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MS. MEGRATH Good morning, Chairman. Mr. Nugent, please.

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Good morning, Mr. Nugent. Thank you.
THE WTNESS: Good morning.

# MR. J OSEPH NUGENT CONTI NUED TO BE DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY M5. MEGRATH, AS FOLLONG: 

1 Q. MS. MEGRATH Now, good morning, Mr. Nugent?
A. Good morning, Ms. McGrath, how are you?

2 Q. Now, I think when we finished up yesterday evening, we had just gone through the sets of minutes in relation to the conference on the 23 rd October, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

3 Q. We have looked into overnight one of the pages I had asked you to look at, and that was the page that had the minutes of the meeting that you didn't recognise. It's 10149. So if that comes up just. And just for the record -- so it's $10149 ?$
A. Yes, Ms. McGrath.

4 Q. Thank you. So, I think we will ask former Assistant Commissioner Fanning to deal with this, because when looked through the disclosure, it appears to have come in with his material. But in any event, you didn't
recognise the document, is that right?
A. No, I didn't recognise the document, that's correct. okay, perfect. So in relation to the minutes that we saw, I think when we opened the two sets of minutes, one which was the formal minutes and the second set of minutes from Mr. Gallagher, I think you'd agree with me that there were some additional matters in the handwritten minutes, isn't that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.

Okay. And I think in the handwritten minutes you had referred to the words of exposure and you had spoken about delay, isn't that right, at the meeting?
A. That's what Mr. Gallagher, Garda Gallagher recorded, that's correct.
7 Q. okay. Now can I ask you this, yesterday evening, when I was asking you about the impetus for the conference, I had asked you whether it was driven to some extent by requests from the Department of Justice, isn't that right?
A. You asked that, yes.

8 Q. Yes.
A. I explained yesterday as well that there were two strands to this. There was a broader concern that Commissioner ó Cualáin had, related to the amount of coverage in the media which suggested that Garda Keogh's matters were not being dealt with; and in paralle1 to that, there was a request from the Department of Justice in relation to a frequent or regular update on a number of matters, generally and specifically, in relation to this particular case. Can I ask you, again just a question, to what extent might this conference have been driven by matters in the media. In particular, I just want to ask you to look at an e-mail which came in from Mr. John Burke in RTÉ on the 6th October. Now this is shortly after the first conference, which you were not at, I accept. It's 10110. Now, if Mr. Kavanagh just goes down there. It's an e-mail, you say, from Mr. Burke in RTÉ on the 6th October. It's:
"Subj ect: Recording of si ck I eave of Garda Ni chol as Keogh. "

If Mr. Kavanagh just scrolls down through the e-mail request, we can see that it's primarily concerned with recording of his sick leave, and even if you go into the next page, it's talking about the manner in which it's recorded, it's mentioning work related stress in the second paragraph. It's mentioning his sick record. Can I just ask you about the last paragraph Mr. Burke has written. He says:
"What action has been taken by the CAO on this matter or by Garda management in particul ar to investigator examine the issues rel ating to the clains made by Garda Keogh regarding what he says was the persistent and consi stent misrecording of his absence and theref ore the absence of what his lawyers say was the conducting
of a proper examination or investigation into the alleged cause of his stress which necessitated his absence from work since 2015?"

So, I think will you accept there is a clear reference to your office there, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

10 Q. Now, to what extent were you aware of that, what knowledge did you have of that media interest after the 3rd October meeting?
A. I can't recall explicitly seeing the message but I think it's likely it would have been brought to my attention by the Press Office, given the reference to myself and to the office. So I think that's the case. Ms. MCGrath, you opened up this by saying that -- you were asking the question, to what extent was the case conference driven by media coverage. The case conference was driven by concerns from Commissioner ó Cualáin regarding whether all of the issues raised by Garda Keogh had been addressed. The media commentary, I suppose, were sending the sorts of signals that we would be want to be listening out to say that there perhaps is a problem here. Commissioner ó Cualáin, in tasking me to take this on, was to confirm yes or no whether the media reports are -- sorry, whether Garda Keogh's matters had been dealt with appropriately or not.

11 Q. You would accept, though, that there was media interest at around this time in the Garda Keogh issues?
okay. And would you accept that your office would have known about that? I am not suggesting to you that that is why the meeting was called, I mean I was asking for your view of that. But you would accept that that was reality at the time?
A. Yes, certainly. I think there was considerable coverage for some periods of time, so, yes, I would accept that.
Now, one of the things that I opened to you yesterday, we looked at the -- we didn't go through them in any great detail but we looked at the minutes of the meeting on the 3rd October, and we looked at the task sheet that was drawn up afterwards relating to the appointment of an assistant commissioner. One of the really came upfront and central subsequently on the 17th October, when you were put in place or asked to take over by the Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin, or the acting commissioner at that time, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

Okay. Now, can I ask you this then: There was activity or you thought or it may have been thought that there was some activity after the meeting of the 3rd October, with regard to appointing an assistant commissioner called orla McPartlin. Do you remember this?
A. Yes, I do.

15 Q. Okay. Now, we have correspondence which is from

Mr. Barrett and he makes reference in correspondence to putting her in place on the 19th October. Now, I am just going to open a letter, we will come back to it in due course, but I only want to open it for a specific reason at the moment. It's a letter to the Secretary General of the Department of Justice months later, on 8th November 2017. It is at 10318 . Do you see that there?
A. Yeah.

Now, I think you would have seen this material. As I say, we're going to come back to it in sequence in a moment. But what I want to ask you about is, this is superintendent Mahon talking to the Department of Justice. If you go to the last page, 10321, please. And what I am asking you to look at, the next page, please, you see on the 19th October, do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.

17 Q. "On the 19th October."

So this is two days after you had been put in place, maybe a week or more after the 3rd october meeting. It says:
"Executive di rector HRPD appoi nted Assi stant Commissioner Orla MEPartlin to undertake a fact-finding 10:38 i nvesti gation. "

Do you see that?
A. I see that.

18 Q. Okay. Now, what I want to ask you then is, when you sit down in the room on the 23rd October, all of this seems to have fallen away or not certainly to have been upfront and central in relation to in Assistant Commissioner McPartlin. Can you tell us what is happening really on the ground in relation to this?
A. Well, it would appear that very little was happening, in my opinion. From memory, I'm not certain that Assistant Commissioner McPartlin had been told that she had been appointed, to the best of my knowledge. Perhaps she is better placed to answer that. But certainly if you look at the minutes of the meeting on the 23 rd, there was no reference to the actions that we're referring to here.
19 Q. Were you aware of this activity before the meeting of the $23 r d$ ?
A. I was aware that Mr. Barrett had organised a case conference, I was aware that he had taken certain actions. He did not bring that information to the table at the meeting to that extent. There was a discussion about this scoping exercise, as I described yesterday. But beyond that, we did not get into an individual being appointed to undertake the bullying and harassment allegations. Again, as I said yesterday, my primary concern was to ensure that the bullying and harassment complaint was progressed.
20 Q. okay. I mean, we know and we have seen from the attendees that this was an extremely high level meeting on the 23 rd October and yet this piece, if we call it
that, is missing from it?
A. That's correct.

21 Q. Can you explain how that might be?
A. I can't explain that. Perhaps Mr. Barrett, if he is giving evidence, can talk to that.

22 Q. Okay. Now, as I said to you yesterday evening when he were finishing up, after your meeting on the 23rd October, we have been provided with a number of exchanges between various personne1. Can I ask you to look at a couple of them, please? At page 3600 . This is an e-mail from Mr. Barrett and it is to Ken Ruane and Fiona Broderick and you are copied there, can you see that?
A. Yes.

23 Q. You can see your name copied?
A. Yes, I can see it.

24 Q. Do you remember this e-mail on 25th October 2017?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. So he is referencing the meeting at the officers Club. He says:
"Cl arification requi red. "

He gives his views. He says there:
"The meeting at this office was the occasi on when AC Fanning and I agreed that an AC should be appointed to revi ew all the el ements of the matter."

It may be his matter, the matter.
"We had si ght at that meeting of many el ements, the file and the fact that segments of it are being dealt with by external as well as internal functions."

Now, again Mr. Barrett will be dealing with this in more detail when he is giving evidence. He says:
"The AC made the poi nt that matters set out by Garda Keogh were beyond the scope of the bullying and harassment policy and I agreed with that observation. In my vi ew the issues whi ch go beyond that can and are bei $n g$ addressed and that approach does not obvi ate the need to have revi ew of the specific issues whi ch can and in my opi ni on should be addressed under the pol icy. At the pol icy owner and being now in the possession of the identity of whomit is that allegation is directed, I intend to proceed. "

So again, we will ask him in his own evidence but he seems to be dealing about the bullying and harassment policy, is that right?
A. That would be my interpretation, yes.

26 Q. And he says:


#### Abstract

"A key i ssue whi ch was rai sed by AC Corcoran at the meeting, which in my vi ew requi res should fair and appropriate procedural action to be commenced under the


pol icy, is the requi rement of the organi sation to ensure full and fair and procedural natural justice are made available to the officer agai nst whomthe allegation is made. There are very clear obl igations resting upon us as the an organi sation to ensure that the pre-steps of admi ni strative law are consi dered and auct i oned. "

That should probably be actioned. I mean, is there an understanding here by everyone that when he's talking about the officer against the allegation is made that that's Superintendent Murray
A. Certainly I don't recall being told explicitly that it was now Chief Superintendent Murray, but I believe it was felt that was the case.

27 Q. He goes on to say:
"W th respect to the suggestion that the current --"
A. Would it be possible to scroll down.

28 Q. Sorry, I am sorry, I am reading and I wasn't following
A. That's okay.
Q. There is a reference there, he says, to the Byrne/McGinn type investigation. He says:
"I amneutral at best. I do not agree that the approach bei ng adopted by the CAO is new or novel."

You gave evidence yesterday that your approach was
proceed with the $B \& H$ and then scope the remaining matters; is that right?
A. That's correct.






A. Yes.

Now, you must have sat up and thought, what is the position here? what is he talking about? why is he referencing AC McPartlin and in what context? Did you take a view on the e-mail when you saw this?
A. I took the view from the e-mail that what Mr. Barrett was doing was to formalise his position in relation to Byrne/McGinn and what was being put out here was his view on how to proceed. I didn't take a strong view one way or the other about the individual components of that. My primary concern was that he had agreed that he was going to make an appointment to have the bullying and harassment piece progressed.
32 Q. But what was your understanding of his reference to AC McPartlin?
A. Again to -- I was seeing it as referencing back to the discussions that we'd had at the case conference, where

I had asked would it be possible to make sure that all elements of the complaint from Garda Keogh were being considered.

Sorry, Mr. Nugent, I have to ask you again, in relation to AC MCPartlin what was she doing, when you read this e-mail?
A. My understanding was that she had been tasked by Mr. Barrett to do that scoping exercise as I described.
34 Q. of the bullying and harassment claim?
A. No, of the entirety of the claim.
okay. Now, then there's a series of e-mails which commence with yourself and Assistant Commissioner Fanning on the 24th October. So this is the following day. If I can ask for that one to be opened up, at 10201. If Mr. Kavanagh could scroll down there, please. So it's 24th October 2017 at 14:49. It's from Assistant Commissioner Fanning to yourself and copied to Mr. Barrett and James McCarthy, whom we know was in Assistant Commissioner Fanning's office; isn't that right?
A. Yes. Ms. McGrath, can I just confirm, I think you suggested there that it was an initiated by myself, $I$ think the exchange was initiated by retired Assistant Commissioner Fanning.

37 Q. okay. So this e-mail comes in from him to you?
A. That's correct.

38 Q. The following day.
A. Yes.

39 Q. okay. I think this is an issue he raises in this and subsequent e-mails about the confidentiality of the meeting and the broad number of people who were there, is that right?
A. That's correct.

And this is why I had asked about it yesterday, what was your view on the confidentiality of the meeting?
A. And the minutes make it very clear from the outset, the confidentiality of the matters were flagged from the very start of the meeting. That was the first issue that we talked -- before we got into any detail, the first matter that we addressed was the need for absolute confidentiality, you know, in the meeting itself. And in my evidence yesterday I said that we did not get into the detail of any of the issues that had been raised, rather it was the strands associated with them. So we did not discuss any specific complaint. By that I mean the nature of our bullying interaction. So none of that was discussed whatsoever.
41 Q. Okay. He talks about, there, if you go down, he talks about the pie chart, and again, Assistant Commissioner Fanning will be dealing with all this in his evidence, that he presented to the meeting, isn't that right?
A. He circulated the pie chart at the meeting, that's correct.

42 Q. okay. He talks about, he confirms, he says:
"Lest there be any mi sunderstanding of the B\&H matter, Chi ef Superintendent John Scanl an is the person who took both statements from Garda Keogh, the first occasi on he was without his solicitor. My role under the B\&H is to determine if the allegations cross the threshol d in terns of admitting the compl aint. I have then communi cated with the process owner and now it is
down to your decision."

So this is to you, isn't that right?
A. He is sending that to me.

43 Q. "Whi chever approach you take, it will need to be an assistant commissioner or external investi gator by agreement with all the parties as there are superintendents and chi ef superintendents."

So what is he putting in your court there?
A. My interpretation of what he is saying is that his responsibility was to make the appointment in conjunction with Mr. Barrett, and he was telling me that it was not my responsibility to make an appointment to go into those issues.
44 Q. He says in the next paragraph, he says:
"I don't know what a fact-finding is. It's not provi ded for in the process. I certainly would not recommend it. Normally a fact-finding is concerned to
establ ish facts in the absence of some facts, for example, di scipline, if there is a report, but some information deficit, there is a requi rement for fact-finding to aid the deci si on-maker to base his/her decision. In di scipline there are strict timelimits gi ven as gui del ines by the courts, it is six to ei ght weeks. In thi s case I had made the deci si on some mont hs ago."

So what was he telling you there?
A. Well, he is saying that he made the decision some months ago but there had been no progression of the bullying and harassment investigation. So I understand what he is saying there but it just doesn't stack up. So if he had concluded that the bullying and harassment 10:49 matter should progress, I didn't understand why it hadn't been initiated. That's the first part.

The second part, in relation to the fact-finding, I think we have been over this ground, where I explained in my perspective what that was about, no more than that. AC Fanning was concerned that it was going into areas that he felt -- in my view he felt was inappropriate and, you know, he is welcome to his opinion on that. My primary concern here, as I keep saying, was that when you look at the strands of issues that had been raised by Garda Keogh, that the bullying and harassment one had not progressed. And that to start something again, the Byrne/McGinn type approach,
was going to do nothing but delay the investigation of the bullying and harassment element even further. But I think this is more specific, leaving Byrne/McGinn aside, he's in the B\&H territory at this stage, and he says:
"In this case I have made the deci si on some months ago. "
A. But I don't know what decision he made. Like it's not clear to me and certainly at the meeting it wasn't clear what decision was made. What comes out of the meeting is that the bullying and harassment, that nobody had been appointed -- sorry, at the meeting nobody was identified as had being appointed to undertake the bullying and harassment element. That I think is fair in terms of what was said at the meeting. clearly then we're in to issues, it seems to me, about process. My primary concern, I am like a broken record in some ways on this, was to get the bullying and
harassment element commenced. AC Fanning here was suggesting that he had made a decision. It's not clear to me what decision was made in relation to the bullying and harassment piece. He said I think in subsequent correspondence that he has been interacting with the executive director Mr. Barrett on the issues. And, you know, there is a significant amount of material there that shows that to be the case. But at the end of the day, on the 23 rd October I was not aware
of anybody who had been appointed to undertake that investigation. And that's what I wanted to --
46 Q. Can I stop you there, because when we looked at the formal minutes, there is, at the very last page, a little box which said "deci si on", and when we read the decision, it said, I read it out to you, that you were to take charge. Can I ask you this: Was a decision made at that meeting around that table to appoint a commissioner to the bullying and harassment investigation?
A. There was a decision that it was to happen, but there was no appointment made at that meeting.
47 Q. Okay. Well, let's go back to his e-mail there and look at what he says next. He says:
"The B\&H sets out the process. A complaint is made and this activates the process or not."

Do you agree with him on that?
A. Sorry, the statement as it stands alone is factually 10:52 correct, yes.

48 Q. Okay.
A. The question really comes down to whether the statement, and we talked about this yesterday as well, whether there had been sufficient specificity in the statements that had been made that would allow the bullying and harassment complaint to progress. I think that's perhaps where there is some disagreement between, perhaps Mr. Barrett and AC Fanning.

49 Q. Okay. So can I ask you this: Are you stuck at that point? Are you going around in circles here at this point after the meeting? Because, as I say, what I'm trying to pin down is the concrete decision made at the meeting. As you said, the concrete decision made, in your evidence, is that the bullying and harassment is to go ahead?
A. Yes.

50 Q. okay.
A. And AC Fanning, in fairness AC Fanning is saying that he has responsibility for the appointments in this area. I don't dispute that. My job was to say, can we please move on with it. It has been running since March and nobody has been appointed to undertake it. And within a month AC Finn, as I understand it, is appointed to take on the investigation.
51 Q. By Assistant Commissioner Fanning?
A. Yes.

52 Q. okay.
A. I don't dispute that, my only point was that this matter had been -- this is not about individuals, organisationally Garda Keogh had made a complaint through his statement in March, organisationally that matter had not progressed. The meeting of the 23 rd , in my opinion, kick starts the process of getting somebody 10:53 investigated to deal with the issues itself.

53 Q. Okay. And I mean, I think you seem to be at one in that regard, because he says in that paragraph:
"I just don't want to get it lost in the process, the seriousness of the allegations. When you consider all the other matters, excl udi ng the protected di scl osure and the confidential recipient process, there is a lot of serious concern."

So are you at one in relation to that then effectively?
A. I think in my reply, I am just trying to find the reply.
54 Q.
Well, we will bring up your reply in a minute, I am just asking about --
A. Sure. I think in my reply I agree with him about the seriousness of the allegations, yes.
55 Q. So let's look at your reply there on 2nd November 2017. so this is at page 10235. So you're referring to the e-mail correspondence to yourself on the 24th October, do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. which we've just looked at. You say in the second paragraph:
"Per our di scussion..."

## Etcetera.

"We' re all clear about the breadth and seriousness of the matters rai sed by Garda Keogh and his sol icitor Mr. Cullen."

Okay. You're at ad idem on that, is that right?
A. That's right.

57 Q. "To assist in ensuring the totality of the various strands of this complex case are all fully and properly addressed, I support the following course of action."

Now, you see, Mr. Nugent, here we are again with Assistant Commissioner McPartlin, you are now saying in affirmative terms:
"She has been tasked with a pi ece of work, to examine the totality of the matters complained of by Garda Keogh. I think there is a broad agreement that such an overview of all aspects of the case is nowessential to ensure that each el ement and the essential interrel ationship bet ween themis fully assessed and underst ood. "

So, now can you assist the Chair in relation to this? Because when I was asking you earlier about orla McPartlin, you seemed to put it in Mr. Barrett's court and not profess any immediate knowledge of this appointment. So can you just assist the Chairman there?
A. From memory, from memory I don't believe that Assistant 10:55 Commissioner McPartlin was actually tasked to do the job. So it had been put to Mr. Barrett to progress the issue. This records the fact that this was an approach that was been taken to look at those strands. I'm not
certain that she was actually tasked to take on that piece of work.
58 Q. Okay. But you say in affirmative terms there "she has been tasked"?
A. Absolutely, no, I accept that. That is on the basis of ${ }_{10: 56}$ a conversation with Mr. Barrett.
Q. Okay. So that's by the 2nd November, isn't that right?
A. Apologies, say that again?
Q. That's the 2 nd November you are writing this letter, isn't that right?
A. Is it?

61 Q. It's on the next page there, the date. Do you see that?
A. Okay, that's fine.

62 Q. Okay. So we go back to the first page there again, Mr. Kavanagh. So at the next bullet point you say:
"Foll owing up on his letter of 13th October 2017 to Garda Keogh' s sol icitor Mr. J ohn Gerard Cullen, I have asked the executive di rector Human Resources and People Devel opment to further engage with Mr. Cullen and Garda Keogh on wel fare matters and issues arising from Garda Keogh's correspondence."

Isn't that right? I think that is reflected as well in 10:57 your meeting, that concern that you had, isn't that right
A. That's right.

63 Q. Okay. You say:
"I have further asked the executive di rector HRPD to liaise with you on progressing matters and on a number of documents which you referenced at our meeting."

You say:
"I very much agree with your view that this entire matter is broad and complex. As I made clear at the out set of our meeting on 23rd October 2017, both speed and thoroughness are best served by coordi nation and I was very clear in not allowing that the meeting descend into the fine details, that is for another forum"

Okay, so that is in accordance with your evidence that you have given us to date, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

64 Q. You say on the next page, at the top of the next page, you say:
"I do not share your vi ews on the need to inform Garda Keogh on the hol ding of the af orementioned meeting and particul arly where legal issues to include ongoing ci vil litigation on behalf of Garda Keogh were di scussed, as such meetings would take place in a I egally privileged context."

Okay. Now, we know that Garda Keogh is somewhat critical of the fact that he doesn't know what is going
on. Your view here is that he doesn't need to know the fine details of the meeting and, in any event, it crosses over into a legally privileged context, is that right?
A. It would my view there would be two issues at play. Garda Keogh has every right to know what is happening in relation to his complaints. But he would not be involved in matters, internal matters, internal HR matters in relation to taking a management position, if I can use that phrase, on progressing the resolution of 10:58 the concerns he had made. And that is most particularly the case in circumstances where there was live civil litigation at that point and the meeting just would not have been possible to progress the issues as we proposed. It's not unusual. Again, I
think I made this point yesterday, and I am very conscious that AC Fanning has said in his career he had responsibility for $H R$ for many years, that this was not the case. I respect that view, but equally, certainly in my experience, in my three and a half years or so in 10:59 An Garda Síochána, this would not be the only circumstance in which such matters or such case conferences are held.
65 Q. Would there have been anything which would have taken the Garda Keogh file out of the norm, as it were, with regard to informing him in general terms, given that there had been this delay since March?
A. Sorry, could you clarify your question, sorry, Ms. McGrath?

66 Q. We11, what I am asking you there, you're setting out a position there in relation to not informing him and referencing the legal context. I am asking you, in the context of Garda Keogh and given the timeframes and the delay or the period that had passed, could those factors have taken him out of the norm and required him to be informed in any way about all of this?
A. We11, I think maybe I don't accept the entire premise of your question, but what I will accept is that there was a necessity to ensure and to assure Garda Keogh that his concerns were being properly addressed. That didn't need his attendance at a case conference, but it did require the organisation to provide him with updates. I think the chronology that chief Superintendent McLough1in had provided, we talked a little bit about this, provided him with some comfort that there had been engagements going on between Garda Keogh and the organisation. But clearly Garda Keogh felt that -- or it seems to me Garda Keogh felt he wasn't aware of some of the issues at play. I certainly would separate the question of his involvement in a management meeting and his -- and our requirement to keep him aware that we were progressing his concerns.
67 Q. And whose responsibility was that?
A. It would have been, I suppose, through HR, so it could have been Chief Superintendent McLough1in and Mr. Barrett.
68 Q. Okay. Now can I ask you then, the letter continues, it
references the protected disclosures policy procedures document. The next paragraph goes on to say:
"Any i ssues or comments with respect to the draft mi nutes should be conveyed to Mr. Gallagher."

No difficulty with that. You say:
"In concl usion, l wi sh to assure you that l will stay close to progress so as to ensure that the corporate response is full and compl ete. I appreci ate your ongoi ng support to the organi sation, efforts and your l eadershi p of the in-regi on response.

The executive di rector HRPD will be in touch with you shortly."

Can I ask you, what would seem to be, and it's a matter for your evidence, an omission from this response is a reference to $B \& H$ and to appointing somebody to progress 11:01 the bullying and harassment, and that was a feature of his e-mail of the 24th October?
A. Assistant Commissioner Fanning made it clear that I did not have the responsibility in accordance with policy to make that appointment.
69 Q. And that's why you didn't deal with it in --
A. Absolutely. I was not in dispute with AC Fanning around the appointment. My concern was: Can we have an appointment, please?

70 Q. But that's not reflected in the letter, is it?
A. Well, you know, that's --

71 Q. okay. In black and white, isn't that right?
A. It's not in the letter.

72 Q. Okay. Now, we see that Assistant Commissioner Fanning comes back to you on 6th November 2017, and this is an e-mail at 10225. He is referring to your minute of the 2nd November. So I think that would be that letter we just looked at. Now there had been texts communications, isn't that right, in the interim?
A. Yes.

73 Q. Okay. And I think he was also texting with the acting commissioner Donal ó Cualáin at the time, but that's not for yourself. In any event, he is referring to those and he refers to the meeting. If you see there in the middle paragraph, he is talking about the amendments that he thought should be made to the minutes. Now, I think in that paragraph, they're reflected in that box we looked at yesterday, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

74 Q. okay. And I think they were put on to the formal minutes by way of that amendment, is that right?
A. That's correct.

75 Q. Okay. He says in the next paragraph he remained concerned about confidentiality and he references the $B \& H$ policy. He queries on the next page, if you could just look at that, he queries your minute of the 2nd November, advising that Assistant Commissioner

McPartlin has been tasked with a piece of work. He says:
"I am unsure under what pol icy that an appoi nt ment has been made as 1 was not party to that decision. As this 11:04 cannot be part of the B\&H appointment, I await the i dentity of the assistant commissi oner as agreed on the 3rd October, so there is no further did del ay to the i nvesti gati on of Garda Keogh's compl ai nt."

So the missing piece that $I$ was asking you about in your letter of the 2nd November, he is asking you about here in his e-mail of the 6th November. Would you accept that?
A. He's asking. As I've said, he has made it very clear in his previous correspondence that the policy provides for who should be -- who has control of making the appointments. So that's the first part. The second part, in relation to the comments around being tasked with a piece of work and where that sits in the policy, it doesn't sit in the policy. At the same time, if we were so focused on the policy, so focused on following all the elements of the policy, you know, we were left in a situation where Garda Keogh's complaints had not progressed. There are very often times when you need say, what is the right thing to do? And the right thing to do was to ensure that all of the complaints that were raised by Garda Keogh were being addressed.

