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CHA RMAN YES.

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

1 Q. MR. MARRI NAN Good morning, chief superintendent?
A. Good morning.

2 Q. I think we come now to the 16th November, if you have your statement there.
A. Yes.

3 Q. It's 2073 of the materials. We note on the 16th November that you received a call from Mr. Joe Nugent, asking if you had any objection to supply to the Policing Authority, the document that we referred to, the 338-page document?
A. Yes, Chairman.

4 Q. And you indicated that you had no objection to that?
A. I didn't.

5 Q. Perhaps we could just look at your note of this, it's a little bit more detailed, at page 2835 of the materials, please. You note:
"Recei ved a call fromJoe Nugent. He told me he was in communi cation with Hel en Hall of the Policing Authority and that they wanted today to make deci si ons re appoi nt ments for the meeting on the 23 rd Novenber and

particul arly my appoi nt ment. He tol d me l had the support of the organi sation and he was working on the issue with Ken Ruane, Head of Legal Affairs."

What did you take him to mean in relation to the support of the organisation?
A. I suppose, I felt he was explaining to me that the delay of the promotions, just based on allegations that had manifested themselves in public, you know, wasn't sufficient, that was the organisation's view, to just stop it like that. And I felt he was conveying that to me.

6 Q. "He asked me why I had any objection to he gi ving my 338-page document to the Policing Authority. I said no probl em and expl ai ned that thi s was just one of the myriad of issues l was deal ing with in Athl one. He said he was aware of the appoi nt ment re the bullying i nvesti gation. "
A. Yes.

7 Q. So then if we move on, I think on Sunday, the 19th November there was an RTÉ News at One radio programme which had a feature regarding Assistant Commissioner Finn's appointment to investigate Garda Keogh's allegations against you?
A. That's correct, Chairman. It was the third month in a row in which such media coverage had occurred.

8 Q. You've set out the media reports in relation to this. They're at page 2840. We don't need it, Mr. Kavanagh, on screen. But by way of reference you have included
those in the documents that you have given to the Tribunal, isn't that right?
A. Yes, Chairman.

9 Q. If we then move on to 28 th November 2017. You highlighted your concerns to the Garda organisation. what you say is, regarding what occurred, it was an orchestrated effort to prevent my promotion by the emergence of a complaint just then, which had apparently been made by Garda Keogh in March of 2017 and which was being combined with media and political campaign against you. How did you become aware of the fact that Garda Keogh had made a complaint of bullying and harassment in March of 2017?
A. Because on the 15th November, Assistant Commissioner Fanning, on notifying me of the appointment of Assistant Commissioner Finn, also included with that the set of documents as an attachment to these.
10 Q. Yes.
A. And on that was a statement signed by Garda Keogh and dated the 27th March and countersigned by chief Superintendent Scanlan.

11 Q. We might look at your statement, or your letter, which is at page 2849 of the material. We might spend a little time on this because it might indicate your concerns at the time?
A. Yeah, it indicates my mindset just at the time.

12 Q. Yes. It is to the Commissioner, the Deputy Commissioner of Policing and Security and the Chief Administrative officer. Who was Deputy Commissioner

Policing and Security at that time?
A. Deputy Commissioner Twomey.

13 Q. Twomey. It's dated the 28th November. You say:
"I refer to the above matter. I find myself in the unprecedented situation of having to correspond di rectly with the executive leadershi p teamto outline my concerns at what l bel ieve are efforts being made to tarnish my reputation and character in a way that will affect my good name and career in An Garda Sí ochána. amled to understand that assi stant commi ssi oner roads pol icing has been appoi nted by assi stant commissioner Eastern Regi on to i nvesti gate workpl ace rel ation all egati ons by Garda Keogh agai nst a number of seni or officers, incl uding myself. I understand the allegations were made on the 27 th March and rel ate to a period from March 2014 to September 2015."

You go on to say:
"I was transferred to Athl one on 9th March 2015 as di strict officer. I discovered a myriad of serious i ssues there, some ongoing, impacting on the del ivery of an effective policing service. The maj ority of those issues did not rel ate to Garda Keogh. "

If we scroll over to the next page:
"I engaged meani ngf ully with Garda Keogh through my
recogni sed managerial structural line, whi ch incl uded assi stant commi ssi oner Eastern Regi on, for the short period Garda Keogh was in the workpl ace during my tenure, with a view to supporting himand dealing with his work rel ated issues. I ndeed, I have been compl i mented by my line managers, incl udi ng assi stant commi ssi oner Eastern Regi on, in rel ation to the manner in whi ch I dealt with Garda Keogh. "

Then you go on to say:
"I attended a case conference with the CMD in rel ation to Garda Keogh on 9th December 2015. Six days later my name was mentioned in Dáil Éi reann for the first time. Si nce then, I bel i eve I have evi dence to suggest that I have been subj ected to a strategi cally managed smear campai gn, including medi a exposure, prior to Pol icing Authority meetings, where my appoint ment to the rank of chi ef superintendent was to be di scussed.

At the outset l must set out my serious concerns in rel ation to the initiation of this workplace rel ations i nvesti gation. "

You then point out in the next paragraph that in
November 2016 you were made aware of the civil proceedings that had been instituted.
A. Yes.

14 Q. If we scroll down, in the next paragraph you refer to
your 338-page document.
A. Yes.

15 Q. Which set out our defence. Then if we scroll down:
"I first heard of these latest workplace rel ations
allegations on Sat urday, 11th Novenber 2017, at 3: 45pm when I recei ved an e-mail fromassi stant commi ssi oner Eastern Regi on whi ch postdated and referred me to correspondence I only recei ved two days Iater by post, on 13th Noventber 2017. On Wednesday, 15th Novenber

2017 I recei ved a further e-mail notifying me of the appointment of assistant commissioner Roads Policing."

That's the document that we referred to yesterday?
A. Yes.

16 Q. "What appears to be a hurried and contrived nat ure of this appointment in terns of its close association with what appears a planned and strategi cally managed medi a campai gn, is very concerning to me. "

Over the next page we have:
"I understand fromthe correspondence I recei ved that Garda Keogh made this workplace rel ations complaint in March 2017. The time del ay in notifying meis, I believe, extraordi nary. In the absence of any expl anation --"

And then in bold print you say:


17 Q
A. Yes.

18 Q. -- in relation to the investigation?
A. Yes.

19 Q. But you seem to be coming at it from a different angle, isn't that right?
A. I'm looking at it from the angle of it being introduced at a particular time following what $I$ saw as a
political and media campaign and that certain elements were introduced then further along. So in September I had RTÉ and the Dáil, in October I had RTÉ again and a 10:12 letter from Mr. Barrett to the Policing Authority, I suppose suggesting a scenario in relation to this complaint. And then in November again more media with the introduction of the appointment of Assistant Commissioner Finn in relation to this. And I felt all those things were occurring in or about the time of Policing Authority meetings where my appointment was perhaps being considered.

20 Q. You will appreciate that Garda Keogh's position in
relation to this is that there was a delay in the investigation to facilitate your promotion so that there could be a declaration that you had no issues to be dealt with in An Garda Síochána?
A. I wouldn't agree with that. And when I studied the documents from the Tribunal, you know, between the time Garda Keogh made the complaint on the 27th March and until he sent a letter to Garda Headquarters on the 21st September, I don't see any enquiries being made in all the correspondence that's there even about me to various bodies, I don't see any enquiries about this particular complaint.
21 Q. Yes.
A. Or where it was in that period. Particularly from when he learned I was on a promotion list again in July of
'17 until 21st September '17, while he wrote plenty of letters, I just don't see any enquiries about where that complaint was at that particular time.
22 Q. Yes. But if we come back to the delay that there was.
A. Yes.

23 Q. Garda keogh had made his complaint of bullying and harassment. So it doesn't appear that he was part of a deliberate plan to delay it and then to, as it were, reactivate it around the time that the policing Authority were considering your application?
A. Yeah. I don't see any evidence of that, but again, I suppose my mindset at the time was that, you know, things were being introduced at certain periods which seemed to have maximum impact on decisions that the

Policing Authority were making. I felt that people were adopting, I suppose, a position against me, based on what was in the media and the Dáil.

24 Q. Yes.
A. And I was being painted as some type of monster, when I 10:14 had never had an opportunity to address some of those issues.

Yes. And one can understand that, but I suppose because you're both coming at this from a different angle, as it were, on the one hand he says there's some 10:14 sort of conspiracy behind this to delay the investigation of his complaint, and you're sort of indicating at the same time that there is a delay and that it's rather peculiar, to put it at its lowest --
A. Yes.
-- that this matter comes to the fore in a hurried fashion --
A. Yes.

27 Q. -- immediately before the Policing Authority are going to consider your application?
A. Yes.
A. Yeah. I suppose my mindset is influenced maybe by what had occurred in 2016 as well. So that's the way I felt at the time.

29 Q. Well, do you see this perhaps as being a coincidence, as it were? I know that you have a view in relation to Garda Keogh and his interaction with the Policing Authority and the letter that he sent to the Policing

Authority concerning your promotion. But do you see that as a coincidence, that An Garda Síochána, as it were, begin to take action in relation to the bullying and harassment complaint shortly before the policing Authority are going to consider your promotion?
A. I'm not a hundred percent sure of that.
Q. Yes.
A. I don't know when it came to Garda Headquarters to allow, I suppose, what happened there occur in relation to it. But there seemed to have been no one appointed until the 15th November, for whatever reason.
A. No.
Q. CHAL RMAN what happened, what is the significance of
the 21st. Just remind me. I should know.
A. It's at 6886 and it's a letter from Garda Keogh's solicitor to several -- quite a few people in relation to me.
37 Q.
CHA RMAN To whom was that letter? was that the one to the Chairman of the Oireachtas Committee, Caoimhghín ó Caoláin and others, is that the one?
A. The minister, the Commissioner, the policing Authority. CHA RMAN Thanks, no, no, that's the one I want. I just hadn't got that in my mind?
A. The Justice Committee, Mr. Barrett and -CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
39 Q. MR. MARRI NAN we can just go back to the letter. You refer to media reports there.
"Outline An Garda Síochána's plans to carry out a scopi ng exercise in rel ation to this matter. I must ask if that scoping exercise was carried out and what the result was. I believe fair procedures and nat ural and constitutional justice would entail such an exercise take place so that chapter 5.2 of the policy document, Wbrking Together to Create a Positive Wbrking Envi ronment, under whi ch such complaints are dealt with, can be considered in my pre-investigation exami nation now to take place. For I say not to do so gi ves a credi bility to the complaint outside the terms of chapter 5.2."

Can you just explain what you meant by that?
A. I had learned in the media that there was some, I suppose, fractured brow between different elements in the Garda Síochána at a high level as to whether a scoping exercise should be carried out or not.

## 40 Q. Yes.
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A. I felt that, you know, without that scoping exercise it gave a credence or a credibility to the complaint, outside of that chapter there, which outlines what is not bullying in the policy document.
Did you merely learn this from media reports or were you aware of meetings in Garda Headquarters?
A. I learned them from media reports but I subsequently became aware of them then.
42 Q. But at the time you learned from the media?
A. Yeah, I was learning quite a lot of things from media.

43 Q. Then you go on to say:
"I must ask why I was gi ven no opportunity to consi der medi ation as outlined at chapter 8.4 of the policy.

I must ask what ot her compl ai nts Garda Keogh has made in rel ation to these matters apart fromthe ci vil claim referred to and what ot her processes are in being. Has professional independent legal advi ce been sought to ascertain if this process can proceed considering its i nextricable link to other avenues Garda Keogh may be engaged in."
what did you mean?
A. Civil action mostly, yeah.

44 Q. "I must ask for a full di scl osure of all rel evant documents rel ating to this matter, to include all documents and letters referred to in media reports."
A. Yes.

45 Q. What were you referring to there?
A. The meetings that I learned about in the media in October of 2017.

46 Q. Then you go on:
"I must ask how this, what I say is a contrived and hurried appoi nt ment, can continue, consi dering the compl ete lack of confidentiality displayed by the compl ai nant."

That is a reference to Garda Keogh.
A. Yes.

47 Q. "And ot hers."
A. Yes.

48 Q. "As evi denced in the medi a reports attached."
A. Yes.

49 Q. "The pol icy document under whi ch it is proposed these allegations are dealt with, regards confidentiality as sacrosanct."
A. Yes.

50 Q. Is that right?
A. Yes.

51 Q. And then you go on to point out that you have:
"...an unbl emi shed 35 years of service in An Garda Sí ochána and have never before in any of the roles । have hel d had such a compl ai nt made agai nst ne. I am mindful of the fact that allegations of this nat ure are serious and are having very di rect implications for my career in An Garda Sí ochána. I seek i mmedi ate clarification on the issues raised and confirmation as to whet her informed, professional legal advi ce was sought prior to pursuing these allegations in the manner chosen. "

It's quite a strong letter that you have written to the Commissioner.
A. Yes. As I said, I felt $I$ was $i n$ an unprecedented situation insofar as I was concerned, having to write, it's unusual and I never had to do it before in my service, to write in that fashion.
52 Q. Did you believe that you were being treated at that time unfairly by the organisation as well?
A. I suppose I felt that I was going to be scapegoated because of the position that may have been adopted by people who were making decisions about me because of what was in the media and the Dáil. And I felt that I was going to be scapegoated to allow placation of, I suppose, all of that noise that was occurring with politicians in Garda Keogh's favour.

53 Q. Yes.
A. That's how it felt.

54 Q. You see, part of the suggestion that is made is that

Garda Keogh's allegation of bullying and harassment was being deliberately withheld from the Policing Authority to facilitate your promotion. You understand that to be the position?
A. Yes.
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57 Q. Did you receive a reply to this letter that you sent?
A. I got an acknowledgment indicating that Mr. Nugent was dealing with the issues.

58 Q. But no written reply?
A. Other than to say that.

59 Q. Other than an acknowledgment?
A. But I had been engaging with Mr. Nugent then.

60 Q. Yes. If we go forward then to 22nd December 2017. If we could have notes of your conversation with Ms. Helen Hall of the Policing Authority. It's page 2885 of the material. Can you just tell us about this conversation as you recall it with Ms. Hall of the Policing

## Authority?

A. Yeah. I suppose --

61 Q. Would you like me to read your note for you?
A. Yes, okay.

62 Q. Would that be better?
A. Yeah.

64 Q. You note there that you received a call from Helen Hall and how long it lasted. Ms. Hall began by telling you that the Policing Authority considered your appointment at their meeting on 18th December 2017, but decided they didn't have enough information from An Garda síochána on the issues regarding a bullying and harassment complaint made against you. She said that they had not obtained sufficient information from the Garda Síochána despite seeking same repeatedly. Were you concerned about that at the time?
A. I was. I didn't realise that there had been a problem on the Garda side supplying information. I was of the understanding that information was being supplied as it was required and I felt that was -- I didn't know where I stood then. Again, that increased my suspicion.
65 Q. You went on to ask her who she was dealing with in An Garda Síochána. She said that they should be dealing with the Commissioner but he was compromised. You had been already advised of that --
A. Yes.

66 Q. -- by Mr. Nugent?
A. I had.

67 Q. Is that right?
A. I had.

68 Q. In some way as a result of his involvement in an investigation he carried out. So they were dealing with the CAO, Joe Nugent. She said:
"The Policing Authority are writing to hi magain today, the 22nd December, expressing thei $r$ deep frustration and annoyance and looking for the information agai $n$ bef ore their January meeting. "

You then note:
"I asked her if the Policing Authority were aware of
the medi a campai gn around this issue each month before the PA meetings in September, Oct ober, November and December. She said they were trying to get through the noi se around this but only had weak information from the Guards, whi ch i nvol ved a summary of the compl ai nt."

I think at that stage you offered Ms. Hal1 the 338-page document to overcome what you saw as an impasse --
A. Yes.

69 Q. -- between her and Mr. Nugent, is that right?
A. Yes.

70 Q. So this was another occasion on which you had been passed over?
A. Yes.

71 Q. If we could just then go forward to page 2888. Arising out of that conversation you were sent an e-mail from Ms. Helen Hall?
A. Yes.

72 Q. And we see there it's dated the 22nd December, at 14:05. The second paragraph:
"The Authority has been seeking inf ormation from the Garda Sí ochána si nce October in respect of the outstanding compl ai nt agai nst you in rel ation to bullying and harassment."

Well, that sets it out very clearly in relation to the issue.
A. Yes.

73 Q. And the issue is that they have information that there was a bullying and harassment complaint and they had been apparently trying to ascertain what it relates to.
A. Yes.

74 Q.
"The Authority noted that not withstanding repeated requests to the Garda Sí ochána it di d not have full information regarding thi s compl ai nt and was not therefore in a position to make a decision regarding cl earance in accordance with regul ation 12.

Subsequent to that meeting, on the 18th Decenber we have recei ved some further det ails fromthe Garda Sí ochána of the compl ai nt agai nst you and I have today
written requesting an update in advance of the Authority's next meeting in January regarding what progress has been made in rel ation to the investigation of that complaint. We have expressed a vi ew that in the interests of fai rness to you and the compl ai nant, it is important that this matter be deal t with as expeditiously as possible in accordance with the Garda Sí ochána bullying and harassment pol icy."

So they're setting out their position and I suppose you wouldn't disagree with that, the fault didn't appear to 1ie with them.
A. That's what they said, yes.

75 Q. And they seem to have been pursuing the matter for some considerable period of time. I think that then, on 18th January of 2018 you had a meeting with Assistant Commissioner Finn.
A. Yes.
Q. I will return to that when we are dealing with the notes that you've disclosed.
A. Yes.
Q. Because that relates to the bullying and harassment issue.
A. Yes.

78 Q. I think finally, on 29th January 2018 you received an 10:29 e-mail from Helen Hall of the Policing Authority, informing you that the Authority had met in special session on Friday, 26th January 2018, to consider your promotion and that she went into detail, describing how
she had photocopied the report that you had given her on 22nd January 2017 for each of the nine members of the Authority and that allowed them to peruse the supporting documentation. She said that following that, the Authority was happy to promote you and backdate the promotion to 26th October 2017. I think at page 2898 you have a note?
A. Yes.

Again you have the time that the call lasted. You note there:
"I again remonstrated a bit with the entire affair and expressed di ssatisfaction re having to engage a solicitor. She said l will get paperwork the next day and I did at 11: 44am and same repl ied to accepting promot i on. "

At that time had you engaged a solicitor yourself?
A. I did on the 1st November, the day after I was passed over for the first time. I got very concerned and I engaged a solicitor from that point on, privately.

80 Q. The following day, Acting Commissioner Ó Cualáin informed you that in line with the call that you referred to yesterday --
A. Yes.

81 Q. -- of the 14th September, that you were being stil1 transferred to the Garda college as director of training as and from 8th February 2018, following on from your promotion. You have a note of that
conversation and that's at page 2900. We don't need it on the screen, Mr. Kavanagh.

The next event that you note of consequence is on 6th February 2016. Clare Daly TD referred to your promotion in what you describe as a negative way in Dái1 Éireann, again citing allegations Garda Keogh was making against you, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

82 Q. If we can just have page 2910 up on the screen. And if 10:32 we scroll down there, we can see the contribution from Deputy Clare Daly, where she says:
"The $M$ ni ster can dress it up in any way he likes but it has been establ ished that there has been Garda
i nvol vement in the drugs trade in Athlone. It is a fact that no action has been taken agai nst those responsi ble. It is a fact that the person who made the allegations is out sick and his seni or manager has recently been promoted despite bei ng at the centre of allegations of bullying and har assment. Those allegations have not been investigated. We have a mechanism which is not fit for purpose."

So again, you're being drawn into debate in Dáil Éireann.
A. I am. I suppose the Policing Authority advised me that I should expect such a backlash, you know, from politicians and the media, when they advised me of my

83 Q. Now, that largely was the end of matters as far as you were concerned in relation to your promotion, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

84 Q. Now, I've omitted a huge number of documents that you provided to the Tribunal, but do you think that's a fair reflection of your position --
A. Yes.

85 Q. -- in relation to it?
A. Yes.

86 Q. I don't think I have left out anything.
A. No, absolutely not.

87 Q. Are you happy with that?
A. I am.

88 Q. During the whole process of your application for promotion back in 2016 and then going through to your ultimate promotion in 2018, do you believe that you had done anything improper in relation to any of your representations that you made to the Policing Authority 10:35 or to any TDs or otherwise?
A. No. I tried to be very careful in everything I did. In 2016 I was working with a group of eight people under the auspices of the representative association. That turned into five then after November of '16. And in 2017 I was working on my own with my solicitor with the Policing Authority, from when they passed over me in October.

89 Q. You have disclosed notes to the Tribunal and I don't
intend to open all of them, but it shows fairly extensive correspondence or, sorry, meetings that you had with various TDs?
A. Yes.

90 Q. Can you explain the circumstances in which you approached members of Dái 1 Éireann in relation to your promotion?
A. So, I suppose the 18 people who were promoted, and I was one of those, or listed for promotion in '16, were of the understanding that we were all going to be promoted clear in line with, I suppose, documents that had circulated in the organisation indicating that there were vacancies for 18 people, in line with the modernisation and renewal programme and a governance document that was introduced. when ten people were promoted, we couldn't find out any information then right throughout the summer. We got a date of September and I do see that Garda Keogh got some information in September as well himself that there was going to be some appointments at cabinet. And I see in 10:37 August where there was some interaction between the department and the Attorney General in relation to me and promotion. I didn't know any of that. But in October, one of the eight people who hadn't been promoted made contact with the other seven and we met as a result of that communication then with our representative association and decided on a course of action to try and find out what was happening and, number two, could we possibly get promoted before the
end of the year and before the list was to extinguish. And could some transitional arrangements be made in our case, as was similar in legislation or regulations which allowed for that to happen at the ranks of garda sergeant and sergeant to inspector.
91 Q. If we could just have page 16653 on the screen. This is the Garda Code. I just want to ask you in relation to chapter 10.1 and 10.23. We can go through to page 1668. If we scroll down to the bottom of that page to 10.23. It says:
"Attempts at using influence.
Members are forbi dden to commin cate either directly or through some ot her person with any publ ic body, department, public official or other person with the obj ect of influence or modi fying a deci si on regarding di sci pline, promtion or transfer of themsel ves or any nenber of the service. Where, with this purpose in mind, a rel ative or friend of a menber communi cates di rectly with the Commissioner or any officer of the service, or indi rectly through the medi um of any public body or organi sation, or public official or private indi vi dual, it will in all cases be presumed that such body or indi vi dual has so acted with the cogni sance of the member in whose interests the representation is made. "

In terms of your representations that you were making at the time to the various TDs, did you regard that as
infringing at all on that regulation?
A. No.

