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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVS, ON MDNDAY, 29TH J UNE 2020:

CHA RMAN Good morning. Can you hear me, Mr. McGuinness?

MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes, Chairman, thank you.
CHA RMAN Very good. I was going to say, I'm not sure how to say this, but it's nice to see people and it's nice to be back. But just before we start, I was going to say that the reason we're able to do this is in
large part due to the efforts of our office Manager, Mr. Barnes. So take a bow, Mr. Barnes, for the arrangements that we have here. okay. Now, thanks very much.
MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, the witness today is
Mr. John Barrett.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGUNNESS: Just before I ask him to commence his evidence, I was going to just inform members, colleagues who are here, for technical reasons, that the order of cross-examination after I finish, it will go to Garda Keogh's team then to ask what questions they may, and I think before they wish to do that, they wish to consult with Mr. Kelly, who is tuning in and listening from London, their leader in the matter; it
will then go to the Garda síochána team behind me, where Mr. McGuinness will be dealing with the matter; and then it will go to Assistant Commissioner Fanning's team, if there is any questions to be asked; and then
go to Mr. Barrett's team, where Mr. Clarke is appearing for Mr. Barrett, instructed by Mr. McTiernan; and then back to me for re-examination. I just say that because it is in ease of the cameraman as well.

CHAN RMAN Very good.
MR. MEGI NNESS: That he will follow that sequence. CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Nobody has any objection to that I'm sure, that seems perfectly reasonable. MR. MEGU NNESS: If I can ask Mr. Barrett to come forward.

CHA RMAN where is Mr. Barrett? Thanks very much Mr. Barrett. Good morning.

MR. J OHN BARRETT, HAV NG BEEN SUDRN, WAS DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY MR MEGU NNESS, AS FQLOVS:

THE WTNESS: John Barrett.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Sit down, Mr. Barrett.
MR. MEGU NESS: I should also say, chairman, that
Mr. Barrett's statement is to be found at volume 56 at page 15960 of the Tribunal papers. Good morning, Mr. Barrett.
A. Good morning, Mr. McGuinness.

1 Q. Mr. Barrett, you joined An Garda Síochána as a civilian at a stage of its development where there was an increase in civilisation of the force, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

2 Q. I think you became the first civilian executive
director in An Garda Síochána with responsibility for Human Resources and development?
A. That's correct.

3 Q.
A. Following graduation from UCC, I joined IBEC, the Irish Business Employers Confederation, as it is now, it was the FUE back then, as a labour law industrial relations negotiator and adviser to industry. I spent six years there. Then I joined in succession two companies that I had advised who were on my case list; Full flex Internationa1, a US multinational company, and thereafter a company called Walsh western International. I was the group director of HR at Walsh Western. I joined one of our customers, Stratus Computer, a Boston based multinational US organisation. They in turn were taken over by a company called Send Communications of California, which in turn was taken over by Lewison Technologies, and through that I had increasing ranges of responsibility for Ireland and Europe.

After that I joined Millipore Corporation in Strasbourg as European head of HR and deputy general manager for Europe. Then I became European head of HR for applied to Silicone Valley in California, where I headed up mergers and acquisitions for the organisation.
4 Q. Yes. I think after that, you came back to Ireland then?
A. Yes.

5 Q. And applied successfully for the position of executive director?
A. Correct.

6 Q. I think you took up your position on 3rd October of 2014?
A. Yes.

7 Q. Obviously a number of events had happened prior to your arrival, but you must have been familiar with them obviously, the departure of Commissioner callinan?
A. Yes.

8 Q. I think Deputy Commissioner o'Sullivan had been appointed as acting commissioner after his departure. She was then appointed formally as Commissioner in her own right. I think, did that happen before your arrival?
A. She was acting commissioner on my arrival.

9 Q. On your arrival. But she was appointed shortly thereafter?
A. Yes.

10 Q. As executive director, could you just give us an overview of what your responsibilities were at that point in time and for what?
A. The intention at the time in appointing a civilian was that the organisation would begin a process of renewal and change, that there would be significant investment in the functions in my area, which included recruitment and selection of staff, the office of professional
standards, garda Internal Affairs, the office of the chief medical officers, all matters relating to internal competitions, industrial relations and the management of employee relations generally for both civilians and guards, the Garda College in Templemore and a range of policy areas under each of those.
11 Q. Yes. I think the employee relations, that encompassed bullying and harassment and grievance procedures?
A. Yes, it did.

12 Q.
I think your responsibilities also covered, as part of the employment issues, sick pay and matters related to that, sickness?
A. That's correct. That is for the Garda force and for civilians.
13 Q.
Did payroll management come under that, under your watch?
A. Tangentially in that it is managed by a central payroll function for the entire civil service based in killarney.
14 Q. Yes. We will come to aspects of that in due course, but your arrival then in October 2014, Sergeant McCabe had been identified as a Garda who made protected disclosures at that stage, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

15 Q. I think you were appointed by the Commissioner as a point of contact with Sergeant McCabe, was that from February 2015 onwards?
A. Correct.

16 Q. Had you met him prior to that?
A. No, not prior to that.

17 Q. In terms of Garda Keogh with whom the Tribunal is dealing now at this point, what was your awareness of Garda Keogh's position, when you joined and then shortly after?
A. I had no awareness prior to joining and really no awareness in any material way until about 2016. My engagement with Sergeant McCabe was a unique appointment by the Commissioner. It essentially made me the protected disclosures managers for dealing with Sergeant McCabe. In the case of the response to the 2014 Act, the Commissioner appointed two protected disclosure managers, Alan Mulligan and Chief Superintendent McLough1in in those particular roles, for civilians and guards respectively.
18 Q. Now, Mr. Mulligan and Chief Superintendent McLough1in, they were effectively working under you, is that right?
A. They were.

19 Q. But were they reporting to you in relation to their management of protected disclosures from that period
on?
A. No, that's an important distinction, sir. The matters of protected disclosures are dealt with, it's quite an independent brief within a delegation from the Commissioner essentially to act as a PD manager. And to do so, the reporting line is directly to the Commissioner.

20 Q. So you have no oversight or, as it were, responsibility, as such, for the management of those?
A. No.

21 Q. And were you or would you have been briefed as to the identity of anyone or any issues?
A. Specifically no, and I wouldn't have asked in the circumstances if it was not in the public domain. Protected disclosures managers effectively would have had responsibility to be recipients of protected disclosures in situations where they had arisen within the organisation. They would become investigators and managers of that investigation. They become protectors 10:40 under part 3 of the Act and they obviously communicate with the discloser on an ongoing basis, keeping them briefed on progress on their disclosure.
22 Q. Yes. We will see later in 2016 a debate about work related stress.
A. Yes.

23 Q. Two particular guards who were out on sick pay, Garda Y, who is not Garda Keogh, but Garda X -- sorry, I have it the other way round. Garda $Y$ was another guard and Garda $X$ was Garda Keogh, is that correct?
A. I don't know the designations of the Xs and Ys in this particular --

CHA RMAN There were two gardaí -- is it okay, can you hear me?

THE WTNESS: Surely, sir, yeah.
CHA RMAN There were two who in respect of whom there were issues about work related stress; is that right? That was my understanding.

MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.

CHA RMAN One was Garda Keogh and the other wasn't Garda Keogh. It doesn't matter whether he was X or Y or $z$ or anything else, all we need to know is that one was Garda Keogh and one wasn't Garda Keogh.
THE WTNESS: okay.
CHA RMAN Is that right?
MR. MEGI NESS: Yes, but it is in the context where Ms. Nugent met Garda $X$ at a stage in 2016.
CHAN RMAN She met the other officer.
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN The other garda.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN Okay. Ms. Nugent met the other idea.
24 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: Yes. I just want to be clear at the beginning, you had met Sergeant McCabe some time in February 2015?
A. For the first time, yes.

25 Q. Immediately after your appointment, I think?
A. I was there since October '14.

26 Q. Yes. When was the first time that you met Garda Keogh?
A. I met him only once in my official capacity and that was on 15th December 2017.

27 Q. We will come back to that in due course. But the Tribunal has heard that Garda Keogh, as a result of sick absences, had gone into a period of what's called TRR?
A. Correct.

28 Q. I think you understand what that means?
A. Yes.

29 Q. Is that where his absences had exceeded 183 days, it had an effect on his pay?
A. Yes.

30 Q. And in April of 2014, following a meeting with his superintendent, Superintendent Murray, he was referred to the Chief Medical Officer, inter alia. I just want you to help me with your, either, involvement or knowledge at that stage. So could I ask you to turn to page 3272 , which is in volume 11 of our books. It should be there on your left-hand side. You are free to look at them either on the screen or in hard copy there. I'm not sure if they are coming up on our screens in front of us.
CHAN RMAN Is it on your screen, Mr. Barrett?
A. I am seeing "Wel come to Dubl in Castle".

MR. MEGU NNESS: A picture of Dublin Castle.
THE WTNESS: I have the letter, Chairman.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN Certain7y I am seeing "Wel come to Dubl in
Castle". If we can do it reasonably quick1y, well and good, if not we will carry on. Carry on, Mr. McGuinness. If anybody has a problem, just let us know.

MR. MEGI NNESS: Yes. We have seen this document before.

CHA RMAN Of course, yes.
MR. MEGU NNESS: It is a report from chief Superintendent wheatley dated 7th Apri1 2015. CHA RMAN Ah yes, I know the one.

MR. MEGI NNESS: It is directed to executive director HRPD, sick report Garda Nicholas Keogh, Athlone Garda Station. It refers to correspondence from Superintendent Murray, which was his report of the 2nd April. Just to read the substantive paragraph in the midd1e, it says:
"As outlined in the attached correspondence, Superintendent Murray bel ieves that Garda Keogh would benefit fromthis referral to the Chi ef Medical Officer 10:45 as he has frequent si ckness absences occurring in haphazard fashi on. The referral to the medical officer may assist in provi ding additional workpl ace supports for the nember who has indi cated work rel ated stress as a source for his absence."
A. Yes.

31 Q. Now, I don't think I need to open Superintendent Murray's report, but it came following a meeting that he had with Garda Keogh at the end of March, there was a referral up with medical certificates and so forth. But that on its face appears to be directed to your office, is that right?
A. That's right.

32 Q. Would that have come to you?
A. Truthfully, I have no recollection of this letter, I think it was responded to by Alan Mulligan, if I reading the succession correspondence. I get correspondence like this all of the time, but I would
put it to the relevant section and that would have gone down to Alan, and then on to perhaps the folks in Athlumney House in Navan.
Yes. I mean, if we do look on the next page, Mr. Mulligan deals with it, he dealt with it in the interim, but he deals with it slightly later and at this point, but he is referring then back to the chief superintendent in the second paragraph, saying:
"You should now interviewthis menber in order to establish the source of the member's stress and if it is suggested as bei ng work rel ated stress a full investigation shoul d be carried out."
A. Yes.
Q. Yes.
A. And so, it was elevated at chief superintendent level and Alan dealt with it in accordance with the policy, which is what he states here.
Q. yes.
A. It's for the chief to determine whether or not there is a causal link. Historically, Chairman, and I am saying this only to be helpful to the Tribunal, injury on duty, which is matter in the Garda Code dealt with at 11.37, I think you dealt with this in the course of your inquiries.

Yes.
A. It was always considered very simple blunt force injury on duty kind of concept. With the development of medical science around Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and PTSD generally and it being a real issue, work related stress was given some consideration. There was a working group set up to give consideration to how that would be dealt with.
Q. Yes.
A. I think Chief Superintendent McLough1in was originally involved in drafting a HQ Directive, which put the onus on the chief superintendents to ensure that they carried out the enquiries at local level as to whether or not there was a link between an issue of work related stress and work.
A. Yes.
part of that effort generally to ensure that there is enquiries made.
41 Q. Yes. Could I just ask you then to look at another report from Chief superintendent wheatley, dated 27th April 2015. It's at page 3716 in the next volume. I will have to ask you to switch to volume 13 there. chief Superintendent wheatley had been in possession of a report from Superintendent McLoughlin, that we needn't look at, it referred to further absences of Garda Keogh, further medical certificates citing work related stress. Chief wheatley is writing here again and looking for an expedited review. Again, it's directed to you but does that ring a bell at all or would it have been dealt with by Mr. Mulligan?
A. It would have been dealt with, there is a process by which these matters are routinely dealt with.

42 Q. Yes, okay. We know in any event that the review was expedited and a date was fixed for the 19th May. Would you have been informed of the outcome of that review, whether the member was being certified as fit or otherwise?
A. I have no recollection of being informed that he was fit or otherwise. But in the normal course I would see these things in statistical form.
43 Q. Yes.
A. We would track across the organisation data by grade, by region, but rather than at name level. So I wouldn't have been, you know, aware that this was Garda Keogh. I would have been watching the trend across the
organisation.
44 Q. Yes.
A. Single day absence, pattern absence, civilian absence versus garda absence, absence by rank, absence by region.
Q. Yes. If we turn in the same volume then to page 3719, this is written to you explicitly at that time by Dr. Oghuvbu?
A. Yes.

This is obviously in the context of an intended appointment, but he has written back in relation to Mr. Mulligan's letter, which is in initial referral, which is referred to in the documents. But he is writing back to you explicitly there.
A. Yes.
A. It would be a matter of form. His superior at the time was Dr. Donal Collins, who was the Chief Medical officer.
Q. Yes.
A. Doctor Collins sat on my staff and was particularly careful to manage both confidentiality and thorough reporting. So I am sure he would have named various people at that point in time. I don't recall the letter, frankly.

49 Q. Yes.
A. But I would place a high degree of confidence that Donal Collins would have made some reference to it.
Q. Yes. I think that's a fairly standard form as to what
is required to be done?
A. Yes.

51 Q. The appointment date is fixed and then there is an onus on local management to explain the purpose of it?
A. In the exception, I attended a number of case conferences of a medical nature, but by and large I wouldn't. These case conferences would be attended by staff from Athlumney House who administer sick pay and related benefits and generally there are -- there's a decision tree which would go from, if you like, the operational side and it would elevate to me by exception.

Yes.
A. And I think that's ultimately what happened in September of '16, when the issue of pay with respect to Garda Keogh was brought to my attention.
Yes. But a slightly different question and focus now. Obviously Chief Superintendent wheatley has written up, drawing attention to the work related stress as a possible source of the absence, the superintendent has
forwarded the original referral and supporting documentation and then there's further documentation coming in, including actual reports from his own doctor certifying him out with work related stress. when it is now going to the doctor at this stage, would you have expected the doctor, without an investigation report locally, to assess a member for work related stress?
A. Doctors routinely -- we have three doctors, routinely
assess people for all kinds of reasons.
54 Q. Yes.
A. So that would be, you know, any day you would walk to the surgery there would be a queue of people waiting to see one or other of the doctors. That's a routine
matter. It happens all the time. As do those case conferences I describe, wherein consideration is given to how pattern absentees, for example, are dealt with, or people with particular conditions arising from accidents or injury on duty.

55 Q. Yes. Obviously Mr. Mulligan, we have seen one of the first letters I asked you to look at, writing back to chief wheatley looking for an investigation into work related stress. From your point of view, do you regard a report of that investigation as a necessary prerequisite for the doctor to go about assessing whether there is work related stress?
A. Not necessarily, No. I mean, the doctors are a tremendous resource, both for advice and for diagnosis. So, there aren't strict preconditions which would guide the engagement of a doctor. Donal Collins in particular at that time would have been urging chief superintendents throughout the divisions to reach out and be proactive with respect to people who, for example, had addiction problems or who had, you know, psychological issues. He was hugely proactive in that space. So there was an effort to be of assistance.

56 Q. Yes. Mr. Mulligan was met with the reply from chief wheatley dated 26th May 2015. Again, it's technically
addressed to you. It's at page 3276 in volume 11. 3276. She is reflecting a report from Superintendent Murray, which we don't need to go into, but she summarises it there in the second paragraph:
"As outlined in the attached correspondence, the district officer Athl one advi ses that he cannot further expl ore the reasons for the menber's alleged stress as the nember is not willing to further discuss the issue which he states arising out of his invol vement and protections under the confidential reporting I egi sl at i on. "

Now, that appears to be the first mention in writing --
A. Yes.

57 Q. -- of the link, as it were, between Garda Keogh, his absences, possible work related stress issues, medical certificate and then this impediment, as it were, to the investigation. First of all, just a question, to get it out of the way, you presumably didn't get this or if you did it would have been referred on in the usual way?
A. It was referred on in the usual way. I mean, the difficulty in the sense, in advance of the Covid break I read quite an amount of this material.
58 Q. Yes.
A. So I have a perception of it, but at the time I can certainly say this would not have been something I would have engagement with.
Q. Yes.
A. Conscious also, you know, I have read carefully the examination of Chief Superintendent McLough1in and, you know, he was actively engaged with his role as protected disclosures manager after this. The original 10:59 complaint, as I understand it, Chairman, from Garda Keogh was made under the old currency of the confidential recipient.
A. So I think you're in a nether land time here between

Chief Superintendent McLough1in's appointment and -we're post obviously the Act but we're pre the appointment.
61 Q. Yes.
A. This is the first time also $I$ would have noted that in my reading of this material now, as opposed to then. Yes. I mean, it is perhaps unfair to look back with total 20/20 vision, but this issue here of the linkage, it did give rise to the problem that you attempted to resolve with Chief Superintendent McLough1in a year later, the inability to actually have an 11.37 investigation. But I am just wondering, looking back, do you accept perhaps that this should have been picked up at the time in some way?
A. We11, it was dealt with, I think, again, and I fully 11:00 accept your 20/20 hindsight issue, because I have been trying to identify the same difficulty.
63 Q. Yes.
A. Yes, the onus -- let's be clear about this, the onus
rests on the chief superintendent to conduct an investigation. That's what the HQ Directive says. I think Chief wheatley made certain efforts and we can see from the correspondence that those efforts did not reach conclusion.

64 Q. Yes.
A. A year on, as you said, I had to make a decision in this matter.
Q. Yes.
A. And I decided in favour of Garda Keogh, and I think properly so.
66 Q. We11, we will come to that obviously. I think perhaps it may be the case that it certainly didn't become a financial issue, because Garda keogh at this point was certified fit for work.
A. Correct.

67 Q. And went back to work. And he wasn't necessarily then, at that stage, tripping into TRR?
A. Correct.

68 Q. There may not have been, as it were, the financial hardship arising from this issue as such?
A. I think your point that this had potentially a flag element to it is correct.
69 Q. Just going forward to later in the year, there were various absences from work by Garda Keogh throughout
later 2015. Superintendent Murray was seeking a further referral and a case conference. A case conference took place in relation to Garda keogh and the doctor I think wrote to you again. If we look at
page 3751 in Volume 13. Again, is that pretty standard form there?
A. Absolutely, yeah. Yeah. And the response to it looks very standard also, yes.
70 Q.
Yes. Now, we know from Dr. Oghuvbu, his own evidence, he saw Garda Keogh and Garda Keogh produced a document in terms of a list to him and talked him through different issues that he had at work relating to his superintendent and his employers. But ultimately he reported to you on the 8th January. If we look at page 11:03 3750 in the same book there. If we look at the top there. It's addressed to you directly, as it were. would that have come past you or would it have been automatically referred on by your office?
A. It would have been automatically referred on.

71 Q. Pardon?
A. It's a report of a consultation, yeah. Yes. Now, he refers there to issues relating to his work, workplace accommodations adjustments there in the last paragraph. In the first page paragraph:
"Agai nst a background of reported issues in the workpl ace or associ at ed work..."

Would you expect -- although he is respecting his obligation of medical confidentiality, he is signalling something there? would you expect that to have been picked up upon by someone in your office or by someone to whom this report was referred on?
A. Yeah, I think the -- I am looking at the letter. I haven't studied this correspondence before. The answer is yes in general terms, I would have expected that people would have responded or picked up on this. You know, inappropriate use of alcohol", "workpl ace or associ ated", yeah, "issues", I would have expected that would raised a flag, yes.
73 Q. Obviously the doctor there isn't engaging in any discussion about whether there is work related stress or what his own doctor is certifying, but would you expect if there is a query raised with the doctor about how he was being medically clarified, that perhaps best practice might have been important?
A. Mr. McGuinness, this is new to me in the sense that I haven't seen this document before. But I would very much expect and I would be surprised if there wasn't a follow through from some other part of the organisation with respect to this correspondence.
74 Q. Yes.
A. I don't know if it's there.

75 Q. CHA RMAN which section would you be looking for, Mr. Barrett.
A. I would expecting that the sick and absence section, sir, would be the appropriate people to deal with it.
76 Q. CHAL RMAN who is in charge of that section?
A. Monica Carr led that section in Athlumney house. It is a significant team of people.
Q. CHAL RMAN Yes.
A. All familiar with both the regulations and, you know,
engaging with the office of CMO and Dr. Oghuvbu, who worked for Donal collins at the time and was part of that team.

78 Q. CHA RMAN So the sickness and absence section?
A. Yes.

79 Q. CHA RMAN Is that, so to speak, the SAMS section?
A. Well SAMS is the system that they use.

80 Q. CHA RMAN okay. So the sickness and absence section in Athlumney House in Navan, they should have picked up on this?
A. I think so, yes.

81 Q. CHA RMN was it said to them?
A. I would assume it was.

MR. MtGU NESS: Yes.
A. I would assume it was.

82 Q. CHAD RMAK How would we know whether it was or not?
A. Because my office would generally forward it there, in -- they maintain files on -- it's from them that I get the statistics with respect to numbers of people absent by region etcetera.
83 Q. CHAL RMAN So this comes to your office?
A. It does.

84 Q. CHA RMAN And who deals with it?
A. My clerical staff would deal with this in the normal way. It would normally be then sent for Alan In 2015 Alan may have been in fact heading up Athlumney House at that point.
85 Q. MR. MEGM NESS: Yes. If we look at some further
correspondence. I mean, at this point in time Garda Keogh was, I don't say permanently absent, but he was certified as unfit on the basis of work related stress from his own doctor from the beginning now of 2016 onwards, just if we are looking forward from that date. 11:07 If we look at page 3744, Ms. Carr there.
A. Yes.

This is again volume 13. Ms. Carr has scheduled him for review. So that process has kicked in at that point in time?
A. Yes.
A. Yes.

88 Q. Normal procedure. If we then look about the appointment, the chief superintendent is written to, at 11:08 3747. That letter, if we go to 3747 , issued then to the chief superintendent. That would appear to have issued on foot of a letter from the doctor to you, if we look at 3748?
A. Yes.

89 Q. Again, it's addressed to you directly. He refers back to his earlier, as it were, formal report after the -would that be standard procedure?
A. It would be. This is Monica Carr identifying herself. Essentially it's under my style and title as executive 11:09 director, but to the sickness and absence section. She was at the time heading up that part of the Athlumney operation, as well as being the director there at the time, she was doing two jobs.

90 Q. Yes. Now, Garda Keogh's evidence is that he raised an issue of misclassification with the doctor at the December consultation and then it raised its head again at the consultation on 19th May 2016, that Garda Keogh attended. He also gave evidence, the doctor gave evidence that he actually received and took a copy of a script which was headed "har assment index" on that date. But in the interim, Chief Superintendent wheatley had written to you again on 18th May 2016, which as it turned out was the day before the appointment was fulfilled. But if we look at page 3203 in volume 11. She is referring to an earlier report from Superintendent Murray, who is keeping her up-to-date. She also says:
"I have al so on today's date visited the member at his home to enquire into his wel fare and well being. I enqui red as to the probability of himreturning to work in the future and was advi sed by Garda Keogh that his current absence is attri butable to work rel ated stress arising from his invol vement in investigations being progressed outsi de the West meath di vision. Garda Keogh intimated he would not be returning to work until these matters had been concl uded as these matters were exacerbating his conditions.

Garda Keogh stated that he would be attending the schedul ed appoi nt ment with the Chi ef Medical Officer on the 19th May and informed me that he was engaging with
the Empl oyee Assi stance Service. Upon Garda Keogh's resumption to duty l will ensure that a full i nvesti gation is conducted to establ ish the source of the member's alleged work rel ated stress and if same can be attributed to his absence."

Is that correspondence that would you have seen at that point?
A. I think it's about that point that I became aware that we had a difficult problem to address.
Q. Yes.
A. I think that is the first occasion I think I list in my own chronology attached to my own statement.
92 Q. I mean, it does raise issue and I am wondering whether one could regard it as topsy-turvey in the sense that the member is out sick --
A. Yeah.

93 Q. -- allegedly due to work related stress, he is saying there can't be a work related stress investigation, in a sense, and that he wouldn't be returning to work until his investigations had taken place. And on the other hand, the chief superintendent is saying that she won't be able to or won't be conducting a work related stress until he returns to duty. Did you see that as a Catch 22?
A. Yes.
A. I think that's a fair comment.
Q. And can I ask you to express a view as to what you
think the way out at this point perhaps might have been?
A. At this point in time $I$ had a conversation, at least one that I can remember with Tony McLoughlin, Chief Superintendent McLoughlin, about this. Because having been the author of the policy, he was very anxious -or the author of the HQ Directive, he was very anxious that the division would conduct this particular review and he, I think, concludes about this time or shortly thereafter that this is, as you describe it, a Catch 22 $11: 13$ situation.

96 Q. Yes. Now, I don't think -- subject to what you may tell me, Garda Keogh had written to the Minister on the 16th May. If we look at page 3296.
A. 3296 .

97 Q. He is making a final point there. You saw this letter later in the year I think?
A. Yes.
Q. It was referred at a later stage. Garda keogh is making many points in the letter but this is one to the 11:15 minister about the penalisation issue. I think you became aware that Superintendent McLoughlin spoke to Garda Keogh on the phone on the 20th?
A. Yes.

99 Q. They had a second conversation then on the 23rd, where Chief Superintendent McLoughlin gave an undertaking to look at the misclassification issue?
A. Correct.

100 Q. Isn't that correct? Did you become aware yourself that

Garda Keogh's SAMS record was changed then at that point in time from ordinary illness flu/viral to mental health?
A. That's correct, I was informed of that.

101 Q. Superintendent McLough1in met Garda Keogh then on the 3rd June and he was given a copy of the harassment index, did you discuss that with you?
A. Not until afterwards, he met him, as I understand it now, in Tullamore with the employment assistance
officer who was supporting Garda Keogh in that period. Yes.
A. Michae1 Quinn, Garda Michae1 Quinn.

103 Q. He did express the wish at that meeting also that the classification would be changed from mental health and enquired about whether it should be in fact certified as injury on duty?
A. Yes.
Q. I think you became aware of that at that point?
A. So, in ease of the Tribunal's understanding of these matters, you may very well have covered this in fine detail already, so just to reiterate, injury on duty is a designation under the Code where effectively a chief superintendent has the Authority to determine that somebody's absence through injury has arisen because of their duties. And effectively, an 11.37 maintains the pay and benefits levels of that member at a full level on an ongoing basis for a period of time.
Q. Yes.
A. Normally it's reviewable, within quarterly or whatever
time horizons were set, depending on the nature of the injury. In parallel, at about this time, counsel, there's a working group looking at the matters I referred to earlier, as to whether or not an 11.37 is a suitable way to deal with stress/post traumatic injury. 11:17 And that is also seeking to progress some kind of definitions on this matter. The chief did not seek to address this by way of 11.37 , is my understanding.
106 Q. Yes. We know that Chief Superintendent McLoughlin went back to Chief Superintendent wheatley to say was an investigation done?
A. Yes.

