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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLONE, ON TUESDAY, 8TH
FEBRUARY 2022:

CHA RMAN Good morning, Sergeant Hughes.

## SERGEANT WLLI AMS HUGES CONTI NUED TO BE CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR O H GG NS AS FOLLOVS:

1 Q. MR. O H GG NS: Good morning, sergeant.
A. Morning.

2 Q. We were deal with -- before we broke last night, we
were dealing with some of your medical reports in the context of... we11 a few of the themes that the Tribunal is investigating. I think you would agree with me that your GP, Dr. Reilly had indicated you had reported inability to cope during the period February 2007?
A. That would be correct, yes.

3 Q. All right. And, as I understand it, you were off work December '06 to March '07, approximately, is that right?
A. That would be correct, yes.

4 Q. And you returned in April for a while, doing your best to get back?
A. Yes. If I can be reminded, yes.

5 Q. Sorry, this is my summary now. Please differ with me
if I am wrong in any of it, this is what I picked up from the papers. And you took sick leave again then in the second half of 2007, and you were out from July to December?
A. That's correct. It was the 4th July I think on the records there it was made, but I distinctly remember being on duty on the 1st July.
6 Q. Yes. You're aggrieved, aren't you, as I understand your complaints, that the CMO recommended you for
A. That's correct.

7 Q. But can I suggest to you that your dissatisfaction with that is difficult to fathom, if I could put it that way, in that it appears to have been based on what you had told your psychiatrist, Dr. Griffin, in January 2008, that you couldn't ever foresee yourself returning to the force as an effective police officer?
A. That's not correct. Exactly what I said to Dr. Griffin is, I said unless the matters were resolved in the workplace.

8 Q. Maybe if we just look at that, if you don't mind, sergeant. If we could have page 1343 on the screen, please. And what is going to come up here is a medical report from Dr. Griffin, psychiatrist, dated 7th
January 2008. And this was an independent psychiatrist, is it?
A. On behalf of the CMO, yes.

9 Q. Yes. And he's writing to Dr. Quigley?
A. That's correct.

10 Q. And it indicates you attended on the 4th January last -- that'd be January 2008 -- for the purpose of preparing a medical report. And then it outlines, in the next paragraph, towards the bottom, it refers to
your -- there's a reference to Dr. Joe Fernandez who you saw in Swords Clinic on two occasions, and you'd also attended your family doctor. It said you were not on any psychotropic medication. "Al so seen by Dr. M chael Corry in Dun Laoghaire on threes occasions in recent months."
He was your own psychiatrist?
A. Yes, I was asked by my solicitor to see him.

11 Q. Pardon?
A. I was asked by my solicitor to see Dr. Corry.

Is there a pattern there? Are you distancing yourself from going to see him?
A. Well my solicitor advised I go see Dr. Corry. But it is a medical issue, really. Are you not behind the decision to go to get help to an appropriate professional?
A. Having discussed it with my solicitor, he recommended that I go to see Dr. Corry, and I did.
Q. But my question is: did you feel you needed to see a psychiatrist?
A. Well, I felt that I probably needed a medical report from a separate psychiatrist to that of -- that was being appointed by the Смо.
16 Q. But was there a medical need for you to see a
psychiatrist, as far as you were concerned?
A. Well, the non-medical matters that were affecting me were relayed to Dr. Corry, and that's the purpose of going to see him, to --
17 Q. I don't want to delay you, or anybody, unduly, but it is a reasonably straightforward question. Was it your position that you needed to see a psychiatrist, or are you saying you didn't need to see a psychiatrist?
A. Well, the matter was discussed with my legal representative and he recommended that $I$ go to see a psychiatrist.

18 Q. Al1 right. If we turn over the page in his concluding remarks on page 1344, Dr. Griffin, the psychiatrist, says the following:
"When I pressed Sergeant Hughes on continuing in the police force..."

And this now is in January '08
"... even on light duties he feel s that he can't foresee any way of returning as an effective police of ficer."

Did you say that to the psychiatrist?
A. I would have told him that I couldn't see myself returning until the matters in the workplace which were affecting me were -- there was resolution attempts being made.

19 Q. Well his report goes on:
"Certainly having read detailed file which I don't have a copy of but have full sight of, I don't think this nan is in a position now or will be in a position in the future to give full and effective service as a police officer. I don't thi nk he now has the ment al robustness or will in future have the mental robustness to continue in the Garda force. Thus my recommendation would be that he be considered for retirement on medi cal grounds."

So that's fairly clear. Having discussed with you, having pressed you for your view of matters, there's a recommendation by him. And my suggestion to you is that this was a recommendation that he was making with your backing.
A. The decision arrived at by Dr. Griffin, I had furnished him with an extensive document in relation to the reasons for my difficulties in the workplace, which I think he read through, or he skimmed through it anyway, and this is based on the medical end of the equation, if you like. Obviously, we contested this -- when it surfaced through the CMO's office, we contested that opinion later on.
20 Q. Did his recommendation have your backing?
A. Not that -- not in that format, no.

21 Q. So did he do something of a solo run against your wish?
A. We11, al1 I'11 say is that he submitted that report and
we contested it then later on in the year, and ultimately he then changed his mind.

Because, I wonder is there -- do we have a situation here of you changing your mind and then being unhappy with the Garda authorities?
A. No, that's not correct.

Is it possible that you actually didn't really know what you wanted yourself at this difficult time in your 1ife?
A. No. I knew exactly what I wanted, and I furnished a report to Dr. Griffin in that regard setting out all the difficulties I had in the workplace, and he formulated a form then to Dr. Quigley, and I didn't see the report, obviously, before it went to Dr. Quigley and I think when I went back to Dr. Griffin then, I clarified the issue with him and he then came -- he arrived at a different opinion.
Q. report and he indicates that his purpose in writing to Dr. Griffin was to seek an independent specialist psychiatric opinion, and the opinion had been the most accurate diagnosis was one of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, and that the death of Ms. Saulite and the "threats to his own life had affected him greatly", was the view. And he acted on that recommendation, which I 10:40 am suggesting you backed?
A. Em, sorry, that Dr. Quigley acted on that recommendation?
Q. Yes.
A. And I backed it?
Q. Yes.
A. No, that's not true. We contested it actually.

27 Q. You did later.
A. I think there was correspondence to and from

Dr. Quigley in the interim, but by June 2008 he had decided to pursue the medical discharge route -- this is Dr. Quigley now.
28 Q. You see, Dr. Quigley says -- and this is on page 1333 if we need to go there -- he says he further reviewed your position on the 5th June 2008 and advised you that he, Dr. Quigley, had formed the opinion that you should be retired on the grounds of 111 health based upon the independent psychiatric report of Dr. John Griffin regarding his assessment of the member on 4th January 2008.

So, on foot of that, he wrote to HRM in June 2008, on the 9th June, that's four days later, speedily dealing with the matter, outlined the position and referenced his earlier advices of the 6th March 2008. And, in
fairness to your position, he noted that the case was particularly complex.
A. Yes.

There was a mixture of issues, grievance, welfare issues, disciplinary, legal issues, industrial
relations issues, and obviously factual issues. He doesn't include factual but $I$ am suggesting factual as wel1.
A. Sorry, what's that last one?
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Q. Factual.
A. Factual, yes.
Q. I am adding factual, he doesn't list factual. And we know that considerably later on in October 2008, you appealed the decision regarding ill health retirement?
A. That's correct.
Q. And that was based upon Dr. Michael Corry's report, the consultant psychiatrist?
A. That's correct.

And, again, Dr. Quigley took the appropriate step of writing to Dr. Griffin and seeking his further opinion?
A. That's correct.
Q. And Dr. Griffin, when he got that further opinion -sorry, Dr. Quigley, when he got that further opinion, acted on that?
A. Yes. I went at the see Dr. Griffin in the interim and furnished him with the same information as I had furnished him before in relation to the difficulties in the workplace.
Q. And there was a change in emphasis or, some might say, a change of mind, but I am suggesting you were in the engine behind this change of mind; you change your mind?
A. No, that's not correct. My mind was always set in relation to my difficulties in the workplace.
Q. And it's unfair to blame the Garda authorities for you changing your mind?
A. Well the Garda authorities weren't -- they were not pursuing investigations of the matters that were
causing my workplace absence, so, to a certain extent, I would blame them, yes.
37 Q. The authorities were being guided at every step by reports from responsible professional medical practitioners, which, in turn, were based upon information you were giving them?
A. The information $I$ was giving to Dr. Griffin I don't think was actually passed on to Dr. Quigley, the written information, the reports.

The recommendation was.
A. The recommendations were, but the non-medical reports and extensive reports that were furnished to Dr. Griffin were not passed to -- sorry -- to Dr. Quigley, as far as I know.
But what was passed on to Dr. Quigley by Dr. Griffin was his indication that you had sought -- you had felt you didn't have any future in the Guards.
A. That was a mistake. I didn't envisage a future in the Guards if the matters that were affecting me were not attended to by Garda management in the workplace.
40 Q. By who?
A. By Garda management in the workplace.

41 Q. No, no. The information that was conveyed by you to Dr. Griffin, which was in turn in a report conveyed to Dr. Quigley upon which he premised his decision, are you saying that was a mistake?
A. What $I$ am saying is that the report that $I$ furnished to Dr. Griffin set out very clearly my concerns with regard to my workplace environment and the matters that
were affecting me. Dr. Griffin didn't pass that report to Dr. Quigley and he arrived at his conclusion there in the report obviously sent to Dr. Quigley. But I hadn't sight of that at the time.
Throughout the period October 2007, November 2007 and into the spring of 2008, and into April 2008, you were ruminating obsessively on your problems, isn't that right?
A. Well they were certainly to the fore of my mind, yes.

You were obsessed with your sense of grievance and persecution?
A. We11 I wouldn't say obsessed. I would say I was seeking resolution of the matters, the non-medical matters with local management, but that wasn't made available to me.
44 Q. Do you take issue with my putting it as bluntly as that; that you were ruminating in an obsessive way?
A. Em, that would be a matter of opinion, probably, of a medical person, but certainly $I$ was available to management at all times there to seek resolution to the 10:46 problems that were affecting me.
Q. You see, $I$ am suggesting to you that your initial sense of personal guilt, which was unreasonable and overly harsh upon yourself, that appears to have been reported to Dr. Fernandez, and at some point in time that morphed into an anger, an anger with your colleagues and with management, and that further then heightened into a sense of vengefulness with Garda authorities?
A. No. I was never vengeful towards Garda authorities.

In all my reports I submitted, which are a matter of record, there is -- you can see that my points are set out quite clearly and not in a vengeful manner.
46 Q. You mentioned Dr. Michael Corry, your psychiatrist, would you mind looking at his report, page 1361. This is a report dated 17th April 2008 and under "Presenting Hi story" there, he recounts, in summary form, that you alleged that you had been the target of bullying and harassment in the workplace since September 2003. Did you report that to your own psychiatrist?
A. In the reports I submitted to the psychiatrist, yes.

47 Q. "It intensified following the death of Bai ba Saulite on 19th Novenber 2006 when she was shot dead in her home."

Over the page, under the heading of "Exami nation and Presenting of Compl ai nts" he continues:
"To date l have seen hi mon three occasi ons; namel y October 2007, 8th November 2007 and 11th April 2008.

He presents as an open forthright indi vi dual who articulates his di stress intensel y. He has been on sick leave si nce 17 th Decenber 2006 with the exception of April, May and June 2007. He is currently on pensi on rate of pay."

It is the next bit I want to draw to your attention:
"He compl ai ns of racing thoughts, obsessi onal
ruminations over the way he has been treated by Garda management, multiple reminders, i.e. seei ng a Garda patrol car, difficulty sleeping, ni ght mares, feelings of profound isol ation, fear of being arrested, irritability..."

The next two I have asked you about --
'... anger, vengef ul ness towards his authorities, avoid routines, gets his mail and pay posted out to the station, poor concentration, poor retention, hopel essness and depression. "

Sergeant, that is quite the list.
A. Yes, it is, indeed.

48 Q. You were ruminating in an obsessional way, according to this, over your difficulties.
A. Well, Dr. Corry would have received the same report, he did receive the same report of me as was provided Dr. Griffin in relation to all my concerns in the workplace, and this is his summation in relation to the reports I furnished him and through my interviews with him.
49 Q. Is it correct that at this time you had difficulty sleeping and were experiencing nightmares?
A. Well I had difficulty sleeping on occasions, yes, in relation to developments that were, you know, presenting while $I$ was off sick.
50 Q. And at this point you're off sick, are you?
A. Yes.

51 Q. So you are ruminating on your own or -- certainly not with colleagues at work?
A. No.

52 Q. He was of the view, in his concluding paragraph, that you were in great suffering and you required ongoing support of psychotherapy. Did you get psychotherapy?
A. Sorry, where's that?
Q. The last two lines, sorry.
"To concl ude Sergeant Hughes is in great suffering and requi res ongoi ng supportive psychot her apy."
A. I didn't avail of psychotherapy, no.

54 Q. Why not?
A. I felt that the -- if the matters were dealt with by Garda management, they would have alleviated my situation considerably, but that was not to be.
55 Q. Didn't another psychiatrist recommend that as well? Am I correct about that?
A. Sorry, can you remind me, please?
Q.

Did -- I am just trying to recal1 it myself. We11, can 10:51 you assist us? Did any of your other practitioners suggest to you that it'd be helpful for you to get psychotherapy?
A. I can't recall now.

57 Q. Didn't Dr. Fernandez?
A. I'd have to be reminded with his report.

58 Q. If we might look at page 1356. And this now is -- just to put it in context, this is March '07 report, 12th March '07, which is earlier:
"Gi ven hi s presentation l advi sed Mr. Hughes that he was not fit to ret urn to work pending further revi ew. He was not on any psychotropic medi cation when revi ewed and I was rel uctant to consi der this prospect unl ess absol utel y necessary."

Then he says:
"Under these circunstances I feel that supportive psychother apy would be the most appropriate intervention until l have familiarised myself with the further aspects of his presenting compl ai nts, incl uding hi s antecedents."

So it is very clear that this specialist as well, at that period, is giving you a recommendation to get psychotherapy and get to the root of difficulties.
A. I think this is addressed to Dr. -- is it addressed to my own doctor, is it?
59 Q. Yes, to Dr. Reilly.
A. And I would have seen Dr. Reilly then afterwards and maybe discussed that with him. I can't recall discussing with Dr. Reilly the psychotherapy option.
60 Q. No, but it would be an important part of the whole you discuss that with Dr. Reilly on foot of the recommendation from this specialist?
A. I don't recall the conversation I had with Dr. Reilly
following Dr. Fernandez's intervention, but I do know that the remedy lay within the workplace and it didn't lie within the medical arena.
61 Q. I wonder are we getting close really to, really, one of the root causes of the ongoing difficulties? Your doctors are suggesting a path towards recovery and are you spurning it?
A. Because I knew in my heart of hearts that the remedy for my situation lay within the workplace, and resolution of matters within the workplace, and I was very happy that it didn't lie within psychotropic medication or psychotherapy.

62 Q. Did Dr. Reilly at any point suggest you go to see a counsellor?
A. I think he may have. I'd just have to be reminded now through the report.

63 Q. I think it is page 6769. But I'm not even sure if it is necessary for us to go there. Did somebody suggest to you to go see a counsellor?
A. I think De11a Murray, Inspector De11a Murray, at the time she suggested, and I did, but I didn't think it was of much benefit, with the greatest of respect to the counsellor involved.

64 Q. Dr. Reilly, there in the report on screen, said he referred you to a counsellor and he gave a note for work. How many times did you see the counsellor?
A. Excuse me?

65 Q. How may times did you see the counsellor?
A. I didn't see the counsellor. I must have discussed it
with Dr. Reilly and I don't recall seeing a counsellor back then on behalf of Dr . Reilly.
66 Q. So, you have been advised to undergo psychotherapy by two different psychiatrists. You've been advised to go see a counsellor by your GP and also by, you mentioned, the welfare support officer. Wasn't that eminently good advice that you should have taken?
A. Em, I, myself, thought, and I believed that that route was not the route to take and the route to take was to have the matters, the non-medical matters remedied in the workplace.