92 Q. Would you just explain why?
A. Because, I suppose, when we met first the representative body wrote to the Commissioner and met with the Commissioner at the time, and, you know, insofar as I was concerned explained what we were going to do. She appeared to have no information, although wanted us promoted and had requested that to happen. She was, as I led to believe, not -- or, you know, she wasn't getting any answer on that and it was just being kind of left in abeyance. And I suppose one of the -I will just come to it here. I suppose a short note I have of that first meeting that we had indicates what we agreed to do under the auspices of the association. They had met the Commissioner and we had a list of things that we would do there. And my understanding was that the association were keeping the Commissioner informed. In addition to that then, one of our group had just been the general secretary of the association a short time before that and was well familiar with the processes that we had to use to make sure we did things right but at the same time put our best foot forward.

93 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, the association is the association of --
A. Garda superintendents at that time.

94 Q. CHA RMAN of superintendents?
A. Yes.

95 Q. CHA RMAN Because you weren't yet a chief.
A. No, we were all superintendents.

CHA RMAN I just wanted to check that.
MR. MARRI NAN In some of the disclosed notes that we have, additional notes that we have, and perhaps it's proper to refer to this interaction because it perhaps indicates your frame of mind during the course of your interactions with various TDs. If we have 16214 up on the screen. This is 19th June 2017. You say that you got a call from Boxer Moran re how you got on in interviews. Then you told him how you had got on. This is somebody that had you been making representations to in relation to the problem that arose that you've described, isn't that right?
A. I met him with one of my group, yeah, back in 2016. But he was a local politician to Athlone and I suppose he first became aware of the situation as a result of the Minister announcing in the Dáil that she was concerned about policing in Ath1one, on 6th October 2016. I was summoned by local politicians to an in camera meeting to discuss that.

97 Q. Yes.
A. I went there with my two inspectors, Detective Sergeant Martin, Sergeant Haran, Sergeant Monaghan, who all have been here. And we made a presentation to the local councillors, two TDs and senator, who were there as a result of their concern and the Minister's concern. We made a presentation in relation to how policing was going in Athlone, what we were doing, what we intended to do, the changes in governance $I$ had introduced and
how all the different areas of crime, including drugs, subversion, community engagement were to be addressed. And they were all very happy with that presentation. And I was anxious to find out what the concerns were around policing and they couldn't get answers for me on that. And that's where the interaction started at that point in time. And one of my colleagues, and I met him following our meeting with the representative association, to explain our position around promotion. If we go back to the note, because having advised him you got on well in the interviews, he indicated that he was meeting the Minister the following day and you have recorded here:
"I tol d hi mot to say anything as canvassing di sal I ows."
A. Yes.

99 Q. "He sai d he under stood."

That was your position.
A. I didn't want anything done at that point. It was in 2016 those representations were made and he brought it up in June of 2017. I had sat my final interview on the 15th June and I certainly didn't want any interference because $I$ had, $I$ felt, got on quite well at both interviews.

100 Q. Is there anything more that you would like to say in relation to the promotions issue, issue $20 ?$
A. No.
Q. -- your statement in relation to this, but it appears that you had a number of different files under which you had filed notes, isn't that right?
A. Yes. I had. I am very annoyed with myself for allowing the situation to develop, that $I$ didn't do this properly. I am disappointed with myself that I didn't put more time and effort into doing all this.
Q. You may have considered not disclosing certain material because it was irrelevant at the time that you were making disclosure.
A. Yes.

104 Q. But has since become relevant in some shape or form, is that correct?
A. Yes, and I didn't revisit that relevance assessment that I did back in March of '19, unfortunately. I put too much energy into studying the volumes of documents I was getting rather than keeping my mind on what -CHA RMAN okay.

105 Q. MR. MARRINAN we will just then perhaps go through the notes, briefly. If we have 16210 up on the screen. is:
"Called Deputy Commi ssi oner Ó Cual ái $n$ at home with a
small thank you gift. Di scussed issues re assi stant commi ssi oners, whi stlebl owers, Commi ssi oner's plans. Said all list to be promoted together."

What was that about? First of all, what was the gift for?
A. So, I was at a wedding in the area where he lives in Galway on that day, and I had been notified of my promotion on the 25 th May. Deputy Commissioner
ó Cualáin and two other people were on board, and I decided to take the opportunity of my being in that area to call to him and express my gratitude to the board, through him, for, I suppose, their faith in selecting me for promotion. It's something that I have done before and I did it again in 2017, when I was promoted to chief superintendent, both to the Policing Authority and to the garda member of the board.
106 Q. As it turns out, it was a bit premature?
A. It was. And -- well, yeah.

107 Q. Then if we scroll down, well there is a reference there, there was some discussion in relation to whistleblowers, what was that about?
A. No, it wasn't that kind of a conversation. The deputy commissioner didn't know I was calling. I had to enquire exactly where his house was. And I didn't know 10:47 he was going to be there, so it was an unannounced call. He was happy to receive me. He brought me in. And I suppose, he gave me a pep talk on the anticipation that $I$ was going to be promoted and that's
what he felt, that all the list were to be promoted. So he spoke about the assistant commissioners who had just been notified of promotion as well, six of them. And he was explaining to me that I would -- as a chief superintendent $I$ would be hugely supporting those new assistant commissioners in their role in relation to the modernisation and renewal programme and how I would more than likely be appointed on several major change projects as a business owner with a particular assistant commissioner as a business sponsor and I would have to support the introduction of those. He discussed the organisation in terms of the whistleblower issues and how all of that had affected the organisation, but no one in particular, and how that was going to manifest in the change programme then into, $I$ suppose, changes in relation to culture and renewal in that area. And all the Commissioner's plans then. And one of his comments, I remember, is that he said to me, you know, we all have to pull on the green jersey now. It was that kind of a pep talk.
108 Q. So then we see there on the 9th Ju7y:
"Call fromJ Mbl oney."

Who is that? Is that Inspector Moloney?
A. No, he's a superintendent in Tullamore.

109 Q. A superintendent in Tullamore.

[^0]goi ng to be promoted re a cl ai mand am hol ding chi ef 's list up."
A. Yeah.

110 Q. What was that about?
A. I suppose that's some rumour that seemed to be going around about me. It's referred to in the documents here, when Garda Keogh gave my history to Ms. Daly, at to page 13063, he included in it a note to indicate that I had been disciplined in some way for falsely claiming 31,000 and transferred. He appeared to get that information from Garda Harrison, in his diary at page 13340, on 3rd December '15. But that rumour then started to circulate.

111 Q. You have:
"Thi s is the smear campai gn started by those in At hl one when members were suspended. Had heard Garda Keogh making enquiries re my time in Gort."
A. Yes.

112 Q. And then you mentioned somebody else there spent time in Gort before.
A. My recorded suspicion is entirely wrong there.

113 Q. If we could then just move on to page 16211. We see there is an entry there, the 11th November and the 15th November and the 17 th November, in relation to your interactions with TDs. Then if we could scroll on to 16212. Again there are a number of interactions members of the Dáil.
A. Yeah, that was all around the time before the list
expired in November and early December. we go on to page 16213, again your interaction with a TD. Then there's an entry for 23rd march 2017:
"Spoke with AC Nol an and CS Scanl an re Garda Keogh's st at ement. AC Fanni ng. "
what's that entry?
A. I was at a social function in Portlaoise, the retirement of a superintendent there, and I was talking ${ }^{10: 52}$ to Assistant Commissioner Nolan about his retirement and obviously the matters he was handing over that he was investigating in Athlone. Chief Superintendent Scanlan joined the conversation and he merely said that he hadn't managed to get a statement from Garda Keogh. He had indicated to me on the 1st March that he was meeting him the next day to take it. Assistant Commissioner Fanning then joined the conversation and it stopped and we broke up.
115 Q. Then if we go over to page 16215, we have an entry on 23rd January 2018:
"Lorrai ne meet D Ó Cual ái n. "

Is that Assistant Commissioner Finn?
A. "During the day", yeah.

116 Q. What was that about, do you know?
A. So I have my diary page here. I was in Blanchardstown, where she was stationed then, on that morning,
discussing the prosecution of a Garda member that had occurred in Athlone but who was stationed in
Blanchardstown. I met her very briefly and she said that that day she was meeting both of those men.
117 Q. If we scroll down then to 14th February 2018, you record that you met John Barrett between 1:20 and 3:00pm in his office?
A. Yes.

118 Q. "He spoke at length about himself and his previous experi ences."

Then there is a note here:
"He mentioned Assistant Commissioner OBrien had vouched for my bona fides to him"
A. Yes.

119 Q. What was that meeting about?
A. I had just taken up my position in the Garda college a week beforehand and Mr. Barrett was my direct boss and he asked to meet me about -- to introduce himself to me and to discuss my role, I suppose, in the organisation, under his command.

120 Q. Okay. So they're your diary entries. Then in a separate folder, you have your college notes?
A. Yes.

121 Q. There's nothing of any significance there. And then the bullying file, it's headed 16220 of the material. If we would just then look at an entry for 11th January 2018. You will see there:
"CS Meyers and inspector called to station and met and gave documents to DI Drea, Inspector Farrell, Sergeant Haran, Mbylan, Mbnaghan, Martin and Gui nan. I am al so aware of an Inspector Baker."

I will just read the whole note and then you can explain to us the various aspects of it.
"I had no prior know edge of them coming. He called to me in my office and said he was aware of my document and Iegal issues."

That's the 338-page.
A. Yes.

122 Q. "Said they hoped to deal with this qui ckly. Spoke of my promotion and prai sed people they met. Di scussed the context of the compl ai nt around problens in At hl one. Emphasi sed that M Finn was honest and et hi cal and would make sure everything was done right, so there 10:56 was nothing to worry about. Spoke about extra pip on my shoul der. Felt l am being belittled in my workpl ace with the nature of the visit, its purpose and no courtesy call to me."

Just deal with that last line first of all.
A. Yes.

123 Q. What was the issue there for you?
A. That is reflecting my mindset at that time. I was
passed over for the second time for promotion on the 22nd December. Right throughout that christmas period I had that mindset, that people were against me and that, I suppose, I was to be scapegoated, I felt, because of the campaign that had been mounted against me. And I felt, I suppose, when the group called or the chief superintendent called, it was unannounced and that that was having an affect on my leadership credibility in the workplace. That's how I felt at the time. So it wasn't a pleasant meeting for me with them.

124 Q. Then the phrase before that "emphasi sed that Assi stant Commissioner Finn was honest and ethical and would make sure everything was done right, so there was nothing to worry about"?
A. Yes.

125 Q. Were you comfortable discussing these issues with chief Superintendent Meyers, who was going to be part of the investigation team in relation to a complaint that had been made by Garda Keogh?
A. Yeah, I had no difficulty with it. I maintained a professional approach towards that, as I expected he would as well.

126 Q. Then if we just go on then to the next page, 16222. There is a note here, the 13th January, at 10:01:
"I text Assistant Commissi oner Finn re his request for a meeting. He replied at 12: 57, asking if l was free to talk. I rang himat $12: 58$ for 5.55 mi nutes."

Had you become in the habit of recording the precise times of telephone conversations and meetings? It seems to be a feature of your notes. Is that something you do in every instance?
A. No. It again reflects my mindset at the time. I suppose, these sets of notes were opened, the promotion notes and the bullying notes were opened on the advice of my solicitor. I felt that, as I said, there was going to be an adverse decision against me from the Policing Authority and I felt I was heading down a legal route to challenge that. And that reflects the precision I tried to have with the note then.
127 Q. "He said he spoke to Chi ef Superintendent Heal y, who examined the entire situation re mirrored civil claim bet ween J anuary and August 2017. He sai d he now knows of the meticul ous files and records and notes I have."

Did you discuss your notes and records with him during that, did you?
A. Well, I've two notes of this conversation, I have another one, I suppose, a shorter note at page 12380.
128 Q. Yes.
A. Which was made closer to the time of the phone call, on the afternoon of the phone call. And the second note is part of the notes in the bullying file that I was keeping. I suppose it's --

129 Q. Perhaps if we have 12380 up on the screen.
A. I took that note down on a single piece of paper.

130
Q. This was taken at the time?
A. Close enough after the time, yeah.
Q. "He spoke of Chi ef Superintendent Heal y and now knew my records etcetera."
A. Yes.
Q. "Spoke of what I did and now bei ng puni shed."

## Is that you saying that?

A. That's me saying that. He wouldn't have known that.
Q. "Spoke of teamlrish reception."
what's is that?
A. That should be T Meyers, it's a misprint.

135 Q. A11 right.
A. T Meyers reception.
Q. "I expl ai ned the ot her people, probl ens, work closel y, Lorrai ne deal ing with issues in a careful way. The cal i bre of the people invol ved. Thei $r$ frustration and annoyance and confidentiality."

So you then have a note here:
"Confirmthree i nvol ved."
A. Yes.

137 Q. They're yourself and the other two --
A. Yes.
Q. -- against whom complaint was being made.
"Said Keogh and solicitor I ooking for money."
A. Yes.

Who was it who introduced that?
A. Well, I think both of us said it. He said it and I said it. The conversation was about the civil claim. I suppose $I$ was linking that closely with the bullying allegations, because they were inextricably linked.
Who said it first, I'm not sure. But I definitely had that view, because I was being sued personally and he had spoken to Chief Superintendent Healy and he was fully aware of the information he had gathered or he had given me that impression, and he said it.

140 Q. Just scrol1 down there.
"Chi ef Superintendent Heal y report 17th July 2018."
A. So that's a little scribble $I$ have on the page to myself after writing the note.

141 Q. A11 right. "Says he knows of no bullying all egation."
A. Yes.

142 Q. "What did Fanning write up as he knew?"
A. Yes.

143 Q. What's that about?
A. So I had been given a copy of Chief Superintendent Healy's report in relation to the information he had gathered for the State claims agency and the Garda legal section. And in it he said he knew of no
bullying allegation and he submitted that report in around I think July of '17.
144 Q. Could you scroll down then --
A. And I wondered, you know, if something was in place then, why hadn't it appeared there. And I was suspicious of that.

145 Q. The rest of the note there, is this a note to yourself effectively that you have written?
A. That note, while it's typed on that page, that's on a separate page.

146 Q. Yes.
A. And that note was made for a meeting with my solicitor on the 16th --
147 Q. All right. We don't need to look at that then?
CHA RMAN we can forget that.
A. Yes.

148 Q. CHA RMAN As far as you're concerned.
A. That's on a separate page.
Q. CHAN RMN Somebody else might want to ask about it. But you say it's not relevant to this encounter.
A. No. So it's on a separate page. Meeting my solicitor on the 16th January.
150 Q. CHA RMAN on the 16th of?
A. January.

CHA RMAN okay.
151 Q. MR. MARRI NAN If we go back now to page 16222. So that's the short note, as it were?
A. Yes.

152 Q. And this is a more detailed note?
A. This is, yeah, I suppose, to put into the bullying file.
Q. When did you make the more detailed note?
A. I'd say on the morning of the 16th, before I met my solicitor.

154 Q. So three days later?
A. Yes.

155 Q. Did you use your original note that you made to assist you?
A. Yeah, I had it in the same file. It's in the same file.
Q. Do you think that the note reflects a fair --
A. No, it doesn't.

157 Q. Pardon?
A. I have to admit, it doesn't. It's, I suppose, transposed with my view, with my suspicions, with my mindset and imbued with my perspective in a very defensive way.
158 Q. We11, it's prepared for your solicitor?
A. Yeah.

159 Q. Apparently at the time?
A. Yeah.

160 Q. Assuming that you are going to ensure that potentially it could be used in litigation or in a defence to litigation and, indeed, a bullying and harassment case. 11:05 I would assume that you would make sure that it was as accurate as possible?
A. We11, I suppose it reflects my defensive mindset at the time. It's not as accurate as the shorter note, which
161 Q. Al1 right.
A. I imbued it and that's just what happened.
162 Q. If we then take up where we had left off.
"He said he now knows of the neticul ous files and records and notes I have. He sai d he knew now of the corrections I made in Athl one and was now being puni shed for doing so."

```
Do you see there?
Do you see there?
```

A. Yeah.
Q. You're attributing this comment to Assistant Commissioner Finn?
A. Yes.
is more precise and accurate.
All right.
A. I imbued it and that's just what happened.

162 Q. If we then take up where we had left off.
punis for
Q. And it's a suggestion -- well, it's not a suggestion, this is an assertion that he had said to you that in his view at the time that you had introduced changes in Athlone and that you were being punished for doing so?
A. Well, I told him about how I felt I was being punished, 11:06 so again, I suppose, I reflected it wrongly in the language I used and had a defensive mindset in writing it.
Q. Well, you see, I mean, if you could put yourself in Garda Keogh's situation reading this, it might suggest 11:06 that he is talking to you as -- he's the investigator, isn't that right?
A. Yeah. At the time, yeah.
Q. And he is talking to you in circumstances where he is
about to commence an investigation. It's not as though he has completed an investigation?
A. Yes.

167 Q. He is the investigator and he is talking to you in relation to complaints against you?
A. Yes.

168 Q. And you have him recorded here as saying that he knew of the corrections that you had made in Ath1one and that you were now being punished for doing so. And that's in the context of an allegation of bullying and harassment?
A. Yes.

169 Q. It then goes on to say:
"He spoke of CS Meyers' reception from peopl e accused he spoke to and his vi ew of the ethical cal ibre of the peopl e accused. "
A. Yes, that is Tom Meyers' view.

170 Q. Yes.
A. As expressed to me on the 11th January.

171 Q. "I expl ai ned the situation in Athl one, how CS Weatley and I worked closel y to make corrections with fai ness to everyone in a caref ul way, bei ng aware of the sensitiviti es invol ved. I tol d himof the calibre of the other people accused and thei $r$ frustration and annoyance at this contrived situation."
A. Yes.

172 Q. Did you think that was an appropriate thing to say to the investigator?
A. Yeah. I was expressing my frustration and annoyance. I had expressed it, I suppose, to the executive in the organisation on the 28 th November and, I suppose, I wasn't -- you know, I was in the mindset there where I felt that $I$ was being targeted myself, I didn't know who was behind that, and it appeared to be all managed in the way that was going to destroy my career and reputation. Garda Keogh says he is accusing primarily."

Then you go on to record:
"Assi stant Commi ssi oner Fi nn of fered a vi ew that Garda Keogh and his solicitor were onl y looking for money in a civil claim"
A. No, that's my view, yeah.

174 Q. Pardon?
A. It's my view. And I was attributing it to him after we 11:09 had the discussion about that and I suppose, I felt that he was agreeing with it in the empathetic way that he had, I suppose, listened to me in that call.
Q. Chief superintendent, a moment ago you said that this had been said by both you and --
A. It was said by both of us. But, like, I suppose when you read that, it's as if he offered it entirely unannounced, as it were, and it wasn't like that.

176 Q. So what was it? I mean, was it you saying, look,
they're only after you for money?
A. And he agreeing.

177 Q. And he agreed with you?
A. Yeah.

178 Q. And you've recorded it as Assistant Commissioner Finn offered a view?
A. Yeah.
Q. That's an entirely different situation.
A. Yeah, I was being sued at the time, and, look, you know, it reflects my mindset, I suppose, and the uncertainty in my mind at the time about what was happening. But the first note, I suppose, is the more accurate version of what occurred.

180 Q. Well, we know that Assistant Commissioner Finn has denied that he said that, do you understand that?
A. That he said it at all?

181 Q. Yes.
A. We11, as far as I'm concerned, it was said, yeah, by both him and me.

182 Q. Well, I suppose if you are looking at it from his perspective, he says it would have been something entirely wrong to say and inappropriate in the circumstances?
A. Well, I don't know about that, because like, Assistant Commissioner Finn is a professional person, he has a very good representation in the organisation. I would like to think of myself as professional. And I'd say both of us were fully aware that all of these matters were going to be dealt with in that bullying and
harassment policy. That was going to be subject to a review by someone else, outside of him, quite possibly. In addition to that, there was the civil claim which was going to be examined by the High Court. There was -- I suppose, the Policing Authority were involved as an oversight body, a regulatory oversight body in this. And then this Tribunal was there, up and running, with term of reference (b), a live issue. And so, I mean, for anyone to suggest that there was a mindset between either of us that something was to be readied up, that's absolutely not the case. I welcomed any investigation that was there, if I could participate in it fully. I have no difficulty with that. And I wouldn't want anything hidden. And there was no need to do that, because I had fully addressed all of these issues in the document I had produced a year earlier.
183 Q. You see, the implication in this, it could be argued that it showed a mindset in Assistant Commissioner Finn, in that he had already prejudged the issue, do you understand?
A. Well, I suppose, Assistant Commissioner Finn will have to address that, but there's no --
184 Q. He has addressed it?
A. Yes.