107 Q. And she replied, repeating the previous explanation?
A. Yes.

108 Q. That seems to have been accepted or was there a discussion between yourself and Chief Superintendent McLough1in about that issue?
A. Well, Chief Superintendent McLoughlin advised me that he was very uncomfortable with the fact that we couldn't ground it upon the kind of investigation that would normally be the practice in circumstances like this.

109 Q. okay. In any event, he addressed the e-mail to Ms. Carr and also to you on the 4th June. If we could look at bottom of page 9695 , which is in volume 34 , it should be there beside you. At the bottom of the page the e-mail commences, the last few lines, and if we go on then to page 9696, it refers there to two Gardaí. Garda $Y$ is Garda Keogh, Garda $X$ is another garda. And
it notes the CMO's position then in relation to both of them, it notes that both of them are on reduced pay. It says in the fourth line:
"The investigation of work rel at ed stress allegations are ongoing and are likel y to be complicated. "

Now that's not accurate as far as Garda keogh is concerned, isn't that correct?
A. Sorry, what page are you on, Mr. McGuinness?

110 Q. The e-mail starts at the very bottom of 9695 and it goes on to the next page?
A. Okay. And the fourth line?

111 Q. The fourth sentence, the fourth paragraph, as it were?
A. Fourth paragraph. Yeah.

112 Q. Do you think it is the case that chief Superintendent McLoughlin was anticipating that there was going to be an investigation or that --
A. I can't say. It's imprecise.

113 Q. In any event, he expresses a view that it's urgent and that at a minimum the pay status should not change without personal contact being made with the members concerned. And then it concludes by saying:
"This requires urgent attention. My recommendation is 11:21 that a mechani smbe found for pay not to be reduced while matters are under consideration."

You got that, I take it?
A. Yes.

114 Q. Mr. Downey replies, if we go back to 9695, and then Chief McLough1in replies to Mr. Downey and it is copied just to you and the chief is saying:
"A change of mindset requi red here."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do. And I think the concluding sentences are important.

115 Q. Yes.
A. I would be at one with the chief on that.

116 Q. Yes. In any event, if we look at 9687 in the same volume, you're copied in on all of this these?
A. Yes.

117 Q. I don't think we need to go through them, but I just want to confirm that you're aware of them?
A. I am aware of the deliberations of the committee. I sat in on several of its meetings because this was regarded as an important matter.
118 Q. Yes. We saw from Chief McLough1in's opening one, he thought it was a good idea to meet with both?
A. Yes.

119 Q. If we see at 9692, it appears that Ms. Nugent met Garda X, who is not Garda Keogh, that afternoon. If we go to 11:23 9684, we see that same e-mail, it goes up to Ms. Carr?
A. Yes.

120 Q. And then there is a process proposed by Ms. Egan?
A. Yes.
Q. Which was a general draft proposal, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then it goes from Ms. Carr back up to Ms. Nugent, including you. And then, at the top is your e-mail to everyone else, saying:

"Thi s is a special case. There needs to be a restoration of full pay for Garda X."

I am just wondering where Garda Keogh is Garda Y, was there some distinction being made at the time there?
A. These cases were decided contrary to the arrangements for pay generally.
Q. Yes.
A. And the decision taken was, and I am not altogether
clear who Garda X is, but any changes made at that time with respect to altering TRR or injury on duty arrangements would have to be recommended by me to the Commissioner.
Q. By you?
A. Yes.
Q. That's why I am wondering, you had been briefed by Chief Superintendent McLoughlin, who had met Garda Keogh --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and had a number of phone calls with him. There was confirmation that Chief Superintendent wheatley hadn't in fact conducted a work related stress investigation?
A. That's correct.

127 Q. It appears to have been ongoing in relation to the other officer. I am just wondering, was there not a logic to take the same decision in relation to each of them at the same time?
A. We took a decision at a later stage, I think it is delayed by two or so months from this date.
Q. Yes.
A. I think it's September, Mr. McGuinness, that the decision was taken with respect to Garda Keogh.
129 Q. Yes. Now, I mean, in fairness, I do want to note that the doctor's report was still awaited. And that was sent to you on the 10th June. was that a factor, do you think, involved; that you were waiting for the doctor?
A. I am sure it was a factor. But whether it was a determining factor or not, $I$ can't say. Quite frankly, I am not familiar with these papers in a way that perhaps I should be.
130 Q. In any event, that is your decision in relation to the other guard?
A. Yes, with the approval obviously of the Commissioner.
Q. Yes. Well, could we see what Chief Superintendent wheatley wrote to you on the 8th June, it's at 3266.
A. Yeah.

132 Q. Back in volume 11. She had sent e-mails back in the period we have just been looking at, the 4th/5th June. But this is a more formal report.
A. Yes, I think this was requested by Tony, Chief Superintendent McLough1in.

133 Q. So she is setting out -- if we go on to page 3267 , the report commences there.
A. I have it.

134 Q. In the second paragraph she recites the current position and in the fourth line she says:
"Efforts are being made locally to establish the source of the member's alleged work rel ated stress. However the member is rel uctant to di scuss the matter as he indi cated that it arises out of matters whi ch he has reported through the confidential reporting mechanism, matters whi ch he does not want to di scuss with management within the di vi sion."

She then refers to Superintendent Murray's meeting with 11:28 him on the 26th March and she tabs a report. On the next page she tabs further reports. She seems to be satisfied that Superintendent Murray has made the necessary enquiries, in the middle of that page, 3268. At the bottom of page 3268 she says:

[^0]She refers to the different correspondence there. Page 3269, in the middle she says:
"He hasn't i ndi cated there were inci dents."

Then her conclusion is at the bottom of that page, if we scroll down to the final paragraph. She seems to be saying effectively that it hasn't proved possible to conduct a full investigation and she doesn't believe any further or specific information be provided by Garda Keogh which would enable the further investigation.
"However, and to be clear and to avoid any doubt, I am to enquire if there is any requirement to further i nvesti gate Garda Keogh's absence through alleged work rel ated stress. In the event that further investigation of this matter is warranted, l would recommend that permission be granted to appoint an i nspector outsi de the West meath di visi on to conduct same. "

So, in a sense she is saying the division now can't do it, and I am telling you they can't do it and are you requiring me to do it, and if you are not going to do that would you get somebody else appointed. Do you recollect was there any discussion between yourself and Chief Superintendent McLough1in about getting an outside officer in to try and break the impasse?
A. There was. The discussion centred around the meeting that Chief Superintendent McLough1in had had five days earlier with Garda Keogh in person at the Tullamore Court Hotel. I think there's confirmation of that meeting, at which chief McLoughlin described himself essentially as the single point of contact going forward. I think also Garda Keogh recorded in a letter to the Minister on the 14th June, if I am not mistaken, that Chief Superintendent McLough1in undertook to investigate matters.
135 Q. Yes. If we look at the doctor's report then at 3741. This is sent to you by name. Do you recall getting this?
A. Mr. McGuinness, can you advise me, 3741? This is Volume 34?
Q. No, I am sorry, Mr. Barrett, we're back to Volume 13? A. 13, my apologies. I have it now.

137 Q. It's obviously in the context of this point in time. It's after the decision has been made about the other guard being restored to full pay. Then the doctor's report becomes available on the 10th and it's sent to you, it would appear. Would you recollect getting that?
A. No, I don't.

138 Q. okay.
A. I would have seen these letters by exception. But I would have had a discussion with Chief McLough1in in the case but $I$ don't remember this letter specifically.

139 Q. Yes. In any event, in the last paragraph he says:
"In the context of ongoing background issues reportedly associ ated with the member's work whi ch appear to be having a si gni ficant negative effect on the menber's sense of well being and mai ntenance of same recommend a priority service is invol ving your office and the member's seni or di vi si onal management. This would facilitate el uci dation of reasonable and practicable support re workpl ace consi derations to foster his sust ai ned well being and effectiveness when a return to work becores feasi ble."

In any event, that was arranged and I take it you were informed of that at that time?
A. Yes, in normal course $I$ would be aware that these case conferences would be happening, the specific details being brought to my attention.
140 Q. Yes.
A. I understand a case conference did go ahead.

141 Q. I think the doctor reported the outcome of that to you
A. Sure, yeah.

142 Q. You became aware that there was a programme of treatment agreed upon?
A. Yes.

143 Q. And to some extent substantially funded as well; isn't that correct?
A. I would have approved that, yes. Chief McLough1in is acting at this point, as $I$ understand it, in his role
as protected disclosure manager.
144 Q. Yes.
A. So, I can identify between the lines here of what's actually being said by Dr. Oghuvbu, and I was aware of the generality that we were going to support a programme and we had made arrangements for its funding, as you said.
145 Q. Yes. Chief wheatley appeared to have been enquiring about the issue of an investigation, because she wrote again on 25th July 2016, if we look at page 3314?
A. Yeah.

146 Q. That's addressed to the chief superintendent, which is Chief Superintendent McLoughlin, isn't that correct?
A. Correct.

147 Q. She is restating the position there, but she is also 11:35 saying:
"Wile these matters have been reported on by this office in the past, a decision in respect of the further investigation of this matter has not been
recei ved at this office. Accordingly in the interest of providing clarity and to avoid any doubt, I amto enquire if an investigation into the alleged work rel ated stress Garda Keogh is to be carried out local Iy."

Now, Chief McLough1in wrote back, if we go back to page 3313. This is the response, he says:
"I wi sh to advi se that this correspondence shoul d be redi rected to the executive di rector, Human Resources and Peopl e Devel opment for the attention of Sick Section, Navan, who deal with this issues rel ating to si ck.

I al so wi sh to draw your attention to the Garda Code i nstructions on thi s matter."
A. That last sentence is important I think, Mr. McGuinness, in light of where the responsibility lay for conducting that investigation.
148 Q. Yes. But does 11.37 not require the divisional officer to do it rather than the Sick Section?
A. No, an 11.37 is a decision with respect to an injury on duty.

149 Q. Yes.
A. The instructions in this matter, the Garda Code reference there, I think is in relation to the investigation of the matter.
150 Q. Yes.
A. Which lay with, as far as Chief McLough1in, as I understand it, was concerned, that should have been conducted in the routine way in the first instance by Chief wheatley. Chief wheatley's position on this is she couldn't do it because Garda Keogh was out and he wasn't cooperative. I understand on the 3rd June, when Chief McLoughlin and Garda Quinn met with Garda Keogh in Tullamore, at that meeting I think there was a commitment that the chief would actually conduct some
form of investigation. But he is conscious of the fact, and I think he's correct in this regard, that the fundamental responsibility for managing the determination of this lay with Chief wheatley.
yes. I don't know whether you can comment on this, but 11:37 it doesn't appear that she was ever after this further request ever actually given an instruction to do it or told how she should go about it or whether an independent inspector or superintendent from some other division should do it?
A. I can't comment, I'm not that familiar with the correspondence trail.

152 Q. Yes. But can I ask you this question: If it did remain uninvestigated from that time to this, would you regard that as a fault in the system or an omission that ought not to have occurred?
A. We11, I can say that it was an outstanding matter at the time I came to consider the issue of pay.
153 Q. Yes.
A. In September.

154 Q. Yes. I am looking, as it were, beyond your own responsibility and credit for that obviously, but if it remained uninvestigated, would you regard that as a failure of the system?
A. Well it's certainly contrary to what the system suggests should have happened.

155 Q. CHAN RMAN Mr. Barrett, can you say, what was the question to be investigated?
A. I understand the question to be whether or not the
absence of Garda Keogh was caused by the stress that he alleged occurred at work.
Q. CHA RMAN By?
A. The work related stress.

CHA RMAN What does that actually mean. what was the question that somebody was going to say, right, let's get to the bottom of this?
A. Somebody would have had to determine was there a causal link between -- was there reason to believe that he was out on foot of the matters that he alleged occurred.

158 Q. CHA RMAK His doctor was certifying that he was suffering from work related stress?
A. Yes.

159 Q. CHA RMAN And that was the reason why he was absent. So, I am trying to understand, what was the nature of the investigation?
A. Well, there wasn't an investigation in any meaningful way.
160 Q. CHA RMAN No, but what was the nature of the investigation that was intended or supposed to be carried out?
A. Well, in the normal course, if it was --

161 Q. CHAN RMAN Do you understand me?
A. I do, I do.

162 Q. CHA RMAN I mean, I am wondering, was this something a 11:40 garda would undertake, something a doctor would undertake, something, $I$ don't know, a psychiatrist, a psychologist, what was the question they were trying to answer?
A. Normally in the course of these things it would be determined with reference to the CMO's office and by local garda management.
163 Q. CHA RMAN I mean, it's very simple: If somebody says, look, Garda Ryan and Garda Barrett were on the beat when people came up and beat them up, injury on duty, no problem?
A. Correct.

164 Q
CHA RMAN That's simple?
A. Yes.

165 Q. CHA RMAN As you say, it's more difficult if it's post traumatic stress or if it is of a psychological nature?
A. Yes.

166 Q. CHA RMAN That's not obvious, it's more difficult?
A. It is.

167 Q. CHA RMAN But I am just wondering, so suppose Chief Superintendent wheatley said, very good, I am going to either get somebody to do this or I am going to do it myself?
A. Correct.

168 Q. CHA RMAN Very good. One would think that she would explain to Garda Keogh, look, this is important, because of whatever other reason, it's important because your sick pay --
A. Exactly.

CHA RMAN -- is very much dependent on this, you're on a pension rate at the moment and your service is, so to speak, interrupted because you're not qualifying for pension and so on, all your entitlements. Here is a
big issue for you. So, you know, put him in the picture?
A. Correct.

170 Q. CHA RMAN Nobody seems to have done that?
A. Well, you're absolutely right, Chairman. In the normal 11:42 course across 41 divisions, there are adult to adult conversations, difficult things every day. And they normally work very we11. That's what I think Chief McLough1in was anticipating should happen in this particular case and that is what clearly didn't happen in this particular case.

CHA RMAN Yes.
171 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: Obviously without commenting, and this question isn't commenting on anyone's position, but it requires cooperation with the process in a sense?
A. Yes.

172 Q. And perhaps an exploration as to why people mightn't be prepared at any particular time to cooperate with the process. But ultimately, is it dependent on that, is it wholly dependent on that in your view?
A. We11, I credit Chief McLough1in for his meeting on the 3rd June, in that he opened a channel of dialogue directly with Garda Keogh. I understand from papers I have now read that he undertook to conduct some form of investigation, into what specifically I'm not sure.

But at least there was an engaged conversation around the issues. I think that's what is missing in the correspondence from Chief wheatley. She called to his house, certain1y, but she didn't manage to get past his
view that I'm not talking to you. I was mindful of that when it came to making a decision in September.
173 Q. All right. Perhaps we would look at just a note relating to the decision, there's a degree of uncertainty about when you met with Mr. Mulligan and Chief McLoughlin and made the decision.
A. There is.

174 Q. Can I ask you to look at this note, volume 35, at 10072.
A. 35 , yeah.

175 Q. This is a standard form, it's form D22B, which is meant to be filled out on a current basis to continue the authorisation to grant full pay.
A. Correct.

176 Q. If we just go down the screen there, this is one of these that records this, it's for a different later period obviously. But it records:
"I now request permission to authorise to grant the nember full pay for the $4 / 8 / 17-31 / 8 / 17$ as per chi ef superintendent HRPD and executive di rector HRPD on 27/ 9/ 16. "

That would appear to suggest, I know it's not your document, it's from the pay section, that they appear to have been told this is when the decision was taken. If we look at the e-mail that Chief McLoughlin has given evidence about at 3441. You see there that's from Chief McLough1in to Clare Egan:
"You will be aware fromprevi ous di scussi ons that Garda Keogh is out of work on sick leave with what I understand to be stress rel ated. I believe he is on reduced or no pay at this stage. I al so understand your department has written to DPERS for clarification on this situation. In the meantime l recommend that this member is restored to full pay as soon as possible pendi ing the out come of your report to DPERS.

I would be obliged if l can be informed when this is to happen so l can contact the member."

In any event, you met with Chief McLoughlin and Mr. Mulligan around this time and he was certainly strongly of the view and recommended it to you and you agreed with that, as I understand it?
A. That's correct.

177 Q. This was in a formal sense your decision to recommend this?
A. Correct.

178 Q. We had some discussion with some of the other witnesses about what full pay meant here?
A. Yes.

179 Q. But Mr. Mulligan on Day 144, we needn't look at it, but 11:46 he said full pay is basic pay but not the allowances?
A. Correct.

180 Q. You'd agree with that?
A. I would. Allowances are paid for such things as
unsocial hours working, shift work and in circumstances where those hours aren't required of somebody then the payment for them doesn't arise. So there is a loss, if you like, to normal earnings in being restored to full basic pay, which is what we did here. Mr. Mulligan said, I mean, that there was a number of things under consideration at the meeting as per the e-mails, were we penalising him by applying the sick regulations strictly and were we on humanitarian grounds possibly victimising him also?
A. We sought direction from the Department of Public Expenditure and Reform on that matter and Mr. Mulligan brought that to the table as I recall. This matter seen through the prism of part 3 of the Protected Disclosures Act gives rise to real considerations of whether penalisation arises or not. That's the basis on which Mr. Mulligan sought the input of DPER.
182 Q. Yes. Mr. Mulligan also told the Chairman at the time, we couldn't do the allowances because there was no 11.37, I think you would agree with that?
A. Well, there was no 11.37 , that's correct.

183 Q. In any event, if we go to 3442 , we see Chief McLough1in receiving the e-mail from Ms. Egan on the 6th October from pay section. Did Chief McLough1in tell you that he informed Garda Keogh to inform him of this?
A. I read that.

184 Q. And that he then wrote to him also formally to inform him of that. Perhaps we will look at that, because it is relevant to your state of knowledge about the
bullying and harassment issue. If we look at page 3467. The second paragraph:
"I wi sh to advi se that I have pursued the issue of your pay and have written to civilian HR in Navan in order to progress same. At this stage you should be returned to the payroll.

In the interest of clarity and completeness I wish to ask if it is your intention to make a formal complaint under bullying and harassment policy in addition to any ot her complaints made by you. I appreciate that you indi cated to me on the phone that it is not your intention to do so."

Was that something that the chief had advised you of at the time?
A. Yes. We had had a discussion about this time, obviously the pay meeting that we held brought -- it was a single issue meeting as $I$ recall and it was purely focused on Garda keogh.

185 Q. Yes.
A. So, there was clarity required around this. I understood from Chief McLoughlin that there was some previous engagement with GSOC and I couldn't understand 11:50 how that arose but I thought it was useful to ask that question.
186 Q. Yes. Garda Keogh replied, if we look at the next page, 3468, he says:
"I wi sh to acknow edge recei pt of correspondence. | al so acknow edge that I have been ret urned to the payrol.

I accept I made an indi cation to you regarding bullying and harassment. However, the fact that I have reported this and supplied rel evant documents to support my allegations. I understand there are obligations for both myself and An Garda Sí ochána to have this i nvesti gated under the terms of bullying and har assment pol i cy of An Garda Sí ochána and l wi sh to make a formal compl ai nt in rel ation to same."

I think you were informed of that, I think Chief McLoughlin recommended to Ms. Hassett that there would be a full investigation into the matter. Mr. Mulligan opened a file in the matter on the 1st November, and I think you then wrote to Garda Keogh on the 15th November. If we look at that letter, page 3472. You 11:51 are saying there:
"I refer to correspondence dated 20th addressed to Chi ef Superintendent MtLoughl in in whi ch you state that you wi sh to have the complete dealt with formally. has no role in the investigation of compl ai nts made under the harassment policy other than to provide advi ce and support to menbers on the policy."

That is because he was the equality officer I think; is that right?
A. That's correct. No, he could -- it was open to Chief McLoughlin to actually conduct an investigation in his autonomous role as the equality officer, that is clearly stated I think at 7.4 in the policy.
187 Q. Yes.
A. But that wasn't happening here.

188 Q. Yes. It says:
"I've encl osed a copy of the policy..." Sorry, I should read the previous sentence:
"However, he does not investigate complaints made under 11:52 the policy. I have encl osed a copy of the policy for your information in particular which may be of assistance to you."

Then you detail various matters. Then you conclude by saying on the next page:
"The person appoi nted to investigate a compl ai nt under the policy must be hi gher than the complai nant and the person compl ai ned of and be not lower than inspector rank. While you have provi ded certain documentation to Chi ef Superintendent MELoughlin regarding your complaint it is uncl ear fromsame agai nst whomthe al legations are being made, the exact detail/nature of
your compl ai nt and the hi ghest rank being complai ned of.

To ensure the resol ution of your complaint may be commenced the details referred to above should be provi ded by you to your di visional officer at your earliest conveni ence. "

Can I ask you, had you considered the documentation that Chief McLoughlin had been sent in the post?
A. I hadn't seen it.

189 Q. You hadn't seen it. Did your office receive that?
A. No, I think Chief McLoughlin in his own evidence said he gave it to Kathleen Hassett and it was kept under lock and key, I presume that's the same document.
190 Q. You never saw it as part of your function to --
A. I'd add no value to that.

191 Q. Yes. I think Chief mcLoughlin informed you of a call that he had with Garda Keogh on the 25th November, where he, Garda keogh, said he understood the process, that he was seeking legal advice, but also indicating that making the complaint to his divisional officer, who was Chief Gralton, at the time, could be an issue?
A. I don't recall that, and I know that when the relationship that I subsequently discovered well after 11:54 the fact, the familial relationship between Chief Gralton and Superintendent Murray, I was not aware of at the time. So if I was told it, I simply didn't recall it.
Q. Okay.
A. The chief did write to me I think or suggest to me that because of the nature of this my letter was asking him to put the complaint through the people he was complaining of. And I think we went and made an alternative arrangement.
Yes. I think you were made aware by Mr. Mulligan, who phoned Mr. Cullen I think, and there was an offer even to go down to meet Garda Keogh and Mr. Cullen to take the complaint or discuss the issue with them, is that correct?
A. Yes, I read that.
Q. But also then you received a letter from Mr. Cullen I think, if we look at page 3476. This was addressed to a number of people, including you, and it sought a number of different things. Did you reply to that, do you recall?
A. I think there was action taken on foot of it, I don't know if I made a reply. I know that at that point in time I received a direction thereafter to make certain that there was a statement taken on this matter.
Q. Yes. I think the PIAB authorisation issued in respect of Garda Keogh's application to initiate proceedings and I think you were made aware of that at one stage?
A. I have seen the papers.

Yes. But then on the 15 th December you were in contact with Chief McLoughlin again about the matter, if we look at page 3495. That related to gathering up all the information for the defence of the bullying and
harassment claim in the proceedings, do you recall that?
A. I know vaguely about this. I would have simply received a query from legal and I would have passed it to the two relevant gentleman, Chief McLoughlin and Alan Mulligan.

197 Q. Okay. Mr. Cullen wrote to you again on the 15th December. If we look at page 3504. And it says:
"Dear, Mr. Barrett, Mnister and Mb. O' Sullivan.

We refer to the letter of Mr . Barrett dated 11th Novenber 2016 requesting further inf ormation on the bullying and harassment compl ai nt.

Pl ease note Garda Keogh her eby again invokes his rights under such bullying and harassment pol icy. Garda Keogh advi ses that he wi shes to make a statement of compl ai nt under said policy as soon as practicable to a non- conflicted officer."
A. Yes.
Q. "Pl ease advi se when and where he can make further such statement of compl ai nt as soon as practicable."

I think the Commissioner made an instruction on the following day, she obviously having received this, that a statement should be taken as a matter of priority?
A. Yes, that's correct.

199 Q. That was sent to you, that instruction, isn't that
correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. That's at 3506 , we don't need to look at that. You nominated Chief Superintendent Roche on the 20th, is that correct?
A. I did.
Q. If we go to page 3507 , the next page that is, and this is directed to Assistant Commissioner Fanning?
A. Yeah.
Q. You're in the middle paragraph nominating him to investigate the complaint. But it was his responsibility to make the appointment.
A. Correct.
Q. Would you just explain that, because it seemed to become an issue in a minor way, perhaps?
A. Okay. Again, the regulations suggest that those with policy responsibilities have the facility to nominate somebody, but those with line responsibilities have the Authority to make the appointment.
Q. Yes. I think you were copied on an instruction to a different chief superintendent, Chief Superintendent Scan7an?
A. Yes.
Q. On the 23rd December?
A. Just to clear this up, Mr. McGuinness.
A. In very simple terms: There was a period of time when chief superintendent John Scanlan and Garda Nicholas Keogh was were in the same district together, I think
Q. Yes.
A. And the basis for me recommending Gerry Roche was to avoid the possibility that this matter would become an issue of they having had a prior relationship or whatever.
Q. okay.
A. Assistant Commissioner Fanning assured me that wasn't an issue and to expedite matters and to proceed, I was quite pleased with his assurances and I then nominated Chief Superintendent John Scanlan. Yes. So that, as it were, that divisional responsibility was respected in that regard?
A. Yes.

Okay. In any event, I think Chief Superintendent McLough1in was looking for an update as to what was happening in early January and I think you received an update from Assistant Commissioner Fanning on the 31st January. Perhaps if we look at that, page 3515. If we go down the page. Chief Superintendent Scanlan's report is attached, which is on the next page, if we scroll on further. Then that reports on the actual then raising of a potential issue of conflict?
A. Again, I should just point out, this is precisely the kind of thing that I was seeking to avoid by my nomination of Roche in the first instance.

212 Q. Yes. I think Assistant Commissioner Fanning didn't
perceive that there was a conflict in the sense that it wouldn't prevent him taking statement, whatever about investigating it?
A. Correct, and that's ultimately how I think it was
resolved. complaints.
Q. Yes.
A. And that was the purpose of the statement.
Q. Yes. From the point of view of the Commissioner, the Commissioner's office through I think Superintendent Walsh was, $I$ won't say keeping the pressure on but regularly enquiring whether a statement had yet been taken?
A. Correct.

217 Q. When it was going to happen, that it would be
A. And somewhere in there I think I wrote to Assistant Commissioner Fanning circa March and asked about the progress of --
Q. Yes.
A. -- the discussions.

219 Q. Yes. I think you sought an update in early April and you had by the 12th Apri1 I think received -- you received a report of the 12th April on the 21st April. 12:04 If we look at page 10021. That is quite clear as to what is enclosed there, just to note the middle paragraph.
"This office is now in respect of a further report dated 12th April from chi ef superintendent Portlaoise encl osed document of Garda Keogh dated 2nd March 2017 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."

Do you recall getting that?
A. I don't, and I don't recall the enclosures.

220 Q. Yes. Well, that document referred to, it's a five-page typed script, unsigned?
A. Unsigned.
Q. Yes. Perhaps if we scroll down the page to 10013 .

This is the report of Chief Superintendent Scanlan of the 12 th April that I referred to, which is his report relating to that five-page statement.
A. Yes.

222 Q. And he describes what happens there. Now, I think you
received a second report from Assistant Commissioner Fanning on the 28th April, could we look at that, at page 3525. I am sorry, that is your report to Chief Superintendent McLoughlin. You are reporting to him that Garda Keogh provided the chief superintendent with a prepared statement, documents are currently being considered by assistant commissioner Eastern Region and you will advise him of developments on receipt of a further report from that assistant commissioner.