67 Q. Did you not fee1 that in terms of your, the very difficult situation in which you found yourself, being in the eye of the storm, that it'd be a good plan to get help and to act on the recommendations of the medics whom you saw?
A. Yes. As I repeatedly say, I felt that the remedy for the situation lay in the workplace, and if we were to look at the, even the recommendations of the CMO, the assistant CMO to HRM, subsequently through HRM, to try and get these matters investigated in the workplace, and this was ignored by local management. And I think the psychiatrist there for Dr. Quigley suggested that it would be a very positive step to have the non-medical matters investigated.
68 Q. But I wonder are you merging two different concepts? And we've been over this perhaps, Mr. Marrinan brought you over this, the distinction between the injury at work controversy or dispute versus your desire that
there be some class of investigation into what you insist were system errors?
A. No. I'm not morphing it at all. I was very clear with what was affecting me with all the medical people I attended, and subsequently and eventually it was referred to the CMO that this is the kernel of his problems and we need to have it sorted out, and HRM made several attempts to secure investigation files from local management, and they went unanswered.
69 Q. You see, the reason I'm suggesting to you perhaps you did need medical assistance and you needed to take their advice to get proper treatment, was that you were developing something of a persecution complex. Your anger -- your guilt had turned to anger and you were developing an unshakeable belief that your colleagues were doing you down.
A. Well I think I wasn't happy at all with the developments in relation to the disciplinary inquiry, and I think I had good reason to believe that my colleagues were acting in the manner as you describe. I am suggesting to you that in the initial stages you believe you had seriously messed up, and you appear to have believed that had you read the victim impact report and reported to management the concerns that were in it raised by Baiba Saulite, that somehow things would have been different and you were way too hard on yourself, and that is a significant route of your problems?
A. From the outset, following the murder, I believed that
there was a systems failure. I believed that Baiba Saulite and John Hennessy were exposed to viable peril, and I believed that there should have been investigation into the Garda handling of the entire matters regarding Baiba Saulite and John Hennessy immediately following the murder. This was the not the case and I was concerned that management were not pursuing that course.
71 Q. Coming back to Dr. Quigley's role in matters, when he received your appeal of the decision to retire in October, he took the necessary and appropriate step of making further contact with Dr. Griffin?
A. I think so, yes.

72 Q. And you were assessed in January of '09 by Dr. Griffin, and Dr. Griffin concluded, following a long
consultation, that in fact it would be not -- he considered it would be appropriate -- sorry, he did not consider it would be appropriate to retire on medical grounds.
A. That's correct.

73 Q. Right. And, properly and reasonably, Dr. Quigley forwarded that communication to HRM, on the 19th January, alerting them to Dr. Griffin's, if I may say, changed position?
A. I think so, yes.

74 Q. And he also reported -- outlined that you were reporting financial difficulties at having been placed on a pension rate of pay?
A. I think so, yes.

75 Q. And that was a reasonable and decent thing for him to include in the report?
A. I think so. And, if I recall, he outlined some of the non-medical matters that needed to be addressed by management.

76 Q. And he also wrote to management -- to HRM in March, and also sought further advice from Dr. Griffin with a view to exploring your reintegration into the workplace?
A. Yes, I think so.

77 Q. And he also wrote to your GP, again with a view to progressing your, hoped for, reintegration and to seek an updated medica1?
A. I think so, yes.

78 Q. I think a subsequent appointment was arranged with the independent specialist Dr. Griffin for May, 21st May 2009, and Dr. Griffin continued to report that you were suffering financially, and he queried whether there was any way that the process of bringing the whole issue to a conclusion be progressed as quickly as possible?
A. I think so, yes.

In July, Dr. Quigley wrote to your GP, seeking clarification about medical interventions, again to support your return to work?
A. I think so, yes.

In August, he received -- Dr. Quigley received
confirmation from HRM that the disciplinary investigation had been brought to a conclusion and that it was considered no breach of discipline had occurred, and this was advised to your GP by Dr. Quigley?
A. I think so, yes.

81 Q. I presume that brought some level of solace for you, the fact that you were now informed the discipline -- I appreciate you fee1 it oughtn't to have started at all, and you have made that clear, but it must have brought solace to you that the discipline was finalised and you were fully exonerated?
A. It was great to get that out of the way, okay, yes.

82 Q. Yes. But unfortunately it didn't mend your view of co11eagues?
A. of colleagues?
Q. Yes.
A. It didn't mend my view that the disciplinary investigation was a targeting of me in the workplace. And you'd agree with me that colleagues, in particular your superintendent, Mark Curran, really went out of his way to try and provide a role for you so that you could reintegrate back into employment?
A. We11, I think towards the end of that year I was in such a financial state that I'd no choice but to return 11:03 to the workplace, and Superintendent Curran was there to receive me and to allocate me to a particular job within Coolock Garda Station.

85 Q. No, but didn't -- I mean we've seen it in the correspondence -- didn't Mark Curran try and really find a role for you? I am not suggesting it was an invented job, but he went out of his way to try and accommodate your return?
A. Yes. He was the officer to whom I reported on my
return to the workplace.
Q. That's not actually my question.
A. And he processed the situation in accordance with the ACMO's suggestions.
87 Q. You're not willing to give him any credit for your assisting your return to work?
A. Well I returned to work and he facilitated me in the staff office in Coolock, yes.
Q. All right, we'll come back to that when we are dealing with Superintendent Curran's position more fully.

As matters moved into 2010, you came -- you were referred to Dr. Patrick Devitt, consultant psychiatrist, isn't that right?
A. In 2010, yes.

89 Q. And Dr. Devitt was of the view that when you reported to him in 2010 -- his report is dated September 2010 -that your overwhelming emotion was one of anger, is that right?
A. well, I wasn't happy at all with the manner in which I 11:05 was treated by the Garda authorities over the preceding three years.
90 Q. You were talking about your feelings of being oppressed and harshly dealt with all the time -- ruminations and obsessions?
A. Well, I presented Dr. Devitt with a similar report to that furnished to Dr. Griffin and to Dr. Corry, and obviously he, through talking with him there, he composed that report.
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Q. The whole issue had become an obsession for you, hadn't it? Truly entrenched, imbedded in cement at this point?
A. Well I was extremely unhappy with the manner in which I felt that Garda management had dealt with my situation over the preceding three years.
Q. But you weren't getting any break from it, you were talking about it, really, every day and you were avoiding contact with colleagues?
A. I don't recall saying that I'm avoiding contact with colleagues. When I was working in Coolock Garda Station I had plenty of contact with colleagues. well did you not tell the specialist -- I don't want to be unfair because you don't have the report in front of you -- page 1366. We might start with page 1365, it's the first page of Dr. Devitt's report. This is a report of the 16th September 2010. The report is prepared at the request of Dr. Richard Quigley, Assistant CMO, and if we look over the page to page 1366, he reports, halfway down, your symptoms. And just above that heading it records that:
"I n Decenber 2009 he ret urned to work in An Garda Sí ochána in a light duty capacity. He has been working in that capacity at Cool ock station in the storeroom, performing janitorial tasks whi ch he regards as demeani ng. "

That is not a fair summary of your role, is it? It was
a proper job.
A. Well it was originally the Staff Sergeant's office, but most of the staff sergeant had been taken up by civilian staff, so there was very little -- it was effective an office whereby store equipment was kept and requisitions were made for different storeroom items and stuff, and matters like that. Sorry, isn't that description there, that down-in-the-mouth description is overblown, I am suggesting to you, you had a proper job with infrastructural role within the station, a responsible role which was organised for you, and it's unfair to regard it as demeaning, particularly when you didn't say that to people?
A. Well that's an expression I used at the time. I had no 11:09 job description given to me in relation to my functions at Coolock Garda Station, and they were certainly not that of the staff sergeant's historic roles -- my predecessor, in other words.
Q. And am I correct, ordinarily it wasn't a role that was accompanied by weekend allowance?
A. That's correct.

But in point of fact, when you requested if there could be a weekend allowance, the superintendent and the chief superintendent conferred and they organised, in a 11:09 very decent way, that there would be an allowance made available even though the role didn't normally carry it?
A. Sorry, I want to qualify that. The predecessor, the
staff sergeant previously, did receive his weekend allowances.

97 Q. I'd understood you made a special request that there would be allowances. They acted on that and they organised you to get -- you've put it here -- twice a month on a Sunday?
A. Yes.
Q. You see under the heading "Symptons Suffered by Sergeant Hughes as Reported to the Psychiatrist Dr. Devitt":
"1. Anxi ety, fear of the workpl ace and authorities.
2. Bad sl eep.
3. 'I talk about it and think about it all the time'."

And that's in quotations.
"....i.e. rumin nations and obsessions."
A. They are not my words. They're his words. If we were discussing my situation, well I would say well it's on my mind constantly.
Q. Forget about the specific words, but did you not indicate that information in number 3 ?
A. I may have indicated to him that it was affecting me adversely in relation to the treatment of the
authorities for the preceding three years.
100 Q. Did you tell him that you were thinking about the issues all the time?
A. I was saying they were continually on my mind, which
they were.
101 Q. And obsessions, did you tell him that they were obsessions for you?
A. Well, I wouldn't have used the word 'obsessions'. I would say 'determination' more than 'obsessions'; determination to have the matters resolved. Mr. Marrinan previously asked you I think about your reporting of drinking. It's noted here "heavy drinking" in number 4.
A. We11, yes, at the time -- at low times there I probably 11:11 would have had a couple of glasses at nighttime, probably three or four times a week.

103 Q. Is that the height of it?
A. Yes. I generally kept myself pretty fit, and that can be reflected in that $I$ attended a gym three or four times a week and partook in a lot of 10 K races and 5 K races during that time. So I was reasonably fit in mind and reasonably fit in body.

104 Q. Heading 5 is "Avoi dance" and it says:
"As any contact with An Garda Sí ochána caused hi m di scomf ort he tended to avoid it."

That's why I was asking you that question. Did you report that to the specialist?
A. I don't recall reporting that I was avoiding members of An Garda Síochána. As I said, my position in Coolock Garda Station, I think there was 70 or 80 staff there in Coolock there, and I'd interact with them on a daily
basis.
105 Q. And the last one is a theme I have been developing with you -- anger.
A. Yes. I was less than happy at the manner in which I was treated by my predecessors over a protracted period.

106 Q. Your overwhelming emotion was one of anger, isn't that right?
A. We11, deep unhappiness with management, yes.

107 Q. If we see under the heading of "Current Condition" he $11: 12$ says:
"Sergeant Hughes still suffers anxi ety, reduced confidence, di strust and anger. His sleep is still adversel y affected and he still drinks to excess, though less than previ ously when he was on sick leave. He al so has a feeling that he will be targeted by his superiors.

Sergeant Hughes acknow edged that he is fit for his current duties.

Asked why he regarded hinself as unfit for nore regular duties he cited his loss of confidence, his anger, his di strust and the feeling that he is being targeted. He 11:13 al so felt that the ongoing litigation would make rel ationshi ps difficult for himworking in a normal capacity. "

Then, it is proper I read it out as we11. You say:
"However he stated if the matters were resol ved then he was hopef ul that these symptons would resol ve such that he could resure full duties."

And this next bit I have been pressing. He says:
"Ser geant Hughes stated that his over whel ming emoti on is one of anger. 'I have a terrible anger, I amafraid 11:13 I'II retaliate, sometimes l have to go home'."

Was it as bad as that, sergeant?
A. There was certainly a situation following the -especially the two-year disciplinary process and I just 11:14 received a letter saying that the matters were dealt with and that I was exonerated; in other words I think after being subjected to that for two years, I was considerably angry that that process had taken place at al1.
108 Q. Under the heading of "Al cohol/Drugs" he gives information that he presumably got from yourself.
"Wile he was of fick he was drinking up to 20 units of al cohol per day."
A. No. I went back to Dr. -- I think I went back to the doctor after that, that was a misunderstanding. I don't think I'd be in my full health here today if I was drinking 20 units of alcohol a day.

109 Q. There seems to be a pattern of doctors making quite a number of mistakes in your case?
A. Well that is a mistake, you know. That just wasn't realistic, you know.
110 Q. It says:
"Currently he drinks approxi matel y 50 units a week."

Is that a mistake?
A. No. That is a mistake, yes.

111 Q. So has he dreamt these figures --
A. Sorry?

112 Q. Has he taken these figures from thin air?
A. I don't know how -- if he asked me how many pints I drink, I probably would have say five or six when I'm 11:15 out, and how many nights a week I would be out? I don't recall how he arrived at those figures, but through general conversation in relation to alcohol consumption -- but I did actually correct him when I went back the next time to him, Dr. Devitt, and I said "look, that's a bad reflection there and I certainly don't consume that much each week."
113 Q. Isn't the source for those figures fairly clear: it's yourself?
A. Is the source fairly clear?

114 Q. Yes. You told him those figures.
A. I wouldn't describe my drinking as units. If somebody asked me what I drink when I'm out, I tell them what I drink when I'm out for a night.
Q. Over the page, he deals with your mental state as of the 16/9/2010. And there's a heading "Mental State", if Mr. Kavanagh scrolls down a little bit, we have it there, second paragraph down:
"It was qui ckly obvi ous that Sergeant Hughes was greatly consumed by every detail much the events whi ch had befallen hi mith respect to the di sci plinary proceedings and the bullying and ot her irregul arities he had percei ved at his workpl ace."

This now is September 2010 --
A. Yes.

116 Q. -- he is offering this opinion.
"He felt that he was the victimof injustice. Sergeant Hughes reported that he constantly thi nking and tal king about these events such that his wife and a wife of a colleague find it difficult to listen to himand his colleague was al so i nvol ved.

It was difficult to deflect Sergeant Hughes fromgoing into minute detail."

Is that accurate?
A. Well, if anybody wanted to talk to me about my views on what had happened, I would gladly inform them of that, you know.
117 Q. He did -- in fairness, I should draw -- read on. It
says:

3
"You di d not appear depressed or anxi ous. There was no evi dence of psychosis. And he was not and had never been sui ci dal."
A. That's correct.
Q. So there's balance there as well?
A. That's correct.
Q. And in the conclusions, over the page, sergeant, he comes back to matters at point 5 , and he says at point 11:17 5 :
"Currently Sergeant Hughes, because he is still consumed with every aspect of his case, and is di strustful of An Garda Sí ochána, and still exceedingly 11:18 angry, must be regarded as mentally unfit to resume regul ar Garda duties."

## Was that your view at the time?

A. Well, I was extremely -- my confidence had seriously eroded at that point with the Garda authorities and my views of the Garda authorities for dealing with matters in the workplace that were affecting me.
Q. Al1 right. And if -- as we look now at Dr. Devitt's next report, $I$ am suggesting to you one summary of it would be to say that your obsessional mistrust issues worsened as you moved into 2011?
A. Well, the basis for -- that formed my opinions there in relation to matters in the workplace were never, were
never actually investigated properly by Garda management, and I feel that if they had have investigated the matters that were affecting me, it would have alleviated my condition substantially.
121 Q. Right. So page 1370, please, which is the report of Dr. Devitt, consultant psychiatrist, of the 10th March 2011. Towards the bottom of page 1371, the next page, there's a heading "Sergeant Hughes's attitude towards An Garda Sí ochána". It says:
"Sergeant Hughes is extremely angry at the organi sation. "

And then he puts in quotations:
"'I hate the organi sation. My career has been turned into a compl ete mess at the hands of Garda management'."

Was that your view?
A. That would have been the way I was feeling back in 2011, yes.
122 Q. "'The onl y levers that they have over me are to cut to my pay'."

And then the report continues:
"Sergeant Hughes believes that from Septenber 2010 to March 2011 his di strust of An Garda Síochána has
i ncr eased. "
A. That's correct.
Q. "'l feel persona non grata. l'm completely usel ess in the workpl ace'.

Sergeant Hughes is al so angry at the Garda medi cal department because he bel ieves 'Garda nedi cal did not have access to the sickness investigation files'."
A. Yes, indeed. As I said, the matters that were affecting me were not investigated by Garda management properly and proper report sent forward to assist the ACMO in dealing with me.
124 Q. Over the page, on page 1372, he puts this in quotations:
"'l can't work for an organisation that condones corrupt activity'."

Were you reporting that to the specialist?
A. Well I would have been reporting those matters to Garda 11:21 management if they had interviewed me.
125 Q. In fairness, I should read out the bit underneath that.
"He wrote: 'I continue to feel that properly conducted and objective investigations (in accordance with the al legations whi ch had been made known to Garda management may go some way to restoring my health to a point whereby a returning to the workplace may be a
possi bility'."
And that encapsulate what you have been saying here?
A. That's it.