185 Q. And he has denied that he said this. He said not only 11:12 that, but he acknowledged himself that this would be unprofessional and totally inappropriate to say in circumstances where he was about to commence an investigation. And I am sure that you as a chief
superintendent, that you would regard it as inappropriate if you had said that to somebody else who you were about to investigate and, as it were, cast some sort of aspersion on the complainant. Do you understand?
A. I do, but my frustration, I suppose, came out in my conversations with Assistant Commissioner Finn from the couple of conversations I had with him on, I think it was the 22nd December, where he seemed to be unaware of any of the linked issues here, which I found astonishing, and I sent him an e-mail to that effect after the telephone call. On the 11th January then I think I spoke with him again and he was telling me about the advice he had got, legal advice that it could go ahead. But I didn't feel he fully comprehended what the legal impediment I had was and in that conversation then on the 13th, it was all about the civil claim. It was all about how, I suppose, I felt that I was being hampered in a way from being ab7e to put my best foot forward in his investigation, while I wanted to do that 11:13 and I wanted it, you know, done properly, not quickly, but I wanted to put my best foot forward with my big document and I felt I couldn't do that.
186 Q. It was a very short call, it was just almost six minutes?
A. Yes.

187 Q. So there couldn't have been that much discussed.
A. There was, yeah. There was.

188 Q. I mean, there is this conflict in evidence between what
you have recorded and what you say in relation to this and Assistant Commissioner Finn. Do you think that in some way that perhaps you defended yourself and had gone on the offensive to some extent by writing the letter that you wrote to the Commissioner and to the assistant commissioner. We opened that earlier on. It's a very robust defence. One perhaps could understand in the circumstances you found yourself, being mentioned in Dáil Éireann repeatedly, and in circumstances where twice you had been passed over by the Policing Authority, even though you knew you were eligible to be promoted. Do you think that you perhaps overreacted to things that were said to you and perhaps attached too much significance to throwaway comments?
A. I may have. I may have. But I did feel isolated at the time and, as I said to you, I probably felt that I was going to be scapegoated because of the racket that had been created about me. And it had started in December '15, I suppose, when the corruption accusations or allegations were made against me in Dáil Éireann. No complaint that I know was ever made or no one ever approached me about it. So I felt I was going to be scapegoated.
189 Q. We just might go on to the rest of the note on that page. This isn't a note of the conversation?
A. No.

190 Q. This is an aide memoire?
A. This is me writing my own thoughts, I suppose.

191 Q. It may perhaps give some insight into the way you were
thinking at the time. You say:
"It now appears this bullying investigation is being driven by the Policing Authority and their desire to have something tangible to hel $p$ their decision re me as 11:16 I have written legal letters to them"
A. Yes.
Q. That perhaps displays some sort of paranoia at that time on your part. I mean, it now appears that the bullying investigation is being driven by the Policing Authority?
A. Yes, and that's the way I felt. And I suppose, when I taught about any communications I had with them, their first indication to me was there was something in the public domain stopping it. And then $I$ was led to believe that it was the civil action that they needed some information about. But when the bullying and harassment investigation became public knowledge in November, they grabbed onto that and they forgot about the public domain then.
193 Q. We11, you see, the suggestion is that the investigation is being driven by the policing Authority?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Prior to this, and we went through it earlier on in your evidence, they had made it very clear that what was holding it up was the clearance process in An Garda Síochána, and that they had been looking for this bullying and harassment issue since the previous October. You agreed with me that the fault didn't lie
in relation to this with Garda Keogh, it didn't lie with the Policing Authority, but it lay with headquarters. We went through that earlier on.
A. Yes.

195 Q. But here you're suggesting in your own note -- is this the way you were thinking at the time?
A. We11, I suppose, I was looking -- trying to look at the totality of it, where meetings were had in Garda Headquarters and as a result of that this bullying investigation happened, there was no scoping occurred. The Policing Authority then had just grabbed onto that and they were now using it as the only obstacle, when there were elements in the public domain prior to that. And I felt that -- like, my call with Ms. Hall on the 22nd December, she had indicated that she felt this should be done at speed and that she didn't seem to understand the links to other people and with other people. And she felt that $I$ could be isolated in some way out of what was occurring and that this just could be conducted against me at speed to satisfy their need to have it bottomed out before making a decision. And that is reflected in what $I$ have written down there.

196 Q. You go on:
"This is the converse of what John Barrett is alleged to have written to themre the investigation suppressed for me. Now this investigation is being driven for them and procedures bei ng overlooked for everyone accused. "

And then you go on:
"In reading CS Heal y's report of 27th July 2017, he says he looked for all files and knows of no bullying allegation. Yet AC Fanning was aware of same from March 2017 and had tasked CS Heal y with hi s i nvesti gation but di dn't tell hi mof such compl ai nt of the March compl aint. I find that suspicious. I al so find it suspi ci ous that Garda Keogh has much more exhi bits attached to the documents AC Fanning gave me in November ' 17."

Just again, is that your mindset at the time?
A. That's me reflecting my own thoughts there prior to going to my solicitor.

197 Q. Okay. So then if we could just go to your meeting with Assistant Commissioner Finn on the 18th January. That meeting, where did that take place?
A. That meeting took place at my home.

198 Q. It was a four-hour meeting.
A. Yes.

199 Q. You have a note of that, it's at page 2896 of the material. It's a short note.
"Met Assi stant Commi ssi oner Finn 11: 00amto 3: 15pm and went over all documents I have. He indi cated Policing Authority needed assurance and that seei ng my documents and the information he was willing to provi de that. He
gave me Garda Keogh' s compl ai nt, had it al ready from Assi st ant Commi ssi oner Fanni ng. "

If we can just go to the next page, 2897. This is a fuller note:
"Met AC Finn at my home. We went through his compl ai nts and my 338-page document and di scussed all. I expl ai ned my concerns re provi ding it in circumstances where Garda Keogh will get it and my responsi bilities in that regard to my co- defendants, the organi sation and myself and confidentiality. I showed himaletter to Ken Ruane in that regard. He agreed with same. I gave hima copy of a letter I had sent to top three."

So what else was discussed during the four-hour meeting?
A. So, I went through the myriad of files that I had. And I suppose from when I was speaking to Ms. Hal1, it became clear to me that there were a number of issues that the Policing Authority had or weren't aware of and I felt they needed to be made aware of them in relation to my promotion. She didn't seem to be aware of the legal impediment that $I$ felt $I$ had in cooperating fully 11:22 and putting my best forward in the bullying investigation while civil proceedings were extant. She didn't seem to be aware that the delay in relation to the bullying complaint not coming to the fore until

November was not down to me and she seemed to be of a view, maybe based on Mr. Barrett's letter, that I was some way involved in that. And I wanted to, I suppose, have that information communicated to the policing Authority through the organisation. I felt that she didn't understand that the civil complaint and the bullying and harassment complaint were broadly aligned and mirrored. And, as I said to you, she seemed to think that it could be isolated and I could be just taken out and dealt with quickly. You know, she didn't 11:23 seem to understand it would take longer than 28 days, which is what is set out in the policy. And then I felt that, you know, I would have liked to have provided evidence through the organisation that I actually had this 338-page document and it was actually 11:24 a tangible, real thing. And my conversation, you know, after I had spoken to Ms. Hall on the 22nd December, I telephoned -- I sent her e-mail to Mr. Nugent, who telephoned me and I also spoke to Assistant Commissioner Finn. And I wanted to get that information provided to the policing Authority through Mr. Nugent and the organisation by way of Assistant Commissioner Finn. Not in connection with the bullying investigation but in connection with my promotion.
200 Q. Did you go through the document page-by-page during the 11:24 four hours?
A. No. He sat there and I -- no not page-by-page. I went through the various issues, and I have set it out here in a note I have at page 12313, what I went through

201 Q. If we just have tha
"Garda Keogh file."
A. Yes.
Q. "Notes and original exhi bits file re trailer."
A. Yes.
Q. "Mb. B allegations in Tullamore."
A. Yes, there were particular issues that files existed for in a big box that I had. I went through them, yeah.
Q. "Civil file. Vol ume 1 and 2. Supreme Court case. Ci vil all egations. Assi stant Commi ssi oner Fanning prai sing you constantly."
A. Yes.
Q. "Assi stant Commi ssi oner Fanni ng inter actions."
A. Yes.

206 Q. Then:
"Garda Keogh, Garda A, Greene, section 49 and
intelligence, journalist, politici ans creating chaos."

Then you go through them.
"Bullying file."

Is that right?
A. Yes.

207 Q. Then your letter to the Commissioner.
A. Yeah, which I gave him before he left.

208 Q. Then the media since September and your promotion and then you went through the promotion file?
A. Yeah.
Q.

Then if we scroll down. The Garda A file. Then
A. That's in a separate file again, yeah. And I had reported that to the organisation.
Q. If we just scroll down. So we then have -- is this a continuation?
A. No, this is something is I prepared prior to the meeting with Commissioner Finn.
211 Q. These are the matters that you wanted to discuss, is that right?
A. Yeah, as reflected then in the note that we did discuss, go through.

212 Q. I suppose Assistant Commissioner Finn was the chief investigating officer in relation to a complaint of bullying and harassment. This wasn't a formal interview with you, isn't that right?
A. No.

213 Q. No notes were kept by him?
A. Yeah. I did.

214 Q. But you have some notes?
A. Yeah.

215 Q. Which of course couldn't cover the four-hour period?
A. It took quite some time for me to talk through that.

216 Q. But they're headings --
A. Yeah.

217 Q. -- in relation to the various files that you discussed. In hindsight, do you think that it may have been inappropriate to have gone into this level of detail with Assistant Commissioner Finn in an unrecorded situation?
A. No, because I suppose Mr. Nugent had indicated to me that he was talking to Assistant Commissioner Finn. And my interpretation was that Assistant Commissioner Finn was providing the information and assurances and views to Mr. Nugent, so as that the Policing Authority could be properly informed in a credible way through the organisation that -- you know, those things I mentioned there.

218 Q. I suppose, chief superintendent, I mean, I suppose a complaint could be made by Garda Keogh that, for instance, if you were to discover that Assistant Commissioner Finn had sat down and visited Garda Keogh in his home and spent four hours discussing his allegations against you and none of it was recorded, you might be quite either suspicious of that or angry about it. Can you understand that perception, that there may be a sort of --
A. Yeah, but $I$ think it's a sinister perception that's being made but there wasn't a sinister motive on my part or, indeed, I'd say his. This wasn't about Garda 11:29 Keogh's complaints, this was about my promotion and having what I felt were the impediments and assurances the Policing Authority needed delivered to them in a proper fashion. And I didn't -- like Assistant

Commissioner Finn's investigation I knew I would have to deal with further on down the line. I had a problem with it. It was put aside. The meeting wasn't really about that, other than he gave me Garda Keogh's complaint, which I already had from Assistant

Commissioner Fanning. But apart from that, that was left aside. And this focus of this meeting was, $I$ suppose, my promotion insofar as I was concerned. okay. Then if we could just move on to 16225 of the material. This is a note of a conversation with Chief Superintendent wheatley, the 27th October. It records:
"Call from Chi ef Superintendent Wheatley, who said she had it fromthe hi ghest authority that the issue is with me and COR the PA recei ved and issues they raised.

They asked that the hi ghest authority in Garda woul d back me and same done at hi ghest level after thorough exami nation of the issues. She sai d that they are happy they have it over the line and it should be i mmi nent. "

That relates to your promotion, is that right?
A. That's right. I suppose that was prior to my being passed over, and she got that information and she relayed it on to me.

220 Q. "She said all at top extremel y annoyed I am being treated in this fashi on, when everyone knows l did not hi ng wrong. "

Was that the sentiment that you were getting at the time?
A. Yes. I got that from Mr. Nugent as well, that I was being supported by the organisation. But I remember saying to him that doesn't appear to be reflected in decisions that the Policing Authority are making about me.
221 Q. Then if we have 16231 up on the screen. This is a note that you made on the 2nd November. Then if we just scroll down, please, Mr. Kavanagh. Scroll down further. You just see there:
"Fromtal king to himand Joe Nugent and hearing from Lorrai ne Wheatley what Tony MELoughlin says about John Barrett accepting being wrong, I amgetting the i mpression that An Garda Sí ochána in a way to out manoeuvre Mr. Barrett and the Policing Authority are stalling on plying details to hel pecause they don't bel ieve the Policing Authority are entitled to the ci vil clai mor bullying claimas it's outsi de the criteria for the competition and they are saying those are the issues for the Guards and the State Cl ai n s Agency and not the Policing Authority."

That was a view that was held at the time, is that right?
A. That's the impression $I$ was getting, yeah, and that there was some -- I was being caught in the middle of, I suppose, a lack of information because of different
reasons. And I suppose that was reflected to me then by Ms. Hall on the 22nd December, when she said she was frustrated that she was getting information from the Guards. So obvious7y it wasn't being given, even though it was there.
Q. You go on to note:
"He sai d he hoped it would work out but would take a few days."
A. Yes.

223 Q. You note that you were:
"... getting the impressi on that the Policing Authority feel the Guards are del aying by not gi ving documents, so I am caught in the middle in a power game. It appears this could be sorted out by di al ogue and the Pol icing Authority to read the documents, but the rel ationshi p and level of commini cation is so poor that's not muted now. "
"Mboted now', I think that should be.
A. Yes.

224 Q. And that was a view that you held?
A. Yeah, that was my thought process in relation to any information that I had. And I suppose it's reflected
when Ms. Ha11 phoned me on the 22 nd December and she expressed that she wasn't getting the information. So my suspicions appeared to be founded.

225 Q. Yes. If we could then have 16234 up on the screen.

This is a conversation with Matt Nyland. You note there that you spoke to him and he was offering support and his legal view is that you're entitled to due process and that you're not getting it. And that you're entitled to your good name and that the Policing Authority can't continue to keep this sword of Damocles hanging over you in the fashion as alleged.
A. Yes, that was his view that he outlined to me.
Q. If we just go to page 16237. Scroll down, Mr. Kavanagh. This is a note of a meeting with Matt 11:36 Nyland. You note:
"I bel ieve it was a del i berate message fromthe or gani sation. "

What do you mean by that?
A. That was my mindset at the time, but I don't now think that that's true, I think he was just offering me personal support. I was with my solicitor that morning and I discussed that I was going to meet Matt Nyland and he advised, go and listen to what he has to say. And I did that.

227 Q. If we scroll over to 16238, the last four lines there:
"He advi sed me to use legal means agai nst the Policing Authority and said he would keep me informed. Said I was a vi ctimunnecessarily and the issue is to try and maxi mise Garda Keogh' s fi nanci al settlement. He di dn't offer any hope for an early sol ution."
A. Yes.
Q. Then if we could just go forward to 16241. This is a call from Chief Superintendent Gralton and he says that he had met with Commissioner ó Cualáin that morning.
A. That's right.

He informed you that Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin would like to ring you but he can't and is conscious that he would like to talk to you. I think that's because Commissioner ó Cualáin had already declared there may be a conflict of interest; isn't that right?
A. That's right. Chief Superintendent Gralton was the chief superintendent in Westmeath when I was there, he had left and gone to Crumlin. Commissioner ó Cualáin was going around visiting superintendents at that time, he hadn't -- he was the commissioner at that stage and he was visiting every chief superintendent as a result of an undertaking he gave the Policing Authority, and I think that conversation came up in that context here and Chief Superintendent Gralton relayed it to me and I wrote it down.
230 Q. If we look at page 16243 of the material. Again, this is a phone call that you had with Mr. Nugent on the 8th January, at 6:00pm. It was a short phone cal1, 1asting three minutes and 35 seconds. You discuss with him that you had been passed over for a second time and he indicated that he was anxious to get you over the line?
A. Yes.

231 Q. Because he felt that you had been badly treated and indicated that he was meeting Helen Hall on Thursday,
the 11th January, in an entirely different context, and he is going to meaningfully discuss your case with her. Says that he will have a better sense of the issue then but he mentioned that it's about the bullying. Then you have noted:
"He offered the opi ni on that l coul dn't have bullied Garda Keogh in the short time l was with him"
A. Yes.

232 Q.
"He said it was all normal managerial dealings with work rel ated issues, as Judge Charl et on said in the Harrison case."

Then you:
'. .. brought up Garda Keogh's allegations re ex Commi ssi oner Ó Sul I i van in April 2015, expl ai ned how I udi crous it was. He agreed. He brought up Garda Keogh's compl ai nt re overtime. I said the sergeants deal with that. He offered, it is an unbel i evable issue to stop your promotion."

## Is that right?

A. Yes.

233 Q. Then if we just go forward to page 16245. Friday, the 26th January, you received a call from Assistant Commissioner Finn, at 7:04 in the evening.

[^1]pronot i on. "

He said he had been talking to Mr. Nugent and he would ring you. And you have recorded there:
"Sai d PA made deci si on Friday morning, the 26th J anuary, and had extended Thursday's meeting into Friday. Said he would try and find out more."
A. Yes.

234 Q.
Was he doing this as a favour to you? Because obviously it wasn't part of his investigation.
A. We11, I understand he was engaged with Mr. Nugent in providing some assurances --
235 Q. Yes.
A. -- around those things, that I felt were impediments to 11:41 the Policing Authority. And I got a couple of phone calls that evening. I suppose everyone in the organisation at those senior management levels were aware that the Policing Authority had had a meeting where promotions were discussed. There were a number of people waiting for promotions and $I$ had calls from him, I had calls from Mr. Nugent and another chief superintendent who was waiting to be promoted to assistant commissioner, all with the same information, that no one had any information or no one had any idea 11:42 what the Policing Authority had done. As it turned out they made my appointment on that day but they didn't tell me then until the following Monday evening.

236 Q. Okay. We will just now move on to the disclosure of
the additional notes in relation to the civil file 2. If we go to page 16249. This is a note of 1st March 2017.
A. Yes.

237 Q. Were you here yesterday --
A. I was.

238 Q. -- when Chief Superintendent Scanlan gave evidence in relation to this? will you just tell us about that with the aid of your note, of how this conversation arose and what was said?
A. Yes. I was at the Forensic Science Ireland conference in Maynooth and at one of the breaks there Chief Superintendent Scanlan approached me and he said that he had been asked to meet Garda Keogh and see if he wanted to make a complaint under the bullying and harassment policy against Chief Superintendent Curran and I, that he was writing gibberish to HRPD about us.
239 Q. Are you sure that he said that, because he takes issue with that, he said that --
A. I'd say that's my word, yeah.

240 Q. You'd say it's your word?
A. I'd say it's my word as a result of what I understood him to be saying, that the message that was coming from headquarters was unclear and that's why he was being tasked to go and meet Garda Keogh.
241 Q. Then if we move on, you made disclosures in relation to another file, the original Garda Keogh file. It doesn't appear to me there is anything of significance, but the parties may disagree with that.
A. Yes.

They may wish to explore some of these additional notes. Thank you very much, chief superintendent. If you answer any questions.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Very good. Now, Mr. Kelly.

## CH EF SUPERI NTENDENT PATRI CK MRRAY WAS CROSS- EXAM NED

 BY MR. KELLY, AS FOLLOVG:243 Q. MR. KELLY: Yes. Chief superintendent, on the 3rd April, I will take you to it in a moment, according to you, Garda Greene called to your office explaining his backdoor contacts to the Police Authority, how he passed that information, passed on to them information favourable to you, do you remember that?
A. I don't think I said favourable, I said about me.

244 Q. Yes. Well, we will just look at volume 9, 2620. What 11:45 you said there in the middle of it was -- just to put in context, five to six o'clock approximately, the 3rd April '17, Garda Greene called to my office. Then if we go down, it says just after Garda A and CS Glacken, were the ones complained about.
"Said he had passed to J Feehily, Policing Authority, through her brother-in-I aw, her husband's brother that I was doing great work."
A. Yes.
Q. Is that not favourable to you?
A. We11, I suppose, it may or may not have, I don't know, you know, what way the Policing Authority would take that. But that's what he said to me.

246 Q. These are your words, not mine.
A. Yes.

247 Q. "I was doing great work"?
A. Yes. That's what he said he informed the Policing Authority.
248 Q. "Said di scussi on took pl ace re me at Gal way races and gave the impressi on Josephi ne Feehily was enqui ring about Athl one."
A. Yes.

MR. KANE: Judge, I am very hesitant to --
CHA RMAN I can't see who is speaking. Sorry, forgive me, I am trying to pan around.
MR. KANE: Sorry to interrupt, Judge, I am sorry to Mr. Kelly. I represent Garda Greene.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KANE: I am wondering if this line of questioning has any relevance to the issue. The issue, as $I$ understand it, is issue number 20; namely whether the Ó Cualáin investigation was somehow carried out in a manner that would facilitate Chief Superintendent
Murray's promotion. I am not sure this line of questioning, unless Mr. Kelly can demonstrate it, has any relevance to that issue, Judge.
CHA RMAN We11, Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: Yes, I can, because -- it will take me a couple more questions just to get to it, before I get to the point.
CHA RMAN Well, my position at this point, Mr. Kelly, look we all know what we are investigating and we all know what we are not investigating.

MR. KELLY: Yes.
CHA RMAN And I am reluctant also, so there's direct materiality, okay, stroke, is it strictly relevant. But there's obviously, as we all know, another zone of cross-examination that is legitimately pursuable in the overall interest of the veracity, credibility, reliability or whatever. So if the issue arises -please proceed, Mr. Kelly, you have asked nothing so far in my view that is legally objectionable. If that 11:48 arises, people may -- obviously we have to bear in mind we're not investigating the actions of the Policing Authority.

MR. KELLY: Yes.
CHA RMAN Obviously. Bear that in mind, Mr. Kelly, 11:48 and proceed.

MR. KELLY: Thank you very much.
CHA RMAN So, sorry, your question was about 2620. The memo of the 3rd April about the conversation with Garda Greene, as reported, subject to anything else we may hear, but as reported by chief superintendent Murray.

249 Q. MR. KELLY: Absolutely. This is as recorded by you, chief superintendent.
A. Yes.

250 Q. In your diary.
CHA RMAN Okay, proceed, Mr. Kelly.
251 Q. MR. KFLLY: You are reporting what Garda Keogh said?
A. Greene.
Q. You say there --
A. Garda Greene.

253 Q. Sorry, Garda Greene.
CHA RMAN Don't worry, I haven't missed that, he made a mistake. Garda Greene said. Okay, Mr. Kelly, question.