The consideration of the documents had been earlier reported to you by Assistant Commissioner Fanning, if we just go back a little bit in time to the 5th April, at page 6823. I think the minute of the 22nd March, you're referring to there in the first line is a request for an update. He is reporting to you the following by way of interim report:
"Chi ef Superintendent Scanl on Portlaoi se has sent me one part of a two part report from Garda Keogh.

I amexamining it and froman early perusal of the file it appears to be much wi der than a bullying and har assment issue.

I will revert on recei pt of the next phase of the report."

And there doesn't appear to have been anything enclosed
with that.
A. There wasn't. Not that I have seen.
Q. In any event, you acknowledged receipt of Assistant Commissioner Fanning's second report to you, the one we looked at, of the 12th April, sorry on the 21st April, if we look at your letter at 6872. That says:
"I amto acknow edge recei pt of your correspondence dated 21st inst. made under the above caption, the contents of whi ch are noted.

I await your further report in due course."

So that is acknowledging receipt of the report of the 21st with the five-page statement
A. We11, I wondered about that, Mr. McGuinness. "The contents of whi ch are noted", I have sought from both the Tribunal and from other sources whether or not this attachment was given to me at that point in time. I can't determine whether it was.
224 Q. Yes. We11, we just looked at that report of the 21st, if we go back to 10021?
A. Yes. So let's be clear as to what I was expecting to receive. The terms of reference that John Scanlan was pursuing was to determine the -- to take statement in full from Garda Keogh of his complaints and to determine on foot of those complained of the level of the person to be appointed to conduct the B\&H investigation.
Q. Yes.
A. okay.
Q. So you're raising a query as to whether you got the five-page unsigned statement with that?
A. The five-page unsigned statement effectively enabled nothing to happen. What we needed was, ultimately what we got I think much later, the comprehensive document, I think it runs to 18 different sections, signed and dated the 27 th March. I think that reached my office on the 4th October.
227 Q. Yes. We11, perhaps we will look at the letter that Assistant Commissioner Fanning sent to you on 24th May 2017?
A. Yes.

228 Q. He had had some and instructed Inspector McCarthy to have some further dealings and enquiries with Garda Keogh in the interim about what further matters he wished to have encompassed in the investigations. But ultimately he made this report to you on the $24 / 5$. If we look at page 10049. Now, he refers to your original 12:11 correspondence tab A, which we are not concerned with.
"I al so refer to correspondence fromthis office dated 21, tab B."
which we have just looked at.

[^1]Which is the acknowledgment of that?
A. Yes.

229 Q. He then says:
"On the 16th May 2017 I al so corresponded with Garda Keogh copy attached tab D. "

That is neither to you or from you. Then he refers to a discussion with Mr. Mulligan. Then he refers to a phone contact with Inspector McCarthy?
A. Yes.

230 Q. And then he refers to:
"Garda Keogh al so stated that he first raised his
issues as outlined in his statement to Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an, di rectly with Chi ef Superintendent MELoughl in HRM in June 2016, some 11 mont hs ago."

If we continue down then. There is reference to a sergeant that we needn't be concerned with. Then he starts referring to the statement.
"One of the greatest issues of concern to me is the
openi ng line of Garda Keogh's statement dated 27th March 2017: Following my making protected di scl osures I encountered harassment, excl usi on victimisation penal isation. .."

Etcetera, etcetera. Then he says:
"I am not aware of the i ssued rai sed under the protected di scl osures investi gation. However, these matters are now rai sed in both statements and in his account Inspector McCarthy may wel come within protected di scl osures policy. It is clear that his allegations are grounded in his current stat us as protected di scl osure di scloser. I am of the view that this could 12:13 well be treated as effectively bei ng a protected di sclosure and it may well be that those allegations are incl uded in the earlier di scl osure."

Then he refers to an incident about Garda A.
A. Yes.

231 Q. Then the next paragraph, if we scrol1 down:
"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 nost serious. The allegations could in some circunstances merit a criminal investigation and the allegations include an allegati on agai nst the Garda Commi ssi oner by a
protected discloser. I am of the firmview that the bullying policy is not wi de enough to incl ude the comprehensi ve i nvesti gation you deci de. The deci si on in an earlier case (McCabe) by HRM "

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

That was the request from Garda Keogh to meet him, which Assistant Commissioner Fanning didn't in the instance. He then concludes by saying:
"You will recall in correspondence dated 20th May, tab E, that Chi ef Superintendent Roche was nomi nated to i nvesti gate the compl ai nt under the bullying and har assment policy and was requested of me to formalise the appoint ment. You will al so note that Garda Keogh i nf or med Inspector McCarthy that he had first rai sed these issues directly with Chi ef Superintendent MELoughl in HR PD in June 2016 and that inf ormation then provi ded with as not made available to me as part of the deci si on-making process.

I recommend a full investigation into these matters."

Now, there is no tab including Garda Keogh's statement
of the 27th March there, the signed one, with different appendices. He does refer to a very small portion of the content. But, was that statement of the 27 th received by you in the office with this?
A. No. Shall I say, at that particular date, that letter, $12: 16$ I wasn't actually there, but notwithstanding, I didn't receive it until the 4th October.
Q. We11, I think you were asked in the course of your interview with the investigators about a number of reminders that issued from the assistant commissioner's 12:16 office?
A. Yes.

233 Q. You recall that?
A. I do, I was very troubled about it.

234 Q. And there were reminders referred to in the interview and related to letters of the 16th June, the 17th August, the 1st September and the 22nd September, and they're at pages 6879, 6882, 6884 and 6889. Do you recall getting those reminders?
A. well, curiously that summer had two --

235 Q. Pardon?
A. That summer had two very significant issues for me that were going on and that I think would have been well in the public domain. The first half of my year was very taken up personally with the financial irregularities at the Garda college.

236 Q. Yes.
A. This led to a Public Accounts Committee hearing that occurred in May. Immediately after that I was away for
two weeks, during which that time Assistant Commissioner Fanning met with Alan mulligan, who was my delegate, in my absence. I was doing some exams at the time. I returned in June for a further hearing at the Public Accounts Committee and it's in that interregnum that this correspondence that you've just opened arrived in my office.
237 Q. Yes.
A. The second series of letters that came from Assistant Commissioner Fanning, there are two of them in an August window, which fall I think between the end of July and the 22nd August.
Q. Yes.
A. In this period of time $I$ was on annual leave and again doing exams. I did have no recollection, so when I saw 12:18 these the dates from the investigators of the Tribunal I was troubled, because I had no knowledge of receiving this critical report, the statement of Garda Keogh, prior to October. And the suggestion was made to me, well, you had to have received it. And the short answer is, I didn't. Now, I was troubled by it as we went through this evidence and I said, I will need to see the records.

239 Q. Yes.
A. And it's only, Mr. McGuinness, having read the transcripts of the Tribunal itself that I come to understand actually what had happened.
240 Q. Yes.
A. But when I was interviewed I didn't have the benefit of that.

241 Q. Yes. We11, I mean, in relation to the first reminder on the 16th June, you appear to have replied on the 17th June?
A. Yeah, I would have been there for that.
A. I would have been in, at work at that date.

243 Q. Yes. And you may recall that, your reply referred to the fact that chief superintendent McLoughlin was away for three weeks?
A. Yes.

244 Q. Isn't that right?
A. This was with reference to a case conference that I understand we were seeking to advance at that time.
245 Q. Yes. But if we look at the first letter, 6879, this is 12:20 from Assistant Commissioner Fanning and that's the 16th June, it says:
"I refer to my previ ous correspondence to you dated 24th May 2017.

It is three weeks since my last correspondence for whi ch I have recei ved no acknow edgment. I believe that taking all factors into account that any del ay should be kept to a minimum

I amkeen to revert to Garda Keogh with a deci si on with I bel i eve to be strai ghtforward.

I await your response."

That is dated 16th June. In terms of what was in that, he was recommending a full investigation, larger than a bullying and harassment?
A. Yes.
of a sort of Byrne-McGinn model essentially, is that what you took from that?
A. Well, I didn't, because the correspondence that I understand he had met with Alan mulligan circa 22 May in my absence, and that the reference to larger at that point, he was talking about a Byrne/McGinn mode1 certainly when we sat down for conversation on the 3rd October, he was very of the view that a Byrne-McGinn type model would work. The decision on a bullying and harassment policy rested with me. I had to make a determination whether or not the confines of the policy would be sufficient or whether there were matters in the statement, at which time I hadn't actually seen the full statement.

247 Q. Yes.
A. Were such that it needed a Byrne-McGinn type mode1 or whether bullying and harassment could take care of it. The reality of the request that was made by Garda Keogh was, he was seeking for action under the policy. And it was Assistant Commissioner Fanning's respectful view, and I respect his experience, he sat in my chair before I did, that it required something larger.
248 Q. Yes.
A. I, in my letter back to Mr. Cullen, I think on or about the 13th October, made it clear I was going to deliberate on it and I told I think that I would take a month or take to the end of the month of October to determine whether or not it was a Byrne-McGinn or bullying and harassment type investigation. At the end of the day $I$ made a determination that it was more suitable that it be a bullying and harassment type investigation and I did so because the policy provided a framework under which if there were, for example, elements of criminality, they could then be assessed and independently investigated. One did not preclude the other.
249 Q. Yes. And I mean, it is easy for us to look back and say but it seems clear that you didn't know what was in Garda Keogh's original protected disclosures or what allegations, criminal or otherwise, were being enquired into?
A. Correct.

And it would appear that Assistant Commissioner Fanning didn't either, because he was not -- I think he didn't have knowledge of what was in the allegations that were being investigated?
A. But, Mr. McGuinness, he had the benefit of the statement of the 27th March, which I didn't. Just in relation to that, having received his report, as it were, if we could call it that, of the 24th May, I am just wondering why you mightn't have written back to him saying, look, you're referring to the statement
of the 27 th, please send me a copy of it.
A. Well I wasn't there. The 24 th March, I went looking at that point in time to see had we received the documents and we hadn't. Curiously, I get these follow up e-mails or letters from Assistant Commissioner Fanning through the summer and we're still awaiting the Scan1an report.
Q. We11, perhaps we will just look at them in sequence. If we go to your reply to the letter of the 16th, which is on the 17th, 10057. If we scroll down there.
"I act to acknow edge recei pt of your correspondence.

Please advise that Chi ef Superintendent McLoughlin is on annual leave for three weeks and on his return I will arrange a meeting to di scuss issues arising in thi s matter."
A. Yes.

253 Q. Obviously a meeting was what was being sought by the Commissioner at case conference, you had in a sense postponed it earlier because you hadn't got Scan1an's statement?
A. He had asked Alan Mulligan in my absence to make arrangements to have a conference.
254 Q. Could we look at the next letter of the 17th August, 6882?
"I am di rected by assi stant commi ssi oner Eastern Regi on to refer to above and previ ous correspondence dated

24th May and 16th June.

Assistant commissioner enquires as to present position regarding this matter please."

Do you recal1
A. I wasn't there at the time, I was absent at that time.

255 Q. Okay. 11th September, 6884?
A. Yes.
Q.

He refers to the previous letters, refers to your previous correspondence, and then he says:
"You will recall my correspondence dated 24th May that I recommended a full investigation into these matters and Lordship that any del ay should be kept to a min num

I would appreciate your response to these natters, whi ch are ongoing sometime."
A. Yes. I think there is a further letter later in

September that requested either we were going to have this case conference -- Alan -- Mr. Mulligan had sought to bring the various matters together on a number of occasions through the summer and I think he references illness and absence and certainly my absence would have 12:27 been part of it, as to why that conference didn't take place.

257 Q. Yes.
A. So I was reading this correspondence in that context.

There is a letter later in September I understand from Fintan, from Assistant Commissioner Fanning, which arrives at about the same time that we had received a letter from Mr. Cullen. Now, a couple of things that need to be said about this particular correspondence. It's very clear at this point in time that Garda Keogh is to be considered in the prism of protected disclosure. The reference in the earlier letter to protected disclosure $I$ think is really important. So that, matters from the time that Chief Superintendent McLough1in identifies himself as the protected disclosures manager are dealt with in 2016 and the early part of '17 almost exclusively by him. This correspondence from Assistant Commissioner Fanning breaks that loop to some degree in the summer of 2017. We11, I suppose he is reacting to what he has read in the statement on one view?
A. Yes.
Q. That he is concerned that it is quite a different bag of issues?
A. But it would still fit under the umbrella of a protected disclosure, though he sees it as broader than a bullying and harassment issue.
260 Q. Yes. Perhaps we will look at this letter of the 22/9 at 6889?
A. Yes.

261 Q. He refers to the previous correspondence and then he copies you with a letter from Mr. Cullen's office?
A. Yes.
Q. And then he says:
"Assi stant commi ssi oner has di rected me to acknow edge recei pt of letter fromJohn Gerard Cullen. Assi stant commi ssi oner Eastern Regi on is awaiting confirmation fromyour of a meeting to discuss this matter."
A. Correct.
Q. Yes. Could we look at that page?
A. Yeah.

266 Q. Volume 35?
A. That's the one, there's no response given to that, I think.

267 Q. No response given to this?
A. No, to the letter from Keogh in July, from Mr. Cullen in July.

268 Q. Right. We11 perhaps we'd look at the letter that was sent to you, 10064. That's dated 12/7. They're enclosing a letter, a manuscript from Garda Keogh dated the 9th July.
"Thi s letter (whi ch speaks for itself) contai ns an initial garda attachment."

That is a SAMS record
"Which records his current absence from work as being due to mental health issues.

In rel ation to this latter matter, Garda Keogh was
ori gi nally i ncorrectly recorded by An Garda Sí ochána as bei ng somebody sent from work due to flu instead of work rel ated stress. This flu was clearly contradicted by his doctor's certificates which restated work rel ated stress.

An effect of such early misrepresentation of his di sability was firstly a failure to initiate any timely i nvesti gation into the causation of such work rel at ed stress. A second consequence was that he was not, for a substantial period of time, gi ven his basic rate of pay. We understand that both an investigation and the payment of wages are mandatory in accordance withlong establ ished customand practice in respect of work rel ated stress. We encl ose here with a letter fromthe general practitioner dated 31st January 2017 confirming for the voi dance of doubt the di agnose of work rel at ed stress.

It now appears that instead of rectifying the of ficial record fromflu to work rel ated stress in June 2016 there has been a further error in categorisation by An Garda Sí ochána such that he is now currently being recorded as bei ng absent fromwork for ment al heal th
reasons. A further consequence of this latest official error is that there has agai $n$ been a further prol ongati on of a failure by An Garda Sí ochána to initiate any investi gation into the causation of such work rel ated stress together with a deni al to Garda Keogh of payment of wages at the full rate of pay. Thi s latter is ordinarily paid to gardaí who are absent from work due to work rel ated stress.

In all the circunstances we would be grateful if you might furnish all documentation rel ating to decisions taken by An Garda Sí ochána to i ncorrectly Garda Keogh firstly as being absent with the flu (contradicting the regul ation notice fromhis physi cians of work rel ated stress) and secondly, being absent with ment al health issues thereby further preventing any investigation and the payment of wages at a full rate. We should al so be gratef ul if you might kindly furnish us with all documentation whi ch rel ates to ei ther the del ayed, partial or full denial of payment of full wages inthis 12:32 case and to the failure to investi gate such serious matters of harassment for over a year now."

Then it refers to the Data Protection Act etcetera. But Garda Keogh's letters that came with that is at 10066. And again, that's addressed directly to you.

[^2]di scl osure. I was forced to go out si ck on 26/ 12 / 15 can work rel ated stress. I was curiously being recorded sick with the flu.

I met with Chi ef Superintendent MELoughlin on the 3rd J une ' 16 who undertook..."

If we scrol1 down the page Mr. Kavanagh
"...to address my si ck record and di d so.

However, under Freedom of I nf or mati on request I recei ved my absence report (attached) where I am now marked out sick with mental health despite my sick certs stating work rel ated stress.

I now understand that your of fice may not be aware of same.

For your information please and yours si ncerel y."
A. Yeah.

269 Q. Now, I think you received those letters, isn't that correct?
A. I did, after I returned.
Q. Yes. And I think --
A. Can I just --

271 Q. A draft was prepared for you to send out in reply in the middle of August, is that correct?
A. That's correct. Mr. McGuinness, can I just deal with
this, because I am very conscious of the realities of this. The Chairman mentioned SAMS earlier. This is a fairly rigid system in which there are a series of drop down menus for the categorisation of absence and for dealing with general causes associated with people being sick or absent and there isn't, certainly there wasn't then, any categorisation specifically for work related stress. The nearest approximation of it, and you know, I am very sensitive to people's concerned around labels and being labelled in a mental health context, and indeed, you know, An Garda Síochána has tried to deal with building support systems to support people with mental health. Chief McLough1in has been in the vanguard of that. But I could understand the distress this caused and it is a function of the drop down menus on the SAMS system and perhaps Chief McLough1in should have gone back and explained we don't have specific label that says work related stress and clarify the point before it came a clear bugbear to Garda Keogh and for that I am apologetic, but it is the 12:35 reality.

272 Q. So may we take it from that, that this wasn't sort of an individual fault or omission directed at Garda Keogh as such?
A. No.

273 Q. But just simply the way the system was?
A. That's an excellent and important observation, Mr. McGuinness. There would have been other various forms of condition that would have been dealt with
under the general label of mental health. And that's what the printout clearly said.
274 Q. Yes. In any event, we will see in due course a reply ultimately issues but I think the office and the sick pay section had prepared a draft for you and you probably saw that on your return from holidays but another letter had come in from Mr. Cullen's office on the 17th August directed to a number of people. If we look at that, 10094. If we just scroll down the page there, the second paragraph there it says:
"We now understand Garda Keogh's express compl ai nts of har assment, bullying, detrimental treatment and his formal invocation of the Garda bullying and grievance procedures have been suspended. Garda Keogh has been advi sed in fact that the whereabouts (in An Garda Sí ochána) of his formal compl ai nts are unknown. His compl ai nts have effectively been clandestinely secret ed and covered up. "
could I just ask you to comment on that from your knowledge or perspective?
A. I think I addressed this question, Mr. McGuinness, when the Tribunal investigators asked me was, I think, the complaint lost. And at no point was the complaint lost ${ }_{\text {12:37 }}$ or was there -- I think more particularly of interest, to the Tribunal Chairman, there was no reason for it to be lost. It simply wasn't transmitted to me as I had expected it would be in a timely fashion. But there
was no clandestine plan to facilitate the progression of Pat Murray from superintendent to chief superintendent that I was aware of. I certainly had no hand, act or part, as I described it in my statement, in that.
This letter goes on to repeat many of the complaints which have been made in the two previous letters that we have just seen and then at the bottom of the page it continues on to make that explicit acquisition, as it were.
"It appears that on the one hand for over 18 mont hs any investi gation into the grave and systematic bullying has been initially camouflaged, secreted and paced 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 furtivel y advanced.

We now call on you again to investigate the failure of the Cormis ssi oner of An Garda Sí ochána to carry out any timely investigation into the causation of work rel ated stress to the prej udi ce of Garda Keogh and the favour of Superintendent Murray."

Then it concludes as writ there.

Just in terms of Superintendent Murray, I think you were asked in interview what your knowledge of

Superintendent Murray was?
A. Correct. Mr. McGuinness, I had not met Superintendent Murray, I am sure we were at large meetings together, where he was in one part of the room and I was in another. I think the first time I shook hands with Chief Superintendent Pat Murray was when he joined my staff as the head of the Garda College, after his promotion. I wouldn't have been able to recognise him prior to that.
276
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Prior to or meetings with him prior to him coming on to the Templemore staff?
A. No.

278 Q. Had you any knowledge as to whether he was seeking promotion, what steps he was taking in relation to promotion?
A. No, I hadn't, and you know, I need to be very clear about this, the competitions office sits within Human
Resources, but since the advent of the Policing Authority, the competitions for superintendent and chief superintendent, assistant commissioner etcetera, were managed exclusively and properly by the Policing Authority. And so, any candidate who wished to apply for such positions would do so and send their application forward in the normal way to the Policing Authority. So I would have no idea who the candidate slate was, other than you know, water cooler
conversation about Diarmuid McGuinness has applied and John Barrett has applied, that would have been the extent of it, would I have had no idea who were the applicants.
279 Q.
Okay. One of the assertions in the letter earlier was that Garda Keogh had been advised that this has happened his complaint. Had you any conversation with Garda Keogh at that point in time?
A. No. I met Garda Keogh only once and that was I think December 17th, 2017. And we met in Portlaoise.
A. I had no knowledge of Garda Keogh's complaint in the round until I got that comprehensive document in october.

281 Q. A11 right. We11, perhaps we will just scroll up the page here, just to see the top of this letter.
A. Clearly I have --
Q. It was sent to quite a number of people?
A. Yes. So it's sent to first of all the Minister, the Commissioner, the Policing Authority, and then the fourth person is Mr. Ó Cualáin?
A. I think I am cc'd, Mr. McGuinness, at the end.

284 Q. That's the point, you're cc'd on it?
A. Yes.

285 Q. It doesn't appear from the documents I have seen that you have made any reply to that directly at that particular time?
A. Not at that time, no.

286 Q. But I think within the month of September, you received correspondence from Mr. Cullen's office?
A. Yes.

Dated 25th September 2017?
A. That's correct.

288 Q. If we look at that, it's Volume 35, 10100. I think in fairness to yourself, I think you said in your interview that this was the first time when you received the statement. So you actually got it towards 12:43 the last week in September, is that correct?
A. Yeah. Can I make two points?

289 Q. Yes.
A. They are contextual but $I$ think they are relevant. The period August/September '17 was a tumultuous time for the organisation, and it was clear to me from a number of -- I returned from vacation at the back end of August and it was clear to me that this matter, which was, as far as I was concerned, a protected disclosure being dealt with by the protected disclosure manager from the time he identified himself as such to Garda Keogh, this needed assistance from me, the correspondence was clearly at a high pitch, there was a series of very visible accusations now being addressed to me by Garda Keogh and his legal team that needed my 12:44 engagement directly.

290 Q. Yes.
A. I think there's a preponderance of correspondence right across this matter. Somewhere in and around the last
week of September, beginning of October, I began to tell Mr. Mulligan and Mr. McLoughlin that we were going to deal with this. On the 2nd -- I asked people to prepare for a case conference that was called by me on the 3rd october. And on the 2nd october, in preparation for that, Chief Superintendent McLoughlin and I telephoned Mr. Cullen and had a conversation which was in part to, if you like, put a voice and a dialogue around these matters, to say we have received your correspondence and we are going to take some action on foot of it. And it's, I suppose, an a consequence of the various elements that had come about throughout the summer and I think what the media were making comment on and we had a change of Commissioner's in the office, I think Ms. O'sullivan had gone on extended vacation, and this matter was crying out to be dealt with. So that conversation on the 2nd October informed the meeting of the 3rd october and on the 4th October we take delivery of the statement dated 27 th March.
291 Q. That is what I am suggesting here, that you actually got it with this letter?
A. Yes, yeah.

292 Q. You were I think resent it or sent it by Assistant Commissioner Fanning on the 4th?
A. Yes.

293 Q. Isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

294 Q. As well. But on the same date then, I think Chief

McLoughlin gave you a brief update on matters that were perhaps pertinent to your discussion and on the 25 th he sent you an e-mail. If we look at 3549 . Perhaps it is 3548. I may have the pagination wrong. Bear with me. Yes. This seems to reflect a discussion where he was able to get confirmation that the PD had been investigated, that the file had gone to the DPP who advised no prosecution. не says:
"I understand that statement not sure if it was si gned 12:47 was made by Garda Keogh in May under B\&H pol icy but I have not seen it.

I have written on a number of occasions for work rel at ed stress compl ai nt to be investigated. It may i2:47 formpart of a B\&H complaint but have I no update."

You received an e-mail then from Assistant Commissioner Fanning on the 26th, if we look at page 6891. He refers to the earlier e-mail and he is looking to have a date confirmed. I think you got back to him that day, if we look at 6892, and you are proposing in the heading there, meeting Tuesday, 3rd October 2017 at 12 as a matter of urgency
A. Yes.

295 Q. The phone call that was had with Mr. Cullen, you were speaking to Mr. Cullen directly?
A. That's correct. I had him on a speaker phone in the conference table with Chief McLoughlin present.
Q. Yes. And Chief McLough1in said the purpose of it was to enable you to be in a position to bring any issues raised by Mr. Cullen to the conference?
A. Yes and to give Mr. Cullen a certain amount of assurance that there was an effort being made. Given the correspondence of the previous number of summer months, I felt we needed to directly engaged.
Q. Yes. The meeting took place on the 3rd and there are typed minutes, a record made by 1 think Chief McLough1in. If we look at volume 36, 10118. You have 12:49 seen these in the documents, I take it?
A. I have.
Q. I don't want to go all the way through it, but it records the assistant commissioner outlining his position there.
A. Yes.
Q. About the need for a bigger investigation.

CHAN RMAN I think we have been through this previously, isn't that right?
MR. MEGUNESS: This witness hasn't commented on it but I don't want to open it in its entirety. CHA RMAN No. If anybody wants to question about it, then they are obviously free to do so.

MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
Q. There was a debate about what scope of inquiry might be --
A. Correct.
Q. -- appropriate and perhaps who might do it as well. Was there a discussion of Assistant Commissioner
McPartin being appointed at that time?
A. Not at that stage, no.
302 Q. In any event, an action sheet was agreed or issued on foot of the meeting, if which look at page 3551 . And you were to do the first two actions, isn't that right?
A. Mm-hmm. Yes.
Q. I think Assistant Commissioner Fanning, it had been agreed that he would liaise with Garda Keogh about what was going to happen, and what he would be informed of as well, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct. One of the things that I think Assistant Commissioner Fanning deserves credit for and to some respects it created a problem was, Assistant Commissioner Fanning and Inspector McCarthy stayed in close touch with Garda Keogh. Now, I think they were giving him an understanding that we were in possession of a document, which we were not in that period of April, May, June etcetera. That may have created the commentary that came later in Mr. Cullen's letters. But to be fair, there's an obligation on a -- there is
a right of a protected discloser to be kept informed. I think that is something that would normally fall to the protected disclosure manager to do.

304 Q. Yes. You did receive an e-mail on the 4th October, as you have referred to, from Assistant Commissioner Fanning in relation to the statement. Perhaps we will just look at that, page 10104.
A. Yes.
Q. It is Inspector McCarthy directed by assistant
commissioner Eastern Region to refer to a meeting of yesterday and to forward copies of statements taken by Garda Nick Keogh on 22nd March and hand-delivered to HRM on 24th May 2017 per file from Assistant Commissioner Fanning dated 24th May 2017, please.

So you seem to be certainly getting it there and it just seems to be --
A. But the suggestion that it is, you know, per file of Assistant Commissioner Fanning 24 May, I think Mr. Mulligan and I are at one, neither of us had seen it to this date from Assistant Commissioner Fanning.
Q. There is a notation on that, I think that is Ms. Hassett's reference?
A. Yes.

307 Q. "Case conference Mr. Barrett to appoint investi gat or i ssues rai sed by Garda Keogh broader than bullying and har assment."
A. Bullying and harassment.

308 Q. I think Assistant Commissioner Fanning wrote to you then on the 6th October, if we look at page 10108, four pages down from that, that it was now going to be your responsibility to be dealing with Garda Keogh at that stage, that's the 6th October. He is referring to the meeting. He is acknowledging the e-mail for actions arising. In the last line he informs you that:

[^3]with Garda Keogh will be fromexecutive di rector Hunan Resources and Peopl e Devel opment and that an assi stant commissi oner would be appointed to investi gate these matters."
A. Yeah.

