that ought to go into his report. It doesn't appear to be in his report. But could I ask you just to look at that issue in terms of what the text says? It's at page 11384. It's part of Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin's disclosure. If we just down the page. It should appear on the screen or if you want to see the paper copy, it will be handed to you there. It's just a short paragraph there:
"I e-mail ed you the paragraph re A Nol an and the meeting where it was agreed to put it in abeyance pending the submissi on of your investigation file. I thi nk I have made it too wordy and I amtrying to figure out where best to put a full stop. Everything el se is compl ete."

There wasn't, as I see it, any reference to the meeting or the disciplinary inquiry being put into abeyance,
but that appears to suggest that there had been a decision reached to put the disciplinary inquiry into abeyance as a result of the meeting?
A. I cannot comment on that. I haven't seen this before.

394 Q. Yes.
A. I am not quite sure of the context.
Q. Okay. Let's leave the text aside. Was it your position that your inquiry under the discipline regulations was in abeyance until the criminal investigation had finished?
A. That's not my recollection, because I did not have enough material to come to a decision or a conclusion that an investigation should be put into an abeyance, bearing in mind that the general principle is that investigations should be conducted as swiftly and as expeditiously as possible.
396 Q. Yes. In any event, going back to the sequence as outlined in the McMahon report, for convenience. At page 11872 , at the bottom, point number 10 .
A. Yes, I can see that, number 10 , yes. That would appear 14:59 to be in order, yes.
397 Q. Were you made aware that Detective Superintendent Mulcahy was the point of contact with the confidential reporter, Garda Keogh?
A. I don't recall that, because I was dealing direct with 15:00 the private secretary to the Commissioner, as the conduit for anything to do with confidential reporting or confidential recipient. That would be the normal -that was the normal route when confidential reporting
was involved.
398 Q. Yes. It would appear that Garda Keogh was informed of your appointment by Detective Superintendent Mulcahy on 3rd September 2015. This is a report, Chairman, you have previously seen when Detective Superintendent Mulcahy was giving evidence. It is his report of the 3rd September 2015. If we just look at page 7688. And if we go down to the very last paragraph on that. The report is dated the 3 rd September. This relates to events on the 30th July. He says:
"I made contact with the confidential reporter, he advised me he had witten a letter about the i nvesti gation to the $M$ nister for Justice and the office of Director of Public Prosecutions. On the same 15:01 date I advised the confidential reporter that a di sci pline investi gation had al so commenced and was bei $n g$ overseen by Assi stant Commi ssi oner Jack Nol an. The confidential reporter stated that there were two ot her investigations with GSOC. "

There is the reference then to another person and a reference to you there. In terms of your investigation, just going back to the sequence at 11873. It would appear that there was some element of public controversy brought out in October of 2015, because Deputy Daly and a reporter, Mr. John Burke from RTÉ, raised the issue publicly. Do you recall that being made an issue at the time
A. I recall that this occurred, that there was publicity about the investigation.
399 Q. Yes.
A. I didn't have anything to do with that publicity.

400 Q. Yes. Well, perhaps we will look at Volume 39, page 11022. This would appear to have been a query -sorry?
A. Thank you. 11022, yes.

401 Q. Yes. A query initiated I think in the normal way between Mr. Burke and the Press office?
A. Okay, yes.

402 Q. And it's raising an issue, if we go down the page, it says:
"Can you gi ve me an update in rel at ion to an issue we previ ously covered on the Thi s Week radio programme some weeks ago; specifically the deci si on by the Garda Commíssi oner Nói rín Ơ Sul Ii van to appoint Assi stant Commissi oner AJ Nol an to take a leading role in the di sci plinary process into a seni or garda, despite the expressi on of concern by a Garda whi stl ebl ower that they had a concern over a possi ble conflict of interest bet ween the seni or garda in question, who was under i nvesti gation and AC Nol an.

What steps are being taken to ascertain the exi stence of conflict of interest as between the two men as al l eged.

Is Assi stant Commi ssi oner Nol an still performing the task as descri bed, taking a seni or role in the internal di sci pl inary investigation or has he been asked to step asi de fromthis role, as he had vol unteered to step
asi de. "

I think that related not to the to Garda A but to one of the other members that you were also being asked to investigate, that reference to a senior guard?
A. Yes, that is another member --

403 Q. Another member.
A. -- mentioned on the IA32, yes.
Q. This appears to have been the subject of further discussion on the This week radio programme on 4th October 2014. Do you recal1 that being raised at the time?
A. I didn't hear the radio programme. But it was brought to my attention that the investigation had been raised on the radio programme. Then I sought advice as to whether I should continue in the role of investigator in this particular disciplinary case. And I wrote to Assistant Commissioner Kenny, who, as I have outlined, held that administrative function associated with disciplinary investigations. And he subsequently responded to me that he had no concerns about my role

405 Q. Yes. The transcript of that radio programme is at page 11025, going on to page 11026.
A. I have not seen this before now.

406 Q. Is that right.
A. Absolutely, yes.

407 Q. okay. I am really just concerned to ask you about one particular portion, which is there now on the screen. It says:
"I ndependent TD Cl are Daly has al so rai sed this issue in the Dáil since the Dáil has resumed. We are now told that an examination is being carried out by gardaí in rel ation to issues raised. Those issues being that there is a potential conflict of interest bet ween this hi gh ranking Garda appoi nted to lead the di sci pl inary i nqui ry into the seni or Garda the subject of that i nqui ry. So our understanding is that this has led to the di sci pl inary inqui ry being temporarily suspended pending the out come of that investigation."

Is it factually correct that you suspended the disciplinary inquiry for this reason alleged?
A. No. I never suspended the disciplinary investigation.

408 Q. This appears to have led to a Parliamentary Question then to the Minister. If we look at page 11042 to 3. 11042 is the Commissioner's private secretary referring the assistant commissioner in the Western Region, who would have been your appointing officer, to the $P Q$, which is attached there. And then on the next page, the PQ is there. It's a simple -- it looked like a simple enough question to the Minister, asking that she provide an update on the investigations into serious
allegations. And it says in the substantial paragraph, in the middle there:
"As a result of this investigation, several possible di sciplinary issues arose that need to be examined. The assistant cormi ssi oner that was appointed to carry out the di sciplinary investigation in respect of the first confidential reporter was so appoi nted as he had not had any previous dealings with the confidential reporter."

That is factually correct, isn't it? You had no previous dealings?
A. I had no previous dealings with the confidential reporter. That's absolutely correct.
409 Q. "The confidential reporter since indicated he was not happy with this appointment. This has al so been rai sed in recent media reports and legal advice has been sought as to how best to proceed at this time and in particular whether the option of referring the di sci plinary matters to the Garda Sí ochána Onbudsman Commission is available."

You have referred yourself there to legal advice. Is this you seeking legal advice from Mr. Ruane or Legal Affairs generally?
A. I haven't seen this material before now.

410 Q. Yes.
A. And in one of my pieces of correspondence to the office
of the Commissioner, I point out that I was unsighted as to the paper trails around this particular issue.
411 Q. Yes.
A. So I have never seen this before.

412 Q. Yes. I am really just asking you then about the previous answer you gave me, that you did seek legal advice?
A. I did seek legal advice on several aspects. One, about putting the matter into an abeyance; and two, whether I should continue with my investigation.
413 Q. Yes. I am not asking you to disclose the legal advice, but did you put the matter into abeyance at any stage or did you continue with the investigation?
A. I did not put the matter into -- I did not put the investigation into an abeyance at any time. I continued with the investigation but did I have the material that enabled me to continue the investigation.
414 Q. Yes. All right. Could we return to Assistant Commissioner McMahon's report and the timeline given there? If you go back to page 11873.
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. Point 13, it's going back slightly in time.
A. Yes.

416 Q. You're being informed by Assistant Commissioner Nolan that you had no prior knowledge of the investigation?
A. Sorry, I'm being informed, by Chief Superintendent ward.

417 Q. Chief Superintendent ward, I beg your pardon, that, and that you should liaise with the Northern Region on the
matter?
A. Yes.
Q. The issue then arose, at point 15 of the correspondence, relating to your views on Garda A and any concerns displayed by local management. Do you
A. Okay, I recollect this. when I corresponded with Chief Superintendent Ward in Internal Affairs, I believe I was corresponding with him about issues raised by the chief superintendent of whom allegations had been raised. And he replied that he had no prior knowledge and that I should contact Assistant Commissioner Kenny in the Northern Region, who was the original appointing officer. And that $I$ believe is the sequence in that, Chairman.

419 Q. Yes. Perhaps we could look at Volume 39, page 11039.
A. Yes, I have that.

420 Q. It would appear that as a result of your service of the discipline form on Garda A, that he brought that to Superintendent Murray's attention and Superintendent Murray said that he:
"... would be obl iged if enquiries could be made to ascertain if Garda A presents a risk by being left in the present workpl ace. "

Etcetera. Now, Superintendent wheatley, if we go back to 11038 , reports the matter up to the Chief Superintendent in Internal Affairs. That was Chief

Superintendent Ward, I think, was it?
A. Internal Affairs would have been Chief Superintendent ward at that time, yes.
421 Q. This is referred on to you, if we look at page 11037. There's an e-mail from Assistant Commissioner Fanning there, saying:
"Pl ease see attached whi ch makes concerni ng readi ng. I appreci ate if this matter could be progressed urgently and the question of his suitability for the workplace be eval uated urgently. Pl ease let me knowif there is anything I can add to my previ ous correspondence."

You appear to send that on to David McCarthy, if we look at the top of that page, 11037?
A. Okay, yes.

422 Q. For discussion Tuesday?
A. Okay.

423 Q. Just to clarify matters, who is David McCarthy?
A. David McCarthy would have been the inspector in the regional office in Kilkenny, in the Southeastern Region.

424 Q. Yes. That would appear to be the context for your correspondence with Assistant Commissioner Kenny, which is referred to at point 15 , if we go back to page 11873?
A. That's correct.