And under the heading of the interview that he had with you on 10th March 2011, three paragraphs down, it says:
"Ser geant Hughes appeared to be agai n greatly consured by every detail of the events which had fallen himand the conduct and irregul arities that he had percei ved at
the workpl ace.

It is quite obvi ous that he rumi nates on these matters on an al most continuous basis. Again it was difficult to deflect Sergeant Hughes fromgoing into minute detail."
A. Well I had provided him with an extensive report in relation to the matters that were affecting me, the non-medical matters that were affecting me.
127 Q. And I think the situation that's described in those two reports continued as we moved into late 2011, isn't that, broadly speaking, correct?
A. Sorry? Excuse me?
Q. Your ruminating -- what $I$ am suggesting is your obsessiveness and your inability to defect from your own personal situation, all those symptoms continued
A. We11 I had been subjected, in my view, to serious workplace abuses over the preceding years and these were not addressed by Garda management and I'd lost
complete trust in the organisation, its ability to resolve these issues properly, and that's the situation as it stood in 2011.
All right. If we look at page 1376, this is in the report of the October 2011, under the heading of "I ntervi ew with Sergeant Hughes on the 6/10/2011." If we scroll down slightly, the second paragraph beneath that heading it says:
"Sergeant Hughes was pleasant at the outset while engaging in social pl easantries. However, once the topics of his absence fromwork and his grievance agai nst Garda management were rai sed he agai $n$ I aunched into great detail of the injustices done agai nst him and became quite ani mated.

Again he was greatly consumed by every detail of the events which had befallen himand his perception that his workpl ace was harnful to his mental health.
' When they start dealing with the el ephant in the room l'Il start feeling better myself'."
A. I recall saying that to him, yes.

130 Q. And towards the bottom of the same page, he again comes back to the symptom of anger that you reported, the last line there:

> "The over whel ming enot ion commi cated by Sergeant Hughes was one of anger."
 to be retired?
A. I can't recal1, in October 2011, what my feelings exactly were and whether I was waiting for developments in relation to other matters.
133 Q. A11 right. I don't mean it to be some sort of quiz. I appreciate it is difficult to track all of this. But a 11:26 more straightforward question: did you -- didn't the desire to retire actually come from you?
A. It did in the latter years, yes.

134 Q. Right. And if we look at the Dr. Devitt's next report,
which is 29th March 2012, as we move into spring of 2012, he's reporting that it was your opinion you should be medically discharged?
A. That could be correct, yes.

135
A. Sorry, was it a grievance of mine?
Q. Yes.
A. Well I felt I was -- I had no choice, I was worn down by the entire process. Management were not looking after the matters that were affecting me in the workplace and I felt I had no option, in 2012, but to pursue this route for my own personal benefit. asking you this is, $I$ had understood it to be a grievance of yours that you came to be medically discharged.

137 Q. But I mean in terms of the actual decision to medically discharge you, you've no complaint with that in and of itself, am I correct?
A. Sorry, I have no?
Q. In terms of the actual decision to medically discharge you, you do not complain about that, or do you?
A. It was an option that $I$ had no choice but to avail of for my own personal benefit.
Q. I wonder -- are you or are you not complaining that you were medically discharged ultimately?
A. I am complaining, yes, afterwards, that I was medically discharged, but at the time I had no choice and I wasn't going to object to it.
140 Q. Is this another example of you complaining about

How can you logically give out or complain about something that you sought and wanted and lobbied for?
A. I sought it as my last option for my own personal benefit. I didn't see any future for myself within An Garda Síochána without the matters being resolved. On page 1380 which is the next page under the heading of "Progress si nce the 6th October 2011", which is the date of the previous interview, there are a number of bullet point numbered paragraphs. Could I ask you to look at number 6, please? It says:
"It is Sergeant Hughes's opi ni on that he should be medi cally di scharged. 'I thi nk a medi cal di scharge would actually benefit me. It's one way of getting a monkey off my back'."
Did you say that to the doctor?
A. I don't recall that term, but what I wanted to convey to him was that for my personal benefit it would be more advantageous to seek a medical retirement.
143 Q. Did you also report that to Dr. Keenan, who is referred
to in the next bullet point, number 7 ?
A. Yes, I think I had conversations with her in that light as well.

144
Q. Number 7 reads:
"Thi s opi ni on is corroborated by Dr. Keenan who in her I etter of the 28th February 2012 to Dr. Qui gley stated ' I feel the huge psychol ogi cal toll of the past number of years have effectively made himunfit to return to hi s work'."
A. That would be in line with the way I was thinking in 2012, yes.
Q. "8. Sergeant Hughes has been of f work since January 2011 and is upset he hasn't been cont acted or intervi ewed by management since that time."

Did you say that?
A. Well, interviewed in relation to the matters that caused my workplace absences in the first place.
146 Q. Did you say that you hadn't been contacted by management?
A. Well that's what she wrote, but what I would have conveyed to her was that I hadn't been contacted by management in relation to the matters that were affecting me in the workplace.
147 Q. Is this another mistake by the doctor?
A. Well all I can say is that's what she wrote, but I do know if anybody had interviewed me back then, I would say the reason why I'm retiring and seeking retirement
is that the matters that were affecting me were not being resolved by management.
148 Q. Did you report to the specialist that you were upset you hadn't been contacted by management?
A. Sorry, is this to Dr. Keenan, is it? Did you report to this specialist, who is Dr. Patrick Devitt, consultant psychiatrist, did you report to him that you were upset you hadn't been contacted by management?
A. In respect of the matters that were affecting me. Contact with management -- I had contact on a daily basis with management at Coolock Garda Station when I was there.
Q. And hadn't you also been contacted by management during the period when you were off?
A. In relation to the -- basically in relation to notifications of pay reductions and appointments with the cmo.

151 Q. Inspector Hanrahan?
A. Inspector Hanrahan? I can't recall, I'd have to be reminded.
Q. Inspector Lacey?
A. I met Inspector Lacey I think on one occasion in Swords Garda Station I furnished him with a report.
153 Q. Superintendent Curran?
A. I'd have to be reminded -- in relation to phone calls, is it?
Q. Yes.
A. I was contacted by Superintendent Curran, I think, when

I originally went sick in January 2012.
155 Q. You see, you seem to be reporting here, incorrectly, to your specialist that nobody's contacting you. Are you miss reporting the facts to your specialist?
A. No, I'm not misreporting anything. what I was conveying to him was that the management were not dealing with the matters that were affecting my workplace absences, and I think that in 2012 again I went through the cycle of management not looking to interview me as to my workplace absences.
"It became qui ckl y obvi ous Sergeant Hughes had not rel inqui shed any of the resentments he had di splayed on previ ous meetings.

He referred frequently throughout the intervi ew to allegations of mal practice and corruption I have made but were not investi gated.
' The el ephant in the roomis the huge injustice done agai nst me.' He said 'it shoul dn't be left to the medi cal department to sort it out'."

Then it says:
"Sergeant Hughes appeared anbi val ent regar ding
retirement on medical grounds. He said that when he was offered medical retirement in the past he did not take it on Iegal advice."

Were you blaming your lawyers to the doctor?
A. Excuse me, sorry?

157 Q. Were you blaming your lawyers to the doctor?
A. No. No.

What's that about? And I don't want to know about legal advice you were given; that's none of my
business. But you appear to be putting blame on lawyers here, or advice you claim you were given?
A. No, at the time I think we're talking about it 2008 medical discharge process, and at that point I'd obviously received legal advice, but my own opinion was, at that time, that I should be medically retired.

159 Q. It reads:
"He said that when he was offered medi cal treatment in the past he did not take it on legal advice. He was aware that retiring on mental health grounds might have fut ure i mplications."
A. At that time.

160 Q. Are we to take from that that there was some sort of tactical play going on and you weren't actually
focusing on what was best for you medically, you were focusing on some sort of strategy?
A. In 2008 -- we went through it already -- the strategy was -- not the strategy, but my intention was to not
retire on medical grounds. However, in 2012, I think when this report was being composed, I was thinking that perhaps the best approach would be for a medical retirement.
161 Q. If we look at the conclusions to Dr. Devitt's report on the next page, and the final one $I$ just want to ask you about, they're listed number 1 to 8 . Just before $I$ do that, can I ask you: You're going in and out of work a little bit. You decide to go sick, as I think you've said, from time to time, was that being used as part of 11:35 a strategy?
A. Strategy?

162 Q. Yes.
A. There was no strategy. I reported sick after visiting my GP.
Q. Was sick leave being abused here?
A. Not at all, no. Sure, sick leave was as a result of the doctor's opinion in relation to me reporting to him the matters that were of concern to me.
164 Q. Number 8, the specialist says:
"The i ssue of retirement on medical grounds (mental heal th) should not be addressed until his Hi gh Court action is settled as there is still a possibility that if Sergeant Hughes feels a sense of vindi cation, his
mental state will i mprove such that he could resume Garda duties."
A. That's what he wrote, yes.
they? Your own psychiatrist was advising you to not finalise retiring on medical grounds until at least after your civil proceedings were finalised?
A. No, I disagree. The fault lay completely at the door of the Garda management in failing to investigate the matters that were concerning me and causing my sickness absences, and they were not sending their reports to HRM for even Dr. Devitt's consideration or the ACMO's consideration. And without those reports being forwarded, I believe that a proper decision could not be made by the medical people, and HRM for that matter, in relation to my position.
Q. I want to suggest to you, sergeant, that the medical reports enable me to suggest to you that throughout this period you had lost perspective in a serious way, you had lost your judgment on these issues, and you were pursuing an obsessive campaign.
A. That is not true. My perspective was very clear. I had serious matters to be investigated by Garda management in relation to my workplace absences and Garda management failed to actually properly investigate those absences and forward the relevant files for determination by A/C HRM and the ACMO.

167 Q. You came to believe, I suggest to you, that almost every action of management was directed against you and 11:38 you saw slights where there were none?
A. No, I don't accept that.
Q. I'm suggesting to you that your recollection of matters, and indeed conversations with colleagues
became flawed, such was your daily rumination with your campaign?
A. I don't accept that.

169 Q. And you turned on people who were actually trying to help you?
A. I turned on them?
Q. Yes.
A. No, that is not true.
Q.

You developed an anxiety to draw other people into your personal controversy and to deflect from your own situation and your initial feelings of guilt?
A. That's not correct.
Q. And I am suggesting to you that your lack of judgment and perspective during this period, which built and built and built as the months went by, prevented you from appreciating that you were cleared of all potential wrongdoing by Chief Superintendent Feehan's investigation?
A. Yes, and I would say that I don't agree with that and that Chief Superintendent Feehan's investigation, in my 11:39 view, should never have commenced in the first place.
173 Q. I suggest to you that throughout his saga, as your anger and defensiveness grew, you became obsessed with your campaign to pull others into your predicament to share blame.
A. Yes, I was less than happy with Garda management's failure to interact with me in relation to forming reports to be sent up to the relevant professionals there to make decisions in relation to my future in the Can I ask you, sergeant, to move to one of the themes the Tribunal is looking at, which is the CRO investigation and your dissatisfaction with it?
A. The confidential recipient investigation, yes.
Q. Yes, the confidential recipient investigation. It has been your evidence to the Tribunal -- we11 actually, sorry, before we just move there, can I ask you this question: You were happy, were you not, with the valuable role you had played in the abduction investigation, that is to say the investigation into the abduction of Baiba Saulite's children?
A. Yes, we did everything to the best of our abilities.
Q. Yes. And you had done valuable work in that, as was acknowledged I think by Garda management, throughout that investigation?
A. I wouldn't be seeking accolades in relation to my work I am doing but $I$ don't recall a commend, if that is what you are saying, anything like that, coming down.
178 Q. Do you not? Do you not recal1 Inspector Mangan saying that the investigation was carried out in a professional manner?
A. Yes, he did, but I didn't see that until 2012.

179 Q. I see. Do you not also recall seeing it referred to
elsewhere in the papers, Chief Superintendent Feehan agreeing with it was done professionally?
A. Again, I had no knowledge of that until 2012.

You, presumably, wanted -- well it's obvious -- you wanted the perpetrator of the killing of Baiba Saulite brought to justice?
A. Oh certainly, yes. knowledge of the relationship over the years between Mr. A and Baiba Saulite?
A. All the information $I$ had, all the evidence, all the artifacts, all the files, all the intelligence material was with Garda management at the time of the murder and shortly thereafter.
184 Q. No, no, but that's no substitute for you sitting down
and providing the lead investigators with your statement --
A. And -- sorry, go ahead.
Q. -- so that it could go into the DPP file, the file going into the DPP?
A. And I was always available in that regard to Garda management.
Right. why didn't you, just as you did with the defence of your position in the Mangan report, why didn't you take time to write down your statement for the file, for the murder investigation?
A. As I said, I was requested to provide a statement in 2007, September 2007, and I expected that Detective Inspector, as he said he would, he would get back to me in relation to what was required in my statement.
187 Q. Well you see, I wonder were you putting your own personal agenda above the interests of the investigation?
A. Absolutely not. And if there's any suggestion of me actually following that route there, Detective Inspector o'sullivan was free to contact one of my line managers, namely Superintendent Curran, if there was an issue in that regard and to raise it with him. And I note from the files that have been submitted here to the Tribunal that he has recorded the fact that there was no statement forthcoming from me. I wasn't aware that was being recorded at the time, and he should have taken this up with Superintendent Curran, for Superintendent Curran to address any issues that were
affecting me in relation to providing the statement. No such approach was made to Superintendent Curran, as far as I am aware, and no such approach to me was made by Superintendent Curran.
188 Q. Sergeant, even if you lift it beyond Inspector o'sullivan, who makes it clear he sought a statement and reported that up the line --
A. Yes.

189 Q. -- surely you must have realised the DPP was going to look -- was going to be anxious to get a statement from 11:45 you, the lead investigator in the abduction, who knew all about the relationship between Mr. A and Baiba Saulite and who could provide valuable insight into all of these things, including the question of motive, why didn't you proactively sit down, write out a statement ${ }^{11: 46}$ and provide it to the investigation?
A. I was waiting -- as with the initial approach, I was waiting for the detective inspector to come back and clarify precisely what he wanted me to put in the statement. That approach wasn't made. And I wasn't aware of the fact that he had reported that my statement wasn't forthcoming. I would have been alarmed to hear that because, under the Garda síochána Act, gardaí are not permitted to decline to make a statement -- the Garda Síochána Act 2005 that is -they are not permitted to decline to make statements or to submit their views that a statement is not forthcoming. It just didn't fit in with proper procedure.

The proper procedure, if there was a difficulty or an issue with me not providing a statement, was for local management to contact my line manager, Superintendent Curran, and he would, no doubt, have addressed the matter with me at that time.
190 Q. Are we agreed at the end of the day you didn't provide a statement?
A. Well, it's recorded on the file there a statement is not forthcoming, so I take it they decided that a statement wasn't necessary then from me.
191 Q. I see. All right. I want to move to the confidential recipient investigation. Can you just outline, because I am a little bit unclear on it, you feel that the handling of the CRO investigation represented bullying and targeting of you, is that your case?
A. The -- as I saw it, the investigation wasn't conducted in accordance with the regulations that underpinned that particular procedure. I wasn't kept informed of developments. I wasn't given feedback. And when the investigation completed two years later I was merely sent a one-page letter from the confidential recipient saying that the allegations I'd made, or had made, were without foundation and I considered that not to be sufficient given the input I had made into this process from the start. In addition, I feel that chief Superintendent Feehan, with respect, should not have been involved in that investigation because some of the matters that were the subject of complaint in the confidential recipient process were in respect of his
handling of the disciplinary investigation and the previous investigation, the fact-finding investigation. whom do you say targeted you with respect to the CRO investigation? And can you tell -- more importantly, can you tell the Chairman what evidence do you have against any of the alleged targeters?
A. Well, I believe that the CR -- sorry, the confidential recipient investigation was managed by chief Superintendent Feehan and Inspector Fergus o'Dwyer, and the people that I say that matters were reported to failed to actually investigate the issues to my satisfaction at the time.
193 Q. In plain English, that means you weren't happy with the outcome?
A. I wasn't happy with the process, nor the outcome.

194 Q. Yes. So no matter how in-depth, no matter how thorough, no matter how comprehensive the report was, the investigation was, if it didn't reach a conclusion that you agreed with, that was targeting?
A. Well, you see, I didn't know what conclusions it had reached in relation to specific matters that I had complained about. Only that I was told that the matters that I had complained about were without foundation. I don't think that is a sufficient response to the allegations I had made which I categorically included in the reports to the confidential recipient.