Whether that meant that one has to do things in a slightly different way, well so be it. If there is a criticism of that, that's fine too. But in my view it was the right thing to do.
76 Q.
Can I ask you, Mr. Nugent, in real terms, by this date, on the 6th November, bearing in mind you'd met on the 23rd October, in real terms there is no progress, because in real terms Assistant Commissioner McPartin has not been put in place and there's still no appointment under the B\&H policy. Is that not the 11:05 reality of what's happening at this point?
A. The reality of, what are we talking about, a few weeks, a couple of weeks.
77 Q. Well, as of this date?
A. As of this date.

78 Q. Isn't that the position?
A. What is the date here?

79 Q. The 6th November?
A. Okay. So we had a meeting on the 23 rd October and on the 6th November, what's that? Two weeks? I am making 11:06 the point, Ms. McGrath. You're asking was there a delay. I'm just saying, I'm just making the point that things take a little bit of time. This matter had been out there since March, here we are, essentially within two weeks of the meeting taking place, and if I'm not mistaken, Assistant Commissioner Finn is appointed within a matter of days of this as well. So I think in public service terms that possibly is not bad, and certainly is much better than it would have been given
that the matter had been lying there since March.
80 Q. Okay. We will see in the next paragraph Assistant Commissioner Fanning is exercised, it seems, about the delay. He say:
"Procedurally there are a number of matters that I need to progress. The del ay in appointing an AC to work with me on this is further exaggerating the del ay which is ultimately i mpacting on a member of Garda Sí ochána who has additionally made a protected disclosure, the menbers subj ect to the complaint, on me, and on the integrity of the Garda processes and the reputation of An Garda Sí ochána. "

So, just in light of what you've just said to me previously about this being all very normal in the public service, I take it you disagree with that comment, is that right?
A. No, I don't disagree with it. What AC Fanning was complaining about was that I was addressing the issue of delay from March, and he said that matters needed to move on. I think what I took from what he is saying here is that he wanted matters to move fast. And, I think, in fairness, matters do progress, as I said, within a matter of days.
81 Q. Okay. I think you go back to him, at 10217, which could be the next page. No, sorry it's different. 10217. If you just scroll down, Mr. Kavanagh. You reply on the same day, you say:
"Fintan, you rai se some important issues here. I will revert to you ASAP in that regard. Joe."
A. Yes.

82 Q. Okay. And the important issue being the necessity to progress the matter; is that right?
A. He raised a series of important issues, that's correct.

83 Q. Okay. And he comes back to you and he says:
"Thanks. I just want to get the next stage of the 11:08 process up and running. I've obligations under the pol icy personally. I have no i dea what the outcome will be. That will be for the investigat or and can onl y be based on the evi dence he or she gathers once l make the appoi nt ment.

Ultimatel y all those names compl ai ned of are serving in ranks are bound by the B\&H policy, so it will produce an out come that we can all stand over."

So that's his response to you at the end of the day on the 6th, is that right?
A. That's correct.

84 Q. I think he rights again to you on the 16th November. We won't come to that for a moment, because in the
interim, I think he proceeds on the 9th November. You will have seen the documentation in the briefs, where he writes to the members he considers are the subject-matter of the complaint; isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

85 Q. Then he subsequently appoints Assistant Commissioner Finn on the 15th November?
A. That's correct.

86 Q. On the 16th November he writes to you, at 10146. He says:
"It is ten days since you acknow edged this matter. I do not have a response to this serious matter, whi ch goes to the heart of what I want to do."

As you say, in the interim things have started, isn't that right?
A. In the interim things have started, that's correct. As far as I was concerned the matter had now progressed, the primary issue of the bullying and harassment complaint, which those in attendance at the meeting were of the opinion was the one strand that had not progressed sufficiently, was now in train and I was pleased to hear that.

87 Q. Okay. Now, one of the things I would just like to ask you about, because something else that happened in the interim was there was an article in the Irish Independent on 13th November 2017. And this is at 10245.
"Row er upts over whi stlebl ower's bullying clains."

It is referencing the conference, it would seem, on the

23rd October. Do you accept that?
A. I accept that.
A. Sorry, I accept that's what the story is about. I am not accepting that there was a row.
89 Q. No. We11 the row erupts?
A. Yes.
Q. This article concerns --
A. I accept that the article concerns that meeting, yes, I do.
91 Q. okay. So, in fact, the meeting did make its way ultimately into the media. Do you know anything about that or how that might have happened?
A. No, I don't. I talked about this briefly yesterday as well, it is a sad feature of the culture of An Garda Síochána, I think that it's not a healthy culture, I think that to be leaking to the press is something that I don't think does anybody any good whatsoever. Equally, I said yesterday, and more importantly, that healthy disagreement within, you know, a professional sense, is also important. So I don't accept the tenet there had been a row. I accept there was a difference of views between myself and Assistant Commissioner Fanning and that's okay. have also seen in our document ation that Garda keogh becomes aware of these meetings and his solicitor writes to the Garda Commissioner effectively complaining about the calling of these, what he says
are, unprecedented meetings. Would you be aware of that correspondence that came in?
A. Yes, I am aware of it. I think he complained, if I am not mistaken, that there had been two meetings, which
wasn't the case. So I am not sure where the information that was being provided to Garda Keogh was coming from. Certainly, as I confirmed in my evidence yesterday, there was one case conference meeting which I had organised, no more than that.
okay. As you just said there, he did query whether there was a second such case conference, but --
A. There was no --

94 Q. -- it was confirmed subsequently to him that there was no such?
A. That's correct.
okay. Can I ask you, just before we move onto the issue of Superintendent Murray's promotion, just to finish up this part of the evidence, what is happening then is, the Department of Justice are corresponded with by the Garda Commissioner, I think Superintendent Mahon. Just to finish up this point about this whole period of time. He writes to the Secretary General of the Department of Justice on 8th December 2017. This is at 10318. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do. that have been generated at this particular point as to what was happening with the bullying complaint from September onwards, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

97 Q. okay. This was the one I opened to you earlier on.
A. Yes.

98 Q. Where reference to the -- actually, we will look at the 1ast page, sorry, it's easier. 10321. If you keep going down there, please. That was the page I opened to you, the 19th October, where the Minister is being told that Orla McPartlin has been put in place for a fact-finding investigation and the Minister is also being told that Assistant Commissioner Michael Finn was 11:13 appointed by Assistant Commissioner Fanning on 15th November 2017 to investigate the bullying and harassment complaint made by Garda Keogh. There is also references to the sustained support of Garda Keogh. He is under the direct supervision of Garda Mick Quinn, etcetera. And it outlines the contact with him in relation to his welfare, okay.
A. Yes.

99 Q. The reason I just wanted you to look at that is because quite some time later, you have a letter here on our documentation which goes to the Secretary General of the Department of Justice. It's 11669. Do you see this? Now, this is from you. If you look at the second page. Mr. Nugent, that date appears incorrect to us?
A. Yeah.

100 Q. It should be 2nd February 2018, would that be right?
A. That sounds correct.

101 Q. Okay. So if we go to the first page, please. This is
where you are telling the Secretary General of the Department of Justice, you say:
"I refer to the above entitled subject and previ ous rel ated correspondence most recently dated 8th Decenber 11:15 2017."

That is Superintendent Mahon's letter we looked at.
"In that correspondence it was reported that the executive di rector HRPD had appoi nted Assi stant Commi ssi oner Orla MEPartlin to conduct a fact-finding i nvestigation of all the el ements of the issues hi ghl i ght ed by Garda Keogh. "

You say:
"However, it was di scovered in mid J anuary 2018 that due to an admi ni strative oversi ght in HRPD department that the correspondence informing the assi stant commi ssi oner of her appoi nt ment was not transmitted to her.

Thi s is an unfortunate error and is regretted."

So at this stage the error had come to light and everybody now has been informed that she is not in fact in place, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. However, you then go on to say, and this is what I would like to ask you about, you say:
"Upon bei ng made aware of the error, the matter was reconsi dered and a deci si on made to appoi nt an external HR empl oyment specialist to gui de and advi se them on the totality of the issues pertai ning to Garda Keogh with the necessary degree of independence. "

Now, can you tell the chair about that?
A. So this was -- so this information was provided to me by Mr. Barrett and I would suggest that it would be better if he can give -- I certainly don't recall the specific detail of this, Ms. McGrath. So apologies, I just don't recall the specific elements of that.
Again, I would be confident that Mr. Barrett will be we11 placed to answer to that.
103 Q. Okay. So it's your evidence that this specific issue came via Mr. Barrett to you, is that right?
A. That's my recollection.

104 Q. And it says:
"An Garda Sí ochána has i dentified a number of potentially suitable specialists and will shortly be in a position to engage and brief the sel ected candi date." 11:16

Again, do you remember that?
A. Well, as I said, I actually don't recall this, this particular letter. I know that's my signature on it, I
have no issue with that. I don't recall the detail. If you are going to ask me who it was or who those were, $I$ honestly can't recal1. But it wouldn't have been -- the appointments and the engagement of the individuals would not have come from my office. They would have come from HR. So they would be better placed to provide that information.

105 Q. Now, speaking from today, in March 2020, what's your knowledge of that? Did that ever happen?
A. I don't know, is the answer.

106 Q. You don't know?
A. I don't know if it ever happened.

107 Q. Okay. Now, as I say, just finally then, the last issue I just would like you to deal with, Mr. Nugent, is the issue concerning -- issue number 20, which is before the Chairman, which is the promotion of Superintendent Murray to chief superintendent, okay. I think we have already heard a little bit about this from you yesterday, where on 17th October 2017 the acting commissioner puts you in place for two reasons. One, 11:17 to do what we've just been looking at, the strands in relation to Garda Keogh, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

108 Q. And one to deal with the clearance issue for Superintendent Murray with the Policing Authority,
A. That's correct. The normal practice would have been that such clearance requests and the collation of that material would have been managed by the office of the

Commissioner, but, as we explained yesterday, Commissioner ó Cualáin sought that it be done differently in this case for the purposes of avoiding any possible perception of conflict and asked me to take on that particular issue.
I suppose a good starting point would be, could we look at a letter from the Policing Authority, at 12471. This is addressed from the Policing Authority, the 12th October. So we're going back a little bit. This is before you're put in place, or put in charge. This is to Commissioner Donal ó Cualáin, 12th October 2017 and it's from the Policing Authority. It says:
"Dear Cormis ssi oner, further to the clearance formyou completed on the 19th Septenber in respect of the above 11:19 candi date, I would be grateful if you would clarify a matter arising further to the Authority's clearance process.

Further, to an alleged matter which is in the public
domain, I would be gratef ul to know if any bullying or harassment complaint has been recei ved or if there is any investigation rel ating to same in train or being cont empl at ed with regard to this candidate and if so, the stage of those processes."
okay?
A. Yes.

110 Q. So that is the 12th october. As we know, you are asked
to deal with it by the acting commissioner on the 17th. And you have a reply to this letter, at 12511. okay. Now, this is the 25th October, you have been put in charge, you have had your case conference, so you are very alive to all of the issues that are bubbling in relation to Garda Keogh and his files, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

111
Q.
okay. So you say:
"I refer to your letter of the 11th October."

Now we think that must be the 12 th. Would you accept that?
A. I accept it's the 12 th, yes.

112 Q. okay.
"And I can confirmthat Superintendent Murray has been the subject of a compl ai nt by a Garda member in respect of alleged bullying and harassment through internal processes and al so named separatel y by means of a personal injury summons in the Hi gh Court."
okay.
A. Yes.

113 Q. So, you go on to deal with the civil proceedings, and there's detail there of the service of them in May 2017. You confirm Superintendent Murray is separately named as a defendant in it, is that right?
A. I confirm that.

114 Q. You also confirm the State Claims Agency is dealing with it and as part of the process Chief Superintendent Fergus Healy was tasked with conducting an initial investigation into the various allegations made in the civil proceedings on1y, is that right?
A. That's right.

115 Q. You say:
"It is expected that the State Cl ai ms Agency will
undertake thei $r$ own exami nati on of the issues as part of their consi deration of the personal inj ury summons, to incl ude consulting with all rel evant indi vi dual s and those i ndi vi dual s agai nst whom bul lying and har assment is alleged."

Now, in relation to the bullying and harassment complaint, you tell her:
"The Gar da member concerned has al so made separate allegations of bullying and har assment, excl usi on, vi ctimisation, penal isation, and additional issues agai nst Superintendent Murray, whi ch are documented in detail and contai ned in two statements whi ch have been taken fromthe rel evant member under the oversi ght of assi stant commi ssi oner Eastern Regi on. The statements al so allege ot her matters that do not rel ate in any way to Superintendent Murray and as such I do not propose to address same. It is undoubtedly the case that there
will be significant overlap between the allegations rai sed in the statements taken fromthe menber and the matters alleged in the civil proceedings."

Okay. Now, that's the detail you give to the Policing Authority. And I think it is accepted and, as we will see in the communications, it's accepted that the civil proceedings and the bullying and harassment claim, the word used being, mirrored each other.
A. Yes, that's correct.

116 Q. okay. And that's what you are reflecting there in your note to her?
A. That is what $I$ am reflecting in my correspondence.

117 Q. okay. Now, that's, as you say, on the 25 th October. Can I ask you then, what I would like to do is, and I hope you have an opportunity to look at them, in the brief -- Superintendent Murray kept notes and journals and I wonder if you have had been opportunity to --
A. I've read some of them, yes.

118 Q. Okay. I just want to take you through a few of them. 11:22 He records in particular some conversations with you and he records some conversations with Assistant Commissioner Finn where you are mentioned. I just would like to deal with those conversations?
A. okay.

119 Q. Okay?
A. That's fine, yes.

120 Q. If we can start. So you reply on the 25th October to the Policing Authority. We have a note that

Superintendent Murray kept at the time. It's at page 16228. Now, this is where, you see at the top, he records that he has texted Commissioner ó Cualáin?
A. Yes.

121 Q. And he is expressing some concern about being passed over, etcetera, okay?
A. Yes.

122 Q. Now, he records a cal1 with you at 17:05, do you see that?
A. I do.

123 Q. Received a call from, he gives the number, which lasted six minutes and 20 seconds and it was CAO Joe Nugent. Do you remember this call on the 31st?
A. I can't. I mean, I had a number of calls with Chief Superintendent Murray, so I can't recall the specifics of those and what might have been said from one conversation to another but I am not disputing what Chief Superintendent Murray is saying.
124 Q. okay. So you're not disputing the fact that had you the cal1, I suppose, let's start at the beginning?
A. No, no. I have no issue with that.

125 Q. Okay. And you say you are not disputing the contents of it. Can I just ask you, this is what you are saying.
"He sai d commi ssi oner asked himto contact me as he mi ght be compromised. "

We know that that's reflected in the acting
commissioner's own statement, he refers to putting you in place for that reason, isn't that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.

126
Q. "He said."

Now this is you.
"He and the Commissioner were concerned that there were unsubstantiated allegations to bl ock my appointment."

So do you accept his reference to unsubstantiated allegations?
A. I accept his reference, yes.

127 Q. okay. And you accept that you said that?
A. I can't say I used the word unsubstantiated, I may have 11:24 said unproven, you know, again I can't recall the specific words that were used. But I think at that stage they were allegations, they were not proven.
128 Q. Okay. He says that you are going to be in touch with the Policing Authority. In the second paragraph there he says:
"I explai ned the situation in Athl one, that I came to himand told himl felt l was being penalised for doing my job. He di dn't say anything substantial."

Do you remember Superintendent Murray telling you that?
A. Again, as I said, Ms. McGrath, like it'll be the same for any of these notes, I can't, I can't talk to the
specifics of what's there. I accept completely that these are Chief Superintendent Murray's notes. I am not going to dispute the material that's there. I'm happy to talk to -- as I said, they are his words, so I might differ about different words, but the substance of what he was saying is fair.
129 Q. Okay. okay. So that is on the 31st october. On the 1st November he records a note of another call he has with you. It's 12392. So 12392. At 5:26:
"Phoned J oe Nugent. He said the PA had not contacted hi myet but he expected they were focusing on the breath test stuff del ay."

I think you mentioned that yesterday, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

130 Q. "He expected to talk to themtomorrow and said he would ring me. He complimented me on my letter to the PA and said it was fair and reasonable what I was asking."

Do you remember that?
A. Yes. I won't dispute that.

131 Q. okay. So you're quite involved at a quite detailed level, you know his contacts with the PA and what he is communicating with the PA; is that right?
A. I couldn't say I would know his contacts with the PA. Certainly Chief Superintendent Murray would have told me that he would have been in contact with the PA but I wouldn't have any detail about that. What I would
equally have had conversations on, I am just guided by the Chair here, about processes. So please, Chair, pull me up if we getting into the Policing Authority space. But there would have been contact from a chief executive of the Policing Authority with myself in relation to these various matters.

I think that's quite standard, is that right?
A. Yeah, I accept that in this situation it is different. As I described earlier, there is a difference here in that the matters were not going through the office of the Commissioner firstly; and secondly, the conversations were being held at a very senior level, the chief executive of the Policing Authority and a chief admin officer. I'm not certain that that would happen in all circumstances.
133 Q. Just to be clear, you're saying that the communications had a happened in this case between you and the chief executive officer of the Policing Authority wouldn't have been the normal course?
A. No, it wouldn't be the normal course. And that might 11:27 just reflect that because I was dealing with the matter personally, that the chief executive of the Policing Authority was dealing with it personally. But in the ordinary course of events, as I understand it, it would be done at a different level, it would be done at a lower level in the organisation. I think in this situation there were clearly -- we were going into a different territory, in that there were -- there was a concern on behalf of the Policing Authority about
getting the information that they would need to assist them in their determination.
134 Q. Okay. Now, on the next day, on the 2nd November, it's at 16231. This is the 2nd November, the following day, he gets a reply back to his e-mail from the Policing Authority, and he says:
"I drafted a repl y and sent it to AC Corcoran for
perusal."

If you go to the next line, he says that AC Corcoran phoned him. A11 right? Now, the reason I am opening this one is that AC Corcoran, it's recorded, says -just if Mr. Kavanagh doesn't move the screen, but at the very last two lines there:
"He said the most persuasi ve piece of correspondence must come fromthe Commi ssi oner's of fice and he spoke to Joe Nugent about that."

Do you remember having a conversation with AC Corcoran about this?
A. I don't.

135 Q. Okay. Superintendent Murray records, if you just scroll down now to the rest of the page, Mr. Kavanagh, please, he says:
"Fromtal king to himand Joe Nugent and hearing from Lorraine Wheatl ey and what Tony McLoughl in says about

John Barrett accepting it bei ng wrong, I am getting the i mpression that An Garda Sí ochána in a way to out manoeuvre M. Barrett and PA are stalling on suppl ying details to hel p because they don't believe the PA are entitled to the civil claimor the bullying claimas it's outside the criteria for the competition and they are sayi ng those are the issues for the Guards and the State Cl ai n A Agency and not the PA."

So, can I just open that to you, when Superintendent Murray was giving evidence on Day 146, at page 62 , he was asked about this and he said he was caught in the middle. That's how he saw it. So can I ask you your views on that? was that the view coming from the senior level of An Garda Síochána, that the civil claim and bullying claim were outside the remit of the promotions issue?
A. Sorry, could you phrase that last part of the question? I just want to be very clear about what you are asking me, Ms. McGrath.
Well, he is saying that they don't believe, now he seems to be including you in the they, that the PA are entitled to the civil claim or the bullying claim as it's outside the criteria for the competition.
A. Okay. So firstly, can I just revert and then I will answer your question. I do recall AC Corcoran speaking to me now about the issue associated with the challenges of providing matters related to the civil litigation issue and the potential that material that
was sensitive to that process was coming into a broader space, where perhaps it was or was not entitled to be. In relation to the provision of the information in respect of the bullying and harassment, absolutely not. And all of the evidence suggests that we provided the information -- sorry, I provided the information that I thought was being sought by the policing Authority to assist them in their determination. You certainly did, and we will come to that in a moment. But what I want to ask you is, at the outset was there a view or a concern as to whether this was within the domain of the competition or not?
A. There certainly was not. I mean, there may have been legal concerns about legal issues, but there was no concern about the provision of information, no. For my 11:31 part, absolutely not.

138 Q. Okay. So when Superintendent Murray feels he is caught in the middle, do you accept or reject that?
A. Oh I can understand. Like, this was a very unusual circumstance, where Superintendent Murray was waiting to be -- was waiting to have a determination made, where the Policing Authority on the one hand were making a call and the material that was being sought was being sought from the organisation. Superintendent Murray was not in a position to influence either of understand it being a very uncomfortable place to be.

139 Q. Okay. He has a note of a phone call with you on the same day, the 2nd November, it's at page 12393. You
see there:
"Call fromJ oe Nugent. He rang Hel en Hall to meet her but it may not take until after Mbnday. He will be in touch as soon as he meets her. He showed me he and the. ..."

I'm not sure that's correct
"He and the organi sation feel I have been badly wr onged. "

First of all, do you remember this particular call on the 2nd November?
A. I don't. But, as I said before, I am not going to 11:32 dispute, you know, the notes Chief Superintendent Murray has made. Do I recal1 using the word "badl y wronged" no, I may have used other words, I might have said unfair perhaps. So what was my position on this? In my, you know, vast experience in the public service I hadn't come across a situation where an allegation, and that's all it was at that point in time, an allegation which had not at that point be proven, would be used to defer somebody's promotion. Like in my experience I had never come across that. And I am not 11:33 saying that -- the Policing Authority has their own processes and I am conscious of what the Judge said yesterday. But in my opinion that's unfair.

140 Q. okay.
A. So if that is what Chief Superintendent Murray is reflecting there, then $I$ have no issue.
141 Q. Now, you say, in my view that's unfair. I am asking about the organisation's view. You are at the senior executive level of the organisation?
A. Absolutely. I think across the organisation, the idea -- people in the organisation are used to due process and we had a situation where an individual -an individual's promotion was being delayed in advance of the process being completed. No more than that. There were other ways, it seems to me, to do this. Ultimately an individual appointed, and this would have been appointed on probation, if it a matter of concern surfaced later on, it could have been dealt with that way. What was at play here was not that. So I am 11:34 offering my view on it, certainly the view of others in the organisation, other senior people in the organisation, as a process it seems unfair.
142 Q. okay. In this note, if Mr. Kavanagh goes down, he seems to be saying at number 2 there that he has this document that he prepared for chief Superintendent Healy for the civil claim. He's offering it up effectively. He says:
"Can and should that be shown to the PA, as it is so comprehensi ve it will deal with any bullying claim whi ch can onl y mirror the civil clai m"

Do you see that?
A. Yes.

143 Q. Do you remember that of the 2nd November?
A. Yes, I do.

144 Q. So he is putting this on the table for a provision to the Policing Authority at this stage; is that right?
A. That's correct.

145 Q. I am not sure if it's clear from this, but did you take the position you needed to get advice on the provision?
A. Yes, I did.

146 Q. okay.
A. Just to be clear, through this process, through this clearance process $I$ would have been taking legal advice at all of the stages along the road.
147 Q. okay.
A. So the replies that were provided to the Policing Authority, I would have sought legal advice, which explains some timeline differences that are there.
148 Q. Okay. Now on the 3rd, the following day, the 3rd November, he has a note at 16232. This is Superintendent Murray. He is talking about an e-mail that he sent to Helen Hall and that he has received a reply. He said he has he forwarded all the e-mails to CS Wheatley, AC Corcoran and to yourself:
'... with a message asking for the Commissioner's of fice 11:36 to become invol ved in reassuring the PA about my character re my duties in Athl one."

Do you remember that?
A. Sorry, I don't remember that. But this is a note of what he had said he had done. Fine. But that just -the Commissioner's office did not become involved in any way.

149 Q. Okay. So he may have requested it, but you're saying this didn't happen?
A. It didn't happen.

150 Q. okay. Now, what happens next then is 7th November 2017 you get a letter from the Policing Authority. This is at 12518. Now, can I ask you first, this is addressed directly to yourself and it's referring to your letter of the 25th October, which we opened there a little bit ago. okay?
A. Okay.

151 Q. And that was where you had described the civi proceedings and the bullying and harassment proceedings. okay?
A. Yes.

152 Q. So this is the Policing Authority coming back to you. Can I ask you about those handwritten notes, are they your notes?
A. That's not my handwriting. You definitely wouldn't be able to read my handwriting, Ms. McGrath, so I know it's not my handwriting. whose handwriting, I don't know. There is a cleaner copy, I have certainly seen cleaner copies in evidence, there are cleaner copies there, but I don't know whose handwriting that is.

153 Q. Okay. So she says:
"Havi ng consi dered the inf ormation cont ai ned in that correspondence, a number of enquiries arise in respect of which I require further information to progress the clearance process for Superintendent Murray.

1. You state that in the High Court personal injury whi ch named Superintendent Murray as a defendant, the pl aintiff alleges that he was the subject of various gross acts of harassment, del i berate excl usion, bullying, contri ved complaints, humiliation and vi ctimisation carried out by menbers of An Garda Sí ochána who are not named as defendants and by Superintendent Murray, who is named as a defendant."

He says:
"I request further information in rel ation to the nat ure of the allegations made agai nst Superintendent Mur ray speci fically.
2. I would be obliged if you would confirm whet her the revi ew of Chi ef Superintendent Healy will consider the allegations in rel ation to Superintendent Murray, whet her Superintendent Murray will be consulted with as part of that review and when that review is likely to be compl ete.
3. With regard to the bullying and harassment complaint, I request the followi ng: Details of the
nat ure of what is alleged regarding Superintendent Murray; details of the process for investigating this matter and the level of fair procedures that will be afforded to the superintendent."