425 Q. Is that correct then?
A. Yes, that would appear to be, yes.

426 Q. Did you become at some stage that Garda A had in fact been suspended?
A. I don't recall anybody telling me about it.

427 Q. Yes. I think you subsequently received letters from Garda A's solicitors, but we will come to those in due 15:15 course?
A. Okay.
Q. You may recall that?
A. I recall those, yes.

429 Q. The issue of your correspondence with Ken Ruane appears 15:15 to be dealt with at points 19 onwards to 22 , on page 11874. During this period had you received anything from the ó Cualáin investigation, to the best of your knowledge?
A. Just on those points.
Q. Yes.
A. I believe that that record relates to Mr. Ruane's correspondence with AG in relation to advices for the Commissioner, as distinct for advices for me.
431 Q. Yes. We11 at point 22, it appears that you had correspondence in early December with Mr. Ruane.
A. Yes.

432 Q. I think there is some advice there?
A. Yes, and I sought his advice and he responded that his section did not provide advice in relation to disciplinary investigations.

433 Q. Yes. Was that a surprise or did you expect to be getting that advice?
A. I probably expected to get the advice, seeing as I
asked for advice.
434 Q. Yes. At point 23 there, it records Assistant Commissioner Kenny corresponded with you stating there is no issue with the discipline investigation progressing?
A. Yes. Assistant Commissioner Kenny would have replied in that vein. I think I outlined that earlier.
Q. Yes. It is said:
"It is al so noted that none of the members named in the 15:17 al leged breaches obj ected to the appoi nt ment of Assistant Commissioner Nol an, nor did the confidential reporter."
A. Yes.

436 Q. Was any objection to your appointment made known to you directly or indirectly?
A. No objection to my appointment was made known to me directly. We have already touched off the issues that were raised in the radio programme, but nobody made that to me directly.
437 Q. Yes. The issue of legal advice seems to be bubbling along there in points 24,25 . And you're recorded then at point 26 as:
"Corresponded with Assistant Commissioner Kenny citing concerns rai sed of his appointment as investigating officer and the current employment stat us of one of the naned nembers under investi gation."

And you are recorded then as enquiring is there any reason for preventing your progression of this discipline.
A. Yes.

438 Q. Do you recall getting a reply to that at that point in time?
A. I believe the reply to that was the response from Assistant Commissioner Kenny to say that he no concerns about myself conducting the disciplinary investigation. There was at the next point, there was also a correspondence ongoing in relation to queries that the chief superintendent had raised about the validity of the disciplinary allegations made concerning him and I corresponded again with AC Kenny, who would have drafted the original alleged breaches.
A. The advice I got was that they were a mere outline of potential breaches of discipline, as distinct from being the actual breaches that would be preferred, if we got to a board of inquiry in due course.

441 Q. CHA RMAN They were headings, not charges, if you like.
A. Correct. Correct, Chair.

442 Q. MR. MGGU NESS: we have a letter from chief
Superintendent wheatley to Internal Affairs of the 26 th January, at page 9587. If we just perhaps look at that, just very briefly. It's the paragraph at the bottom of that page. It says:

# "The di sci pline investigation being conducted by Assi stant Commissioner Nol an has commenced and is currently ongoing. It is antici pated that the di sci pline investigation will only be concl uded following a determination in respect of the criminal matters under investigation." <br> Then it continues on over the page: 

"In the light of the foregoing, the continued suspensi on of the member from duty to allow for these matters to be brought to a conclusion is recommended. "

Does that paragraph on the previous page represent what was happening in your investigation?
A. Could I just go back and see it again.

443 Q. Yes. Scroll back. Just the last paragraph at the bottom?
A. Who is this addressed to?

444 Q. That is addressed to Internal Affairs?
A. Oh right, okay.

CHA RMAN Just go down, Peter, so that we can see the whole thing.
MR. MEGU NESS: It is not suggesting that it is --
CHA RMAN Sorry, just one second, Mr. McGuinness. No, go down the other way so we take it from the top first of all. You can see this on the screen? I would like to see the heading, I would like to see the top of the
page and then I would like to move to the bottom of the page. Go further, so we see the full top of the page. okay. Thanks very much. Chief superintendent Internal Affairs, and it's going down. Do you see that?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Does that make sense?
A. Indeed, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. No, go down to the bottom, Peter. Thanks very much.
MR. MEGUNESS: It's not saying that it's in abeyance, it says it's currently ongoing but it's anticipated that it will only be concluded following the determination in respect of the criminal matters. would that reflect your position vis-à-vis the disciplinary inquiry?
A. Normally a criminal investigation would take precedence over a disciplinary investigation.

CHA RMAN of course.
447 Q. M. MEGUNESS: And even then, if it proceeds to a prosecution, the disciplinary aspect will await that?
A. Correct. Correct.
Q. Could we look at page 9589? It's only two pages down from that. This is sent by Assistant Commissioner Kenny to you, which is the correspondence from the chief superintendent of Internal Affairs. So if we go to 9590 , the next page, we will see what that is. There's a reference there in the middle paragraph there:
"Records at this office indi cate that in August 2015 Assi stant Commissi oner Nol an intended to pl ace the di sci pline investigation in abeyance pending the out come of the criminal investigation."

Then last:
"By way of clarification, l amto enquire as to the present position of the di sci pl ine investi gation being conducted by Assi stant Commissioner Nol an in rel ation to this matter, in particular if it remains in abeyance at present. If the matter was placed in abeyance in August 2015, I al so wi sh to seek confirmation as to whet her Assi stant Commi ssi oner Nol an informed the members concerned at that time."

Do you recall that being referred to you?
A. Obviously that documentation was addressed to me. I may have seen it, I believe I replied that the matter was -- that the investigation was never placed in abeyance and I'm not sure, I don't know anything about the records retained in Internal Affairs section.

449 Q. Yes. Perhaps we would go back down then to the sequence in Assistant Commissioner McMahon's report?
A. okay.

450 Q. At page 11875. It has at point 29 there:
"9th February - I nspector Farrell di ssemi nates date for conference for the nomi nated investi gation teamto
attend. "

Can you recollect, had you been made aware that Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin had submitted his investigation file to the Director at that point in time?
A. I don't think I was ever made aware of that.

451 Q. It would appear that you made additional appointments to the investigation team then at point 31 ?
A. That's correct. At point 32, this has you notifying Internal Affairs that you never sought to have it placed in abeyance?
A. That would appear to be the response to the query on the last information item.

454 Q. Yes. That you notified the chief superintendent in Mullingar then, at point 34 , that it remained ongoing?
A. Okay. Yes.
Q. I think just to look at that, it's Volume 39, page 11178. Now, that's your letter to the chief superintendent, isn't that correct?
A. That's my letter, definitely, yes.

456 Q. The director's decision had been made, as it were, or communicated in early March, it's dated 3rd March 2016. At point 34 of the narrative, on page 11875, at the bottom of the page, after you send this letter, it
says:
"Assi stant Commi ssi oner Nol an notified Deputy
Commíssi oner Ó Cual ái $n$ that all i mpedi ments had been cl arified in respect of criminal investigation file and 15:27 that a copy is now requested to fully brief the di sci pl ine i nqui ry team "

And at point 35, on the next page, 11876, it is recorded here that:
"Deputy Commi ssi oner Ó Cual ái $n$ di rects that onl y witness statements contai ned within it be made available."

As of this point, had you received anything?
A. I don't recal1 receiving a written notification that the DPP had directed no prosecution.

457 Q. Yes.
A. But from this, the tone of this correspondence, it
would potentially indicate that $I$ had been told in some form or other that's why the investigation was constituted. And it would appear, that's what it would appear to me. But I don't recall getting a copy of the DPP's instructions or anything to that effect. I am not saying it didn't come to the office, but I don't recall seeing it.

458 Q. Yes. The sequence of events is set out here. Point 36, you're corresponding with Internal Affairs looking
for a copy of the witness statements. They reply that they don't have them. There's an e-mail sent to Superintendent mulcahy seeking them. A reply saying they're preparing them, that they are going to be provided. And at point 41, it says more or less you don't want any further delaying the matter; is that correct?
A. Yes. I recall contacting retired Superintendent mulcahy saying that we can't countenance any further delays now.

459 Q. And I think you were given them the next day, is that right?
A. That's correct. They came by e-mail to the office e-mail, as far as I recollect.
460 Q. Yes. Point 43 refers to an issue relating to some media reports relating to GSOC?
A. Yes.

461 Q. And their conducting an investigation?
A. Yes.

462 Q. Did you go to a meeting with GSoc at some point, can you recall?
A. Yes. A media report, I think it was the Sunday Business post, had an article about GSOC investigation into the same set of circumstances. I enquired then as to were GSOC conducting an investigation, because a GSOC investigation normally over takes a Garda disciplinary investigation. I then subsequently -- and it took many months to arrange a meeting with GSOC, and the meeting was subsequently held, and the date is
probably in this chronology of events, somewhere along there.
463 Q. Yes. If we go to the next page, 11877, at point 44. You're told by Internal Affairs that GSOC had been notified of the matters?
A. Yes. Under investigation the previous year?
A. Yes.
Q. And that it wasn't known what course of action they'd be taking?
A. Yes.

466 Q. I think point 45 there reflects your proposal that a meeting be convened?
A. Yes, that would appear to be accurate, yes.

467 Q. I think ultimately it came to pass that they were suggesting that they would have a representative, a senior investigating officer at case conferences relating to the discipline inquiry?
A. Yes. And then the legality or appropriateness of that became the subject of examination, as to whether that was covered in the legislation within the Garda Síochána Act, etcetera.

468 Q. Yes.
A. And I recall that the advices from Internal Affairs was that this didn't appear to be an appropriate course of action.

469 Q. Yes. It didn't proceed on that basis, it proceeded on the basis of your appointment under --
A. The Garda Síochána disciplinary regulations.