195 Q. In your view, was the decision not to uphold your complaints, was that targeting of you?
A. Well I felt that I was -- I had earnestly provided ample information to the confidential recipient process that merited a full investigation. And the failure to actually apply a full investigation to the matters there, what $I$ would see as a targeting of me, and the fact that there was officers involved who were involved in previous investigations that were complained of in the confidential recipient process, I reckoned it highly irregular.
197 Q. Just taking things sequentially. First of all, do you say that the report was not thorough or comprehensive?
A. The report seems to be very extensive, yes.
Q. Who are the investigators of the report?
A. I think Chief Superintendent Feehan was the lead investigator.
Q. Yes. Who else?
A. Inspector Fergus Dwyer.
Q. Yes.
A. And I had given -- provided reports personally to Superintendent O'Gara and Inspector O'Boyle. Senior, highly regarded distinguished senior officers, carrying out an in-depth investigation, isn't that right?
A. They were senior officers, yes. Carrying out an in-depth investigation?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you complaining about the fact it was in-depth?
A. Not that it was in-depth, but it didn't actually discover, it didn't high1ight the -- at the end of the investigation it didn't highlight matters that were brought to their attention as being -- confirming, some of them confirming the issues that $I$ had complained of.
Q. So, really doesn't it come down primarily to your grievance with the outcome; they didn't accept your complaint, they didn't uphold your complaint?
A. They didn't, as far as $I$ could see, and on reading the documents now that were provided, they didn't actually highlight areas where there were obvious failures on behalf of Garda management.
Q. You have mentioned in dispatches Superintendent Noe1 McLough1in?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have maintained a position that, in your materials at any rate, that he supported your complaint that there were system failures?
A. He certainly did.
Q. Are you clear on that?

## A. I am very clear.

Q. Didn't Superintendent MCLough1in indicate to the CRO investigation that you should have given crime prevention advice to Ms. Saulite?
A. I saw he said that, yes.
Q. Didn't he also indicate that as far as he was concerned, there were not system errors?
A. Sorry, there were not what?
Q. Isn't that right?
A. Sorry? what was that question, please?

211 Q. That there were not system errors?
A. Sorry. I just can't hear that last --

I am sorry, you're not hearing me. Didn't Superintendent McLough1in indicate that as far as he's concerned, there were not system errors?
A. They're not systems failures, is it? Sorry, that last word.
Q. Systems failure -- your phrase?
A. No, the conversation I had with him was in his own house and he was agitated as a result of receiving correspondence from the confidential recipient process, and part of the conversation $I$ had with him, he confirmed that he had received no information at all from a certain division in relation to Baiba Saulite prior to him retiring, and he himself said that, well if I didn't receive the information, how could he make make decisions on it? And if he hadn't got the information well then that was a failure in the system. 214 Q. You see, he provided a report to, and input, to the CRO investigation?
A. That's correct.

215 Q. If you felt there was system errors, is it not logical that you were extending criticism to the divisional officer, who was Superintendent McLough1in -- he's in charge of the district?
A. District officer, sorry. He was superintendent.
Q. Yes. have been primarily pointing at him?
A. Em, not if he -- yes, it points at everybody. It points at the Garda Síochána as an organisation. The big question is: what was the systems failure? The systems failure, as far as I am concerned, was the lack of coordination, correlation of crimes information and intelligence.
A11 right. That's fair enough, you have made that point. But what I am wondering is if that is so, that means the superintendent messed up in failing to ensure coordination and pooling of information; it was the superintendent's fault, amongst others perhaps, but it was primarily his fault?
A. Only if he was aware of the information that was available to him from other divisions. As it turns out, he wasn't aware of the information from the other divisions.

219 Q. I see. So I wonder is there a logical flaw in your thesis, because he's a friend of yours, isn't he?
A. I would know Noel well, yes.
Q. Is he somebody who targeted you?
A. No. I haven't stated him as targeting me. investigation report, which starts at page 2752. The report received from the Garda confidential recipient concerning the Garda investigation of the murder of

Baiba Saulite. And if we look at page 2763, we've paragraph 2.14. It says:
"Thi s i nvesti gation..."

We might scroll up a small bit there.
"This investigation has not found that any formal crime prevention advi ce was imparted to Ms. Saulite. Neither has it found any reports or directions emanating from the di visional or di strict offices regarding this issue. During the course of the child abduction case Ser geant WIII am Hughes assi sted Ms. Saulite in obtai ni ng accommodation in an effort to di stance herself from Mr. A."

That is the case, is it, you helped her get accommodation?
A. That's correct, in the early stages of the child abduction investigation.
222 Q. "She was al so advi sed to report any alleged mi streat ment towards her by Mr. A. This advi ce was gi ven in the context of the investi gation undertaken by Sergeant Hughes and his team and di d not incl ude any specific threat to the life of Mb. Saulite emanating fromeither a confidential source or from Ms. Saulite herself."

The next bit I want to ask you about:
"Ex Superintendent Noel MELoughlin informed this investigation teamthat Sergeant WIIiam Hughes was primary investigator of the child abduction case and theref ore the primary point of contact for ME. Bai ba
Saulite. Ex Chi ef Superintendent MELoughlin stated that Sergeant Hughes should have gi ven crime prevention advi ce to ME. Saulite. Ex Superintendent MELoughlin stated that he rei nforced on numerous occasi ons to his staff in general to give appropriate crime prevention advi ce to the rel evant parties. Ex Superintendent MELoughlin in the many meetings he had with Sergeant Hughes reinforced the instruction to him The i nvestigation team has not located any written direction emanating from Ex Superintendent MELoughlin directing that crime prevention advice be given to Mb. Saulite."

It would appear to indicate that if there was an error, it was yours, was Noel McLoughlin's view?
A. Sorry, can we scroll up to the top, the first paragraph there, please?
Q. Just a moment.
A. Yes.

224 Q. I am asking -- we will go to that if you like, but in 12:00 2.15 --
A. Yes.

225 Q. -- it appears clear that Noel McLoughlin doesn't agree with your view on these matters and is indicating that
you were the primary investigator, the primary point of contact with her, and you should have given crime prevention advice, was his view.
A. Yes. He is talking -- he is referring there to crime prevention advice possibly in relation to matters I knew of -- the child abduction case. There's a couple of aspects to this here, is that Superintendent McLoughlin informed me that he didn't know of the Blanchardstown information -- the other division's information in relation to Baiba Saulite; he told me at 12:01 that meeting that day. In relation to me giving crime prevention advice, I always -- in dealing with Baiba Saulite, we'd always do our best for her in any circumstances in relation to advising her. However, there is a crime prevention advice officer based in the 12:01 division whose primary function is to issue crime prevention advice in serious matters. And following the 11th October 2006, the threat to John Hennessy, and Baiba was party to that, the crime prevention officer, as we know through documentation, provided extensive crime prevention advice to John Hennessy both at his place of business and at his home and to his own personal safety. No such crime prevention advice was provided to Baiba in advance -- at that time. And the -- if Ex Superintendent McLoughlin there, if he's referring to crime prevention advice I would give, it would only be in the context of what I know in relation to --

226 Q. Sorry, say that again, he was referring to crime
prevention advice that you might have given?
A. In relation to matters that $I$ would know of.

227 Q. Yes. But he was of the view, at any rate, that you ought to have -- I suppose the reason I am mentioning this to you --
A. Yes.
A. Yes.
-- it's his bona fide view I think we can assume, but that isn't targeting of you that he is offering a very different view to you on things you ought to have done or might have done. So, the reason I am bringing this up, just as an example, to suggest to you that merely because somebody holds a different view to you on an important matter, in this case a very different view to you, doesn't mean the person is targeting you or that they have a malicious intention to do you down. Do you understand the point I am making?
A. I do.

So, also if we widen that from the superintendent to any of your managerial colleagues, merely because they didn't agree with the point you were making, and repeatedly making, doesn't mean that they were targeting you -- in this case merely because the CRO investigation did not uphold your beliefs does not mean that they were setting out to target you. Do you understand?
A. In the context of these two paragraphs here, Noe1

McLough1in, Superintendent Noe1 McLough1in, asserts that -- seems to be asserting that I was the primary crime prevention advice officer in relation to Baiba Saulite and all her troubles in relation to the Garda Síochána. where I see the matters -- an item that I raised in the confidential recipient investigation report was the fact that crime prevention advice was not -- the fact that it said in the press release that crime prevention advice was provided to Baiba prior to her murder, and part of it was that I had not been informed of that, but it was discovered then in this confidential recipient process that the press release was incorrect in that regard, and that was discovered. Now, I think that's a very important issue here. The Garda press release, after following up within three days of her murder, said she was issued with crime prevention advice in relation to herself and her property. That wasn't true. And that was discovered in the confidential recipient process here.
So is that an example of you seeking to rely upon the CRO report when it suits, but reject it as targeting when they come to a conclusion that doesn't suit?
A. Well, there are areas in it that $I$ would agree with and other areas that I don't agree with. And I think an opposing view shouldn't be seen as dissent. I think that clearly here, in these two paragraphs here, Noel McLough1in is of the view that I should have issued her with the ultimate crime prevention advice in relation to all her difficulties, when in fact $I$ was only
looking after the child abduction investigation and there were several other matters involving other gardaí that were dealing with her too.
Could I ask you, superintendent, to look at page 47 -sergeant, excuse me, page 47 of the materials, which is $12: 05$ your statement of interview to the Tribunal. And it deals with this issue of the CRO investigation and its propriety. And on page 47, four lines down, we see it says:
"On the 19th May 2010 I recei ved correspondence from the confidential reci pient stating that matters had been examined and no issue were arising. I have provi ded a copy of this correspondence to the Disclosures Tribunal. As a result of this process $1 \quad{ }_{12: 06}$ felt bullied, harassed and scapegoated. I felt there was an abuse of process, cover-up, harassment of me, criminal activity and mal practice."

That's pretty high, isn't it, sergeant?
A. Well that's the way I feel in relation to -- this is the entire process now, not just to the matters we were referring to there two minutes ago.
233 Q. What was the criminal activity?
A. Well the harassment of me I believed, and I'd reported this in the confidential recipient reports and I reported it in the disciplinary investigation report, I believed that the protracted harassment of me in the workplace amounted to a breach of the Non-Fatal

Offences Against the Person Act harassment.
234 Q. The way you put it in the statement, if we read on:
"The criminal activity I amreferring to here is the continued harassment of me by the Garda authorities in 12:07 failing to properly investigate serious complaints which I believe may have constituted a breach of the Non- Fatal Offences Agai nst the Person Act."

But there's been an in-depth thorough and comprehensive 12:07 report into your allegations. How is that targeting?
A. Well, we'd have to go through the report and I can point out areas where I feel that the matters that I was alleging were not investigated -- highlighted as a result of that investigation.
Q. Who targeted you arising from this report, you say?
A. I think I have it later in my statement to the Tribunal who targeted me.
236 Q. Yes. Who do you say targeted you?
A. Well, primarily Chief Superintendent Feehan, I feel, 12:07 should not have been in charge of the investigation.

237 Q. We have that point.
A. Yes.

238 Q. But who targeted you in the carrying out and conclusion of the report, who targeted you?
A. Well it would be the author of the report then -- Chief Superintendent Feehan.
Q. So the author of the report. Is it because of the outcome?
A. Because I feel that the matters that I had comprehensively reported to the confidential recipient office had not been, had not been investigated properly.
I see. Did anybody else target you?
A. We11 any of his -- any person acting on his behalf that would know of the issues $I$ was raising and the fact that they weren't actually investigated.
Q. So anybody associated with the investigation, including the series of senior officers who carried out the in-depth report, they were targeting you as well?
A. We11 I believe that anybody who had knowledge of the complaints that were made, and then the investigation that was carried out into those complaints could see that there was a shortfall in the investigations of the 12:09 specific complaints $I$ was making.
Q. distinguished officers were involved in targeting you arising from the outcome of this report is illogical, but it is more than illogical, it's very unfair to them, and I am suggesting to you there is not a jot of evidence to support your allegations of targeting.
A. I believe there's a lot of evidence to support the fact that the matters complained of, substantive matters complained of in my report to the confidential recipient's office were not properly investigated in that process.

243 Q. There are two newspaper articles -- well a number of newspaper articles that you're unhappy about, but just
taking them in turn, sergeant. The Sun newspaper article, early on, that was looked into by Superintendent Dennedy, isn't that right?
A. Yes, indeed.

244 Q. And you weren't happy with that, am I right about that? ${ }^{12: 10}$
A. Sorry, happy with?

245 Q. With the investigation into that.
A. I don't think --

246 Q. I appreciate I am going back a good bit of time --
A. Yes.

247 Q. -- but we have to move into the various themes that you are aggrieved about. Superintendent Dennedy did a report into The Sun newspaper article way back --
A. Yes.

248 Q. -- the 23 rd November 2006, in the aftermath of Baiba's killing, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

249 Q. And he interviewed Damien Lane, the journalist in The Sun newspaper, and he was accompanied by Sergeant Buckley, and they went out to the newspaper offices in Bishop Street, and also present was the solicitor for the newspaper, isn't that right?
A. I didn't -- I wasn't made aware of these matters back in 2006 and 2007.
well sorry, didn't he interview you and Garda Nyhan at Swords Garda Station on the 12th December '06?
A. That's correct. We made witness statements, I think.

251 Q. Yes. So it was looked into at your request, comprehensively, by an accomplished officer, and he
reached -- then inspector -- and he reached his conclusion, having spoken with another journalist in The Mirror newspaper and also having interviewed the allegedly offending journalist from The Sun?
A. Yes. But I wasn't made aware of these developments. I see. Well let's look at what he notes was the product of the interview. We might look at page 1883, please. So this is a report, I might just scroll up and get the date of it, I think it's 15th December '06. Yes, we see that in the top right. And it's a report to D/Superintendent Byrne in Santry. There's a reference to the interview with Mr. Lane, the journalist in The Sun newspaper.
"On 11th December at 4: 30, accompani ed by Ser geant Buckley, I met Dami en Lane The Sun newspaper. Al so present was M chael Tyrrell solicitor from Mathews [sic] Ornsby and Prentice. I asked Mr. Lane the foll owing questions:
Q. Did the source mention rank when he was referring
to Gardaí in this article?
A. No, it was an assumption on my part.
Q. Did the source mention 24 -hour guard?
A. No, it was an assumption on my part.
Q. Did the source mention gardaí across north county

Dubl in?
A. No, it was an assumption on my part.
Q. Did the source mention drugs I ords?
A. No. It was an assumption on my part. I put two
and two toget her and got five. I don't have the name of any particul ar drugs I ord."

If we go over the page:
"Q. What do you mean by if he cannot get the intended target?
A. Answered by $M$ chael Tyrrell: artistic licence on behal $f$ of the journalist.
Q. Who is your source?
A. He is not fromthe criminal fraternity.
Q. Is he a guard?
A. I cannot say, but it's a source you shoul d not have no concerns about.

Mr. Lane stated that he over-egged, sensational ised and tabl oi di sed the article."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.

253 Q. Sorry, just above that it says:
"Mr. Tyrrell indi cated that [blank] for Sergeant Hughes had written to them Mr. Tyrrell stated that he rang [bl ank] to allay any fears that they may have had over the article."

Was that conveyed to you?
A. I don't know what -- sorry what's this blank?
Q. I don't know. Was it your solicitor?
A. Sorry?
Q. Did your solicitor make contact with the journalists?
A. Oh he could have in the meantime, yes.
Q. Then under the heading of "I ntervi ew with Sergeant Li am 12:14 Hughes and Garda Decl an Nyhan" the following is said, two paragraphs down:
"I enqui red if either of the two members had been personally threatened or if they had any more inf ormation to support the substance of thei $r$ letters.

Sergeant Hughes stated that (a) at the time of the arrest [bl ank] stated that the Gardaí were being personal towards him(b) at the bail application [bl ank's] demeanour was aggressi ve and he went on a rant, and (c) comments of D/Inspector O' Sul Iivan in the bail application that Mr. A was a dangerous criminal with international connections..."

And this last bit I want to ask you about:
"(d) Bai ba told hi m--" that's you -- "Bai ba tol d him at Swords Garda Station that she feared for her life and that of Sergeant Hughes, Garda Nyhan and

Do you see that there?
A. I do.