And she is looking in the next page for specific details, this is paragraph 4, of timelines. She is saying:
"At a minimum When the allegation of bullying and harassment in respect of Superintendent Murray was recei ved by An Garda Sí ochána; when the Garda Sí ochána were notified of the civil proceedi ngs agai nst Superintendent Murray; dates on which key activities rel ating to both matters have been actioned to date; an 11:38 estimated timeline for both the civil litigation and the bullying and harassment investigation. "

So, she says she is requesting this information in accordance with regulation 12 of the Garda Síochána Act 11:38 20205, regulations that were put in place in 2016. okay. So, stopping there. She is asking for quite a lot of detail in relation to both sets of proceedings, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

154 Q. She says at the very end of the paragraph there:
"As you will be aware, Regul ation 12 provi des that the Authority shall not appoint a candidate sel ected for
appoi nt ment to a specified rank unl ess the Authority is satisfied as to the outcome of any clearance process and other matters in that regul ation."

So, clearly at this stage the Policing Authority have taken the view that it's clearly within the interests of the competition and clearance process that they have all this information, do you accept that?
A. That's the position of the Policing Authority, that's correct.
155 Q. Okay.
A. And just, sorry, I don't dispute. I mean, they were looking for information. My job was to provide them with the information that was needed to assist them in coming to their determination. As they point out, it's 11:39 in their --
CHAI RMAK The letter speaks for itself.
A. Yeah.

156 Q. M. MEGRATH Okay. So that is on the 7th November. Can I ask you to go to the 16th November, which is at 11:40 2835. Again, it's one of Superintendent Murray's notes. And he says:
"I recei ved a call fromJoe Nugent. He tol d me he was in commi cation with Hel en Hall of the PA and they wanted today make decisions re appointments for meeting on the $23 / 11$ and particularly my appointment."
okay. So you know that there's a meeting coming up on
the $23 / 11$ and they are proposing to deal with the promotions on that date, is that right?
A. Ms. Hall would have told me that, that's correct.

157 Q. Okay. Now, Superintendent Murray says that you told him that he had the support of the organisation and that you were working on the issue with Ken Ruane, Head of Legal Affairs; is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.

And that you asked him if he had any objection to the giving of the 338 -page document to the Policing Authority, and he said no problem. okay?
A. That's correct. And from recollection, it was a request on legal advice of Mr. Ruane to establish in the first instance whether Superintendent Murray had any objection to the material being provided, not that we were going to provide it, but we needed in the first instance to understand whether Superintendent Murray had an objection to it being provided.
159 Q. Okay. He had offered it on the 2nd November, as we said, and you said in response to that, that you were getting legal advice on it in the interim, is that right?
A. That's correct.

160 Q. You said he had the support of the organisation, what did you mean by that?
A. To come back to, I suppose, to the conversation we had just shortly before, where Superintendent Murray felt that he was caught in the middle between the Policing Authority and ourselves. I was saying to him that we
would provide whatever information was needed to assist the -- sorry, I said the organisation would provide whatever information was needed to assist the Policing Authority come to their decision.
Now, there's a reference there where you tell him that you were in communication with Helen Hall of the Policing Authority. Now that is dated, that note, the 16/11. I think you e-mailed her that day, would that be right?
A. I can't recall that, but if it's there --

162 Q. We11, it is just we don't -- look, we will come to that in a moment. It may have been redacted for legal professional reasons, but we will come to it in a moment. If we just stay with the sequence of what I have. Because on the 20th November, a couple of days later, which is at 12397, he is contacting you again on this date:
"Phoned J oe Nugent. He agreed..."
which is suggesting yourself:
"...that the meeting of the 19/11 was all very contrived agai nst me and worrying."

Can you help the Chairman with what is referenced there?
A. The fact that there was a lot of discussion going on in the media about whether Superintendent Murray should be
appointed or not. It seemed to me worrying that an independent process, you know, that had that transparent and accountable approach was perhaps being frustrated by media commentary as opposed to, you know, it following the normal routes that it should progress. 11:43 163 Q. Okay. So that's on the 20th. You're in contact again the following day, on the 21st, which is 12398. 12398. And he is saying he phoned you, he wants to know if his document has gone to the PA. Now that's his civil document, the 338 pages?
A. The 338 pages, $I$ believe is what he is referring to.
okay. And I think that that was an e-mail by you on the 21st and it was attaching literally the civil material?
A. Yes, I won't dispute that, Ms. McGrath, I just can't remember the exact -- I remember being sent a series of material, but $I$ just want to be clear, at that point in 11:44 time I wasn't certain of what had been sent.

166 Q. Okay. Now it's not in the booklet, we did locate in disclosure an e-mail of the 21st November, but it's essentially attaching the civil summons?
A. And related materials.

167 Q. And the related materials?
A. Yeah. I have no issue with that, yeah.

168 Q. okay. Now, can I bring you then, staying on the 21st, there's a letter you write back to her. 12524. Now
this is where we had a little bit of difficulty. She's referring to an e-mail of the 16th November. Now we haven't been able to locate it and, again, it may have been a legal professional privilege because I know you were talking to Ken Ruane a lot about this, so that may 11:45 be the case. But she is saying:
"I note your reference to section $40(2)$. This requires the Garda Commissi oner to provide on request by the Secretary General any document in the power or control of Garda Sí ochána. Section 40 (2)(a) is the provi si on that applies to the authority and requires the Garda Cormissioner to provide to the authority any document rel ating to policing services in the power or control of An Garda Sí ochána. I amadvi sed that this may not provi de an appropriate stat utory basis to demand the records described in your e-nail of the 16th Novenber."

What's really going on there in the sense of -- is this the provision of the civil material?
A. Yeah, I think that's certainly my recollection, that there was dialogue around the limitations that might be there around what should or what could be provided to Authority at that point.
169 Q. okay. And as we know, in any event later that day, it 11:46 was sent?
A. It was sent.

170 Q. Okay. Can I ask you to look at the next page, there's just a handwritten note which I had difficulty reading,

12525?
A. Then I suspect it is my handwriting.
Q. What is that, Mr. Nugent?
A. "The issues contai ned in the correspondence were overtaken by the content of the CAO s e-mail whi ch crossed. " okay. And that's what we were talking about that it went through?
A. As I said, you wouldn't be able to read my handwriting.
okay. Moving on a couple of days, 24th November. I think Ms. Hall comes back to you about this e-mail. It's 12526. It's the 24th November. She's referring to an e-mail of the 22 nd November, but it would seem to us to be the 21st?
A. The 21st, $I$ believe so, yes.

174 Q. She notes the attachments relate only to the civil litigation. Now here she is, she says:
"According to information in the public domain, a formal bullying and harassment was made about the candi date in March 2017 and, indeed, that an assi stant commi ssi oner has been appoi nted to undertake an investigation into the compl aint. In my letter of the 7th November I al so requested documents rel ating to the bullying and harassment compl ai nt whi ch was referenced in your letter of the 25th October. I would be obliged if you would provi de the det ails requested regarding this bullying and harassment compl ai nt as per points 3 and 4 of that letter.

In particular, I amrequesting details of what is cont ai ned in the compl ai nt, what steps have been taken to investi gate the compl aint, a copy of the rel evant procedures and the timel ine for compl eting this i nvestigation. l would al so reiterate my request for a timel ine regarding both the civil litigation and the bullying and harassment allegations as set out in point 4 of my letter of the 7th November.

Please note that agree that you should redact third party inf ormation fromany copy or précis of all third party information with a bl ack marker."

Etcetera. okay. So that is the 24th, okay. And she is coming back and she is looking for the bullying and harassment materia1. Now, I think that you then go back to her on the 8th December by e-mail. Do you remember this e-mail on the 8 th December?
A. Yes, I do. Could we bring it up on screen?

175 Q. We will bring it up here. It appears a couple of times in the books, but it's 12533, if we can look at that one. This is "Dear Hel en", this is from you on the 8th; is that right?
A. That's correct. And to explain the timeline, I would have -- if it's relevant, I would have got legal advice in relation to this and, indeed, the letter would have been composed for me in that regard.

176 Q. Okay. You say there:
"I note your comments in respect of matters in the public domain suggesting that a formal complaint under An Garda Sí ochána bullying and har assment pol i cy was I odged in March 2017. In that regard, I can confirm that difficulties were experienced in progressing an i nvesti gation in the respect of the compl ai nt under this policy. Specifically difficulties were experi enced as the compl ai nts were broad in nature and extended to Garda members ot her than Superi ntendent Murray, covered periods bef ore Superintendent Murray was working with Garda A and rel ated to matters not covered by the pol icy."
okay.
A. Yes.

177 Q. You go on to say, you confirm that Assistant Commissioner Finn has been appointed, that he has met with Garda Keogh. Now, we know from hearing Assistant Commissioner Finn's evidence he had met with him on the 11:49 1st December, and we have seen minutes of a meeting in that regard. You say:
"The out come of this meeting is for Garda A to specifically confirmexact matters of his compl aint that rel ate to Superintendent Murray and whi ch are covered by the organi sation's bullying and harassment pol i cy:

You say:
"Assistant Commissioner Finn expects this work to be compl et ed shortly and the formal investigation of the rel evant issues will proceed. You will theref ore appreci ate that $I$ am not in a position to confirmthe fact nat ure of the allegations under the organi sation bullying and harassment policy agai nst Superintendent Murray at this time, other than that they rel ate to Superintendent Murray and a number of ot her seni or officers. Until such time as Garda A confirns the i dentity of all persons compl ai ned of, Assi stant Commi ssi oner Finn is not in a position to confirmwhen he would expect his investigation to have concl uded."
okay.
A. Yes.

178 Q. Now, we had some to-ing and fro-ing with Assistant Commissioner Finn about this meeting of the 1st and whether or not there was sufficient clarity or not, but 11:50 effectively this is what you are advised 1egally and this is what you respond to Ms. Hall with, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

179 Q. You say:
"For the purpose of example and to further assist in provi ding you with a more detailed response to your enquiry at point 3 (a) of your letter dated 24 th

November 2017."

Can I ask you about this, you say:
"I have appended a redacted copy of correspondence
recei ved fromthe sol icitor of Garda A in whi ch he details some of his issues of compl ai nt (appendi $x$ A)."

Now, what was appendix A, do you remember?
A. I don't remember.

180 Q. Okay. We may try and subsequently clarify that. We have looked for it but, as I say, we will try and clarify it.
A. And if I can help the Tribunal in that regard, I am happy to take on board.

181 Q. Okay. Can you remember, though, in general terms what you were sending, was a précis of the bullying and harassment complaint?
A. I think we may have taken a general element of the complaint and shown in a redacted fashion why there were difficulties in specific about the nature of the complaint against Superintendent Murray. So from memory, it may have looked at another allegation against another person, it may have been something of that type. But without -- clearly redacting out the issues, that would have been referenced. But, as I said to the Chair, I will happily take that off line. 182 Q. We will keep looking, we may be able to locate it, but as of this morning we don't?
A. okay.

183 Q. You are referring to point 3(b) of her letter of the 24th. And you say:
"If you look at the policy, we take cogni sance of fair procedures and natural justice to both the compl ai nant and person compl ai ned of. It is in accordance with this policy that the af orementioned investigation of Assi stant Commissioner Finn will be conducted. "

You refer to point 4, you give your responses A, B, C and D. You refer her to the chronology. We do, I think, have the appendix B. If I can just open it up, you might recognise it. 10331, Mr. Kavanagh. Is that the appendix $B$ that you recognise?
A. Yes.

184 Q. Okay. And that's similar to what we have seen with the movement of the bullying complaint from late 2016 ?
A. That's correct.

185 Q. Then if we go back to your e-mail of the 8th, 12535, you finish off -- so that's 12535. You finish off at number D, you say:
"As I expl ai ned in my e- mail of 21st Novenber 2017, I am not in a position to provide any indication as to when the ci vil litigation matters mi ght be concluded. Thi s is matter for the St ate Cl ai mゅ Agency."

You say it may be many months before it's finalised.

So you go back to her on the 8th. Now, we will be coming back again to a couple of more e-mails going between both of you, but can I bring you back to a note for that date that Superintendent Murray has. It's at 12400. He is saying he met you at the Garda college, do you remember that, on that date?
A. Yes, I would be down regularly. But, yes, again I don't dispute that we met.
Q. And that you told him you had sent on his civil document, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

187 Q. And that they were now looking for the bullying complaint, okay?
A. Yes.

188 Q. So he said, and he is attributing this to you:
"He was having that material prepared to be sent down to themin a few days. He said he assured the PA that the bullying compl ai nt mirrors the ci vil complaint."

I think you accept that, yes?
A. Yes.

189 Q. "Whi ch they have and is a wi de sweeping, non-specific set of allegations covering a number of people over a period of time."

So was that your view?
A. That was my view, the absence of specificity, which the Policing Authority were seeking.

190 Q. He is saying that you gave him an assurance that the top three were highly supportive. Can you tell the Chairman about that?
A. Yeah. Again, as I referenced earlier, we were very keen to provide the material necessary to the Policing Authority to enable them to make their decision. He continues, and I want you to look at this very carefully, he says that you had spoken to the PA re that and had given them assurances about my character. Is that correct?
A. So what -- I can't say I used those particular words. What would I have said is that at that point in time I wasn't aware of any issues that had been proven against Superintendent Murray at that point.
192 Q. He records that you said that you advised the PA that 11:55 they shouldn't be doing what they are doing and taking account of unsubstantiated allegations being decisions?
A. I don't recall saying those words, but I certainly would have expressed concerns to the Policing Authority about the fairness of the process. It's their process ultimately, so I'm not going to be critical of them. In my view, as I said, in my civil service experience it's not fair.
193 Q. okay. It would seem to suggest that at this stage, certainly by the 8th November, the previous meeting on the $23 / 11$ has passed, he hasn't been promoted, there's now another meeting coming up I think on the 18th December. But at this stage are you set against each other, the senior executive of An Garda Síochána and
the Policing Authority on this issue?
A. No. No. I wouldn't say that. I mean, I said, and I have been very clear, I have absolutely no desire whatsoever to criticise the Policing Authority. The Policing Authority have a set of processes. They follow the process. It's my job to provide them with the information they require. That I did. As I said, I'm offering a personal view, and it's certainly the view elsewhere, that the process by its nature, which would allow somebody's promotion to be deferred where due process has not concluded, seems to me to be unfair.
Q. Well that's if, I mean, as I say, we're not investigating the Policing Authority's process?
A. No, no, I am just saying. If we park Superintendent Murray, just the generality of a process that would allow an allegation be made unproven, unproven at that point and that would delay somebody's appointment, in my opinion is not what $I$ have seen across the public service throughout my civil service career.

195 Q. Okay.
A. But to be very clear, we're not at odds, not at odds with the Policing Authority.

196 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry?
A. I say we're not at odds with the Policing Authority.

197 Q. CHAL RMAN No, I understand.
A. I wouldn't like it depicted in that way.
Q. CHAL RMAN No.
A. We may again disagree on the process but it's their
process and we provide the information that they require.
MS. MtGRATH Okay. Now I think that was the 8th December, I think the Policing Authority come back to you, on 12531, which is the 14th December?
A. So there was an issue, I think, in relation to whether material may have been complete or not. So, Ms. Healy, who works for the Policing Authority, was in touch to get touch on clarity on what was there. Again, from memory there was some uncertainty that they had been provided with all of the information that been saying was being sent down from ourselves. on the 18th December, which is at 12530. Do you recognise this e-mail?
A. Yes.

201 Q. "Further to my conversation with Hel en on Friday, I confirmthat the material provided last week is a compl ete document and deals with the substantive nat ure of the compl ai nt. The appendi ces referenced were not incl uded as they are onl $y$ an add on to the detail of the substantive issue and the very consi derable task of reaction (over 60 pages) woul d have del ayed the transmission of the primary el ement of the document. I further understand that the appendi ces were passed di rectly to the Policing Authority by the solicitor to the compl ai nant under separate cover."

Does that help you jog your memory as to what actually
appendix A was?
A. It doesn't. But, as I said, Ms. McGrath, I will check into that over lunchtime, if that's helpful.
Q. okay.
A. But what is here, there is a view in the Policing Authority that we haven't provided them with all the information. Like we have replied in that regard. 203 Q. Ms. Hal1 comes back to you on the 22nd December, that's at 12536 . She says:
"Dear Joe, I refer to your e-mail bel ow and to the follow up material recei ved. As the Chai rperson expl ai ned to you, it was not possible for the Authority to fully consi der the clearance of Superintendent Murray in the absence of full information regarding the 11:59 bull ying and harassment compl ai nt agai nst him

We note that you state in your e-mail bel ow that until such time as Garda A confirms the identity of all per sons compl ai ned of, Assi stant Commi ssi oner Finn is not in a position to confirm when he would expect his i nvesti gation to have concl uded.

It is not clear on the basis of information you have provi ded us with that the del ay in commencing an investigation is justifiable or in accordance with the bullying and harassment pol icy forwarded by you on the 8th December. We note that the pol icy cont ai ns a commitment to sel ect a suitable investigator, which has
now been done, and that the investigat or will report their findi ngs within 28 days of they bei ng recei ved at the divisi onal office.

In the interests of fairness to Superintendent Murray and the compl ai nant, we would request that this matter be dealt with expeditiously and that a further update in rel ation to the commencement and progress of this investigation be provi ded to the Authority well in advance of its next Authority meeting on 25th January 2018. "

So at this stage we have passed the date of the 18th December?
A. Yes.

204 Q. Which is the Policing Authority --
A. which was the Policing Authority meeting.

205 Q. So now it's gone down the road into January at the very least?
A. That's correct.

206 Q. Okay. She is asking you then for further information. we know and we have seen that Ms. Hall e-mails Superintendent Murray on the 22nd December and she refers to repeated requests for information to you. Now, I can open it if you like, but is there some frustration building here with regard to the provision of material?
A. I think there's frustration on all parties, Superintendent Murray, the Policing Authority and
myself with regard to the provision of the information. yes, I think that's fair.
Q. okay. Now you rang Superintendent Murray on the same day, the 22nd December. It's 12407. It says:
"J oe Nugent rang me re my e-mail and call. He said the PA are looking for further clarification material now and he had gi ven them verbal assurances and summaries of information but they remai ned unsatisfied and that they were seeki ng more."

Is that correct?
A. The Policing Authority were unsatisfied and they were looking for information. Yes, that's correct.
208 Q. You said:
"I told hi ml feel the PA are adamant they don' t want to pronote me."

And you said you didn't get that sense. Okay? Do you accept that?
A. I accept what the Policing Authority were trying to do were to get the information to enable them to make a decision and they felt that -- so it wasn't anything about Superintendent Murray per se, it was more about the process had not concluded to a fashion that would allow them make that decision.

209 Q. Okay. In the last sentence, again you reassured him, he is saying:
"... on all three executive support and thei $r$ real isation of the unfair way I ambeing treated. "

You have already given your evidence to the Chairman in 12:02 relation to that?
A. Yes.

210 Q. Now, can I ask you, on the same day, there's a note, 12309. This is actually a phone call between Superintendent Murray and Assistant Commissioner Finn, who had been put in place on the 15th November. And the reason I am asking you about this is that it is recorded here that Assistant Commissioner Finn said he would contact Joe Nugent and K Mulkerrins re legal issues. Right. Now, I think at that stage you would have been aware that Superintendent Murray was raising issues with Assistant Commissioner Finn as to how he could run the $B \& H$ in parallel with the civil litigation; isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

211 Q. Okay. I think you were in some contact with Assistant Commissioner Finn, is that correct?
A. So I was in touch with Assistant Commissioner Finn to obtain some further information about the status of the matter and also there would have been probably
discussion around the issues associated with the legal issues that have been referenced there by Superintendent Murray. And by that I mean we wouldn't have got into what the issues were, but there would
have been a discussion saying there are legal issues here, there are potential legal issues upon which we need legal advice. Ms. Mulkerrins, to explain, is now the executive director for legal services, so would now be taking the lead in this space. Okay. So we see you're speaking to Assistant Commissioner Finn during this process as well, is that right?
A. Speaking to him, not about the investigation, but more the status of the investigation. That was the nature of my contact.

213 Q. Now, if we can move along then, I think that on the 22nd we see things go quiet for a little while over the Christmas period, is that right?
A. Yes.

214 Q. And we have again some notes from Superintendent Murray, he is in contact with you on the 8th January, at 16243:
"Phoned J oe Nugent. No answer. Mr. Nugent called back. "

## Do you see that?

A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember this particular call?
A. Again, $I$ won't dispute the call. So, I can't recall it directly. As I said, there were so many calls, I couldn't be --

216 Q. Okay. He is saying that:
"We di scussed me being passed over for a second time. He said he was anxi ous to get me over the line as he felt I have been badly treated. "

So this is quite a theme that is developing in the sense of the organisation supporting Superintendent Murray and the phrase here is "getting hi mover the line" do you accept that language or the sentiment that is being expressed?
A. I certainly express the sentiment. I mean, again to reflect on this, this matter, just this particular matter had now been running since -- are we saying the request was the 12 th October I think, so at this point we had essentially run -- just on this issue, had been running for a series of months. In that regard, it was taking an excessive amount to address whether Superintendent Murray should be promoted or not. That's unfair. I am not putting blame on anybody, but I am saying it is unfair for the length of time for this to be dealt with. You know, I take responsibility for the material we provided to the Policing Authority and that wasn't answering the questions they have. That is unfair and it was unfair on Superintendent Murray that it would drag on that long. you were meeting Helen Hall on the $11 / 1$ in a different context and you were going to meaningful discuss his case with her.
"Says he will have a better sense of the issue then but he mentioned that it's about the bullying. He offered the opi ni on. "

And this is you:
"That I coul dn't have bullied Garda Keogh in the short time l was with him"

Did you offer that opinion?
A. I don't recall saying that. I just don't recall saying it.
Q. "He says."

And this is you
"It was all normal managerial dealings with work rel at ed issues, as Judge Charl et on said in the Harrison case."

Did you say that?
A. And again, I suspect that there was a conversation between Superintendent Murray where he would have been, you know, putting his position in relation to the matter, so I may well have said that from what he describes and that was the case.
Q. You may have said it?
A. I may have said it in the context of how it was
described, but not on the basis of information, separate information I would have had.
220 Q. It says:
"I told hi mabout the bullying case in the Supreme
Court and Judge Charlet on's invol vement in the Reddy case. I brought up Garda Keogh's allegations re ex Commi ssi oner ÓSullivan in April ' 15 and expl ai ned how I udi crous it was. He agreed. "

Is that correct?
A. Is which correct? That I agreed.

221 Q. He agreed. Yes.
A. And I don't know what I was agreeing to, so...

222 Q. Well, it was the previous sentence?
A. Okay. Well, you know, there's a couple of things there. But, no, I don't know. I can't recall that.

223 Q. Okay. He, this is you:
"Brought up Garda Keogh's compl ai nt re overtime. I
said the sergeants deal with that. He..."
which is you.
"... offered it as an unbel i evable issue to stop my promotion with."

Is that correct?
A. It would sound, at face value, yes. It's certainly
unproven at that point in time.
224 Q.
Q. Okay, so you are digging into the substance of the matter here with him?
A. So, Superintendent Murray is explaining to me the situation that he faced and I am offering a personal view, and it is only a personal view, about whether what was being described, which at that point in time had not been proven as bullying, as unfair. I still hold that view.

225 Q.
"I asked himif he knew of anything el se and I was very
12:08 confident I had done nothing wrong. He agreed and said as far as he know this was the onl y issue."

Again, is that correct?
A. That sounds fair.
okay. what happens then, it would seem from the e-mails that we have seen, is that -- so that date, just let me refresh, that is the 8th January, and a couple of days later you write to Assistant Commissioner Finn. This is at 12549, which is the 11th 12:09 January. So 12549. And you say:
"We spoke briefly about this earlier this week."

This is Assistant Commissioner Finn.
"Gratef ul if you were able to send me something short by means of update whi ch mi ght answer some of the issues rai sed by Hel en Hall."

He comes back to you on the 15th, which is 12547, and this is --
A. A status update.

227 Q. -- a status update, which we will go through with Assistant Commissioner Finn when he is recalled. He is giving you, as you say, the status update of the investigation. And he says at number 11:
"It is anticipated it will take a number of weeks to compl ete the investi gation."

## Do you see that?

A. Yes.

228 Q. Now, I think you send that on to Ms. Hall on the same day, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

229 Q. That's the 15th January. And what happens then, the next contact is, she comes back to you on the 18th January, and this is 12544, the 18th January?
A. Yes.

230 Q. She says:
"I refer to our conversations yesterday and earlier today in rel ation to this matter. As 1 understand it, 12:10 the Garda Sí ochána has recently recei ved a refinement of the bullying and harassment compl ai nt (dated March 2017) previ ousl y recei ved in rel ation to Superintendent Murray. In order to ensure that the Authority are
provi ded with the most up-to- date information on this matter, I would request that you forward any updated allegations and/or refinement of previous allegations to us as qui ckly as possible so as to avoid any unnecessary del ays in advancing this cl earance process."

So that is the 18th January. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.

231 Q. That's the essence of that e-mail really. I think what 12:11 is really coming out of that, would that be a reference to the addendum complaint that was handed to Assistant Commissioner Finn when he met Garda Keogh on the 1st December?
A. Yes, that's correct.

I think she comes back to you on the 23rd January, looking for this, because there was a clarification on the date issue?
A. That's correct.
Q. which we don't need to go into?
A. Yeah.
Q. But she comes back to you, 12539.
A. Yes.

235 Q. And at 12539, this is the 23rd January, she says:
"In reference to my e-mail bel ow of the 19th January, we are still awaiting the updated allegations and a refinement of previ ous allegations that you referred to I ast week when we spoke. As you know, I want to avoid
any unnecessary del ays in advancing this cl earance process, so l would appreciate if this information could be provided to us today."
okay?
A. okay.

236 Q. Then you go back to her, the following day I think it is, and it is at 12538. You say:
"I refer to your request in respect of the nat ure of
the additional information provi ded to AC Finn as part of his investigation. I can confirmthat the additional material provided al most entirely rel ates to the broad bullying question and rel ated to indi vi dual s ot her than Superintendent Murray. Only one reference was made to Superintendent Murray (bel ow) and in that regard it rel ated to cl arification of one small aspect of the allegations agai nst Superintendent Murray."