470 Q. Garda discipline regulations?

## A. That's correct.

471 Q. Your assembly of the investigating team that you had appointed?
A. Yes.

472 Q. That was sanctioned and the investigations that they had done up to that point?
A. Correct.

473 Q. At point 49, this appears to record then the first conference held, is that right?
A. Yes. That appears to be right. Yes.

474 Q. The issue then of Garda Keogh's consent being sought to the use of his statements and the disclosure of his identity I think obviously also arose and arrangements were made to have --
A. That's right, over the Christmas period of that year.

475 Q. -- him then interviewed?
A. Yes.
Q. And give his consent. That took place on 22nd February 2017, is that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

477 Q. The next matter recorded is that it was placed -- the discipline investigation was placed into abeyance due to the retirement. But Garda Cooke's report that we looked at, at the beginning, did that represent the sum 15:33 total of the work that had been done under your stewardship up to that point?
A. Yes. Yes. That was it. Yes.

MR. MEGI NESS: Thank you, assistant commissioner. If
you would answer any other questions.
A. Thank you very much.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHAI RMAN Now.
MR. O BRI EN Just one question. CHA RMAN Certain7y.

## RETI RED ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER J ACK NOLAN WAS

 CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. $O$ BRI EN AS FOLLOVS:478 Q. MR. O BRI EN Assistant commissioner, you were appointed, as we know, in Ju7y 2015 and you retired in April 2017. So, as Mr. McGuinness outlined, a window of about 22 months while you were in charge of the investigation. Would you accept that the delay compromised the investigation during that period? That there was a period of delay and that it compromised the investigation?
A. Well, I think with Mr. McGuinness we have gone through the chronology of many issues that emerged that needed to be fleshed out or finalised during the course of what on the surface looks like a lengthy period of time, but there were particular reasons for each, statements were not available for a considerable period.
479 Q. But there was a delay though, wasn't there, assistant
commissioner?
A. Well, it's a lengthy period of time. As regards whether it was a delay, it wasn't a matter that things were not being considered or things were not being done, it just wasn't possible to move on due to the issues that emerged.

480 Q. Was there any particular reason why the investigation team didn't meet with Garda Keogh until 2nd January 2017?
A. Well, it would be related to the finalisation of all the issues that had emerged, which we have gone through in chronological order here, unless we need to go back through them all again.
481 Q. Finally, would you accept that those delays in that period are to the discredit of Garda Keogh?
A. I wouldn't think they were. That would not be my understanding.

MR. O BRI EN $I$ don't have any further questions, Chairman.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Now, anybody else? No. Yes, Mr. Murphy.

MR. MRPHY: A few questions arise, Chairman.

RETI RED ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER J ACK NOLAN MAS THEN EXAM NED BY MR. MRPHY, AS FOLLOVG:

482 Q. MR. MRPHY: Assistant commissioner, can I ask you in relation to the questions you have just been asked. You outlined to Mr. McGuinness that the fact that the criminal investigation conducted by the ó Cualáin team was clearly a very important investigation?
A. Absolutely.

483 Q. Is it the case from what you have said to
Mr. McGuinness that you had to approach the material in that investigation with care because it was a protected disclosure and had that special feature?
A. That would be a very fair summation, yes.

484 Q. In terms of your interaction with Commissioner
Ó Cualáin, I think the position was from all that you can demonstrate in your evidence that there was a joint concern to make sure nothing was done to impede the criminal investigation or slow it down?
A. That is accurate, yes.

485 Q. Insofar as have you sought legal advice or spoken to your colleagues as outlined in the communications trail which Mr. McGuinness has outlined, it's been suggested that this was all effectively discrediting to Garda Keogh. Did anything you did or not do at the time discredit Garda Keogh?
A. I don't believe anything emerged that discredited Garda Keogh during that time.
486 Q. When we look at page 11877, which is the 2nd February

> 2017?
A. Yes.

487 Q. At that stage it says that Superintendent Lacey and Inspector Maher met with Garda Keogh at Portlaoise Garda station?
A. Yes, that's correct.

488 Q. During that meeting Garda Keogh provided consent for his disciplinary investigation to use al1 his previous witness statements?
A. That's correct.

489 Q. During the course of your tenure in the conduct of the disciplinary investigation, did Garda Keogh ever complain to you or to your staff that you're collectively or individually discrediting him by delaying the investigation deliberately?
A. No, Chairman, not to my knowledge.

490 Q. In fact, did he cooperate with your investigation at the time?
A. He did, indeed, yes.

491 Q. Can I ask you please just to be shown page 120? This 15:38 is Garda Keogh's statement to this Tribunal. Can I just draw your attention to the second paragraph. In the middle of that paragraph, there is a sentence beginning "subsequently, Assi stant Commissi oner Jack Nol an" do you see that paragraph?
A. Yes.

492 Q. First of al1, I think it says:
"Assi stant Commi ssi oner Jack Nol an was appoi nt ed by

Commissi oner Nói rín O Sul Iivan to carry out di sci plinary investigation' into [blank] and Garda A in rel ation to my substantive complaint not withstanding the fact Jack Nol an had been the subject of criticism in the report of the honourable Mr. Justice Fennelly."

Just pausing there for a moment, that was factually false?
A. That is an incorrect assertion, yes.

493 Q. And the Fennelly report, I understand, you agree with me, is available publicly on the internet?
A. Publicly available.

494 Q. And in your statement I think the quotation which Mr. MCGuinness referred to is coming from that report?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

495 Q. And this is a statement made in preparation for this Tribunal?
A. Yes.
Q. And then moving on, to add fuel to the fire, this statement says that you:
"J ack Nol an was al so under si mul taneousl y under i nvestigation by GSOC in respect of di scl osure of confidential information contrary to the Garda Sí ochána Act 2005 and the Protected Disclosures Act 2014."

Is that true or false?
A. That's false, Judge.

497 Q. Insofar as both of these points are made in a statement
to this Tribunal, perhaps you'd indicate to the Chairman how you felt when these things were said wrongly about you?
A. Judge, I fee 1 very disappointed that such comments would be made about myself personally when they are totally inaccurate.

498 Q. Thank you very much.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN okay. Very good.
MR. MEGI NNESS: Nothing further.
THE WTNESS: Thank you, Judge, thank you very much.
CHA RMAN Thank you, assistant commissioner. Thank you.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

MS. MEGRATH Thank you, Chairman. The next witness is Superintendent Michael Lacey, please.
CHA RMAK okay.

## SUPERI NTENDENT M CHAEL LACY, HAV NG BEEN SUDRN, WAS

DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY ME. MEGRATH, AS FOLLOVG:

THE WTNESS: Superintendent Michae1 Lacey. CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Good afternoon, superintendent. Thank you.
MS. MtGRATH Thank you, superintendent. Your
statement is at page 15751 of the book.
Superintendent, I think at the time when you made the statement to the Tribunal you said you were attached to Dungarvan Garda station, is that right?
A. That's correct.

500 Q. Are you still in that position?
A. I am, indeed.

501 Q. okay. I think you had been attached to that station then for a number of years. You were certainly attached to the station during the disciplinary investigation, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

502 Q. okay. Would it be fair to describe you as the lead investigator or one of the lead investigators of that disciplinary investigation?
A. I was appointed to assist Assistant Commissioner Nolan in the investigation and continued that on with Assistant Commissioner McMahon.

503 Q. Okay. Vis-à-vis the team and hierarchy in your investigation team, can you just tell the Chairman who was it?
A. There was myself -- well, Assistant Commissioner Nolan was appointed as investigating officer, I was appointed to assist and then there was a number of personne1 from around the region selected to also participate. Sergeant Keevans, a number of other personne1, two other people from Dublin and then other people then were attached when Assistant Commissioner McMahon took
it up.
504 Q. Okay. And you were appointed on $24 / 2 / 2016$; is that right?
A. That's correct.

505 Q. You knew that at that time the investigation had been going on for a number of months at that stage, it commenced on 25th June 2015, under the retired Assistant Commissioner Nolan, is that right?
A. Yes. I was aware he was appointed to investigate, yes.

506 Q. okay. Now, can I ask you just to look at notes in and around this time? As I say, your date of appointment is 24th February 2016. Can I just ask you to look at page 15800 of the brief please. If Mr. Kavanagh can scroll down there please a moment. So that was 15800 , please. Are these your notes that you provided to the Tribuna1?
A. Yes.

507 Q. Okay. These are the typed versions. I know we have handwritten versions as well, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

508 Q. Now, you see the date there is 25th February 2016, which is a date after your appointment but what I want to ask you about first is the entry beforehand. So if Mr. Kavanagh scrol1s back up. It's 15800 again. You see there at the top, it's not dated. I am just presuming it was before the 25 th?
A. It was the 24 th.

509 Q. So it was on the 24th, okay.
A. Yes.

510
Q. Can we just look at that note? You say there is a meeting in Kilkenny re the Athlone investigation, is that right?
A. That's what I was saying, in the regional office in Kilkenny, yes.
Q. Assistant Commissioner Nolan to seek advice re-interview of confidential reporter Nicky Keogh, is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

512 Q. A number of issues arise. There is one there just at 15:44 the end of this meeting:
"Pat Murray, superintendent At hl one, arranged meeting."

Do you remember that?
A. Yes, he was the district officer in Ath1one I think at the time and just to arrange with a meeting with him to tell him that we were part of the discipline investigation team and to make the necessary kind of connections, that we would get material or meet people or arrange to meet guards etcetera, during the course of the investigation.
513 Q. Okay. And did that happen and was it just a courtesy meeting?
A. That was a courtesy meeting, yes.
A. No, he was never interviewed. No.

515 Q. That's right. Okay.
A. It was just to make the necessary arrangements.

516 Q. Then, as we note there, the following day you also have a note of some work that you were doing on the investigation. I think nothing is arising there. Now, I think at the time that you were appointed, you just heard from the retired assistant commissioner there that there was an issue with regard to receiving the Ó Cualáin material, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

517 Q. In fact, you came in, in February and it was May by the time that material came in, in 2016, is that right?
A. That's correct.