262 Q. It doesn't say that --
A. No, it doesn't.

263 Q. -- but it seems to be a reference to that?
A. It doesn't, no. But if it does refer to the 14th November 2006, he's actually mistaken.

264 Q. So, both he is mistaken and, you say, Inspector Cryan is mistaken?
A. We have to see Inspector Cryan's report that he submitted to Chief Superintendent Phillips on the day after the meeting.
Q. You have seen his note?
A. I have seen his notes.
Q. You are aware of his position on it?
A. I am aware that he made those notes, yes.

267 Q. Yes, but you are aware of his position; it came up as a 12:17 live issue in the proceedings against Garda Nyhan, didn't it?
A. To my recollection, yes.
Q. Yeah. So you're aware that two officers have attributed -- and remember, they are taking down what you are saying. They are saying this is what you said. So I just wonder is there a bit of a pattern? You're not anxious that that would be said. You appear to be insisting that it wasn't said, even though the suggestion is you said it?
A. Yes, I have a difficulty with Inspector Dennedy's notes there in that regard, and I think the pattern really should be that when notes are taken, you know, the best practice would be to read the notes back off the person from whom they are taken just for validity purposes to 12:18 make sure that's what they said. We do that throughout the Garda Síochána in all aspects of interviewing people, whether they are suspects or witnesses, we read the documents back over to them for validity of
content, and perhaps even to get them to initial it or sign it. This account here, if it refers to the 14th November of 2006, is incorrect.
269 Q. All right --
A. That is Inspector Dennedy.

270 Q. Can we move forward in the time machine two years on to The Star newspaper about which you're also unhappy?
A. Yes.

And this was November 2008, and we can see it, just so to locate it in context for you, it's on page 8092, the 12:19 actual article. Just looking at the headline, and I am not suggesting this was fair content or, you know, a nice thing to have to look at, I do acknowledge that. Having said that, the headline, unpleasant as it is, it's actually correct, isn't it?
A. It is correct.
Q. Yes.
A. That I didn't look after -- if it's referring to me, I didn't look after the -- at the warning contained in the victim impact.
273 Q. Yes. In any event, on the 12th December 2008, Séan Costello's office, on your behalf, wrote to the Commissioner in relation to this article, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

274 Q. And Chief Superintendent Feehan appointed Inspector Fergus Dwyer to investigate the complaint as set out in your letter, isn't that so?
A. That's correct.
A. I can't recollect that meeting.
Q. A11 right. It is -- sorry, this meeting that we're discussing, it is the one where you handed a
A. Yes. I think I on7y met Inspector Dwyer, I could be corrected on this, once probably, in Séan Costello's office.

281 Q. Right. Now, you're aware that Inspector Dwyer conducted a thorough investigation of this matter and interviewed Michae1 O'Toole, the journalist who had written the article, isn't that right?
A. He interviewed Michael O'Toole, yes.
A. So I believe, yes.
Q. To take a statement from him regarding the newspaper article?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. And the conclusion that was reached was that the bulk of the information in the article was available from material in the public domain already, with the exception of a reference to disciplinary proceedings against a garda based in north Dublin, isn't that right?
A. Eh, I'd have to compare the documents before I come back with an answer on that, the documents you're referring to, we'd have to contrast them.
Q. Wasn't that the gist of the conclusion of the investigation?
A. Well that's his conclusion, yes.
Q. Right. And the investigation was unable to ascertain the source of the information contained in the article, 12:23 and I am suggesting to you that notwithstanding the considerable efforts that were gone to, there was nothing more that could have been done in relation to that investigation?
A. Yes. I think when you say it didn't identify the person, $I$ think the journalist confirmed that it wasn't of anybody above Assistant Commissioner rank, if I am corrected.

Well you see, we're dealing with just more general points here. The man -- you have asked this to be looked into?
A. Yes.
Q. It is isn't just given to a garda on-the-beat. Senior investigators are tasked with the role of going to a journalist, interviewing them --
A. Yes.
Q. -- arranging a meeting with a solicitor present, going to another source, another person who might offer valuable input -- the solicitor Mr. Hennessy, chasing things down, they look into it. That was respectful of your complaint and your inquiry, wasn't it?
A. Yes, over the period of the investigation. But the point I am trying to make is that I think you said that they didn't establish who it was, the actual person who 12:24 provided the information. But I think Michael o'Toole may have indicated in his report that it was -- I think he mentioned it wasn't anybody above chief superintendent or assistant commissioner rank, but he was more or less confirming it was a member of the

290 Q. Wel1 that's your slant on matters.
A. No, that's what I read in the documents.

291 Q. So, my question to you is this: Mindful that that was
fully investigated, and the Garda management couldn't go any further with it, how is that targeting of you?
A. Well, the targeting I thought was initially from the -the article had appeared within a few weeks of me approaching the confidential recipient process, which I 12:25 was alarmed about, that it came from within the -- I was reliably informed that it came from within the Garda Síochána. The motivation, as I believed at the time, was as a result of me taking this action in the confidential recipient process and reporting corruption/malpractice within the organisation; that was my feeling at the time. And I felt that the matter could have been investigated more promptly and, you know, the lines of inquiry followed up to a conclusion. You use 'I feel' quite a bit in your targeting allegations. You don't seem to have any evidence of these matters?
A. Well, the fact that the article appeared in The Star newspaper, $I$ fee1, was a targeting of me.
293 Q. I see.
A. And despite the investigation finding that there were similar articles -- I think I briefly read through those similar articles and they don't contain the information that's in this particular article here. This is a direct, without naming me, it directly identified me, and I felt it was targeting of me.

294 Q. Yes. And in terms of the thoroughness of the investigation, we've already been over, that was carried out by Superintendent Dwyer, Inspector O'Boyle,

Inspector Sweeney, Sergeant Bailey, Sergeant Grady, Sergeant Dalton, Sergeant McAvinchey, and Sergeant Waters and Superintendent O'Gara, assisting Chief Superintendent Feehan in the CRO investigation, that was also targeting because of the outcome?
A. It was targeting -- the initial targeting, I believe, was in relation to the article itself appearing, and I believed it was a member of the Garda Síochána that had leaked this information, and this is confirmed by the journalist more or less.

295 Q. I see. Can I ask you then --
296 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, can I just clarify? okay, let's assume that was targeting. In what way was the investigation targeting?
A. I think, Mr. Chairman, the length of time it took to actually investigate the matter, $I$ felt, was just... it was too slow.

297 Q. CHA RMAK It was too slow. How was that targeting?
A. Well it's a matter that --

298 Q. CHA RMAN I am just trying to be clear. I understand your point that the original leaking, you say, was targeting. Okay, so here there's an investigation, it should have happened faster. What difference did that make?
A. Yes, I would have preferred, Mr. Chairman, if probably 12:27 the matter was referred to GSOC for investigation and I --

299 Q. CHA RMAN If what matter was referred to GSOC?
A. The leaking of this article to the media. If it had
have come from a member of the Garda Síochána, I think that an independent investigation should have been conducted and perhaps it shouldn't have been conducted by the people who were already concerned with matters. conducted -- we know it was actually investigated, I don't want to be difficult about this but I don't want to be slithering off into all kinds of other areas. In what way did the investigators of this matter target you?
A. Well, I felt --

301 Q. CHA RMAN Question.
A. I just felt that an independent investigation -CHAL RMAN I know that. Don't go --
A. Yes.

302 Q. CHA RMAN Don't go off on that --
A. Just to qualify my answer, yeah.

303 Q. CHA RMAN You didn't get an independent investigation?
A. Yeah.

304 Q. CHA RMAN You didn't get an investigation. I can't remember whether you actually made that case in your interview, that's not important, none of that is important. The question is, there was an investigation, you may be happy or unhappy, but in what way did the investigation, of the investigators, target 12:29 you?
A. Well as I have stated, Mr. Chairman, it was the overly protracted nature of the investigation I felt was again just --

305 Q. CHAL RMAN Okay, it took too long?
A. Yes. And --

306 Q. CHA RMAN How did taking too long target you?
A. Well, I felt that the --

307 Q. CHA RMAN Targeting you; I mean we are using language here.
A. It's targeting me in that $I$ felt that the investigators shouldn't have been in charge of that investigation from the outset and that it was overly protracted, and I just felt that it wasn't being taken seriously.
308 Q. CHA RMAN How do you say it wasn't being taken serious7y?
A. We11, in the first course the proper procedure, Mr. Chairman, is to interview the complainant in relation to any complaint, and from that then the investigators then can proceed to interview witnesses, potential witnesses. And if that had been done, rather than waiting for my statement, in the autumn I think it was, and then interviewing John Hennessy and carrying out further interviews of other persons involved, I think it could have been dealt with much more expeditiously if a statement had been obtained from me at the earliest juncture.
CHA RMAN okay. Thank you.
A. Thank you.

309 Q. MR. O H GG NS: Just arising from the Chairman's question, sergeant, I think on the 24th March 2009, your legal representative wrote to Inspector Dwyer objecting to $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{S}$ Feehan's involvement in the
investigation?
A. I think that's correct, yes.

Having been informed of the decision that the investigation should continue, Inspector Dwyer wrote to your legal representative, I understand, on the 29th April 2009, and again on the 29th May 2009, requesting that a meeting be arranged with you so that a formal statement of complaint might be taken. The inspector provided his mobile phone to facilitate contact by you. The reason for corresponding through your solicitor was 12:31 that the inspector had previously been asked that any communication between himself and Sergeant Hughes should in fact be made through the legal representative.
And I am suggesting to you that on the 27th July 2010, Superintendent Dwyer wrote to your legal representative stating that he was affording you a final opportunity of making a statement of complaint in respect of the newspaper article. And at that point your solicitor responded to Superintendent Dwyer, on the 10th August 2010, stating that Sergeant Hughes was happy to provide a statement.

So there was a considerable period of time that was taken up with delay on your side of the house.
A. We11, I said I think that this was raised previous7y 12:32 and I can't account for the considerable amount of time between correspondences there, I don't know what was happening, but certainly there was no delay on my part in trying to expedite this investigation. I was
available to the investigators there from January, when they first received the complaint officially from the Commissioner.

311 Q. And my understanding is that Superintendent Dwyer, who I mentioned already, and Detective Sergeant Mark Waters, met with you in the presence of your solicitor on the 12th October 2010, and at that point you handed in the pre-prepared statement. We've been over that but you don't think it was Sergeant waters?
A. It wasn't, no, it was Detective Inspector Francis Sweeney.

312 Q. I see. Your solicitor acknowledged that he'd received correspondence from Chief Superintendent Dwyer seeking to interview you, but asserted that the superintendent should have made contact directly with the sergeant. Do you remember this?
A. Sorry, the --

313 Q. Mr. Marrinan brought you over this.
A. Yes.

314 Q. There was a slightly ridiculous situation where you were criticising the guards for making contact -- the solicitor hadn't responded to correspondence, and now the guards were being blamed for not contacting you directly. It was mad, it was ridiculous position?
A. Yes. There was some sort of breakdown in communication there.

315 Q. Yes. So how can you blame Garda management for that?
A. Sorry, just to qualify my answers there in relation to targeting, this matter just struck me --
Q. No, how can you blame, in relation to this delay that was clearly not the fault of management, how can you blame them for that when it was a mess up between you and your solicitor?
A. I can't explain, as I said previously, the breakdown in communication there but $I$ was always available to assist this inquiry, after al1 I initiated it, I wasn't going to stand back from it.

But if I may qualify a previous answer there as to how I felt targeted. During that investigation one of the witnesses was visited at her home, and she was informed that the inspector was there to obtain a statement in respect of Liam Hughes, Sergeant Liam Hughes and the disciplinary matters that -- the disciplining of Sergeant Liam Hughes, or words to that effect, and it heads her statement. And I just felt that it was highly irregular for an inspector to actually identify me as being subject to disciplinary procedures to a witness who is not in An Garda Síochána.
317 Q. Al1 right. Can you just remind me, because I am unclear on this detail, in respect of one of your complaints about one of the articles, you felt that -and I just wonder was it this one -- that An Garda Síochána should have availed of powers under the, I think, offences Against the State Act, to arrest the journalist to force the journalist to reveal their source. Was that this article?
A. I didn't, I didn't say to force any journalist do
anything. what I said in my correspondence to the superintendent at that time in relation to, $I$ think that was The Sun article --
A. Yes. It would appear that the journalists have information in relation to a capital murder, you know. And that -- I said, if that is the case, well then the person should be actually approached in that regard. Well when you say approached, were you urging that the journalist, in relation to The Sun article, should have 12:35 the coercive powers of the Offences Against the State Act deployed against them and an arrest power used to force them to reveal his source, was that your position?
A. We11 if you read the article, it was very direct and it 12:36 actually said that a member of the Garda Síochána is about to be murdered. And that is a capital offence, and anybody with that type of information, we have powers there to actually investigate that and we should be using the utmost powers if there was truth in the article. Now, we see there that he admitted that it was fabrication, more or less, and --

320 Q. So you wanted -- this is now dealing with The Sun I appreciate and not the one we're on at the moment -but The Sun article, you wanted your colleagues to arrest the journalist?
A. I don't think, I don't think that I used that term, that I wanted them to arrest the journalist. I was saying if there's any truth to the information in the
article, well then the journalist is in possession of information in relation to a possible capital murder. You see, I wonder is this an example of what I was talking earlier about your perspective having become really quite skewed? It would be a gross abuse of Garda power, would it not, to arrest a journalist under the offences Against the State Act in order to obtain information from the journalist; that simply wouldn't be countenanced by a reasonable person?
A. Of course. And if I was given that job, if I was to approach a journalist, I wouldn't be going in with the section 30 offences Against the State Act. First of a11, I'd do exactly what was done in this investigation; I'd establish first was there any truth behind it? The investigating members did find out that ${ }_{12: 37}$ was utter fabrication, so that was ruled out any option to enforce any legal constraints on the journalist involved. But, at the outset, the article appeared to suggest that the journalist was in possession of information in relation to a capital, potential capital murder, and I think that should have been taken seriously. If they're going to put that in print, wel1 then they have to face the consequences of the Garda attention to it; there has to be some Garda attention to it.

322 Q. Returning to the 2008 article which I was asking you questions about, Chief Superintendent Feehan indicates that as well as directing that the steps be taken of Inspector Dwyer interviewing you with his colleague,
directing that there be an interview with the journalist concerned, there was also interviews with other journalists carried out, and you're aware of that?
A. No, I wasn't, no.
Q. Yes...
A. And saying -- and I think they're putting forward the argument that there was similar content in those and that this particular article in November 2008 was, the information was garnered from those articles. I think 12:39 I disagree with that. I think there is more in this article that -- and it was agreed by the journalist that it came from a source within the organisation. 325 Q. All right. You see, if we look at page 980 of the materials, we see the efforts that Inspector Dwyer was making. And it says -- you might scroll up there for a moment just to get the date of this communication. It's to you, it's September 2010 -- 10/9/2010.
"As you are aware I have been endeavouring to take a af or ementioned complaint. In this regard we arranged to meet on the 8/9/10. This meeting was subsequently def erred to the $10 / 9 / 10$ and again to the $13 / 9$ each time
at your request.

On the 10th Septenber 2010 I nspector Ai dan O Donnel I AGSI contacted me on your behal fand requested a further deferral of our meeting citing the unavailability of your legal representative as his reason for doing so.

In view of the fact that our proposed meeting has been deferred a number of times linformed Inspect or
O Donnell that I was now placing the onus on you to contact me within the next 14 days and provi de me with a date suitable to all parties when you can meet and provi de me with a statement of complaint in relation to this matter."

And then we might look at page 982 , please. And it says -- it's a communication of 2/10/2010:
"In compl iance with the di rections of the Deputy
Commi ssi oner Operations on the 12th July 2010
Superintendent Dyyer corresponded with Séan Costello Sol icitors on the 27 July 2010 informing Sergeant Hughes one final opportunity to make a written statement of compl ai nt in respect of the...

On the 10th August 2010 Séan Costello solicitor indi cated that Sergeant Hughes was willing to make a statement in respect of the matter. The menber's legal
representatives stated that they were not in recei pt of Superintendent Dyyer's response of the 29th May 2010 and that their client was happy to give a statement at any time.

Arrangements were put in place to meet with the menber on the 8th Septenber 2010. As stated in previ ous reports this meeting subsequently referred to 10th Septenber and again to the 13th September, each time on the request of Sergeant Hughes."