Now, this gets to the nub of it. You put in the extract from the addendum, which is on the 2/3/2017:
"Garda A states he met Garda $T$ for the purpose of making a statement."

And Garda A is Garda Keogh, isn't that right?
A. I believe so, yes.

237 Q. "And it became evident to Garda A that he should make a written statement. Garda A states that he gave a
written statement to Garda T on 27/ 3/17 and heard nothing further about the processing of the compl ai nt at such time. Garda A states that he di dn't real ise that the compl ai nt had gone missing until he found out that Superintendent Pat Murray (who had come to At hl one 12:13 from Garda G s regi on) was on the promotion list. It is further stated that Garda $G$ was the poi nt of contact with the Policing Authority and theref ore critically i nvol ved in any clearance of Superintendent Murray in respect of his bullying compl ai nt to the Policing Authority for the purposes of the promotion."

As I say, that came from the addendum Garda Keogh handed over on the 1st December; isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

238 Q. Okay. So I think that is where effectively the to-ing and fro-ing with the Policing Authority ended as regards information, is that right?
A. Well, no, there's one further interaction, which was on the 26 th.

239 Q. We will come to that in a moment, where you are asked for the clearance?
A. Yes.

240 Q. But as regards the information, sorry, of the bullying complaint, that was where it ended?
A. That was where it ended.
Q. okay. And that was the information they had?
A. Yes.

242 Q. Now, as I say, that brings us up to January, the 24th

January. Now, in the meantime, what we have then in the days in between that, we have some further notes that Superintendent Murray kept and. One of them would be 12413. This is a conversation you had with him, which is a couple of days before, while all these exchanges are going on with the Policing Authority, he says he's talking to you, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. That you said, midway down, you're working with Finn in providing a report to the Policing Authority and understanding where $M$ Finn is. And that's what we saw, isn't that right?
A. The status update, yes.

244 Q. Yes.
"He sai d the PA real ised they were being unfair to me. He sai d he expected a positive outcome and would contact ne if anything cropped up to change that."

Is that correct as of that date, the 12 th?
A. I think, and it comes back to this question of frustration, I think that they and ourselves were collectively recognising that the process was being unfair as opposed to the decision. So I can't say I used the words that they are unfair, but the generality of it was, this matter, the clearance matter was taking an excessive amount of time.

245 Q. Now, we know that Assistant Commissioner Finn down with Superintendent Murray a couple of days later, on the

18th January. Would you be aware of that from the papers?
A. No.

246 Q. He referenced a four and a half hour meeting with Superintendent Murray, do you remember that?
A. No.

247 Q. Okay. We11, if I can just ask you to look at 12378. 12378. Actually it's a little bit unclear, so $I$ just want you to clarify this. He seems to have phoned you on that day, do you see that?
A. Yes.

248 Q. He says:
"No answer, left ressage."
A. okay.

249 Q. He is asking you had you spoken to M Finn.
"F Heal y report anal ysis. My question re my defence document. Do PA real ise the legal issues?"

Are these all familiar issues to you at this stage?
A. Yes.

250 Q. okay. It says:
"J oe Nugent conversation 20/1."

Do you remember having a conversation with him on 20/1?
A. I don't recal1, but again, I'm not -- if Superintendent Murray recorded the notes, I won't dispute them.

251
Q. We11, he has a note here of 12418 of that conversation:
"Phoned J oe Nugent as instructed. "

I think you had told him to phone you back at a particular time that was suitable; is that right?
A. That's probably it.
Q. You are telling him that you are going to be talking to Helen Hall again on Monday and Tuesday.
"He doesn't know what they are going to do at thei $r$ meeting but he assured me he will make sure they have all they want."

So at this stage you're assuring Superintendent Murray that you're working closely with the Authority, is that right?
A. That's correct.

253 Q. Now he says he told of the four and a half hour meeting he had with Assistant Commissioner Finn and he says:
"Assi stant Commíssi oner Finn's vi ew is that all is okay."

Do you remember a conversation around that?
A. No, I don't. But I would suspect -- the only piece that I would have, I can only envisage, related to the status of the material and the provision by me to the Policing Authority of the material that's there. But I
certainly have no recollection of talking about the specifics. In fact, I don't recall any discussion around the specifics of Assistant Commissioner Finn's investigation. It would merely have been about something, you know, that I am working on with it, but certainly not in any detail at all.
well, when Superintendent Murray was asked about this on Day 146, at page 113, he saw this as AC Finn passing on assurances to you. when he references the words assurances and what is being assured about, what is your understanding of that?
A. My understanding is that the material that was needed to assist the Policing Authority to make a decision was being provided. No more than that. Certainly there was no more assurances around the nature of what was being considered by Assistant Commissioner Finn's investigation. So assurances would have related to where this investigation is in terms of its current position, assurances would have been around the timelines provided, assurances that AC Finn was dealing with the matter expeditiously and assurances on my part that that information would be communicated to the Policing Authority, as we did earlier.
Q. okay. Because a couple of lines down:
"J oe Nugent spoke about M Finn doing his investigation qui ckl y. "
A. Yes, I would have asked him, I mean this is in the broad context, to say this matter had been going on
since March and that I really felt that the matter needed to be progressed.
Q. we're calling it, contact with the Policing Authority had run its course by the 24th January, as we just saw, 12:20 when you went back about the addendum, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

Superintendent Murray has a note, at 12421, where he says he got an unexpected call from you and that you said.
"The PA had just confirmed to himthat there is now nothing outstanding in rel ation to me fromthe Guards that they want."

Is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Then, as you said yourself, you had one further dealing with the Policing Authority on the issue, that was on the 26th January. This would be at 12570. This is where you enclose a declaration of suitability in respect of Superintendent Murray, and you say:
"I decl are that there are no grounds known to Garda
Sí ochána rel ating to heal th, character or ot herwi se why Superintendent Pat Murray is not suitable to be appoi nted to the position of chi ef superintendent at this time. I decl are that the candi date is suitable to
be appoi nted to the post of chi ef superintendent having regard to the candi date's sick leave record and any rel evant sick I eave regul ations and policies."

Can you tell the Chair how that came about?
A. So, that day there was a meeting of the senior leadership team in wexford, I took a phone call from Ms. Hal1 to say that they required one final piece, which was a declaration from the organisation in relation to Superintendent Murray's suitability for promotion. I sought advice from Ms. Mulkerrins, who was in attendance at the meeting in this regard, and that resulted in this declaration being sent to the Policing Authority.
259 Q. Okay. As you say there, you sought advice from the organisation?
A. I sought advice from the legal representative of the organisation, just to be very clear, I sought advice from the legal representative of the organisation. okay. Now, I think as we know then, the superintendent 12:22 was subsequently promoted, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

261 Q. At the next meeting. And you're aware of that?
A. Yes.

262 Q. Was that effectively where matters ended? And the
reason I ask you that, because we are now in January, the end of January 2018, and in disclosure we were provided with some text messages, and you might have seen them, at 12574. This is 16th February 2018. Did
you see these in disclosure?
A. I have seen them, yes.
Q. These are text messages between yourself and the Policing Authority; is that right?
A. I apologies, I couldn't hear, could you say that again, 12:23 please?
Q. Are these text messages between yourself and the Policing Authority?
A. I suspect so, yes. but was there ongoing issues or was the matter at an end in relation to Superintendent Murray?
A. No, I think as far as I was concerned the matter was at an end.
Q. You're not aware of any ongoing issues?
A. No.

267 Q. Okay. A11 right. And really then to bring your involvement with all of this -- I mean, you will be cross-examined by other parties, but to ring your involvement to a close, we saw Assistant Commissioner Finn's report coming in at the end of 2018. Where we see you getting involved again is, we know that Assistant Commissioner Fanning can't complete the review and I think you were the person to put Assistant Commissioner O'Brien in place in January 2019; is that 12:24 right?
A. That's correct.

268 Q. If you just give me a moment, Mr. Nugent?
A. Of course.

269 Q. Thank you, Mr. Nugent. If you can answer any questions, please?

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Now. Yes, Ms. Mulligan.

MR. J OSEPH NUGENT WTNESS WAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY ME. MLLI GAN AS FOLLOMS:

270 Q. MS. MLLI GAN Good afternoon, Mr. Nugent. Can I just ask, in relation to your role, to be clear, you step into the shoes of Acting Commissioner ó Cualáin because of an identified conflict.
A. Yes, that's correct.

271 Q. So from an organisational point of view, it wouldn't be ordinary for the CAO to perform either of the two roles that we just heard about between yesterday and today?
A. It wouldn't be -- it wouldn't be usual, I think would be fair to say. I am struggling to think of other examples.
Q. Yes.
A. But it would not be inappropriate.

273 Q. No suggestion from that point of view. My question is, so it's not something that you would do on a regular basis?
A. No, certainly not, no.

274 Q. Ordinarily that role would be filled by the acting commissioner and you, in doing these two pieces, we'11
say, in relation to directly with Garda Keogh and directly dealing with Superintendent Murray, were in new territory, would that be fair?
A. I think that's fair.

275 Q. Okay. Just in relation to how we deal with the issue of the promotion. You said yesterday that you didn't think it would be appropriate for you have contacted Garda keogh and that was a matter for HR. And then we see in relation to the promotion, what I am going to describe as, an extensive amount of contact, largely which you don't dispute, between yourself and Pat Murray. From an organisational point of view, can you see how that might look as somewhat suspicious to both the general public and in particular to Garda Keogh?
A. No.

276 Q. No? You don't see any --
A. No, I don't. I mean Superintendent Murray was -- the matter that we are talking about here relates to the promotion of Superintendent Murray. In many ways it had nothing to do with anyone else in the organisation and $I$ don't mean that in a disrespectful way, the matter related to Superintendent Murray. I was the one who was tasked with addressing and engaging with the Policing Authority in relation to that matter. I wasn't the person who was tasked in relation to dealing 12:26 with the bullying and harassment allegations levelled by Garda Keogh. So my engagement with Superintendent Murray seems to me most appropriate. In fact, I think it would have been -- I think I was equally critical of
the organisation yesterday in terms of not providing sufficient information to Garda Keogh in relation to what was happening in relation to the bullying complaint.

277 Q.
Just to go back then to my question then in relation to the level of contact that you had with Superintendent Murray, I think I know the answer because you haven't done this role before, can you confirm or deny to the Chairman whether or not you viewed that contact as quite substantial?
A. Yeah, it was substantial. I think we equally need to reference that a lot of the contacts were occurring in or around meetings of the Policing Authority, where these matters were going to be addressed. So there was naturally a spike of contact in advance of that. clearly it was equally unusual for somebody whose promotion was being put forward, and was being delayed because a matter had not gone through due process, that's unusual as well. So it is not surprising, if I was sitting in Superintendent Murray's shoes, that I would equally have been seeking assurances that the material that was required by the Policing Authority was being provided. And ultimately that's really what Superintendent Murray was on to me about.
278 Q. we will come back to this issue of due process in due course. But can we just go back for a minute and look at Garda Keogh and your decision not to contact him after you had this initial meeting? You say it was a matter for HR, yes?
A. Sorry, after which initial meeting now?
Q. So your case conference?
A. okay.

280 Q. Singular case conference.
A. Okay.

Q. And again, $I$ am just going to clarify, in terms of while it may not have been your role, in terms of the concept of the reassurance and going back to your concept of fair procedures and justice being seen to be 12:29 done, we have a situation now where we see you having extensive contact with Superintendent Murray about a promotion which is largely linked to this issue of bullying and harassment, and you have given your
evidence to the Tribunal that you didn't think it was appropriate to make any contact with Garda Keogh. I just want to give you the opportunity to clarify any position that you might have. But it appears, certainly to me, that an issue arises with the hierarchy changes, the level of contact and importance changes.
A. No --

Sorry, just so I am clear and so that you can give your he evidence to the Chairman, Superintendent Murray gets, I recall it, contacted three to four times a week for a period of three months. Garda Keogh finds himself in a situation where he gets a number of letters and some contact, finds out about a meeting, a case conference and you don't think to pick up a phone and reassure him in any way when you are stepping into the shoes of the Commissioner. I just want to give you an opportunity to comment on that?
CHA RMAN what is your question, Ms. Mulligan?
ME. MLLIGAN I just want to give him an opportunity 12:30 to comment on whether or not he thinks that is appropriate.
CHAN RMAN What's appropriate?
ME. MLLI GAN Not making contact.
CHA RMAN That he should have phoned Garda keogh.
ME. MLLIGAN Yes.
284 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Should you have phoned Garda Keogh?
A. No, I should not have phoned Garda Keogh. I was tasked -- you have contrasted that with my engagement in
relation to Superintendent Murray. I was personally tasked with providing the information to the policing Authority in relation to Garda Murray's promotion [sic]. My role in relation to Garda Keogh was about the process. There were others who were tasked with making and dealing with those issues. That was their responsibility. For me to become involved, in my opinion would have been inappropriate.

MS. MLLI GAN So you were personally tasked to liaise with the Policing Authority for Superintendent Murray?
A. I was personally tasked with addressing those issues, yes. Yes, but with the Policing Authority, not with Superintendent Murray?
A. But that required the engagement with Superintendent Murray. It wouldn't have been possible to do this with it. Because there were clearly -- and we have seen some of the interactions, where there was a necessity to ensure that Superintendent Murray's materials were -- in some instances whether Superintendent Murray was satisfied with the material being provided. So it would not have been possible to do that without having contact with Superintendent Murray.

287 Q. Okay. In relation to your role in Superintendent Murray's engagement with the Policing Authority, and I identified this issue of an unproven or an unsubstantiated allegation and you identified to the chairman the need for due process, can I confirm, are
you discussing the idea of the presumption of innocence? Just I wasn't entirely clear what you are describing as due process?
A. Absolutely. A presumption of innocence. At that moment in time there wasn't a finding of fact against Superintendent Murray. And in my view, in my civil service experience $I$ have not come across situations where matters that have not reached a finding of fact would have prevented somebody from progressing for promotion.
288 Q. I just want to give you an opportunity to make this clear to the Chairman, this is the first time you step into this role, yes?
A. It's the first time I step into this role, yes.

289 Q. Is it the only time you have ever had to step into this ${ }_{12: 32}$ role?
A. Yes, I believe so. From memory, I believe so, yes.

290 Q. Okay. I don't want to go into the role of the Policing Authority in any way, and I am sure the Chairman will stop me if I am do, but in relation to the appointment ${ }_{\text {12:32 }}$ of a chief superintendent, am I correct in saying there's only 47 ?
A. It would be of that order, that's correct. you continually go back to this idea of a civil servant and their presumption of how this would be unusual, but 12:32 surely the role of the chief superintendent within the State has to be considered to a different threshold and a different standard. Did you consider that at all?
A. Absolutely. And I don't think there is any suggestion

I did not. But the point is at that point in time nothing had been found against Superintendent Murray. That seems to me a very basic, normal natural position to be. And to suggest anything otherwise, in my view is unfair. I think in those circumstances anybody can make -- and this is not about Garda Keogh, to be very clear what I am saying here, but that fair process means fair process and it cuts for all ways. And to presume an outcome before a process has completed and make a finding that is substantially important in the context of anyone's promotion, in my view, in my civil service career, a long time, as I said yesterday, I have been since 2002 in senior positions in the public service and across the civil and public service I haven't come across it.

292 Q. And do you say that in relation to all allegations as opposed to just the allegations that Garda Keogh made?
A. Excuse me, could you say that again?

Do you say that in respect of all allegations, once unproven shouldn't be considered, or just the
allegations that Garda Keogh made?
A. I want to be clear. I don't want to talk specifically about Garda Keogh, I am talking about the generality of this. That the concept that an individual could have their promotion deferred because of an allegation, not 12:34 landed at that point in time, in my view is unfair. That is not about Garda Keogh, this is a general position.

294 Q. Just because you were stepping in the shoes of the

Commissioner at the time that this is relevant, does that include allegations in terms of a sexual assault then or of sexual harassment?
A. We11, you know, again that's not something that I was dealing with. And without looking into specifics of that, I would need -- you know, you are asking a very hypothetical question.
Q. Well no, I am not?
A. You are.

So now I need to ask you the question, respectfully, that this is a role that should have been completed by the acting commissioner, in relation to a public post, of which only 47 people hold, for the benefit of the State and for the functioning of the nation and in those standards, perhaps using our civil service hat, for want of a better word, was not entirely appropriate?
A. I disagree.

298 Q. You disagree. And in terms of that issue, then we find ourselves in a situation where unless an allegation, irrespective of what it is, is proven, a person or a member of An Garda Síochána, should be promoted to senior ranks without any further question from anybody else, is that your evidence to the Chairman?
A. I didn't say that at all.

Q. I am going to identify that you spoke to -- I did the dates for my own record. You spoke to Superintendent Pat Murray on the 31st October, on the 1st November, on the 20th November, on the 16th November, on the 2 nd November, on the 13th November, on the $8 / 12$, on the $22 / 12$, on the $8 / 1$, on the $13 / 1$, on the 21 st and I think again on the 24th. I think there were other days as wel1. But it's a huge amount of contact to have with one member in terms of your role when you're stepping into the shoes of the acting commissioner and you don't take any notes, yourself, you don't take notes of that correspondence or any of those conversations?
A. No, I don't.

301 Q. No. So we have notes that you don't refute in substance?
A. In substance, no.

302 Q. Yes. Where you seem to accept that you believed that it was unfair for a member of An Garda Síochána to
be -- for their promotion to be, we'11 say, stalled based on unproven and unsubstantiated allegations. Isn't that your evidence to the Chairman?
A. Yes.

303 Q. Yes
In the role of the acting commissioner --
12:38
A. Well, I wasn't in the role of acting commissioner, just to be clear. There is technical difference here. I was asked to take responsibility and delegate for a specific function.
Yes. In the role of the acting commissioner for this purpose, you applied, $I$ am going to describe it as, your general civil service experience to a role that perhaps required a higher level of scrutiny?
A. That is an extraordinary comment, I have to say. As somebody who served --
Q. Well, certainly --
A. Well, sorry, as somebody who has served -- let me finish. For somebody who has served in senior manager positions for a large portion of my career, having been appointed to the position of chief administrative
officer in 2016, I find it objectionable, being honest, that you would question my ability to make decisions. That to me is not acceptable.

306 Q. Nonetheless, I am still doing it.
A. That's fine. And we disagree.

307 Q. And that's the position?
A. That's okay.

308 Q. Because it's my understanding of your evidence that in acting as the commissioner, you have identified to the

Chairman that An Garda Síochána support an accused until such time as an allegation has been proven?
A. Sorry, explain that last piece again.

That in acting as commissioner, as did you in this role, you have given your evidence to the Chairman that ${ }_{12: 39}$ An Garda Síochána support an accused until such time as an allegation has been proven, irrespective of what that allegation is?
A. And I said in relation to this particular case, that's the position, yes.
310 Q. Well, I am going to repeat myself, you didn't say it in relation to this particular case, you said it generally. That was your evidence to the Chairman?
A. That's fair. But you're bringing about a series of hypotheticals, you brought in a particular matter which 12:39 is not relevant to here at all. I have given my general position. My general position is that to withhold somebody's promotion on the back of an unproven and unsubstantiated allegation is unfair, based on what I have seen in multiple -- a variety of different organisations across the public service. That's my position. Clearly in circumstances you would look at -- if there were other circumstances that may apply, you might look at that differently. But in general terms, yes, that is my view. And in relation 12:40 to this specific case, it is absolutely my view.
311 Q. Irrespective of the effect may have on the alleged victims?
A. I wasn't dealing with the alleged victims, I was
dealing with -- in this case the issue related to the promotion of Superintendent Murray, that's what my responsibility was. It wasn't in relation to the generality of the matters being dealt with by Garda Keogh. As I said, I was dealing with the clearance of Superintendent Murray in this regard.

I will repeat myself. Irrespective of what happened, irrespective of how this would affect Garda Keogh, Superintendent Murray, prior to any determination, is appointed as a chief superintendent, irrespective of any outcome of the complaints made by Garda Keogh in 2016. We're here to discuss whether or not that had the effect of discrediting or targeting Garda Keogh. I am putting it to you that it must have the effect of discrediting Garda Keogh?
A. I certainly am not in a position to give any evidence around that whatsoever. My responsibility related to the specific issues associated with the appointment of Superintendent Murray, who entered into a process that was advertised by the Policing Authority with a set of procedures that were applied. My job was to address and deal with those. No more than that.

313 Q. Very good. Could I just ask, Mr. Kavanagh, could we just for the sake of completeness go to page 12390.
A. Sorry, I am going to turn my back on you.

314 Q. That's fine. Just to go to the post, the italicised piece, onto the third and fourth line, the fourth line. It identifies that Pat Murray spoke to Joe Nugent.
"He said Cormis ssi oner asked hi mto make contact. He said he and the Commissi oner were concer ned that unsubstantiated allegations could block my appoi nt ment. "

I think, just to give you the benefit, you said you didn't say the word unsubstantiated but that is the thrust of the --
A. Yeah, I wouldn't argue with the thrust of it.
Q. If we could just go to page 12392. Do you see that? Can I just ask:
"HR confident I will be okay."

Could you just confirm for me who in HR are confident he would be okay?
A. Can I just read this, apologies?

316 Q. of course.
A. I am just wondering is that a separate -- maybe I'm wrong, 6:28 call from Tony McLough7in. So I am just wondering if that note relates to Chief Superintendent McLoughlin.
317 Q. Very good, you think that might relate -CHA RMAK It does seem to be.
ME. MLLI GAN No issue, Chairman, I am just clarifying ${ }^{12: 43}$ it.

CHA RMAN There shouldn't be any doubt about that. "Call fromT MELoughlin, HR confident I will be okay."

In fact, I can even envisage what that was about.

M5. MLLI GAN Okay, very good, Chairman. If we can go to page 12397. Just in relation to this issue of the media, all very contrived against me and worrying. I think again you didn't take issue with the substance of 12:44 that when Ms. McGrath mentioned this piece. I just want to give you again the opportunity to clarify any position that you might have. Is it your position that the media should have no involvement or concerns or any publication of appointments of senior members of An Garda Síochána.
A. It's my position that the process should be allowed to complete and that the media commentary on that could be seen to be interfering with the process. We have appointed -- we put in place a Policing Authority, we have put in place a process which would take the appointment of senior ranks out of the hands An Garda Síochána, from a public trust point of view, let the Policing Authority get on with it. I am not sure what the media commentary around some aspects of that, how that was helpful.

319 Q. And just to go back then to page 12400, just to be absolutely clear about this. It says:
"He gave me assurances that the top three were hi ghl y 12:45 supportive and that he had spoken to the Policing Authority and gi ven them assurances about my character."

Can you just confirm that you are happy that you did give assurances about character?
A. As I think I said in my evidence earlier, that I suspect what I had said in that regard, that I had -nothing had come to my attention at that point in time, 12:45 proven in fact, in relation to complaints associated with Superintendent Murray.
320 Q. okay. And I am going to confirm then, so in order for you not to give assurances about someone's character, it would have to be a proven fact as opposed to an allegation?
A. Yeah, I would say proven, yes.

321 Q. And that is in all scenarios or specifically in relation to the --
A. I think I have answered this question, Chairman.

322 Q. I just want to give you the opportunity because I think there --

CHA RMAN we have been over it, he has made it very clear.
ME. MLLI GAN very good, Chairman.
CHA RMAN It's called fair procedures.
ME. MLLI GAN very good, chairman.
CHAI RMAN That's his position.
323 Q. ME. MLLI GAN Yes, very good, Chairman. Then if we go to page 12407. This just relates to the diary note of ${ }_{\text {12:46 }}$ Chief Superintendent Murray, arising out of something that Ms. McGrath asked you at page 12533. Ms. McGrath asked you in relation to the documents that were sent to Ms. Hall, at page 12533, what the appendix A was, do
you remember that?
A. Yeah. I said I can't answer with that is but I will happily take that, see if I can clarify that and I will try and do that over lunchtime.
324 Q.
Very good. Just on that note, was there any attempt or, I suppose, just trying to understand why more material couldn't -- all of the material that had been gathered to be provided to Mr. Finn just couldn't go straight to the Policing Authority? I just wanted to ask that question.
CHA RMAN Sorry, could you say that again, Ms. Mulligan?

MS. MLLI GAN why every piece material that everyone had, be it from Pat Murray or given to Assistant Commissioner Finn, why it wasn't just handed straight over to the Policing Authority for them to -CHA RMAN In other words, why was there any kind of discussion as to what was to be sent?
Q. MS. MLLI GAN Yes, just hand it over.
A. And this was the advice $I$ was given, this was the appropriate way to proceed.

326 Q. Can I just confirm, is that the legal advice that you were given?
A. Legal, yes.

327 Q. And that's Mr. Ken Ruane; is that right?
A. Or Ms. Mulkerrins.

328 Q. Right.
A. Or Assistant Commissioner Corcoran, because they were all in at different stages of the process. So, sorry,
apologies, for that part it would have been Mr. Ruane and Ms. Mulkerrins.
Just if I could go to page 12415. I am not sure if this was opened to you.
"Spoke with M Finn, to meet on the 18th. See bullying file. Following conversation with J Nugent and himit appears to me the bullying investigation is now being driven entirely to satisfy the Policing Authority and to get themout of a tight spot."

Are you satisfied that that's an accurate -- I know it's to Mick Finn.
A. It's to Mick Finn.

I appreciate it's to Mick Finn, but I just want to give you an opportunity because he does reference you. Was the purpose of the bullying investigation entirely to satisfy the Policing Authority and to get them out of a tight spot?
A. No.

331 Q. No. So Superintendent Murray is incorrect about that?
A. Well, he was giving his opinion at a moment in time. I mean, I can't answer as to what is there but I can say that the bullying and harassment investigation was not related to the promotional process.
332 Q. I just want to give you an opportunity to comment on whether or not, based on what you have given to the Chairman and the information you've provided, it is your view that An Garda Síochána should only provide
material to the Policing Authority where there have been proven allegations?
A. Could you repeat the question, please, just to be clear what you are asking.
Q. That --
A. We should only provide information -- but we --

334 Q. Against proven allegations?
A. No, we provided information. We have provided information relating to a bullying and harassment claim that wasn't proven at that stage. So I am puzzled as to the premise of your question.