518 Q. Okay. Now, you then have also provided a note for a meeting. There was meeting reference there and an issue arose in respect of GSOC. You heard the evidence just recently there with the assistant commissioner, that there was an issue regarding GSOC and there was a meeting with GSOC. And you gave us those notes at 15801. In fact, if you just scroll down, Mr. Kavanagh. 20/9/2016, is that right?
A. That's correct.

519 Q. I think all of that page relates to that meeting, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

520 Q. I think you say who is there, including Robbie Butler from GSOC. If you keep going down please, Mr. Kavanagh. I think very early on, do you see there in the middle:
"I ntervi ew protected di scl osee. "

Is that meant to reference Nicholas Keogh there?
A. Yes.

521 Q. Okay. So very early on this issue is alive as to whether or not the team is going to meet and interview Garda Keogh; is that right?
A. I suppose it's to make the necessary arrangements and how to go about that, in relation to getting permissions to meet Garda Keogh and interview him in respect of the statements or the allegations he was making.

522 Q. Okay. We know and I think you will accept that it's several months, in fact the following year in February before it actually happens, isn't that right?
A. Yes. I think it was February 2017 I met with Garda Keogh, myself and Inspector Maher.

523 Q. Okay. We will stay with the sequence of the years, because you're now in September 2016, we have heard from the assistant commissioner that the first case conference is 9th November 2016. But can I ask you, you also provided us with the jobs book for your investigation. I just want to ask you about one question from the jobs book. It's at page 8510. Do you see that? I think that is a jobs book from your investigation, is that right?
A. That is just the status, it's not the actual jobs book but the status of each of the jobs.

524 Q. okay. If you just go down to the end of the page, I wanted to ask you about number 15 , job number 15 . So
it refers there and it's yourself, you're tasked with this:
"Pul se intel li gence record 4085409 indi cates Mb. B was deal ing in her oi $n$. I ntelli gence created by Garda Ni chol as Keogh on 18th May 2014. Obtai n statement in respect of this intelligence report from Garda Keogh. "
A. Yes.

Again there is another reference then to getting a statement from Garda Keogh, and this was on a specific 15:47 issue, did that ever happen?
A. He was interviewed in February 2017 and he provided his statement in relation to the allegations he was making. So if you look at the statement that he gave you, because I suppose we are reaching that point now in any 15:48 event, is this the one you're talking about, at page 5974? Is that it?
"On today's date in Portlaoi se Garda station by appoi nt ment."
A. Yes.
Q. That's yourself and at the time it was Inspector Maher. That's the statement he gave you, is that right?
A. Yes.

528 Q. But you'd accept that it's not a statement of statement of a Q\&A in relation to the intelligence issue?
A. No.

529 Q. Okay. But he hands over material to you?
A. Yes.

530 Q. Okay. But if we are being precise, you didn't obtain the statement from him on that issue?
A. That's correct.

531 Q. Okay. Now, you met him on that particular day and you 15:48 took the statement from him. Can I ask you something, that's your record of the meeting with him, is that right?
A. That's the statement, yes.

532 Q. Okay. It's just that when he was giving his evidence, and that is at page 104, I will Mr. Kavanagh to bring it up. Sorry, Day 104 and it's at page 102. So Day 104 of the transcripts, and it is page 102, line 11. And he is saying:
"Except that, when I met Superintendent Lacey and I nspector Maher, I actually poi nted out, there's four members that's being di sci pl ined but two of them shoul dn't be di sci pl i ned. That they were spreading, spreading, let's say, the wrongdoing out to make it appear naybe basi cally less serious. Spreading it out. I poi nted out to them that two of those l bel ieve shoul dn't have been disciplined in rel ation to that."

Etcetera. And he goes on like that. Do you remember this conversation with him?
A. He may have spoken about that, I'm not sure. But I know that the appointment that we were investigating, there was four members and two were from the drugs unit
in Dublin, the national drugs unit.
533 Q. Do you have any notes?
A. No.

534 Q. You have provided handwritten and typed notes?
A. No.

535 Q. But we didn't see any notes for that around date?
A. No.

536 Q. Is that right? But do you accept that he may have said that to you?
A. He may have, yes, he may have.

537 Q. okay. Can I ask you this then: We know and we have heard that the investigation then takes on a new assistant commissioner, Assistant Commissioner McMahon, isn't that right, on 26th Apri1 2017?
A. That's correct.

538 Q. Okay. Now one of the issues that Garda Keogh has is that he wasn't notified as to who was taking over the investigation. If I can just -- this issue -- there's no need to bring up the transcript unless you wish me to, but Assistant Commissioner McMahon was asked about this:
"Di d anybody tell hi mabout your appoi nt ment?"

This is Day 140. And she said she didn't do so, but she understood that Garda Keogh and the four guards would be notified. Was that your job? Is that something that you considered that you should have done?

539 Q. Okay. Who do you think would generally notified the persons involved?
A. In relation to a discipline investigation, the members concerned would be notified by the investigating officer.
Q. The investigating officer?
A. Or the appointing officer.

So is it your evidence to the Chair that Assistant Commissioner McMahon had the responsibility to notify the four gardaí and Garda Keogh?
A. We11, I think she referenced that in her evidence as well, that she enquired if they had been notified.

542 Q. I think we might as well open it up, if there is an issue about it. Day 140 and it's page 11. Keep going down. She said:
"I got confirmation that the guards who were the subject of the investigation were notified. I didn't get any confirmation that Garda Keogh was notified."

But what I am asking you is: whose job was it to do the notification and was it your team or not or you as one of the investigators or not?
A. No. Assistant Commissioner McMahon sought the application in that regard. We were dealing with a discipline investigation. It certainly wasn't my function to notify Garda Keogh.
543 Q. Okay. Now, that's in April and we know then that the
investigation continued throughout. You have other notes in your diary, which move us into the period of 2018. That's at page 15803. I am going to look at both your statement and just look at this page. And this is just the final issue I want to put to you.

This was an issue which arose in respect of contacts made with Garda Keogh to update him on the investigation. I wonder if you are aware from the transcripts that there was this issue as to whether he was kept updated in relation to your investigation. Now, we have a meeting here on 14th August 2018 and this is a meeting in Dublin, do you see that, at the end?
A. Sorry.

544 Q. You see the attendees there, you have Assistant Commissioner McMahon. You have Orla McPartlin there. I think she subsequently did a peer review on the investigation?
A. That's correct.

545 Q. Do you remember, can you confirm if she was at this
A. She was.

546 Q. Okay. She was there, Chief Superintendent Nyland, who is Internal Affairs, and Margaret Nugent was Internal Affairs at that stage; isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

547 Q. And D/Inspector Coppinger, was he then from the criminal side, the criminal investigation side?
A. Yes.

548 Q. And Inspector S Maher and Sergeant John Grace. I think these were your team, I think Garda Henry Burke, Garda Adrian Cooke, is that right?
A. That's correct.

549 Q. If you go on down. There is a discussion there concerning the statement of Ms. B and concerning Garda A. I think at this stage, isn't it by this stage that her statement had been withdrawn? I think she withdraw it on the 2nd August, is that right?
A. Through her solicitor, yes.

550 Q. Okay. So this was the live issue. Was this the live issue, I should ask you, at this meeting?
A. It was a discussion, yes, certainly was, yes. The meeting was arranged to discuss this issue.
551 Q. okay. Through the solicitor's statement -- sorry, it says:
"Though sol icitor statement withdrawn and wants no further contact with gardaí criminal investigation to re-i nt ervi ew Garda A and ME. B regarding di scl osure made by MS. B."

Is that an accurate record of the...
A. That's my record, yes.

552 Q. Was there a discussion of putting the discipline 15:56 investigation on hold or not because this was to happen, do you remember that?
A. It certain7y would have been a factor to consider because if the Gardaí, the criminal investigation team
were going to re-interview Ms. B and Garda A in respect of this particular aspect in her statement, then we wouldn't be interviewing Garda A in respect of disciplinary matters until that was concluded. okay. But was there an express discussion with regard to suspending the criminal investigation to allow this issue to proceed or what do you recal1?
A. That's my note of the meeting and I would imagine that if a decision was made to interview Garda A in respect of this, following interview with Ms. B, then the discipline side wouldn't continue to interview Garda A until such time as that had been done.
554 Q. CHA RMAN Do you think that was the understanding of the people at the meeting?
A. Yes, yes.

555 Q. CHA RMAN In other words, even if they didn't say, we11 that means --
A. Yes.
Q. CHAL RMAN -- it's suspended for the moment. That was actually the understanding?
A. Yes. We weren't going to proceed to interview Garda A until that was done.

CHA RMAN okay.
557 Q. MS. MEGRATH You certainly didn't, he wasn't interviewed until the 4th December, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

558 Q. Okay. But you have a note there tend:

> "C S Nyl and. "

не is Internal Affairs.
"To make arrangements to contact the confidential reporter on the matter."

Can you just tell us about that.
A. That's just my note of what was said at the meeting.

So what's your recollection? was he to contact him to tell him about this issue, that there was going to be another -- a re-interview?
A. Yes, I imagine so.

560 Q. Okay. So what you are saying there related back to the previous paragraph?
A. Yeah.

561 Q. Okay. Now, one of the issues -- one of the reasons you were asked to give a statement to the Tribunal recently was because of references to contacts that were put in evidence during Garda Keogh's cross-examination. Contacts, that you had made contacts or tried to make ${ }_{\text {15:58 }}$ contacts with his solicitor during August and September 2018, do you remember that?
A. Yes.

562 Q. Okay. You say in your statement, you made contact with his solicitor's office on 24th August 2018, at 11:40am. 15:58
A. That's right.

563 Q. And that's your statement. Now, what I am going to do is look at two documents. That's your statement. If we can open the reply Mr. Cullen has put in on behalf
of Garda Keogh, at 1527. Now, 1527, in respect of the 28th August, he says his office received a voicemail at 11:40 from Superintendent Lacey. It gives the number. He says:
"Thi s is the day apparently on whi ch ME. B withdraws her statement made on the 15th February."