If we scroll down:
"On the 10th Septenber Inspector O Donnell cont acted Superintendent Dyyer ... as his reason for doing so. In view of the fact that the meeting with Sergeant Hughes had been deferred a number of times, Superintendent Dwyer informed Inspector Dwyer that he was pl acing the onus on Sergeant Hughes to contact him (Superintendent Duyer) within the next 14 days with a vi ew to providing a date suitable to all parties."

Then if we scroll down, it concludes:
"On the 16th September Superintendent Dwyer corresponded with Sergeant Hughes informing himof the matters di scussed with Inspector O Donnell.

On the 28th Septenber 2010 Séan Costello solicitor
contacted Superintendent Dwyer and arrangements were put in place to meet Sergeant Hughes on the 4th October 2010. However on the 1st October 2010 Mr. Costello's office contacted Superintendent Dyyer requesting a deferral of the proposed meeting as Mr. Costello had to ${ }_{12: 43}$ attend an urgent family matter over the weekend.

The meeting with Sergeant Hughes now stands deferred to the 20th October 2010."

```
Do you see al1 that?
```

A. I do.
Q. In the light of all this, do you wish to withdraw your criticism of delay and therefore targeting by Garda management?
A. I don't. As we can see from that report there, the subject matter of the report, from start to finish, is a request to have a meeting with me in relation to the statement. The statement was always available from me and it could have been posted into -- I am pretty adept ${ }_{12: 43}$ at making statements -- I could have made a statement and just forwarded it on to them if that was the matter that was holding up the investigation, I could have forwarded a statement in December or January in that regard.
327 Q. Can we move to Superintendent Mark Curran please, sergeant. Superintendent Curran you brought into this matter in the first instance with respect to the meeting of the 23rd April 2007.
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. Am I correct that you did not have with you at this meeting -- you weren't taking notes?
A. No, I was not. a report, isn't that right?
A. Yes. I could see he was taking some notes.
Q. Yes. So, his report is dated the next day, is a note -- a record of the points discussed between yourself and Superintendent Curran, isn't that right?
A. I just haven't got them in front of me on the screen here.

331 Q. Certainly...
A. Sorry.

332 Q. We can call it up. Page 1067. This is a report to the 12:45 Chief Superintendent DMR North, and it carries the date stamp 24th April 2007.
"Matters rai sed by sergeant Li am Hughes, Swords station.

Ref erence to above, I met with Sergeant Hughes, Swords station on the 23rd April 2007."

So the heading there "Matters Rai sed", it's a list of matters raised, isn't that right?
A. It looks like it, yes.

333 Q. It continues:
"Sergeant Hughes rai sed a number of issues whi ch he bel i eved are outstanding and requested that he recei ves communi cation regarding same.

They are as follows..."

And they are numbered 1 to 5.
"1. Si nce the murder of Bai ba Saulite he is still in fear for both himelf and his family. He states that he has not been informed of any assessment of inf ormation regarding his or his family's situations."

My instructions are that was one of the overarching messages you were wishing to impart.
A. That's the overall --

334 Q. This was one of your big messages, isn't that right?
A. The discussion I had with, I think we've gone over it before, the discussion $I$ had with Superintendent Curran primarily was in relation to me reporting to him my belief that there was a systems failure with regard to the investigations of matters prior to the murder of Baiba Saulite, and of my belief that they have to be looked after, they have to be investigated, because it would have negative impact on the investigation of the murder and would be required in the coroner's inquest also.

335 Q. So you're sticking with the idea your purpose of the conversation here was to impart -- this was the big
one, this was the system failure disclosure you were making?
A. Yes, indeed. And we spoke about other matters as we11, but primarily my report to him was in relation to the systems failure. yesterday in relation to walter O'Sullivan, what was conveyed here in relation to those remarks was, why didn't I make a comment on that over until two years later? At the point when I met Mark Curran, Superintendent Curran at Swords, I had already supplied my evidence of chronology to the Mangan investigation. I hadn't heard anything back. And I had expected that all other members of the Garda Síochána who were dealing with Baiba Saulite were subject to investigation in that matter. I had no reason to
believe that Detective Inspector walter o'Sullivan hadn't contributed to that investigation and disclosed those remarks he made to me on the 20th November 2006. And at the point when I met Mark Curran, Superintendent Curran, in April 2007, I still hadn't heard back from the fact-finding inquiry. I wasn't approached again by that inquiry in relation to clarifying any issues, or -- so -- and you will see reference to it there, that I would have said that to Superintendent Curran at
the time.
337 Q. On your case, this was the meeting in which you're disclosing system failures?
A. Yes.
Q. I am suggesting to you, it would have been a sensible and an obvious thing for you to disclose what walter o'Sullivan told you, that was a gross system failure on your case?
A. We11, I have mentioned -- sorry, can I answer? I have mentioned already the reticence and the reluctance I would have in actually making such disclosures at that period in time. If we can recall that the Confidential Charter was actually set up in 2006 by the Minister for Justice at the time and the Tanaiste Michael McDowell and the introduction to that Charter outlines that they were introducing a charter that would protect members of An Garda Síochána from making disclosures there and would protect them in the workplace. And we, at the time I was making the disclosures to Superintendent Curran no such protections were in place. But the Charter document that was produced which led to the confidential recipient process being set up, it is quite clear that the Charter was being introduced to
help people stand up and make confidential disclosures to the authorities without fear of -- without fear.
341 Q. On your case, you've summoned up the courage to disclose the system failures at this meeting?
A. Yes, I did.

So any excuse justifying non-disclosure by you, non-mentioning of it, based upon fear or not summoning up the courage, that's out of the picture. You've summoned up the courage and on your case you're telling Mark Curran all about system failures. It is
incredible that you don't mention the biggest system failure of all?
A. Well, as I said, running parallel to me reporting to Superintendent Cryan fact-find investigation. And as far as I was concerned at that point in time walter o'Sullivan may or would have had disclosed his dealings with Baiba Saulite and any assertions that he wants to make to that investigation.
343 Q. The report, you're aware, that he sent up to superiors after recording the list of matters raised by you, makes no mention of system failures, are we agreed about that?
A. I see that, yes.

344 Q. Nothing about warnings in respect of investigations, nothing about your being isolated, no reference to the Garda Code, isn't that correct?
A. Sorry? There's no reference to that, no. There doesn't appear to be.
345
Q. No, no. You see, both yourself and Superintendent

Curran differ as to what was your recall of this meeting and the only record of what was said, the only note taken at the time is the report we're looking at on the screen?
A. Well, he was writing something on a brown envelope $I$ remember at the time, so I don't know whether those notes are available.
Q. I am suggesting to you, the most accurate and credible account of what was discussed at the meeting is on screen?
A. No. I don't agree.

347 Q. The narrative of the report of the 24th April that is on screen does not contain within any material that could be considered a protected disclosure, does it?
A. I guess not.

348 Q. Didn't you confirm to Superintendent Curran subsequently your agreement with the report that he had sent up?
A. Sorry, can you repeat that?
Q. Didn't you confirm to him subsequently your agreement with the report he had sent up on your behalf recording your different grievances?
A. I think he said he rang me and read out the content of that report, $I$ don't recollect the conversation or the narrative that he used, but if he's -- I don't remember 12:54 disagreeing with the report he was sending up, but I'm not sure if the report, if he mentioned systems failure to me over the telephone.
350 Q. No, no. Did he read it out to you?
A. Well he -- I've a vague recollection of a telephone call with Superintendent Curran --
Q. Okay. But you don't say otherwise, do you?
A. In relation to? I don't say otherwise in relation to?
Q. He read out his report and you agreed with it as a correct record?
A. As I said, I've a vague recollection of the telephone ca11 and I see that the report actually is signed by another officer. So I don't know whether it was Donal Waters rang me in that regard, Inspector waters.
Q. So let's just be clear: Are you saying you didn't confirm that's the list or are you saying something
A. I am saying I don't recollect confirming a list as without lined there with Superintendent Curran over the telephone.
357 Q. You see, I am suggesting to you that if you had a discussion with him or had raised system failures he would have asked you as the basis for your belief: what system? what element of the system? was there a process failure? who was responsible? How did it come
to this opinion? How would this have impacted the murder investigation? He would have asked you basic questions around it, and noted them.
A. I couldn't agree more, that would have been the best way to actually send a report up, was to seek a full report off me in the categories that you just outlined there.
358 Q. He wouldn't have buried this; he would have asked you questions about it, had you raised it?
A. Yes, but he did not.

359 Q. But did that not prompt you to say, we11, you don't seem to be concerned around this, here's more, this is why I say it is significant?
A. Well, he was taking notes and he said he was going to report matters up, so I took it that he was going to report up my assertions of a systems failure.

360 Q. So when you -- when it was read out to you subsequently what the report said, and didn't include system failures mention, presumably you came back on it and you said, hang on, you've left out the big one, the system failures?
A. But you see I don't recollect the telephone call, the conversation I had with Mark Curran that he says he rang me and read this, read these articles over to me.
361 Q. So is this another example of somebody else getting the ${ }_{12: 58}$ conversation wrong and their recollection being flawed and yours being right?
A. I am saying that the conversation $I$ had with him in the office is not fully reflected in this report that he
sent up.

362 Q

A
Q.

Mark Curran's position, Superintendent Curran's position, then superintendent, is that he doesn't believe your words "system failures" were used in your That's when you were dropping into conversations system failures. That's the best of his recollection.
A. Well, I can assure you that from the night of the murder and the following morning I formed the view that 12:59 there had been a systems failure. And that was the best phrase I could use to describe what I saw was a complete failure on behalf of Garda management to correlate and coordinate serious matters before the death of Baiba Saulite.

Because you see, he feels that had you mentioned it, the term is striking, "system failures", he would have inquired into it, as is his practice, and would, for instance, have sought a report from Inspector

O'Sullivan just as he did in 2008 in relation to a separate matter about the statement?
A. Sorry, that's what he is going to say? That's what he is saying?
Had you said it, he would not just have looked into it, he would have sought a report from somebody else?
A. Well, the fact is, he didn't. He didn't look into it. I made this assertion to him in that meeting in April 2006 -- sorry, I get my -- 2007, sorry, and I also alluded to the statement in my report to the confidential recipient and to the disciplinary inquiry, and no clarifications were sought or withdrawals were sought or clarifications from me in relation to those matters were sought then. You see I just want to, just before we finish before lunch, can I ask you this: I think you respect Superintendent Curran?
A. Yes. I respect all members of authority.
Q. No, no, actually Mark Curran. I think you respect him. Because I think you said that previously.
A. Yes. I worked with Mark throughout my career, briefly he was a sergeant of mine in Swords and then he was an inspector when $I$ was a sergeant in the Bridewell and then he was superintendent in Coolock.
369 Q. And not only that, but you know that he went to quite lengths to try and help your situation, get you back to work, find a job for you, get you the Sunday allowance, record what your grievances were, notify them to his managerial colleagues, he was a decent manager and went
out of his way for you and I suspect -- I am suggesting to you that you respected that about him?
A. Yes. If I can qualify that, please. Mark was always courteous to me and me to him as well. Like, I never felt threatened by him in any shape or form. However, there is one important aspect of his duties that I feel with the greatest of respect that he didn't look after. And that was to interview me in relation to my absences from duty and the matters that were affecting me and causing me to be absent. As required by HRM, numerous reports came down to local management requesting specifically those investigative reports and with respect to Mark, Superintendent Curran, those reports were not forthcoming.
CHA RMAN Very good. Thanks very much. We'11 break 13:02 there. Thank you.

THE WTNESS: Thank you.
CHA RMAN And you can continue on afterwards, as you please, on the topic, but we're obviously not going to finish it this second, so we'11 take a break.

MR. OHGGN: Thank you, Judge.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Very good.

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

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Are you settled in, sergeant? Now, Mr. O'Higgins, are you settled in Mr. O'Higgins?




MR. O H GG NS: Thank you, Chairman. So, sergeant, we
moved on to speaking about your relationship -- or your dealings with Superintendent Curran. And I think you told us that you -- I don't want to misparaphrase what you said -- you have respect for Superintendent Curran, and, I've offered to you, considerable respect, would that be fair?
A. Yes, we've mutual respect, yeah, on a personal basis. Yes, all right do you recall a conversation that Superintendent Curran recalls, that September 2011, or thereabouts, he's not absolutely clear on date, you were saying to him, consistently in fairness, that you weren't fit for operational duties due to your belief that the Garda authorities could not be trusted?
A. I don't recollect that.




Q. So just taking those answers to the questions you've given. Firstly, that you have respect on a personal level, mutual respect, with the superintendent; that's point one. Point two, if it's correct, as he recollects, you indicated your distrust of Garda management did not include him. Can I take it,
therefore, and I am trying to limit the list as best we can so that we know what we're disagreed about, can I take it that I can just take Mark Curran off the list -- you're not abandoning your other points, I accept that -- but we can take Mark Curran off the list 14:04 of the list of people who are deliberately doing you down and targeting you?
A. well, if the failure to investigate my absences from work is attributable to Superintendent Curran, well -and on a consistent basis -- I can't really say that we 14:04 can remove him from the list of people that I didn't trust to look after my best interests.
All right. So, you're continuing -- and I'm not -- I just want to get it clear. Your reservation, and the reason you're not in a position, perhaps, to fully clear Mark Curran from your criticism is you feel he played a role in the failure to sort out or investigate the cause of your stress?
A. Yes. And, in addition, $I$ believe that all the senior officers were aware of the circumstances of the systems 14:05 failure, and I was not being listened to in relation to that.

374 Q. All right. So, if the Chairman, and I appreciate it is an if, and it's a matter for the Chairman, but if the Chairman were to conclude that the system -- that your assertion there was failure to investigate the cause of your stress, if that was not the fault of the Gardaí and didn't amount to targeting -- if -- that would mean there's no other accusation being made against Mark

Curran?
A. Em, the failures, as I saw it, there with local management was, as I said, the failure to interview me and send proper investigative files up to HRM, so that proper --
Q. We have that --
A. Yes.
Q. That one, but that's it.
A. And also, that local management were very aware of the matters that were keeping -- that were of major concern 14:06 to me, and that relates to, it relates to the systems failure and the failure to prevent a viable risk to Baiba Saulite prior to her murder.
377 Q. You see, Superintendent Curran, in common with, really, as far as $I$ can see, most, if not a11, of his
colleagues, is a bit bemused and troubled by your allegations. You don't seem to have, in any particular conversation -- and I am asking you this: can you point to a particular conversation where you confronted, where you manned up and confronted the person sitting opposite you, you're targeting me, stop it! Did you have such a conversation?
A. With Superintendent Curran, is it?

378 Q. Anybody.
A. No, I didn't actually have that conversation.

379 Q. Doesn't that speak volumes? You never alerted them or gave them a chance to answer the allegation that they were targeting you?
A. That's incorrect. In the two reports I submitted in

2008, the confidential recipient report and the disciplinary report --
380 Q. No, no, we'11 come to that.
A. -- I'm --

381 Q. I'm talking about a conversation man to man with somebody whom you, years later, include in correspondence to various State agencies that they're targeting you. You never manned up and said it to them in a conversation directly person to person, is that fair?
A. I don't think it is fair, because I had a meeting with Superintendent Curran at Coolock station on the 17th September 2008 --
382 Q. We'll come to that
A. -- and I raised the issues in a report that I submitted 14:08 to him on that occasion. And following that report, I didn't receive any feedback, and then again the two reports in 2008, the confidential recipient process and the disciplinary process clearly sets out my concerns in relation to the matters that were affecting me inside the workplace.
383 Q. With one exception, which I'11 come to, I'm suggesting to you that it wasn't until september 2008, when you made your report to the confidential recipient, it wasn't until then that targeting came into the because you had raised criticisms.
A. Yes. Along with another -- a lot of other descriptions of behaviours that I felt were, in my case were apt in

my case.
But you see, if we marry that up to what we've looked at this morning and a little bit late afternoon yesterday, and the medical situation, where you -- the medics are saying you're reporting daily, brooding -it wasn't the brooding word, it was ruminating, and obsessively thinking through and not being able to deflect from the subject-matter, and being absolutely self-preoccupied, if you marry that with the fact that it doesn't appear it's until September '08 that you make an allegation of targeting -- now there is one exception to that $I$ will come on to that in a minute -CHA RMAK Sorry, Mr. O'Higgins, it is not really fair -- may $I$ suggest respectively, it is not really fair to say you didn't do this until September 2008 with one exception I'11 come on to in a minute. You better come on to the exception and then you can say except for that one you didn't do it.
MR. OHGG NS: Fair enough.
CHA RMAN It seems more fair as a way of asking the question, do you understand?