335 Q. Very good. I have no further questions.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAK Thank you very much. who else?
MR. MEGARRY: Chairman.
CHAN RMAN Mr. McGarry, you're for Assistant Commissioner Fanning.
MR. MtGARRY: Yes.

MR. JOSEPH NUGENT WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. MEGARRY, AS FOLLOVG:

MR. MEGARRY: There is one matter, Mr. Nugent, I just want to ask you about very briefly, and it relates to the point of disagreement, maybe that's a strong way of describing it, between yourself and AC Fanning at the meeting on the 23 rd October. If we could just have
page 10235, please. This is your letter, we had this earlier, to him on 2nd November 2017. As I understand your evidence, the point of disagreement related to the fact that AC Fanning's view was that there was more to this than simply a bullying and harassment issue, that there were a whole range of issues, a much wider set of concerns. He referred to the pie chart and so on; is that right?
A. I would share that position, yes. There's was disagreement between myself and the assistant commissioner about the breadth of the issues, no.

337 Q. And it wasn't limited solely to concern on his part that there had to be a Byrne/McGinn style inquiry, he was concerned in a general sense that all of the issues should be looked at?
A. I think the point of disagreement would be around the approach of dealing with it. I don't think either of us would be in disagreement that the matter shouldn't be considered. Yes. It's perhaps not the case then that there is any change of mind or change of heart on your part when you refer to all the various complex issues in this letter of the 2nd November?
A. No. Myself and the assistant commissioner were in agreement that this was complex, it covered multiple strands. I have no issue with that at all.

339 Q. Thank you.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Very good. Anybody else? Yes, Mr. McGuinness.

## MR. J OSEPH NUGENT WAS EXAM NED BY MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS, 12:52 AS FOLLOVG:

340 Q. MR DONAL MEGU NNESS: Mr. Nugent, if we could just deal with the Policing Authority issue first. In terms of the level of contact that you had with
Superintendent Murray, and there seems to be some criticism about the level of contact from Garda Keogh's counse1. Superintendent Murray himself described himself as under pressure at the time, insofar as he considered he was under attack from a number of different angles. How did he strike you at the time?
A. Yeah, I certainly share that. I think a lot of the contact was being initiated by Superintendent Murray and it reflected, I think, a broader concern that -- I think he referenced it in other evidence, about the impact this was having on himself, on his family and how he was perceived. So I absolutely felt -- and I could hear that in the nature of the tone of the conversations, that he did feel under pressure, yes.
341 Q. Notwithstanding anything that Superintendent Murray, as 12:53 he was at this stage, would have said to you, you had a very clearly defined role at the time?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

342 Q. And that role was engagement with the Policing

Authority, to get them whatever information they needed in order to consider his promotion?
A. That's correct.
Q.

And am I right that you didn't engage in any consideration of the substantive aspects of Garda Keogh's complaint?
A. No, certainly not, no.
A. Absolutely not, no. It was about what information did they require to enable them to make their decision. No ${ }_{12: 54}$ more than that.

Q
And would I be correct in saying that insofar as you were aware of any of the substantive allegations, that information would have been in the limited context of those conversations that you had with Pat Murray?
A. Yeah. So material I would have passed on, which clearly would have got into some of the substance, was literally -- I was a conduit in that regard, I wasn't looking into the primary substance of that at that point.
346 Q. And your contact with AC Finn was also only for the purpose of getting information and providing that to the Policing Authority?
A. Absolutely. The Policing Authority wanted an update as to the status of the investigation, they wanted to understand how long it was going to take to be progressed and my contact with AC Finn was purely in relation to that, no more.
347 Q. Did you offer to the Policing Authority any subjective
comments or opinions on the bullying and harassment complaint?
A. No, I didn't. No.

348 Q. Just in relation to the issue of fairness, the bullying and harassment complaint is one thing, it comes to a conclusion, but $I$ assume from the point of view of An Garda Síochána, if someone is found to be guilty of bullying and harassment or a serious breach of discipline, that there are consequences for the garda concerned?
A. Absolutely.

349 Q. One of those consequences for a serious breach could actually be demotion; isn't that correct?
A. That's correct. Certainly, there would be circumstances in which individuals have not been promoted because of proven issues that they have had, yes.
350 Q. Now, moving back to the first issue. You have been questioned at length about the delays that have been referred to in evidence. I just want to ask you a few questions about that. If we could look briefly at page 105, please. This is the statement of Garda Keogh. I have a reference to:
"I did not make my written statement to Chi ef
Superintendent John Scanlan until 27th March 2017, when I physically handed to it to him This statement went missing for approxi matel y seven months. My solicitor resubmitted my bullying and harassment complaint to

Garda Human Resources (NK 9 refers) on 25th September 2017. "

Are you aware of any complaint going missing?
A. No, I'm not aware.

12:57
"I heard nothing further about the processing of my compl ai nt until such time lidn't realise the compl ai nt had gone missing until I found out that Superintendent Murray who had come to At hl one from Donal Ó Cual ái $n$ 's Western Regi on was on a promotion list."

So, he's referencing in the first instance in his discussions with the Tribunal that the complaint went missing but he is tying the fact that it went missing to the promotion of Pat Murray. Are you aware of any connection --
A. No.

352 Q. -- between the delays -- we know it didn't go missing, but between the delays and the promotion of Pat Murray? 12:58
A. No, I'm not aware of any.
Q. And in any sense was the so-called delays in processing the bullying and harassment complaint associated with the promotion of Pat Murray, to the best of your
know7edge?
A. No.

354 Q. Could I ask you to look at page 6873, please? Now, we know that the bullying and harassment complaint was completed by Chief Superintendent Scanlan or by Garda Keogh on 31st March 2017. You have been asked at some length by my Friend Ms. McGrath in relation to the delays in dealing with the bullying and harassment issue, and you indicated your concern in the October 23 meeting that this matter needed to move on. But if I can just ask you to look at this letter. This letter is from AC Fanning to Garda Keogh on the 16th May. He is essentially telling Garda Keogh -- if we could just scroll up, one moment please. He is essentially acknowledging the fact that he still has the bullying and harassment complaint in his possession at this point in time, he has been on annual leave for a while and he is anxious to proceed with the matter:
"In order that l can make a determination on how to proceed, I would appreci ate confirmation on whether or not you have further material to offer in this matter and, if so, I would appreci ate your response to reach the Cormin ssi oner, bef ore 30th May 2017."
A. Yes.

So the complaint is completed in March, end of March 2017, AC Fanning is now indicating that he is going to move forward with this issue and he wants Garda Keogh to indicate if he wants to add anything further in
relation to it, that's essentially it.
A. Yes.
356 Q. Then if we just go 6874. Is that 6874 ? Yes. And at
paragraph three of that letter:
"Garda Keogh has indi cated..."
This is Inspector McCarthy, who is assisting AC Fanning
in relation to this issue.
"Garda Keogh has indi cated that he was satisfied that
all of his issues were incl uded in both his si gned and
unsi gned statements."

So Garda Keogh is very much in the loop here at this point in time in relation to his bullying and harassment complaint?
A. Yes.

357 Q. We're now at the 17th May. Mr. McCarthy visited Garda Keogh on the 22nd may and then the complaint actually goes to headquarters on 24th May 2017. Just for the record, this is in accordance with the documents at 10050 and 10049. I don't think we need to necessarily open them. If we could have a look at document 10051, please. And once more we have a communication from Assistant Commissioner Fanning to Garda Keogh, saying:
"I am updating you as to the current position.

I have noted that Inspector McCarthy visited you on the 22nd May, where you rai sed two further issues. I have incl uded those issues al ong with your statements and forwarded themto chi ef executive of Humen Resources on 24th May 2017.

The purpose is, I am of a view these matters merit consi deration outside the bullying and har assment policy. Bef ore proceeding to the next steps, I am awaiting his decision and once I have his decision I will commi cate with you further."
A. I see that, yes.

358 Q. And then just document 10052, please, takes us to the 5th June. This is again a communication from Inspector McCarthy. He refers to discussions about Garda Keogh, on the third paragraph there:
"On the 1st June Garda Keogh contacted me by phone to confirmed that he had recei ved this correspondence dated the 31st May and that he was satisfied that the matter was progressing and was thankful for the progress report."

So, essentially AC Fanning has indicated this is something bigger than bullying and harassment, Garda Keogh is essentially saying, yes, he is happy with that position. And we're now on 5th June 2017
A. I'd agree with that position, yes.

359 Q. And then, just for completeness of the record, a
reminder was then sent on 16th June 2017 by AC Fanning to the Executive Director of HRPD. We don't need to go to this document, but it's 1055, for the record. And then, at document number 5902, he advised Garda Keogh of this fact also. So Garda Keogh is very much in the loop as of the 16th June 2017.

On 17th August 2017, AC Fanning sends a further reminder and that's at document number 5898. Again, he tells Garda Keogh, at document 5897, that he has sent a 13:04 reminder. And that document, if we just call up that document, please, 5897, this document acknowledges a meeting between James McCarthy, Inspector McCarthy, on Assistant Commissioner Fanning's behalf:
"I wi sh to acknow edge our meeting yesterday."

So the meeting would have been on the 16th August.
"At your home, wherei $n$ you spoke about matters regar di ng members of An Garda Sí ochána who had previ ously served or are presently serving in West meath. I al so refer to previ ous correspondence."

So he is very much being kept in the loop in relation to what's going on?
A. Yes.

360 Q. And there's no suggestion of a lost bullying and harassment complaint or anything like that?
A. No, that's correct.

361 Q. Then if we could just go to the 17th August, which is same day essentially. Page 3542. This is a letter from Mr. Cullen on behalf of Garda Keogh to the Minister for Justice, Nóirín O'Sullivan and Josephine Feehily of the Policing Authority. And in this letter there's reference to:
"Garda Keogh has been advi sed in fact of the wher eabouts in An Garda Sí ochána of his formal compl ai nts are unknown, his compl ai nts have effectively been cl andestinel y secreted and covered up."

That would appear to be completely untrue, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

362 Q. Just for the record, that's the second paragraph on that page there.
"His compl ai nts have been effectivel y cl andestinel y secreted and covered up."

Then just over the page, at 3543. The first paragraph:
"It appears on the one hand that for over 18 mont hs any 13:06 i nvesti gation into this grave and systematic bullying has been of ficially camouflaged, secreted and placed on hol d while on the other hand the promotion of Superintendent Murray to chi ef superintendent has been
covertly preferred, protected fromthe inside and furtively advanced."

What do you have to say about that?
A. It just doesn't sound consistent at all with what was being -- you know, the evidence would suggest.
Q. Yes, and also is inconsistent with --
A. Inconsistent, absolutely, with what had been said and the communications between AC Fanning and Garda Keogh. Yes. Matters progress a little, and in fairness to AC Fanning, he sends a further reminder of 1st September 2017, that's at document number 5896. If we could just have a brief look at that document, please. It's a reminder but it's also a view that he continues to express:
"I recommend a full investigation into this matters and al so that any del ay should be kept to a mi num"

So the letter has two purposes. One, he wants to
indicate that he is still of the view that a full investigation is required.
A. Yes.

365 Q. And the other is, he would like to keep the delay to a minimum?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Then if I can just go to page 5891, please. Again we have a letter from Mr. Cullen, of 21st September '17. This is the letter that Mr. Cullen encloses a further
statement from Garda Keogh, that the Tribunal has already seen but I might just refer. This letter, sorry, to Minister Flanagan, Commissioner o Cualáin and Josephine Feehily, and it's cc'd to AC Fanning, John Barrett, Clare Daly, Michael Wallace and Caoimhghín ó Caoláin TD. He encloses the additional statement that Garda Keogh sent to him dated 17th September '17. And if we might just call up that document, which is page 3560.

Now, at the bottom of paragraph 1 there, Garda Keogh says:
"I want to know who is investigating this and where does it stand."

And then if we go just over to paragraph 4, which is on the next page, please, Mr. Kavanagh. At the end of that paragraph 4, he says:
"In the meantime..."

He talks about the Policing Authority in the top of the paragraph. But he finishes by saying:
"In the meantime, the actual complaint is withhel d/lost by Garda management to facilitate their choi ce of candi date being pronoted. Is this possible!"

Not a question mark, but an exclamation mark.
A. Well firstly, it was the Garda Síochána's choice candidate, this was a Policing Authority, independently run process. So just to say, and that last part, the documents weren't lost.

367 Q. Yes. And then, just for completeness sake, if we go over to the next page, 3562 , the last line just above paragraph 6. If you just scroll down to paragraph 6 and then stop there, please. Garda Keogh says:
"Especially si nce my bullying and harassment complaint is now missing."

He repeats that assertion. So, it does seem somewhat odd that in light of the communication with Inspector McCarthy on behalf of AC Fanning, who is keeping him very much in the loop, that he persists in this allegation that the complaint is lost and is being deliberately arrested to assist a promotion, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

368 Q. Now, we will move on to -- sorry, if we just move on to 24th September 2017, at page 5887, please. Sorry, Judge, I didn't realise it's 1:10?
CHA RMAN Have you much more to go?
MR. DONLL MtGU NESS: I might have perhaps maybe five to ten minutes.

CHAD RMAN Five or ten minutes, we will continue. We will finish, Mr. McGuinness.

MR. DONAL MEGU NESS: May it please you, Chairman. .

369 Q. Page 5887 please. 5887, Mr. Kavanagh, please. Again, this is another example of Inspector McCarthy writing to Garda Keogh to keep him advised as to what's happening, and refers to a meeting with Garda Keogh.
"I wi sh to acknow edge our meeting yesterday, the 25 th September, at your home wher ei $n$ you spoke about the file regarding the compl ai nt whi ch you di scussed and documented with Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an, Portlaoise, and that to date you have recei ved no updated report regarding those allegations.

I al so wi sh to informyou that AC Eastern Regi on has once agai $n$ written to executive di rector Human Resources Peopl e Devel opment on 22nd September seeking an updated report regarding this matter."

So that's the position in advance of the meetings that we have gone into in some detail.
A. Yes, that's correct.

370 Q. On the 2nd October and 23rd October?
A. 23rd, yeah.

371 Q. If I can just ask you to look at page 3549, please. We don't have to look -- look, we've gone through this already, but this is meeting where AC Fanning was concerned to make an appointment under bullying and harassment. He says that the investigation should be made under the Byrne/McGinn mode1 when it encompasses a
wider investigation. I suppose the reason I am referencing this is, would you agree that it's AC Fanning is concerned about making an appointment under bullying and harassment because he thinks it's a bigger dea1?
A. Yes, and I had agreed with it.
Q. So at least as of the 3rd October 2017, the bullying and harassment hasn't kicked in essentially because the person who has carriage of it, so to speak, believes that it's a bigger deal than the bullying and harassment he needs --
A. I would agree, that's what would be suggested here, yes.
373 Q. Then we have gone into the detail about what happened next. We go on then to the -- you become involved essentially on the 20th October, and the first thing you do is call the meeting of the 23rd October?
A. That's correct.
Q. And your evidence, as I understand it, would you agree with me, is, the purpose of this was to make sure that all the strands in relation to Garda Keogh, one of the purposes, was to ensure that all of the strands of complaints that concerned Garda Keogh were being dealt with properly?
A. That is my position, yes.
to this. Your view was that the bullying and harassment complaint should proceed on its own?
A. That is my evidence and that's my position, yes.

377 Q. And at that meeting there was certainly some disagreement as to whether or not that was appropriate or not?
A. That's correct.

Not at that point.
Q. The day after that meeting AC Fanning text Donal ó Cualáin, and just for the sake of the narrative, we might just have a look at the wording of that text. AC Nugent refers to it at page 6593.
A. I think it's 6953.

CHA RMAN This witness has nothing to do with that. MR. DONLL MEGU NNESS: I appreciate that.
CHA RMAN He didn't write it, he didn't receive it. MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: very good, Chairman.
380 Q. We then go on to the 26th October and AC Fanning contacts the Commissioner and he is trying to involve the Commissioner in the process again, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

381 Q. And the Commissioner refers it back to you?
A. He does.

382 Q. And that's because as far as the Commissioner is concerned he carried out the investigation previously, over in Athlone and he doesn't think it is appropriate
that he gets involved in the process?
A. That's correct, yes.

383 Q. So the next step that is taken is, AC Fanning actually decides to engage in the bullying and harassment policy, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. He decides that that he has ownership of this and that it is he who decides?
A. Yes, he made that very clear at the meeting and in subsequent correspondence to me, that responsibility rested with himself, that's correct.

385 Q. He kicks off the process on 9th November 2017 with an offer of mediation to Garda Keogh and to the other parties involved?
A. That's part of the policy.
Q. Garda Keogh rejects the offer of mediation the day after that, on 10th November 2017?
A. Yes.

387 Q. And then the process continues and we have heard --
A. That's correct yes.

388 Q. -- as much as we need to hear about that. Then there is the issue of the -- the dispute is referred to in the Independent article that has been referred to also?
A. Yes.

389 Q. CHAD RNAN Are you sure you need any of this, Mr. McGuinness? we have been over this.
MR. DONAL MtGU NESS: It's just I thought it was useful since this witness has being taken through -CHA RMAN No, look, I don't want to get into criticism
of anybody. But the reality is, we have been right over this, up and down and in and out, and Assistant Commissioner Fanning is going to be giving evidence on his role in the matter. So, if there is anything about Mr. Nugent's role you specifically want to revisit, we11 and good. Otherwise, I know what we are going to hear from Assistant Commissioner Fanning and I know what the disagreement was and $I$ know the thing in the Irish Independent and, you know, whatever about it MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: Very good, chairman. I might just finish off.

CHAN RMAN Yes, sure.
390 Q. MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: with a document at 3630, please. This is a document from John Gerard Cullen to Michael Finn, AC Finn. This is the document, again I don't have to open it to the Chairman because he has read it, but this document refers to an atomising of the complaint, not according to its natural joints put on procrustean bed. He seems to be critical at this point of the bullying and harassment proceeding as a separate 13:19 issue, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

391 Q. Thank you very much.
392 Q. CHA RMAN I mean, the essential situation as I understand it is that Garda Keogh said, look, I had a bullying and harassment complaint, other things perhaps as we11, but I certainly had that, and that was outstanding, it was unnecessarily delayed, he says, for the purpose of facilitating Superintendent Murray's
promotion, and he says when it comes to the Policing Authority, they should not have proceeded with it while there was pending an outstanding complaint. That's his position as I understand it and you have said what your role was, that the Commissioner handed over to you and then you took a position, you say, that said unproven allegations should not stop somebody's promotion based on fair procedures and Ms. Mulligan challenges that and says no, that couldn't apply, either in particular or in general, because there must be some cases where the nature of the allegation should stymie the promotion. That's essentially the situation we have.
A. Yes.

393 Q. CHA RMAN That is me telling you.
A. AND I wouldn't disagree with what you said, Chairman. CHA RNAN That's essentially it, and I think that's where the dispute essentially arises in regard to your function concerning the promotion of Superintendent Murray.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

ME. MEGRATH Chairman, I just have two very quick questions.
CHA RMAN Sorry, Ms. McGrath.

MR. JOSEPH NUGENT MAS RE-EXAM NED BY ME. MEGRATH AS FOLLOWE:

MS. MEGRATH First of awful, it's something I should have asked you earlier, Mr. Nugent. There is a document from Assistant Commissioner Fanning, I won't bring it up, I will just put the point to you. He says, his language is:
"There may have been a subsequent meeting that I was not invited to attend and was excl uded from"

And he is talking to post the 23 rd October. Did that ever happen? Is that the case?
A. That never happened and it's not the case.

395 Q. Okay. Now, one thing I want to go back to is this issue of a missing complaint or a document being lost. You are very emphatic in your evidence, you say documents were not lost. Are you aware of a complaint going missing, Mr. McGuinness asked you, you said no. Now, you had been asked on the 19th October by the Commissioner's office to establish possession. That was the word that was used by Superintendent Mahon, possession of the bullying complaint. Did you ever establish in physical real terms where the complaint had been between March and when you sat down in October?
CHAI RMAN The 23rd October. concerned?
A. So my primary responsibility on the 23 rd October was to move forward. I think looking back wasn't going to
resolve the issues. My primary role was to get the thing moving on. So in the context of where it was at, it was in in that sense. But it wasn't in the sense of blame or it wasn't in the sense of what's happening. It was what I could control now. I couldn't wind back the clock. So it was a matter of moving things on. 397 Q. Did you have a view as to whose desk was it on during those months, in simple terms?
A. I felt it was on AC Fanning's desk. I am not sure AC Fanning would necessarily agree with that. But that was my impression at the time and these issues were clarified at the meeting on the 23rd, where AC Fanning in subsequent correspondence referenced the interaction between the assistant commissioner and the executive director.

398 Q. Okay. But you accept the forma1 minutes of the meeting don't seem to reflect a discussion around this?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can I ask you just a very last question, if the document can be brought up, 12477. This is a letter from Mr. John Barrett to the Policing Authority. You may have seen it in the papers, it's 13th October 2017. нe is extracting a paragraph from Garda Keogh's letter of the 21st September, which my Friend Donal McGuinness opened there a moment ago, the second page of the handwritten letter. If you scroll down, Mr. Kavanagh. It's the paragraph talking about the complaint being withheld or lost. He says he is writing this confidentially to the Policing Authority. Can I ask
you, did you know (a) about this letter or (b), know that the policing Authority had been told this information?
A. No.

400 Q. okay.
A. In both grounds, no.

401 Q. Can you assist the Chair in any way about this letter?
A. No.

402 Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Nugent.
CHA RMAN okay. Just the date of that letter again? 13:23 MG. MEGRATH It's the 13th October. If you scroll down, Mr. Kavanagh, please. 13th October 2017. It's at the end there.
CHA RMAN The 13th, thank you very much.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHAN RMAN Thank you very much.
THE WTNESS: Thanks.
CHA RMAN You're free to go now, but you were going to 13:23 check.
THE WTNESS: Yes, I will.
CHA RMAN If you can.
THE WTNESS: Appendix A.
MS. MEGRATH we have actually written to the cSSO
during the course of the evidence for clarification.
CHA RMAN You can help them liaise with that.
MS. MEGRATH If it's necessary we can deal with it at another time, but we will get it in writing.

CHA RMAN Okay. We will resume at 2:30. Thanks very much.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED FOR LUNCH AND RESUMED AS FOLLOV6:

MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, the next witness is Former Assistant Commissioner Fintan Fanning.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.

## FORMER ASSI STANT COMM SSI ONER FI NTAN FANN NG, HAM NG

 BEEN SUDRN, WAS DI RECTLY-EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NNESS, AS
## FOLLO/S:

THE WTNESS: Fintan Fanning.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Thanks, assistant commissioner.

403 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, for the convenience of parties, Mr. Fanning's statement is to be found in volume 22, at page 6447.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
404 Q. MR. MEGU NNESS: with associated documentation
continuing into volume 23, 24 and 25 . He has produced a second statement for the benefit of the Tribunal on 14th January 2020, which is in Volume 56, at page 15851?

CHA RMAN 851.
MR. MEGU NESS: 15851.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
MR. MEGI NESS: Could you provide us with an overview of your career in An Garda Síochána?
A. Thank you, Chairman. I joined the Guards in 1980 and I worked mainly in Dublin. Then I worked in Donegal and I worked in Enniscorthy, Kilkenny, Garda Headquarters and finally Mullingar, and I retired in August, last August.
Q. Yes. Just in terms of some of the more senior ranks you held, when were you first appointed as a superintendent?
A. Maybe in 1992, I went to Enniscorthy as a superintendent.
Q. Yes.
A. And then I transferred to IT, the computer section, as a superintendent in Garda Headquarters. And then I was promoted to chief superintendent and spent sometime in Garda Headquarters in the same section.

408 Q. Yes.
A. Then I moved as a chief superintendent to Pearse Street.

409 Q. Yes.
A. I was promoted assistant commissioner in Pearse Street and went to Kilkenny, and was responsible for Wexford and Tipperary and waterford. And then I was
transferred back to Human Resource Management, I think about 2008, and I stayed there until about 2014. And
then I was transferred to the Eastern Region, Mullingar which included the counties of wicklow, Kildare, Laois, offaly, Meath and westmeath. And I retired on the 25th August.
410 Q. You retired last year on the 25th August?
A. That's correct.

411 Q. You had remained in position then as assistant commissioner of the Eastern Region for approximately five years?
A. Yeah. I think it was September '14 to September '19. 412 Q. Yes. In any event, I think you were in HRM in May of 2014?
A. I think I was there until september.

413 Q. Yes.
A. That's correct.

414 Q. So you were in headquarters when Garda Keogh made his protected disclosure and that got a lot of publicity in the Dáil. Did you become aware of that at that time?
A. No. I had no responsibility for people who made protected disclosures. So apart from something I may have read in the papers, if it was in the papers at the time, it wasn't something that concerned me, because I wasn't aware of the circumstances of it.
415 Q. Yes. The Tribunal has heard obviously that the Commissioner appointed Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin 14:35 to investigate those protected disclosures, had you any knowledge of that?
A. Very little. If I had, I may have factual knowledge if somebody said that the then Assistant Commissioner ó

Cualáin was investigating something.
416 Q. Yes.
A. But it is something I had no involvement in as such, because I was just conscious that if somebody makes a protected disclosure, that there's certain protection around it.

417 Q. Yes.
A. When it didn't concern me, I didn't go enquiring about it.

418 Q. Obviously as of May 2014, I think Mr. Barrett hadn't been yet appointed; isn't that correct?
A. That's correct. when I finished in the HR section in September of that year, I think Mr. Barrett started in October, so he was the first civilian to come in to do the job that $I$ had been doing.