254 Q. MR. KELLY:
"...gave the impressi on that she had been in touch with Enda Kenny, Taoi seach, sent a report confirming that they spoke to the Taoi seach's office. Then he got a call fromsomeone in Fi anna Fáil to meet Assistant Commi ssi oner Fanning and said he woul dn't."

And so on.
A. Yes.
Q. When you were being told this, did this shock you?
A. Garda Greene had some issues and I suppose twice in my time in Athlone he had come both to myself and Superintendent Minnock about making a protected
disclosure about the issues that he had which he felt were, I suppose, being resurrected by something that had occurred to him at that recent time. He didn't know how to deal with that and he was thinking of
making a protected disclosure. He decided not to. And I think he went towards the policing Authority then to deal with some issues for him.

Right. What I am asking you is, here's Garda Greene telling you that he has a backdoor line of communication to the Policing Authority, to whom you had applied, and that he was supplying information which could broadly be said to be favourable to you. I am asking you, did that shock you?
A. No, because my understanding at the time was Garda Greene was engaging with the Policing Authority about his issues and I suppose he may have been giving an example of how things had changed for him in Athlone, he felt better about the place now, since my arrival. I didn't see it as reflecting in any way information about me directly to the Policing Authority. Nor did I want him to do it. Nor did I ask him to do it. Nor did I need him to do it.
257 Q. Perhaps I can just move quickly through this. I can take you through a whole series of these notes that you have recorded, where you have met with Garda Greene and Garda Greene is telling you about various contacts he says he is having directly or indirectly with the Police Authority, would you agree with that?
A. He did several times come to me to tell me --

258 Q. It's more than several times, there's at least nine, ten of them, isn't that right?
A. I'm not sure. You're saying ten, I don't know.

259 Q. okay, well then unfortunately we will just go through
them?
A. Yeah.
Q. Right. Let's then start with page 2636. 31st May 2017.
A. Yes.
Q. "He is praising me."
A. That's what he told me, yeah.

263 Q. Is that what attracted your attention?-
A. That's what he told me that he in the document. I saw ${ }^{11: 52}$ a copy of a document he ultimately sent, it's disclosed. He did praise me and Superintendent minnock and Sergeant Haran and he criticised other members who had served in Athlone prior to that.
264 Q. Did that surprise you?
A. which?

265 Q. "He is praising пе", in a document going to the chair of the policing Authority?
A. Did it surprise me? well, he held a view of me that $I$ was okay, that I had treated him well and that I had made changes that he was happy with, both to his own work area and in the station and in the area generally. As I said to you, twice he had expressed a view that he wished to make a protected disclosure. So he was in
that mindset. He had some welfare issues. And I suppose Superintendent Minnock and I dealt with him in relation to all that and he engaged with us in relation to -- we kept it confidential. He wanted someone to deal with his issues. I think he had been to politicians, he had been to GSOC and now he was trying the Policing Authority.
266 Q. Yes. I think then on the 14th August, we will find that I think at 2070 of the documents. If we could have that up on the screen.
> "14th August. Garda Greene spoke to me about his interaction with Mb. Josephine Feehily, Policing Authority."

MR. KANE: Judge, I am again very sorry to Mr. Kelly. This is my last intervention, I am very sorry, Judge. CHAD RMAN No, don't apologise. Mr. Kelly, here's my concern, help me on this: The Policing Authority is not here.
MR. KELLY: Yes.
CHA RMAN we're not investigating them.
MR. KELLY: That's right.
CHA RMN It strikes me that it must be possible to ask, in fairness to you and without inhibiting you in global question that doesn't involve particular reference to interactions with (a) a party who has not yet given evidence, and where we go with that evidence
is another day's work, but I think much the same thing will arise in it. So, can you help me on this? $I$ mean, obviously I don't want to inhibit your cross-examination. At the same time, I think we looked at a question, how far do we go, what is our remit, and 11:55 we said it's not to do -- I mean, Garda Keogh says, look, An Garda Síochána facilitated the promotion of Superintendent Murray and I regard that as targeting/discrediting. It may be debated which of them it is, but that's what he says, I made legitimate 11:56 submissions to the Policing Authority, the Gardaí frustrated that, if you like. That's his complaint.

I can't say whether the Policing Authority did right or did wrong or did anything. So I am in a difficulty. I 11:56 can well imagine that through the door will come the Policing Authority lawyered up for a fray and they'11 be right, because they'11 be saying, what are you doing? So, help me on this.
MR. KELLY: Yeah.
CHA RMAN I have the documents. We will be looking at the documents. So, can you ask a question in general terms? I mean, we can count how many encounters there are.

MR. KELLY: Yes.
CHA RMAK And the details, that's not a worry and so on. Can you put that into a question that saves -- I mean, I am asking for your assistance as much as anything else, in endeavouring to --

MR. KELLY: I will certainly, yeah.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. KELLY: Just if I can do this before I do it. The on7y reason $I$ was going down that road was --
CHA RMAN I will leave it to you, Mr. Kelly.
MR. KELLY: -- the chief superintendent thought it was appropriate to challenge the number of times he had such interactions.
CHA RMAR I understand that. Look, don't worry about that. I can count.

267 Q. MR. KELLY: Chief superintendent, the question is simply this: If this was going on and you were aware and you were making notes about it, did you ever report it to the Policing Authority, saying, look, there's a lot of canvassing going on on my behalf and it's wrong?
A. Oh, no, there was no canvassing going on on my behalf. That's an outrageous thing to suggest. I never needed anyone to canvass for me. My promotion was achieved on merit.

268 Q. Yeah. But you were aware --
A. I find that outrageous, to suggest that.
Q. You were perfectly well aware that canvassing was utterly prohibited?
A. Absolutely, and I made that very clear to a person in June of '17, after I did my interview.
270 Q. what I am just wondering about, is here you are recording in your diary these things where one member at Athlone is saying that he is canvassing on your behalf. I am asking, why didn't you report it to the

Policing Authority?
A. He didn't say he was canvassing on my behalf. As I said to you, he also wrote comments about
Superintendent Minnock, who also got promoted and was in a competition that year. There was no canvassing. Neither I nor Superintendent Minnock asked Garda Keogh [sic] to do anything for us. Nor I certainly wouldn't need anything to be done for me. I don't think from what I know of Superintendent Minnock he would need anything to be done for him either. My promotion application and my interview stand on their merit.
A. Well, you are, and I take grave exception to that.

272 Q. You may well do. Let me ask the question. I am not suggesting to you that you were getting Garda Greene to 11:59 canvass on your behalf. what I am suggesting to you is, you are recording him telling that there is canvassing going on which benefits you. I am simply asking, did you report that to the Policing Authority?
A. No, I didn't.

273 Q. Thank you.
A. Nor did I see any need to in the circumstances in which Garda Greene outlined to me that he made contact with the Policing Authority to discuss his issues. And if he used an example of what was happening in Ath1one at a time prior to my arrival with something that was now happening because of changes $I$ brought in, we11 that's a matter for him.

274 Q. CHA RMAN May I ask a question that's as neutral as I
can? Let's leave the word canvassing out of the equation. As Mr. Kelly expressly acknowledges there's no suggestion that you inspired Garda Greene or anybody else to make representations on your behalf. There is no suggestion of that kind. But if Garda Greene, in whatever circumstances, I appreciate that he had occasion to be in touch, but in whatever circumstances he was in communication with the Policing Authority, and if he was saying things that were helpful, if you like, or defensive, or putting accurately the position in regard to you in a helpful way, would you have regarded that as being acceptable, not acceptable, something of that kind?
A. I'd be neutral on it, because the interview process that I went through had four people on the first interview board who were independent and five people on the second interview board who had assess me, my character and what I presented to them.
275 Q. CHA RMAN So you got over the hurdles and the decision was made that you were entitled to promotion?
A. We11, I was successful in the competition.
Q. CHAN RMAN That's the case, yes, and you're number 7?
A. Yes.

277 Q. CHA RMAN This much we know?
A. Yes.

278 Q. CHA RMAN And you say that went straightforward, perfectly proper and everything. But now there is an issue, and whether it's fair or unfair, there is a question, the Policing Authority, some might say


Q. CHA RMAN okay, very good. So you did not think in the context, in the circumstances you did not think that anything that Garda Greene was doing to your knowledge, you didn't think that was something to be reported, complained about, or whatever it was?
A. No. And I suppose I gave that letter, when I got it, to my solicitor immediately and I did report it to the Policing Authority subsequently.

283 Q. CHAN RMAN okay.
A. On his advice.

CHA RMAN Okay. Now, I am sorry, Mr. Kelly. But I think that may be illuminating in some way, and it may also get us over a specific question, if you like, of the involvement.

284 Q. MR. KELLY: Yes. There is just one other matter before I move on from that. You instructed your solicitors, McInnes Dunne, to subsequently write to the Police Authority, didn't you?
A. Yes.
A. One second now. Yes, I have it.
Q. Paragraph 2, for example, do you see that?
A. Yes.

287 Q. "Our client has learned that during the course of the application process the Policing Authority engaged in a series of contacts with a serving rank and file member 12:04 of An Garda Sí ochána regarding our client's application for promotion. Our client has been advi sed that the Policing Authority not onl y corresponded with this serving nember, but al so met with himand asked himfor his opi ni on on our clent's character and suitability for appoi nt ment."
A. Yes.
Q. "Details of the Policing Authority's interaction with the serving member in question have been provi ded to
our client by the serving menber, incl udi ng a copy of a I etter sent by himto the Policing Authority which incl udes, apparently at the Policing Authority's request, his opi ni on on our client."
A. Yes.

289 Q. Now, just pausing there, I want to make clear, before anybody objects, that the Policing Authority utterly rejected this. That's perfectly plain, and I am not making any imputation. But I am asking you about that paragraph.
A. Yes.
Q. Why did you wait until after your appointment, your promotion was confirmed, before you get the solicitors to write this letter?
A. That, I sent that letter on the advice of my solicitor, who felt that $I$ should do something about this, that I couldn't hold that information. He sent that letter. It was met with a denial. A second letter went with more information in it. And...
291 Q. But that was after you got the appointment, promotion?
A. Absolutely, absolutely.
Q. I'm asking you why didn't do you it before it?
A. Because the Policing Authority, I was led to believe, were engaging with Garda Greene through a third party.
293 Q. I will ask you --
A. I didn't know what was going on with that.
Q. I will ask you the question one more time: why didn't do you it before your appointment?
A. Because I was acting on the advice of my solicitor and

I didn't see a need to do it before my appointment. I didn't fee1 it had any relevance before my appointment. My appointment was based on the interview process, the competition I won. But and then an analysis of my character, that's based on my service in the Garda síochána and a character reference form that I had provided to the policing Authority, which they were obliged to check with the guards and with GSOC. is in volume 17, page 16249. It's a diary entry of 1st March 2017. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So you're approached by Chief Superintendent Scanlan at a Forensic Science of Ireland conference?
A. Yes.
Q. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. "Sai d", I take it that is Chief Superintendent Scanlan said?
A. Yes.
Q. "He was asked by an assi stant commi ssi oner from Human Resources and People Devel opment to meet Garda Keogh to see if he wanted to make a complaint under bullying policy agai nst Chi ef Superintendent Curran and I, as he 12:08 was writing gi bberish to Human Resources and People Devel opment about us."
A. Yes.

300
Q. That's what he said to you, is it?

CHA RMAN No.
A. Well, I've dealt with this already. The word gibberish is my word.
Q.

MR. KELLY: Right.
A. But in relation to his explanation of it, that's my interpretation of what he said when I some time later wrote out that note. Not at the time.
Q. Did he say it was to make a complaint under the bullying policy?
A. He did, yeah.

303 Q. So back then in March you knew a complaint was in the offering from Nick Keogh?
A. But these things had been mentioned in the Dáil, in relation to my promotion in October '16, so I knew there was something in the offering.
304 Q. There was more than something. Bullying policy.
A. Yeah. But that had been mentioned --

305 Q. Yeah?
A. -- you know, in public outings of me.
Q. Just before I leave that. If that's right, you knew about the bullying policy, why didn't you put it in the application form?
A. There was no obligation to me to anything about bullying on the application form, and all one has to do is read the clearance form that $I$ filled out, that $I$ disclosed. I suppose it would be prudent to put it up on the screen, seeing that you are asking that question, and if you bear with me, I should be able to get the page number. I think it could be around 2624
or thereabouts. It's the copy of the declaration that I completed, and you will see from reading that, that nowhere on it does it say anything about it. It could be a few pages on.
CHAN RMAN That's all right. You say the application form did not say -- I mean, there's no need for us to put it up, unless you particularly want to draw attention to it.
A. The application form didn't say it, nor did the vetting form.
CHA RMAN I understand.
MR. KELLY: I just put it to you, so there's no need to take it up, that the application form does ask for you to update any of the matters that you deal with should they change?
A. Absolutely. And the update, as far as $I$ was concerned, could only have been provided after the 15th November, when I was noted formally of the bullying complaint. At that time I discussed with my solicitor, should I now formally notify the Policing Authority of this, and 12:10 because they already were now aware of it, it was in the public domain, I decided not to. I didn't think it would serve any purpose.
309 Q. We11, I am putting it to you that, as you say, it was quite clear to you back in March, the 1st March, that 12:10 this was -- there was an investigation underway in respect of claims of bullying and harassment being made by Nick Keogh against you?
A. No, that's not true.

310 Q. Okay, I understand that.
A. No, allow me answer the question please. On the 1st March, and I think I heard Chief Superintendent Scanlan say it yesterday, he was not appointed to investigate anybody or anything at that point in time. He led me to believe he was meeting Garda Keogh the next day, to take some kind of a statement. He mentioned it to me again on the 23 rd March, and we went through the note earlier on, and he said to me that he hadn't been able to meet Garda Keogh. And that's as I saw it. And I didn't know that there was any bullying complaint made against me until the 24th September, when it appeared in the public domain and then on the 27th in the Dáil.
311 Q. I will draw your attention and that of the Chairman to the penultimate sentence:
"I asked if the internal process could be entered into consi dering Garda Keogh had initiated ci vil proceedings agai nst the State naming me as respondent. He said it was a good question and he would pose it."
A. Yes.

312 Q. "Internal process", that clearly is a reference to bullying and harassment, isn't it?
A. When Chief Superintendent Scanlan mentioned that to me on the 1st March, he said he was tasked to go and see
if Garda Keogh was making a complaint under the bullying and harassment policy. So, I have no issue with that. But he came to me on the 23rd March and he said he hadn't, nothing had happened.

So back in March you knew that a bullying and harassment claim was in the offering?
A. I knew that Chief Superintendent Scanlan had been tasked with something and I heard no more about it after the 23 rd March until, as I said to you, in September and then subsequently in news media in October, again in November and December.
315 Q. So when you put in -- we know that the bullying and harassment claim with Nick Keogh was given to Chief Superintendent Scanlan on the 27th March?
A. Well I didn't know that.

316 Q. Yeah. And I think it was around the same time that you 12:13 put in your application?
A. The 28th.

317 Q. The 28th, the following day?
A. Absolutely.

318 Q. Before completing it, having had that conversation on the 1st March, did you think to ring and ask, just to be sure, look, has anything come of this because of this bullying and harassment claim, because I have got to fill out this declaration which requires me to say whether such a complaint is being made against me?
A. Now, a couple of points there. The declaration didn't require me to say that such a complaint was being made against me. And secondly, that declaration was not completed or was not required to be completed by me
until 15th June 2017, the day I sat my final interview. And between March and that time, no one had made me aware that any statement was made citing complaints against me by Garda Keogh.
319 Q. Can we call up page 2633, please? This is the declaration of suitability. It's section 1 that I am interested in.
A. Well I think you need to look at all the sections. I am grateful for your advice. Just let me have a look.
"I confirmthe information provided in sections 1 to 5 is complete. If I amplaced on the sel ection panel । will notify the Policing Authority without del ay of any change or update to that information until the expiry of the panel of candidates arising fromthis sel ecti competition. "
A. Yes.

321 Q. Do you accept that that obliges you to notify them of anything which alters that which you have said, any updates, after sending it in?
A. It depends. Like, the rest of the questions, if you care to go down through them, do not relate in any way to bullying and harassment. And I think it's prudent to go down through them. And again, as I said to you,
when it came to my knowledge on the 15th November, I discussed with my solicitor whether I should now formally advise the policing Authority and they said there's no point because they already know, it's just
semantics. And they have never raised an issue with me about that, and it's their competition and their rules and their vetting and their decision to appoint. we11, I am certainly raising it now. what I am suggesting to you is, and we will go through the documents in due course, in submissions with the Chairman rather than debate it at length now, that there was a clear obligation on you to notify the Policing Authority of the existence of the bullying and harassment complaint made by Nick Keogh against you and you didn't?
A. I wasn't aware of its existence until the 15th November.
323 Q. And I am suggesting to you, you were aware of it plainly by reference to that note of 1st March 2017?
A. No.
Q. 27th. I am not sure whether you answered the question I will ask it again. Did you ask Chief Superintendent Scanlan if there had been a complaint before or at any point -- before you filled out the application or at any point thereafter?
A. No.

326 Q. Before November?
A. No, I didn't speak -- after the 23rd March, I have no recollection of meeting Chief Superintendent Scanlan again for quite some time or talking with him or
engaging with him in any way. Up until, I think, the 19th November, when I phoned him to find out where this had been. And he told me he had sent it in immediately when he took it. And I did that result of the media that had occurred that day, which I found quite upsetting, and the lack of confidentiality around the whole process was quite worrying for me, combined with what I saw at that time as a definite and direct campaign to destroy me.
327 Q.
I want to now look, if I may, at some of the entries, some of them you have been through with Mr. Marrinan, others not. These are the diary notes which you have disclosed only recently in the last few weeks. And I think they begin -- it's volume 57, the first one I want to look at is 16209, the 4th September.
A. What year?
Q. 2015. That's what is written on my copy, 16209.
A. Yes.

329 Q. Have you got it?
A. Yes.

330 Q. "Spoke to Detective Superintendent Mul cahy re whi stlebl ower's cases as on files he had sent re- arrest. Superintendent Murray to look after same."

What was that about?
A. Detective Superintendent Mulcahy phoned me in relation to a legacy file he had come across during his investigation, which I think related to Athlone and particular subject there, had been investigated by a
guard who had been in Ath1one but had been transferred to Mullingar. He wanted some correspondence that he had sent returned in relation to the query he had on it, and I simply informed him that that guard was no longer in Athlone, he was in Mullingar and I passed the 12:19 matter on to my colleague over there, Superintendent Alan Murray, to deal with, and I never heard anything more about it again.
These notes which you've just disclosed in the last few weeks, why didn't you disclose them before?
A. Because at the time when I did my statement, I didn't think they were relevant, and there's one in particular, because $I$ knew in my mind that it had nothing to do with this issue. So I didn't feel it was relevant and I did that in March of '19 and, as I said, 12:19 you know, it's an error on my part, I am very disappointed and annoyed with myself that, you know, it can be used against me or to, I suppose, create the impression that $I$ am conceited in some way, when that couldn't be further from the truth.
We11, I was just wondering about not relevant. If you look at 16223?
A. Just give me the date.

333 Q. That's the first meeting between you and Garda Keogh, March the 15th?
A. This list, is it?
Q. Yeah, it's your list?
A. Yes.
Q. Right. Work related stress issues, March the 15th
[sic].
A. Yes.
Q. "Al cohol si ckness."

Did you not think that that was relevant?
12:20
CHA RMAN He didn't meet him on March the 15th. He didn't meet him until March the 26th.

MR. KELLY: March 2015.
CHA RMAN I'm sorry.
MR. KELLY: 26th March 2015.
CHA RMAN I'm sorry. Sorry, Mr. Kelly, a stupid mistake on my part.
337 Q. MR. KELLY: Don't worry about it. Do you not regard that as relevant, the first item, "al cohol si ckness"?
A. I think that's two words, so if you look at the
original there, it's "al cohol/si ckness", it's not one word.
Q. Yes, but is the whole lot of this, his car tax, absent without leave, trailer thefts and so on.
A. Yes.

339 Q. Support, blah, blah, blah. Why is that not relevant?
A. Because it's similar to a note $I$ think $I$ disclosed in relation to when $I$ was going to the CMO, with the same things on it. And this is one I think I prepared in assisting me to compile the 338-page document that $I$

340 Q. Just in relation to that first one, I will ask you that, at that point clearly you thought that Garda Keogh's problem was alcohol sickness, not work related
stress?
A. No, it's two separate words. It is alcohol/sickness.

341 Q. I see, okay.
A. Yeah, and you can look at the original here.

342 Q. Show me the original, where I can see the stroke.
A. [INDICATING].
well, $I$ can't see it from here.
A. It is a photocopy here. [SAME HANDED].

We11, you're right, the photocopy $I$ have been given seems to show alcohol and then stroke sickness. Somebody has written over to the right, stroke?
A. That's my own note that $I$ put on it. That's my copy.
Q. Why would you put on a note saying "stroke" if you have got a stroke there?
A. Because I read in the transcripts where this had been raised as an issue.

346 Q. Perhaps you will show that to the Chairman?
A. Absolutely. The original is available for anybody to see and photocopies of the original were given to the Tribunal in December. And that's, I suppose, the copy that the Tribunal gave to me, gave back to me, it's not my copy, it's a copy that the Tribunal gave back to me [SAME HANDED].

CHA RMAN Yes, I see the point.
MR. KELLY: Yeah.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. I will hand it back. MR. KELLY: I will move on from that. But the point is, it doesn't say anything about work related stress at all in that note, does it?
A. No, and we have been through this when I was here before, you know, I reported work related stress for Garda Keogh on the 2nd April.
348 Q. Just going on through the notes, if we go back to where we were, 11th June 2016, it's over the next page, 16210?
A. 11th June 2016?