But we know that it was an earlier date, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

564 Q. "No subject-matter was identified by the superint endent."

Is that right?
A. I don't know. I don't know, maybe he has the voicemail. I can't remember what was said in respect of it. I don't know.
Q. You left a voicemail or did you speak to -- it was a voicemail, you accept that?
A. No, he -- that's what it says here, isn't it?

566 Q. But is that what it was, you left a voicemail?
A. I presume, if that's what he is saying.

567 Q. okay.
A. I'm not sure.

568 Q. You refer to another call on 28th August 2018. You say the call duration was 35 seconds on that date, in your statement. You see the response there. He said he has no note recording that the superintendent telephoned
other than that now received from the Tribunal. Now you have included records, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

569 Q. okay. Is it your evidence that you did leave a message?
A. I may have spoken to someone, I am not sure.
Q. We11, I suppose from Garda Keogh's perspective, he may wish to know whether you spoke to someone, whether you 1eft a message, whether you identified who you were, was it the investigation, etcetera. Can you give us any detail. Do you remember?
A. I'm afraid not. I kept no notes of who I spoke to.

571 Q. okay. As I say, you do have a record of that, from ca11 records, at 15766 , but there is no need to open those?
A. Yeah.

572 Q. You refer to another cal1, 4th September 2018, at 12:22, and you say that's 26 seconds. Now, Mr. Cullen said that you did call the office and spoke to a staff member and left a landline number but no message, is he 16:00 correct in that regard?
A. Obviously I spoke to someone and that's what he is saying. I think the cal1 lasted $24-25$ seconds, so I must have spoken to someone.
573 Q. Okay. Now, you say you did not keep a note of the contacts or who you spoke to, is that right?
A. That's correct.

574 Q. One of Garda Keogh's issues he raised in that letter was that you didn't write to the office raising any
matter?
A. No.
Q. Do you have anything to say to that?
A. No, I didn't write.
Q. I mean, would you take that as a criticism by Garda Keogh in relation to the nature of the contacts you were making?
A. No.

577 Q. I think other than those three incidents, they seem to be the only contacts that you could aver in your statement, is that right?
A. They're the only contacts I had, yeah.

578 Q. Okay. Thank you, superintendent. If you could answer any questions, please.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

SUPER NTENDENT M CHAEL LACY WAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MS. MLLI GAN, AS FOLLOMS:

579 Q. MS. MLLI GAN Good evening, superintendent. I have very few questions for you. Just in relation to the issue of notification and I suppose keeping Garda Keogh abreast of information. You have given your evidence to the Tribunal that you didn't necessarily feel that that was your role, am I correct in that?
A. That's correct.

580 Q. In terms of other investigations that you have done, is there a person who you believe would ordinarily be the
person who would do that?
A. In relation to discipline, no, Judge.

581 Q. No, just the appointing or investigating officer's role, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
A. No.
Q. In relation to the issue of the arrest, we have seen certainly in the very later papers that there was correspondence between the parties regarding the criminal and civil aspect of Garda A and Ms. B's statement. Did anyone actually question whether or not Garda A should have been arrested on foot of Ms. B's statement?
A. Once we had interviewed Ms. B and she made a statement in relation to it, we forwarded that on to the criminal investigation team to take whatever steps they deemed appropriate.

584 Q. And you felt that that was the extent of your role, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you maintain that that is still the correct thing to have done?
A. Yes.

586 Q. Very wel1. Just in relation to the issue of delay, you were on the case for almost two years as well, am I right about that?
A. That's correct.

587 Q. That's correct. Do you accept that that is a very long time for an investigation to be trundling along?
A. No. In relation to this particular investigation, it just wasn't Garda Keogh, there were three other members, there had to be investigations conducted in respect of those. So I wouldn't accept that, no.
588 Q. So is it your position that that was a reasonable length of time?
A. Yes.

589 Q. okay. On that basis, you don't accept that it had any affect on Garda Keogh in terms of discrediting his position, am I right about that?
A. Absolutely not.

590 Q. No further questions.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

## SUPER NTENDENT M CHAEL LACY MAS EXAM NED BY MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS, AS FOLLOVS:

591 Q. MR. DONAL MEGU NESS: Superintendent, just a couple of questions. In relation to Garda Keogh, he raised three principal allegations, and only three allegations against the inquiry process. One was a failure to arrest on the occasion of Ms. B making a statement?
A. Yes.

592 Q. What was your view at that time as to whether it would have been appropriate to arrest?
A. For the discipline side.

593 Q. For the disciplinary --
A. It wouldn't have been appropriate, no.

594 Q. That was a matter for the criminal investigation?
A. Yes.

595 Q. The second issue that Garda Keogh complains of has already been canvassed in some detail today, but the actual complaint is of deliberate delay. In your view did you ever deliberately delay or did your colleagues ever deliberately delay the investigation?
A. No, Chairman.

596 Q. With a view to discrediting Garda Keogh?
A. Absolutely not, no.

597 Q. And then the third complaint is the failure to keep Garda Keogh informed. You've already referred to the interview in February 2017?
A. Yes.

598 Q. Then there were the three attempts that you made to contact Garda Keogh's solicitor?
A. Yes.

599 Q. Did he contact you back?
A. No.

600 Q. By correspondence or otherwise?
A. No.

601 Q. And your colleague, Superintendent Maher, we will hear from him, he too made a series of contacts with Garda Keogh and he was successful on one occasion, on the 16th March.
A. That's correct.

602
Q. 2018, you're aware of that?
A. Yes.

603 Q. Then he made attempt to contact him on the 30 th Ju7y, seen him on 31st July?
A. That's correct.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

## SUPERI NTENDENT M CHAEL LACY MAS RE- EXAM NED BY MS. MEGRATH, AS FOLLOVS

604 Q. MS. MEGRATH Just one matter arising there, arising from something Ms. Mulligan said. Ms. B made her statement to you on 25th Apri1 2017; is that right?
A. That's correct.

605 Q. Assistant Commissioner McMahon confirmed in her evidence on Day 140, at page 84, this statement was forwarded, which you already said, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

606 Q. To Inspector Coppinger on the 15th February 2018, isn't 16:06 that right.
A. That's correct.

607 Q. That's the date she gave?
A. That's the date, yeah.

608 Q. So that's is a three month period?
A. Yes.

609 Q. Do you know why it took three months to forward it on, given that you were on the ground in the investigation, can you help the Chairman why it took that time?
A. No. We forwarded it on to her office I think almost within a week of it being obtained.

610 Q. Sorry, I just missed that?
A. We forwarded it on to her office, to Assistant Commissioner McMahon's office, for onward transmission then to the criminal investigation team.

611 Q. I think it was also put to Assistant Commissioner McMahon, at page 54 on that day, 140, whether or not during this period, from the forwarding on in February until after she had withdrawn it, was the investigation 16:06 effectivety in abeyance or postponed or suspended at that time. Did you know anything about that?
A. No.

612 Q. No. Did you get any instructions?
A. No.

613 Q. Or directions in that regard?
A. No.

614 Q. okay. Thank you, superintendent.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thank you very much, superintendent. You're free to go. Thank you very much.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

M5. MEGRATH Chairman, there is one final witness we might do today, a very short witness, it's Superintendent Maher.

CHA RMAN Very good. He has been here all day. Okay, superintendent, we will hear you. But on the condition that he is very short.

MS. MEGRATH He is.
CHA RMAN Full stop.
MG. MtGRATH It's a single issue.
CHA RMAK So all present bear that in mind.

# SUPERI NTENDENT SEAMUS MAYER, HAV NG BEEN SVDRN, WAS DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY ME. MEGRATH, AS FOLLOVG: 

THE WTNESS: Superintendent Seamus Maher, strategic transformation office.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Sit down.
M5. MEGRATH Thank you for waiting all day, superintendent. I think, superintendent, you were appointed on the same day as Superintendent Lacey to the investigation, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

616 Q. So that's 24th February 2016; is that right? 16:08
A. 2016, that is correct.

617 Q. Can I clarify, were you at the rank of detective inspector at that time?
A. No, I was a detective sergeant at that time. I was subsequently promoted to inspector, appointed detective inspector in 2017 and superintendent in 2019.

618 Q. okay. Now, he mentioned you there when I asked him could he outline the team. What was your role in the team in the investigation?
A. So I was a detective sergeant at the time, so I would have taken statements, reviewed material and I think later on I was monitoring the jobs book with the incident room coordinator, Garda Cooke, and essentially taking statements and recording data.
okay. Now, you say in your statement, and I should have said, Chairman, it's at page 15808, you say that you had two direct contacts with the confidential reporter, this is Garda Keogh, and the first one was on 2nd February 2017, when you met him with Superintendent 16:08 Lacey. That's the statement that we opened up there earlier, is that right?
A. That's correct, at Portlaoise Garda station.

620 Q. Okay. I did ask the superintendent did he have any notes other than what we saw recorded in the statement. 16:09 Did you take any notes other than what is in the statement?
A. No, the statement was our record of the meeting. okay. Do you recall him raising issues about the spreading out of the investigation or anything of that nature?
A. To be fair to Garda Keogh, I did think he mentioned the two members from the Garda national drugs unit at the time.

622 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, to be fair to him, you do think he 16:09 mentioned it.
A. I believe so.

CHA RMAN Yes. Thank you.
623 Q. MG. MEGRATH Now, the second set of contacts you had
with him were actually much later in 2018. And this is the reason effectively why the Tribunal requested a statement from you?
A. That's correct.

624 Q. That's in relation to a phone call you say you had with Garda Keogh on 6/3/2018; isn't that right?
A. That's is correct.
Q. Now you say in your statement that you spoke to him at 10:15 in the morning and you give the telephone number and you say you made contemporaneous notes of the call in your officer's journal?
A. That's correct.