419 Q. Yes.
A. So part of civilisation.

420 Q. So he was effectively your successor?
A. Exactly.

421 Q. You being the last AC in charge of that directly?
A. Yes.

422 Q. In that capacity, I think you were furnished with a copy of the Pulse entry created by Garda Keogh on or about the 21st May. If we look at page 6649. Mr. Fanning, we can provide you with paper copies of any of the documentation or if you are happy to follow it on screen. I think that came from Chief Superintendent Clavin on the 21st, directed to you. It says:
"In the light of the recent allegations made by Garda Keogh, I respectfully recommend that the information recorded in the attached Pul se printout be forwarded for the information of assistant commissioner Eastern Regi on for investigation, to assistant commi ssioner Crime and Security as owner of Pul se and intelligence, and to assistant commissioner organi sational devel opment and strategic planning froma data protection point of view."

Now, as I understand it, you had no role at that stage in relation to this other than to pass it on to the assistant commissioner Eastern Region, a position that you would later be appointed to that year
A. Yeah, that appears to be correct, Chairman. Yeah, the position is that the report says that the owner Pulse data -- the computer system in the Guards is called Pulse, the owner of the data was then assistant commissioner Crime and Security. So, I mean, if there 14:37 was something to be attended to in terms of the data, it was a matter for the data owner.

423 Q. Yes.
A. So I had no function in it.

424 Q. You did forward it on, if we look at the previous page, 14:38 6648. Was it Assistant Commissioner Kenny who was at that stage AC of the Eastern Region?
A. He was the assistant commissioner in the Northern Region and he may have been covering Eastern Region,
because I think it was Assistant Commissioner Phillips up to his retirement had been there, and then there may have been a gap.
425 Q. Yes.
A. I'm only assuming that now.
Q. Anyway, you did forward that on. It says:
"The matter is forwarded for your inf ormation, pl ease."

Can I just ask you for your interpretation. what was meant to be done with it at that stage?
A. Whatever, he could have investigate the minute, the report that $I$ got from the professional standards unit, and it was a matter for him then to attend to it in whatever way he thought was necessary.
427 Q. Yes. In any event, you succeeded as the assistant commissioner Eastern Region and you were involved in some further correspondence in relation to this issue. Could I ask you to look at page 6611? You're addressing this to the chief superintendent in
Mullingar and you're noting that Superintendent McBrien has made an enquiry with Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin to establish that the matters referred to in the intelligence created were the subject of investigation. And then you are asking other questions 14:39 relating to the matter. From your point of view, were you directing any process in that regard in relation to the content of the entry or relating to the making of the entry?
A. Chairman, to be best of recollection, I'm referring to the previous correspondence of the 8th August, the 4th September and the 9th September. I think those three dates predate my arrival in Mullingar.
428 Q. Yes.
A. So, what the office would have doing there is making sure the matter was being attended to. So, in that case I would have -- there must have been some evidence on the file that Superintendent McBrien had enquired of Commissioner Ó Cualáin's investigation team to establish if the matters were created.

429 Q. Yes.
A. Were the subject of the investigation.

430 Q. Yes.
A. And then I said --

431 Q. You do appear to have been kept up-to-date and briefed on the matter, because you wrote a more substantive 1etter on 23rd October 2014. If we look at page 6603. That's addressed to Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin. 6602 on to 6603. The entry is referred to there. There's a recital of what had been found out by local management, what Garda Keogh reported, if we go on to the next page, reported to the district officer. And then you're raising the issue:
"The di visional officer in Mullingar would appreci ate your vi ews as to how this matter might be progressed and that the term of HQ Directive $126 / 10$ is complied with. "

That related to CHIS, isn't that right?
A. If I could see that directive. But I take it that it does, yeah.
Yes. From the point of view of matters being reported to you, did it seem a perfectly reasonable matter to see whether CHIS was applicable and had been complied with?
A. Yeah. It would be important that all the policies were being followed.

433 Q. Yes.
A. So, I mean, it's a matter for -- like, I would have been bringing it to their attention that if that's a CHIS directive that that would need to be followed.

434 Q. Yes.
A. So ultimately all the commissioners or all the Garda policies have to be followed.

435 Q. Yes. You did receive a report from Chief Superintendent Curran in December '14 and you sent it up to Crime and Security. I don't think we need to open them, but it seemed to go up to headquarters for views from the policy owner, as it were, isn't that right?
A. Yes, because they own the data on Pulse.

436 Q. Yes. I think you pursued that over a number of months and, indeed, into the following year in correspondence. I think, is it correct to say, without having to open them al1, that you didn't get any further response clarifying matters directly as to what ought to be
done?
A. No. And I suppose my primary concern was the intelligence and it was accurate. Then the other issue was, my understanding is that Garda A had raised an issue about it and for me it was important that that issue was closed off. I think some time later a chief superintendent in Mullingar arranged for Garda A to be met and to establish whether or not he had an actual complaint to make about it. And my recollection is that he had no complaint to make about it.
A. So I was keen just to close it off.

438 Q. Yes.
A. So, you know, in fairness if Garda A had raised an issue, it was important that somebody get back to him and say, well, you know, what exactly is your position on this.

439 Q. Yes.
A. They he did, you know, I mean, the answer back was that he didn't wish to have any further action taken.
A. So I was satisfied that all the 00 the data owner was happy and that the garda was happy.

441 Q. You did get confirmation back obviously in the interim from Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin that they weren't 14:43 investigating the creation of the intelligence?
A. Yeah. I take it, I have no recollection, but I take it that --
Q. That's a letter of the 24th November?
A. Yes.

## 

Q. Yes.
A. And if a disciplinary investigation is necessary, wel1 then a disciplinary investigation is necessary. It's a tool in the toolbox.
Q. Yes. In any event, you did direct Inspector folan to meet with Garda A eventually, and that took place then. 14:44
A. It may have been the divisional officer, the chief superintendent who directed him, I think.
A. Just to establish whether or not he had a complaint to make basically.
448 Q. Yes. But from the point of view of your being the commander of the region, as it were, would you expect that the matter would have been investigated in normal circumstances?
Yes. But you were certainly reported to by Chief Superintendent Duff?
A. Yes, that he closed off the matter with Garda A. I think it may be that the chief superintendent asked Inspector Folan to meet Garda A.
Q. Yes.
A. No. I think, looking at the role I had, there was responsibility for the six counties surrounding Dublin, which were quite busy.
449 Q. Yes.
A. And there was a lot of work. So this was one of many files that I would have dealt with. So, I suppose I would have wanted closure in the matter, that if you have a garda saying or reporting as being upset about something that's on Pulse about them, well then we need to get closure. But I mean, at my leve1, I wasn't going to do it, it was a matter for the divisional officer, who in most cases deals with discipline in the Guards, and was also responsible for management of that unit. And then it's for the superintendent then to deal with it. And also, the ownership of the data is with the assistant commissioner Crime and Security.

450 Q. Yes. We have seen obviously from the report that Chief Superintendent Curran sent to you about the matter in which she reported Garda Keogh's response, was a complaint ever made to you that this request for a response or a report constituted targeting of Garda Keogh?
A. No. I mean, no, no, I couldn't see that at all. Like, my concern about this file was, that having read it, and having inherited it, if you like, that this was a bit of unfinished business, that it wasn't clear who had created the incident, as far as $I$ can recall. Garda A had raised an issue about the data being on Pulse. For me, it was to make sure that the
appropriate people in the regional structure dealt with the matter to a closure. But I certainly had no sense of any targeting or anything like that.
I mean, would you expect a superintendent and a chief superintendent under your control to raise a query with a member as to why they had created such an entry and what the basis for it might have been?
A. Yes. I think, like, we're an organisation, it is hierarchical and there is responsibility and, you know, if a matter comes to the attention of management or to an officer in the Guards, that they have on obligation to, you know, be fair about it and go back and check it out. Just as Garda A had raised an issue about it and I wanted to make sure it was closed off. It transpired Garda A didn't want to make a complaint about it. But 14:47 there was nothing about anybody being targeted or anything else. It was simply we had an obligation to keep the data on the data base accurately.
452 Q. Yes.
A. Keep it up-to-date and keep it relevant and accurate. The issue was in this that Garda A had a concern about it.

453 Q. Yes. We are led to believe that even as of this phase, the Tribunal is examining the issue, that the entry is stil1 there, unchanged, unamended and, as it were, without any investigation into its creation. Do you regard that as a satisfactory position?
A. Well, the person who created the record on Pulse created the record. A garda, Garda A raised an issue
about it. Eventually it got to my level. I caused enquiries to be made. I am satisfied that the data owner, who was the then the assistant commissioner Crime and Security, knew about it. And I am sure their view is it was accurate at the time, it was accurate at 14:48 the time. You know, but I don't have the authority to change any data on it, nor would I have it in my role because I'm not the data owner.
454 Q. Yes.
A. If the garda who believes that he -- Garda A, because I $14: 48$ don't think he is named in it, from memory, I think he believes the same or he might suspect the same or something like that, he has never made a complaint. And the purpose for me going out and asking the then chief superintendent to make enquiries -- because he's not names, to the best of my recollection.
455 Q. No, he's not named?
A. He's not named.

456 Q. No.
A. So I think he's speculating it's him.

457 Q. Yes.
A. So the piece I saw on it that was important was, wel1, if he has a concern, let's listen to him as his employer and let's go and go the journey with him. But he didn't make a complaint, he didn't say it was him. 14:49
458 Q. Okay. Passing on then to another matter. You did receive correspondence in April 2015 from Garda Keogh directly to you. You have referred --
A. That was a letter, yeah.

459 Q. Yes, you referred to that on the first page of your statement?
A. Yes. That was one of the issues, yeah. I got a letter from him in the post. I don't believe I had never met Garda Keogh in my life before. I read the letter. A few things in it. So, what I did was, I immediately reported to my superior that I got the letter. And then I proposed a draft response. Because he was a protected discloser and he had certain rights, that $I$ wasn't an expert in, I sought legal advice on the draft 14:49 letter, and i think from memory -- the draft response back to him. I think from memory I said to him basically that it's not easy. I mean, I recognise this is a rank based organisation, it is not easy for a garda to approach an assistant commissioner, and I recognise that. But I said, on the other hand then, there are structures in place, there's management structures and we're a disciplined organisation, so, you know, within reason but. So I wrote back to him and said to him that I was aware of that and that he should really deal with it through management issues, but if there was something there that he felt he should come back to me about, write back to me, set out the details of what it was and I'd consider it. But I never got a response. So I trusted everything was in 14:50 order.
460 Q. We11, perhaps we will look at Garda Keogh's letter, it's page 6467. It's a handwritten letter, the 15th April date stamp on it, 2015. It says:
"On 8th May 2014 I made a formal compl ai nt of Garda mal practice in the Athl one di strict. The said matter is under investigation. Over the last year I have been advi sed by members of An Garda Sí ochána in both my current hest meath di vision and my previ ous Wi cklow di vi si on to speak to yourself. I am now being advi sed by both Independent TDs Cl are Dal y and Mck Wallace to speak to you. I am aware that you are the assistant commissi oner for the regi on and l would be obliged if you woul d consi der meeting with me."

So you obviously took it that this was the whistleblower, the person who had made a protected disclosure, $I$ take it?
A. Well, I wasn't sure, but I mean, you know, he hadn't said it in that. I had never met him before in my life.

461 Q. Yes.
A. So I wasn't sure it was him. But he said he made a
formal complaint of Garda malpractice in the Athlone district and then he said it was being investigated so...

462 Q. But in terms of the reference to the deputies there, were you conscious that Deputy wallace had raised the issue of the behaviour of the superintendent in Athlone on the 31st March in the Dáil?
A. I can't say I was. You know what I mean. If I read it in the newspaper. But it didn't matter to me in the
sense that he said that he had made a complaint and it was being investigated. So, you know, once there was an investigation ongoing.
463 Q. Yes. But just in terms of speaking to Garda Keogh, who said here he had made a formal complaint. Presumably when you moved in to your headquarters in mullingar you knew that you had a protected discloser in your division?
A. No, I was aware we had a very high profile person, a different person altogether, had been involved in utilising that practice, and I had I worked closely with him. He has since retired from the Guards. I was aware of that particular case.
464 Q. Yes.
A. But I mean, I can't say whether I was or wasn't, to be honest with you. But it didn't concern me because it was being investigated by a competent person elsewhere. And there are certain rights around a person who makes that. And that's the reason I reported it to my -when I got the letter, that's the reason I reported it to my superior, and I also sought legal advice, because I didn't want to go back and aggravate the situation or do something that was unlawful.
465 Q. You are obviously quite correct in saying you did that. If we look at page 6466. This is your letter to the deputy commissioner of operations?
A. Yeah.

466 Q. Written the following day. You say in the first paragraph you have received the letter. You say what
it states. And in the last paragraph you say:
"It is my intention that I would write to him acknow edging his letter, enqui ring from himas to why he needs meet with me rather than his immediateline management."

You refer to a draft there. You did send out a response to Garda Keogh, which is at page 6462, on the 24th April. If we look at that, 6462. In the second paragraph you say:
"I knowit cannot have been easy for you to write to me as assistant commissioner, however on the other hand you feel that you had to do so.

You advi se me that the said matters of Garda mal practice are under investigation and accordingly I wi sh to informyou that I amprecl uded from di scussing any matter that has been previ ously investigated or is bei ng investigated in any ongoi ng process. Should the matter rel ate to something other than that, my normal response is that you should take the matter up with your i mmedi ate line management in accordance with code provisions. If on the other hand there are human resource or workpl ace rel ated issues, then I can rel ate those to the executive director of Humm Resources and devel opment people."

Then you say:
"As a val ued member of the regi onal team l would ask you to consi der my position and if it is the case that you still feel the need to meet, you can make cont act with inspector Jimy McCarthy to make the necessary ar rangements."

And there is a number given there. Now, you never got any formal written response to that, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

467 Q. And as far as you know, did Garda Keogh ever contact Inspector McCarthy on foot of this?
A. Not that I am aware of, because if he had, he would have written back to him and there would be a written record of it.

468 Q. Yes. You seem there to leave the door open, as it were, for him to come to you with work related issues. would you have expected to be informed by either the local superintendent or chief superintendents that there were work related issues?
A. And I would have been if there were. You know, so in the sense that he was writing to me with an issue and, you know, I wasn't going to dismiss him and close him down completely but I was saying, it's important that you use the structures that are there.

469 Q. Yes.
A. I acknowledge the very first thing that it can't be easy for a garda to write to an assistant commissioner.

Because we are a hierarchical organisation.
470 Q. Yes.
A. And I know, having spent 39 years in it, you know, it's -- it's not that anybody -- it's just the environment that's there. I set out then and I said to him, well, if there is something exceptional, you know, I wasn't going to say you can't tell me, I said, make an appointment with the inspector. And I would have expected an agenda or whatever and I would have put in an appropriate response.
Yes. I mean, the Tribunal has heard of a number of different issues that were ongoing and about which Garda Keogh has complained obviously. Work related stress, did anyone bring that to your attention at the time?
A. I just can't -- I can't say that they did for sure. Like, I mean, the correspondence -- normally anything to do with absence or sickness goes as far as the district officer, a superintendent, and then it would go across to HRM and be dealt with. I remember we were at a meeting in October and something came up about the classification of his illness.

472 Q. Yes.
A. So I can't say definitely not. But I mean, I heard about it at that meeting.
473 Q. Yes.
A. That is one thing that just registers with me.
Q. Yes.
A. But I wasn't aware that there was any big issue. Nor,
in fairness to Garda Keogh, he didn't tell me.
Q. had come to the region as assistant commissioner and before Garda Keogh went out sick on a full-time basis essentially from the end of December '15. So it's sort ${ }_{14: 57}$ of 14-15 month period there. But you wouldn't expect to have been informed if he had been referred to the CMO, for instance, or the level of absenteeism?
A. No.
A. No. I think from memory the circular deals with sick

Or the nature of his sick certs? absences HQ 139/10 or something and that sort of finishes at the district officer, at the super's office level, superintendent's office level and then there may be an exception where it goes to the chief superintendent. You know, as I say, I was at one meeting, $I$ think it was in October, the '14, where I have a recollection of it.

477 Q. Yes. You do, in your statement of the 20th January, at page 15856, refer to a meeting that you had with Garda Keogh at Ath1one Garda Station?
A. In October or something?

478 Q. In October.
A. Yeah, that's correct.

479 Q. October 2015.
A. Yeah.

480 Q. What you say is:
"The first occasi on was during an unannounced visit to

At hl one Garda Station on 30th October 2015. I have now found a di ary entry whi ch makes reference to the meeting. I bel ieve I was on a journey to Gal way Gar da station when I made a routine and unannounced visit to the station. My handwritten note is as follows:
'called to Athl one GS, checked mail, met Garda Keogh and female garda. Garda Keogh said he was in fairly good form Showed me around station public office and $t$ old me he was under the care of OVO and Mck Qui nn EAS. I told himto ensure he utilised all the structures and di scuss with management. Struck me as a good man. Di scussed Hal I oween and operational Tombol a. Well aware of his duty, Roscommon visit."

So your purpose of the visit doesn't seem to have been to meet him in particular, is that right?
A. No, Chairman. So my responsibility, as I said earlier, was the six counties over as far as the Shannon, we'11 say. Then in the absence of the then assistant commissioner in the Western Region, I was also responsible for the five or six counties in the Western Region. This was a Friday, from memory, it was Halloween time anyway. what I done was, I started working, I was up in UCD, then I was at something in Kildare. I was going on to the west of Ireland because 14:59 there was a significant incident, an operational incident going to happen on Monday or Tuesday of the following week and what I did was, I went down and I stayed in Athlone that night and I was going on to -- I
went to Roscommon the next morning, got into Roscommon Garda station just to see what was happening there, as part of my work of course. Then I went on to Galway to look at a site over in west Galway where there was going to be a search.

What I did the night before was, having been operational all day Friday, I called in -- I stayed in Athlone and I called into the Garda station in Athlone for to access pulse and for to access the e-mails, and to see what e-mails were there. When I went in, I introduced myself and told them who I was. There was a female garda there and a garda there. The female garda went off to attend to whatever duties she was attending to, and the other garda was there. I don't even recall I recognised him, at the time I think he told me who he was. That's the notes I took.
481 Q. Yes.
A. And ovo is the CMO, Mick Quinn is the EAS.

482 Q. Yes.
A. Operation Tombola is the operational plan for Halloween. what struck me was, he had all the details there that if somebody rang in about bonfires or some problems, he had contact numbers. And I just, you know, just to myself, that's a good man.
483 Q. He didn't raise any complaint to you about being assigned to that duty in the public office?
A. No. No, no, my notes are, struck me as a good man. 484 Q. Yes.
A. He wasn't complaining or he wasn't doing anything like that, you know.
Q. Did he introduce himself to you or vice versa?
A. I'd say -- well, I would have certainly introduced myself as Fintan Fanning, the assistant commissioner.
Q. Yes.
A. Because I can't take it for granted he knew me, you know.

487 Q. Yes.
A. And the other thing is, there is always a disparity in ranks. So I find it easier to go and say, how are you, you know, hello, my name is Fintan Fanning, I'm the assistant commissioner, because I wasn't in uniform at the time. I wouldn't think I was anyhow.
488 Q. A11 right.
A. You know, then the chat goes on. They were my notes.

489 Q. He has a slightly different note of it. He does have a note of it in his diary for the 30th October. If we look at page 1335. It's on the right-hand side. He seems to be putting it at 9:00pm perhaps:
"AC FF came in to station. He knew who l was even though we never met."

Would you care to comment on that? Did you know him?
Did you know who you were speaking to was Garda Keogh, who had written to you?
A. Oh yeah, because when he told me his name. However I found out his name. But I mean like, I'm not an expert
on -- you know, I am poor enough on facial recognition. So when I went in, like I always introduce myself to people because they then generally tell me who they are and that leaves it a lot easier for me then, and I probably relate to them if they are on their own in first name terms and try and get over that.
"He said he appreciates what । amdoing."
A. That's correct, yeah.

491 Q. "We coul dn't really tal k."

So is that his work in the public office, is that it?
A. Yeah, like, I mean, I would have told him I appreciated what he was doing, because I think, you know, he was very clear on Operation Tombola. It was important for me to sort of be able to affirm what a garda is doing, as an assistant commissioner, and I would have used that opportunity to say -- when he explained his operational plan for Halloween, which is Operation Tombola, that, you know, if you like, if I was the inspector inspecting the classroom, he gave me a very good account of it.
492 Q. So he was telling you precisely what he was doing in the station, is that right?
A. Yeah, and he showed me around it. There was CCTV cameras, he showed me around those and he showed me how they work, they're in a room beside the public office in the garda station.

494 Q. Yes.
A. I was probably in there for about 10 or 15 minutes, I'd 15:03 say, around that.

495 Q. The entries goes on:
"Printed Pul se re recl assifications. Copi es...."

He didn't mention anything about Pulse records to you, that doesn't appear to relate --
A. No, I think I'd go as far as talk.
Q. Just to deal with it at this stage, is it the position that that was the first time you had met Garda Keogh?
A. Yeah. It's the first time I believe. Now, if I was going to a Bray Wanderers footbal1 match and he was on duty as part of the Guards there, in Bray, if you like, you know, I can't say. It's the first time I am aware I ever met and had a conversation with him.
497 Q. Then in terms of meeting him after that on any other occasion?
A. No, I think I only had one more meeting shortly to my retirement, I had business to attend to with him. I think that was another meeting I had with him, and that 15:04 was in August.
Q. Yes. You say at page 15857:
"I can onl y recall ever speaking or meeting Garda Keogh
on one ot her occasi on, in August 2019, when l met him in the presence of his solicitor at Mullingar Garda station to deal with garda discipline matters."
A. That's correct, my Lord, yeah.

499 Q. That seems to maybe leave a doubt as to whether you might have met him on some other occasion. Are you fairly clear that you didn't?
A. Oh I don't believe I did. But if you were to show me a photograph at a footbal 1 match where he was on duty or something like that. You know, I am not conscious that 15:04 I met him anywhere else. But because I was the one assistant commissioner for all those counties, it is conceivable we could have been in each other's company somewhere, yeah.
500 Q. okay. That occasion, was that when you were giving him 15:05 a Regulation 10 notice?
A. Yeah. What I did was, I dealt with a disciplinary matter and I found him in breach of discipline.
501 Q. Yes. Is that the one that relates to the phone calls to Portlaoise Garda station?
A. Yeah, but I think it was more about the way that he was -- I think he -- yes, it was about the phone calls, yes, and other behaviours or the behaviours in the phone call.
502 Q. A11 right. We11, could we just go back to December
2016. I think you received correspondence from Mr. Barrett, who had succeeded to your position. And if we could look at a letter that you received from him on the 21st December. It's page 6800. You probably
recall getting this, it's one where Mr. Barrett appears to nominate Chief Superintendent Roche to investigate the complaint.
A. That's correct, yes.

503 Q. Just to be specific about your state of knowledge at this point in time, did you know whether Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin's investigation had been completed?
A. I wasn't aware, because in fair to then Assistant Commissioner ó Cualáin, he dealt with that matter, you know, he wasn't disclosing anything to me about it.

504 Q. Yes.
A. Because obviously I didn't need to know about it.

505 Q. Yes.
A. Because I am sure if there was something I needed to know about, he'd have been the first man to tell me.

506 Q. Yes. Even in the most general way you didn't really know what he was investigating?
A. No, no, no.

507 Q. Any specifics?
A. No, because I mean, I never needed to ask him and he never needed to tell me in the sense that -- well, it's still my position that he was doing his investigation. I have no doubt that if there was something, he would be the first man to tell me.
508 Q. Yes. The issue of the disciplinary inquiry that was then also underway, had you been aware of the appointment of Assistant Commissioner Jack Nolan to investigate discipline matters on foot of or arising
out of Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin's investigations?
A. I can't say I wasn't aware, but I wasn't aware in any great detai1. If I was aware, you know, it may be that somebody said that Jack Nolan was doing some disciplinary investigation or something like that. But I wasn't aware of what the focus of the investigation was or anything else.
Yes. But the request here to nominate Chief Superintendent Roche, did you have any concerns at this 15:08 time over appointing somebody to investigate a complaint?
A. No. The only issue I had was, that if I was to be the person to make the appointment, I was going to utilise the Garda policy that's in agreement between the four staff associations and the Garda Commissioner. And that requires to know who the complaint was made against and what was the substance or what was the information that the person who was wishing to use the policy or utilise the policy was doing. And neither of 15:08 those elements of information were available to me at that time.

510 Q. Yes. Well, you sent a reply to Mr. Barrett, if we look at page 6802. You referred to the provisions of the policy in terms of following the process and the need to know. But it does appear that you corresponded with Chief Superintendent Scanlan on the 23rd of that month?
A. As a result of that -- first of all, before $I$ could use the policy $I$ had to be satisfied that it was a member
of the Garda Síochána that the issue was about. 511 Q. Yes.
A. And I didn't know that. The only way I was going to find that out was, and what $I$ said to the executive director of HRPD was, that maybe we should send somebody out to talk to him and find out from Garda Keogh what exactly was the information he wanted to give us and who was the person he the issue with. So I wrote back up to the executive director of HRPD, who was John Barrett, and he agreed with that course of action. Then I carefully considered who was the best person was to go out to meet Garda Keogh. And I selected Chief Superintendent John Scanlan as being neutral because he came from a different division and he is a very experienced investigator and he is, you know, a very professional and very competent man.

512 Q. Yes. Your 1etter of instruction to Chief Superintendent Scan1an is at page 6805. Perhaps we wi11 just look at that. Is it clear then that -- 6805, I am just waiting for it to come up there. That's on the 23rd December. You're providing him with the correspondence from Mr. Barrett, you're providing him with Mr. Cullen's letter and then you're asking in the third paragraph:
"In order to determine (a) if Garda Keogh's compl ai nt comes within the policy for resol ution and (b) the correct rank/grade to be appointed as i nvestigator, if appl i cable. Pl ease make the necessary arrangements to
ensure that a copy of the policy available on the Garda portal is provi ded to Garda Keogh, who is currently on si ckness absence. He should be advi sed of the procedures and processes invol ved and that he may seek the advi ce of the equality officer in Garda Headquarters or, indeed, the equality advi ser."