349 Q. Yes. Here we have the 11th June, you called to Deputy Commissioner Ó Cualáin at home?
A. Yes.

350 Q. We have talked a little about this?
A. Yes.

351 Q. With a small thank you gift?
A. Yes.

352 Q. What were you doing giving him a gift?
A. I called to his home, so I brought the gift with me for him. The purpose of my call was to express my gratitude to the board through him for placing faith in me. I was absolutely delighted to promoted, exuberant, in fact. And I felt it was a huge achievement for me to get it.
Q. What was the gift?
A. A small bottle of whiskey. CHA RMAN A small bottle of whiskey or a bottle of whiskey.
A. Well, a bottle of whiskey, in that it wasn't an expensive bottle of whiskey.

CHA RMAN I'm sorry. I'm sorry. You gave him a bottle of whiskey.
A. Right. It wasn't anything special.

354 Q. MR. KELLY: So having done that, you then went on to discuss issues in respect of ACs, what's that, assistant commissioners?
A. Yes. As I said, there were six people who were selected to be promoted to assistant commissioner and Commissioner Ó Cualáin discussed with me how I would be supporting those and had the support.
"Whi stl ebl owers Commi ssi oner's plan" what is that?
A. No, it's two separate words, it's not to be -- you're reading it as if it's one word it's not, it's the whistleblowers situation in terms of changing the culture of the organisation, and then the Commissioner's plans in terms of the modernisation and renewal programme that then existed and again, what support would have to be given to that. And as I said, one of the things that $I$ distinctly remember him saying to me, we will have to pull on the green jersey because the organisation is in difficulty.
356 Q. And what actually is meant by that?
A. Excuse me?

357 Q. What in this context is actually meant by that? we have got to pull on the green jersey.
A. It means that we have to put our shoulder to the wheel because the organisation, I suppose, needs to change and modernise, we have a plan there for it and it was a very ambitious plan and we have to drive that forward now and that'11 be one of the main things that all of the people who are promoted will be doing.

358
Q. I see. okay.

Chairman, I wonder whether at this time it would be
time to have the earlier break that Mr. McGuinness yesterday was suggesting, resuming earlier too.
Because I have some more to do.
CHA RMAN I was just wondering, is it convenient to carry on, for you not to interrupt your
cross-examination, and then we will have a shorter session in the afternoon. If that is convenient, then that is, I think, probably --
MR. KELLY: I am happy to do that.
CHA RMAN Are you happy to do that?
MR. KELLY: I am.
CHA RMAN Very good. Thanks very much.
360 Q. MR. KELLY: Okay. The 27th July '16, that diary entry there, page 16211?
A. Yes.

361 Q. You attended -- you spoke to Chief Superintendent Finn about promotion?
A. Yes.

362 Q. What was that about?
A. So I was in Mullingar at a briefing that he was
conducting in relation to the performance and accountability framework system that was being introduced. He was then a chief superintendent who had been on a list waiting to be promoted to assistant
commissioner, and I was a superintendent waiting to be promoted to chief superintendent. We discussed very briefly if either of us had heard anything about the promotions because ten people, as I said, had been promoted on the 13th July but eight hadn't, and I was one of those eight. That was the extent of it. Just looking down that page then. 11th November 2016, you met with Jim o'Callaghan at Harold's Cross at 12:30, promotion with B Sutton?
A. Yes.

364 Q. Further discussions with other 8"?
A. Yes.
Q. Jim O'Callaghan was the Fianna Fáil TD?
A. Correct.

366 Q. Isn't that right?
A. Correct.

367 Q. Why were you involving him?
A. As I explained to you, in 2016, when, I suppose, the eight people who hadn't -- who were waiting for promotion and hadn't any information about it, engaged with our association, who in turn engaged with the Commissioner. A meeting was arranged by one of my colleagues and I was asked by the other group of eight or selected one of my colleagues to go to that and to meet Mr. O'Callaghan, put our case forwarded under the auspices of our representative association.

368 Q. So you met with him, you also met with Boxer Moran?
A. I did, and I had people with me on most of those visits, members of the group.

369 Q. And then you also met with Dennis Naughton?
A. I did, I had someone with me there, yeah.

370 Q. And you met with Peter Burke?
A. I was on my own in that one.

371 Q. And you met again with Jim O'Callaghan?
A. With two other guys, yes.

So this was all to advance your promotion, was it?
A. This was, I suppose, to find out if it was possible for us to be promoted prior to the expiration of the list in unusual circumstances on the 31st December or the passing of regulations, whichever came first.

373 Q. Was this you and others involving politicians to advance your cause?
A. Under the auspices of our representative association.

374 Q. So the answer is yes?
A. We11, we gave them a document which set out our case and if they could help us, obviously we would be delighted to do that.
Q. I also see in this, at Volume 58, page 16552, a newspaper report is being recorded, that:
"The government is facing a legal challenge froma group of seni or Garda of ficers who secured promotion in recent mont hs but who now have to reapply under a new systemabout to be introduced. "

Yeah?
A. We did discuss that, yeah, with our representative association again. And the five of us that were left
decided that we wouldn't do that.
376 Q. Who was the source of the story?
A. I don't know. Not me anyway. I never had any contact with the media in any shape or form.
377 Q. And these meetings continued throughout November. We've mentioned Denis Naughton?
A. Again with one of my colleagues, I met him, yeah.

378 Q. Let's just look at one in which I was interested, 16212?
A. What date is that?

379 Q. It's 25th November 2016?
A. Yes.

380 Q. You got a cal1 from Boxer re promotion?
A. Yes.

381 Q. Is this Boxer Moran?
A. Yes.

382 Q. Phoning you about the promotion?
A. Yes.

383 Q. What was he saying?
A. I can't exactly recall now, but it's a follow up from, I suppose, the conversation myself and my colleague had with him where we gave him a document which set out our case. He was, I'd imagine, just ringing me to update me that he had no news. But it was --

384 Q. "Contacted Father Si mon" it looks to me "re pol itici ans"?
A. Yes.

385 Q. Who is Father Simon?
A. He is a personal friend of mine who had connections to
Q. Right. "And e-nail Leo Varadkar."

I take that to be. Was that you?
A. Not me, no. He said he might do that, but he didn't as 12:32 it turned out.

387 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, say that again?
A. He didn't as it turned out.

388 Q. CHA RMAN He didn't e-mail Mr. Varadkar.
A. No, he didn't.

389 Q. MR. KELLY: who is he?
A. My friend the priest.

390 Q. Right. So he didn't actually do that?
A. He didn't actually do it.

391 Q. okay. Another one, 16213, the next page, 28th February 12:32 '17.
A. 28th February '17. Yes.

392 Q. You see there?
A. Yes.

393 Q. "Call from Boxer Mbran re promotion. Sai d Frances Fitzgeral d didn't want to promte me re whi stlebl owers. Sai d he was going to get it done."
A. Yes.

394 Q. Just pausing there, is that Boxer saying he is going to get it done?
A. Yes.

395 Q. Right. And "S Ross", is that Shane Ross?
A. Yes.

396 Q. "And others may ring me."
A. Yes.
Q. Did they?
A. No.
Q. "Assured himl had no issues that would prevent my promotion. "
A. Yes. That has always been my position.
Q. Then on the 23rd March, you then say there:
"Got chi ef to sign my promotion form"
A. That was the day I was at the function for the retiring 12:33 chief superintendent in Portlaoise. The chief superintendent at the time was there. I think he might have been on annual leave then before $I$ was due to send it in and I got him to sign it for me.
400 Q. Who was that?
A. Chief Superintendent Gralton.

401 Q. Right.
A. He didn't have to do anything other than to witness my signature.

402 Q. We11, he had to -- wel1, we will come to that. You say 12:33 he just had to witness your signature?
A. Yeah, he was just certifying that it was --

403 Q. CHA RMAN It was your application.
A. That I was who I was. Yeah. It wasn't a major --

404 Q. CHAN RMAN So this one wasn't carrying an endorsement 12:33 of any kind?
A. No, no, no. There was no endorsement.

CHA RMAN okay.
Q. MR. KELLY: If we look over, 19th June 2017. I think
you have got to scrol1 down, Mr. Kavanagh.
406 Q. "Got call from Boxer Mbran re how I got on in
intervi ews. Told he did shortlisting pl us two
i nt ervi ewers and go on well."
who did the shortlisting?
A. Well, no, no, no.

407 Q. CHA RMAN Got on well.
A. "Got call from Boxer Mbran re how I got on in intervi ews. Tol d hi m did shortlisting and two intervi ews and got on well."

408 Q. I see. I see.
A. Yes.

409 Q. "He sai d he was meeting Charlie Flanagan."
A. Yes.

410 Q. The 20th June?
A. Yes.

411 Q. "I told hi mot to say anything."
A. Yes.

412 Q. "As canvassing di sall ows."
A. Correct.

413 Q. So at that stage you weren't keen to have a government minister lobbied or canvassed?
A. I didn't want anybody canvassed. The representations that we made to politicians as group under our association in '16 were to do with the '16 list.
414 Q. CHA RMAN I understand.
A. That expired and I went into a new competition and I didn't want -- I didn't need anyone to do anything. At that point in 2016 I had already been selected for promotion. It wasn't --
415 Q. CHA RMAK I understand the point you're making. You say that the situation was different after selection.
A. Yes.

416 Q. CHA RMAN Going through the section process.
A. Yes.

417 Q. CHA RMAK And we know there was a guillotine of the 31st December?
A. Correct, December.

418 Q. CHA RMAN or if regulations came in, whichever came first.
A. Yes.

CHAN RMAN Anyway, there it is.
419 Q. MR. KELLY: You go on to say there:
"Shared with WhatsApp group."
A. Yes.

420 Q. What whatsApp group?
A. The five people, my colleagues who had been, I suppose, not selected for promotion, who had lost out the previous year. And all of us --
421 Q. CHA RMAN 14 to 18.
A. 14 to 18 .

422 Q. CHAL RMAN Had a whatsApp group.
A. Absolutely.

423 Q. CHA RMAN which they could put, saw Boxer today?
A. Yes.

424 Q. CHA RMAN Wrote to Leo, whoever it was?
A. Yes.

425 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. And we all entered a new competition again.
A. Two thousand and?

427 Q. 2016, sorry.
CHAN RMAN You want to go back?
MR. KELLY: I think it must be going back. We11, I 12:36 have it at a diary entry.

CHA RMAN No, no, I understand.
MR. KELLY: It may not be in this, in the diary entry.
CHA RMAN The date you're referring to is?
MR. KELLY: It's --
CHA RMAN The date you're referring to.
MR. KELLY: Let me just call this up.
CHA RMAN I'm sorry.
MR. KELLY: Just to make sure.
CHA RMAN Sorry, I don't want to be hassiing you. I 12:37 just want to know what I am to write down. Can we help you, Mr. Kelly. Do you want to say what it's about? MR. KELLY: Yes, it's just, if you cal1 up page 2530. It's on the screen. It's volume 9, if you want to look at it in hard copy. 2530.
A. Yes. okay.

428 Q. It's a diary entry, you're talking about a call from Dave McCarthy and then Assistant Commissioner Nolan?
A. Yes.
Q. "Garda Greene called in to the office. I nspector M nnock telling hi mgo home."
A. Yes.

430 Q. "Chi ef phoned me later to say she was told to tell me l am goi ng a great job."

## Etcetera.

A. Yes.

MR. KELLY: Right. You then say "commi ssi oner about to promote Chi ef Superintendent Glacken. "

And then this other one:

Q. So who was telling you that Deputy Commissioner Ó Cualáin watered down report?
A. It was Garda Keogh telling Garda Keogh telling Superintendent Minnock, discussing it with me. And Garda Greene also discussing it with me.

CHA RMAN We11, that made sure it was accurate so!
437 Q. MR. KELLY: Yeah, quite. It seems to have gone around the whole of the midlands before it gets to you.
A. That's the way it happened.

438 Q. Right.
CHA RMAN I'm sorry. I'm sorry.
439 Q. MR. KELLY: we have a new definition of second, third, fourth hand. I want to ask you, you have been asked about it already but $I$ am going to ask about it again, it is page 16222. Go back to 57. There. This is a recording of this meeting of Saturday, 13th January?
A. Yes.

440 Q. 2018.
A. A telephone call, yeah.

441 Q. Rang Assistant Commissioner Finn, having texted him first?
A. Yes.

442 Q. He told you he had been speaking to Chief Superintendent Healy.
"He said he now knows of the meticul ous files and records and notes I have."

Was that Healy or Finn, which?
A. It is Finn telling Healy. Or sorry, Healy telling Finn.

443 Q. That he, Healy, knows of the meticulous notes you have?
A. Yes.

444 Q. I see. "He sai d he knew now of the corrections I had made in At hl one."

Again, is this Healy?
A. My recollection is that it's Healy telling Finn, who is 12:41 telling me.

445 Q. I see, okay. "He spoke of Chi ef Superintendent T Meyers' reception frompeople accused he spoke to and his view of the et hi cal cal ibre of the people accused."
A. That's Tom Meyers' view, yes.

446 Q. What's his ethical view?
A. Well, he had --

447 Q. Ethical calibre, rather?
A. He had met people and he made comments about you how he
found them to be very personable, that they seemed to be at the top of their game. I transcribed that into, I suppose, my words, ethical calibre, not his. So this was a very ethical calibre, was it?
A. It's my word. You see, I had worked with the people in 12:42 Athlone for nearly three years then and I found them a very willing and able bunch of people, who were very anxious to engage with me in the change programme that I had engaged in. And I found them to be very honourable and ethical people in all of the interactions I've had with them on duty.

449 Q. CHA RMAN But this is reporting Chief Superintendent Meyers' favourable view of the calibre of the people that were accused?
A. I think that he had mentioned that to me when I met him ${ }_{12: 43}$ on the 11th and he also it mentioned to --

450 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. But this note is saying, he is referring to superintendent Meyers' view?
A. Yes.

451 Q. CHA RMAN As to the favourable ethical calibre?
A. Yes.

MR. KELLY: Just going on down: "Assi stant Commi ssi oner Finn offered a vi ew that Garda Keogh and his sol icitor were only looking for money in a ci vil cl ai m"

Now, you covered this with Mr. Marrinan this morning. It was put back on Day 142 , page 263 , line 26 , by Mr. o'brien to AC Finn. AC Finn offered a view. This note was put to him. Sorry, have you got it? 263. It's down towards the bottom, it's line 26 we will begin with:
"Then he says: ' AC Finn offered a view that Garda Keogh and his solicitor were only looking for money in 12:44 a ci vil claim '
A. I di spute that. I woul dn't have said that, Chai r, I mean that would be very unprofessional and unethical of me to say something like that. I might have said I knew, because they had a ci vil action, but l woul dn't have expressed a view. That is a very derogatory comment to make, Chair. I thi nk it would be hi ghly inappropriate and unprof essi onal for me to say something like that."
what do you say about that? That's him talking about your diary entry.
A. Yes. Well, I suppose the short note reflects what he said there, that we said it, or both of us, and it certainly is my view and I transposed my view in the mindset I had at that time, on 13th January '18, I transposed my view into this expanded note, the longer note. I suppose I imbued it then with what can only be described, as far as I'm concerned, as a personal
perspective in a defensive way. I was being sued by Garda Keogh personally and I was a named defendant in his civil proceedings.
454 Q. Right. If we turn up page 12309, the late disclosed documents -- no, it's not, the earlier ones, yeah. It's a conversation on 22nd December '17 with Mr. Finn.
A. Yes.
Q. They phoned him -- you had phoned him. Sorry, find it.
A. I did, after speaking to Ms. Hall, yes.

And discussed various issues and so on. Just going down:
"He said he could look at my 338-page document."
A. Yes.

457 Q. "And might bring clarity to the police authority about 12:47 the issues through the organi sation of J Nugent."

Did he in fact look at this document?
A. No, he didn't, but I talked through it on the day he called to me, on the 18th January.
458 Q. And did he look at it then in January?
A. No, I talked through it, he didn't look at it.

459 Q. Okay.
A. When he came to me, I'm sure he was mesmerised by everything I was telling him and I don't know if half of it even went in.
Q. What, he was mesmerised?
A. Yeah. I don't know if, you know, he fully understood what I was saying.

461 Q. CHAN RMAN We11, he was listening to this for four hours.
A. Yeah, he was listening to a lot of stuff.

462 Q. CHA RMAN It might be understandable he was mesmerised. I'm not being flippant, please don't think 12:47 I am being -- I am being flippant but I am not being un-serious. The prospect, the thought, the picture, I'm sorry, the picture conjured up of the assistant commissioner listening to his host taking him through it 338-page document, does conjure up a certain picture 12:48 for me. okay.

463 Q. MR. KELLY: It does. If you cal1 up page 12418. Again, it's your diaries $I$ think, and it's speaking to Joe Nugent. Do you have that? 18th January '18.
A. Yes.

464 Q. "M Finn's vi ew is that all okay." what does that mean?
A. These are, I suppose, what I thought from my perspective was being relayed from Assistant Commissioner Finn to Mr. Nugent to Policing Authority in a very official and formal way. The things that I
felt in my conversation with Ms. Hall had been problems, that there were was a legal impediment, and she didn't seem to understand that, and I gave -- or I e-mailed Assistant Commissioner Finn on the evening of the 18th January, an e-mail I sent to the Head of Legal 12:49 Affairs in the Garda Síochána at that time, outlining, I suppose, what I saw as impediments and asking for legal advice. I gave him a copy of that. Ms. Hall had indicated to me that she couldn't understand about this
delay and I wanted again information to be conveyed in a proper way, that the delay wasn't of my making. And I gave Commissioner Finn the letter that was opened this morning, that I sent to the executive of the Garda Síochána on the 28th November.

465 Q. Just remind me, Mr. Finn at that time is the investigator conducting the investigation?
A. He was appointed to --
Q. Bullying and harassment?
A. -- to conduct a bullying and harassment investigation. I didn't see that, him with that, and I suppose in conversations I had with him and Mr. Nugent on the 22nd December, I suggested that perhaps Commissioner Finn in meeting me could provide assurances that the policing Authority required, which they indicated had been not forthcoming from the Garda Síochána by way of information.
467 Q. You see, I am just wondering what Nick Keogh, or the Tribunal for that part, is to make of this, the investigator, you speaking and you recording:
"M Finn's viewis that this is all okay."

I am just wondering what we are supposed to make of that?
A. Well, that those points --

468 Q. Given he's the investigator.
A. Those points that were okay to outline, and there was credibility around them, to, I suppose, overcome or
provide the information, the assurances the Policing Authority needed in a proper way through the organisation. And, as I said earlier, both Assistant Commissioner Finn and I were well aware that the bullying issue would be subject to a review under the policy, possibly, had to be conducted properly, that these proceedings were before the High Court, would be examined and reviewed there, that the Policing Authority, the statutory body overseeing the Guards, would be, you know, getting assurances from the organisation and information relating to this. Then in relation to my promotion and then this Tribunal, term of reference (b) was a live issue as well. So I was just very anxious to do everything properly and I felt -- never felt I had anything to hide.

469 Q. We11, can you just help me then with the last paragraph in that entry:
"I then sent M Finn a text at 10.51, asking himto promise he would fill in J Nugent in re our meeting."
A. Yes.

470 Q. He text back at 14:06 saying "al ready on it."
A. Yes.

471 Q. "And he woul d ring me Sunday, 21st August 2018." 12:52
A. Yes.

472 Q. What did you understand that to mean?
A. That to again me making sure Assistant Commissioner Finn was passing on the information and the assurances
under those terms to Mr. Nugent in a proper fashion, so that it could in turn be communicated in a formal way to the Policing Authority to, I suppose, overcome the impasse in relation to my promotion.
473 Q. Just to roundup this particular aspect, turn over the page, we will just see what the conversation is. It's 12419. It's Sunday, 21st January 2018, just to complete it. You spoke with Mr. Fin for three minutes?
A. Yes.

474 Q. And 42 seconds?
A. Yes.

475 Q. At 18:40.
A. Yes.

476 Q. "He assured me he spoken to Joe Nugent on Friday about what he had Iearned over his four-hour visit with me."
A. Yes.

477 Q. "He al so assured me Joe Nugent get it."
A. Yes.
Q. "And is tal king it to the Policing Authority."
A. Yes.

479 Q. "He is to run it by Joe Nugent whether or not I should offer the Policing Authority my document and get back to me."
A. Yes.

480 Q. That completes it, okay. What I want to ask you then about is back to your recent notes, page 16231. It's an entry there for 2nd November 2017, it's 5:44pm. Have you found it?
A. Go ahead.

481
Q. It's on the screen in front of you?
A. Yes.

482 Q. "I received a reply e- mail fromthe Policing Authority. I drafted a reply and sent it to AC Corcoran for perusal. At 8: 23."
A. Yes.

483 Q. "He phoned me at 9: 14."
A. Yes.

484 Q. "He made suggestions regarding the e-mail."
A. Yes.

485 Q. "And its content to maximise its impact."
A. Yes.

486 Q. "With emphasis on the order of merit."
A. Yes.

487 Q. "What's preventing my appoi ntment at this time and it 12:54 is not clear from what's being sai d what's preventing it."
A. Yes.
Q. "I ndi cate thei $r$ letter is incomplete and doesn't i ndi cate the issue."

Then this one:
"Tell themyou are aware that the clain process is compl ete and that my decl aration has been subst anti at ed. "
A. Yes.

489 Q. "Tell them they are not telling me the substantial reason for my appointment. Tell themtolive up to
thei $r$ commitment to me by sel ecting me at number 7."
A. Yes.
Q. Then:
"He sai d not to acknow edge that I am aware that the issue is what the issue is."
A. Yes.

491 Q. "So that the paragraph re publicity can go."
A. Yes.

492 Q. What is meant by that? Is that the bullying and harassment?
A. So I had indicated in the letter -- this is -- so I sent a first letter on my own, they replied and Chief Superintendent wheatley had put me in touch with Assistant Commissioner Corcoran for advice. I asked him to have a look at the draft letter I did and he sent back, gave me this advice. And what is meant by the --

493 Q. "He sai d not to acknow edge that I am aware that the issue is what the issue is."
A. Yes. So, the Policing Authority hadn't made me aware of the issue, although it was in the public domain. And so, he was advising me, don't be blaming them for putting it out in the public domain and change that wording in that paragraph or sentence.
MR. KELLY: Judge, I wonder if we could just take a break at that, I think I have virtually completed. CHA RMAN Yes.