MR. O H GG NS: Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN If there is a reason you are doing it -- I am loathe to interfere with somebody cross-examining, so I don't want to be jumping in, but it does strike me 14:11 as -- certainly it is a little confusing.
MR. OHGG NS: I'11 leave that, Chairman, and do it now.

Chief Superintendent Feehan has noted that he had a
conversation with you on the 8th November 2007?
A. That's correct.
Q. And he says that:
"In this tel ephone conversation --"
well sorry I will just give the backdrop to it. The investigation team in the disciplinary investigation were anxious to interview you in order to progress the investigation, all right?
A. Yes, that's correct.

387 Q. And on the 1st November, you were requested by Chief Superintendent Feehan to attend at Store Street Station for the purpose of being interviewed, and we were over this earlier. But on the 8th November, there was a fax 14:11 received at Store Street from your solicitor and it stated that you were currently unfit due to work related stress and you would not be attending the meeting tomorrow; do you remember that?
A. I do.

388 Q. On the same day, 8th November, you had a telephone conversation with Sergeant -- with Superintendent Feehan?
A. Chief Superintendent Feehan.
Q. Excuse me, Chief Superintendent Feehan. During which you stated you had met with your solicitor who advised you not to attend the proposed meeting. And you went on to state that you were feeling awful but that you would come in to meet him any way as you knew your
responsibilities under the Garda Síochána Act.
A. That's what he says, yes.

390 Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I rang Chief Superintendent Feehan because I was conscious of my obligations under the An Garda Síochána 14:12 Act that I can't decline to meet, without good reason, an officer investigating any matter, and I rang Chief Superintendent Feehan to say I it's not that I'm declining to go in or refusing to go in, it was just I was having fierce difficulties with the disciplinary investigation as $I$ felt it was targeting me.

391 Q. We11 you see, that's where there is a breakdown between your two accounts, there's a dispute?
A. Yes, indeed.

392 Q. And you're aware of that, isn't that right?
A. We11 I am aware of what Chief Superintendent Feehan has reported to the Tribunal, yes.
Q. Yes. You say, don't you, that -- you claim you said you wanted to know why you were being targeted when it was obvious there were failures in respect of other investigations?
A. Correct.
Q. That's your assertion?
A. Sorry, that's my view?

395 Q. That's your assertion as to what you said.
A. Yes.

396 Q. You claim he said in response that he'd contact the CMO to get his advice on interviewing you when you were off sick.
A. I think that's correct, yes.

397 Q. Do you see the disconnect between those two questions and answers?
A. Eh --
Q. Yes.
A. The conversation. Well that's where we're relying on the Chief Superintendent, his recollection of matters, and I've just provided my recollection, with due respect.
403 Q. You see, my instructions are that during this telephone conversation there was no mention made of being targeted or of any alleged failures in respect of other investigations?
A. Well that is incorrect, because my reason for ringing him was to explain to him that $I$ was available to him if required under the Garda Síochána Act, and then we went -- I then went to proceed to tell him that I thought the disciplinary investigation was targeting me, and that's what happened.

404 Q. You see, he points to the fact that in the papers which he received from the liaison officer at Garda Headquarters preparing for this Tribunal, there's a copy of a handwritten note which he made contemporaneously with the telephone conversation he had with you.
A. Yes.

405 Q. And he says that in the event that you had made any conference to being targeted or had referred to
failures in respect of other investigations, he would include mention of it -- he would have included mention of it in the handwritten note?
A. Yes, indeed.

406 Q. That would have been a logical thing to do?
A. Sorry, that would have been logical for?

407 Q. It would have been logical of him to do that. If you had said what you claim you said, he would have included mention of it in the note?
A. Yes. Em, I presume that -- from his recollection of matters, that's what he's reported to the Tribunal. CHA RMAN No, we know that, sergeant.
A. Yes.

408 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, he's asking you what -- if he -- if
you said -- just what Mr. o'Higgins is saying is: if you said I am being targeted, it doesn't make sense for him to say: look, I am going to contact the CMO to see if you're all right to be interviewed.
A. Yes.

409 Q. CHA RMAN He'd say something else. He'd say why are you being targeted? Or whatever it is. Do you understand?
A. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

410 Q. CHAN RMAN Now you're sure you said 'I'm being targeted'?
A. Yes.

411 Q. CHA RMAN But do you understand Mr. O'Higgins' question?
A. I do. I do. That there wouldn't be a flow of conversation that the next thing he would say --

412 Q. CHA RMAN It doesn't seem to make sense.
A. Yes.

413 Q. CHA RMAN Maybe it does, maybe it doesn't, but it doesn't appear to.
A. I can't explain that, Mr. Chairman.

414 Q. CHA RMAN Okay.
A. I can't explain it.

MR. OHGGN: Can we look at the note, which is not the clearest of handwriting --
CHAL RMAN I'm not deciding anything, do you understand?
A. Yes.

416 Q. CHN RMAN But I am following the debate --
A. Yes.

417 Q. CHA RMAN -- as between counsel and you. okay, now you want to look at the note, Mr. O'Higgins, okay.
418 Q. MR. OHGG NS: Page 840, please. And just, I have here the advantage of a typed up version of it, so I might read it into the record so it will assist you, sergeant, in answering the question $I$ am going to ask on foot of it.

What the note appears to say in the hieroglyphics that are there.
"8/ 11/07 Cal led Sergeant Hughes back following a cal fromhim He said he had met his solicitor, Séan Costello, who had advi sed him not to attend a meeting with himtomorrow. Sai d he was feel ing awf ul, but woul d come to meet me anyway. Says he knows hi s obl i gati ons under the Garda Act. I told himl would seek advi ce fromthe Chi ef Medical Officer and would revert to himearly course."

And that's the note.
A. That's --

419 Q. This conversation, 8th November 2007.
A. That's a note of his conversation?

420 Q. Yes. Would you agree with me, just viewing the thing objectively now, that's a note taken at the time. The fact it doesn't include what you say you claim you said to the chief superintendent is a pointer perhaps
towards the possibility that you didn't say it -- just the possibility?
A. Well my recollection is I did say it, and I discussed it with him.
421 Q. All right. Presumably if that was your disposition at the time, and mindful that you have a solicitor on record, it's clear from this note, and the context, you're going to Séan Costello's office, did you get them to write a letter relaying these targeting allegations at this point?
A. I don't think so, no.

422 Q. CHA RMAN Could you just help me, sergeant? Could you tell me what your recollection of the conversation is?
A. I remember the conversation. I contacted chief superintendent feehan because I was worried that the facts would be seen as a refusal to meet.

423 Q. CHA RMAN Indeed, and you were conscious --
A. And I wanted to clarify that with him, and I was feeling pretty low on that occasion, Mr. Chairman, and I --

424 Q. CHA RMAN First things first. Did he ring you back?
A. No, I contacted him.

425 Q. CHAI RMAN He says you contacted him and he rang you back. Am I understanding that?
MR. MCHEÁL OHGGN: Yes.
A. Well --

426 Q. CHA RMAN Is that your recollection?
A. My recollection is I rang his office and I was put through to him.

A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN okay. So you don't remember -- not that it is important whether he rang you back or whatever --
A. Yes.
A. I introduced myself to him and I just told him that I had difficulty in attending. It is not that I was refusing to attend, it was just that I was feeling, you know, awful about the situation and that I was feeling very low, and I felt that the disciplinary investigation was targeting me.
Q. CHAN RMAN Hold on a second. Your recollection?
A. That's my recollection, yes.
Q. CHA RMAN So you phoned and you said it's not that you were refusing to attend --
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN -- it's that you were, in effect, unable to attend, you were feeling absolutely rotten?
A. Absolutely.
Q. CHAN RMAN Is that right?
A. Yes, I was feeling very low that day.

CHA RMAN Okay. Now, proceed. You said at that stage... Te11 me more. I don't want to tell you what I 14:21 think you said.
A. I told him I was on sick leave, extended sick leave, you know, due to the work related stress, and at that point then I think he introduced the topic then of
contacting the CMO to see if I would be fit for interview.
Q. CHAL RMAN Yes. And you said I'm on extended sick leave due to the work related stress?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN And where did, where did targeting come into the conversation?
A. Well I told him that I had fierce problems with the disciplinary inquiry because $I$ felt my work was being targeted through the disciplinary process.
437 Q. CHA RMAN Just as best you can, just tell us the conversation that took place.
A. Well I felt --

438 Q. CHA RMAN You ring him, you tell him, look, it's not that $I$ am resisting or refusing to attend --
A. Yes.

439 Q. CHA RMAN -- but I am just feeling awful?
A. I am feeling awful. And I felt --
Q. CHA RMAN So that explains --
A. Yes.

441 Q. CHA RMAN -- why you are putting off the meeting, okay?
A. Yes. And I was conscious he was ringing me in relation to attending a meeting in relation to the disciplinary process, so I said to him that I felt that the disciplinary process was targeting my work and, you know, that $I$ felt terrible about that, you know. And forgive me if I cannot recollect the actual --

442 Q. CHA RMAN No, no, I understand -- sorry, this is the
best you can do.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Okay. And how did he respond when you said about the targeting and the disciplinary, how did he respond to that?
A. I can't recollect if he made a response to it, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Okay. Thank you. Now, sorry if you want to 14:24 ask anything out of that, Mr. O'Higgins, please feel free. I just wanted to clear up Sergeant Hughes's recollection of the conversation that we're going to hear from Chief Superintendent Feehan about.

449 Q. MR. O H GG NS: So, just the last question there from the Chairman, you made the assertion of targeting and you gave him -- as you say, you also asserted why you were being targeted, and is it your evidence --
CHA RMAN I am sorry to be picky, but I thought Sergeant -- I am sorry to be picky, I thought he said, "I said I thought the disciplinary process was targeting my work." That's what $I$ thought you said, am I right or wrong about that?
A. Yes, that's correct, Mr. Chairman, yes, targeting my work.

CHA RMAN That is being picky but, I am sorry, we might as well try to be accurate.
MR. ḾCHEÁL O H GG NS: Thank you.
450 Q. We11 it was targeting your work?
A. Yes. Because I was very conscious at the time that several other serious matters relating to Baiba Saulite remained unresolved and there was no focus in on what I saw to be clear failures with those investigations.
451 Q. No, but when you brought up targeting, you know, it's quite a stand-out --
A. Yes.

452 Q. -- moment. You're making an allegation of targeting to a chief superintendent.
A. Yes.

453 Q. Just tell us precisely what he said just on foot of you saying that. He must have responded obviously?
A. Well I would -- I don't recollect the actual chronology of the conversation, you know.
Q. No, but the gist of it. What was his -- how did he receive that information?
A. Well I felt I was being targeted and just that $I$ am on extended sick leave at the moment and, you know, I had --
Q. No, no, what did he say?
A. Yeah, that's what I'm saying. In response to that he said he'd get in touch with the CMO and he'd be back in touch with me. He said he was going to get in touch with the CMO to see if I was fit to be interviewed and he'd back in touch with me, as he said, in early course.

456 Q. Right. So when you heard him say that, did that not prompt a thought in your head: this fella is not 1istening to me --
A. No.

457 Q. -- his answer hasn't flown from what I've just said?
A. No. I wasn't -- the conversation wasn't an official complaint about targeting. I just said it to him by way of saying how I felt, feeling very low, I feel I am being targeted, my work is being targeted, and that I am on extended sick leave at present. That was the substance of my conversation, my side of the conversation with him.
458 Q. So it wasn't an official complaint of targeting?
A. No. It was just bringing to his attention how I felt in relation to the disciplinary inquiry.

459 Q. Just that this seems to have a chime with a later conversation, or with a different conversation, sorry,
with Superintendent Curran, where he too has failed to pick up on things you claim you said.
A. Yes. And most of these matters I raised, as I said, in the confidential recipient investigation file and I was never asked to clarify back then these matters in relation to conversations, et cetera. So, that's just a point I just wish to make. It's difficult this far ahead to actually recollect the train of the conversation, the actual verbiage used in the interactions.
460 Q. You see, on your case, sergeant, you've summoned up the courage in this conversation with the chief superintendent in November, you've also summoned up the courage to say you what you claim you said to Mark Curran in April '07, but it isn't until September 2008 that you make your full-blown allegation of targeting and harassment on foot of your raising criticisms. Do you see that doesn't seem to make any sense?
A. It does make perfect sense. As I said this morning, a charter was introduced by the Tanaiste and minister for Justice in 2007 to protect people stepping forward making allegations of internal abuse within the organisation, and it's well set out there in the charter there that it was introduced to protect people and to make them feel safe and confident in moving
forward. The confidential recipient report, and obviously the disciplinary report, were submitted following my engagement with that process and I felt at liberty then to make actually make full disclosures in
relation to the matters that I was concerned of. 461 Q. Can we go back to the meeting which you have been discussing with Superintendent Curran on the 3rd April 2007. If we look, once again, at the note he sent up following that meeting, the following day, the 24th April 2007 -- that's at page 1067. We might do this quickly because this document has been on screen previous7y.

We've dealt with point 1. Point 2 , the second issue which you, according to the superintendent, relayed was:
"The i nvesti gation into certain matters - some of whi ch rel ate to the first point above - by Chi ef Superintendent Feehan and Superintendent Mangan. No communi cation of stat on out come of investigation."

So he was, it's fair to say, he was recording your unhappiness about that and he was sending that forward to management, isn't that right?
A. I think so, yes.

462 Q. Number 3:
"I nvesti gation into The Sun newspaper article 2006 conducted by D/I nspector Dennedy."

не records here:
"No communi cation of stat us on cone of i nvesti gation." Isn't that right?
A. I wasn't contacted on the outcome of that investigation, yes.
463 Q. He's recording your unhappiness?
A. That's correct, yes.

464 Q. "4. He believes he may be the subject of discipline regarding allegations of Garda [blank] reported approxi mately two years ago."

This is the historical row you were having from times gone by, isn't that right?
A. Well row, not -- I reported certain matters to the authorities in relation to what I perceived to be misbehaviour on behalf of certain members.
465 Q. All right. And as far as you were concerned, it hadn't been fully resolved to your satisfaction so you were including it in your list of concerns to the superintendent.
A. Well that's in his report there, yes.
"5. He bel i eves that di sci pline proceedi ngs may be contempl ated agai nst himbut he is not aware of what they might be. He has suffered consi derably from stress since the murder of Bai ba Saulite. He is currently empl oyed as sergeant in charge cormunity police in Swords and believes he is fully able to performthese tasks. He is under a the care of medi cal professional who certified his ability to perform
tasks."

Again, that is a faithful recital of your complaint in relation to that, isn't that it?
A. That's correct.

467 Q. And then at the top of the next page, the following sentence appears:
"I read over this list of issues with Sergeant Hughes."

That's a true statement, isn't it?
A. That's what he's saying in his report. As I said, I don't have a recollection of him ringing me and reading out the contents of -- those contents to me.
468 Q. And he concludes:
"He requests some communi cation regarding each matter rai sed. "

This document is a pro Liam Hughes document, isn't that right?
A. Except for it doesn't contain the allegation I made in relation to a systems failure to him on that occasion.
469 Q. Yes. Can I ask you then to deal with a later meeting about which there may or may not be dispute.
We11, just before we do that, can I ask you: You returned to work as staff sergeant in Coolock in December 2009, isn't that right?
A. Yes. December 2009. Yes.

470 Q. Right. And you've no complaint in relation to the superintendent regarding that?
A. No, except for the fact that he hadn't still completed the investigation files as to my previous sickness absences.

I see. We've been over already that in June of 2010, there was efforts made, at your request, for you to be provided with the additional weekend allowance?
A. Yes, indeed.

472 Q. You were happy about that, were you?
A. Em, I think he resolved that issue for me, yes, with the chief superintendent.
Q. Would you accept that Superintendent Curran, in conversations with you, endeavoured to explain that it was his view that the parameters of your work, of what you were able for, was really to be determined by your capability and was a medical question. And he also made it clear you were not obliged to perform duties outside your own personal limits.
A. Yes. In relation to it's a medical issue, I don't agree with that. The matters that were affecting me were of a non-medical nature and leading to the medical situation. He did not do investigations into the reasons for my absences from the workplace. If he had, the reports would have been with the ACHRM and the CMO to allow them make full decisions in relation to my situation going forward.
474 Q. Right. We will deal in the conclusion with the injury at work issues, so don't worry about that, I am not
going to -- you know, you'11 be entitled to cover that.