12:53
309 Q. Now, I think you were being prompted by Sergeant Brodrick, is it, following up on the action sheets to appoint the assistant commissioner, and I think you were contemplating Assistant Commissioner Barry O'Brien at one stage, is that right?
A. That's right.

310 Q. Had you discussed that with him, for instance, or do you clear these things in advance?
A. Well, it's an informal engagement because you are dealing with people who are extraordinarily busy and this arose with Assistant Commissioner McPartlin as we11. Ultimately, I think probably a month later than I had wanted to, I think somewhere around end of November, I make a decision that the matter is going to be dealt with under the bullying and harassment policy and it's going to be dealt with by Assistant Commissioner Finn. There was a suggestion, and this was considered right the way up to a meeting that was convened by Joe Nugent on the 23 rd October, there was the consideration of whether or not bullying and harassment should be one part and all other parts should be hived off into a separate investigation. Ultimately I determined that there would be an investigation, as was requested by Garda Keogh, under
the B\&H policy and the policy had a framework. I think my reasons for this decision are important. It had a framework which was respectful of the person seeking to invoke the policy and it provided protections for those who may be impugned by the matters to be investigated.

311 Q. Yes. Well, you had written directly to Mr. Cullen on the 13th October, yourself, and perhaps we would look at the letter at 10121. This is replying to quite a number of different issues, and in particular it follows the sequence of an eight point handwritten letter where Garda Keogh had enumerated concerns?
A. Yes.

312 Q. Which were copied by Mr. Cullen to a number of parties?
A. Correct.

313 Q. This came to you then to reply in a compendious way to each of those eight points.
A. Yes.

314 Q. The notion seems to have been reached that, as expressed in two of the letters, that his pay will be stopping?
A. Yes.
Q. And your first paragraph deals with that, that assurance, that there would be a continuous of his basic pay beyond that date, no plan to change that at this time. Had there been some reconsideration of the pay issue?
A. To be honest, I don't know what that reconsideration was, but it seems to me that in light of the discussions we had on the 2nd October on the telephone,
in the correspondence that I received, that there was nothing that should interfere with the continuation of pay pending the actioning of the items agreed at the meeting.
okay. We will just see the next thing that you said to him, the second matter, if we go down the page onto the next page there.
"Secondl y, the matters rai sed by Garda Keogh under the terns of the protected disclosure Act continue to be revi ewed. "

You say:
"Last week at this office a series of deci sions were taken to action key el ements of our tel ephone cushi on with you."

You address then the eight issues as set out in that letter, as follows:
A. Mm-hmm.

317 Q. You say:
"I have undertaken the specific action of assessing how best to proceed with respect to item1. I expect to
have reached a concl usi on on thi s bef ore the end of October and it will be commin cated to you directly. I will set out the process to be followed and the per sonnel assi gned. "
A. Yes.

318 Q. I mean, there is an issue of delay which Garda Keogh is raising with the Tribunal in the context of the bullying and harassment investigation not having been initiated and latterly progressed quickly. At this stage it is almost a year since he has confirmed to Chief Superintendent McLough1in that he is evoking it. Just as a process manager, would you regard it as unsatisfactory to have a delay --
A. I would.

319 Q. -- of that period. It related to status or the number of issues he was raising or where they went, what would you like to say about that?
A. I think the delay is unsatisfactory. I think you have the anatomy of the serial events that took place from the end of '16 through to this juncture in 2017 wel1 enumerated in your questioning of me. So you can see what the various segments are. In honesty, the bullying and harassment policy itself gives timelines as to when an entire bullying and harassment investigation should be concluded, and they are tight timelines. I think the criminal investigation into the matters raised by Garda Keogh took three and a half years. I think that the actual investigation conducted by Assistant Commissioner Finn took something over a year. So these are lengthy periods of time. And you know, we appointed John Scanlan and agreed on his position somewhere in January 2017. The statement dated 27th March reached me six months later.

320 Q. Yes. I raise the issue because the Chairman is entitled to make such recommendations as he may think fit and I am not in any way suggesting he is going to make any recommendation, that is a matter for the future. But it would seem that a part of the process contributing to delay might include issues that various sections at different stages didn't know what had happened with the disclosures and the investigation into disclosures. Is that an inbuilt problem by reason of the issue?
A. I think the actions of and the way the policy on the protected disclosures is set up is designed to have a protected disclosure manager to shepherd these matters that we talked about and to ensure that there is, you know, as I said, a place at which disclosures made internally can be received, matters can be investigated, communication with the discloser can be managed and managed confidentially and resolved ultimately if that's possible. So the intention and the policy there, it didn't in this case and this is under the prism of a protected disclosure, this is suddenly in my hands and I'm not the protected disclosure manager, you know, so it didn't work particularly well, is the point.
321 Q. But I suppose I am asking you perhaps more directly 13:01 then, are the delays or the lack of knowledge or the problems that can beset an issue such as this, are they related to the non-disclosure of the person making the disclosure, a lack of knowledge of others as to what is
being investigated etcetera?
A. That can be a part of it, certainly. These are complex matters, I think Chief McLoughlin has made that point, and sometimes because of the confidentiality needing to be maintained it hampers active engagement with other parties. I think dealing with matters in serial as opposed to parallel certainly tends to extend time.
322 Q. You refer to the length of investigations as well, which is a feature of all of the investigations to some greater or lesser degree. You may not have any knowledge of this, but is it perhaps a fault, if it is a fault, that investigators have other jobs to do, in the sense that they're not dedicated full-time to the carrying out of these specific tasks, they have to carry their additional other daily weekly monthly burden?
A. I can't really make any useful comment other than to say specialists who have specialisms tend to be able to focus more so than generalists who have many irons in the fire. That is a truism not just for the guards but ${ }_{\text {13:03 }}$ for any place I have ever worked in this country, Europe and America, it's no different.
323 Q. All right. In point 2 there you say:
"With respect to the bullying and harassment complaint
I amadvi sed that there has been extensive correspondence from Garda HRM section seeki ng clarification from Garda Keogh as to who specifically he was naming as the subject of his complaint. We are

```
now aware from both the correspondence and the tel ephone conversation who that individual is. We will proceed accordingly."
Had Garda Keogh or Mr. Cullen named Superintendent
A. No.
A. There is an error in that paragraph. That should really have referred to the materials received but one of the issues that we had all the while in the absence of Scanlan's report was specificity of the very two questions that we were being asked to clarify through the efforts of Chief Superintendent Scanlan. who is it that is being named, and that's a list of names, your point, and what are their ranks, so that we can make a determination to the level of the bullying and harassment investigator.
Q. Paragraph 3 then:
"The matters rel ating to how the Policing Authority proceed in circumstances outlined. I have today
A. That's an error on my behalf. written to the CEO of the Policing Authority and rai sed that question with them My letter is attached."
A. Yes.
327
```

A. Yes.
Q. -- October, written on the same date?
A. Yes.

329 Q. And obviously written prior to writing this letter on the same date?
A. Yes. I would have been conscious from reading the correspondence, Mr. McGuinness, that there was a very clear concern being articulated that there was some silence or some conspiracy or some actions taken or not taken which would suggest that Garda Keogh was very uncomfortable with the process. For transparency and in the light of the Garda Code of ethics I wanted to demonstrate that I was alerting, personally alerting the Policing Authority, even though I was conscious that in prior correspondence Mr. Cullen had copied correspondence to the Chairperson of the Policing Authority, so I think they were already well on notice of the concerns of Garda Keogh, but for the purposes of making it clear that, you know, we have nothing to hide, there is absolutely no issue with putting them on notice formally from my office, I did so and I copied that letter to Mr. Cullen.
330 Q. Yes. You were asked in interview by the investigators whether you had informed the Commissioner's office that you had written the letter to Ms. Hall of the Policing 13:06 Authority?
A. I couldn't recall.

331 Q. You couldn't recall?
A. I don't have a copy. I see it in -- I was given some
materials from --
332 Q. Yes, but you in fact cc'd had letter to Chief Superintendent McLough1in, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q.

So it's not as if you have done it in a clandestine way?
A. No, I am conscious that Chief McLoughlin would a direct reporting line to the Commissioner as protected disclosures manager for Garda Keogh.
And certainly your explanation that you gave to the investigators was that you felt you had an obligation to ensure that all relevant information available to you was put before the Policing Authority?
A. Correct.
Q. And it wasn't a secret, in fact, it was out in the
A. Right.
Q. You probably weren't aware the Commissioner's office had written the day before?
A. No.

337 Q. In relation to -- been written to the day before, on the 12th, about matters that were in the public domain?
A. The guiding principle for me was more the code of ethics which demands that, you know, we do what we can to make matters transparent and plain and that was I think an appropriate response in the context of all the issues that had been put to us.

338 Q. Yes. At paragraph 4 you say:
"I have written to the office of the Garda Keogh and the to office of head of legal services to address the errs set out. This office has had no sight of the correspondence to date and we have now requested. Our expectation is that it will formpart of the comprehensive file which will be made available to the indi vi dual or teamto be appoi nted under 1 above to revi ew matters.
5. In the matter.
6. Our intention is that matters to be established under 1 above will address the issues comprehensi vely and diminute the need for intervention of the Tánai ste. "

There was a request for an outside investigator?
A. Correct.

339 Q. "7. I wi sh to assure you and your client that this office that those charged with the management of protected di scl osure report. Huge confidence in the prof essi onal ismof the office hol der Chi ef Superintendent MELoughlin has met with Garda Keogh in his capacity as protected di sclosure manager and this rel ationship continues in effect.

A number of poi nts to concl ude and to poi nt a way for ward.

Firstly, we are submitted to addressing the issues put forth by Garda Keogh, your client. You can be sure that I will remai n available to you and the commitment to action gi ven will be actioned. "

If we scroll down the page, Mr. Kavanagh, thank you.
"Secondly, at a meeting at this office last week, it was agreed that the regul ar cont act fromthe Empl oyee Assi stance Servi ce would be suppl emented by a visit, as has happened in the past, to your client fromlnspector McCarthy. This will take place shortly.

Finally this, office has now assumed coor di native responsibility for matters at issue and we will seek to 13:09 progress the issue transparently and with all due Él an. "

That is dated 13th October. Chairman, I think the witness has been in the witness box for over two and a half hours, it might be an appropriate time to take a short break.

CHA RMAN Yes. I think Mr. Barnes notified the parties that we want to avoid a situation where people have to go through an elaborate checking, so that we had proposed a shorter lunch break of half an hour rather than an hour and $I$ hope that that message got through to everybody so they could bring themselves a sandwich or whatever it was that they needed, so as to
avoid starvation afterwards. So the plan would be, what time is it now, we will sit in half an hour's time and we will proceed to around 3:30, if that is convenient. I mean in the meantime, if you find the whole going a bit rough, let us know.

THE WTNESS: No.
CHA RMAN Okay. I appreciate that Garda Keogh's team wil1 need a few minutes for consultation. Perfectly understood, not a problem. okay.

MR. MEGUNESS: And if it helps parties assess the position, Chairman, I estimate I will probably no more than 30 minutes 1eft.
CHA RMAN Very good. Thank you very much. okay. very good.

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

## FOLLOV:

MR. MEGI NESS: Mr. Barrett, just before the break we had been looking at the first of your long letter of
reply to Garda Keogh on 13th October 2017. I have referred to your letter to the Policing Authority, and that's at page 12477. It's addressed to Ms. Ha11. And you say:
"I write in the strictest confidence on foot of a question rai sed by a Garda nember in correspondence. The letter fromthe nenber's solicitor rai sed a series of questions and was copi ed to arongst ot hers the

M ni ster for Justice and Equal ity, the Chai rman of the Policing Authority 21st September 2017 fromJohn Gerard Cullen sol icitor.

In the light of extensi ve and ot her general issues rai sed in the letter from Mr. Cullen whi ch attaches the handwritten letter of Garda Keogh, I thought it best to draw the correspondence to your specific attention and to restate the question rai sed. It was as follows: Has the Policing Authority consi dered such a scenario wher eby (I cannot say for sure that this has happened) a compl ai nt is made agai nst a seni or of ficer who is going for pronotion and happens to be favoured by Garda management. Garda management del ay commencing the i nvesti gation, incl udi ng serving notice di sci plinary or 13:47 ot herwi se on the seni or of ficer candi date, wher eby should the Policing Authority ask the candi date to di scl ose such di sci pline inf ormation he/she could answer none in good faith. In the meantime the actual compl ai nt is withhel d/lost by Garda management to facilitate thei $r$ choi ce of candi date being promoted. Is thi s possi ble?

This office now seeking to deal with all matters rel ating to Garda Keogh and I would be most gratef ul if 13:48 you could ensure that I am copi ed on any reply you mi ght send or have al ready sent to Mr. Cullen."

So, I think you were explaining that you were aware
that they had been, as it were, in the loop?
A. Yes.

340 Q. And addressed correspondence directly by Mr. Mr. Cullen and elsewhere. You saw it as part of your function to refer to this portion of the letter. And, as I say, you copied that letter to Garda Keogh and to Chief McLoughlin?
A. That's correct.

I think you received a reply from Ms. Hall, just it complete the record on that, at page 12513. That's a letter dated the 27th. The essence of the reply is in the first paragraph:
"I acknow edge receipt of your letter of the 13th October which refers to a letter fromsolicitor John Gerard Cullen, on whi ch you were copi ed. It would not be perhaps for us to copy third parties (incl udi ng An Garda Sí ochána) on any response sent to Mr. Cullen. Mr. Cullen's client is of course free to provide you with a copy of any such correspondence if he so wi shes. "

It then sets out the clearance process.
A. Yes.

342 Q. Which you understood at the time and were not enquiring 13:49 at all obviously. But you probably hadn't been aware when you wrote your letter that they had originally earlier written to the acting commissioner, Mr. Ó Cualáin, on the 12th October. If we look at page
12471. Writing to the Commissioner there about the clearance form and the second paragraph says:
"Further to an alleged matter which is in the public domain l would be gratef ul to know if any bullying or harassment compl ai nt has been recei ved or if there is any investi gation rel ating to the same in train or being contempl ated with regard to this candi date and if so the stage of those processes."

The Chairman has already heard evidence from An Garda Síochána, the relevant people at this stage dealing with that issue.
A. Yes.

343 Q. The second case conference then took place on the 23rd October, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

344 Q. There are typed notes of that to be found at page 3598. You have seen those notes, I take it?
A. I have seen a couple of versions of notes.

345 Q. Yes. There's also I think some maintained by Sergeant Ga11agher?
A. Yes.

346 Q. Séan Gallagher, is that right? Perhaps we will just scroll down here. It was chaired by Mr. Noonan, I think, the chief administrative office?
A. Mr. Nugent, yeah.

347 Q. Mr. Nugent, I beg your pardon.
A. Yeah.

348 Q. I beg your pardon. There was a discussion to identify a11 the particular strands, which are set out there. But at the bottom of it, correct me if you don't agree with this, there seemed to be a determination that of all the things that ought to happen the bullying complaint should be bottomed out and that that should be progressed, an appointment should be made and an investigation should take place?
A. Yes. I think at that point there were people in the room who knew that I was on the verge of making an appointment and that in effect my determination was that while I had a certain sympathy for the argument made by Assistant Commissioner Fanning, I was neutral at best, $I$ think is how $I$ express it in a subsequent note, that the thing needed to be expanded beyond B\&H.
349 Q. Yes. There does seem to have been some discussion there or thereabouts about the appointment of Assistant Commissioner McPartlin?
A. Yes. And that would have arisen if there was going to be a broader discussion. As in, if there was going to be that second paralleled investigation. There's some confusion about this, which I think I can clear up.
350 Q. Yes.
A. In the event of there being can go more than a Byrne-McGinn type thing.
351 Q. Yes.
A. One suggestion I think addressed at that meeting was that effectively, I think the term used is, strip out the bullying and harassment and all the other issues
would go into some other investigation, fact-finding or whatever.
Q. Yes.
A. That's if $I$ was to determine that it's a bullying and harassment and it's not sufficient, because it doesn't cover all the issues.
A. Yeah.
Q. -- isn't that right, you're talking not merely about the Finn appointment but the McPartlin appointment too?
A. Yes. There is a suggestion, you know, that there were other issues that needed to be dealt with. The thing that ultimately guided me in going with just a bullying and harassment, under the policy, was that if criminality, as Assistant Commissioner Fanning I think was genuinely concerned about, if there was an issue of criminality arising in that investigation, then at that ${ }_{13: 54}$ point the criminality could be taken and commenced as a separate investigation. I think it's fair to say, Mr. McGuinness, you raised it with me before we broke for lunch, there was a real imperative around time at this point. This thing has taken a lengthy period.
There was a framework or a scaffolding or a B\&H investigation and that was more easy expedited than something wherein the parties who were impugned by certain allegations might find fault with a

Byrne-McGinn or something that didn't have the same, if you like, policy structure.
Q. Yes.
A. That was a consideration of mine.

Yes. I mean, what was envisaged as the larger one would be in a sense non-procedural, non-policy based but simply based on an administrative decision that an investigation shal1 encompass everything?
A. And I quite frankly didn't know if I had the vires for that.

357 Q. okay. We11, in any event, obviously one of the other concerns were the people who were being complained about and I think you received notice from Assistant Commissioner Fanning on the 10th October, following he having sent Inspector McCarthy out to visit Garda Keogh, that Garda Keogh was not available to mediate on the point?
A. Yes.

358 Q. Perhaps if we look at page 3619 ?
A. Yes.

359 Q. That is an e-mail to you, just if we go down the page. He had sent Inspector McCarthy out the previous day, Garda Keogh had signed a sort of objection and he had received that back. At the same time I think were you aware that Assistant Commissioner Fanning had written out to those who were possibly named or implicated in the complaint to inform them of the making of the complaint?
A. Yes.

360 Q. And seeking a similar sort of response as to whether they would be objecting?
A. I think that is the correct policy that Assistant Commissioner Fanning was following.
Q. It obviously follows that whoever objected first would mean -- or objected at all, if any objected, there wouldn't be a mediator?
A. Correct. Everyone would have to buy in.
Q. Then if we look at page 3625 , this is you writing to the Assistant Commissioner Fanning, nominating Assistant Commissioner Finn and you're asking him to formalise the appointment under the sexual harassment and bullying policy?
A. Yes.

364 Q. "Keep me informed of matters". Am I correct in saying that nomination took place following a meeting in your office when he came to see you about a possible appointment, is that right?
A. Yeah, I think so. I think we ironed it out on that basis, yes.
Q. And then if we look at page 3624 , one page up, he is confirming that Assistant Commissioner Finn was appointed, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, and under the specific policy provisions.

366 Q. Yes. You had prepared an update for the Deputy Commissioner I think on the 5th July covering the whole
period of effectively a year, from the 1st December '16 up until the 5th December '17, isn't that right, for his information. If we go to page 3626 . Was this in response to a particular request for an update from the Deputy Commissioner?
A. It may have been. Quite frankly, I don't recall.
Q. Yes. It should be 5th December, if we scroll up, or down. It gives an overview of events?
A. Yeah, and 5th December, okay. I think there's a reference in there that might be incorrect. But anyway. Yes.
369 Q. What do you think that may be?
A. I think the McPartlin thing may have made its way into that.
Q. Yes.
A. I think it shouldn't have.

371 Q. Yes.
A. Because I think by that date two things have happened, AC MCPartlin had indicated that she was unwilling, and I think at that point we had also bottomed out that it was just going to be a bullying and harassment matter.
372 Q. Yes.
A. So that should have been circa the time we appointed AC 14:00 Finn.

373 Q. Yes.
A. I would imagine that's on foot of a request, Mr. McGuinness. I don't have the request in mind, but
it looks like something that would be done on foot of a request.
374 Q. Perhaps if we just look at the volume itself, it should be in volume 12. 3626 and the preceding page.
A. Got it, yeah.
Q. It would seem, in any event, that a request came from the Deputy Commissioner's that you were responding to, is that correct?
A. That looks like it. I don't...
Q. The error that you referred to, if we just look at page 14:01 3628 , the last paragraph there.
A. There was some debate, Mr. McGuinness, at the meeting of the 23 rd as to whether or not there was a requirement for a fact-finding mission. And, you know, what that was going to accomplish in the circumstances, 14:01 I think I wrote a note after the meeting of the 23 rd which said, and this is from memory now, that I was somewhat neutral on the idea of the more expanded format.
377 Q. Yes.
A. And I think that began to fall away somewhere in that window.

378 Q. Yes. I mean obviously I think it's clear you didn't appoint her on the 19th but her appointment is contemplated in a number of different documents and
A. It is.

379 Q. And it may be that you intended to record here that you intended to appoint her?
A. Yes, I think that's fair comment. There's confusion around that, for certain.
Q. Okay. In any event, following Assistant Commissioner Finn's first meeting with Garda Keogh and Mr. Cullen, Mr. Cullen wrote on the 5th December a letter complaining about conceptual fragmentation and procedural fragmentation of the complaint and that it was being disarticulated in its parts from a whole.
A. Okay.
A. No, I don't but if you can pull it up, I will have a better --
Q. Yes. 3630.
A. Yeah.

383 Q. It has gone purple on the screen for some reason. You have that in front of you?
A. Yes.
Q. A three-page 1etter?
A. Yes, have I it. I am cc'd on it.

385 Q. Yes. It appears to be a complaint which follows upon an understanding on his part that it was limited to the bullying and harassment claim and wouldn't embrace the other matters. And there the memorable phrase about the procrustean bed at the top of page 2?
A. Yeah. It's in the nature of -- and I am not an investigator, so let me put that label very clearly out there.

386 Q. Yes.
A. It's in the nature of these kinds of investigations
that there is compartmentalisation for reasons of getting things clearly defined and stated. So I wasn't obviously at the meeting that is referred to in the mullingar Park Hotel.
Q. Yes.
A. I read this letter and in some respects I felt it's well within Assistant Commissioner Finn's competence to deal with the matters. He didn't speak to me about it. I think he proceeded from there. I was aware that he was planning an early meeting.

388 Q. Yes. I think you wrote to him about that suggesting the 15 th?
A. Yes.
Q. If we look at page 3633, there is an e-mail from you to him at 12:30 on the 16th, just down there.
A. 3633.

390 Q. Yes, it's in the middle of the page, your e-mail to Chief McLoughlin. It says:
"Hi Tony. Just tried to call you back and I saw you were at a meeting on this matter. I think we need to appoi nt Mck Donl on in the di scl osures office to track and trace. All the various el ements of this moving file make certain that we keep all the el ements together. We need to be cogni sant of the appoint ment of AC Finn and AC MEPartlin to two el ements of this case.

After our di scussion this norning we do need to make
time to speak to Mr. Cullen and his client bef ore Christmas and see where that leads us froma welfare and return to work plan."

Then you are suggesting the 15th.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

391 Q. He agrees with that. You did meet them on the 15th I any in the Killeshin Hotel?
A. That's correct.

392 Q. I don't know if you kept minutes of that but you have seen Chief McLoughlin's minutes?
A. I have, and I kept a note that I wrote in my own hand on a letter from Mr. Cullen. It was just a very simple handwritten scrawl. I think I had typed copies of that made and given to the investigators, Mr. McGuinness.
Q. Yes.
A. I don't know if it's on the file.
Q. In any event, just looking at the chief's note at page 3635 , if we go back over the -- if you turn over the page yourself?
A. Yeah.
Q. It's in volume 12. It records who is there. Then there are a number of sort of bullet points.
"Mck Finn B\&H.

AC MEPartlin all the el ements.

Welfare. What can we do for you?

Back to work.

Set up if I go back and..."

I am not sure what that says.
"... and work."

He refers to the health meeting with the CMO and the minutes of that and correspondence. The case conference in December?
A. Loss of allowances.
Q. Loss of allowances, yes. Work related stress, loss of allowances. He complains about Superintendent Murray on the next page:
"No i ssue with M Curran. It was chi ef's office."

It goes about, it goes into different elements
regarding Garda A and Ms. B that we are not concerned with. On the final page of it, at 3639, towards the very bottom of the page, raising again obviously the possibility of injury
A. Yeah. IOJ, injury on duty.

397 Q. Yes. That was something that was still concerning him, isn't that correct, injury on duty issue?
A. Mr. McGuinness, can I just volunteer this in ease of the Tribunal.
Q. Yes.
A. I felt going to that meeting that it was an important opportunity to continue the dialogue that we started on the telephone call with Mr . Cullen on the 2 nd September.
A. Many of the issues, and this is from experience in dealing with Sergeant McCabe, many of the issues that were difficult, example like trust building, confidence building, etcetera, were overcome in that case when Sergeant McCabe returned as the traffic sergeant in Mullingar.
400 Q. Yes.
A. And I was seeking to encourage Garda Keogh to consider a return to work as such a measure. And I felt it was important that we do it in person. Garda Keogh was in excellent form, he was looking extremely fit and well. We had a lengthy conversation in the shadow of Christmas on the 15th December. And I felt we were moving in the right direction. AC Finn had begun his dialogue, and that my sincere hope was that we would be able to engineer a return to work for Garda Keogh, which would then, you know, vitiate all the issues about full pay and allowances and all that, would naturally restore themselves, and the opportunity to first years of its time in An Garda Síochána. I thought it was the right thing to don't and that was the mindset $I$ brought to that meeting.


Q. Yes. I mean the reference to checking the allowance payment for injury on duty, was that progressed after the meeting, that is on page 3636 ?
A. I think it was. Again, that is a question $I$ think is best asked of Chief McLough1in in his capacity. But to 14:10 the best of my knowledge, those items were dealt with. We -- I was seeking to allow AC Finn opportunity to conduct his investigation and hopefully on foot of this meeting to create a situation where Garda Keogh would return to work.
Q. Yes. I know you wrote to Assistant Commissioner McPartlin in late January talking about her appointment?
A. Yes.

403 Q. She wrote back saying you haven't spoken to me about the appointment?
A. Yes, that is where the matter was. She came and spoke to me at that point and said, what appointment. I think that's when the idea of going beyond the B\&H ended.

404 Q. I am wondering, did it become abandoned in a more practical way because of what Garda Keogh and Mr. Cullen said to you at this meeting. At page 3638, at the top of it?
A. Yeah.

405 Q. It's in his handwritten obviously, the top of 3628:
"All aspects of my compl ai nts are under some sort of i nvestigation at present. No loose ends at present.

But I amthe one pushing it."
A. That is clear. I mean, we had a multiplicity of investigations ongoing at this point. There had been a criminal investigation. There was civil litigation. There was bullying and harassment commenced. The matter was dealt with under the prism of protected disclosure. There was a multiplicity of activities or avenues being pursued. And it had taken -- it was a complex matter, I think we have to describe it for what 14:12 it was, and it had taken a very long time. That too had its consequence.
406 Q. Yes. No other investigation was established thereafter?
A. To the best of my knowledge.

407 Q. Yes. Insofar as Assistant Commissioner Finn's investigation occurred then, had you any role in monitoring it or --
A. No.

408 Q. He wasn't required to report to you?
A. No, he wasn't required to report to me. His report would go back to Assistant Commissioner Finn.

409 Q. You are written to about the issue of stenographers and recording meetings in February?
A. Yes.

410 Q. And later in the year you're making enquiries, if we look at a letter, 4711, this is on the 28th September 2018. You're writing to Assistant Commissioner Fanning and you are referring to his previous correspondence.