626 Q. Okay. Those notes are at 15810, if Mr. Kavanagh could open them up. Now, can I just say and remind the
Chair, that during Garda Keogh's cross-examination it was put to him that he had had this conversation with you and he said he didn't remember the conversation?
A. I understand.

627 Q. But he didn't deny that he had such a conversation, he said he couldn't recall it?
A. I read the transcript.
Q. And he described it as an unusual.

CHA RMAN oh yes, you read the transcript.
A. I read the transcript, Chairman.

CHAN RMAN Thank you.
629 Q. M. MEGRATH He described it as unusual but, as I say, he didn't say that this did not take place, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So these are your notes. 15810. You give the date from your official journal. You say:
"Note: Possi bl y i nebri at ed. "
A. That's correct, Chairman.

631 Q. Can you tell the Chairperson about this call. You say you introduced yourself, you were ringing from a landline, if you can take it from there. Please?
A. Yes. 10:15 I made a note in my officer's journal to ring Garda Keogh. I wanted to update him with the progress of the investigation. No so much in detail, but to let him know that we were dealing with matters as expeditiously as possible. I was tasked at a conference I think in Kilkenny, maybe in January or February, by Assistant Commissioner McMahon to make efforts to contact Garda Keogh. I was able to get the phone number from -- Garda Keogh's phone number from a previous statement. So I made that contact. I think may have asked Aidan Minnock, Superintendent Minnock the day before or previous to that for Garda Keogh's contact details but $I$ was able to retrieve them myself. The following is a narrative and contemporaneous notes of a discussion that $I$ had with Garda Keogh in relation to the investigation. I did explain that I was ringing on behalf of AC Anne Marie MCMahon, my details are at SM, Garda Keogh's details are at NK. While I don't have all the detail, it's a fair description of the conversation that took place.
CHA RMAN Okay, we11, we can read what you say you
said and you say possibly inebriated. Just scroll down a bit there.
632 Q.
MS. MEGRATH Chair, maybe if it could be read into the record, it's probably the quickest.
CHA RMAN Al1 right.
A. Yes, Chairman.

MS. MEGRATH It might be the quickest way of doing it. CHA RMAN A11 right.
A. "10: 15 rang number. Introduced mysel f. Rang from Nenagh I andl i ne. "

I was an inspector in Nenagh at the time.
"I don't want to be rude inspector but you can meet me through my solicitor. It's this shit with Donie Ó Cual ái n. Read some of the replies from chi ef superintendent and they are crazy.

SM "

Myself.
"I just want to give you an update on where with our i nvest i gation.

NK: I have very good contacts, there ids no need to tell re an update. You're not at fault. No one was ever arrested. Pull yourself away. No one was ever lifted. I have no hassle with ye, I have no issues
with ye. I have with Ó Cual ái $n$. Anything new you can tell me over the phone. I'm not recording this.

SM I expl ai ned I amringing on behal fof AC Anne Marie McMahon.

NK: Not a good fit. Do you know who her husband is? Best superintendent I ever had. He was one of the best to tackle crime. He was one who supported Nói rín O Sullivan when she was what she was. Anne Marie MEMahon is a friend of Nói rín O Sullivan."

At this point I note I tried to intervene
"NK: Somet hing about being a bi gger game. "

When I wrote something it was a little incoherent, I didn't understand what that precursor was, so I wrote:
"Somet hi ng about being in a bi gger game. Ó Cual ái $n$
turned a blind eye to what's going on in Athl one. Drugs going missing and two other mega things. It's all going to come out.

Talk to D/ Inspector Decl an Mul cahy. He'll explainthe serious investigation is about.

SM I'mjust part of the investigation.

NK: You see what's happening with MECabe stuff. I heard word Ó Cual áin is trying to bring Garda A back and wasn't arrested.

Ri ng Decl an Mul cahy, that's all I'masking.

SM I asked to meet you agai n.

NK: Meet you agai n Cig- no probl em

SM I expl ai ned with Superintendent Lacey.

NK: Don't know what to make of him l found nothing bad.

SM I expl ai ned we can meet in a coffee shop, plain cl ot hes. Update and pi cture of what's going on.

NK: Someone at the door."

I noted that the dogs are barking. He asked to ring back in five minutes. I rang at 10:30. FPP relates to fingerprinting of a particular issue. Rang at 10:38, message minder
633 Q. Okay. Now you say you made that phone call because you 16:14 had been tasked by Assistant Commissioner McMahon to do that, is that right?
A. That is correct.

634 Q. Now, again, and this is also in your statement, you
have two notes of attempting to make telephone contact, one on 30th July 2018 and on 31st July 2018. You just left messages on his message minder, is that right?
A. That's correct.

Did you ever succeed in making contact with him?
A. Not from that point onwards, no. And I escalated it at the next conference to Assistant Commissioner McMahon, informing her of my failure to make contact and then that's when Superintendent Lacey got involved and was asked to contact Mr. Cullen's office.
636 Q. Thank you, superintendent. If you can answer any questions.

END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Any questions?

SUPERI NIENDENT SEAMUS MAHER MAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY ME. MLLI GAN AS FOLLOVE:

637 Q. M. MLLI GAN Superintendent, very briefly. My apologies, Chairman, very briefly in relation to similar questions to your colleague. In relation to the arrest, is your position the same, that essentially your obligation was to hand over the statement of Ms. B and after that, if an arrest was to occur, it was for a different --
A. That's correct, Chairman. It was a discipline investigation. Essentially it was for the criminal
team to determine those matters.
638 Q. That's your position?
A. That's my position.

639 Q. Just in relation to the notes, you have given your evidence there, just in relation to the first conversation, was there any -- would there have been any value in identifying there had been, I suppose, some move in the criminal investigation to Garda Keogh at that time?
A. Essentially it was going to be very non-specific, it was a discipline investigation, there were parties complained on, served with allegations, I just wanted to give a timeline as to completion and a very brief update that we were progressing as expeditiously as possible, without any great detail.
640 Q. Is there any reason why you didn't just do that in writing when you had difficulty in corresponding via telephone?
A. Essentially I just had a phone number. I had no specific address for Garda Keogh.
641 Q. I presume, for the purposes of the transcripts, your position is the same as your colleague in relation to the delay, that you don't accept there was a delay?
A. Chairman, I think it was a very difficult investigation. It was voluminous. There was a number 16:16 of statements. There was four volumes of statements from the criminal team. There was 28 different conferences. We had to add to the investigation team at a later point when Assistant Commissioner Anne Marie

McMahon came on board. I suppose a lot of the witnesses were throughout the country, that's why we brought gardaí from around the country to assist our investigation, due to geography, volume and capacity. would you accept that it would have been very difficult for Garda Keogh to understand this delay given the lack of information that he had at the time?
A. Well, I understand that there's an office dealing with Garda Keogh at that time, informing him of different matters. But I don't think it was a matter for the discipline investigation team to go into specifics with Garda Keogh.
643 Q. Just in relation to that question, do you mean the EAS in that regard, that it's obligation of the employment assistance team to keep him up-to-date?
A. I don't think so. It was the protected disclosures office.

644 Q. Just so we are clear.
A. Yes.

645 Q. It's your position that in relation to the investigation, that is should have been the protected disclosures team to keep Garda Keogh abreast?
A. No, in relation to any matter.

646 Q. Okay, any and all matters?
A. Exactly.

647 Q. Very good. No further questions.

END OF EXAM NATI ON

## MEGU NNESS, AS FOLLOMS:

648 Q. MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: Superintendent, just one question. In relation to the note that you took when this was put to Garda Keogh during his cross-examination or during his examination-in-chief, he said:
"J udge, I have no note of that. It's a very strange
thing. A solid thing. I don't remenber that conversation. I have no note of it. I am not saying it di dn't happen but it's a very serious thing the way that thing was done."

That is on Day 104, page 95 , but I don't think we need to bring it up. The only question $I$ have in relation to that: was this note made by you in anything other than the normal course of your duties and recording what happened and what transpired in the call between you and Garda Keogh?
A. In the ordinary course of business an inspector or an officer of rank is expected to maintain a diary, a journal, an officer's journal, and that's why I would have kept it in my officer's journal.
649 Q. Thank you.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Very good.
ME. MEGRATH Nothing arising, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much. You're free to go now, superintendent. Very good. We11 you were true to your
word, Ms. McGrath, thank you.

## THE WTNESS THEN W THDREW

MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, in relation to tomorrow, we have two witnesses to get through and we were going to suggest, if it suited you, Chairman, and the parties, that we would commence at 10:00am to hear the evidence of Chief Superintendent Nugent and then Mr. Alan Mulligan.
CHA RMAN Yes. Are we all happy with that? It might give us a chance to finish early. So we can do that if we are all happy with that. Very good. So we will do it at 10:30.

ME. MEGRATH 10:00am.
CHA RMAN Sorry, did I say -- ten o'clock, I am sorry. 16:19 Let me start again. A half an hour earlier tomorrow; 10:00am. Thank you very much.

THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED UNTI L FRI DAY, 21ST FEBRUARY
2020 AT 10: 00AM
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| 144:15, 144:18, | 16:20, 23:25, | 116:14, 117:1, | - 95:15 | 40:18, 43:8, | 77:18, 77:29, |
| 145:7, 145:10, | 23:26, 65:10, | 131:6, 131:7, | REDDY [1] - 4:8 | 170:16, 177:20, | 78:7, 78:14, |
| 146:17, 148:9, | 67:11, 95:21, | 150:4, 150:12, | refer [14] - | 183:12 | 78:22, 78:23, |
| 148:11, 151:19, | 111:17, 149:8 | 157:16, 180:2, | 11:27, 23:14, | regards [1] - | 79:6, 79:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 151: 26,152: 12, \\ & 181: 28.184: 23, \end{aligned}$ | reads [1] - 46:28 | 181:1 | 25:23, 27:26, | 162:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 14,82: 21, \\ & 83: 9,85: 26,86: 4, \end{aligned}$ |
| raising [4] - | 85:24 | 36:1, 117:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 29,39: 14, \\ & 39: 15,55: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { region [5] - 8: } \\ & \text { 87:28, 89:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $86: 28,87: 5,90: 4,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 40: 28,143: 12 \\ & \text { 181:29, 189:19 } \end{aligned}$ | reality [1] - $121: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 157:17, 170:6 } \\ & \text { recent }[5]-48: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $70: 14,75: 17$, $93: 8,126: 28$, | $94: 25,167: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 5,90: 6,91: 25, \\ & 93: 19,99: 20, \end{aligned}$ |
| ramifications [1] | really [12] - 8:9, | 48:2, 133:14 | 180:26, 181:17 | 8:20, 9:1, 9:13, | 101:17, 104:5, $105: 3.105: 13 .$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & -44: 5 \\ & \text { rang [4] - 192:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:22, 13:11, } \\ & 26: 20,43: 24, \end{aligned}$ | 134:28, 146:18 recently [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reference [24] - } \\ & 33: 24,42: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 17,44: 4,48: 28, \\ & 91: 4,91: 5,95: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:3, 105:13, } \\ & \text { 110:3, 110:7, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 194:22, 194:23 | 43:25, 44:14, | $87: 25,170: 15$ | $43: 4,51: 23$ | 127:21, 127:22, | 115:16, 123:9, $123 \cdot 14 \quad 123 \cdot 28$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { rank [6] - 48:26, } \\ & 95: 26.97: 9 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 77:20, 113:7, } \\ & \text { 130:4. 145:3. } \end{aligned}$ | 179:17 | 64:13, 68:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:6, 129:18, } \\ & 132: 3 \quad 139: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:14, 123:28, } \\ & \text { 123:29, 124:26, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 188:22, 198:23 | 147:5 | 141:28 | $84: 18,85: 13$ | 139:4, 145:24, | 126:5, 126:10, |
| ranking [1] - | reason [11] - | reckon [1] - | 85:14, 120:15, | 147:29, 148:13, | 129:20, 130:15, |
| $145: 12$ | 65:17, 68:29, | 49:17 | 126:13, 129:28, | 149:22 | 132:7, 133:25, 143:15. 145:10 |
| rather [5] - 19:7, | 83:22, 96:27, | recognise [2] | 134:3, 140:10, 140:28. 142:22. | regional [8] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 143:15, 145:10, } \\ & \text { 150:18, 150:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 59: 4,67: 18,74: 9 \\ & 77: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:12, 116:1, } \\ & \text { 145:19. 152:2. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 24:11, } 37: 22 \\ \text { recollect }[3] \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:28, 142:22, } \\ & \text { 142:23, 144:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 3,13: 26,48: 27, \\ & 49: 4.49: 6.133: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:18, 150:25, } \\ & \text { 152:11, 155:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| rational | 162:7, 190:2 | 148:7, 156:3 | 154:27, 170:13, | 149:21, 169:4 | 163:5, 165:3, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:11 } \\ & \text { rationale [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 196:16 } \\ & \text { reasonable [13] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 158:14 } \\ & \text { recollection [6] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 171:2, } 172: 9 \\ & \text { referenced }[4] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | regions [1] - 8:2 regulation [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 171:8, 172:13, } \\ & \text { 172:27, 173:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 22:21, 27:23, | -13:8, 26:21, | 52:21, 95:21, | 52:22, 82:28, | 88:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 175:4, 176:10, } \\ & \text { 182:6, 182:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 139: 29,140: 1 \\ \text { re [6] - 140:21, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 6,29: 23,52: 7, \\ & 53: 19,56: 4,95: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:21, 140:1, } \\ & 141: 11,179: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89: 7,175: 12 \\ & \text { references } \end{aligned}$ | regulations [7] - | $\begin{aligned} & 182: 6,182: 22, \\ & 183: 2,183: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| 169:2, 169:7, | 117:26, 117:27, | recommend [1] | 10:20, 35:11, | 89:6, 95:15, | 183:18, 183:27, |
| 177:20, 178:1, | 118:22, 184:8 | - 95:3 | 179:18 | 141:9, 159:29, | 184:4, 184:23, |
| 179:11 | reasoning [1] - | recommendati | referred [18] - | $160: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 190:5, 191:23, } \\ & \text { 195:22, 195:23, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{R E}_{[4]}-5: 18 \\ 5: 30,123: 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:14 } \\ & \text { reason } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { on }[4]-89: 11, \\ & 121: 24,124: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 21,26: 10, \\ & 36: 18,50: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reinstated [2] - } \\ & 63: 3,94: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 195:22, 195:23, } \\ & \text { 196:4, 196:5, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 186:9 | 83:12, 103:9, | 131:4 | 76:21, 77:14, | reject [2] - | 196:22, 197:13, |
| RE-EXAMINED | 111:5, 114:22, | recommendati | 78:13, 110:9, | 14:14, 63:10 | 197:20, 197:23, 198:5. 198:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[4]-5: 18,5: 30} \\ & 123: 3,186: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $135: 14,161: 25$ | ons [1] - 48:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:17, 119:10, } \\ & \text { 132:23, 135:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rejecting [1] - } \\ & 36: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 198:5, 198:17, } \\ & 199: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:3, } 186: 9 \\ & \text { re-interview [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:16 } \\ & \text { reassure [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recommended } \\ & {[1]-153: 13} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:23, 135:23, } \\ & \text { 146:24, 149:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 36:24 } \\ & \text { relate [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | 199:9 <br> relations [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:7, 177:20, } \\ & 178: 1,179: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 121:4 <br> reassured [1] | recommending | $\begin{aligned} & 149: 25,155: 17, \\ & 165: 14,185: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 102:7, 103:17 <br> related [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 127:26 } \\ & \text { release [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| reach [1]-63:8 reached [2] - | $81: 1$ <br> recasting [1] | $\begin{gathered} {[1]-96: 1} \\ \text { record [16] - } \\ 21: 17,21: 19, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { referring }[3] \text { - } \\ 76: 15,145: 23, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:2, 122:9, } \\ & \text { 144:7, 162:10, } \end{aligned}$ | 139:9 <br> relevance [1] - |
| $\begin{array}{r} 110: 26,141: 2 \\ \text { reaches [1] - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60:19 } \\ & \text { receipt [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:21, 21:23, } \\ & 63: 1,94: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:20 } \\ & \text { refers [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:13 } \\ & \text { relates [10] - } \end{aligned}$ | $135: 17$ <br> relevant [6] - |
| $72: 6$ <br> reaching [3] - | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 12:11, } 23: 13 \\ \text { receive }[3]- \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:16, 150:17, } \\ & \text { 160:9, 172:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:12, 158:15, } \\ & 172: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:5, 41:3, 57:16, } \\ & \text { 127:1, 128:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:5, 76:18, } \\ & \text { 102:6, 103:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 57:4, 110:22, | 15:4, 32:24, | 173:7, 177:23, | reflect [2] - | 136:27, 142:9, | $103: 24,103: 26$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 172: 15 \\ & \text { read }[23]-17: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 50:29 } \\ & \text { received }[35] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 177:24, 181:13, } \\ & \text { 189:18, } 192: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 67:21, } 154: 14 \\ \text { reflects [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:17, 170:21, } \\ & 194: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reliance }{ }_{[1]}^{-} \\ & 71: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| 17:9, 19:27, | 10:11, 13:23, | recorded [6] - | 159:12 | relating [5] - | relied [3] - 90:5, |
| 19:29, 28:27, | 14:11, 14:27, | 139:6, 151:22, | refute [1] - 45:10 | 136:19, 148:4, | 110:20, 110:24 |
| 29:8, 29:25, | 23:29, 32:5, | 152:1, 157:10, | regard [10] - | 158:15, 158:16, | $\begin{gathered} \text { relying [2] - } \\ \text { 114:20, 114:23 } \end{gathered}$ |
| 33:23, 37:7, | 32:10, 32:26, | 160:22, 189:15 | 49:11, 82:9, | $159: 18$ | 114:20, 114:23 remained [1] - |
| $46: 26,63: 5,63: 6$ $64: 8,64: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 4,35: 27,40: 2, \\ & 45: 24,46: 22, \end{aligned}$ | recording [4] 180:29, 189:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97:23, 108:6, } \\ & \text { 170:6, 175:26, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { relation [88] - } \\ \text { 12:24, 24:28, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { remained [1] - } \\ & \text { 156:20 } \end{aligned}$ |