MR. KELLY: I just want to take an instruction.

CHA RMAN Very good.
MR. KELLY: And if I do have to have some, it is going to be very, very short.
CHA RMAN That's very good. Thank you very much. No problem whatsoever. We will take a break then and we 12:56 will come back at two o'clock. okay.

THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED FOR LUNCH

## THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVG, AFTER LUNCH

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Now, Mr. Kelly.
494 Q. MR. KELLY: If we could turn up page 16245, please.
This is a diary entry of yours, Friday, 26th January 2018.
"Call from M Finn at 7:04 for 1 minte 11 seconds. Asked if the PA had been on to me re promotion. Said he and J Nugent tal king and he would ring re."

Just those two sentences, what do you mean by that? I understand you got a call from Assistant Commissioner Finn, then who is it asked if the Police Authority had been on to you in respect of promotion?
A. Commissioner Finn, Assistant Commissioner Finn.

495 Q. And that's that he, Commissioner Finn, and Joe Nugent were talking and he would ring me, who is that, Nugent or --
A. Mr. Nugent, yes, and I did get a call from Mr. Nugent.

496 Q. Right.
A. And one from another chief superintendent then who was waiting to be promoted to assistant commissioner. And there was an air of anticipation that day as whether the Policing Authority had made decisions or not. And I got phone calls from a number of colleagues asking me if $I$ had heard anything, because the authority meeting was on the 25 th.
497 Q. What was meant by your note "said he would try and find
out more." what's that about?
A. As to whether or not the Policing Authority had actually made any decisions, whether they were going to announce them. I suppose that was the general air of expectation that was around those waiting to be appointed at that time, to see if the Authority had made decisions.

498 Q. Just to be clear, that was Commissioner Finn that said that?
A. Commissioner Finn, yeah.

499 Q. Okay.
A. Just to be clear, that said which now, which line?

500 Q. Said that he would try and find out?
A. That he would try and find out more as to whether any decision had been made or not, yeah.

501 Q. We11, it's your note?
A. Yes.

502 Q. Was it Mr. Finn or was it --
A. Sorry?

503 Q. It's your note, was it Commissioner Finn said this?
A. Yes, Assistant Commissioner Finn said he would try and find out whether or not any decisions had been made. okay, I've got it.
A. Yeah.

505 Q. Page 16241. This is a diary entry of yours, it's dated 14:06 January 2018. This is a call from CS Gralton?
A. Yes.

506 Q. "Met Commi ssi oner Ó Cual ái $n$ this morni ng."
A. Yes.

507 Q. "My case was di scussed. He reported as follows."
A. Yes.

508 Q. Is this Chief Superintendent Gralton reporting to you or Ó Cualáin reporting to Gralton? Which?
A. Yes, it's Chief Superintendent Gralton's view of what Commissioner Ó Cualáin said to him.

509 Q. I see. "Commi ssi oner Ó Cual ái n was well aware. Wbul d like to ring me but can't and is conscious that he would like to talk to me."

Is that right?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

510 Q. "Said he tol d Policing Authority they were very wrong to allow this interfere with my promotion and career. Said he has told Policing Authority on a few occasions there is no issue with me. Said he was hopef ul it would be resol ved. "

Is that right?
A. That's my understanding of what was said to me.

511 Q. Well, Chief Superintendent Gralton is in fact your brother-in-law, isn't he?
A. That's correct.

512 Q. Who told the Police Authority that they were wrong to interfere?
A. Sorry?

513 Q. Who was it that was telling the Policing Authority they were wrong to interfere with your promotion?
A. That's Chief Superintendent Gralton reporting to me in
relation to a conversation he had with Commissioner ó Cualáin.
514 Q. I see. So it's ó Cualáin?
A. That's the way it was reported to me, yeah.

515 Q. I see. Thank you. Now, there's just one other matter I want to raise, I will be very brief. If we look at a diary note of yours, it's at 2934. This is your description of Josephine Feehily coming up to you in the reception room, passing out parade in Templemore?
A. Yes.

516 Q. "She said we probably need to have a chat."
A. Yes.

517 Q. "Went on to say sorry for del ay."
A. Yes.

518 Q. "But they would try have deci si ons evi dence based."
A. Yes.

519 Q. "She spoke of all the noi se and said she is before the Justice Cormittee Wednesday, 21st March, where she has to answer re not tal king to two girls and expects my pronotion to be brought up."

And so on.
A. Yes, and it was brought up and she was asked questions about my promotion.
520 Q. Yes.
A. And, indeed, Ms. Hall had explained to me that there would be such a backlash when she informed me that the decision had been made to appoint me on the 29th January.

521 Q. Then you write:
"I said l was writing to her. She said perhaps you don't need to write and we could meet over coffee."
A. Yes.

522 Q. You are quite clear about that?
A. Yes.

523 Q. "I said it was about trust and I would prefer to write and then hopef ully do our busi ness in private."
A. Yes.
$14: 10$
524 Q. "She spoke of people with agendas and I said I could advi se her about that if she cared to listen."
A. Yes.

525 Q. "Ot hers came over then and the conversation ended."
A. Yes.

526 Q. Now, you will be kind enough to then just look at what Ms. Feehily says about that, which you wil1 find at 7512. It's paragraph 21 I am interested in. Ms. Feehily says:
"I confirml had such a conversation."

That's the one we've just looked at.
"Whi ch I regarded as being in the nat ure of a soci al
circunstances where it was my first visit to the Garda college si nce Chi ef Superintendent Murray was assi gned to his position there. Chi ef Superintendent Murray had
been particularly hel pf ul to me by giving a colleague and I the use of his office and I thanked him My recollection of the conversation differs somewhat from his account. My recollection is that it was Chi ef Superintendent Murray who proposed that we meet for a coffee and asked if before doing so he would write to me, but I would not take issue with the general thrust."

Is that right? Do you disagree with that?
A. I do.

527 Q. Her account?
A. Yes, I do, yes.

528 Q. What do you disagree with in particular?
A. well she -- like she asked if we would have a coffee and then I said that I was on the point of writing to her and perhaps after she got that letter we could have that coffee. That's my recollection.
529 Q. I see. Thank you very much.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Very good. Now, who is next?
MR. KANE: Chairperson, I would ask if I could go next,
if that's appropriate.
CHAL RMAN Yes, indeed.

CH EF SUPERI NTENDENT PATRI CK MRRAY WAS CROSS- EXAM NED
BY MR. KANE, AS FOLLOVG:

530 Q. MR. KANE: Good afternoon, Superintendent Murray. James Kane is my name and I act for Garda Fergal Greene. I want to ask you to begin with, if you leave aside what was said, by who and when it was said, and if you leave aside general chitchat, if you look at all the sworn statements that are now in, would you accept that in light of that, when Garda Greene says that he never spoke about you or your promotion to Johnny Feehily?
A. We11, I can only tell you what he said to me and that's what he told me at the time. I think he also told Superintendent Minnock that he was talking about me.
531 Q. No. I understand that, Chief Superintendent Murray, but I am anxious that there is not a half allegation against Garda Greene. You'11 appreciate it's potentially a serious allegation that you are making and, in light of what I would suggest to you is the absence of any real evidence of this happening, I am inviting you to abandon any implication that Garda
Greene spoke about you and your promotion to Johnny Feehily?
A. I can't do that, because he approached me on the 1st November to tell me he had got this clandestine phone ca11 and from there then he engaged with Mr. Feehily. He told me in relation to me, that's what I recorded, that's what $I$ remember him telling me. I suppose the paragraph that he has in a document he sent in, sort of misplaced or out of place with the main thrust of the
complaints he had in making to the Policing Authority, makes reference to me and Superintendent Minnock and Sergeant Haran.
Well, do I take it that you also won't abandon any allegation that Garda Greene spoke to Josephine Feehily about your promotion?
A. I am not making any allegation. I have never made an allegation against anybody. I can only tell you what he told me and I wrote that down.

I appreciate what you are saying, chief superintendent, just it's either out there and it's part of your evidence or it's not. And if it's part of your evidence I am going to have to address it with you?
A. Well, I don't mind, because like, that's what Garda Greene came to me and told me and that's what I wrote down, so that's where I am.

And he is now saying in a sworn statement and will give sworn evidence that he didn't speak about you and your promotion to Johnny Feehily and that he didn't meet Josephine Feehily. So, that's why I am giving you the opportunity now to abandon it?
A. I'm sorry, but that's what he told me and that's what I have written. So that's where I am.

535 Q. okay. Well I can start then, I think the first of these meetings insofar as they are relevant to what I wanted to discuss with you, I think occurred on 3rd April 2017. You have prepared, I think, a note of that meeting and I think it's at page 2620. That might be opened, please. You're familiar with that, yes?
A. Yes.

536 Q. And is that an accurate note of what occurred?
A. Yes. Yes. It was a conversation over an hour and it's my note of what occurred. It's not verbatim. It was made after the conversation.

537 Q. And when was it made after the conversation, do you recall?
A. I'd say that evening.

538 Q. Now, just formally, Garda Greene's account is that he never spoke to Josephine Feehily, he never spoke to Johnny Feehily about you or your promotion.
CHA RMAN Mr. Kane, may $I$ just endeavour to clarify. You will recall, in fact in response to your own comments and not so much objection, well, intervention, the limit of what Chief Superintendent Murray says is, I had this conversation. He is not in a position to say any meeting took place, any event took place. So really, it seems to me, maybe I am wrong, that the essence of this issue is whether Garda Greene denies that this conversation took place. He may also say, no 14:16 such thing took place, therefore I couldn't have had this conversation. But number one and the way it keeps everybody right, it seems to me, is, I am guessing, I'm assuming that are you going to put that Garda Greene says either this conversation didn't take place at all or it did take place but was on a different subject or that some other things were said. Am I understanding you correctly.
MR. KANE: Yes, Judge, that the conversation happened
but that the note of it is incorrect essentially.
CHAN RMAN Some other conversation.
MR. KANE: Yes, Chairman.
CHAI RMAN Different things were said than as are recorded.

MR. KANE: Yes, Judge.
CHA RMAN Well, isn't it a safer method, if I may respectfully suggest it, isn't it a safer method for you to say that Garda Greene will give evidence that nothing of the kind happened but that here's the conversation that actually did happen.

MR. KANE: Yes.
CHA RMAN or here's the bit he disagrees with, whatever it is. In other words, that the focus is on the conversation rather than on the events. Because in 14:17 fairness to the witness, he cannot say whether meetings took place or didn't take place.

MR. KANE: well --
CHA RMAN He cannot endorse a statement by Garda Greene, well, look, I didn't meet them, or, I did meet them, or whatever. All he knows is what he says he was told. Does that make sense?
MR KANE: No, Judge, I am sorry.
CHA RMAN That's okay. Tell me where it's wrong.
MR. KANE: I have invited him to withdraw it, it's
quite a serious allegation. He hasn't withdrawn it and that's his right. But if chief Superintendent Murray is not withdrawing it, I want the chance to test it. CHA RMAN what is the it, Mr. Kane.

MR. KANE: I'm sorry, that Garda Greene, one, spoke to Johnny Feehily.
CHA RMN He's not saying that. He is saying Garda Greene told me he did this, that and the other. That's the extent of his evidence. He has made that very clear.

MR. KANE: well, the problem is, Judge, there's a public record of this.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. KANE: And in my submission, it's at least a half
allegation that he is making against Garda Greene, saying that Garda Greene told him that he did the following.
CHA RMAN You may say the implication, the implication, the necessary implication or inference
from it is that this indeed happened, because if somebody says it happened, then the inference is it did happen.
MR. KANE: Yes, Judge.
CHA RMAN Assuming the person is believed.
MR. KANE: Yes, Judge.
CHA RMAN I agree. How can he say -- I mean, suppose you were to say, just suppose, whatever particular date, the 3rd, whatever date it is, suppose you were to say, I can prove categorically that Garda Greene was in 14:19 Russia on a three-week holiday, and so he couldn't have met somebody on that. Does that make a whit of difference to the evidence that Garda Greene said, I met this, I met that? I mean, I am trying to clarify
what's in my mind.
MR. KANE: well, the problem is, Judge, the allegation, if it is an allegation.
CHA RMAN okay.

MR. KANE: Is out there.
14:20
CHA RMAR Well, carry on for a moment and we will see how far we go. I am very conscious, however, that somebody is going to come, before we are much older somebody is going to come complaining bitterly from the Policing Authority and I am not sure that we are going to have a good answer for it. But anyway.

MR. KANE: Could I make the following --
CHA RMAN Mr. McGuinness and Mr. Marrinan and
Ms. McGrath will be worrying about that one. Anyway.
okay. Carry on for the moment.
MR. KANE: Judge, I could make the following suggestion if the Tribunal is minded. If the Tribunal was willing to give a ruling that what Garda Greene is alleged to have said or not said to the Policing Authority is inadmissible, I would be happy to stop my line of cross-examination.
CHA RMAN Inadmissible by reference to the Terms of Reference. We11, Mr. Marrinan, what do you say to that?

MR. MARN NAN It seems an unusual situation, but since 14:21 the application is coming from the person, one of two people who are affected by this, because it seems to me there are two --

CHA RMAN Speak a little more closely to the
microphone, Mr. Marrinan, please.
MR. MARRI NAN Yes. There are two people, as it were, in the firing line in relation to this. There's Superintendent Murray, who says I have a note of what took place and this is what Garda Greene told me took place, $I$ am not saying that it's actually true, but all I am saying is, this is what $I$ have been advised. On the other hand, you have Garda Greene, who submitted a statement to the Tribunal dealing with each of these conversations and saying, no, I didn't say that to Superintendent Murray. We took the view, rightly or wrongly, in relation to the matter that it wasn't a matter that we would pursue as part of the proceedings of the Tribunal, because it seemed to be irrelevant to issue number 20.

CHA RMAN Not relevant. Irrelevant.
MR. MARRI NAN Irrelevant, yes. So from that point of view, one can understand that perhaps the parties may feel in some way compromised by that, because they may feel that it's left there in the papers that there is
this conflict between the two of them.
CHA RMAN Mr. Kane suggests that if I declare it irrelevant at this point --
MR. MARRI NAN So if Mr. Kane is accepting, as it were, that this is irrelevant and, therefore, there should be 14:22 a ruling from the Tribunal that it is irrelevant, and that we shouldn't go down that route, if he is happy with that on behalf of his client, and Superintendent Murray's team --

CHA RMAN We11, we will worry with them in a minute. What do you say? You say it is irrelevant.
MR. MARRI NAN Well, we haven't introduced it and it wasn't the intention to introduce it in the evidence of Garda Greene because it's merely a conflict in relation to the content of a conversation.

CHA RMAN of a conversation.
MR. MARRI NAN Yes.
CHA RMAN Okay. Mr. Kelly, what do you say?
MR. KELLY: For my part, Chairman, it seems to me that 14:23
it is a matter which -- it's not a matter of what was
or was not said to the Police Authority, but rather it is one which goes directly to credibility. If on the one hand you have - it's a classic position in many ways - one witness saying, well, yes, this was said, another who was said to be involved in that conversation saying, no, it wasn't. It's a token one as a fact-finder can assess credibility. I have never seen it for my own part other than in that way. CHAN RMAN Assume, Mr. Kelly -- clearly that's, if I may say so -- sorry, I don't mean that -- I agree with that.

MR. KELLY: Yes.
CHA RMAN On the face of it. So if you have a straight conflict of fact between two witnesses,
clearly the resolution of that -- but equally clearly, the Tribunal will have to say, do I need to resolve that or am I permitted to resolve that?

MR. KELLY: we11, it could --

CHA RMAK Mr. Kane says, listen, if you declare this as irrelevant, we won't go any further. which has certain obvious advantages, because it closes down an avenue of exploration in relation to an authority that isn't a party to these proceedings. On the issue of relevance, leave aside credibility, which I do not quarrel with. On the issue of relevance, are you with Mr. Marrinan and Mr. Kane, or do you say it is relevant to this inquiry? Yes, of course take a moment.

MR. KELLY: I am not sure I am going -- I would love to 14:25 be able to come back to you with a very crisp and concise reply to that, which is what I'd normally do. However, the factual matrix here is sufficiently complex. And before I could commit to a position one way or the other, I think I would need five or ten minutes to take instructions from my client.

CHA RMAK Sure.
MR. KELLY: I am not suggesting you rise now.
CHA RMAN No, no.
MR. KELLY: Because it may be --
CHA RMAN I wil1 te11 you, have a think about that, Mr. Kelly, with your colleagues, have a think about that for a few minutes while I -- if there are obvious views elsewhere, I will come back, and I am not even sure that we -- I see Mr. McGuinness talking to Mr. Marrinan and they may have some further thoughts on the matter. Mr. O'Higgins.

MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Chairman, the An Garda Síochána legal team have been proceeding on the basis,
particularly on foot of your comments earlier, have always proceeded on the basis that the Tribunal is not in fact carrying out any inquiry into the processes or correctness of actions of the Policing Authority. That was the basis on which we were proceeding. So from that point of view, it wasn't my intention to canvass these matters.
CHA RMAN Anybody else? Ms. O'Rourke, you have nothing to say about this.
ME. O RORKE: Not in relation to this issue.
CHA RMAN Mr. McGarry, the same. So, Mr. Marrinan, anything further to add?
MR. MARR NAN No. Other than suggest that it may be an appropriate time to take ten minutes, because obviously there's a crossroads that we are at.
CHAL RMAN We11, this does seem -- I mean, it's clear that Mr. Kelly's submission as to the credibility of any two witnesses is perfectly correct, that insofar as any issue arises and is decided, whether traffic lights are red or green, take the most obvious example, did the lorry crash into the car or the other way round, or whatever it is. Now this is clearly at a more serious level, because there is a more sustained pattern of communication between two witnesses. So it goes further than a simple yes, no, on a particular issue about which people might be expected to differ although being completely honest about it. It goes further than that. My concern is, that a further exploration of this invites an application by the Authority. We have
already set our faces against an examination of the procedures and processes of the Authority. So, my inclination is to accept Mr. Kane's suggestion and his submission that -- I think he is right in saying there's no two ways about it, it's either in or it's out. If it's irrelevant, I should shut it down and then reassure him that there won't be any further -and that the report will not -- there will be no findings as to who said what and to whom.

A decision that this issue is irrelevant carries with it a consequence that the report cannot say there was this lengthy sequence of conversations about what Garda Greene said he did or didn't do or spoke to or didn't speak to, there cannot be any findings about that, clearly, if a ruling is made that the matter is irrelevant and is shutdown.

So, Mr. Marrinan, one point, I will rise if you want me to, but what do you say to the point that Mr. Kelly makes, which, I have to say, I think is well-founded, which is that an issue involving an important witness -- now obviously I am saying this entirely neutrally as between Chief Superintendent Murray and Garda Greene, involving an important witness about a sustained pattern of conversation, clearly any issue as to yes, no, it happened, no it didn't happen, affects credibility. But in this instance the matter actually extends over a substantial period. So, it's of a more
significant nature than a simple conflict of fact. There is a substantial conflict of fact. So it has relevance in that sort of adjectival way rather than substantive way.

So what is your response to that, Mr. Marrinan? I am sorry to be putting you on the spot with these. If you think it would be desirable to have a few minutes to reflect on this, that's not a problem.
MR. MARRI NAN I think it would be desirable. CHA RMAN okay.
MR MARRI NAN Because obviously it has consequences. CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MARRI NAN Because if you were to follow-through Mr. Kelly's argument, which is attractive in one sense, but if you follow-through on that, it seems to me that the consequence ultimately will be to drag in the Policing Authority.
CHA RMAN That's my fear. But I acknowledge it's more than just a yes, no, because it's over such a sustained -- sorry, I don't mean to make out it's over that sustained a period, but because it involves quite an amount of detail and if that is accepted on one side or rejected on the other, it is serious. Let me put it this way, if Garda Greene is right, it has serious consequences for Chief Superintendent Murray's credibility, let's be blunt about it.

MR. KELLY: Chairman, if it helps --
CHA RMAN Sorry, forgive me for talking about you as
if you weren't there. I am just discussing this legal issue.

MR. KELLY: Chairman, if it helps. I want to make it clear that we are not criticising nor are we concerned with the procedures of the --
CHA RMAN Quite, I understand.
MR. KELLY: -- Policing Authority and at no point, I hope, have I advanced that.
CHA RMAN No, no, no, I am completely understanding that.

MR. KELLY: Therefore, from the Policing Authority's point of view, there would be little reason to intervene. Firstly, they have a statement from Josephine Feehily, which just sets out clearly the position, and from Ms. Hall, the chief executive, who just simply spells it out clearly and crystally. I don't take issue with that at all, if that helps. CHA RMAN That is what I understand. Okay. Thank you very much. I think I am satisfied to make a ruling, Mr. Marrinan.

MR. MARRI NAN very well.
CHA RMAN Very good. Look, I think that the implications of mr. Kane's submission, it seems to me, are irresistible. He says, I have to be permitted to cross-examine -- these are not his words, but this is my understanding of his position. I have to be able to cross-examine on behalf of my client, Garda Greene, in respect of each of these conversations as recorded by Chief Superintendent Murray. I can't be restricted to
simply saying he said B and you say A. I have to be able to explore more fully, I have to be able to, I suppose, discuss likelihoods, possibilities, practicalities, about the material that is contained in these statements.
so, I think there is logic to what Mr. Kane says. He says, look, okay, the only way -- the way he suggests avoiding this is by declaring the material irrelevant. Now, as it happens, the view taken by counsel for the Tribunal is that this material is irrelevant to the issues in Term of Reference (p), which is our mandate and our only mandate. If it is not within Term of Reference ( $p$ ) then we have no business exploring it or inquiring into it, either directly or indirectly. we're all agreed on that.