He was keeping you up-to-date insofar as he was kept up-to-date, isn't that fair?
A. Yes. I think Assistant Commissioner Fanning, to be fair, was seeking to encourage AC Finn to get this dealt with as expediently as possible.

411 Q. Yes. I mean, some of the issues that were raised and reported upon related to the entitlement and the fact that parties had sought legal advice at different stages?
A. Yes.

412 Q. There in the second paragraph, for instance. But you seem to be pressing here for the investigation to be finalised and that they be given a two-week deadline to respond to the allegations?
A. Part of the difficulty in the elongation of this whole thing, is that there were these gaps in the cooperation or -- it's not anybody's fault, it just occurred, there was legal advice sought or whatever. It had the effect of making the thing elongated.
413 Q. Now, I'm sure you weren't trying to cut across their right to legal advice in any way?
A. No, no.

414 Q. But they don't appear at that stage to have responded to the allegations made and you're suggesting then, if we go down the page onto the next page, what ought to happen.
> "They should be informed that the assi stant commi ssi oner will finalise his investigation."

Then you raise the spectre of non-cooperation.
A. Yeah. As the policyholder on this, you know, while every autonomy must be given to the investigating officer, I have to be mindful of certain of the issues arising in the course of investigation if they are put to me, and they were by AC fanning on I think those two previous occasions you referred to. So that was my response.
415 Q. I mean, you're not in any sense taking side?
A. No.

416 Q. One against the other?
A. Not at all.

417 Q. You're anxious it be concluded?
A. Yeah. In fairness, I think that is precisely what
earlier we had been accused of, by, you know, not expediting matters. I just wanted to make certain that we weren't letting this thing drift off further.
418 Q. Yes. I think Assistant Commissioner Fanning further wrote to you on the 10th october 2018?
A. I had been suspended.

419 Q. On the 10th October?
A. No, sorry, I hadn't been suspended by then.

420 Q. If we look at 4713?
A. Okay.

421 Q. You are being sent the report by Inspector McCarthy which is the report on the next page, if we scroll down?
A. Yes.

422
Q. The reason being explained is that there are further queries raised by Mr. Cullen on Garda Keogh's --
A. And that's fine, all of that is fine.

423 Q. And then I think you got a further report on the 18th October, if we look at 4719 and 4720. Sorry, he is forwarding a request from you dated the 18th?
A. Yes.
Q. If we look on the next page. You're seeking to be updated essentially.
A. Yes.
Q. I think you refer to an issue of suspension there, which isn't relevant. I think you did say in your statement to our investigators that you met Garda Keogh once in your official capacity, as it were?
A. Yes.

426 Q. Executive director. And then you met him, I think was it --
A. The 30th October.
Q. The 30th October, on foot of a request from him I think?
A. Correct.
Q. That he had some information, important information to impart?
A. He left a voicemail on my telephone.

429 Q. Yes.
A. I mean, I have to confess, so did probably a hundred others, and I was in my car when I took the message.

430 Q. Yes.
A. I was driving to Dublin and he invited me to have a
coffee with him.
431 Q. Was it information in relation to any of the issues that he is currently examining?
A. No.

432 Q. No?
A. No.

433 Q. In relation to all of the other issues, I think you have answered the investigators' questions about your knowledge or involvement in our list of 22 issues and I think had you no knowledge or involvement of any of them, except the ones that we have discussed in evidence this morning?
A. That's true.

434 Q. Pay, sick classification and penalisation, bullying and harassment; isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Thank you very much, Mr. Barrett.
A. Thank you, Mr. McGuinness.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAK Mr. O'Brien, you would be next, isn't that right. You probably need a few minutes, yourself and Ms. Mulligan, you need a few minutes, is that right?
MR. O BRI EN Yes, please. I think ten minutes,
Chairman, would suffice.
CHA RMAN Is that enough? okay. It's nearly twenty past, if I said 2:30, is that convenient?

MR. O BRI EN May it please you, Chairman.

THE WTNESS: That's fine, Chairman.
CHA RMAN So be it. We will sit at 2:30 again. Thanks very much.

## THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED BRI EFLY AND RESUMED AS

## FOLLO/S:

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Yes, Ms. Mulligan. MR. JOHN BARRETT WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY ME. MLLI GAN AS 14:35

## FOLLOMS:

436 Q. MS. MLLI GAN Good afternoon, Mr. Barrett.
A. Good afternoon. If you bear with me for a minute.

437 Q. I wonder can I just go back to the very start, without hoping the HQ Directive, are you happy to say that you are familiar with HQ Directive 139/2010?
A. No.

438 Q. okay.
A. If I could have a copy put on the screen, I would be grateful.
Q. Okay. If we could have open Volume 38, please, Mr. Kavanagh, it is page 8202. Just in relation to your role, so I think you have given relatively clear evidence that, for want of a better word, your role is the system, so you don't look at individual people per se, you're looking at the organisation as a whole, would that be a fair summation as to your role?
A. Yes.

440 Q. When we look at the role at local management, it's your role to look at the system and it's the local management's role to look at the individuals who will be applying and who will be using these directives on the ground level, would that be fair?
A. Yeah. These directive are to the organisation on how to conduct various matters of process. I would look at the score that comes back, how many people we have on various categories of illness, etcetera.
441 Q. And I think at the very start of your evidence, for example, you said there would be hundreds of people off at any given moment and you would be looking at the numbers rather than individual cases?
A. Yeah, individual cases only by exception.

442 Q. Yes, by exception?
A. Yes.

443 Q. So, for example, it wouldn't be standard for you for any and all work related stress investigations to be, I suppose, managed in any substantial or personal way by you?
A. Correct.

444 Q. So when you look at the management of the work related stress/injury on duty categorisation, you're looking at it from a numbers, how is it being used, how many people are availing of it, is it effective, how long is 14:38 it taking; would that be fair?
A. That's correct, and I think there was some reference in my evidence, but in others, to a review that was ongoing with respect to injury on duty.

445 Q. Yes. So again, process as opposed to person. And so, from Garda Keogh's point of view, while his file might go up through, I think there are three essentially tenants is the local management, then you have HR and the Sick Section in Navan?
A. Yes.

446 Q. So there are two, we'11 say, HR and administrative processes and then there's the local management role which would be, I suppose, the more direct --
A. Yes.

447 Q. -- interaction from the individual's point of view?
A. That's correct.

448 Q. So when we look at the 11.37 and it says:
"Where there is a doubt about whether or not an injury on duty occurred."
which is just on the second paragraph, on page 8205.
A. 8205 yeah.

449 Q. You did give clear evidence that that doubt, the
question is really for the chief superintendent, is that right?
A. Yeah, the decision is the chief superintendent. My reference to doubt was, when we met in September, there having been no report I think having been requested in 14:39 June, I think somebody used the term we gave Garda Keogh the benefit of the doubt.
450 Q. Just so I am very clear in terms of we see in May of 2015, the start of the administrative process once the
six certs are scanned in through Navan, to say you now need to do an investigation?
A. Yes.

451 Q. And my question to you then is, that letter that's sent saying you now need to do an investigation, is that a proforma letter?
A. Pretty much.

452 Q. I asked Mr. Mulligan and he said this is essentially the process to try and catch any gaps?
A. Yes.

453 Q. Therefore, the authorisation or the engagement with an investigation rest, for want of a better word, purely with the management, the local management?
A. The local management, that's correct.

454 Q. In other words, your chief superintendent is the person 14:40 who holds the responsibility?
A. Correct.

455 Q. But she of course may delegate down to investigations?
A. Yes.

456 Q. So that then leads me on to the issue of that delegation into an investigation. would you expect in ordinary course if someone is going to do the work related stress investigation, that the person who is the subject of that investigation would be informed?
A. Yes.

So in other words, Garda Keogh would be written to in line with presumably the attachment from HR --
A. Yes.

458 Q. -- we have to do a work related stress investigation?
A. That strikes me as --

459 Q. Standard?
A. Yeah, standard.

460 Q. And would, in your -- and obvious7y again I accept that you are a process, not a person, in engaging as HR, but 14:41 from that point of view would you expect to if you open the file that you would see that letter, $I$ have been asked to do a work related stress investigation, I wonder you come in to meet me?
A. Yes. letter on this file, would that surprise you?
A. I would be surprised.

463 Q. okay. Then if I were to look at continuing on I suppose the process as opposed to the individual, and if there was no such letter and a letter -- we'11 say that it's the 7th May letter from HR and it says please conduct an investigation, would you expect when a reply is sent identifying the steps that were taken that there was in fact an investigation outlining what steps were taken?
A. I would, and I am obviously a little bit surprised by your line of questioning, only because there's a very definitive letter from Chief Superintendent wheatley saying that she took the trouble to go and visit Garda

Keogh at his home address. So I was, up to the point of your questioning, assuming that which is written is true.
464 Q. If we might just open then, because I think it might be helpful for everyone, if we just look at page 3267.
A. 3267.

465 Q. Just to be absolutely clear about everything. I think to be fair, you will have seen this, it is a series of correspondence in a report furnished to Chief Superintendent McLoughlin?
A. Okay. And it's written by? who is the author?

466 Q. It might be of a benefit to have a hard copy because there are several sequential pages?
A. 3267. Yes.

467 Q. And you will see -- I will give you a moment?
A. This is the lengthy document that Mr. McGuinness opened, yeah.
468 Q. Yes, the lengthy document. It identifies the steps taken by, we'11 say, local management to investigate the source of the work related stress. One of the issues that arises is that is that efforts were made locally to establish the source of the member's work related stress. And it says:
"On the 26th March Superintendent Murray met with Garda Keogh at Athl one Garda Station to di scuss the frequent absences at work."

```
Do you see that?
```

A. I do, paragraph 3.

469 Q. Yes. Would it surprise you then to identify that that was actually not a meeting for the purposes of a work related stress investigation, but was the very first time that Superintendent Murray met Garda Keogh?
A. I would be surprised, yes. Very clearly what it doesn't say here is to discuss the member's frequent attendance at work.
470 Q. In fact Superintendent Murray in his evidence described it as a meeting to solve problems. A number of issues were raised by Superintendent Murray at this meeting. But just so I am clear about the process, if you are going to conduct a work related stress investigation, you have identified that you would expect the chief superintendent to write to the subject of the investigation, would you expect the investigator, if we acknowledge that this is what Superintendent Murray's role is in this process, as the investigator, who is appointed by Chief Superintendent wheatley, if that is the case, would you expect then that that, I suppose that new role, that additional role that Superintendent Murray would have would be identified to Garda Keogh? There is to be a work related stress investigation, one, and two, that he would be informed of that?
A. I really am always surprised that matters are not dealt 14:45 with adult to adult. I think if this was a meeting, as is suggested here, to discuss the member's frequent absence from work, I take it to mean what it says. I wasn't at the meeting, so $I$ can't make any comment. I
haven't -- the date didn't jump off the page at me. But in an organisation with 17,000 people, one assumes -- you know.
471 Q.
I totally accept again, you're not necessarily double-checking everyone's work?
A. Sure, I'm not. But the business that this letter purports to tell us about is very normal, it happens in every Garda district, in every Garda division in every Garda region every day.
472 Q.
You wouldn't be over -- you yourself wouldn't be, I suppose, doing it in chronological order?
A. Not at all.

473 Q. You would expect local management to do the job?
A. Precisely, and so it must operate.

474 Q. And I appreciate that. So for example, this report that goes to Chief Superintendent McLoughlin, dated 6th June 2016 --
A. Yeah.

475 Q. -- refers to the efforts that were made to investigate the source of Garda Keogh's work related stress. And can I just for the absolute clarity, there's only one direct meeting between Superintendent Murray and my client, Garda Keogh, and that is on the 26th March 2015. So that predates the request for the work related stress investigation and there was no further attempts made by anyone to contact Garda Keogh about the source of this stress.
A. I am at a significant disadvantage here in the sense that I will take your word for it. And I can say that

I did rely upon the kinds of reports that are received, as I did not just from Chief wheatley but from chiefs all overt country when matters became contentious. I would expect and I think anybody in the room would expect that in circumstances like this there would be an honest, open and adult to adult conversation as to why people are absent from work and what is the nature of the stress and what are the stressors and what are the symptoms of the stress and how does it manifest itself. All the normal, lay person, interested enquiries that should be made around topics like that. And any organisation, and I say this as somebody who has a considerable amount of experience in guiding organisations on stuff like this, any organisation would be concerned to understand sources of stress and destress for its employees. Because they impact proper functioning. So when I get a report that tells me this, I take it at face value because it should be so.
476 Q. So the report in the correspondence is dated the 7th may is the request, the response is then furnished by Superintendent Murray on the 20th May. And in that time no efforts were made to contact Garda Keogh about the source of his stress, to inform him that there was an investigation, that there was a request for an investigation, the consequence of cooperating or those things happened?
A. I can't make any comment on that. I don't -- I'm take your word for it, I don't know.

477 Q. I think it's established none of those things happened. What they mean is a matter of submission. But that seems to have been established on the facts that that is what happened. Is that the proper functioning --
A. No, it's not.
okay. When we take it into account the fact that Garda 14:49 Keogh was a whistleblower, would that give you an additional cause for concern?
A. We11, I think the actual issue of stress, you know, it doesn't require -- it's not different for whistleblowers or non-whistleblowers, it's an issue in 14:49 and of itself and I think the conversation should be, you know, a full and frank discussion, whistleblower or no.
Q. Absolutely. But we will say, that if the issue, I suppose the additional stress of having been subject to 14:50 protected disclosure, having had --
A. Yeah, normal human empathy would say, if you were dealing with somebody with some kind of --
Q. Might be more difficult, without minimising anyone else?
A. Just as an awareness.
Q. Indeed. So from that point of view, if what I have just said is correct, would you say that an investigation took place?
A. I am at a real disadvantage here because you are asking me to agree with you, and $I$ will do so in a hypothetical sense, if as you described it to be. of course?
A. It would be improper, it would be insufficient in my view. In my view.

It would be?
A. But $I$ think there is a requirement just in all human interaction that there is an adult to adult transaction about problem identification, you know, and how it is that that problem should then perhaps best be dealt with.

485 Q. Just for the purposes of clarity as well, if we look at the report that was furnished to chief Superintendent McLough1in, and again that's at page 3267, none of that 14:51 is clearly identified in that correspondence to Chief Superintendent McLough1in either.
A. None of what?
Q. The fact that there is only one meeting on the 26 th March 2015?
A. I'11 have to re-read this. It says "efforts have been made locally", it sounds as if it's in the plural.
487 Q. I suppose just for clarity, what I am trying to say is that when a request is made from HR on the 7 th May to do an investigation and a report is furnished on the 20th May, and doesn't make it clear that the on7y attempt to have a meeting with Garda Keogh was dated the 26th March, would you have concern about that and I suppose the honesty behind the report in that regard?
A. I am not prepared to -- there's a series of things here that I am not familiar with that I am being asked to make a judgment on. I think I can make a judgment about the human interaction, the transaction that should occur in a generic way between somebody enquiring about work related stress and somebody experiencing work related stress. The particular mechanics of this, I am not sufficiently familiar with the date sequence or how matters unfolded. But I take your point in general, if that's an answer to the question.

488 Q. Okay. Just so we are -- I might have to be a little bit more specific when we go through the paperwork as is required then. In terms of -- we'11 say, we'11 start with Chief Superintendent wheatley's role. She received the request on the 7th May to conduct a work related stress investigation. One might expect if that investigation was to be completed or any undertaking to have the investigation, you would see some attempt of correspondence directly with the subject, in this case it would be Garda Keogh?
A. I would imagine it could have been done by correspondence, it could have been done by telephone.
489 Q. Yes.
A. Just, I would like to have a discussion with you.
A. There's a matter to be raised. It doesn't necessarily have to be in writing, it could have been done, you know, in a face-to-face meeting in a hallway. But there would have to be a contact.

491 Q. Some direct contact of some kind?
A. Correct.

492 Q. And one of the things that you might then expect to see on top of that would be, what is the nature of the complaint and can you talk to me about it?
A. I think that's a central core to any problem solving, identification of what the issue is, yes.
Q. And I can't imagine that in the circumstances I think you said there was some 17,000 people in the organisation --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that your direct line manager, it wouldn't be that surprising if the person or the alleged source of stress was your direct line manager, I presume that is probably standard enough?
A. It does happen.

495 Q. It does happen?
A. You know, there are any number of stressors, but it can happen, of course.
496 Q. And so, for example, is it possible if such an issue is addressed that a third party, someone would come in from beyond the division to be an independent investigator, so in other words, a different chief superintendent?
A. Sure. It happens all the time, there's adult to adult arrangements made around the organisation to circumvent personal difficulties and to try and resolve things intelligently.

497 Q. So from that point of view, the fact that Garda Keogh had made a protected disclosure, then that wasn't necessarily a bar per se to having an investigation, would that be fair?
A. Having an investigation?
Q. Yes, having a work related stress investigation?
A. Not at all.

499 Q. Not at a11. So one of the issues that was raised by Chief Superintendent wheatley is that she progressed it as far as she could. That obviously from our point is disputed. But from your point of view, if it's the case that she progressed it as far as she could directly, she could have sought the appointment of an investigator from a different division or different district. So in other words, if the individual, Garda 14:56 Keogh had a specific grievance with Chief Superintendent wheatley, can a different chief superintendent be the person to do the investigation, for example?
A. Sure. I didn't realise that there was an issue between 14:56 Garda Keogh and Chief Superintendent wheatley.
500 Q. No, it was hypothetical, just for clarity?
A. Right.

501 Q. That was a purely hypothetical issue?
A. Okay.

502 Q. So in other words, if you're the divisional officer?
A. Sure.

503 Q. And the complaint is about you?
A. Yeah.

504 Q. It would make sense that you wouldn't be the person?
A. Of course.
Q. If that is the case, can a person from a different division become the investigating officer?
A. Of course.

506 Q. So that is something that is in place and happens?
A. It happens all the time by local arrangement right throughout the country. I'm sure there is probably meetings going on now under that particular format.
507 Q. For example, there's no correspondence from Chief Superintendent wheatley or anyone else in that regard for any such request to be made, that we have. Are you familiar with there being any such correspondence?
A. I am not familiar with this. And truthfully, this is at a level which I think Chief McLough1in may have been a better person to ask these questions of. For two reasons: He's an actual architect of the HQ and would be closer to the division in his capacity as the protected disclosure manager that was engaged with Garda Keogh. But I can answer you at a level of principle and I think there's nothing I am saying that isn't, if you like, just common sense. But you know, I respect the requirement for the use of common sense in dealing with matters of sensitivity.
508 Q. Very good.
A. And I can't say about the specific.

509 Q. That's helpful. There is one other issue that has arisen from Ms. Claire Egan, I will find the relevant reference now, but Ms. Egan says that she wasn't aware
of any application for Garda Keogh's to be considered for an injury on duty. Now, where would that application arise from? would that come from local management? I presume, as I understand it, Claire Egan works again for the sick Section?
A. Yes.

510 Q. And correct me if I am wrong, what would you expect is a section 11.37 from Chief Superintendent wheatley?
A. Yes.

511 Q. And then, once that authorisation is provided by her, then HR ?
A. Yes.

512 Q. Or the Sick Section?
A. Yes.

513 Q. Do the administrative aspect of that, is that correct?
A. That is absolutely correct. So chief's prerogative, local decision based on investigation, forward report into Sick Section, matter is resolved and processed.
514 Q. In relation to that then, the role of the CMO is obviously to identify if there's any other reason that might --
A. Yes.

515 Q. -- have caused the stress. Would it be fair to say that it is the absence of any other reason -- or are you familiar with there being a test?
A. No. You know, again, the question is perhaps best directed at Dr. Oghuvbu, but, you know, the CMO is the expert who advises the chief.
516 Q. Yes.

Again for the sake of completeness, that was put to Dr. Oghuvbu and what he said was that he would wait for an application for a request to be made. In other words, he wouldn't diagnose work related stress or injury on duty in the absence of being informed that is what someone was asking him to do. Would you agree with that position?
A. I would have to bow to whatever his process is.

518 Q. okay.
A. But to my knowledge there was a case conference attended by Dr. Oghuvbu.
519 Q. Yes, there was.
A. At some juncture in this process.

520 Q. Some 12 months later, yes.
A. All right. Okay.

521 Q. Yes, that is the case. The issue is that, yes, while the matter was resolved and again by Chief Superintendent McLough1in, there is quite a significant timeline between the first request for an investigation by $H R$ and the subsequent resolution of matters?
A. Yes. I take that point.

522 Q. It is that issue that we find ourselves discussing quite substantively in these proceedings, if that makes sense.
A. I understand. I think Mr. McGuinness asked me some questions about that. I think I have answered as honestly as I can.
523 Q. As best you can. Just then in relation to the bullying
and harassment piece, again Mr. McGuinness has gone through all the substantive correspondence, so I am going to go through a few of them, if that's okay?
A. Sure.

524 Q. Can I just ask, and I am just going to put the question more generally and then I can go more into documents, but in terms of this issue of delay, you have quite reasonably said there was a delay, there were a few moving parts that caused difficulty. It just doesn't appear that you have identified in any of the correspondence when you address the issues that you are acknowledging the delay in a contemporaneous fashion. So, in the flow of correspondence you're not saying there has been a delay here, we need to move this on, or acknowledging that was an issue from that point of view, at the time. Is that just looking at it with the benefit of hindsight now?
A. I think it is, truthfully. One of the issues I think that I am finding difficult is, I read these papers in some detail before Covid in the expectation of coming here and having this inquiry, I read some of them in the last couple of days, and my perspective I think was probably a little different when I was in the middle of it, if you know what I mean.
525 Q. Yes.
A. And that's a reality I think for all of us. So I am finding the question difficult to answer, as to what lens I should use, was I conscious of the delay because I have had the benefit of standing back and looking at
it now, or was I conscious of the delay when I was in the middle of it. You know, I can acknowledge it now, but it's probably with the benefit of reading everybody else's contribution.
A. Yes.

527 Q. And I suppose the same question then sort of applies to the issue of the statement that you say you didn't receive from Assistant Commissioner Fanning until October?
A. Yes.

528 Q. That he says was sent to you in March. And there is a series of correspondence that have been opened extensively by Mr. McGuinness. But at no point do you say that I don't have this statement from Chief Superintendent Scanlan. I suppose just I want you to clarify why didn't you do that?
A. I can address that very clearly and if there is any doubt I think discussion with the investigators for this Tribuna1. When they put that to me, that there was this correspondence from AC Fanning, I said I never saw it. As in, I never saw the attachments or the appendices that were sent. I was troubled, because my initial reaction was, have $I$ missed it? I think the recall evidence of Assistant Commissioner Fanning and the evidence of Mr. Mulligan corroborates at least what I said in absolute honesty to the investigators. I didn't see it because it wasn't sent. It wasn't in the appendixes that I had received. And I wasn't there,
which was the difficulty, I knew, on those dates, Alan was standing in my shoes. So I had that anxiety. But Mr. Fanning himself I think makes the point that it was the 4 th October when the matter was resolved. But my question is: If you didn't receive it, why weren't you looking for it?
A. Well, the correspondence that went to me was opened by Alan, $I$ had reports on it. This is where the benefit of hindsight becomes really valuable. Perhaps I should have said, hold a second, let's go through all of this in fine detail. The reality is, $I$ didn't do it until we had the benefit of Mr. Cullen's correspondence in September or in whatever that was, september. And I think just you have already made the point about the difficulty between having I suppose several different players moving at all times, from the Chairman's point of view and I suppose from the ability to progress matters into the future, if there was to be an issue that Chief Superintendent McLough1in's office -- would it be your view that chief Superintendent McLough1in's office should deal with all issues in relation to whistleblowers and not --
A. Well that's the intent. That's the role of the protected disclosures manager, is to do just that. I had a specific role in that very same vein with difficult and unpredictable obligation to have on behalf of an organisation. And I empathise with the chief. I think what is evident is that there was a lot
of valiant endeavour and a lot of, what I would consider to be, outputs in terms of correspondence and documents flowing. The frustration that I am clearly seeing from the letters from Mr. Cullen is outputs are different from outcomes.

So from that point of view, having one person carrying the whole story is something that is probably necessary to avoid this kind of system failure?
A. I have lived a life in the private sector by and large and certainly a single point of contact is probably a whole lot more effective.

CHA RMAN was there a failure? I mean, sorry, here is the question, if I am understanding Ms. Mulligan's point, he makes his complaint in March, the 27th March, Assistant Commissioner Finn is appointed, if I
understand, on the 11th November, those are the relevant dates?

MS. MLLI GAN The 15th November. CHA RMAN Sorry, the 15th November.
MS. MLLI GAN Yes.
CHA RMAN Are you standing over that?
A. I certainly see it as -- I will answer your question by putting it in this context.

536 Q. CHA RMAK No, are you standing over that as proper
behaviour. I mean, you're the man in charge. You carry the can. Whether it was Alan Mulligan or anybody else, you're the boss. Do you think that's acceptable? Because I'11 tel1 you something, I don't
A. Chairman, I don't disagree with you.

CHA RMAN And I can understand why Garda Keogh is there saying, what's going on, is there something here, maybe there is, maybe there isn't, he thinks there was something very sinister going on?
A. Yes.

538 Q. CHA RMAN Doesn't he have every reason to think there's something sinister going on when everybody is -- however it's done, Assistant Commissioner Finn isn't -- and I don't sense that you were saying, gosh, we made an awful mess of this, I'm sorry. I don't have any sense of that. I think you're explaining things, that it could be this way or it could be that. I don't want to be rough, forgive me. Look, maybe it's because we're just coming back and I am being indiscrete. But I mean, let's face it, he is sitting there, he has made his complaint and nothing is happening and he can't find out what's happening?
A. Chairman, I can certainly agree and understand where are you coming from.
CHA RMAN Yes. I am not trying to -- listen, believe me, Mr. Barrett I'm not trying to give you a hard time?
A. I don't for a moment -CHA RMAN Ms. Mulligan has been more polite than I am but essentially her point is really simple?
A. I am not defending this delay and as you've said, and you're correct, $I$ am seeking to explain it, right. And do I think it's good enough in the circumstances? Absolutely not good enough.
541 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. I think if you -- and let's put this in --

542 Q. CHA RMAN what do you think went wrong?
A. We11, I think that there is a series of communications which are incomplete, in that they did not contain the required information. And let's be clear. All that Chief Superintendent Scanlan was tasked to do was take a statement.

543 Q. CHA RMAN Yes.
A. And determine what it is that was the most senior officer complained of.
544 Q. CHA RMAN So as to tell us the level of which --
A. Precisely.

545 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. In the context of the bullying and harassment itself, it sets out some timelines, albeit they aspirational, which are substantially shorter than the timeline that it took to actually take the statement. So I can't disagree with you, Chairman. I am not seeking to --
546 Q. CHAL RMAN No, no, I understand. Please understand, I am not here to give you a hard time?
A. I understand that.

547 Q. CHA RMAN I am looking more at systems and issues and so on. I think that was the thrust of his Mulligan's exploration of the matter. So the first thing you
think was communication that went wrong. I am looking at the thing then and I think, there are two views about the nature of the investigation to be carried out, isn't that right? Assistant Commissioner Fanning says it should be this way and the other, the majority view says well, no, we have a bullying and harassment?
A. Yes. which is what was sought, let's be clear.