| SAVAGE [1] - | 180:27, 181:18, | seeing [4] - | 142:7, 142:9, | 12:12 | 54:27, 55:1, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3:16 | 181:23 | 14:13, 138:23, | 171:18, 179:21, | SHANE [1] - | 82:28, 109:16, |
| saw [7]-28:12, | secretary [2] - | 150:29, 157:27 | 181:17 | 3:23 | 113:10, 114:4 |
| 36:5, 64:24, | 141:26, 145:23 | seek [10]- | sequence [6] - | SHANKEY [1] - | significantly [1] |
| 85:12, 134:11, | section [21] - | 19:12, 30:6, | 141:17, 142:24, | 3:21 | - 128:23 |
| 137:9, 189:15 | 10:1, 11:10, | 53:13, 73:3, | 148:14, 155:24, | SHANKEY- | signs [1] - |
| SC [5] - 3:23, | 11:25, 11:28, | 99:13, 137:17, | 157:28, 171:17 | SMITH [1] - 3:21 | 129:29 |
| 3:23, 3:24, 4:6, | 12:9, 15:25, 16:5, | 147:6, 147:8, | SERGEANT [5] - | Shannon [1] - | silent [1] - 94:29 |
| 4:7 | 39:16, 73:11, | 155:13, 169:6 | 3:12, 3:20, 4:5, | 23:3 | similar [6] - |
| SCANLAN ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ - | 77:17, 87:17, | seeking [4]- | 4:6, 4:6 | Shea [1] - | 48:12, 65:8, 82:7, |
| 3:8 | 104:3, 127:15, | 29:10, 121:6, | Sergeant [5] - | 133:29 | 83:11, 102:28, |
| Scanlan [5] - | 136:15, 138:12, | 146:25, 158:3 | 43:2, 133:29, | SHEAHAN ${ }^{11]}$ - | 195:23 |
| 53:6, 53:28, | 138:13, 138:14, | seem [13] - | 167:27, 177:1 | 3:18 | simple [2] - |
| 54:18, 112:7, | 138:17, 139:24, | 18:23, 18:24, | sergeant [7] - | Sheehan [2] - | 145:27, 145:28 |
| $113: 20$ | $150: 25,155: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 12,33: 17 \\ & 33: 18,33: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:13, 17:15, } \\ & \text { 18:3, 19:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $90: 3,90: 12$ | simply [4] - |
| school [1] - | 122:13 | $38: 26,79: 1,79: 7,$ | 127:11, 188:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sheets [1] - } \\ & \text { 135:6 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 45: 8,76: 26 \\ 83: 21,112: 26 \end{array}$ |
| $48: 16$ | Security [2] - <br> 87.10, 99•9 | 117:26, 123:27, $138: 25,182: 9$ | 189:1 | SHELLEY [1] - | simultaneously |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { screen [14] - } \\ 34: 14,87: 9,88: 2, \end{gathered}$ | $\text { see }[83]-10: 4,$ | seized [2]-25:2, | $\begin{gathered} \text { sergeants [2] - } \\ 103: 13,104: 22 \end{gathered}$ | 3:25 | [1] - 165:22 |
| 92:28, 94:12, | 11:8, 13:9, 14:2, | 39:24 | series [2] - | SHIP [1] - 3:28 | 124:24, 188:6 |
| 97:1, 98:6, 99:3, | 14:8, 14:20, | selected [1] - | $38: 23,185: 26$ | shit [1] - 192:15 | SINÉAD [1] - 4:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 100: 28,103: 4, \\ & 123 \cdot 7 \quad 140 \cdot 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 15,15: 26, \\ & 15: 28,16: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 167:25 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { serious [7] - } \\ 38: 17, ~ 41: 20 . \end{array}$ | shop [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sit [2] - 126:12, } \\ & \text { 188:14 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 123: 7,140: 17 \\ & 145: 4,153: 28 \end{aligned}$ | 21:27, 24:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { send }[4]-18: 16, \\ & 59: 17,149: 14, \end{aligned}$ | 100:18, 145:29, | 194:16 | 188:14 <br> situation [4] |
| scroll [11] - | 26:21, 30:20, | 156:29 | 173:21, 193:26, | $77: 28,127: 21$ | 16:26, 45:18, |
| 15:13, 37:28, | 30:23, 30:26, | sending [1] - | 198:13 | 140:19, 187:28, | 57:17, 118:26 |
| 38:29, 46:14, | 32:15, 32:27, | 23:9 | seriousness [1] | 188:3 | six [1] - 41:13 |
| 88:2, 99:5, | 33:1, 33:10, | senior [12] - | - 100:19 | shortly [1] - | skills [1] - 18:13 |
| 121:21, 153:18, | 33:20, 34:29, | 44:4, 49:2, 55:17, | served [4]- | 132:9 | slightly [4] - |
| 168:14, 170:18, | 37:19, 37:29, | 95:3, 96:2, | 127:13, 127:20, | show [3] - | 60:19, 80:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 192:1 } \\ & \text { scrolling [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 28,44: 8 \\ & 46: 16,48: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:24, 143:20, } \\ & \text { 143:23, 144:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 137:1, 196:12 } \\ \text { service }[9]- \end{gathered}$ | $27: 16,135: 15$ | $124: 14,147: 22$ |
| 15:21, 16:12 | 48:23, 49:1, 49:8, | 144:9, 145:13, | 23:19, 38:6, | shown [5] - | 8:4 |
| scrolls [1] - | 50:2, 50:14, | 159:17 | 46:27, 106:28, | 119:9, 120:13, | slow [3] - 63:2 |
| 168:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 52: 10,52: 28, \\ & 53 \cdot 2454 \cdot 5, \end{aligned}$ | sense [5] - | 107:14, 127:4, | 121:19, 121:20, | $94: 8,163: 19$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { scrutiny [1] - } \\ & \text { 104:18 } \end{aligned}$ | 53:24, 54:5, 55:15, 60:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 22,80: 23, \\ & 90: 16,108: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 130: 7,130: 11 \\ & 148: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 164:20 | $\text { SM }_{[7]}-191: 26,$ |
| 104:18 SEAMU | 61:27, 65:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 16,108: 22 \\ & 154: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 148:18 service | shows [2] 64:26, 64:27 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 192:19, 193:4, } \\ & \text { 193:28, 194:7, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 6:1, 188:9, | 67:24, 76:1, | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s e n }}[21]-10: 17,$ | $7: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64: 26,64: 27 \\ & \text { sic] }[1]-41: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 193:28, 194:7, } \\ & \text { 194:11, 194:16 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 195:18, 198:1 | 77:12, 79:22, | 21:2, 23:16, | $\text { set }[12]-26: 17$ | sick [2] - 22:6, | SMITH ${ }_{[1]}$ - 3:21 |
| Seamus [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 29,87: 13, \\ & 88 \cdot 3 \cdot 97 \cdot 26, \end{aligned}$ | $34: 10,35: 17$ | $45: 11,68: 21$ | $27: 7$ | SMITHFIELD ${ }_{[1]}$ |
| 133:28, 188:12 | 102:24, 110:14, | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 6,59: 27,67: 8, \\ & 79: 17,81: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:2, 96:5, 111:5, } \\ & \text { 114:14. 128:15. } \end{aligned}$ | side [9] - 65:9, | $-4: 12$ |
| SEAN [1] - 3:17 <br> searched [2] - | 111:2, 119:15, | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 17,81: 3 \\ & 83: 16,85: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:14, 128:15, } \\ & 130: 19,157: 28, \end{aligned}$ | 65:19, 81:7, 81:8, | social [2] - 48:21 |
| 25:1, 39:23 | 119:20, 120:12, | 92:27, 100:2, | 158:24, 189:29 | 178:11, 185:1 | $48: 18,48: 19$ |
| second [17] - | $\begin{aligned} & 120: 23,123: 18, \\ & 132 \cdot 17 \text { 132:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 111:28, 114:10, | sets [10] - 27:22, | sight [3]-81:3, | solicitor [7] - |
| 39:6, 39:14, 54:5, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:17, 132:19, } \\ & \text { 138:11, 140:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 118: 18,123: 12, \\ & 140 \cdot 11 \quad 154 \cdot 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93: 18,94: 21, \\ & 97: 3.102: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $100: 14,114: 21$ | $56: 14,85: 3,$ |
| 57:22, 64:12, <br> $76: 27,77: 3,88$ | $140: 28,141: 20$ | $158: 2$ | 102:21, 102:22, | $\operatorname{sign}[1]-29: 3$ | 177:10, 177:18, |
| 95:28, 97:5, | 147:21, 149:8, | sentence [2] | 107:7, 111:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { signature [1] - } \\ & 33: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 179:21, 185:19, $192: 15$ |
| 116:23, 123:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:17, 153:23, } \\ & \text { 153:28, 153:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $35: 2,164: 23$ | 128:16 | signed [7] - | solicitor's [2] - |
| 135:25, 153:26, | 154:2, 154:4, | $\begin{array}{r} \text { separate [5] - } \\ 42: 4.42: 6.42 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seventeen [1] - } \\ & 103: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 30:11, 37:24, | 177:15, 179:25 |
| 164:22, 185:6, 189:29 | 154:26, 164:25, | $44: 15,102: 18$ | several [5] - | $37: 26,39: 6,$ | SOLICITOR'S |
| seconded [1] - | 168:21, 168:25, | separately [2] - | 127:10, 127:27, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:8, 136:25, } \\ & 136: 28 \end{aligned}$ | [1] - 3:27 <br> SOLICITORS [2] |
| 127:17 | 170:26, 171:24, | 101:29, 102:3 | 146:4, 147:8, | significance [2] | $-4: 8,4: 11$ |
| secondly [1] - | 176:15, 180:28 | September [9] - | 171:13 | $-30: 7,113: 4$ | solicitors [1] - |
| $120: 15$ seconds [3] - | 176:15, 180:28, 194:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:27, 51:11, } \\ & \text { 123:19, 142:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shall }[4]-10: 12, \\ & 10: 14,11: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { significant }[8] \text { - } \\ & 15: 20,30: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 150:5 solid [1] - |


| 198:11 | Southeastern | 93:4, 122:14 | 139:27, 140:4, | stolen [1] - | subsequently |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| someone [6] - | [3]-127:22, | 124:5, 136:14, | 157:13, 158:1, | 17:24 | [17] - 24:7, 25:4, |
| 100:17, 181:6, | 128:6, 149:21 | 140:4, 147:12, | 160:13, 161:27, | stop [7] - 16:18, | 25:11, 32:23, |
| 181:8, 181:22, | Southern [1] - | 150:1, 164:3, | 164:9, 171:10, | 21:5, 34:28, 43:3, | 39:26, 45:21, |
| $181: 24,194: 19$ | 127:21 | 168:6, 176:25, | 189:2, 189:5, | $71: 28,140: 25,$ | 60:11, 94:3, |
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[^0]:    "However, the Policy is silent when an investigation

[^1]:    "Chapter 3 of the bookl et Wbrking Toget her to Create a Positive Wbrking Envi ronment specifies that harassment has to be based on the rel evant characteristic of the person outlining the policy and procedures. It
    in cases where the inappropriate behavi our is not I i nked to one of the ni ne di scriminat ory grounds, then it is not covered by the above definition. Garda Keogh

[^2]:    "The current status of the di sci pline inquiry is that it must be put in abeyance pending the outcome of the criminal investi gations interaction was Garda A."