I do take Mr. Kelly's point about the credibility but I have to say that is not a substantive but an adjectival matter, i.e. essentially procedural. While as a matter ${ }_{14: 35}$ of law and the law of evidence I agree with his proposition, it doesn't overcome the issue about materiality of the evidence. And so, it seems to me clear here that if the Tribunal gets into a big debate about this particular issue, we will inevitably be driven towards exploration of what happened involving the policing Authority. Clearly that is outside our remit, as we are all agreed, and it seems to me in the circumstances that Mr. Kane's submission is a correct
one and I propose to rule this evidence as to the conversations and the sequence of conversations recorded by Chief superintendent Murray involving Garda Greene as being irrelevant.

I hasten to add that this is not a criticism of Garda Greene, still less is it a criticism -- not still less, to the same extent it's not a criticism of chief Superintendent Murray, but it is a ruling that follows a well-founded submission in my opinion and my judgment.

It follows, as I have indicated, there are consequences for what may be in the report, i.e. what it would be permissible to put into the report and what it would be 14:37 not permissible to put into the report, and I think that the exchanges between Chief Superintendent Murray and Garda Greene will not be a subject of determination. I cannot say there won't be any reference to them but there will not be any determination as between who is correct or who is wrong or any exploration in detail of them.

So that is the position. Thank you very much. okay, Mr. Kane.

MR. KANE: Thanks very much, Chairperson. I don't have any more questions.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Now, Mr. O'Higgins, does that make your job easier or harder?
MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: It makes it shorter, Judge.
CHA RMAN okay, thank you very much.

## CH EF SUPER NTENDENT PATRI CK MURRAY WAS THEN EXAM NED

 BY MR M CHEÁL O H GG NS:539 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Just going back then, chief Superintendent Murray, to - and I we will try and do this with as much dispatch as we can - the period at the end of 2015, al1 right?
A. Yes.

540 Q. Just to locate it in time for you, because I am
actually going to start with a conversation that you did with have Garda Fergal Greene but related to a different matter.
CHA RMAN I mean, a conversation may be referred to, it's just the dispute as to who said what is not. But the fact that is something is recorded as a conversation, that's not off limits. So it is okay to refer to that.
MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes, thank you, Chairman.
541 Q. So I think on the 15th December 2015, at the end of 2015, you are already given evidence, that TDs wallace and Daly had made -- basically accused you publicly in Dáil Éireann of harassing and bullying Garda Keogh?
A. That's correct. . 4
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Q. That was allied to a suggestion that you had wrongly classified crimes in your district in a fashion that was deliberate?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

543 Q. I think a short time after that you had a conversation with Garda Greene, on 19th January 2016 ?
A. Yes.
Q. Nothing to do with the Policing Authority but concerning Garda Keogh and his being anxious to, I think it was put it the note, dig up dirt on you?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you just tel1 the Chairman briefly about that conversation?
A. My recollection is that Garda Greene came to me to tell me this. He was giving -- he told me that this was with a view to having it mentioned in the Dáil, to damage me, is the impression I got from it. And he indicated that Garda Keogh had said he hadn't found anything yet but he would keep trying. And I asked him to tell Garda Keogh that I wasn't his enemy, that I was 14:40 concerned for his welfare.

546 Q. Right. And I think you made a note of that and, we needn't look at it now, but that's in the materials at page 25280.
A. Yes.

547 Q. Then moving time on, around about the same time, in fact on 18th January 2016, you had actually applied for promotion to the rank of chief superintendent?
A. Yes.

Q. You were called for interview in May of 2016 , isn't that so?
A. I was.
Q. I think on 25 th May 2016 you received good news, that you were successful in the promotion competition and you had been placed at number 14 on the list?
A. That's correct, Chairman.
Q. And then moving the timeline on then, well just before I move to that, May '16 now, you're told you're number 14 on the list, at that point in time, when did you anticipate that your promotion would proceed and be finalised?
A. The information in the organisation was that it was imminent at that time, because of the change programme and the, I suppose, expanded number that was required, of chief superintendents that was required going to 52 to allow that to happen, to, I suppose, have command positions in particular areas where change was occurring.
551 Q. Al1 right. Then I think moving matters towards June, 14:41 on the 12th June and again on the 19th June, there were certain articles relating -- which made indirect reference to you, I think. For instance, a Sunday Business Post article of 12th June 2016 ?
A. Yes. your position?
A. Yes.

553 Q. We might just very briefly look at that, it's page

2546, please. Just while we are calling that up, I think it's the case that you didn't know at the time but around this time you learned later that Garda Keogh had written to the Minister of Justice casting aspersions on your selection for promotion?
A. Yes. When I got his statement from the Tribunal in February of '19.
554 Q. And that's the correspondence that he had copied to the policing Authority?
A. Yes.

555 Q. GSOC and also Clare Daly TD?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

556 Q. Then looking at this, what is up on the screen at the moment, this is a Francesca Comyn article from the Business post of 12 th June ' 16 . And it records, it states:
"A chi ef superintendent is to I aunch an internal investigation into clains that a Garda whistlebl ower in County West meath has been the victimof a two-year har assment campai gn.

Garda Commissi oner Nói rín O Sul Iivan appoi nted Chi ef Superintendent Tony MELoughlin to handle protected di sclosures I ast month."

And on it goes. Perhaps if we turn over the page then to page 2547. There is this passage I just want you to deal with, please. If Mr. Kavanagh might go to the
next page. Scroll down a small bit there. If we take it up from a little bit further down, please. Thank you. It says, it's the third column over, in the middle of the bracketed piece there:
"Garda Ni ck Keogh first approached the Garda confidential reci pient in May 2014 with a number of cl ai ns of misconduct, including an allegation that a nember in Athl one district was linked to the her oin trade. Having had an exempl ary record as a young guard, si nce becoming a whi stlebl ower he clai $n \$$ he has been di sci pl ined, confined to desk duty and deprived of overtime. He al so alleges that seni or officers subj ected his work to an unreasonable degree of scrutiny. "

The in next paragraph it says, and this is to tie in with your promotion:
"One of the seni or of ficers in question is listed for promotion. Keogh is a currently out on sick leave."

Did you take that as a reference to yourself?
A. I did, Chairman.

557 Q. And just, can you assist the Chair, what did you fee 1
about that when you read that and similar articles?
A. I suppose over a period of time the same theme continued in a huge amount of public media and I felt it was constantly destroying me and belittling me and
making, you know -- destroying my reputation.
558 Q. CHAN RMAN That's fairly neutral as far as it goes, of the examples in newspaper and media.
A. Yes.

559 Q. CHA RMAN I mean, I'm not sure, you couldn't sue for defamation in it, at least -- sorry, I am sorry, I forget myself. But it's pretty neutral. It says, look, claims are made, and it says the person involved is -- so it is reasonably neutral.
MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: Just moving matters on then, chief superintendent, I think on 2nd September 2016, you are aware now I think that Garda Keogh had written again to the Minister for Justice, casting further aspersions on the possibility of you being promoted?
A. Yes.

561 Q. And then on the 5th October you viewed an Oireachtas report in which Clare Daly TD spoke in Dáil Éireann about the person who was at number 14 on the promotion list and that was yourself?
A. Yes.

562 Q. Now, I think then if we move down to page -- if we could have -- if Mr. Barnes might put up page 2559, please, which is a journal.ie publication. This is simply a record of Frances Fitzgerald stating that she was extremely concerned about policing in Athlone at this time. She tells Deputy wallace that she has indeed written to him but was awaiting a reply. So, just can you assist the Chairman with this, from your point of view, you put forward the case that rather
than you being engaged in any targeting of Garda Keogh, you feel that in fact you were targeted?
A. Yes. My promotion in particular.

563 Q. CHAI RMAN Yes.
A. And the elements around that were the subject of a campaign to prevent it happening.
MR. MCHEÁL OHGGN: And as far as you are concerned, what form did that campaign take?
A. What I was aware of at the time was that it was played out in the Dáil and then subsequently in the media. I wasn't aware of the extent of the letters that had occurred until I got the material from the Tribunal.
Q. Sunday Times, Sunday Business Post, the Irish Examiner, and you have drawn attention $I$ think to an article of the 20th December -- sorry, the 16th October, the Sunday Business Post?
A. Yes.

567 Q. And I think it's been your evidence that as far as you're concerned the campaign continued and, in fact, intensified as we moved into 2017?
A. It did. And I suppose at the start of '17, in January, February and March Mr. Wallace mentioned me three times in the Dáil. I see in the materials there where Garda Keogh wrote a letter to the Minister, which prompted a
response from her, indicating that the promotion list was dead and it wouldn't happen. Things seemed to go quiet then until -- in the letters department until the July time, when I appeared in the media again on the Policing Authority's promotion list.

568 Q. Right. Just before we move to that, you were contacted by Chief Superintendent Tony McLoughlin I think and alerted to the fact that the initial panel was effectively scrapped?
A. Yes, the regulations had been enacted. Yes.

CHA RNAN Did that happen before the 31st December?
A. It did, it happened around the 20th. Yes.

CHAN RMAN okay. Thank you.
570 Q.
MR. MCAÉL O HGGN: Can you assist the Chair, I mean, are you tying that in with any of the consequence of the media campaign or no?
A. Well, when I see --

571 Q. CHA RMAN You had to get appointed before the end of the year.
A. Yes.
A. Yes.

573 Q. CHAL RMAN And he had been approved in may. So the expectation was there were vacancies, there were gaps, and there was 14 to 18 , numbers 14 to 18 were --
A. Lost out.

574 Q. CHA RMAN -- waiting at the alter.
A. Yes.

MR. ḾCHÉL O H GG NS: Yes.
575 Q. CHAN RMAN And comforting themselves on their whatsApp group.
A. Absolutely.

576 Q. CHAN RMAN To the best of their ability.
A. And they all dusted themselves off and went again. Unfortunately, only two were selected the next year, the other three lost out.
CHAI RMAN I see.
577 Q
MR. MCHEÁL OHGGN: Yes. The Chairman made
reference to the article that came up on the screen a few moments ago, that it might past defamation muster, he didn't use that expression, but could I ask you to look at an article just by way of example, at page 2594, Mr. Barnes, please. 2594. This is a Dáil
report, exchanges between Deputy wallace and another -24th January 2017.
A. Yes.

578 Q. Perhaps if we go down towards the end of page 2595, which is the next page. This is Deputy Mick wallace speaking, and he is saying, the last paragraph there:
"Meanwhile, Taoi seach, 14 times there's a reference to Keith Harrison, detailing his har assment and bullying. He' s out si ck si nce May 2010."

Makes reference to his income.
"Ni ck Keogh has got nothing but gri ef si nce he reported
mal practice. "

And over the page there, if we turn on a bit. Yes, just that paragraph there:
"The Corminssi oner yester day was boasting yesterday about taking part in the fight agai nst heroin, but she is protecting the chi ef superintendent who has been invol ved in a case in Athl one and I ast year she placed a superintendent on the promotion list who has been accused on numerous occasi ons of harassing a whi stl ebl ower. "

Did you take that as a reference to yourself?
A. Absolutely.

579 Q. Moving matters on then, if we could move the timeline on to March '17. I think at this point you were dragged into controversy about Garda breath tests?
A. Yes.

580 Q. You might just tell the chairman about that.
CHA RMAN I know already about it. The Commissioner suggested that she was going to put somebody in charge of trying to work out what had happened with the breath tests. She mentioned Chief Superintendent Murray, which produced -- was a red rag to a bull.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN What's more, the man who has been bullying all over the place. So, I mean, that was the TDs who were already on the trail, so that scuppered that one.

MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Yes.
581 Q. CHA RMAN I mean, that's about the size of it.
A. Yes.

582 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: I think then in September 2017 you had conversation with Garda Fergal Greene --

583 Q. CHA RMAN But at this stage you had been promoted, isn't that right?
A. No.

584 Q. CHA RMAN oh, you hadn't?
A. No.

585 Q. CHA RMAN As a superintendent you were being suggested?
A. Yes.
Q. CHAN RMAN Oh, thanks very much. okay.
A. Yes.

587 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Just on that, my understanding of matters is that you were selected to sit in the first round interview for a promotion and the interview took place in May of '17?
A. That's correct. The 5th May, I think. Yeah.

588 Q. And on the 19th May I think you were informed by the Policing Authority that you were selected to progress to the final interview stage. That interview took place on 15th June '17?
A. That's correct.

589 Q. Then, I think on 30th June '17, you were informed by the Policing Authority that you were successful in the competition for promotion?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

590 Q. And you had been placed at number 7 in the order of merit list?
A. Yes.

591 Q. That notification was the end of June '17?
A. Yes.
$14: 53$
592 Q. And so, I was bringing you then to the conversation about Garda Fergal Greene. You had a conversation with him on 4th September '17?
A. Yes.

593 Q. In the presence of Inspector Minnock, is that right?
A. Yes. We were leaving the station to go for a coffee and we met Garda Greene at the door.
594 Q. Did he give you any news concerning Garda Keogh's --
A. Yes.

595 Q. -- intentions in terms of going after you or anything like that?
A. Yes, he said that Garda Keogh --

596 Q. CHA RMAN Have we had this before, Mr. O'Higgins?
A. We have.

597 Q. CHA RMAN There's a very familiar ring to it all. I 14:54 mean, I can nearly tell you what the answers are, because they did have this conversation and I wondered whether this was Inspector Minnock visiting Garda Keogh.
A. Yes.

598 Q. CHA RMAN But it wasn't, it was the conversation between -- is this the four-way hearsay we're having?
A. No.

CHA RMAN No, it's not, that's a different one, sorry.

Anyway, I think we have that, Mr. O'Higgins.
MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: May it please you, Chairman.
599 Q. Moving matters on then, you mentioned -- I think you have mentioned, in fairness, already that in October of 2017 there was an RTÉ News at One radio programme, maybe more than one programme, featuring a story about Garda Keogh and again linking in with the whole matter of your promotion, isn't that so?
A. September, October, November and December.

600 Q. Yes. And you were conscious of that and you were listening to this yourself?
A. I was. I was nervous dread every Sunday, to see whether or not I would be referenced in that programme.
601 Q. Presumably your family members similarly?
A. Absolutely. It caused a lot of distress.

602 Q. Then, I think, on 15th November '17 you received the e-mail correspondence from Assistant Commissioner Fanning, informing you that he had appointed Assistant Commissioner Finn to carry out the bullying and harassment investigation?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

603 Q. Then I think again, around about the same time, on 19th November 2017, there was again an RTÉ News at One radio programme regarding Assistant Commissioner Finn's appointment to investigate you and others relating to the bullying and harassment allegation?
A. Correct.

604 Q. Can I ask you about that, in terms of the timing and the sequencing of matters? You high1ighted your
concerns to the Garda organisation at the end of November 2017, isn't that so?
A. I did, Chairman.

605 Q. And you sought to make -- you made the case that you felt there was, what you termed, an orchestrated effort 14:56 to prevent your promotion?
A. I did.
Q. And I think subsequently then, in December 2017, there's yet further coverage, RTE News at One programmes, again featuring another item about Garda Keogh, quoting from correspondence that had been sent to the Minister for Justice?
A. That's correct, Chairman. And as with all those reports, a new element is introduced each time, but the whole story is rehashed each time again then. It brings -- it just adds extra dimensions.
607 Q. Yes. I think the position then is that -- if we move matters on, in relation to the appointment of AC Finn by AC Fanning, a year on from that I think you were looking to find out, well, has the report been finalised and I can I get the answer please.
A. Yes.

608 Q. And you took steps to find that out.
A. Yes.

609 Q. Can you tel1 the Chairman about that, please.
A. Chief Superintendent wheatley and I asked for representations from our representative body, the Chief Superintendent Association, to see if we could see where the investigation was and if the result would be
available. Assistant Commissioner Fanning then notified us in December that the result was there but he couldn't give it to us then. we each contacted the association again separately then in January, to see if we could get the result.

I think you raised a complaint effectively against AC Fanning in relation to your not being happy with, as you saw it, there wasn't an immediate release of the report when he received it?
A. We11, I wouldn't say it was a complaint, but I made the $14: 58$ point that I didn't understand how it couldn't be released. And there was no sufficient rationale around that other than just to say, I can't give it to you now.

611 Q. We might just have page 2968 up, please, just briefly. I think this is your communication to CS Fergus Healy?
A. He's the general secretary of the Association of Chief Superintendent.
612 Q. In which you -- we see there at the second paragraph:
"As you can see fromthe e-mail, the investigation is compl ete and findings and concl usi on have been arrived at by the appoi nted investigator AC Finn, who has submitted the compl et ed investigation to the appointing officer AC Fanning, who now it appears is declining to rel ease the results to me, one of the persons compl ai ned of."

And you make the case that:
"AC Fanni ng offers no rationale for his arbitrary decisi on to deny me the results of the investigation, whi ch appears to be at variance with section 8.9 of the pol icy document under whi ch the matter is dealt with. As I find AC Fanning's deni al of the results of the i nvesti gation to be objectionable, I unf ortunatel y must agai $n$ seek assi stance and representation of the association to allow me to be provi ded with the results of the investi gation."

In the next paragraph you make reference to the fact that -- second line:
"My name has been mentioned 11 times in Dáil Éi reann and further numerous times in the medi a in association with these allegations and the Policing Authority withhel d my pronotion to chi ef superintendent for four months, bypassing me in the order of merit for prometion on two occasi ons in a very publ ic way. As these are what I say are unfounded allegations, have had a very personal impact on me, l am most anxious that I aminf or med i medi at el $y$ of $t$ he concl usi on of the i nvesti gation. "

Is that how you saw matters?
A. Yes.

613 Q. What joy, if any, did that e-mail that you sent yield?
A. On the 11th February then the result was released by

Assistant Commissioner o'brien.
CHAN RMAN The report was released.
A. The report, to all parties, yeah.

614 Q. CHAL RMAN so it had gone from Assistant Commissioner Finn to Assistant Commissioner O'Brien?
A. It went to Eastern Region I think on the 20th December, I believe, 2018, and then Assistant Commissioner o'brien became involved.
Q. CHA RMAN And he circulated it?
A. He circulated it in February.

CHA RMAN Thank you. That's 11th February '19.
A. 11th February 2019.

CHA RMAN okay.
616 Q. MR. MCFEÁL OHGGN: Chief superintendent, just going back then to matters that have been canvassed, and I will do this briefly, in relation to what I might term the long note and the short note of the conversation of the 18th January.
A. Yes.

617 Q. We needn't look at them on screen, but just so we are clear, the long note is at page 16222 and the short note is page 12380?
A. Yes. Can I ask you, in relation to -- can you be as precise as you can in relation to when you made those respective notes?
A. The short note --

CHA RMAN He made the short note shortly afterwards and he made the other one three days later.
A. Yes, Chairman.

MR. M CHEÁL O HGGN: Just in terms of the first one. CHA RMAN Is that right?
A. Yes, Chairman, you have it.

619 Q. MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: And as far as you're concerned, 15:01 which note is more reliable?

CHA RMAN The short one.
A. Yes, Chairman.

CHA RMAN I am sorry, but we have been over this before, Mr. O'Higgins, pretty thorough7y, and if I am able to remember what the evidence was. That's what he says.
MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: I am asking questions, and I will be doing it quickly.
CHA RMAN Assume that we know that and so on.
620 Q. MR. M CHEÁL O H GG NS: You had commenced, had you not -- you had opened a number of files to deal with, as you saw it, the various campaigns and proceedings against you?
A. I did. As each issue came along I opened a file in relation to it.

621 Q. Just can you assist the Chairman in relation to, for instance, these two notes, or other situations where there is more than one note of the same conversation or meeting, what were the files and where did you locate them?
A. I suppose the files themselves were kept in my office. If I had some interaction that I needed to put in the file while $I$ wasn't in the office, $I$ just made a note

622 Q.


Can you assist the Chairman with that? Am I correct that the original of all of the notes you disclosed are recorded with the Tribunal, is that so?
A. Well, I would say copies of the originals.

624 Q. Copies of the originals.
A. Yes.

625 Q. The notes that you have retained up there, one of which you passed down to Mr. Kelly, was presumably -- was what?
A. Was what was passed back to me by the Tribunal, to the CSSO, so as I could have a copy.

CHA RMAN I understand, yeah.
MR. ḾCEÁL O H GG NS: Presumably then you made your own notations on those now passed back copies?
A. Yes, when I was looking at the them.

627 Q. CHA RMAN He says he wrote down "stroke" to point out or indicate that that was missing on the typed version.
A. Yes.

628 Q. CHAN RMAN That's the evidence.
A. To remind me when I was here in the witness box.

629 Q. CHA RMAN That's what you told Mr. Kelly.
A. Yes.

630 Q. MR. Ḿ CHEÁL O H GG NS: Thank you. Lastly, I want to
just ask you this, and mindful that we are dealing here with one central issue.
A. Yes.

631 Q. Concerning the question of whether you engaged in the targeting or discrediting of Garda Keogh, and we are looking at it under the rubric of your promotion. what is the position you take in relation to how your promotion was dealt with and Garda Keogh?
A. well, I don't -- I can't understand how the allegation could be made that I targeted and discredited Garda Keogh merely by trying to fulfil a mission and move my career forward by applying for promotion and being successful in those competitions and demonstrating competency and the capability and capacity to carry out the role, being, I suppose, tested in that fashion at the interview boards that I sat.

632 Q. Thanks very much.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Okay. Thank you very much. Anybody else want to? Very good. Thanks very much. Yes, Mr. Marrinan.

MR. MARRI NAN Nothing arising.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Thank you very much, 15:05 chief superintendent.
THE WTNESS: Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN You will be glad to know that you are finished now from all the various phases and all the
various issues. Thank you very much.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

CHA RMAN Now, Mr. Marrinan and Mr. McGuinness, where 15:05 do we stand.

MR. MARR NAN Yes, the next witness is Garda Fergal Greene.