CHAI RMAN I understand. That is what Mr. Cullen had sought on behalf of -- but that doesn't take a long time to decide. I mean, you have to talk about it and then you decide.
A. Yes.

548 Q. CHA RMAN You don't sit down, wringing your hands and scratching your head. You know, you do it. You of all people with your extensive experience in industry and everything else would know that. You make a decision and there it is, right or wrong. Surely.
A. I would agree with you entirely and can I say further, that in the circumstances of this commencing in May 2014, wherein there are elements that, you know, took their own course, all elongated courses.

549 Q. CHA RMAN Sure, yes. But everything here seems to have conspired to lengthen the time, people not talking to other people, people taking different views and then not able to make up their minds about what to do?
A. Well, I am satisfied, Chairman, with respect to the decisions that I took and the part that I played in this.
550 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. Which moved from the tail end of September to the point at which Mr. Nugent took the coordination role on the 23rd October.

551 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. I am satisfied that $I$ sought to move this Élan and in good faith.

552 Q
CHA RMAN I understand. So basically -- sorry to interrupt?
A. Sure.

553 Q.
CHA RMAN But if I understand your position is, look, you say, I accept there was a delay, and the delay that you say was there and the delay that you accept must be criticised is it arises because of the communications, is that essentially the point?
A. In a lifetime of working in this space and doing all sorts of things, $I$ have never seen so much committed to paper when a phone call, a conversation or a meeting would drive the thing further and faster. Ms. Mulligan's enquiries regarding the report, that it was given, a written report has to be taken into the literal sense. And you know, what was put to me suggested that something is different behind the words "Garda Keogh at At hl one Garda Station to di scuss the menber's frequent absence from work", that tells me what this letter says was discussed.

554 Q. CHA RMAN Not but in this case, just to focus on the point that we are looking at, the delay in assigning the assistant commissioner to carry out the bullying and harassment investigation, that, you say, and I
introduced some other elements about decisiveness and you said no, if I am understanding, it is a lack of communications, that is the report?
A. The nature of the communications elongated the process. I think we could have foreshorten that.
Q. CHA RMAN Thank you.
A. That is a reality in the volumes of correspondence that we have here, I think, you know, things can be done more effectively, much like you and I are having, Chairman, a conversation right now to clarify what it is that needs clarification. If we were doing this in correspondence we would probably have half a dozen letters written at this stage.
CHA RMAN I understand. okay. Thanks very much. That's all I wanted to ask. Do you want to ask anything arising out of that, Ms. Mulligan?
M. MLLI GAN Just one or two things very briefly. CHA RNAN And then I will move on to everybody else. 556 Q. ME. MLLIGAN Just in relation to page 2549, this is just the meeting calling for a case conference, where you did try to take actions and move things forward.
A. Yeah.

557 Q. It just doesn't say there in the minutes of that meeting that you still don't have Chief Superintendent Scanlan's report?
A. No.
Q. I just wanted to give you an opportunity to address that?
A. Sure. Fintan Fanning advised us that he had a copy
with him and that we were going to be given the benefit, if you like, of what it said. The essence of -- the reason this meeting took place was really the letter from Mr. Cullen at the end of September, which came to me and suggested that our protected disclosure arrangements perhaps weren't working as they should.
559 Q. Just so I am clear, Mr. Cullen's letter I suppose --
A. Triggered.

560 Q. Lit the fire to move, progress things forward?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN okay.
562 Q. M. MLLI GAN Just so that I have put it to you, I am going to say that this delay just had the effect of both targeting and discrediting Garda Keogh because it left him in a situation where he was left in limbo, ultimately 18 months for something that is supposed to take a number of weeks.
A. Yeah, I don't think the number of weeks would ever apply to a case of this complexity.

563 Q. I appreciate that but the sheer extent of it had the effect of damaging Garda Keogh and certainly his relationship with his employer?
A. I think that, you know, and taking the chairman's point, I can explain the various segments of this, I am 15:16 not seeking to approve or justify it.
564 Q. Very good. Nothing further.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Now, who is next? Yes Mr. McGuinness. The other Mr. McGuinness, Mr. Donal McGuinness, yes.
MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN You're for An Garda Síochána.
MR. DONAL MEGU NESS: Yes.
CHAL RMAN Are you okay, Mr. Barrett?
THE WTNESS: Yes, I am very anxious to be of assistance.
CHA RMAN It's a long day. Thanks very much.

## MR. J OHN BARRETT WAS THEN CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. DONAL

 MEGU NNESS, AS FOLLOVS:565 Q. MR. DONAL MEGU NESS: Mr. Barrett, can I deal with the 15:16 work related stress issue in brief to start with. The 11.37 process, that has to be engaged in and we have talked about it at great length, that is a process that anticipates a certain amount of participation on the
part of the guard who claims he has been injured on duty, isn't that correct?
A. It does.

566 Q. Garda Keogh was at all times represented by a solicitor during this time. Garda Keogh as a guard would be aware that in order to get the 11.37 processed he has to engage in a process to get certification; isn't that right?
A. I think that is widely understood, yes. Now, the correspondence that you have gone into in relation to Chief Superintendent wheatley, she makes it very clear that from her perspective Garda Keogh has, for the want of a better word, put the hand up to any enquiries being asked of him that address the issue as to yes is claiming he is out of work on work related stress. Do you accept that that is her view?
A. I do. Again, in response to the correspondence that was opened by Ms. Mulligan, that's the suggestion clearly, yes, that there was a less than forthcoming, is the best way I could put it.
568 Q. Yes. Ms. Mulligan has referenced the letter of the 8th June 2016, if we might just call that letter up, and she sets out, Chief Superintendent wheatley clearly sets out the chronology of events that has led her to the view that she is not able to progress this issue of finding out exactly what is the cause of the work related stress. Sorry, the page number is 3267 . This is the letter that Ms. Mulligan referred to:
"On 26th March 2015 Superintendent Murray met with Garda Keogh at Athl one Garda Station to di scuss the menber's frequent absences from work. Superintendent Murray outlined in his report dated 2nd April that Garda Keogh was reticent to di scuss any issues regarding his absence through work rel at ed stress."

Then she goes on to provide some more detail in relation to that.
A. Yeah, I have that letter.

569 Q. Ms. Mulligan has suggested that the reason why Garda Keogh failed to engage with Superintendent Murray on that occasion was because he was in some way concerned with that work related stress, that's my understanding of her question?
A. That's what I understood from it also.

570 Q. But are you aware that Superintendent Murray was barely two weeks --
A. I am.

571 Q. -- in Athlone at that time?
A. He was newly appointed in Athlone, yeah.

572 Q. Yes. So would you accept that it's very unlikely that within such a relatively short period of time there would on such animosity between them, that that is actually the reason why?
A. Well I was conscious of his date of appointment and I know he was preceded in the role.

573 Q. Yes. We might just look in a little more detail at some of the correspondence. There was a letter of the

17th May 2016 from Chief Superintendent wheatley, that is at 3203?

MR. MGGI NESS: Chairman, might I just intervene on that point, because I did open that letter, but that isn't the letter that chief Superintendent wheatley sent to the executive director's office in her report of the 8th June. There's a slightly revised version of it, which is actually dated the 18th May. That's to be found at 3277. There's some more factual information in it in relation to her visit. I should have opened that.

CHA RMAN Are you happy to deal with it on that basis, Mr. McGuinness. I am sure what Mr. McGuinness is saying is correct. Are you happy to accept that?
MR DONAL MEGU NESS: I am, Chairman.
CHA RMAK Thank you very much. Then 3277 is the one, is that right?
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes.
574 Q. MR. DONLL MGGU NESS: If we look at that letter, chief Superintendent wheatley addresses the issue again, isn't that correct, or for the first time.
"I enquired if Garda Keogh was anxi ous to return to work and was advi sed by Garda Keogh he attributes his current absence to work rel ated stress deriving from his invol vement in investigations being progressed outside the Westmeath di vision. Garda Keogh intimated that he would not be returning to work until these natters had been concluded as these matters were
exacerbating his condition.

While this was noted the referral of the member to the CMD by his local district of ficer was made following a si gni ficant number of absences and the menber's own acknow edgment of a dependence on al cohol. During my meeting with hi me outlined that he was not drinking heavily... ."

I will go on.
"Garda Keogh stated that he would be attending the schedul ed appoi nt ment with CMD. "

She references the medical certificates forwarded by the member set out the reasons for his continued absences from work. If we then just go on to the 26th May, which is 3276 , the second paragraph there, Chief Superintendent wheatley advises your office -- sorry that is --

MR. MEGUNESS: That is a year earlier.
575 Q. MR. DONAL MEGU NESS: Actually, if we could look at that year. It's 2015, a year earlier, the alleged stress:
"As the nember is not willing to further di scuss the issue whi ch he states arises out of his invol vement and protections under the confidentially reporting legi slation. "

And then if we go to the 3267 , which is back to this letter, this long letter, and this letter is the 8th June 2016.
A. Yeah.

576 Q. And once more this is in response to this issue as to whether or not an investigation has been carried out, do you understand?
A. I do.

577 Q. And it's to your office. The letter sets out the progress of this issue, the difficulties with this issue and then if we just go to the very last paragraph, at page 3269:
"In view of the foregoing, it has not been possible to conduct a full investigation into Garda Keogh's absence through alleged work rel ated stress, nor do I believe will any further or specific information be provided by Garda Keogh whi ch would enable the further investigation of this claim"

She is making it very clear that she is unable to progress matters. She goes on:
"However, to be clear and to avoid any doubt, I amto enquire if there is any requirement to further investigate Garda Keogh's absence through alleged work rel ated stress. In the event that the further investigation of this matter is warranted, l would
recommend that permission be granted to appoint an inspector outside the West meath di vi si on to conduct same. "
A. Yeah. Now, if you recall my answer to Mr. Diarmuid McGuinness earlier, Chief Superintendent McLoughlin had 15:24 met with Garda Keogh on the 3rd June, that's about a week, five days earlier than this letter, and he had committed per a letter from Garda Keogh of the 14th June that he would conduct the investigation. so effectively what I understand the chief to have done is $15: 24$ to circumvent the dilemma that was pointed up here in this letter, some days earlier he anticipated it, because this had been raised. Chief McLoughlin, to his credit, has been very careful to ensure that in situations where work related stress arises that the obligation to investigate it was very much put in the hands of the divisional office. It's not just in the Westmeath meet division, it's in all of the divisions, he has been a leading light in that respect and a leading campaigner for supports for mental health within An Garda Síochána. So I think this letter in many respects was almost moot by the fact that that meeting took place on the 3rd June in Tullamore and that the chief himself was going to take this in hand. And I think that's confirmed.

Subsequently the actions clearly were in September, which I appreciate again to the Chairman's point there was some delay, but there was a decision taken at that
point, on the recommendation of the chief, that pay, full basic pay would be restored to Garda Keogh.
578 Q. Yes. That's essentially where I get to.
A. Sorry, I didn't mean to preempt.

579 Q. Garda Keogh, who was independently legally advised, as any guard would be, would be aware of the 11.37 procedure?
A. Yes.

580 Q. Chief Superintendent wheatley shows her good faith by explaining to your office exactly the difficulty that she has in completing an investigation into the cause of the work related stress. And that is associated with the very single fact that Garda Keogh has invoked his status as a protected discloser not to engage with Superintendent murray on this issue?
A. I'm not impugning chief wheatley at all. What she wrote I read to be the position.
581 Q. I'm not suggesting you are impugning the chief but what I want to make clear, her motives have very clear here. Her motives are, she is telling head office is this is the problem, this is the reason why we haven't got an investigation and if you still think an investigation is needed --
A. Get somebody else, yeah.

582 Q. -- then there is the opportunity to appoint another to investigate it?
A. Understood.

583 Q. That plays into --
A. It does.

584 Q. -- cross-examination by Ms. Mulligan, who raised the issue with you as to whether or not engaging with outside investigators was something that is done from time to time?
A. It is, and I think we are clear on that.

585 Q. So Chief Superintendent wheatley actually engaged even with that issue as well?
A. She did.
Q. Yes.
A. I think Chief McLoughlin, to his credit, had already 15:27 found a different bridge to try and address the matter.

587 Q. And that's the point I am making, is that the problem was created as a result of Garda Keogh forming a view that as a protected discloser he didn't have to engage with local management on the issues that he says now were causally related to the work related stress because he is a protected discloser. And the work around it was fine, the local division went as far as they could, and the local management went as far as they could and told your office they went as far as they could, and then your office and Tony McLough1in found a work around to that; isn't that really the case?
A. That is the case.

588 Q. He was put on full pay from October 2016 and it was backdated to December 2015?
A. That's correct, when the absence began.

589 Q. Thank you. Now, if we move onto the next issue. This is the issue of delay, this is the issue you have
engaged in with the Chairman in relation to the delay that you believe occurred in relation to the bullying and harassment and the progressing of that complaint. As I understand it, you referenced that there was a delay in actually taking the complaint in the first instance. Did I understand you correctly in saying that?
A. I think that's documented, Mr. McGuinness. I think there were meetings to happen that didn't happen. There was legal advice sought. There was a variety of different things that are in the various papers that I have read. Now don't ask me what papers because there's a forest of paper here.
590 Q. Well, let's break it down. There is the initial period when Garda Keogh eventually decides that he wishes to engage with the bullying and harassment policy. We will call that period number one. He eventually
decides in November 2016 to engage in the policy, isn't that correct?
A. That is correct.

591 Q. So there is that period between November 2016 and the end of March 2017, when he delivers his signed statement to Chief Superintendent Scan7an. That is period number one.
A. That's your numbering, I accept the point.

592 Q. I just want to clarify, do you believe that there has been a delay in relation to that period?

CHA RMAN Between the time he decided to engage with the -- I'm sorry Mr. McGuinness, just so we know where
we are going. The time he discovers he says he wants to engage with the bullying and harassment policy.
A. Yes

593 Q. CHA RMAN And that appears to be November 2016?
A. '16, correct.

CHA RMAN Take that for the moment?
A. Yeah.
Q. CHAL RMAN We know that he meets Chief Superintendent Scanlan in March 2017 and gives him a statement on the 27th March 2017. And Mr. McGuinness says, 1et's take that as period number one. We were discussing period number two. The period between the Scanlan exchanges, the Scanlan encounter when the statement was made and possibly November, when Assistant Commissioner Finn, but that is another matter, but the first one Mr. McGuinness wants to say, let's take the first of those, November 2016 to the Chief Superintendent Scanlan statement, which is the end of March.
A. That's period number one.
Q. CHAL RMAK Correct.
A. A11 right. In that, there are various back and forths, I have a letter in there saying can $I$ be updated on the progress of this statement and I think there are responses telling me that meetings were scheduled and had to be cancelled and that there was legal advice sought and there was a statement that wasn't signed, there's a lot of activity which then, to the chair's point, ultimately results in a signed statement dated 27th March.

597 Q. MR. DONAL MEGUNNESS: We11, I represent quite a few clients in An Garda Síochána and one of them is Chief Superintendent Scan1an.
A. Sure.

598 Q. I had perhaps understood that you were suggesting that there had been a delay under his watch?
A. No, no, I'm not attributing it to anybody.
Q. In taking a statement?
A. Let's be clear, there is correspondence, again please I'm not that familiar with all the paperwork and this is something I didn't micromanage in any way, but there are correspondences in there to suggest that meetings were to be set up with Garda Keogh, and one party or the other, and I'm attributing no blame, right, were unavailable, or that Garda Keogh engaged legal advice. Now, there are people in the room who are far more familiar with the correspondence than I am, but that was my reading, that there was a series of valiant efforts made and for one reasonable reason or another it took the length of time that it did.
600 Q. If I may add some clarity to that period of time?
A. Sure.

601 Q. If we could have a look at page 9866, please. This is the second page of a letter from HR director Alan Mulligan to the superintendent in the Commissioner's
office. If we could go 9866, it's 25th November 2016 it is dated. You might scroll down, Mr. Kavanagh, please. There is a typed there of July 16th but November is inserted because that was the date it was
sent.

If you just scroll up a little bit please to the main paragraph there. Yes. Stop there, please. In the middle of that paragraph Mr. Mulligan says:
"Mr. Cullen said that he has no probl emwith this I etter, that he understands that Garda Keogh must formally submit hima compl ai nt in a clear and unambi guous manner and that he has advi sed Garda Keogh to fully comply with the Garda policy in rel ation to bullying and harassment. He advi sed me that Garda Keogh was working on his compl ai nt and will send it as soon as possi ble. I offered my assi stance and/ or Mb. Hassett's assistance to Mr. Cullen and Garda Keogh in rel ation to the matter. Mr. Cullen took my cont act details and said he will ring meif he needs assi stance. We agreed that Garda Keogh's compl ai nt would be sent di rectly to me or Chi ef Superintendent MELoughlin. I promised that we will arrange for i nvestigating officer to be appoi nted as soon as the compl ai nt is recei ved. "

So An Garda Síochána has very clearly engaged with Garda Keogh and his solicitor at this time, telling him 15:34 what is required in order to progress his bullying and harassment complaint, do you agree with me?
A. I do, yes.

602 Q. Yes. And then if I could just give you a series of
dates and you can disagree with these if you wish, but I think they are correct, on the 23rd December 2016 Assistant Commissioner Fanning instructed Chief Superintendent Scan7an to take the statement under the bullying and harassment complaint, you don't dispute that?
A. I think he did something different, I think he asked the statement be taken and that he would therefore be able to determine the rank of -- there were two elements of it, the second element being, being in a position to determine the rank of the investigator. 603 Q. That's correct. And that was after you had attempted to appoint Chief Superintendent Roche and he thought that that was premature?
A. Which was because I wanted to ensure that there was no issue or conflict which may give rise to a delay, as it did.

604 Q. Indeed. So Chief Superintendent Scanlan was instructed two days before Christmas. He then engaged with Garda Keogh and Garda Keogh told him that he thought chief Superintendent Roche had been engaged and he was surprised by Chief Superintendent Scanlan, that was in January 2017, you don't dispute that?
A. I don't.

605 Q. He on that occasion raised the possibility that Chief Superintendent Scanlan was conflicted, you're familiar with that query. As a result of that conversation Chief Superintendent Scanlan spoke to Tony McLoughlin on 20th January 2017 and passed on the concerns and
eventually he was directed to proceed by AC Fanning on 13th February 2017, you don't dispute any of these dates?
A. No, they're all the explanations I guess.

606 Q. Exactly. Then on the first occasion Garda keogh met 15:35 for the first time with Chief Superintendent Scanlan on the 2nd March 2017, when we have the short unsigned statement prepared. And then there were a series of dates that Garda Keogh was unavailable. 7th March '17, when Chief Superintendent Scanlan sought to engage with 15:36 him; 13th March '17, Garda Keogh was contacted and requested for a time; 15th March 2017 Garda Keogh was unavailable for the week; on the 20th March '17 Garda Keogh looked for further time; and eventually there was a meeting set for the 21st March '17 and Garda Keogh cancelled that meeting. Eventually he did meet on the 27th March 2017 and a statement was finalised and prepared. Do you accept all of those dates?
A. I mean if you tell me so. I didn't micromanage this, but I read it and as I said to Ms. Mulligan, you know, I don't know what $I$ knew at the time relevant to what $I$ know now, Mr. McGuinness. I am not trying to be difficult about this.

607 Q. Yes.
A. But I do accept that there were several valiant efforts 15:37 made, and I am not attributing any became to either side, but this did take a period of time.

608 Q. Yes. And if I might just ask you to have a look at document 10031, please.

CHA RMAN Are you sure that is the right number?
MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN Would you give it to me again?
MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: 10031.
CHAN RMAN Thank you.
609 Q. MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: This is the personal injury summons that was issued by Garda Keogh and his solicitor on 13th April 2017. If I might just refer you to page 10035, I don't want you to spend any time reading it but have you seen this document before.
A. No.

610 Q. We11, I hope I'm not being unfair here, the endorsement of claim that appears on page 10035, if we just scrol1 down please, Mr. Kavanagh:
"Particul ars of bullying, harassment, intimidation, demeani ng behavi our and the Iike."

Then if you just scroll onto the next page please, Mr . Kavanagh, there is a series of particulars.
A. Yes.

611 Q. Of the alleged bullying and harassment. I am going to suggest to you that these particulars very much mirror the content of the statement that was prepared by Chief Superintendent Scan1an, with Chief Superintendent
Scanlan. So the issues being addressed in the personal injuries summons are the same as the issues that are addressed in the bullying and harassment statement. Do you understand?
A. I do.

612 Q. The point I am making is that Garda Keogh may have had his own reasons for delaying the contact with Chief Superintendent Scanlan because he was engaged in another process, which he is perfectly entitled to engage in, namely further and solve his personal injury claim against An Garda Síochána for the very same things that --
MG. MLLI GAN Chairman, I am very reluctant to interrupt my friend, but that seems extremely speculative and not something that this witness can even speak to. So in those circumstances I am going to object to that being put to the witness.
CHA RMAN Yes, that seems like a good objection. It's not that there's anything particular improper about the 15:39 question, Mr. McGuinness, but how on earth could Mr. Barrett, with all his talents and experience, how on earth could he be expected to -- I mean, that is a point that you might make in a submission or an argument. One of the ways I look at this is, if Mr. Barrett said, oh absolutely, does it make any difference? Or if he said, oh absolutely not, does it matter in the slightest what answer he gives to that question?
MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: Very good, Chairman, I was just giving the witness an opportunity to --
CHA RMAN I think the essence is, Mr. McGuinness, if I may, we have identified period number one, and I understood, Mr. Barrett, that you said, look, in the
nature of things everybody was trying to do their best but there were delays. Mr. McGuinness is seeking to establish that whatever about that, the delays were not to be laid at the door of Chief Superintendent Scanlan. There's not much moral blame in it, he's not suggesting, but he is saying that Chief Superintendent Scanlan was not to blame for any of the delay between November and March.
A. Chairman, I am at a very substantial disadvantage. I have never seen these pleadings, whether they mirror the --

613 Q. CHA RMAK Don't mind the pleadings, don't mind that, we're past that. I'm just saying over all, what he is saying is, Chief Superintendent Scan1an -- I'm not sure that Ms. Mulligan is making any claim, but just in case 15:41 somebody is making a claim, Mr. McGuinness wishes to say these dates establish that that it is not Chief Superintendent Scanlan's responsibility, he wasn't responsible for any of the delays in phase number one. That is all he is saying. If you don't want to comment 15:41 on that, say I don't want to comment on that. If you want to say you comment on that, comment on it. And you don't have to say anything on it?
A. I don't want to comment.

CHA RMAN Very good. Thank you very much.
MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: Thank you.
CHA RMAN I mean the dates that Mr. McGuinness has presented, and if I may say so very, very clearly presented, he says that's evidence, if you like, he is
referring to evidence that we already have and to tell the honest truth, Mr. Barrett, it doesn't matter whether you agree with it or not, do you know what I mean.
A. I do.

614 Q. CHA RMAN Now it may be disagreed with, isn't that right, Ms. Mulligan?
M. MLLI GAN It's a matter for submission.

CHAN RMAN Thank you very much. Okay, Mr. McGuinness.
MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: Thank you, Chairman. But it might be of some interest to you, Mr. Barrett, that in a document that you prepared and sent to the deputy commissioner, Governance and Strategy, which was dated 5th December 2017, you indeed set out a very detailed chronology of the events that had transpired, including 15:42 a lot of the dates that $I$ have just mentioned.
A. I don't doubt it. It's just that I'm not attributing any --
CHA RMAN No, no, I understand.
MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: So I'm going to move on to period number two now if that is in order, Chairman? CHAN RMAN Yes, absolutely.
617 Q. MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: And if we could have a look at document number 10049, please. This is a letter which shows that -- it's from AC Fanning, can you scroll down 15:43 to the bottom of that document, please. It's from AC Fanning of the 24th May 2017, scrol1 up to the top please, to your office. I am right in that, yes?
A. That's correct.

618 Q. Yes. Essentially, this document suggests, if you want to take time to read it or perhaps you are familiar with it having prepared for today, it establishes two things, I suggest to you. One is that Garda Keogh was in the loop with what is proposed. But the critical thing here is that AC Fanning is proposing that the bullying and harassment policy is not wide enough and he is making it very clear to your office at this time, hang on a second with the bullying and harassment, I have got the statement, $I$ have read it, it's not big enough to deal with this issue and Garda Keogh is aware that that is my view?
A. Correct.

619 Q. You're also aware that Garda Keogh doesn't in any way criticise AC Fanning's management and governance of this issue. In fact, I think he has apprised him of this?
A. I will take your word for it.
Q. I call this period number two?
A. This is the period two the 24th May?

621 Q. This is the period, if you like, after the statement is received at the end of March?
A. 27th March to 24 May.

622 Q. Yes.
A. Okay.

623 Q. But it goes on. I just want to you accept two things out of this letter. One is that AC Fanning is of the firm view that the policy is not adequate to deal with the issues that arise in the statement. That is the
first thing.
A. Right.

624 Q. Do you accept that?
A. I'm not accepting that.

625 Q. No but do you accept that that's his view?
A. Oh that's his.

626 Q. And he expressed that to you?
A. And he held that view all the way to the 23 rd November.

627 Q. Indeed. But importantly, within that letter is a reference that Garda Keogh has been kept informed of this issue. If you go on to document 10051, and this is a letter from AC Fanning. My understanding is it's dated the 30th May to Garda Keogh. And he tells him:
"I am of the vi ew that these matters merit
consi deration outsi de the bullying and harassment pol icy bef ore proceeding to next steps I am awaiting his deci si on and once I have his deci si on l will communi cate with you further.

I do hope that you are keeping well and I do look forward to you ret urning to the workpl ace, where I bel i eve you can make a very val uable contribution."

He refers to Inspector McCarthy visiting him on the 22nd May, where he raised a number of other issues?
A. Sure.

628 Q. So he is essentially keeping Garda Keogh in the loop as to this is his view, bullying and harassment shouldn't
be progressed, if I could nuance it that way, because there is a bigger enquiry to be made?
A. So let me just go to the second paragraph:
"I have incl uded those issues al ong with your statement 15:46 and forwarded themto (me) on the 24th May."
A. "The purpose is that I am of the view that these matters merit consi deration."

So he is essentially saying that -- he is expressing what he expressed to you on the 24th May, I believe that there is a greater issue at stake here, beyond the bullying and harassment policy. The matter needs a larger investigation. Garda Keogh is being made aware of it?
A. He was consistent on that all the way through. CHAN RMAN Yes. But you don't agree.
A. No, ultimately I don't agree.

CHA RMAN I know you don't agree with that, but you don't agree that he forwarded the material?
A. Oh I don't agree that he forwarded the materials, absolutely no.

631 Q. CHAN RMN There is a factual statement where there is a difference?
A. Okay.

CHAL RMAN You say, no, he didn't do that. You agree that he formed the view with which you do not agree about the policy and the approach to the matter, you
agree?
A. There are two facts that I am absolutely clear about. One is at this point in time Fintan Fanning is very clear that the matters as set out in the statement of the 27th March extend beyond the bounds of --
A. That's his view. The second thing I am clear about is, I did not receive the documents that he talked about until the 4th October.

CHA RMAN So there we are.
MR. DONAL MEGU NESS: If we just go back to page number 10050 please, the second last paragraph, this is the letter to you. He says:
"I amrel uctant to make any appoi ntments in this matter 15:48 as there may well be a conflict of interest, in that l had prior i nvol vement in a previ ous correspondence regarding Garda Keogh and it may well be the perception of the parties that l would not be impartial. Garda Keogh corresponded with me on the 15th April to which I issued a response on the 24th April."