So what's clear is that you are not appointing someone to investigate any complaint.
A. That's correct.

513 Q. You're simply allowing Chief Superintendent Scanlan to inform him of the process, is that right?
A. And to establish (a) if Garda Keogh's complaint comes within the Garda policy for resolution.
514 Q. Yes.
A. And (b), if that is the case, then who is the appropriate investigator? Because in the correspondence I had, it didn't say that it was a member of the Garda Síochána or the Garda reserve that was being complained of. If it was, it was the Garda
policy. If it was a civilian in the guards it was a different policy and I didn't have the power to make the appointment under that policy. So, under the Garda policy a complaint must be made in writing. And the purpose of my appointing Chief Superintendent Scanlan was to go out and talk to the guard who had on issue, establish what -- give him whatever help he had. Particularly tell him about the equality officer and the equality advisers, because if he wanted independent
advice. It was free to him but it wasn't for me to talk to his staff association. The piece 1 had, make sure $I$ had the information from him to determine whether or not it was a complaint that met the requirements of the Garda policy or not, and then if it 15:12 did, what was the appropriate rank if we were going to consider that.

Chief Superintendent Scanlan wrote back to you a minute in which he referred to a conversation with Garda Keogh for the purposes of arranging a meeting and a query was 15:12 raised about whether other officer had been appointed. Also this issue of a conflict that Garda Keogh had raised with him. I think you wrote to Mr. Barrett on foot of that, isn't that right? If we look at page 6808. You state in the second paragraph:
"The purpose was to bring the pol icy to the attention of Garda Keogh. "
A. Yes.

516 Q. And the third paragraph raised this issue about:
"Garda Keogh alleges he supplied an amount of material to Chi ef Superintendent MELoughlin in terns of his compl ai nt and that he would need same bef ore proceeding and that he is consulting with his solicitor."

Was that news to you at that point in time?
A. Yeah, I wasn't aware that he had made -- so the piece about the news is about the piece that he told the
chief superintendent in HRM, is it?
517 Q. We11, in the next paragraph you seem to be saying material was withheld from you?
A. Yeah, because that material wasn't made available to me. I am not saying it's deliberately withheld, I am just saying, if the material existed.

518 Q. Yes.
A. It was not provided to me. Therefore it was withheld.

519 Q. Okay.
A. But I mean, there could be very good reasons for it being withheld.

520 Q. Yes. We11, factually you hadn't received anything from Mr. Barrett's office or from Mr. Mulligan?
A. No, no. I accept that. My recollection is that I got the letter, the first letter originally just before Christmas and I think we dealt with it the next day and responded back very quickly. We sought clarification. Then, in a bid to move the thing along, we proposed that we'd get somebody to go out and bring the policy to the attention of Garda Keogh and then that the we'd move it along and get the information and bring it to the next level.

521 Q. Yes. If we turn over the page, you concluded with two short paragraphs saying:
"I si mply cannot progress the issue until I amprovided with Garda Keogh's compl ai nt, be it fromhimor the material allegedl y in the possession of chi ef superintendent HRM

I do not know the identity of the menber/person, the subj ect of Garda Keogh's allegations. Garda Keogh is a very proud member of An Garda Sí ochána and I am keen to progress the matter as soon as possi ble."

So, did you then the material that Chief Superintendent McLoughlin, who had actually given it to Mr. Barrett's office on the 9th November, did you get that material at that stage?
A. I have no recollection of getting it. Because the alternative was, under the Garda policy there's two people can start an investigation. Either me, and I was directed by headquarters to do it, or the equality officer has the same powers to do it. So in my case, I 15:15 was asking -- that's one thing I was asking, did the equality officer start the investigation or was there something there, or was it for me. If it's for me, I simply can't progress the issue until I am provided with Garda Keogh's complaint. And that is what Chief Superintendent Scan1an was going out to get from him. Or if there was something there already, that chief superintendent HRM already had. But I didn't have it. I just said, I don't know the identity or of the member or person who is the subject of Garda Keogh's allegations.
522 Q. Yes.
A. So that's basically saying -- that was the same point I had made earlier, that for to determine that the Garda
policy applied to it, I had to be satisfied it was a member of the Garda Síochána was being complained of, and I didn't know the content of the complaint or what the nature of the complaint was, and I didn't know the identity of the person complained against, or persons.
523 Q. Yes. Well, Mr. Barrett appears to have agreed with you on those points, when he wrote back to you on the 8th February. If we look at page 6810. The second paragraph recites Garda Keogh's wish to have it dealt with under the policy. The third paragraph refers to Chief Superintendent McLoughlin informing Mr. Barrett of the correspondence and providing him with the same. не notes there the details of who was being complained against or about. Relevant details were not provided. Garda Keogh was requested to provide relevant details. But at the end of the day, Mr. Barrett seemed to agree with your position, if we look at the next page:
"To progress the matter --" this is 6811:
"To progress this matter, Garda Keogh should be informed that he should provide a statement of complaint, to incl ude the identity of the person bei ng complai ned of, rel evant dates and details of the al I eged incidents to Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an as soon as possible.

Until a statement of complaint is provided by Garda Keogh clearly identifying the person and alleged
inci dents being compl ai ned of, it is not possible to make any deci sion on the appropriate policy or rank of i nvesti gat or to resol ve this complaint."

You agreed with that?
A. Yes.
Q. Everyone seemed to agree then that Chief Superintendent Scanlan could take that initial statement, which would satisfy those requirements, if possible?
A. Yes. To identify if there were a person or persons complained of and if it was the Garda policy that would apply.
Q.

Yes. I don't want to go into all the toing and froing about dates that were fixed and set and appointments cancelled, but both you and Mr. Barrett and Chief McLoughlin were keeping an eye on what was happening with the appointments and the taking of the statement and you were getting appropriate reports back from Chief Superintendent Scanlan?
A. Yes. Chief Superintendent Scanlan is a very experienced investigator and, you know, I trusted him implicitly and I had no concern whatsoever about how he did his job.
526 Q. Yes.
A. There was several appointments, for very good reasons Garda Keogh couldn't meet him. But I mean, as far as I was concerned Chief Superintendent Scanlan was diligent and he had met him as advisor.

527 Q. Certainly as of the 8th March Mr. Barrett was writing
to you, enquiring whether Garda Keogh had provided a statement, if so, what action had been taken. And also says, this is on page 6815, in the last line:
"I would appreciate a copy of Garda Keogh's statement of complaint for incl usion inthis office. Copy of file under harassment, sexual harassment and bullying poly if applicable."

So it seemed that he was anxious to get it when it was made there, isn't that right? skipping over all the details of the meeting, Chief Superintendent Scanlan appears to have sent you a copy of Garda Keogh's statement on 31st march 2017. If we look at page 6821. you refer to that in later correspondence and in later timelines, that was the 17-page statement made by Garda Keogh dated the 27th March.
A. Yeah, I just see on that, the one dated the 31st March from John Scanlan to me, he said a more detailed report will follow in the context of this statement. So I think there was two statements, from memory, there was two statements Garda Keogh made.
528 Q. Yes.
A. One was short, a five or six-page one, and then, with the benefit of legal advice, he made a longer one. I am not sure what the exact sequence was. But I think the two of them came in around April.
529 Q. A draft had been prepared for you to send on to Mr. Barrett forwarding that statement but it doesn't
appear to have been sent on the 4th April. If we look at just page 10005. This is a draft, unsigned letter, which says:
"I refer to your minute 22nd March 2017. I al so refer to attached correspondence dated March 2017 from chi ef superintendent Portlaoise together with statement of Garda Ni chol as Keogh, whi ch is now forwarded for your attention. "

There's handwriting there, which is apparently your handwriting and was turned into the letter that was actually sent the following day, on the 5th April. If we could look at page 6823. The body of this constitutes what was handwritten on the previous draft. 15:22 So this is going to Mr. Barrett. It says:
"I refer to your minute of 22nd March 2017 and wi sh to report the following by way of interimreport.

Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an, Portlaoise, has sent me one (1) part of a two (2) part report fromGarda Keogh.

I amexamining it and froman early perusal of the file, it appears to be much wi der than a bullying and harassment matter.

I will revert on receipt of the next phase of the report."

That went to Mr. Barrett, it would seem, without the statement itself being forwarded at that point in time. Do you agree with that?
A. Yeah. It doesn't refer to the statement.
A. But the purpose of the statement is information to enable me to make a decision whether or not to initiate the bullying policy.
531 Q. Yes, I was going to come to that in a moment.
A. Yeah.

532 Q. Obviously without the two parts, you probably considered that you didn't have enough or the complete picture to make that decision?
A. Yes. And I think later on, I think I was away on
annual leave then and I think during that period of time the second statement came in, and I think the two statements were the forwarded on something like the 12th.
well, we will come to that step-by-step, Mr. Fanning, thank you.
A. Yeah.

534 Q. In any event, you received further correspondence from Chief Superintendent Scanlan dated 12th April 2017, which contained a five-page statement dated 2nd March 2017. If we just look at that statement. You may recall seeing it. At page 6824. we don't have to look through it all, but if Mr. Kavanagh scrolls down four or five pages to 6828, it takes the narrative up to a
particular point in time and it's neither signed nor witnessed by anyone, isn't that right? And there's a list of appendices attached to it also, at page 6829.

If we just look at the covering letter that came with it. If we go to page 10013, this should be the letter of the 12th April from Chief Scanlan. If we look at the text there.
"In reference on 2nd March 2017, accompani ed by his sol icitor, Garda Keogh attended Portlaoi se Garda station and commenced making a statement in respect of the matters pursuant to the bullying and harassment pol icy.

He was not in a position to concl ude his statement. Havi ng made a number of appointments to meet with Garda Keogh, he was not in a position to attend until the 27th March. At this time he presented a prepared statement which was read back over to him he signed it ${ }_{\text {15:25 }}$ and he al so presented a vol ume of appendi ces. This vol ure of appendi ces was in line with the appendi ces recei ved at the original intervi ew of the 2nd March with the exception of the second page of the statement of [blank] listed at Exhi bit 7 of his origi nal
statement. Garda Keogh agreed that this should be added to his list of exhi bits. He presented with his present statement.

Garda Keogh was invited to sign the incompl ete statement of the 2nd March. He declined to do so. I advi sed himthat I was subnitting the incomplete statement of the $2 n d$ March as a record of that meeting with the attached appendices. It was read over to him I si gned it and it was witnessed by Detective Inspector Dunne. Detective Inspector Dunne and I al so witnessed the statement of the 27th March, which Garda Ni chol as Keogh si gned. "

So, it would certainly appear that of the receipt of the two parts by this stage, you had what he wanted to submit to you, as it were?
A. I had, I had adequate information to enable me to make a decision then.

535 Q. Yes. You wrote on the 21st April to Mr. Barrett. If we perhaps just look at that, it's page 10021. That says:
"I amdi rected by assi stant commi ssi oner Eastern Regi on
to prefer to previ ous correspondence fromofice dated 5th April 2017.

Thi s office is now in recei pt of a further report dated 12th April 2017 fromchi ef superintendent Portlaoise with encl osed document of Garda Keogh dated 2nd March 2017 and rel evant appendi ces pl ease.

Assi stant commi ssi oner Eastern Regi on will now gi ve
this matter further consi deration and report more fully in early course."

So, that clearly appears to be sending on the five-page unsigned statement on to Mr. Barrett at that point in time?
A. I think I was away on leave, I think I was away for three weeks at that stage.
Q. Yes.
A. To keep the files moving, they were sending them up to Garda Headquarters.

537 Q. Inspector Ferry was signing that for you?
A. He would have been there, in Inspector McCarthy's absence he would have performed that duty.
538 Q. Yes.
A. I'd say it was just a matter of moving everything on.

539 Q. And that was acknowledged by Mr. Barrett, if we look at page 6872, on the 28th April. It says:
"I amto acknow edge recei pt of your correspondence
dated the 21st inst. under the above caption, the contents of whi ch are noted.

I await for further report in course."

So at that point in time what were you intending to do then?
A. Under the policy I had now got the information that identified there was a number of gardaí who the garda
was complaining about. I established that the policy which covers five ranks applied to the five, to the five people that were involved. And then, I was giving thought about it and I was mindful that the bullying policy was there, but the bullying policy is an agreement between the Garda associations and the Garda Commissioner. My predecessor, in a difficult case beforehand, had this mode1, the Byrne/McGinn mode1, and it was a slightly wider approach than the policy. I suppose the question I had in my head was, with the policy owner, I needed to bring this information to the policy owner's attention so the policy owner could make a decision about whether it should be Byrne/McGinn, whether it should be the default position, which was the bullying policy. There was also two other issues involved in it, one was that it would need to be an assistant commissioner because of the ranks that were complained of. I couldn't pick an assistant commissioner, it had to be the policy owner, because I couldn't pick a peer, so it had to be a policy owner that would determine one of those.

There's also an obligation under the bullying policy to make sure there is no conflict of interest in the decision-making. So I would have been aware at that stuff like that. So I just thought, I want to make sure that the policy owner was completely happy and that's why I was looking for a meeting with the policy
holder, the policy owner.
540 Q. Yes. You took the precaution in the interim of writing to Garda Keogh on the 16th May, isn't that correct?
A. Yeah. I would have communicated to the garda what the current position was, that would have been the end of the letter, without reading it.
541 Q. Perhaps we will just look at that, 6873. You're referring there just very briefly to the history of the correspondence with Mr. Barrett. Paragraph 4, you're referring to the receiving of the correspondence from Chief Superintendent Scanlan with the larger statement first and the second, unsigned one second. And then you say you're on annual leave. I think Inspector McCarthy, you're satisfied, he hand-delivered the letter, he spoke to Garda Keogh on the evening of the 16th and he confirmed that there was nothing more he wanted to put in the written statements?
A. Yeah. So like, I mean, I had a written statement, I had a written statement signed with the benefit of legal advice. I had another document that was unsigned, but I mean, the proofs were there that the chief superintendent, the detective inspector and Garda Keogh accepted was there. And I was just checking with him, is there anything else that you want to include now before I give the matter consideration or while I am giving the matter consideration. I had been away on annual leave and now I'm back and this is going to be -- you know, of the many things that go through the office every day, but I just wanted to be very clear
that, you know, he understood. I didn't want to miss something in it either, like you know, if there was another issue that he thought I should consider, well now is the time for it.

542 Q. Yes. Inspector McCarthy wrote back to Garda Keogh again on the 23rd, confirming the contents of the meeting and the conversation on the 16th. That's at page 6875. That was done on your authority, I am sure.
A. Yes.

543 Q. On the occasion of these visits by Inspector McCarthy, would you have typically briefed him what he might encounter, what he should say or how he should respond to Garda Keogh in relation to questions about different issues? Were you giving him a full briefing?
A. No, Inspector McCarthy was bringing the -- Inspector McCarthy would probably have prepared the file for me, would have discussed it, he wold have arranged to have it typed, have the letters typed and all that, the correspondence going up and down. So he'd be familiar with the file.

544 Q. Yes.
A. And you know, one of the issues coming out of that file would be a letter to Garda Keogh, telling him what exactly was happening. And then the purpose of dropping it over to him was, well, there was going to be no confusion about whether or not he got it or whatever else happened. But Inspector McCarthy is very professional. He'd just go and, you know, be courteous and drop it in and that'd be the end of it. I would
assume. I was never there, but I'm aware of anything that happened in those visits. But I mean, the instruction was to bring the letter.
okay. Do the letters not reflect a discussion on these dates that Inspector McCarthy had about whether he wanted these other issues contained or not. Because there doesn't seem to be any direct correspondence on the issue?
A. Did I not write to Garda Keogh and ask him had he everything included?
Yes. But Inspector McCarthy reports back that there were these two issues. So he must have discussed them with Garda Keogh presumably?
A. Yeah, he must have.
A. No, no, no. Inspector McCarthy's knowledge would have came from what he saw on the file, I'm sure. I mean, I can't speak for him.
548 Q. So he would have been au fait with how matters were at any given time?
A. Oh he would, because he was the office manager as wel1 as the operational inspector.

549 Q. Yes.
A. So maybe $20 \%$ of his time was spent on admin functions in the office, this file would have been one of many, and $80 \%$ of his time was operational, out working.

550 Q. Yes. Now, it would appear that after you got this clarification from Inspector McCarthy and from Garda

Keogh as nothing more, I think you had a meeting with mr. Mulligan on the 22nd, which you describe as a preliminary discussion with him, where you set out a summary of the facts as you saw them, is that right?
A. That's correct, yeah. So like, in my thinking all the material was in Garda Headquarters. I went to Dublin one day, I was up probably about other matters, and when I was there I went in to see if John Barrett was there, the executive director of HRPD, I understand he was away or he on leave. Then I met the acting or the senior person there, who was Mr. Alan Mulligan. And I would have mentioned to him, look it, you know, set up all this correspondence and whatever was in -- I think I might have followed up with an e-mail or something, or there might be some written record of it somewhere.
551 Q. Well, we will come to that in due course, but the next thing you did after meeting Mr. Mulligan was to set out your view of the facts in a letter to Mr. Barrett on the 24th May; isn't that correct? If we look at page 6876 and 6877 . This letter may be of some importance because you subsequently in a number of your accounts say that Garda Keogh's complaint was sent with this. I don't know if you recall that?
A. I can't. But if I say it, you know, it's probably accurate at the time. I have the added feature that

Jimmy or whoever prepared it, Inspector McCarthy or whoever prepared the report --
552 Q. You see, that's what I am anxious to just establish. If we could just go through this then line-by-line. It
says:
"I refer to your previ ous correspondence dated 8th March 2017."

That is the letter we have seen from Mr. Barrett anxious to know about the complaints.
"I al so refer to correspondence fromthis office dated 21st April 2017, tab B."

And we have seen that one. That's the one where you send him the five-page, unsigned, unwitnessed statement, isn't that correct? we've just looked at that.
"And your correspondence dated 28th April 2017." That is his acknowledgment of that. It then goes on:
"On 16th May 2017, I al so corresponded with Garda Ni chol as Keogh, copy attached, tab D. "

We have looked at that.
"To enquire if he had any further material to offer and to respond to my office bef ore the 30th May. Should Garda Keogh offer any further material, l will revert to you.

On 22nd May 2017, I held a preliminary di scussion with Mr. Mulligan HRPD, where I set out a summary of facts regarding this matter.

Later on that day..."

That recounts Inspector McCarthy's interaction with him there. And then the second last paragraph:
"Garda Keogh al so stated that he first rai sed these issues as outlined in his statement to Chi ef Superintendent Scanlan directly with Chi ef Superintendent MELoughl in HRM in J une 2016, some 11 mont hs ago."

It then goes on to describe the second issue there, that we are not concerned with. And then on the next page, you say:
"One of the greatest issues of concern to me is the openi ng line of Garda Keogh statement dated 27th March 2017 'following my maki ng protected di scl osures, । encountered har assment, excl usi on victimisation penal i sation... '

I am not aware of the issues rai sed under the protected di scl osure investigation. However, these matters now rai sed in both statements and in his account to

I nspector McCarthy may wel come wi thi n protected di scl osures policy. It is clear that his allegations are grounded in his current stat utes as a protected di scloser. I am of the vi ew that this could well be treated as effectivel y being a protected di scl osure and 15:38 it may well be that those allegations are included in the earlier di scl osure. I am aware of one incident where a garda rai sed issues about Pul se data rel ating to intelligence record. I have agai n requested an update from Chi ef Superintendent Gralton on this
matter.

The issues set out in the statement witnessed by Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an and the additional list set out in the unsi gned statement al so handed to Chi ef
Superintendent Scanl an by Garda Keogh are most serious. The allegations could in some circumstances merit a criminal investi gation and the allegations include an allegation agai nst a Garda Commissi oner by a protected di scl oser. I am of the view that the bullying policy is not wi de enough to incl ude any comprehensi ve i nvesti gation. You decide. The decision in an earlier case (McCabe) by HRM

I amrel uctant to make any appoi ntments in this matter as there may well be a conflict of interest in that l had prior invol vement in a previ ous correspondence regarding Garda Keogh and it may well be perception of the parties that l would not be impartial. Garda Keogh
corresponded with me on 15th April 2015, whi ch issued a response 24th April 2015...."

And you give the reference
"You will recall in correspondence dated 20th Decenber 2016, tab B, that Chi ef Superintendent Roche, Naas, was nominated to investi gate the compl ai nt under the harassment, sexual harassment and bullying policy and it was requested of me to formalise the appoint ment.
You will al so know Garda Keogh informed Inspect or McCarthy he had first raised this issue directly with Chi ef Superintend MELoughlin HRPD in June 2016 and that information then provi ded was not made available to me as part of the deci si on- maki ng process.

I recommend a full investigation into these matters."

So, I just want to, as it were, sort of formally suggest to you that you enclose a number of tabs with this, tabs A, B and C, but that the 17-page statement of the 27th isn't forwarded with this letter, do you agree with that?
A. I simply don't know.

553
All right.
A. If it's not tabbed on it, I take it.

554 Q. Okay. Now, at that point in time, and it's a position you didn't appear to waiver from until much later, but you were looking at a single, comprehensive
investigation into all matters?
A. Yeah. So the position is, the garda made a complaint under the Garda bullying policy.
Q. Yes.
A. The precedent and the policy is that the policy owner in one particular case concerning somebody went for this wider investigation, which we call the Byrne/McGinn model.
Q. Yes.
A. The question I was asking, there was four purposes |I sent the file up; one, was to ask, well is that something the policy owner was going to consider on this case on the basis of that information. The second thing was, was I conflicted because of the prior involvement with the letter? The third thing was to enquire about who -- if the default position was the garda bullying policy, what assistant commissioner was I going to get to do the investigation.
557 Q. Yes. obviously if the complaint -- just looking at it from the top down, if the complaint concerned the Commissioner, it wouldn't fit in under the policy?
A. Because the policy only covers the four staff associations up to and including the rank of chief superintendent.
558 Q. Yes.
A. It doesn't apply to assistant commissioners or it doesn't apply to deputy commissioners or commissioner, or civilians in the garda workplace.
559 Q. I suppose there was a danger in what you were proposing
there, and I think you were conscious of this, because you weren't aware what matters had been investigated under the protected disclosures?
A. Yes.

560 Q. And to what extent matters had already been looked at in that respect. And I suppose there was no easy way for you to find that out?
A. Well, I had been appointed or directed by the policy owner the previous December to start this process. So the policy owner -- when I reported back up in May, was 15:42 it, in that report, it was then for the policy owner to speak to the then Assistant Commissioner Ó Cualáin or to talk -- it was a decision for the policy owner, not for me. And it would have been open for the policy owner to get legal advice or whatever, you know what I mean. The policy owner was going to be a very busy person, a huge amount of correspondence going through different parts of the organisation. Like, I was only one particular region.
561 Q. Yes.
A. So I can only imagine, and knowing from my time in being the assistant commissioner in HRM, how busy the place is and the volumes of material that are going through. So I expected he give the matter very careful consideration.
562 Q. Yes. I don't want to get involved in unnecessary debate about protocol or who is the owner of different bits of it, but your recommendation to Mr. Barrett here, was he entitled, as it were, to make a decision
which would embrace some or all of what required to be investigated?
A. Yes, because the Byrne/McGinn mode1, as we call it, is a much wider approach to investigating. It would include more -- you know, you could everything under the Byrne/McGinn mode7. And I was asking the question, do you wish to consider, as the policy owner do you wish the investigation to be that wide or do you wish to have an investigation under Garda policy for bullying and harassment.
CHA RMAN Can I ask you, assistant commissioner, who would decide, if it was decided to have the Byrne/McGinn model, who would decide that?
A. The policy owner, would be the executive director of HRPD, after getting advice from people.
564 Q. CHA RMAN who is?
A. Mr. John Barrett.

565 Q. CHA RMAN okay. So Mr. Barrett was the policy owner?
A. Yeah, he owns the process, exactly.

566 Q. CHA RMAN That's okay. That's all right. I mean, I 15:44 understand that you use sort of technical terms. So it was a matter for mr. Barrett to decide ti do a Byrne/McGinn, or alternatively, to decide to a bullying and harassment; is that correct?
A. The default position is it would be a bullying and harassment.

567 Q. CHAN RMN: I follow. Unless he chose the other one, there had to be an investigation?
A. Exactly.
Q. CHA RMAN And that was a bullying and harassment un1ess, okay. I see the point, yeah. And your advice, your suggestion was, look, there's more here than fits comfortably into a bullying and harassment?
A. Yes, on the basis of the information I had, Chairman, which was the unsigned and signed statement, and that was the information. Like a full investigation would determine.

569 Q. CHAN RMAN I'm sorry, Mr. McGuinness. The information you had was in the unsigned --
A. And signed, there was two documents, there was the unsigned and signed one.

CHA RMAK The big one was the 27th March?
A. Yes.

571 Q. CHA RMAN That was signed?
A. Yes.

572 Q. CHAN RMAN And there was a further -- it was the 2nd March, but that's not important, and it was about a five-page document?
A. Yes.

573 Q. CHAN RMAN So between the two, you were satisfied, look, there's more here, that was your opinion?
A. Yeah, exactly, and it was only my opinion. CHA RMAN That's okay.
A. I wanted to make sure that everybody knew what I thought and it was for other people to make decisions.
575 Q. CHA RMAN I follow. Ultimately it was Mr. Barrett's call?
A. Yeah. And, you know, I'm assuming, I had done the job
for five and a half years before that, if I was to do it I would get advice from lots of other people as well.

576 Q. CHA RMAN I follow. But however he did it, whether he got advice or didn't get advice, he would have come back and said, look, I have taken into account what you've said, my decision is as follows.
A. Absolutely.

577 Q. CHA RMAN Either agree with you or not agree with you.
A. And he would direct.

578 Q. CHAN RMAN Okay, thanks very much.
A. Thank you, Chairman.

CHA RMAN I am sorry, Mr. McGuinness.
579 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: Not at all, Chairman. Just a follow on question from the Chairman's question there. You did stake out your position at a later meeting that that it was your responsibility to appoint under the bullying and harassment?
A. Yes.