CHA RMAN Yes. Do you want to get Garda Greene started? Is that a good idea, Mr. Marrinan? Tell me
what you wanted to do. I will be stopping at $3: 30$, as I say. If you think it's worthwhile, well and good, if you don't think it's worthwhile, well, I think we might just be a little indulgent.
MR. MARR NAN I know what everybody wants me to say.
I think Garda Greene will inevitably be coming back in the morning, so if we started him tomorrow morning.

CHA RMAN Okay. I hope nobody has any great objection to that. Ten o'clock tomorrow, is that all right? Very good. Thanks very much. Lovely.
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| 139:10, 139:24, | 154:15 | 112:18, 143:6, 147:29 | 114:26, 155:26, | 148:11, 154:16 |
| 144:10, 145:7, | named [1] - 110:2 | nine [2] - 25:2, 73:26 | $156: 23,157: 8,157: 13$ | Nyland [3]-64:1, |
| 146:15, 147:1, | NAMED [1] - 1:25 | nobody [1] - 159:18 | NOTES [1] - 1:25 | 64:11, 64:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 147:10, 149:1, 149:4, } \\ & \text { 149:16, 151:2, } \end{aligned}$ | namely [1] - 70:23 <br> naming [1] - 86:19 | noise [3] - 19:25, | nothing [14] - 15:22, | $\text { NYLAND [1] - } 3: 19$ |
| $155: 14,156: 2,156: 5,$ | natural [1] - 16:19 | 22:19, 121:17 | 15:26, 38:26, 39:21, | Ni ${ }_{[1]}$ - 2:30 |
| 156:13, 156:16, | nature [5] - 11:16, | noises [1] - 80:11 | 86:29, 91:14, 127:10, | NOIRIN [1] - 3:8 <br> Nóirín [1] - 142:23 |
| 157:19, 157:29, | 19:4, 39:23, 122:25, | Nolan [3]-37:5, | 133:9, 140:8, 147:29, | Noirin [1] -142.23 |
| 158:24, 159:7, 159:15 MS [12]-2:8, 2:11, | 135:1 Naughton [2] - 98:1, | $37: 11,104: 28$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 158:24 } \\ & \text { notification }[1] \end{aligned}$ | 0 |
| $3: 26,3: 27,4: 1,4: 7,$ |  | NOREEN ${ }_{[1]}-2: 16$ | $15$ | 'BRIEN [1] - 2:11 |
| 4:8, 133:10 | 150:21 | normal [1] - 66:10 | 35:3, 153:2 | O'Brien [5] - 38:14, |
| Mulcahy [2] - 90:21, | necessary [1] - | normally [1] - 132:12 NORTHUMBERLAN | notify [4] - 85:20, | $109: 4,155: 1,155: 5$ |
| 90:26 | 128:15 | $\mathbf{D}_{[1]}-2: 19$ | 88:14, 88:19, 89:8 | 155:8 |
| MULCAHY [1] - $3: 5$ <br> MULLIGAN ${ }_{[2]}$ - | need [18] - 7:28, | notations [1] - | notifying [3] - 8:15, | O'Callaghan [4] - <br> 97:8, 97:13, 97:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { MULLIGAN }{ }_{[2]} \text { - } \\ & \text { 2:11, 3:13 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 1,44: 14,50: 14 \\ & 54: 20,73: 18,78: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 157:20 | 11:11, 11:25 | 97:8, 97:13, 97:25, 98:5 |
| Mullingar [3] - 91:2, | 78:9, 78:22, 83:1, | note [84] - 6:14, 6:22, | $-23: 21$ | o'clock [3] - 69:22, |
| 91:5, 96:25 | 85:6, 85:12, 88:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 24,21: 3,21: 9, \\ & 22: 13,25: 7,25: 9 \end{aligned}$ | November [42] - | 117:6, 159:19 |
| MURPHY [2]-2:31, | 103:2, 121:11, 122:4, | $25: 29.26 \cdot 4.30 \cdot 13$ | 6:11, 6:15, 6:29, 7:21, | O'CONNOR [1] - |
| 3:23 | 131:27, 132:15 | $32: 10,36: 8,38: 12$ | $8: 4,8: 14,9: 3,10: 26$ | $2: 22$ |
| Murray [20]-71:27, | needed [7] - 53:16, | 39:7, 40:25, 41:13, | 11:6, 11:10, 12:23, | O'HIGGINS [23] - |
| 76:8, 90:23, 91:7, | 55:28, 56:23, 60:28, | 41:22, 41:25, 41:29, | 15:11, 22:17, 25:19, | 3:24, 5:8, 132:28, |
| 122:28, 122:29, | 77:17, 113:2, 156:28 | $42: 25,43: 20,44: 7$ | 27:25, 36:24, 36:25, | 139:4, 139:8, 139:10, |
| 123:5, 124:2, 124:14, | needn't [2] - 140:23, | $44: 9,44: 12,44: 27$ | 37:1, 48:3, 53:19, | 139:24, 144:10, |
| 126:15, 127:27, | 155:20 | $44: 29,45: 3,45: 8$ | 55:12, 57:1, 62:9, | 145:7, 146:15, 147:1, |
| 130:4, 130:11, | needs [1] - 95:25 | $45: 12,45: 29,49: 12$ | 80:19, 85:17, 87:10, | 147:10, 149:1, 149:4, |


| 149:16, 151:2, <br> 155:14, 156:2, 156:5, <br> 156:13, 156:16, <br> 157:19, 157:29 <br> O'Higgins [5] - <br> 132:27, 139:2, <br> 150:18, 151:1, 156:10 <br> O'MARA ${ }_{[1]}$ - 2:18 <br> O'NEILL [1] - 4:1 <br> O'REARDON ${ }_{[1]}$ - <br> 3:18 <br> O'Rourke [1] - 133:8 <br> O'ROURKE [2] - 4:7, <br> 133:10 <br> O'Sullivan [2] - <br> 66:17, 142:23 <br> O'SULLIVAN ${ }_{[1]}$ - <br> 3:8 <br> object ${ }^{[1]}$ - 29:16 <br> objection [5] - 6:16, <br> 6:20, 7:13, 126:14, <br> 159:18 <br> objectionable [2] - <br> 71:15, 154:7 <br> objects $[1]-82: 7$ <br> obligation [2] - <br> 84:23, 89:8 <br> obliged [1] - 83:8 <br> obliges [1] - 88:19 <br> obstacle [1] - 54:12 <br> obtained [1] - 21:16 <br> obvious [3] - 132:3, <br> 132:23, 133:20 <br> obviously [12] - <br> 37:12, 63:4, 67:11, <br> 71:10, 71:16, 71:20, <br> 76:3, 98:17, 106:10, <br> 133:15, 134:23, <br> 135:12 <br> occasion [2]-22:27, <br> 79:7 <br> occasions [3] - <br> 120:15, 148:11, <br> 154:20 <br> occur [1] - 15:9 <br> occurred [12] - 7:26, <br> 8:6, 14:24, 38:2, <br> 49:13, 54:10, 72:28, <br> 90:5, 125:26, 126:2, <br> 126:4, 145:12 <br> occurring [4] - <br> 12:26, 19:25, 54:19, <br> 141:19 <br> October [18] - 12:20, <br> 18:8, 20:14, 22:17, <br> 23:9, 25:6, 27:28, <br> 28:24, 31:18, 53:29, <br> 61:11, 84:14, 87:10, <br> 144:16, 145:15, <br> 145:20, 151:4, 151:9 |  | ```132:14, 134:19, 135:15, 135:23, 138:1, 141:26, 143:20, 148:29, 150:29, 151:6, 153:26, 155:29, 156:2, 156:7, 156:24, 157:13, 158:2 One [4]-7:21, 151:5, 151:23, 152:9 ones [3]-48:10, 69:25, 110:5 ongoing [1] - 9:23 open [1]-28:1 opened [7] - 41:7, 41:8, 52:6, 112:3, 125:29, 156:17, 156:20 opinion [4] - 66:7, 81:25, 82:4, 138:10 opportunity [4] - 14:6, 17:18, 34:11, 125:21 orchestrated [2] - 8:7, 152:5 order [3] - 115:13, 150:1, 154:19 organisation [29] - 7:2, 7:6, 8:5, 19:19, 28:12, 29:22, 35:12, 35:14, 38:21, 48:3, 49:26, 56:12, 57:5, 57:14, 57:22, 59:8, 60:12, 62:4, 64:14, 67:18, 95:13, 95:19, 95:25, 96:2, 110:16, 113:3, 113:11, 141:13, 152:1 organisation's [1] - 7:10 original [9] - 45:8, 58:6, 68:27, 92:16, 93:4, 93:5, 93:18, 93:19, 157:8 originals [2] - 157:10, 157:11 ORLA [1] - 3:21 OSMOND [1] - 3:28 OTHER[1] - 1:3 otherwise [1] - 27:21 outings [1] - 84:19 outline [4] - 9:7, 12:2, 16:16, 112:28 outlined [3] - 17:19, 64:8, 78:23 outlines [1] - 17:8 outlining [1] - 111:26 outrageous [2] - 77:17, 77:21 outrageously [1] -``` | ```80:18 outset \({ }_{[1]}-10: 21\) outside [5] - 16:26, 17:8, 50:2, 62:20, 137:27 outstanding \({ }_{[1]}\) - 23:10 overall \({ }_{[1]}-71: 12\) overcome [5] - 20:17, 22:23, 112:29, 114:3, 137:22 overlooked [1] - 54:28 overreacted \({ }^{[1]}\) - 52:13 overseeing [1] - 113:9 oversight [2] - 50:6 overtime [2]-66:19, 143:13 own [13] - 27:26, 52:28, 54:5, 55:15, 74:10, 74:26, 93:12, 98:4, 108:24, 116:13, 126:13, 131:19, 157:20 owner [1] - 35:9```  | ```page-by-page [2] - 57:25, 57:27 pages [1] - 85:4 painted [1] - 14:5 pan [1] - 70:17 panel [3]-88:13, 88:16, 146:8 paper [2] - 41:29, 157:1 papers [1] - 130:20 paperwork [1] - 25:14 parade [1] - 121:9 paragraph [15]- 10:25, 10:29, 23:6, 81:16, 82:10, 113:16, 116:8, 116:25, 122:18, 124:28, 143:17, 147:21, 148:4, 153:19, 154:12 paranoia [1]-53:8 pardon [2]-45:14, 48:19 part [16] - 13:22, 19:29, 40:18, 41:26, 53:9, 60:25, 67:11, 91:16, 92:12, 112:19, 125:11, 125:12, 130:13, 131:10, 131:19, 148:7 participate [1] - 50:12 particular [20] - 12:17, 13:12, 13:18, 35:9, 35:14, 58:9, 75:27, 90:29, 91:13, 100:1, 114:5, 123:14, 128:23, 133:25, 137:25, 141:18, 141:26, 145:3, 157:3, 157:5 particularly [5] - 7:1, 13:14, 85:7, 123:1, 133:1 parties [3]-68:29, 130:18, 155:3 party [3]-75:28, 82:24, 132:5 passage \({ }_{[1]}\) - 142:28 passed [14]-22:28, 25:19, 27:27, 40:1, 52:10, 61:24, 65:25, 69:17, 69:27, 91:5, 157:14, 157:16, 157:20 PASSED [1] - 1:4 passing [3]-98:11, 113:29, 121:9 past \(\left.{ }^{11}\right]\) - 147:12 PATRICK [9] - 2:7,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| 132:29, 133:5 proceedings [9] - | 97:20, 98:7, 98:23, 99:13, 99:17, 100:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:24, 128:8, } \\ & \text { 143:28, 154:20 } \end{aligned}$ | R | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:26, 11:7, 11:9, } \\ & \text { 11:11, 11:23, 21:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10: 27,20: 9,56: 27 \\ & 86: 18,110: 3,113: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:5, 101:9, 103:4, } \\ & \text { 103:23, 113:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { publication }[1] \text { - } \\ \text { 144:23 } \end{array}$ | races [1] - 70:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:28, 24:25, 61:15, } \\ & \text { 66:26, 105:11, 115:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 130: 13,132: 5,156: 18 \\ \text { process }[15]-17: 25, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:4, 118:9, 118:15, } \\ & \text { 120:14, 120:28, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { publicity }[1]-116: 8 \\ & \text { publicly }[1]-139: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { racket }[1]-52: 17 \\ & \text { radio }[3]-7: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 141:4, 151:16, 153:9 } \\ \text { recent }[3]-72: 28, \end{gathered}$ |
| $27: 16,53: 26,63: 24$, $64: 4,79: 14,80: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:20, 121:24, } \\ & \text { 124:9, 124:21, 125:6, } \end{aligned}$ | pull [3] - 35:19, 95:18, 95.23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:5, 151:23 } \\ & \operatorname{rag}_{[1]}-148: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $98: 24,114: 26$ |
| 81:14, 81:19, 83:3, |  | punished $[5]$ - 42:10, | raise [1] - 121:6 | 90:13 |
| 86:17, 86:22, 90:7, | $140: 28,141: 5,$ | 46:9, 46:19, 46:20, | raised [5] - 19:7, 61:15, 89:1, 93:16, | reception [5] - 42:14, |
| 103:8, 115:24 processes [4] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:11, 142:5, } \\ & \text { 143:18, 143:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 47:9 } \\ \text { purpose }[5]-26: 23 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:15, 89:1, 93:16, } \\ & 153: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:19, 47:15, 107:23, } \\ & \text { 121:9 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 17:23, 30:22, 133:3, | $144: 18,145: 3,146: 1,$ 146:5, 148:10, | 29:18, 39:23, 85:23, | raising ${ }_{[1]}-89: 4$ <br> rang [2] - 40:29, | recipient [1] - 143:7 <br> recognised [1] - 10:1 |
| 134:2 produced [2] - | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 146:5, 148:10, } \\ \text { 149:18, 149:28, } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 94: 17 \\ \text { pursuable }{ }_{[1]}-71: 11 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rang [2] - 40:29, } \\ & \text { 107:2 } \end{aligned}$ | recognised $[1]$ - 10:1 recollection [6] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 50:16, 148:25 } \\ & \text { professional } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:8, 152:6, 154:18, } \\ & \text { 154:20, 158:6, 158:8, } \end{aligned}$ | pursue [1]-130:13 | $\begin{array}{\|c}  \\ \operatorname{rank}[3]-10: 18, \\ 81: 20,140: 28 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:28, 107:20, 123:3, } \\ & \text { 123:4, 123:18, 140:14 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:24, 19:8, 40:22, } \\ & 49: 25,49: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $158: 12$ <br> promotions [5] - 7:8, | 24:14 | ranks [1] - 29:4 <br> rather 88$]$ - 14:14 | recommendations <br> [3] - 106:4, 106:8 |
| programme [11] - | 32:28, 67:20, 67:21, | 30:23, 33:12, 33:20 | 33:22, 89:7, 107:28, | [3] - 106.4 , 106.8 106:11 |
| 7:21, 28:14, 35:7, | 97:4 prompted [1] - | 45:1, 46:24, 51:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 127:15, 131:12, } \\ & 135: 3,144: 29 \end{aligned}$ | record [5] - 38:6, <br> 48:13, 128:8, 143:10, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 35:15, 95:15, 108:8, } \\ & \text { 141:14, 151:5, 151:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { prompted [1] - } \\ & \text { 145:29 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 51: 22,61: 3,69: 21, \\ 76: 27,84: 21,84: 26, \end{array}$ | 135:3, 144:29 rationale [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48:13, 128:8, 143:10, } \\ & \text { 144:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:13, 151:24 } \\ & \text { programmes }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{proper}_{[7]}-31: 5, \\ 60: 29,79: 27,80: 14, \end{gathered}$ | 85:7, 85:12, 87:11, 87:16, 93:12, 93:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:12, 154:2 } \\ & \text { re }[31]-6: 28,7: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { recorded [16] - } \\ 32: 13,36: 22,47: 7, \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 152:10 } \\ & \text { progress [2]-24:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 112:2, } 113: 2,114: 1 \\ \text { properly }[5]-33: 11, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 24,97: 25,103: 29, \\ & \text { 109:3, 109:5, 116:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 13,31: 9,34: 1, \\ & 36: 1,36: 18,37: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 5,52: 1,60: 19 \\ & 67: 4,71: 28,73: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 149:22 } \\ & \text { prohibited }[1] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 21,60: 11,113: 6, \\ & 113: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 126: 24,135: 24, \\ & 138: 15,138: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 27,41: 15,53: 5, \\ & 54: 26,56: 9,58: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 20,124: 26,127: 5, \\ & 136: 28,138: 3, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 77:23 } \\ & \text { projects }[1]-35: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { propose }[1]-138: 1 \\ & \text { proposed [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | 140:10, 144:22, 144:29, 148:22, | 66:16, 66:19, 66:29, 70:11, 90:21, 90:23, | 139:21, 157:9 recording [5] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { promise }[1]-113: 20 \\ & \text { promote }[3]-25: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:22, 123:5 } \\ & \text { proposition }[1] \end{aligned}$ | 156:28 putting [5] - 56:26, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 99:13, 99:25, 100:20, } \\ & \text { 100:21, 102:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 77:27, 78:17, 106:27, } \\ & \text { 112:20 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100:21, } 105: 27 \\ & \text { promoted [25] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:22 } \\ & \text { prosecution [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 10,85: 24,116: 24, \\ & 135: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:10, 105:9, } \\ & \text { 113:20, 116:8, 118:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { records }[8] \text { - 41:17, } \\ & \text { 41:19, 42:4, 42:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 26:20, 28:8, 28:11, | 38:1 |  | 121:19 | 46:7, 61:11, 107:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 28: 16,28: 25,28: 29, \\ & 30: 9,34: 3,34: 16, \end{aligned}$ | prospect [1]-111:7 <br> PROTECTED ${ }_{[2]}$ - | Q | re-arrest ${ }_{[1]}$ - 90:23 reactivate ${ }_{[1]}$ - 13:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:15 } \\ & \text { red [2] - 133:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 34: 29,35: 1,36: 1, \\ & 52: 12,67: 23,78: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1:2, 1:3 } \\ & \text { protected }[4]- \end{aligned}$ | quarrel [1] - 132:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { read [8]-21:3, 39:7, } \\ & 48: 27,63: 17,84: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 148:25 } \\ & \text { REDDY }_{[1]}-4: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 94:19, 95:6, 95:29, | 72:25, 73:1, 74:29 | QUAY [2] - 2:24 | 93:15, 141:26, 143:26 | refer [5] - 9:5, 10:29, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 96: 29,97: 2,97: 5, \\ & 98: 9,118: 23,144: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:24 } \\ & \text { protecting }{ }_{[1]}- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 2:31 } \\ \text { query }[1] ~-~ 91: 3 ~ \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { readied }[1]-50: 10 \\ & \text { reading }[4]-46: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $16: 14,31: 5,139: 23$ Reference [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 149:6 } \\ & \text { promotion [89] - 8:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 148:8 prove [1] - 128:25 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { questioning [2] } \\ 70: 21,70: 27 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { 55:4, } 85: 2,95: 11 \\ \text { real }[2]-57: 16, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:23, 137:12, } \\ & 137: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 13:2, 13:15, 15:1, | provide [3]-55:29, | questions [6] - 69:4, | 124:19 | reference [20]-7:29, |
| 15:5, 20:3, 24:29, | $112: 14,113: 1$ | 71:2, 88:22, 121:23, 138:27, 156:13 | realise ${ }_{[1]}-21: 19$ | $18: 16,34: 20,50: 8$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:6, 25:16, 25:29, } \\ & \text { 26:6, 27:1, 27:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { provided [10] - 27:7, } \\ 33: 2,57: 14,57: 21, \end{gathered}$ | quickly [5] - 39:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { really [3] - } 61: 3, \\ & 80: 17,126: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 28,83: 6,86: 22, \\ & 89: 15,113: 13,125: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| 27:17, 27:18, 28:7, | 81:29, 83:7, 85:17, | 51:21, 57:10, 73:19, | reapply ${ }_{[1]}$ - 98:24 | 129:22, 138:20, |
| 28:9, 28:23, 29:17, | 88:12, 106:7, 154:9 | 156:14 | reason [4]-15:11, | 141:23, 143:23, |
| 32:9, 34:9, 34:14, | providing [3] - 56:9, | quiet $[1]$ - 146:3 | 77:4, 115:29, 136:12 | 145:14, 147:11, |
| 35:3, 39:17, 40:1, | 60:9, 67:13 | QUINN ${ }_{[1]}$ - 3:11 | reasonably [1] - | 147:23, 147:27, |
| $41: 7,56: 24,57: 24,$ | prudent [2]-84:26, | $\begin{gathered} \text { quite }[16]-16: 3 \\ 17: 15,19: 12,32: 25 \end{gathered}$ | 144:9 | $148: 14,154: 12$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 59: 2,59: 3,60: 26, \\ & 61: 8,61: 22,66: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 88:24 <br> public [17] - 7:9, | $50: 2,59: 27,60: 20,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reasons [2]-12:3, } \\ & 63: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { referenced [1] - } \\ & 151: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 67:1, 70:26, 76:7, | $29: 14,29: 15,29: 21,$ | 85:25, 89:29, 90:5, | reassure [1] - 134: | referred [9]-6:17, |
| 77:18, 78:10, 79:20, | 29:22, 53:15, 53:18, | 90:7, 106:18, 122:6, | receive [2] - 20:18, | 11:8, 11:14, 17:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 81:22, 82:13, 82:20, } \\ & \text { 84:14, 96:22, 97:9, } \end{aligned}$ | 53:20, 54:13, 84:19, <br> 85:22, 86:13, 116:22 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { 127:26, 135:22, 136:6 } \\ \text { quoting }[1]-152: 11 \end{array}$ | \| 34:27 | 18:4, 25:24, 26:5, <br> 36:6, 139:19 |


| referring [4] - 18:6, | 32:28, 33:6, 34:21, | report [25]-20:8, | respectfully [1] - | round [2]-133:21, |
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