So he is raising another issue as well in addition to the issue about the bullying policy not being comprehensive enough to cover this matter. Do you accept that?
A. I understand that clearly, I think. But what was the question about, Mr. McGuinness, I didn't --

634 Q. No, I am just pointing it out?
A. okay.

635 Q. This is his view at that time. This is the view of AC Fanning, whom Garda Keogh finds no fault with, so it is relevant that his view is expressed in evidence and you are given an opportunity to comment on it if you feel the need to.

If we go on then to page 10052, and this is an e-mail, now it's very difficult to read but $I$ will read it out to you, it's an e-mail from AC Fanning, as commissioner 15:49 east, to you, or to HRPD.executivedirector.
A. Yeah.

636 Q. That's you. And it's dated 5th June 2017. I might just read it out.
"Executive di rector.

I am di rected by the assi stant commi ssi oner Eastern Regi on to refer to previ ous correspondence fromthis office on 24th May 2017.

I al so refer to the attached correspondence dated 31st May 2017.

On 1st J une 2017 Garda Keogh cont acted me by phone to confirmthat he had recei ved this correspondence dated (something) May 2017 and that he was satisfied that with how this matter was progressing and was thankful for the progress report."

So very clearly Garda Keogh was in the loop here about AC Fanning's firm views as to how to progress matters?
A. And also firm in his view that these materials had been transmitted to my office.
Q. Yes.
A. So if you recall my earlier evidence, Mr. McGuinness, I was clear that Mr. Fanning or Assistant Commissioner Fanning did in effect some of the work of the protected disclosure manager because communication is a key part of that.
Q. Yes.
A. By keeping the protected discloser, Garda keogh, appropriately in the loop, save that he is giving assurances to Garda keogh that materials which were not ${ }_{\text {15:51 }}$ transmitted had been.

639 Q. Yes.
A. That's my earlier evidence.

640 Q. But I suppose if you were to take the key message that AC is communicating to you, is that he doesn't want the 15:51 bullying and harassment policy to kick off, because he believes that there is a bigger issue, a bigger investigation required?
A. If you go through the transcript of Assistant Commissioner Fanning's evidence, I think he is very correct and very respectful as to who is the policyholder, as to who is the personal ultimately going to have to make that decision. And I think the trail of correspondence, including some from me, makes
the point that I am neutral at best on the idea of extending it. I was mindful of the fact that time that had elapsed, to the Chairman's point, we would be setting potentially the clock at zero, and I think that might be an expression you yourself used.

CHA RMAN Yes.
A. And I was mindful of the fact that in the context of something that assistant commissioner Eugene Corcoran said at the meeting of the 23 rd November, we needed to have regard to the consideration of those who were impugned by Garda Keogh in his allegations, and there were a number of those people. By going with what Assistant Commissioner Fanning argued as Byrne-McGinn model, we were going into a situation where there weren't tram rails and handrails and parameters in a way that such exists in a bullying and harassment policy. And so, due process, fair procedure, timelines, resources and there being precedent that we could rely upon was all part of my consideration as to why B\&H trumped any nove1 extended beyond. Plus, after the 4 th October when I had an opportunity to read at 1ength and read several times the statement taken by -please let me finish, this is important -- the statement taken by Chief Superintendent Scan1an, I was satisfied that in the main the matters raised fell
within the terms of bullying and harassment, which was my jurisdiction, and that if there were criminal matters there was a facility for the criminal matters to be explored in paralle1, as a part of a criminal
investigation if AC Finn so decided.
CHA RMAN Mr. McGuinness's point however is, for what it's worth and as far as it goes, this e-mail shows that Assistant Commissioner Fanning was keeping Garda Keogh in the loop, we all agree with that.
A. Yes.

641 Q. CHA RMAN You're agreeing with that. And number two, that Garda keogh appeared to be satisfied with it. That's what Mr. McGuinness is suggesting?
A. I understand that.

642 Q. CHA RMAN okay. I am right about that, Mr. McGuinness?

MR. DONAL MGGI NESS: You are indeed, chairman. CHAN RMAN That's essentially the point. okay. It doesn't mean it's right but that is what Mr. McGuinness 15:54 $^{\text {m }}$ is suggesting this e-mail indicates, evidences or implies.
643 Q. MR. DONAL MEGU NESS: Yes. And if we could just move to document 13367, this is Garda Keogh's diaries, and there's an entry there of the 5th July, you probably can't read it, I will do that for you.
A. I can't.

CHA RMAN why don't you read it, Mr. McGuinness.
644 Q. MR. DONAL MEGU NESS:

> "Under pressure, trying to stop promotions, di dn't need (two initials) witness crap."

So I'm suggesting to you that Garda Keogh had other
things on his mind in July of 2017, he was trying to stop promotions.
A. I haven't seen this before, by the way, so it's news to me.

CHA RMAN We11, Mr. McGuinness, there is some limit to $15: 55$ what Mr. Barrett as the executive director can say about a diary entry. There's a limit to cross-examination.
MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: I do accept that, Chairman, but
in circumstances where this witness has been asked directly about the period of delay and he has deprecated the period of delay, I believe there is a -CHA RMAN I understand that, but explicating the meaning of his diary, Mr. McGuinness, you and I know we will not fall out over this one, Mr. McGuinness, because we both know the rules.

645 Q. MR. DONAL MEGU NESS: May it please you, Chairman. If I could ask you then to look at document 5897, please. This is a letter from Inspector McCarthy to Garda Keogh. Again, I only reference it to illustrate that Inspector McCarthy on behalf of Assistant Commissioner Fanning is keeping him in the loop at all times.
"I wi sh to acknow edge our meeting yesterday afternoon at your home, wherei $n$ you spoke about matters regarding 15:56 nembers of An Garda Sí ochána. I al so prefer to previ ous correspondence fromthis office to you dated 16th June 2017 and to informyou that AC Eastern Regi on has written to executive di rector HRPD on the 17 th

August seeki ng an updated report regarding this natter."

So AC Fanning is writing to Garda Keogh and he is saying, listen, $I$ am keeping in touch with your office about this matter, but the matter that essentially is still a live one is, AC Fanning's view, that the investigation that needs to be carried out is not the bullying and harassment complaint but a larger type investigation. Do you agree with me that that is the live issue on the 17th August 2017?
A. No, I don't, and here's why: The outstanding matter upon which the decision is going to be made is the assignment given to Chief Superintendent Scanlan in January or December of 2016, a copy of which we still do not have. And I would contend that this letter from James McCarthy tends to suggest that HR and PD are equipped with all the necessary inputs upon which to make the decision and the delay is attending therefore on us. Now, let's be clear about this, I commend the regional office for keeping the protected discloser updated on progress. Essentially that is the action that would normally fall to the PD manager. And in my evidence earlier before you began this cross-examination I think $I$ called that out. At the meeting on the 3rd October in my office I explicitly instructed that the contact established by the said James McCarthy inspector should continue. I saw it to be positive and of assistance to anybody who felt they
were being obscured by or cut out from or deprived of information. So, insofar as the communication exists, goodness.
CHA RMAN Communication is good but it is based on a mistake?
A. Correct.

646 Q. CHA RMAN And you say the mistake is there's an implication, which there apparently is, I'm going to look for an updated report, meaning I haven't got one?
A. Yes.

647 Q. CHA RMAN And you say you couldn't have got one because we didn't have the right material?
A. And that fundamentally is, I think --

648 Q. CHA RMAN I mean we're not going to resolve that one, if you know what I mean. But Mr. McGuinness's point is, here they're keeping in touch with Garda Keogh?
A. Goodness.

649 Q. CHA RMAN And you say you're entirely in favour of that?
A. Yes.

650 Q. CHA RMAN But you say there's a real problem insofar as your office is concerned?
A. Absolutely.

651 Q. CHA RMAN Because your office does not have the -that is your case, your office does not have the documentation and clearly Inspector McCarthy and Assistant Commissioner Fanning think you do, or apparently think you do?
A. At that point in time they may very wel1 have been
labouring under the misapprehension, but to go through the transcript --
652 Q. CHA RMAN I understand that.
A. The transcript of Assistant Commissioner Fanning's own evidence makes clear that it was October 4 when that material became available to me, from him.
653 Q. CHA RMN I am with you. To the extent that it's an issue of fact, we will have to worry about that and look at the various things. But that's what you say about this e-mail, this letter?
A. Communication in general good, Chairman.

654 Q. CHA RMAN Okay, I think we have that.
A. Material communicated not correct.

655 Q. MR. DONAL MGGU NESS: If we could have a look at 5896 please. This is another letter from AC Fanning to your 16:00 office of 1st September 2017.
"I refer to previ ous correspondence fromJune."

He goes on to say:
"You will recall in my correspondence dated 24th May that l recommended a full investigation into these matters and al so that any del ay should be kept to a min nim

I would appreci ate your response to these matters which are ongoing for some time."

So it's clear to me, from reading that letter, that he is referencing back the letter of the 24th May, he's not referencing the statement of Garda Keogh in the bullying and harassment complaint, he's referencing the larger investigation --
A. But Mr. McGuinness --
A. Isn't it only fair to say that he is making the matters." assessment that this is a matter larger than bullying and harassment, based upon a statement taken with Chief Superintendent Scan7an? That is the basis of his assessment that this is larger than B\&H, right.
657 Q. Don't get me wrong, I am not saying that he is right or wrong, I just want to explain that this is in his mind?
A. I am accepting that it is in his mind and I said to the Chairman that it continued to be in his mind.
658 Q. CHA RMAN Carry on, Mr. Barrett, you said that he is basing his view as to the nature of the inquiry on the statement given to Chief Superintendent Scan7an.
A. That is my belief.

659 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. We11, that appears to be so. Sorry, let's assume that that is the case, I don't think anybody is going to dispute that. So what is the next thing you are going to say about that?
A. So he has the facility to have a fully formed opinion.

660 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes.
A. Based upon this document.

661 Q. CHAI RMAN Yes.
A. Which at that point, right, there is no way I can counter it, because nobody has had sight of it, right. CHA RMAN You haven't seen it. That's your evidence?
A. So the reality becomes that when we gain sight of this document, and he continues to canvass this view and I am accepting Mr. McGuinness's point, at the meeting we had in my office on the 3rd October, he said, oh, this is larger than $B \& H$, and he says, I think there could be criminality in it.
CHA RMAN Yes.
A. And we spend a little bit of time discussing, well, if there was to be criminality in it, what would that give rise to, it would give rise to a criminal investigation independent and separate from.
664 Q. CHA RMAN Indeed?
A. So B\&H does not obviate or prevent --

665 Q. CHA RMAN I heard that, I understand that to be your situation and to be also your situation as a matter of logic. So you really challenge the logic behind Assistant Commissioner Fanning's position?
A. It's, I'm sure, a very sincerely held view.

666 Q. CHA RMAN I understand that. People have disagreements. But I'm understanding that you don't agree, first of al1 you say about the statement, I have that, then you say the logic is, you could still have the $B \& H$ investigation and if criminality is revealed you can slough that off, you can send that off to a criminal investigation, there's nothing to stop you doing that. That's what you are saying. Okay.

667 Q. MR. DONAL MtGU NESS: If we can look at 3549. Please, if we look towards the -- yes. The last complete paragraph on that current screen grab.
"Assi stant Commi ssi oner Fanning is concer ned about making an appoi nt ment under the bullying and har assment pol icy. He says that the i nvestigation should be made under the Byrne/ MLGi nn model where it encompasses a wi der investi gation."

So he persists in his view at the meeting of the 3rd October 2017?
A. I said that earlier.

668 Q. I know you did. We are talking about periods of delay, so $I$ am just chronicling the reason why there was a delay, is that AC Fanning, who is in touch with Garda Keogh, and is apparently in agreement with this approach is saying, hang on a second here, let's not engage the bullying and harassment policy, let's get a wider investigation. And he is persisting in that approach, correctly or incorrectly, I am not passing any judgment on it, he is persisting in that approach as of 3rd October 2017?
A. We are in violent agreement.

669 Q. Sorry, I beg your pardon?
A. You and I are in violent agreement.

670 Q. Yes.
A. He is consistent right the way through to the 23 rd November, to the best of my knowledge.

671 Q. Indeed. Exactly. That's essentially where we will end this discussion, that right up to the very end AC Fanning essentially tries to divert matters to move away from bullying and harassment because he is obviously concerned that you start the bullying and harassment that the larger investigation will never be engaged. So eventually, after the second meeting of the 23rd October, he finally agrees that he will nominate, or that he will appoint someone to conduct the bullying and harassment policy?
A. Mr. McGuinness, I know that this is, you know, a matter related in some way to delay, AC Fanning is entitled to his sincerely held views and I am certain that they were sincerely held.
672 Q. Indeed, I am not suggesting otherwise?
A. He attended that meeting, I understand, on the 23 rd and this is based on my reading in a subsequent conversation with him, where he made submissions at the meeting and after the meeting with respect to pie charts and various other things that he had prepared for Joe Nugent to consider. I think there is a correspondence between himself and Joe after that meeting. So $I$ want to make it plain, I get the point that he was advocating something different. I am the policyholder, $I$ have to make a decision as to what is the appropriate way to proceed here.
673 Q. CHA RMAN U7timately it was for you to decide?
A. It was for me to decide. But I explained, you know, as transparently as I could, having read the Scan1an
statement, that I was satisfied that in the main, right, it related to matters that I would consider to be bullying and harassment. And as I said to the chairman, if it emerged in the course of that investigation that, for example, and it's only an example, if criminality, which was one of the things that AC Fanning --
CHA RMAN That could be accommodated?
A. Precisely.

CHA RMAN Okay, all right. Anything else,

MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: You are in agreement with me that as of the 23rd October there is essentially a decision taken. You were at that meeting, Joe Nugent was at that meeting, AC Fanning was at that meeting, there was a decision taken as of the 23rd October to move forward with the bullying and harassment.
A. I can't say there was a decision taken at the meeting. The meeting was chaotic in some respects, in the sense that I think we have a couple of different minutes of
it. I made a note myself of the meeting and I don't have it to hand. I left the meeting hearing clearly that Fintan was of the view that it was a broader issue and that there were views around the table that we should keep it as a bullying and harassment issue and that I should go away and reflect on that.

676 Q. CHA RMAN There can't have been many people in the Garda Síochána who weren't aware at this stage of Assistant Commissioner Fanning's view that it should be
broader, because everybody was aware of it at this stage. All right.
MR. DONAL MEGU NESS: Including Garda Keogh.
CHA RMAN Eventually a decision was made, let's have a bullying and harassment decision. You had to make that 16:08 decision, you made that call and that was your call to make.
A. That's correct.

677 Q.
MR. DONLL MEGU NESS: And a nomination was eventually made on 15th November '17.
A. Somewhere around then, yeah.

CHAI RMAK Yes.
Q. MR. DONLL MEGU NESS: You would agree with me that there was never an attempt to clandestinely, secrete, camouflage Garda Keogh's bullying and harassment statement at any stage within An Garda Síochána?
A. I would like to be clear about that: No, I would certainly agree that there was no clandestine effort that I was aware of at a11, and I would have been central to an awful lot of the movements of that statement.

679 Q. And the period of delay that I call period of delay two, that we just discussed --
A. No, I thought you were characterising that to 24 May, from 27 March.

CHA RMAN No. Wait now. Don't worry, I mean I have the point, Mr. McGuinness.

680 Q. MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: Thank you, Chairman. There's one other issue, Mr. Barrett, that I would like to just
raise with you, because AC McPartlin is also a client that this legal team represents and there is some documentation on file that suggests that on the 19th october that you appointed her to carry out a fact find into issues concerning Garda Keogh.
A. There was confusion around this on the basis that at that point we were looking at the two possible options and the suggestion was made and it wasn't me in the first instance that came up with it, I don't know where the name orla McPartlin came from but --

681 Q. Can I interrupt you, Mr. Barrett, I don't want to delay the Tribunal unnecessarily, it's the only the fact?
A. Sure.

682 Q. -- the fact that there was a letter, there is a letter, it's document 10416?
A. Can I see it?

683 Q. It's signed by you, it dated 19th October 2017, it says:
"I am hereby appointing you to conduct a fact-finding
investigation on matters rai sed with respect to the above nenber."
A. And do you have her reply?

684 Q. No, but if we just look at this letter first. It is ${ }_{16: 10}$ cc'd to Acting Commissioner Donal ó Cualáin, Deputy Commissioner John Twomey, Mr. Joe Nugent Chief Administrative officer?
A. John Twomey I think was the source of the suggestion
that we approach Orla, and Orla wrote back, so you have a reply?
Q. Yeah, just we'11 come to the reply in a second, Mr. Barrett. Do you accept this letter never reached AC McPartlin?
A. Well she wrote me a reply declining, so she must have had knowledge of this.
686 Q. Well let's have a look at her reply then, 10424. She references your correspondence of the 29th January 2018, if we just go back to your letter of the 29th January 2018, it's 10425, if we call that up first, Mr. Kavanagh. I will just read this.
"Prior to Christmas we spoke with respect to the revi ew of all matters pertaining to the file of complaint sense to An Garda Síochána by a solicitor acting for Garda Keogh. That Iong list of issues required two appoi nt ments and with assent I appointed AC M chael Finn to examine the bullying and harassment issues arising and I appointed you to survey all ot her matters.

It seens that the commi cation to your office was not properly forwarded and so as to ensure that the original intent is appropriately set out । amwriting to you again to confirm

Very hel pf ully, AC Fanning segmented the issues set out to M. John Gerard Cul I en acting for Garda Keogh and I
attach a copy of Mr . Cullen's letter.

Any and all files and materials hel d by HRPD will be made available."

Then if I can just go to 10424, this is AC MCPartin writing to you on the 31st January --
A. No, this is a letter from Joe Nugent.

CHA RMAN Thank you.
MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: Sorry, 10424, please.
CHA RMAN Now, there we are.
687 Q. MR. DONLL MEGU NESS: "With ref er ence to your correspondence of the 29th January in above matter, I wi sh to state that at no stage prior to or since Christmas 2017 did you and I have a conversation about a revi ew of matters pertai ning to a file of complaint sent to An Garda Sí ochána by the sol icitor acting for Garda Ni chol as Keogh.

In addition, I have not at any more time received
correspondence fromyou in that regard either in my role as AC Western Regi on or $A C$ executive support and corporate services.

There has been no previ ous communi cation either written or oral bet ween your office and mine in rel ation to the af orementioned matter. I note al so that there is no copy of correspondence attached to your letter of $29 t h$ J anuary 2018 as indi cated in same.

I amat a loss as to the purpose of your correspondence of 29th January 2018. "
A. I have never seen that letter as it's presented there.

I had a conversation with orla, she declined the appointment and that is news to me.

688 Q. We11, perhaps we will finish this by looking at 10426, please. This is a letter from Joseph Nugent CAO of the 31st January 2018, who, as you will recall, was one of the parties indicated as a cc corresponded on your initial appointment?
A. Yeah.

689 Q. It says:
"I refer to the above ours of the 25th January 2018 and 16:14 yours of the 29th J anuary 2018, the contents of whi ch are noted.

In our ours of 25 th J anuary 2018 it was confirmed that none of the addressees were in recei pt of yours of 19th
October 2017. There was no instruction to correct this anomaly as you were separatel y informed that the executive di rector, I egal and compl i ance, is looking at the broader question and will devel op a strategy on how best to proceed in this issue.

Forwar ded for your inf or mation and necessary attention. "
A. He never saw that correspondence either.

CHA RMAN So you never saw this?
A. No. I saw Joe Nugent's response in his cross-examination and it referred to writing a letter to the Department of Justice. This correspondence is news to me.

690 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. But the net result is that there was never an assignment of Assistant Commissioner McPartiin to do anything?
A. There was originally a suggestion that she should be assigned if there was to be -CHA RMAN I understand that.
A. Sure.

CHA RMAN But it never actually happened?
A. No, it didn't.

693 Q. CHA RMAN However it happened and whether the letters 16:15 got crossed or lost or did or didn't, it didn't happen?
A. It fell away.

694 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
695 Q. MR. DONAL MEGU NESS: And the reason I mention it and the reason $I$ bring it up is not to cause any
embarrassment, Mr. Barrett, it's that AC McPartiin subsequently did a peer review at the instruction of AC Sheahan in relation to the McMahon investigation.
A. That was a separate matter entirely.

696 Q. That was a separate matter entirely?
CHA RMAK So are we clear that Mr. Barrett confirms she had nothing to do with anything.

MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: Indeed.
CHA RMAN Either on his recollection she turned it
down flat at the verbal suggestion, or there's a mystery was to how it happened but she never had anything to do with it. She wrote a stiff letter of protest but it comes to nothing in the end.
MR. DONLL MGGU NESS: Indeed. But I can confirm my firm instructions.

CHA RMAN I understand.
MR. DONAL MEGU NESS: That she never received any such instructions in the first instance.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. DONAL MEGU NESS: Thank you. Mr. Barrett.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Now, how are you doing, Mr. Barrett?
THE WTNESS: I am fine.
CHAL RMAN Are you fine? Has anybody else many questions of Mr. Barrett? I wouldn't have thought so. Mr. McGarry, why don't I start with you, you're for Assistant Commissioner Fanning.
MR. MEGARRY: Yes.
CHA RMAN I am going to end up with Mr. Clarke, who is for Mr. Barrett. So I am going to end up there but I wouldn't have thought that anybody else had a great deal of questions. Now, Mr. McGarry.
MR. MtGARRY: Just a couple of matters, Chairman, if I may.

CHA RMAN Yes.

MR. JOFN BARRETT MAS CROSS-EXAM NED BY MR. MGGARRY, AS FOLLOMS:

697 Q. MR. MtGARRY: Mr. Barrett, you said in your evidence that Assistant Commissioner Fanning's evidence supports you to the extent that you didn't get any of the material relating to Garda Keogh, that's the statement and the Scanlan report?
A. No, I got it on the 4th October.

698 Q. Yes, but prior to the 4th October?
A. No, I didn't. I got an unsigned statement, the Scanlan report comes to us, I think it's October 4th, the day after the meeting we had in my office.

699 Q. You said earlier in your evidence that the evidence of Assistant Commissioner Fanning corroborates what you've said in relation to it, $I$ didn't see it because it wasn't sent. That's what you said earlier on in your 16:17 evidence.
A. Correct, and I would have to get you the page number of the details, $I$ can send it to the Chairman or send it to the Tribunal.

700 Q. Assistant Commissioner Fanning's evidence, that was not 16:17 his evidence. His evidence specifically was, because he was asked about this in some detail on Day 148, after page 200, when he was asked about the position, he didn't accept that that material had not been sent.

In fact, the correspondence that was opened was the correspondence that we've looked at, which referred back to the letter of the 24th May and, indeed, the letter that was sent by Inspector McCarthy following the meeting in October, I think it was on the 4th october, where he refers to the fact that the material was hand-delivered, that included the statement witnessed by Garda Keogh hand-delivered to HRM on the 24th May?
A. I have seen that piece in the first statements made by Fintan Fanning and I would refer you also to the evidence given by Alan Mulligan on the same matter. He was standing in my shoes on that particular day in may.
701 Q. Yes, but your evidence when you said that Assistant Commissioner Fanning agreed with you to the effect that I didn't see it because it wasn't sent, that wasn't his evidence?
A. All right. Let me get the reference, apologies. My evidence can be confined to this then. I did not receive a copy of the Scanlan statement made by Garda Keogh until 4th October 2017.

702 Q. You seem very adamant about that, Mr. Barrett, but you've also told us that you didn't see the letter of the 24th May, the 16th June, the 30th June, the 17th August, even the two letters in September because you were occupied with other things at the time?
A. That's true of much of that correspondence. I mean, you are giving me a list. But certainly, given that I wasn't in the office for a period of time in May, I was
dealing with matters pertaining to the Garda College and PAC and I was out for 28 odd days of August, there is a substantial amount of that time. But the office receives material and so, in my stead would have been Alan mulligan and I think his testimony referred.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Okay, thank you very much. Now, anybody else before I come to Mr. Clarke? Very good. Okay, Mr. Clarke, thank you.
MR. CLARKE: Chairman, I don't have any questions. CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Well it has been very well ventilated. Mr. McGuinness, have you any questions.

MR. MtGU NESS: yes just a few, chairman. CHA RMAN Yes.

MR. JOFN BARRETT MAS RE-EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NNESS, AS 16:20 FOLLOVS:

704 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Mr. Barrett, when Ms. Mulligan was asking you about Chief wheatley's responses to the issue as to whether she had carried out one and whether 16:20 she could carry out one etcetera, you seemed to be implying that Chief Superintendent McLoughlin had given Garda Keogh an undertaking that he, the chief, would carry it out.
A. Well, I wonder --
A. On the 3rd in Tullamore.

707 Q. Yes. I just am going to suggest to you that that may be a misinterpretation of matters in the sense that Garda Keogh subsequently in that letter considered that Chief Superintendent McLoughlin had undertaken to investigate the bullying and harassment, whereas Chief Superintendent McLoughlin's evidence was that that wasn't so, because Garda Keogh made it expressly clear that he had made a complaint to GSOC about it at that point in time?
A. Okay, I will be guided by you, sir.
Q. You made reference there, which just caused me a little bit of concern. You said you had never seen the assignment of Chief Superintendent Scan1an in the papers.
A. No, no, my apologies, the output.
A. The output of the chief superintendent's work. Obviously I was involved in the appointment and the assignment of Chief Superintendent Scanlan.

710 Q. Yes.
A. And as I was saying to Mr. McGuinness, it was a twofold assignment that he had; take the statement and determine on foot of it what was the level of the person to be appointed to conduct the investigation. same letter, page 3508, just to confirm that.
A. Yes, that's it.

712 Q. This is Assistant Commissioner Fanning's instruction to Chief Superintendent Scanlan as to what to do?
A. Yeah.

713 Q. okay. Now, if we go back to 3507, you had recommended something entirely different, which was the appointment of Chief Superintendent Roche to investigate the complaint?
A. Because, and this is one of the things when we're talking about delay, my original thought in recommending that Chief Superintendent Roche would effectively roll what the Chairman is calling delay A and the work that was subsequently done by AC Finn, that he would effectively try and roll with that as a way of expediting matters, but that didn't prove workable for a couple of reasons, the assistant commissioner rightly pointed out that we needed first as a preliminary statement get a statement and the investigation.
714 Q. I am not saying there is anything improper about that view because it does determine who you should appoint
as such?
A. The level, yes.
Q. But if an appointment had actually been made it might have avoided the year's passage of time?
A. It would have proved problematic, because as it turned out I think CS Curran was one of those that was impugned and he too was a chief superintendent. So it perhaps --
716 Q. CHA RMAN So it wouldn't have worked?
A. It wouldn't have worked.

717 Q. CHA RMAN There was Chief Superintendent wheatley and there was Chief Superintendent Curran.
A. Chief Superintendent wheatley wasn't impugned.
Q. CHAI RMAN At that point, sorry?
A. I think Curran was, I think that's true. So, in some respects while it was the longest way around, it was the shortest way home.