580 Q. So, if Mr. Barrett and others had agreed for a large scale Byrne/McGinn, would he have responsibility for appointing someone to do that?
A. Yes. would that side step your policy responsibility under the bullying and harassment?
A. Yes, because it would sort of be the Commissioner's policy.

582 Q. Yes.
A. Because the whole bullying policy is an agreement
between the Commissioner and the staff associations. so the Commissioner and the staff associations are the people concerned, can vary it.
583 Q. Yes.
A. And if they all agree to go down the Byrne/McGinn road, $15: 46$ well then that's the model they use.
584 Q. We11, that's what I was going to ask. I mean, if it was a Byrne/McGinn investigating everything, that would be, as it were, a side stepping of the policy and would be an investigation including the bullying and harassment but outside the scope of the policy?
A. Well, I am sure the Policy would -- but it would be agreed between both sides, like I mean, the legal representatives and the others. Because the agreement -- the bullying policy is an agreement that stands, but 15:47 then that agreement can be varied by consent or by whatever with the other people.
585 Q. CHA RMAN But the Byrne/McGinn is not the subject of an agreement?
A. No. No. It's a once off. It was used once.

586 Q. CHA RMAN The Commissioner could say -- the authority, Garda that headquarters could say, it is appropriate in this case to have a full inquiry and that was in their jurisdiction as police officers in authority?
A. Yes.

587 Q. CHAN RMAN Correct me if I am wrong, if it was the bullying policy, the bullying and harassment policy, that's the subject of an agreement?
A. Yes, and that's the default position.

588 Q. CHA RMAN That was the default position in accordance with the agreement but the parties could agree to vary that agreement in respect of the bullying and harassment policy?
A. Exactly. And it comes from -- the basic principle is management always have the right to manage.

CHAI RMAN Yes.
A. And secondly, there is a statutory piece that we always interpreted, the Commissioner has the right to direct, control the force. And if there was such a matter, the 15:48 Commissioner would control and direct the force.
CHA RMAK Okay. Sorry. Thank you very much.
THE WTNESS: Thank you, Chairman.
590 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: In any event, subsequent to this letter, you didn't get an immediate reply, I think. You wrote subsequently then to Garda Keogh on the 31st May to tell him the position, to keep him updated, isn't that right? And if we look at page 6878. In the main paragraph at the middle, you say:
"The purpose is that I am of the vi ew that these matters merit consi deration outsi de the bullying and har assment policy. Bef ore proceeding to next steps, I am awaiting his deci si on."

That is the executive director.

[^0]So, as matters stand, that's where it was that is where it was at that point in time. We have seen in other documents a fairly constant flow of minutes from the Commissioner's office, enquiring about the taking of a statement, progressing the investigation, instructing the chief administrative officer to convene a case conference. That gets passed over to Mr. Barrett's office and Mr. Mulligan to have responsibility for a case conference. We know that at a stage in middle March when no statements had been taken, it was obviously considered there was no reason to have a case conference. But did you understand that that was a process that the commissioner wanted, that there should be a case conference on the matter once the statements had been received?
A. No, Chairman. I don't think I was copied in that correspondence. But I mean, that wouldn't be unusual, because the commissioner, you know, is going to be a busy person and they are they are going to control and direct the force, they are going to ask their head of HR to do whatever it is, or the CAO, I suppose, is the way it probably came down. But, no, I hadn't part of that. As you see, any correspondence I had is there, up and down. I think the first I wrote in september then looking for a case conference and then we had it on the 3rd October. That was the first. But I wrote I think on the 24 th or the 26 th, something like that. I wrote twice looking for a case conference.

591 Q. I am just wondering, is the reason a case conference may not have been held was because you had only sent over one part of the statement rather than the substantive 17 part?
A. I'm not aware. Nobody ever said to me there was a problem with not getting statements. There was no issue. I mean I wouldn't expect, don't take me up wrong, I wouldn't be expect to be consulted by the Commissioner about everything on it. I was doing my piece. It was going to the policy owner. what I understand about that part is, that was the Commissioner communicating with the policy holder, the policy owner, you know.
592 Q. Yes.
A. So it wouldn't be in that relationship.

593 Q. In any event, we have heard reference this morning to reminders that you wrote to the executive director Mr. Barrett. You wrote on the 16th June, we don't need to look at these, 6879, urging him to keep delay to a minimum and to express your concern that you were keen to revert to Garda Keogh with a decision. You inform Garda Keogh of that on the 16th June, also at page 6680. The next page. Mr. Barrett writes back to you in June, informing you of Chief McLough1in being on annual leave at that point in time and a desire to arrange a meeting. 6882, the 17th August, you're pressing for an update on the position there, the current position. You're informing Garda Keogh again of that, on the 17 th August, if we look at 6883 . And
you're telling him there that you are seeking an updated report regarding this matter. You again wrote to the executive director then on the 1st September, if you look at 6884. Keen to avoid delay. You're again copying Mr. Cullen on that. 6885.
A. Sorry, copying Mr. Cullen there, sorry?

594 Q. You are informing Mr. Cullen of that position I think? CHAI RMAN Mr. Cullen, the solicitor of Garda Keogh's.
A. Yeah, sorry, yeah.

595 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: We11, you're informing him there that --
A. That it was gone to HRPD, yeah.
Q. That it was gone to Mr. Barrett?
A. Yes.

597 Q. You write to Mr. Barrett then on the 22nd September, seeking a meeting, if we look at 6889. You're informing Garda Keogh of that, 6890. And then a meeting takes place shortly after that, on the 3rd october. Perhaps we will just look at the minutes briefly of that, page 10118. You make the case for a
bigger investigation there. Was there general agreement on that issue at that point in that meeting?
A. I remember it was a productive meeting. The minutes came out relatively recently, I think I just got a -after the meeting we got an item or an item list with
about ten points on it. No, it was a good -- because I remember we worked through lunch, like. So everybody was there and everybody was really concerned. I think that's the meeting came up about the classification of
the member's absence and that, that he wanted it reclassified. So there was a lot of stuff covered in that and a lot of people came and worked through lunch with this. You know, that's when it came up and I gave my points about the Byrne/McGinn model, or the default position being the policy or do we go the other way. 598 Q. You see, at the bottom of this first page, 10118, you seem to be urging that a statement needs to be taken from Garda Keogh and a process followed.
"Someone neutral needs to carry out an investigation. Assistant Commissioner Fanni ng suggested a full statement be taken and sent to the Director of Prosecutions and outlined what had al ready been submitted on the file. Then, when the Director of Public Prosecutions come back, all other matters should be I ooked at under the rel evant policies. Mr. Barrett is in agreement with this."

But would that not have been setting the process back to the beginning again?
A. No, Chairman. No. Because the process, the formal investigation had not started. So the formal investigation was going to start either as the default position, which is the bullying and harassment policy, or, if the policy owner changed it. So we hadn't got to day one yet. So if it was to be the Byrne/McGinn model, it was going to start that day, or, if it was the bullying policy, it was going to start as soon as I
got the name of the person from Garda Headquarters to appoint. And that didn't happen I think until November.

We11, I am just concerned to see whether from your point of view, you didn't know what statements Garda Keogh had made in the criminal --
A. Absolutely not, no, not for the protected, disclosure no.
A. Yes, because he had sent the unsigned and the signed statements, the two statements that Chief Superintendent Scanlan had.
601 Q. Yes.
A. They were the two I got. They were information to allow me to decide whether or not the complaint was to be accepted or it met the threshold to be investigated.
602 Q. Yes.
A. And I was at that point and the default position was the bullying investigation or, if the policy owner --
which I was saying seemed a bit wider. One instance was, he had some difficulty with the Commissioner at the time. The Commissioner wasn't covered under the bullying policy. So the easiest thing was to say, we11, you know, what have you got to say about that and 15:57 follow it out and close it out, whatever the outcome was.

603 Q. Yes.
A. And that couldn't be done under the bullying policy,
whereas it could have been done under the Byrne/McGinn model.
604 Q. All right. On the second page there it seems to report Mr. Barrett to appoint someone at assistant commissioner level to do the investigation. If we just ${ }_{\text {15:57 }}$ go down to the middle of the page. Just there. That would only be possible if it was the sort of larger Byrne/McGinn type model, wouldn't that be correct?
A. This is the line beginning, Assistant Commissioner Fanning, no?

605 Q. No, Mr. Barrett?
A. Is in agreement the rule --

606 Q. At the bottom there.
CHA RMAN Mr. Barrett to appoint someone at assistant commissioner level.
A. We1l, he was going to have to appoint an assistant commissioner whether it was --

607 Q. CHA RMAN One way or the other.
A. One way or the other, exactly. Sorry, was going to have nominate an assistant commissioner.

CHAL RMAN I understand.
608 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Do you recollect Assistant Commissioner McPartlin being discussed at this?
A. I do, yeah. I thought it was something about she was going to do a fact-finding or something like that, which was something else.
609 Q. Yes. Well, what would that be?
A. I don't know because it wasn't one of the two alternatives I have. I think, as I say, these minutes,
a11 I got from that meeting was an action list and Assistant Commissioner McPartlin's name is in that action list I think. But I mean, that was something that the executive director John Barrett was going to appoint her to do, I don't know what it was or what policy it was under or whatever. I don't mean that in a disparaging way, but I just simply don't have the information.

610 Q. Well, the action list is at page 10820, if we just turn to that. So when you got this, did you think that the Byrne/McGinn sort of overarching comprehensive investigation was what had been decided upon?
A. No, because I wasn't told at the meeting that the default position had stopped, that it was definitely going to be a Byrne/McGinn investigation. So like, I wasn't -- I wasn't -- there was a lot of discussion went on that day, we worked through luncheon on it. But I certain7y wasn't of the view that I had been relieved of anything at that stage.
611 Q. So were you expecting then to get a nomination from
Mr. Barrett as to appointing somebody under the bullying policy?
A. To me this was a third thing. He's the policy owner, he has the absolute right to treat the matter whatever way he wanted. But the issue was, if the Byrne/McGinn model, which was the established model and had been established before, there was precedence for it, or the default position wasn't going to go ahead, then I'd expect to be told that. So I wasn't told neither was
going to occur. So I was left in the position that I was going to have to make an appointment. But I would be relying on the executive director, Mr. John Barrett to nominate one of the assistant commissioners to be available to me to make the appointment under the bullying policy.
As of after this meeting?
A. Yeah, after that meeting. I mean, look, it was perfectly reasonable for Mr. Barrett to consider this, like I mean. He probably came back off holidays, you know, I mean I have a lot of correspondence to deal with and he has six or eight regions, six regions and two other functions, so he is going to have six or eight times the amount of paper, and a lot of the regions have a lot more gardaí than I had. So, you know, for every one of mine he had ten others. CHA RMAN Assistant commissioner, this meeting ended, as I understand from your evidence, it ended without a specific decision as to what kind of investigation was going to take place, is that correct?
A. Yeah, and there was some suggestion that he was going to ask Assistant Commissioner McPartlin.
614 Q. CHAI RMAN I follow. So she was mentioned,
A. Yeah.

615 Q. CHAI RMAN Possibly for some fact-finding or whatever. But if I am understanding, there wasn't a consensus as people left this meeting as to precisely what was going to happen next. In other words, what investigation was going to happen; is that right?
A. Well, $I$ felt $I$ was still in the same position, that it was going to be one of two.
Q. CHAN RMAN But it hadn't been decided?
A. No, there was no firm decision which way we're going. And that was perfectly reasonable in my view.

617 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, and I'm not implying a criticism or anything else.
A. Yes.

618 Q. CHA RMAN There may be criticisms, but I am just trying to establish the factual situation, that it wasn't decided at this meeting.
A. Exactly.

619 Q. CHA RMAN There was a discussion and you say a very useful discussion and so on. Anyway, there we are.
620 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Just before passing on from this
meeting then, can you confirm whether there was any discussion at all of Superintendent Murray's promotion or the consideration of it by the Policing Authority in any respect?
CHA RMAN At this meeting.
621 Q. MR. MEGU NNESS: At this meeting?
A. No. Not to the best of my knowledge, because I had no recollection of any discussion about Superintendent Murray's promotion, with anybody.
622 Q. It would appear that on the day after the meeting 16:02 Inspector McCarthy forwarded Garda Keogh's statement of the 27th March to the executive director's office. If we look at page 6893, it says:
"I amdirected by assistant cormi ssioner Eastern Regi on to refer to a meeting of yesterday's date and to forward copy statement witnessed by Garda Ni ck Keogh on 27th March 2017 and hand delivered to HRM on 24th May 2017, per file fromAssistant Conmissioner Fanning dated 24th May 2017, please. "

Now, we have seen the letter, it doesn't actually refer to it at all. So is this perhaps the first occasion when the major part of the statement is sent to the executive director's office
A. I can't be sure. But I suspect what came up at the meeting was they wanted a copy of everything.
623 Q. Yes.
A. I don't know. I mean, whatever they asked for, we gave 16:03 them.

624 Q. Yes.
A. And made sure it went up the next day like.

625 Q. Yes.
A. But I wouldn't just assume that it didn't go the first time.
Q. Yes.
A. I think I'd be of the view that, you know, there when there was a request made at the meeting for certain things, there were certain actions to follow the meeting and we complied with it the very next day.
627 Q. Yes. Chairman, I have some considerable time to go on the matter.
CHA RMAN Yes. Just so we can clarify, I am sure

Mr. Kelly will be back in a moment. How long do you anticipate?

MR. MEGI NNESS: Perhaps an hour.
CHA RMAN Ms. Mulligan, are you proposing to cross-examine?

M5. MLLI GAN I anticipate it to be very short, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. okay. A11 I am thinking of is this, do we need to start early tomorrow? Because we have to finish the assistant commissioner, we have Commissioner ó Cualáin and we have Assistant Commissioner Finn, isn't that right? MR. MEGU NESS: No, we just have Commissioner Ó Cualáin after this witness and Mr. Marrinan thinks he will be half an hour.

CHA RMAN Oh, that's fine. That is fine. So there's no particular pressure on us in that case for tomorrow. Sorry. So okay. Very good. We will leave it over until tomorrow. 10:30 tomorrow, yes. That's why I was enquiring, I was wondering if we needed some special arrangements. Thanks very much, everybody.
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| $125: 18,126: 7$ | $46: 17,48: 29,49: 2,$ | 84:8, 84:10, 99:13, | 8:6, 8:10, 9:10, 10:13, | $3: 14$ |
| 128:15, 130:3, 136:9, | $60: 22,65: 16,79: 16$ | $115: 15,122: 4,122: 9$ | 11:16, 11:18, 11:21, | officer [18] - 15:3, |
| 142:23, 157:1, 167:2, | 88:2, 89:29, 104:6, | 124:12, 143:25, | $12: 2,12: 29,13: 8$ | $15: 11,50: 14,50: 18$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:16, 167:22, } \\ & \text { 169:17. 172:28. } \end{aligned}$ | 104:22, 104:25, | 153:9, 154:11, 174:17, 176:29, | 13:17, 17:13, 17:18, | 105:21, 142:23, |
| 181:16, 183:18, | $157: 17,157: 28$, $158: 16,169: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 174:17, 176:29, } \\ & 181: 21,185: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:21, 21:29, 24:16, } \\ & 26: 18.27: 10.30: 22 . \end{aligned}$ | 142:26, 145:16, 146:12, 147:11, |
| 192:23, 194:23, | 158:16, 169:13 nothing [12]-21:1, | numbers [1] - 157:24 | $32: 8,33: 7,33: 19$ | 154:19, 155:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 200:28, 202:18, } \\ & 202: 26 \end{aligned}$ | 83:11, 87:2, 92:14, | NYLAND [1] - 3:19 Ní 11 - 2.30 | $37: 1,39: 7,42: 19$ | $165: 5,165: 28$ $166: 11.168: 15 .$ |
| NICHOLAS [2] - | $96: 20,102: 2,110: 5,$ | NI [1] - 2:30 <br> NÓIRÍN [1] - 3:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 9,43: 11,43: 29 \\ & 44: 3,44: 11,46: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 166: 11,168: 15 \\ & 168: 17,193: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $2: 10,4: 5$ | 118:11, 129:16, 147:16, 178:16, 181:1 | Nóirín [1] - 123:5 | $44: 3,44: 11,46: 14$ $46: 28,49: 7,57: 12,$ | Officers [1] - 13:19 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Nicholas [4] - 8:12, } \\ 172: 8,175: 8,182: 22 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 147:16, 178:16, } 181: 1 \\ \text { notice [1] - } 161: 16 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:26, 80:14, 104:14, } \\ & 113: 29,119: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { officers [2]-68:11, } \\ & \text { 191:24 } \end{aligned}$ |





| 131:29, 148:14, | 46:2, 83:29, 104:3, <br> 121:2, 144:4, 144:14, <br> 146:28, 147:13, <br> 147:29, 150:25, <br> 166:11, 166:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 78:12, } 93: 26,128: 1, \\ & \text { 149:19, 151:19, } \\ & \text { 151:20, 193:12, 194:1 } \\ & \text { reasonable [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | $185: 17$ <br> recommendation [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:23, 142:20, } \\ & \text { 148:28, 149:1, 155:7, } \\ & \text { 163:24, 166:9 } \\ & \text { referring }[12]-12: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 156:15, 165:25, |  |  |  |  |
| 166:17, 173:7, |  |  | - 187 |  |
| 179:24, 192:21 |  |  | reconsidered [1] - | $24: 15,31: 7,31: 14$ |
| purposes [6] - 43:3, |  | 49:19, 143:6, 200:9 | 41 | 57:11, 63:11, 64:2 |
| 87:11, 124:20 | 166:20, 183:11, | 201 | ord [15] - 6:2 | 65:12, 70:2, 142:1, |
| 128:22, 166:10 | 183:27, 183:29 | reasons [4]-42:20 | 8:20, 21:19, 93: | 178:8, 178:10 |
| $186: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 184:8, } 185: 12 \\ & \text { raises }[1]-18: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $62: 13,167: 10,170: 25$ | 104:13, 120:22, | refers [10] - 31:15, |
| 174:13 | raising [3]-78:16 | 98:10, 98:24 | 47 | 121:15, 12 |
| pursued [1] - 143:25 | 142:24, 145:3 | reassure [1]-99:16 | 147:29, 153:16 | 129:14, 129:25 |
| 22] | rang [4]-54:3, 77:3, | reassured [2] | 175:4, 181:15, 184 | 131:17, 169:1 |
| 11:20, 16:20, 25:21 | $\begin{gathered} 77: 6,157: 23 \\ \text { range }[1]-114: 6 \\ \text { rank }[5]-60: 1, \end{gathered}$ | $\text { 77:28, } 98: 9$ reassuring [1] - | recorded [6] - 7:13, $8: 19,51: 13,78: 13$ |  |
| 25:27, 31:22, 33:9, |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:29, 140:4 } \\ & \text { recording }[2]-8: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $84: 26,85: 3,85: 28$ |
| $39: 8,43: 10,44: 3$, $59.21,78 \cdot 11,86.20$, |  | 56:26 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { reflect }[4]-50: 21, \\ 80: 12,134: 17,180: 4 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 59: 21,78: 11,86: 20, \\ & 94: 24,97: 17,109: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 149:14, 166:6, 170:2, } \\ & 186: 23 \end{aligned}$ | recalled [1] - 84:6 <br> receipt $[4]$ - 172:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recording }[2]-8: 12, \\ & 8: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80: 12,134: 17,180: 4 \\ \text { reflected }[5]-26: 25, \end{gathered}$ |
| 109:16, 131:18, | rank/grade [1] - | $175: 11,175: 24$ | ```8:17 records [10] - 25:28,``` | 31:1, 31:19, 47:29, |
| 133:4, 154:9, 178:17 puts [1] - 42:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:28 } \\ & \text { ranks [7] }-35: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 176:20 } \\ & \text { receive }[3] \text { - 129:18, } \end{aligned}$ | 47:8, 49:8, 51:24, <br> 64:17, 72:15, 160:11 | reflecting [3]-46:11, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { putting [8] - 11:2, } \\ \text { 19:19, 48:1, 56:4, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:28, 109:17, } \\ & \text { 137:11, 158:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 143:18, 148:27 } \\ & \text { received }[19]-43: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|r} \text { 64:17, } 72: 15,160: 11 \\ \text { recounts [1] }-183: 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:13, } 55: 2 \\ & \text { refresh [1] - 83:18 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 80:19, 81:25, 107:14, | 137:11, 158:11 | $47: 11,56: 21,59: 12$ | $\text { redact }[1]-66: 11$ | refute [1]-104:25 <br> regard [25] - 10:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 158:20 } \\ & \text { puzzled [1] - 113:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 152: 5,194: 3 \\ \text { RE }[2]-5: 9,132: 27 \\ \text { re }[9]-56: 27,60: 26, \\ 72: 8,77: 6,78: 14, \end{gathered}$ | $76: 2,84: 26,84: 28$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { redacted }[3]-62: 12, \\ & 69: 5.69: 20 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| puzzled [1]-113 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 2,84: 26,84: 28 \\ & 121: 19,127: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:5, 69:20 } \\ & \text { redacting }[1]-69: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 28,28: 26,35: 3 \\ & 43: 24,53: 26,58: 28, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | 151:29, 161:26, | $\operatorname{REDDY}_{[1]}-4: 8$ | $66: 28,67: 5,67: 22,$ |
|  |  | 161:28, 167:12, | Reddy [1] - 82:6 refer [21]-40:4, | $69: 14,75: 7,76: 26$ |
| QUAY [3] - 2:24 | $160:$ | 193:16 | $44: 11,70: 11,70: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 1,80: 16,86: 17 \\ & 93: 2,93: 12,98: 6, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2:31, 4:12 } \\ & \text { queries [2] - 31:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RE-EXAMINED [2] - } \\ & 5: 9,132: 27 \end{aligned}$ | receiving [1] - | $75: 11,84: 24,86: 10$ | 107:6, 110:4, 116:18 |
| 31:28 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5:9, 132:27 } \\ & \text { reach [2] - 98:12, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 114:22, 122:23, | $147: 27$ |
| query [3]-38:10, | 119:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recently [3] - 40:5, } \\ & 84: 26,195: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 171:15, 172:5, |  |
| 147:5, 166:10 questioned [1] | reached [1] - 101:8 reaction [1] - 74:23 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 172:18, 173:5, 182:3, } \\ & 182: 9,202: 2,202: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 19,59: 1,65: 27 \\ & 66: 7,75: 15,122: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| $117: 19$ |  | recipient [1] - 24:4 | reference [24] - 9:5, |  |
| questions [7] | read [15] - 17:5, 22:5, | recital [1] - 142:21 | $9: 13,11: 1,12: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 127: 17,183: 4 \\ & 184: 28,195: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| 80:23, 95:2, 113:12, | 65:9, 108:17, 118:9, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reclassifications [1] } \\ & -160: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 39:4, 48:11, 48:13, |  |
| 117:21, 132:24, |  |  |  | regards [2] - 87:18, |
| 141:25, 179:13 quick [1] - 132:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:24, 149:5, } \\ & \text { 150:28, 174:20, 175:5 } \end{aligned}$ | reclassified ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ $196: 2$ | 62:5, 64:8, 85:11, <br> 85:26, 86:15, 97:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87:24 } \\ & \text { region }[6]-30: 13, \\ & 87: 6,145: 27,150: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| quickly [3] - 85:4, | 150:28, 174:20, 175:5 <br> reading [3] - 15:20, | 196:2 recognise [8] - 6:22, | 112:16, 117:23, |  |
| 91:27, 167:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 64: 29,178: 6 \\ & \text { real }[4]-33: 5,33: 7, \end{aligned}$ |  | 123:7, 150:24, 156:2, | 87:6, 145:27, 150:10, $155: 3,187: 19$ |
| quiet [1] - 79:13 |  | $7: 1,7: 2,70: 14,70: 15$ | 123:7, 150:24, 156:2, <br> 174:10, 185:4, 194:16 | Region [16] - 45:26, |
| QUINN [1] - 3:10 | $33: 8,133: 22$ | 74:15, 149:13, 149:16 recognised [1] - | referenced [10] - | 118:15, 127:14, |
| Quinn [3]-39:16, | realisation [1] - 78:3 <br> realise [4]-87:3, | 157:16 |  |  |
| 156:9, 157:19 |  |  | $69: 26,72: 4,74: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 138:1, 138:8, 140:6, } \\ & \text { 140:14, 140:27, } \end{aligned}$ |
| quite [10]-38:26, | $\begin{gathered} 89: 19,118: 12,126: 24 \\ \text { realised }[1]-88: 16 \end{gathered}$ | 88:2 | 78:27, 89:4, 115:20,$134: 13$ | 156:20, 156:22, |
| 39:20, 49:23, 50:7, |  | recognition [1] - |  |  |
| $59: 22,80: 6,97: 10,$ | reality [4]-10: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:1 } \\ & \text { recollect }[1]-198: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { references [4]-30:1, } \\ & 31: 26,39: 14,91: 9 \end{aligned}$ | regional [2] - 147:1, |
| 146:3, 151:24 | really [14] - 10:17, |  |  |  |
| R |  | recollection [12] - | referencing [7] 13:19, 16:16, 16:28, 29:3, 36:29, 118:18, | 153:3 <br> regions [3] - 200:12, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 6,22: 23,64: 19 \\ & 85: 10,85: 11,92: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 41:20, 61:12, 64:21, |  | 200:15 |
| -35 | 94:17, 97:23, 149:21, |  | 128:2 | registers [1] - 154:27 |
| 145:3, 147:5, 157:26 | 155:2, 159: | 155:18, 167:14 | referred [ı3] 7:11, | REGISTRAR [1] - 2:5 |
| raised [25] - 9:19, | 162:17, 195:28 | $168: 11,201: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 85:28, 114:7, 117:20, } \\ & 130: 22,130: 23, \end{aligned}$ | regretted ${ }^{[1]}$ - 40:24 <br> regular [2]-7:29, |









[^0]:    "And once I have his decision lill communi cate with you further."