719 Q. CHA RMAN On the other hand, by appointing Chief Superintendent Roche he would have run into this problem presumably at the very beginning and he would have reported back and somebody more senior would have been appointed?
A. Well, as I said to Mr. McGuinness, Chair, the initial thought Gerry Roche was somebody who hadn't served with --

CHA RMAK He was not likely to be in any way sort of connected. I see that point, yes. So there would have been something to be said for having him do it, and if he ran into an issue he would be reported back and
somebody else would be appointed?
A. There was value in that.

721 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Just in terms of the preparation that you engaged in for the meeting of the 3rd october, we have seen obviously Mr. Cullen's letter to you of the 23rd September and then an e-mail that chief Superintendent McLoughlin sent you?
A. Yes.

You actually did reply to that and I perhaps should have opened that, at page 3547. That's your reply of the 28th September. You say:
"Thank you for your e-mail of the 25 th September, whi ch addresses the areas which are bei ng consi dered with respect to bullying and harassment. The factual
position as of today is that to progress a bullying and har assment investigation the person seeki ng to invoke the policy must nominate the source of the bullying and harassment complaint. Despite repeated requests to do so, Ni chol as Keogh has not done so as of today's date." ${ }^{16: 26}$
A. Yes.

723 Q. Now, your state of knowledge in order to make at that statement?
A. Well, I was without the Scanlan report and I suppose that's a clumsy way of saying it, but the issue that was arising was, we were without whatever it was that had been downloaded from Garda Keogh.

724 Q. You had obvious7y Mr. Cullen's letter of the 23rd, but
you hadn't spoken to Garda Keogh yourself until the 2nd October?
A. No, I spoke to Mr. Cullen on the 2nd.

725 Q. On the 2nd?
A. Yes.

726 Q. But obviously that is subsequent to this letter?
A. Yes.

727 Q. So your statement there about Nicholas Keogh not having done so as of the 28th?
A. Was incorrect.

728 Q. How did you know that?
A. That was incorrect.

729 Q. I see. The second paragraph then says:
"I am unsi ghted on progress of investi gations being conducted by Chi ef Superintendent Scanl an as of today's date. "
A. Yes.

730 Q. He "but I understand that some of the papers are in file with Ms. Kathleen Hassett."
A. Per Tony's e-mail, yeah.
A. Chief McLough1in had I think received papers from Garda Keogh and had handed them to Kathleen Hassett, I think there is some reference prior to that.
732 Q. Obviously it doesn't appear that Chief Superintendent Scanlan was conducting any investigations other than the taking of the statement?
A. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. I think that was provided to you in the Tribunal papers?
A. And if it was, sir, I didn't take any heed of it. And I will go and study those papers on my return to Limerick.
737 Q. Don't worry. Just for your own information, they appear to be in Volume $37 ?$
A. Volume?
Q. Volume 37. Thank you, Mr. Barrett?
A. Thank you, sir.

CHA RMAN Okay. Mr. Barrett, thank you very much for facilitating us by agreeing to come in today for
good-humouredly and good-naturedly tolerating a very long day and answering all the questions that you did. So, we are very grateful to you, thank you very much for doing that. I thought it was best if possible to keep ourselves going so that you would be finished.

THE WTNESS: I'm ob1iged to you.
CHA RMAN And get it all over in one day rather than have you thinking about it and coming back overnight. So I think that is a more satisfactory way and thank you very much for your assistance.
THE WTNESS: Chairman if I could say one thing, I would like to commend your investigators for the assistance they were for me unsighted of documents and access to my office.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much, indeed, thank you very much, yes, and I am sure they will be most grateful to receive that. Thank you, indeed.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

CHA RMAN So 10:30 tomorrow.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes, Chairman, thank you.
CHA RMAN Thank you.
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| 112:14, 112:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 93:29, 127:25, } \\ & \text { 129:23, 132:20, } \end{aligned}$ | 10:11, 11:22, 18:16, | $6: 5,6: 6,6: 15,6: 18,$ <br> 6.27.7.6.7.9, 7:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 35:3, 36:23, 37:29, } \\ & 39: 28,40: 2,40: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| 172:8, 172:10, 175:3, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 24,32: 20,33: 3, \\ & 34: 27,38: 10,38: 12, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 175:16, 179:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:23, 132:20, } \\ & \text { 132:28, 140:12, } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 27,7: 6,7: 9,7: 15, \\ & 7: 19,7: 23,12: 29, \end{aligned}$ | $39: 28,40: 2,40: 5 \text {, }$ |
| 198:6, 198:13, 199:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:28, 140:12, } \\ & \text { 142:19, 151:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 40:10, 42:18, 45:10,53:20, 58:11, $63: 17$, | 7:19, 7:23, 12:29, <br> 13:7, 13:10, 13:12 | 42:13, 42:27, 43:21, |
| mails [4]-37:25, | 158:22, 159:9, |  | 13:14, 14:16, 14:18, | $3: 27,47: 9,47: 21$, |
| 50:8, 72:5, 110:26 | 159:10, 159:18, |  | $14: 22,14: 24,14: 27,$ | 8:6, 48:27, 48:29, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{MAIN}_{[1]}-2: 12 \\ & \text { main }[3]-161: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 159:29, 163:7, 163:9, | $73: 14,73: 18,73: 23,$ | 15:1, 26:14, 27:14, | 49:14, 50:22, 50:24, $51: 24,52: 16,52: 24,$ |
| 174:25, 184:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 163:11, 163:12, } \\ & \text { 163:11, 163:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 74:10, 77:22, 85:9, 86:1, 90:4, 91:5, 92:9, | 27:29, 34:10, 37:8, <br> 40:14, 43:10, 47:13, | 52:26, 53:5, 53:27, |
| maintain [1] - 27 | 163:17, 166:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 86:1, 90:4, 91:5, 92:9, } \\ & 93: 23, ~ 94: 13, ~ 94: 16, \end{aligned}$ | 57:25, 62:16, 68:25, | 54:10, 54:13, 54:18, <br> 55:27, 56:5, 58:18, |
| maintained [2] | 168:22, 168:23, | 95:3, 95:6, 96:24,98:22, 98:25, 99:8, | 71:24, 78:29, 79:28, |  |
| 95:5, 104:21 | 168:22, 168:23, |  | 80:23, 82:2, 83:1, <br> 83:24, 87:20, 87:24, | 55:27, 56:5, 58:18, 61:4, 64:18, 66:23 |
| maintains [1] - 32:25 | MARGARET ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 22,98: 25,99: 8, \\ & 99: 12,100: 15, \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:9, 72:14, 74:11, } \\ & 78: 5,79: 13,79: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| maintenance | 3:21 <br> MARIE ${ }_{[2]}-3: 8,3: 17$ | 102:24, 111:23, | 97:7, 101:10, 101:19, |  |
| 41: |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:8, 119:17, 123:7, } \\ & \text { 128:25, 130:3, 133:9, } \end{aligned}$ | 106:23, 109:29, | 78:5, 79:13, 79:17, 85:2, 85:6, 86:1, |
| majority ${ }_{[1]}-145$ : | $\text { MARK }_{[1]}-3: 3$ |  | 110:12, 113:15, | 86:29, 87:1, 87:10, |
| Malone ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1:24 | marked [1] - 78:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 136: 24,138: 21, \\ & \text { 141:18, 152:29, } \end{aligned}$ | 114:28, 121:18, |  |
| MALONE ${ }_{[1]}-1: 29$ | MARRINAN ${ }_{[1]}-2: 7$ material [11] - 11:7, | 141:18, 152:29, <br> 154:23, 169:15, <br> 170:9, 171:4, 173:3, | 127:16, 138:26, | 99:23, 103:7, 112:18, 116:5, 127:10 |
| man $[1]-143: 1$ manage $[2]-19.22$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:1, 140:14, } \\ & \text { 148:14, 149:12, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { manage }[2]-19: 22 \\ & 47: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $22: 25,23: 16,170: 21$ | 170:9, 171:4, 173:3, 174:25, 174:28, | 148:14, 149:12, 149:13, 149:14, | 132:17, 136:15, |
| managed [5] - 10:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 178:12, 179:6, } \\ & \text { 179:13, 192:10, } \\ & \text { 192:29, 193:6, 194:4 } \end{aligned}$ |  | 149:13, 149:14, | 138:19, 155:5, <br> 155:13, 157:10, |
| 82:24, 94:18, 123:19 |  | 179:27, 180:8, 183:3 | 149:16, 149:23, |  |
| management [25] $10 \cdot 4,10 \cdot 15,11 \cdot 20$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 192:29, 193:6, 194:4 } \\ \text { materials }[7]-8: 26, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 184:2, 186:21, } \\ & \text { 187:15, 187:21, } \end{aligned}$ | 152:13, 152:15, | 57:21, 161:20, |
| $10: 4,10: 15,11: 20$ 11:29, $20: 4,38: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 10,98: 1,170: 22, \\ & 173: 4,173: 15,188: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 188:16, 191:26, | 153:21, 153:22, | 195:14, 198:7, |
| 41:7, 46:3, 99:20, | MATT [1] - 3:19 <br> matter [79]-6:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 194:1, 195:6, 195:7, } \\ & \text { 195:12, 196:22 } \end{aligned}$ | 155:5, 158:8, 158:29, | MCLOUGHLIN ${ }^{[1]}$ - |
| 102:14, 102:20, |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:10, 159:16, } \\ & \text { 160:1, 163:22, 164:2, } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 123:1, 123:22, 124:4, 124:8, 125:13, | matter [79]-6:25, $6: 27,13: 2,16: 22$, | matters" $[1]$ - 108:18 | 160:1, 163:22, 164:2, | 3:6 <br> McLoughlin's [6] - |
| 125:14, 127:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:4, 19:16, 19:17, } \\ & 21: 6,24: 8,33: 7, \end{aligned}$ | McBRIEN ${ }_{[1]}$ - 2:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:4, 164:6, 165:16, } \\ & \text { 165:25, 165:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:11, 35:21, 113:11, } \\ & \text { 141:19, 141:21, } \end{aligned}$ |




|  |  | ```144:15, 153:4, 161:21 officers [1] - 10:2 official [4]-13:21, 76:25, 77:1, 120:14 Oghuvbu [7] - 19:8, 25:5, 27:1, 42:4, 137:27, 138:3, 138:12 OGHUVBU [1] - \(3: 11\) old [1] - 23:7 OLIVIA [2] - 3:12, 4:1 omission [2] - 44:15, 79:23 ON [6] - 1:5, 1:9, 1:18, 2:13, 6:1 once [7]-13:21, 83:9, 120:14, 124:29, 137:10, 154:6, 169:18 one [79]-8:15, 13:1, 13:3, 13:4, 14:29, 21:5, 21:11, 30:15, 31:4, 31:20, 35:12, 35:21, 46:21, 48:15, 55:24, 61:20, 62:4, 64:25, 67:1, 71:12, 74:17, 75:16, 81:12, 82:4, 83:5, 88:11, 89:11, 90:10, 90:26, 96:10, 96:20, 105:27, 106:8, 107:5, 107:11, 108:24, 117:2, 119:12, 127:20, 128:24, 129:2, 129:21, 132:19, 133:17, 134:4, 135:8, 136:27, 139:18, 142:6, 147:17, 152:16, 158:17, 158:24, 159:11, 159:15, 159:19, 160:2, 160:13, 160:19, 165:20, 165:28, 166:19, 168:4, 168:27, 171:3, 176:15, 177:7, 178:9, 178:11, 178:14, 184:6, 185:29, 189:9, 194:25, 194:26, 196:16, 197:6, 201:7, 201:11 ones [1] - 121:11 ongoing [9] - 12:12, 32:27, 34:6, 37:1, 41:2, 73:19, 117:4, 123:29, 179:28 onus [4]-17:17, 20:3, 23:29 onwards [2] - 10:27, 28:5 open [8] - 15:18, 53:4, 87:21, 122:22,``` |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |





|  | $\begin{aligned} & 161: 16,188: 26, \\ & \text { 190:23, 192:19 } \\ & \text { relations }[4]-8: 8, \\ & 10: 3,10: 4,10: 7 \\ & \text { relationship [5] - } \\ & 54: 25,54: 26,58: 7, \\ & 99: 25,149: 3 \\ & \text { relatively }[2]- \\ & 122: 24,151: 23 \\ & \text { relevant }[13]-16: 1, \\ & 50: 29,52: 8,56: 5, \\ & 60: 13,84: 14,98: 12, \\ & 104: 12,120: 12, \\ & 136: 28,142: 22, \\ & 163: 21,172: 4 \\ & \text { reluctant }[4]-38: 9, \\ & 66: 4,165: 9,171: 15 \\ & \text { rely }[2]-130: 1, \\ & 174: 19 \\ & \text { remain }[2]-44: 14, \\ & 100: 3 \\ & \text { remained }[1]-44: 23 \\ & \text { remember }[2]-31: 4, \\ & 40: 28 \\ & \text { reminder }[1]-69: 2 \\ & \text { reminders }[3]- \\ & 67: 10,67: 15,67: 19 \\ & \text { renewal }[1]-9: 26 \\ & \text { repeat }[1]-81: 6 \\ & \text { repeated }[1]-198: 19 \\ & \text { repeating }[1]-33: 13 \\ & \text { replied }[3]-33: 13, \\ & 51: 28,69: 3 \\ & \text { replies }[2]-35: 2, \\ & 35: 3 \\ & \text { reply }[21]-21: 28, \\ & 55: 16,55: 19,69: 8, \\ & 72: 9,78: 27,80: 3, \\ & 83: 28,91: 15,101: 21, \\ & 102: 26,103: 9, \\ & 103: 11,126: 22, \\ & 186: 24,187: 2,187: 3, \\ & 187: 6,187: 8,198: 9, \\ & 198: 10 \\ & \text { replying }[1]-91: 8 \\ & \text { report }[71]-14: 27, \\ & 15: 2,15: 4,15: 19, \\ & 16: 16,18: 4,18: 8, \\ & 20: 27,21: 15,22: 2, \\ & 25: 17,25: 29,28: 22, \\ & 29: 12,37: 11,37: 27, \\ & 38: 2,38: 16,40: 11, \\ & 40: 21,49: 9,58: 23, \\ & 60: 5,60: 10,60: 16, \\ & 60: 25,60: 26,61: 1, \\ & 61: 3,61: 9,61: 17, \\ & 61: 20,61: 27,62: 4, \\ & 62: 12,62: 14,62: 21, \\ & 63: 19,68: 18,71: 26, \\ & 72: 7,78: 13,96: 12, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 99:21, 117:20, } \\ & 117: 21,119: 26, \\ & 119: 27,120: 4, \\ & 124: 25,127: 9, \\ & 129: 15,130: 17, \\ & 130: 19,132: 14, \\ & 132: 25,132: 29, \\ & 137: 17,146: 19, \\ & 146: 20,147: 3, \\ & 147: 25,151: 4,152: 6, \\ & 172: 29,177: 1,178: 9, \\ & 192: 11,192: 15, \\ & 198: 25 \\ & \text { reported }[10]-25: 10, \\ & 25: 22,38: 11,41: 20, \\ & 42: 18,52: 7,61: 12, \\ & 118: 7,197: 21,197: 29 \\ & \text { reportedly }[1]-41: 2 \\ & \text { reporter }[1]-38: 25 \\ & \text { reporting }[9]-11: 19, \\ & 11: 26,19: 23,22: 11, \\ & 38: 11,61: 4,61: 16, \\ & 98: 8,153: 28 \\ & \text { reports }[5]-20: 23, \\ & 38: 17,58: 24,130: 1, \\ & 141: 8 \\ & \text { represent }[1]-160: 1 \\ & \text { represented }[1]- \\ & 150: 4 \\ & \text { represents }[1]- \\ & 186: 2 \\ & \text { request }[23]-44: 7, \\ & 48: 19,59: 6,61: 16, \\ & 66: 12,70: 24,78: 12, \\ & 99: 17,109: 4,109: 28, \\ & 109: 29,110: 2,110: 6, \\ & 120: 6,120: 19, \\ & 129: 24,130: 20, \\ & 130: 24,132: 24, \\ & \text { require }[2]-43: 12, \\ & \text { requesting }[1]-14 \\ & \text { required }[12]-20: 1, \\ & 35: 6,50: 2,51: 23, \\ & 70: 28,117: 20, \\ & 133: 16,136: 12, \\ & \text { requests }[17], 133: 14, \\ & 144: 10,161: 26, \\ & 173: 23,187: 17,138: 20 \\ & \text { requirement }[5]- \\ & 39: 15,110: 14,132: 8, \\ & 136: 23,154: 26 \\ & \text { requires [2] - } 34: 25, \\ & \text { requested }[7]- \\ & 37: 28,66: 19,73: 21, \\ & 90: 29,99: 4,124: 25, \\ & 163: 12 \\ & \text { re, } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 12,58: 15,89: 23, \\ & \text { 100:15, 125:16, } \\ & 166: 18 \\ & \text { responsible }[2]- \\ & 59: 8,166: 19 \\ & \text { rest }[1]-125: 12 \\ & \text { restate }[1]-102: 9 \\ & \text { restated }[1]-76: 9 \\ & \text { restating }[1]-42: 15 \\ & \text { rested }[1]-70: 16 \\ & \text { restoration }[1]-36: 8 \\ & \text { restore }[1]-115: 25 \\ & \text { restored }[4]-40: 20, \\ & \text { 49:8, } 50: 4,156: 2 \\ & \text { rests }[1]-24: 1 \\ & \text { result }[4]-13: 24, \\ & 157: 13,162: 27,190: 6 \\ & \text { results }[2]-59: 12, \\ & 159: 28 \\ & \text { RESUMED }[3]-6: 1, \\ & 101: 16,122: 5 \\ & \text { resumption }[1]- \\ & 30: 2 \\ & \text { reticent }[1]-151: 5 \\ & \text { RETIRED }[7]-3: 5, \\ & 3: 6,3: 7,3: 7,3: 11, \\ & 3: 12,3: 13 \\ & \text { return }[9]-41: 10, \\ & 72: 15,80: 6,113: 3, \\ & 115: 15,115: 22, \\ & 116: 10,152: 23, \\ & 200: 18 \\ & \text { returned }[7]-51: 6, \\ & 52: 3,68: 4,78: 24, \\ & 84: 17,115: 11,200: 10 \\ & \text { returning }[5]-29: 18, \\ & 29: 23,30: 20,152: 28, \\ & 169: 22 \\ & \text { returns }[1]-30: 24 \\ & \text { revealed }[1]-181: 26 \\ & \text { revert }[2]-61: 26, \\ & 69: 27 \\ & \text { review }[10]-18: 12, \\ & 18: 17,18: 19,28: 9, \\ & 31: 8,99: 8,123: 28, \\ & 187: 14,188: 16, \\ & 190: 22 \\ & \text { reviewable } \\ & 32: 29 \\ & 32 \\ & \text { reviewed }[1]-92: 11 \\ & \text { revised }[1]-152: 7 \\ & \text { rightly }[1]-196: 24 \\ & \text { rights }[1]-56: 16 \\ & \text { rigid }[1]-79: 3 \\ & \text { ring }[2]-18: 13, \\ & 161: 17 \\ & \text { rise }[5]-23: 19, \\ & 50: 15,162: 16,181: 13 \\ & \text { ROAD }{ }_{[2]}-2: 18, \\ & 4: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |




| 28:3, 29:20, 30:4, | sequenty ${ }^{[6]}$ | 28:15, 28:17, 30:22, | 162:13, 162:18 | switch [1] - 18:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30:18, $30: 19,30: 24$, | 27:26, 54:25, 155:27, | 32:23, 42:12, 44:9, | 162:21, 162:22, | SWORN ${ }_{[1]}$ - 7:14 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 34: 5,36: 28,38: 8, \\ & 38: 24,38: 26,39: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 190:22, 195:13, } \\ & \text { 196:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 48:21, 57:21, 57:28, } \\ \text { 60:11, 61:5, 81:2, } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:26, 162:28, } \\ & \text { 163:6, 163:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sympathy }[1] \text { - } \\ & 105: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 42:24, 45:1, 45:4, | ubstantial [4] - | 81:3, 81:16, 82:22 | 164:25, 165:4, 166:4, | symptoms [1] - |
| 45:12, 46:12, 49:4, | 76:16, 123:19, 166:9, | 82:23, 124:21, | 166:6, 166:14, | 130:9 |
| 76:8, 76:10, 76:15, | 19 | 124:23, 125:1 | 166:18, 174:2 | - |
| 76:20, 76:23, 76:26, | substantially [2] - | 128:15, 134:25, | 177:14, 180:12, | 44:15, 44:24, 44:25, |
| 77:5, 77:8, 77:15, | 41:26, 144:21 | 135:18, 160:25, 197:7 | 180:20, 194:27, | 79:3, 79:16, 79:26, |
| 78:2, 78:15, 79:8, | ubstantive ${ }_{[2]}$ | SUPERINTENDENT | 195:14, 195:16, | 122:26, 123:2, 142:8 |
| 79:18, 81:23, 86:15, | 15:5, 139:2 | [15] - 2:15, 3:3, 3:3, | 195:23, 195:29, | systematic [1] - |
| 114:14, 123:18, | substantively ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 3:4, 3:5, 3:6, 3:8, 3:9, | 196:10, 196:14, | 81:13 |
| 125:23, 125:29, | 138:24 | 3:9, 3:13, 3:14, 3:17, | 196:18, 197:11, | systems [2] - 79:12, |
| 126:8, 127:20, | successfully ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 3:19, 3:19, 3:21 | 197:12, 197:13, | 144:27 |
| 127:23, 128:4, | 9:3 | Superintendent [159] | 197:19, 198:7, | SÍOCHÁNA [1] - 3:2 |
| 128:13, 128:23, | ccession [2] - | -11:14, 11:16, 14:5, | 199:16, 199:26, | Séan [1] - 104:24 |
| 129:20, 129:25, | 8:10, 15:28 | 14:28, 15:4, 15:9, | 200:4, 200:8 | Síochána [26]-6:26, |
| 129:27, 130:8, 130:9, | suddenly [1] - 94:22 | 15:18, 17:16, 18:4, | superintendent's [1] | 7:24, 8:1, 52:10, |
| 130:15, 130:23, | ffering [1] - 45:12 | 18:7, 18:8, 20:18, | - 195:27 | 52:12, 76:6, 76:28, |
| 131:13, 131:20, <br> 133.6, 133.7, 133:17 | suffice [1] - 121:26 | 22:2, 23:3, 23:11, | superintendents [2] | 77:3, 77:12, 79:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:6, 133:7, 133:17, } \\ & \text { 134:15, 135:6, } \end{aligned}$ | sufficient [3] - 70:18, | 23:20, 24:26, 29:8, | - 17:18, 21:23 | 80:17, 81:21, 103:18, |
| 137:23, 138:5, | 106 | $31: 26,32: 5,33: 9,$ | supplemented $[1]$ | 104:12, 115:27, <br> 148:17 149:15 |
| 149:26, 150:16, | $133$ | 33:10, 33:16, 33:18, | 100:10 | 155:21, 160:2, |
| 150:27, 151:6, | suggest [9] - 48:24 | 34:16, 36:23, 36:27, | supplied ${ }_{[1]}-52: 8$ | 161:24, 165:7, |
| 151:14, 152:25, | 55:2, 57:16, 97:10, | 37:22, 37:29, 38:15, | support [7]-41:9, | 176:26, 184:28, |
| 153:24, 154:17, | 160:12, 164:23, | 38:18, 39:28, 40:2, | 42:5, 52:8, 52:29, | 185:16, 187:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 154:28, 155:15, } \\ & \text { 156:12, 157:16, 195:3 } \end{aligned}$ | 168:4, 177:17, 195:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 9,42: 13,46: 17, \\ & 52: 24,52: 26,53: 27, \end{aligned}$ | $79: 12,188: 22$ supporting | 188:17 |
| Stress [1] - 17:10 stress/injury [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:12, 128:27, } \\ & \text { 146:22, 148:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 27,57: 4,57: 21, \\ & 58: 13,58: 17,58: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 20: 21,32: 10 \\ \text { supports }[3]-15: \end{array}$ | T |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:23 } \\ & \text { stress/post }[1]-33: 5 \\ & \text { stressors }[2]-130: 8, \end{aligned}$ | suggesting [13] 85:21, 94:3, 96:19, $112 \cdot 11$ 113.5 | 59:13, 59:20, 60:25, 61:4, 61:19, 64:17, 64:18, 65:20, 65:22, | 155:20, 192:8 suppose [19] 46:16, 74:16, 85:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{T \& N} \mathbf{N}_{[1]}-4: 2 \\ & \mathbf{t a b}_{[6]}-63: 21, \end{aligned}$ |
| 134:19 | 118:24, 156:18, | 66:17, 66:22, 69:9, | 94:25, 123:19, 124:9, | $63: 24,63: 29,64: 7,$ |
| strict [1] - 21:20 <br> strictest [1] - 101:26 | 160:5, 166:6, 175:9, 175:16, 175:29 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 72:14, 74:10, 78:5, } \\ & \text { 81:16, 81:24, 81:28, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:19, 128:20, } \\ & \text { 129:11, 131:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 66: 16,66: 29 \\ \text { table [3] - } 50: 13, \end{array}$ |
| strictly ${ }_{[1]}$ - 50:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 175:16, 175:29, } \\ & 183: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 82:1, 82:2, 82:6, 85:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:11, 131:20, } \\ & \text { 132:23, 132:29, } \end{aligned}$ | 86:29, 184:24 |
| strikes [1]-126:1 | suggestion [10] | 93:7, 96:5, 96:6, | 140:7, 140:16, | tabs [2]-38:16, |
| strip [1] - 105:28 | 68:19, 89:9, 90:22 | 96:14, 98:3, 99:23 | 141:15, 141:17, | 38:17 |
| strongly [1] - 49:16 | 105:27, 106:14, | 114:15, 126:28, | 148:7, 173:19, 198:25 | tail [1] - 146:1 |
| structure ${ }_{[1]}$ - 107:2 <br> studied $[1]$ - $26: 2$ | 150:18, 186:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 127:10, 127:25, } \\ & \text { 128:5, 128:9, 128:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { supposed [2] - } \\ 45: 20,148: 26 \end{gathered}$ | talents [1] - 165:17 tangentially ${ }_{[1]}$ - |
| studied [1] - 26:2 $\text { study }[1]-200: 18$ | 186:29, 190:9, 191:1 suggests [3]-44:26, | 128:17, 128:19, | surely [2] - 12:25, | $10: 17$ |
| stuff [1]-130:14 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { suggests } 3 \\ \text { 168:1, 186:3 } \end{array}$ | 128:21, 129:16, | 145:17 | TARA [1] - 3:22 |
| style [1] - 28:25 | suitable [2] - $33: 5$, | 129:22, 130:21, | surgery $[1]-21: 4$ | targeting [1] - |
| subject $[7]-31: 12$, | 71:8 | $132: 14,132: 17$ | surprise [2]-126:16, | 148:24 |
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[^0]:    "Despite a number of enquiries with Garda Keogh to establ ish the source of his alleged work rel ated stress, the member has continuousl y correl ated his i nvol vement as confidential reporter to his absence through alleged work rel ated stress. I am al so consci ous that the member's conti nued absence was the subject of a case conference in December 2015."

[^1]:    "Which refers to the statement of the 2 nd March and your correspondence dated 20th April at tab C."

[^2]:    "I am writing in rel ation to my sick record, Garda Ni chol as Keogh. I am a garda that had made a protected

[^3]:    "Garda Keogh had been i nf or red by I nspector McCarthy that the actions arising in all future correspondence