In relation to the stress side of things and retraining opportunities so that you can get back to work and fully reintegrate, am I correct that you were afforded the opportunity to avail of CPD and in-service training, and you met with Sergeant Mebitarian?
A. I have a recollection that $I$ was facilitated with a word processing course in late 2010.
475 Q. We might have a look at page 1186, please. who is
A. I think he was based at Santry there in the in-service training at the time. He's an inspector now in the organisation, if I am correct.
476 Q. It's an e-mail of the 9th September 2011, from Mr. Mekitarian to Superintendent Curran -Superintendent Coolock:
"Forwar ded copy of e-mail I sent regar ding the I ast I WS courses."

Is it?
"I had spoken to Li am and offered either of these courses to him I al so offered hima Mcrosoft Wbrd course in order for himto improve his skills in this area. He started the Wbrd course on the 29 Novenber ' 10 and compl et four of the five days. This course had to be terminated early due to the extreme weat her
conditions at the time. l was al so going to do a few Sundays with hi min order to show hi mthe Garda portal and any new legislation that may have come into force during the time he had been off work."

Then it says:
"Li am Hughes had no interest in attending the II VS or any other course apart fromthe $M$ crosoft Wbrd course.

Sergeant Greg Mekitarian."
A. Can you remind me what IWS is? I don't know. what is IIWS, does anybody know?
477 Q. What do you say to the statement that had you no interest in attending, whatever the IIWS course is, or any other course apart from Microsoft word?
A. That's not true. I actually jumped at the opportunity to do the Microsoft word course, and if any course was presented to me, I would have taken it. I don't know why he said I had no interest. It could have been a casual conversation with the gentleman to say what about this? and to give me a choice. But to say no interest, $I$ don't know what that course is. CHA RMAN I am guessing that the ws is welfare service, but I'm baffled as to the II. I am only guessing, and my irresistible urge would be to Google it but I don't have my phone, for good reasons.

MR. O H GG NS: Sorry, Chairman, would you mind bearing with me for one moment? It is one of many gaps in my
own know7edge.
CHA RMAN If somebody has a phone, they can Google it. But, as I say, I am just guessing that it is welfare service, something-something welfare service, but maybe I'm wrong.

MR. OHGGN: My understanding, from my instructions, Chairman, is that it's stands for Investigative Interviewing of witnesses and Suspects.
CHA RMAN Ah! There you are. There you are. Totally wrong. Yes. So now you know. So now you know. Now, there's something to add to your knowledge, sergeant.

478 Q. MR. OHGGN: Whatever it was, you weren't partial to it, were you, sergeant?
CHA RMAN It's investigating of witnesses -- a course in interviewing witnesses in the course of an investigation.
A. Yes. I think back --

479 Q. CHA RMAN which, it is understandable he might say you might be interested in this court?
A. And I could have said not really, I'd prefer the word processing course.
480 Q. CHA RMAN I understand, yeah.
A. I just think "no interest" I don't think he should have put down, it just doesn't --
481 Q. CHAI RMAN I don't think he is being critical. 14:39
A. Yes, yes.

482 Q. CHA RMAN No, I don't want, you know, I've no interest in going to the pictures, you know that kind of thing --
A. Yeah.

483 Q. CHA RMAN I am not interested in that film.
A. Yeah.

CHAI RMAN Okay. Anyway. That was the interviewing of witnesses. Thank you, Mr. O'Higgins.

MR. O H GG NS: Your role, sergeant, we discussed yesterday, and my understanding of matters is that it's involved with the maintenance of the district station and equipment and other administrative tasks within the station itself and liaising with colleagues?
A. Yes. There was a guard already present in the office looking after most of that anyway. So I just wonder... I mean if you forgive me for commenting, you appear to be running it down in your portrayal of it to the medics?
A. Yeah, I accept I may have been a bit critical of it at the time but $I$ felt that, you know, it wasn't -- it wasn't what I was trained to do, even though I couldn't return to the full workplace occupation.
487 Q. We11 is that another example of damned if they do,
A. No, not really.

488 Q. You didn't want to return.
A. My demeanour at that stage in 20 -- this is 2011, is
it? Yes. That I just was so -- getting so worn out by the procedures that had proceeded in the previous three years, and this is just a reflection, possibly, on my outlook of the organisation.
Didn't you tell Mr. Justice Cross in the High Court proceedings of your colleague, that your role was lighter work and it was far better than frontline policing?
A. Oh at the time, yes, it was far better, yes, than frontline policing, yes.
Do you accept that Superintendent Curran had no knowledge of you being a person who had made, or was claiming to have made, a protected disclosure with the confidential recipient until May 2012?
A. That may be the case because it is a confidential reporting process.

491 Q. Can I ask you then to, if we could go on and deal with a meeting you've mentioned already, the welfare meeting of -- well I am terming it that -- there was a meeting on the 17th December 2008, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. This was held at the superintendent's request for the purposes of your ongoing welfare, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

493 Q. Inspector Hanrahan and Sergeant Gorm1ey of Coolock District were also present, were they?
A. That's correct, yes. And sergeant Dave McCormack I think from Malahide Station.

494 Q. Superintendent Curran does not have a specific
recollection of this meeting but he expects that, as with the other occasions on which he had dealings with you, he encouraged you to return to the workplace where you would receive his full support. Is that a fair
statement?
A. That's a fair statement, yes.

495 Q. And the various topics that were raised during the meeting were raised by you and not by the superintendent?
A. Yes. I handed him a pre-prepared report for the meeting.

496 Q. And I think that upon entering the meeting for the first time, you provided him with a copy of the report that you had with you?
A. For that meeting, yes.

497 Q. So you didn't flag to him in advance: Listen Mark, I am going to be sending you a report; here it is. or even flag to him that you were going to be coming with a pre-prepared report?
A. Superintendent Curran made it clear that the meeting was in relation to welfare issues, so I prepared a report to cover that aspect of my situation.
498 Q. But did you press Superintendent Curran on the issues you wanted to discuss? were you pressing issues with him?
A. Yes, I drew up notes of that meeting there, I think they're in the papers, in relation to what was discussed, from my perspective what was discussed and what was decided at that meeting, and I think it sets
out very well my interactions at that meeting with Superintendent Curran.

499

500
Q.
-- you indicate and you assert that you pressed Superintendent Curran, you continually pressed him about particular matters that were on your mind?
A. Yes. I wonder can we see that on the screen? Sorry just --
501 Q. Yes. I don't have the page reference.
A. Yes.

502 Q. We might come to that in a moment, it will come to me.
A. Yes.

503 Q. Assuming that that's correct -- and I am going from jotter notes, do you accept that those -- if that occurred, that would tend to indicate you weren't treating the meeting as a welfare meeting, but rather as a meeting where you wanted to confront the superintendent about certain issues in your mind?
A. I was never confrontational with any member of authority, and it shouldn't be suggested that way. I handed him the report. He read through it and we discussed the contents of the report, and based on that then, I submitted my notes to Mr. Costello.

504 Q. Just as an obvious matter, I mean isn't it correct that the incidents which you referred to during this 2008 meeting are alleged to have occurred prior to the superintendent becoming superintendent, isn't that
right?
A. Sorry, if we can see the document there, please?

505 Q. Yes. Page 506, thank you. Ms. Horan has located it for me. So this is your note to your own solicitor of the 18th December 2008 -- your letter:

## "Dear Séan,

Pl ease refer to the encl osed report which I furni shed to Superintendent Curran on the 17th Decenber. I wish to provi de you with the responses gi ven by Superintendent Curran to various matters arising.

My refusal to attend meetings:
Superintendent Curran stated that he was sure that । had informed himthat I insisted that all communi cation 14:48 with himshould be by tel ephone although he did not produce any notes or documents to support his belief."

So the superintendent indicated his understanding that you had asked that communication be by telephone?
A. That's what he says, yes, at the meeting.

506 Q. Then: "My reports of serious concerns:
On several occasions throughout the meeting
Superintendent Curran emphasised that an investigation
is now under way by the Garda whi stlebl ower into aspects 19:48
of the conduct of various investigations surrounding the death of Bai ba Saulite and that investigation should deal with the serious concerns I have been raising in the past.

I pressed hi mon why my concerns were not addressed by Garda management prior to the intervention of the Garda whi stlebl ower but I could not elicit an adequate response from hi mother than he had reported my concerns to authorities. The matters referred to now were the subject of enqui ry by the whi stlebl ower."

I continually pressed him--"

That's what $I$ was getting at.
"I continually pressed himas to why Garda authorities
failed to i nvesti gate reports of serious concerns expressed by a member of sergeant rank."

Just, it seems to have the ring of you're logging this now in a document to your solicitor --
A. Yes...

507 Q. -- in a meeting that was intended to have been about your welfare?
A. Yes.

508 Q. CHA RMAK Sorry, who said it was a welfare meeting?
A. Superintendent Curran, in advance.

CHA RMAN Thank you.
509 Q. MR. OHGGNS: That's what it was intended to have been; that's what he understood it was going to be, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. But these matters I was raising
directly affected my welfare.
510 Q. So you blind-sided him?
A. Excuse me?

511 Q. You blind-sided him.
A. oh, not at all.

512 Q. "I continually pressed him..."
A. Pressed, asked, yeah, continually asked him why the matters $I$ was raising in the previous -- at previous -on previous occasions were not being addressed by local management, and Superintendent Curran continued to defer to the confidential recipient process that was underway at the moment and that would actually determine the matter.

513 Q. So you are just locating it in the timeline, September 2008, you have pressed the button on the CRO?
A. That's correct.

514 Q. So you're piling in here now with your, I suggest, retrospective thesis?
A. I wouldn't say piling in. I attended a meeting with Superintendent Curran and just produced the
pre-prepared report which pertained to my welfare, and that was the purpose of the meeting, with respect.
515 Q. Just dealing with one or two matters arising out of this, sergeant.
A. Okay, no problem.

516 Q. The superintendent has indicated in his statement that:

[^0]bel ieved all communi cation with himshould be by tel ephone. I reject this statement as being incorrect. In itself his appearance in my office on my request was contrary to this notion."

Do you see the point being made?
A. Sorry, I don't understand it. If we could have it up on the screen maybe?
He has just organised that you attend his office for a face-to-face meeting. That's inconsistent with the suggestion that it was his position all communications should be by telephone.
A. We11, it was the -- HRM had that on record from local management in the months prior, and I had raised it with Inspector Hanrahan prior to this meeting, this welfare meeting, and I raised it again there with him in relation to that assertion, and my purpose in raising it then was to have the record corrected that in no way would I ever insist that local management contact me only by telephone and refuse face-to-face meetings.

518 Q. The superintendent says that he never received a complaint from you in respect of the bullying and harassment policy in place at the time.
A. He says that?

519 Q. Yes.
A. The matters that $I$ refer to there in relation to -- the bullying and harassment, the historic stuff, possibly no, but the more recent stuff, more recent allegations
in relation to the imposition of the disciplinary process, et cetera, were well documented in the reports I sent to the whistleblower's office and to the disciplinary investigation.
520 Q. His understanding was that the references to bullying were in connection with the garda -- and I am not going to name the person -- but a complaint relating to somebody formerly of coolock district and that person had departed before Superintendent Curran's arrival into the division?
A. Sorry, I didn't get the gist of that there.

521 Q. That the bullying related to somebody and of a time that was prior to his arrival altogether in Coolock?
A. Yes, that's the historic matters, yes.

522 Q. Right. It was his understanding that those allegations ${ }_{14: 53}$ had been withdrawn in that particular case and the matter discontinued.
A. Yes. But that wasn't my position.

523 Q. And that no disciplinary proceedings ever commenced.
A. That wasn't my position. Again that's historic.

524 Q. And I do appreciate we're not --
A. Yes.

525 Q. -- dealing with them here. And it was his belief that the matter had been treated from a management perspective in accordance with the prevailing processes ${ }^{14: 54}$ at the time. That was his understanding. But I want to ask you this: He says that you never named any individuals to him that he wanted to complain about, is that so?
A. At that meeting?
A. That's -- that is so, yes.

527 Q. Even though you've already committed to paper a few months back your whistleblower allegations in September 14:54 '08?
A. Yes. That's correct, yes. And I -- I was hopeful that the metres would be resolved through that process.
Q. The reference, and we see it there on the note on screen, to the salary reduction, his belief is that this is ultimately a HRM issue but obviously primarily flowing from the classification of injury at work issue?
A. I disagree. The only way, as far as I am concerned, that a decision can be rightly made in relation to my absences from the workplace was through the medical reports, and also reports as to the non-medical issues which fell within the remit of Superintendent Curran to actually forward investigative reports to HRM in that regard.
529 Q. Can you not see that the decision relating to a reduction in salary which, under the Code, appears to be somewhat automatic after a number of days, is not something he was involved with?
A. I disagree with that.
Q. A11 right. The discipline process that you complained of here, would you accept that was a matter completely outside of his direction and control?
A. I don't accept that.

531 Q. And in terms of items 1 and 4, which we've looked at, the work related stress issue, his position on that is that it is an issue primarily for determination by a medical professional, and you disagree with that?
A. That work related stress issue?
A. Yes, I disagree on that.
Q. In relation to the work situation, he's quite clear that he strongly encouraged you to return to work, is that a fair statement?
A. Oh yes, he did.

534 Q. Do you see there under the heading of "Unsafe Wbrkpl ace", the last sentence within that paragraph, the penultimate sentence:
"He invited me to ret urn to work even on a phased basis and would even arrange for a clerical position for me if I preferred not to take up operational duties. He sounded very sincere in his offer."
A. They were my notes to Séan Costello, yes. the meeting was that the purpose of the meeting, as far as he was concerned, was to make a genuine enquiry of a colleague who the superintendent had worked with intermittently throughout his career, as you approached 14:58 the Christmas 2008 period?
A. Yes, I read that. Yes.
Q. And it's fair, isn't it?
A. That's what he said, yes, in his report. But I think
he'd be better served by actually forwarding the investigative files to HRM as required.
537 Q. CHA RMAN Just which investigative files are you talking about, sergeant?
A. At that point I think, Mr. Chairman, there were several requests from HRM for the investigative files into my sick --

538 Q. CHAL RMAN

And which files were you talking about?
A. Sorry?

539 Q.
CHA RMAN You said by forwarding the investigative files.
A. Yes.

540 Q. CHAI RMAN And I am just wondering which investigative files?
A. Well the investigation files into my absences from the workplace were required by HRM, but they weren't forthcoming from him.
541 Q. CHA RMAN And where were they?
A. They weren't carried out, Mr. Chairman.

542 Q. CHA RMAN So there weren't any investigative files? 14:59
A. Precisely, Mr. Chairman.

543 Q. CHAI RMAN Okay. So we're back to the same thing: he should have investigated the reason for your absence?
A. Precisely, Mr. Chairman.

544 Q. CHA RMAN And the reason for your absence, i.e. the 14:59 non-medical reasons for your absence --
A. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

545 Q. CHA RMAN -- i.e. the systems failure?
A. And the imposition of the disciplinary process which I
regarded as a targeting of me in the workplace and mostly unfair and --
546 Q. CHA RMAN okay. So just to be clear, he should have -- the reason for your absence was, number one, the systems failure non-investigation and; number two, the unfair disciplinary process?
A. Yes, I had huge concerns in relation to the -CHA RMAN okay --
A. -- as we said, the systems failure, we'll call it the systems failure, and the fact that then I felt that I was being targeted in the workplace through the disciplinary process.

CHA RMAN Just to keep it simple, sergeant, because I want to be sure $I$ understand this and $I$ don't need to -- I am sorry, I am being impatient, I am sorry, and 15:00 intolerant, I am sorry.
where he fell down, on your criticism, was that he should have forwarded investigation files in relation to the reasons for your absences?
A. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

549 Q. CHA RMAN And that means that he should have had investigation files into the reasons for your absences?
A. Correct.

CHA RMAN If we take it just a step at a time. And those files should have related to (a) the systems failure that you had spoken about in the period before the murder of Baiba Saulite on the 19th November 2006, that's the first thing it should have included, is that right?
A. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

551 Q. CHA RMAN Correct me if that is wrong.
A. Yes. The systems failure in relation to Baiba Saulite prior to the murder, and also, what $I$ perceived to be a systems failure after her murder in relation to the non-investigation of the --

CHA RMAN I am going to get to this in a second.
A. Yes.

553 Q. CHA RMAN The first systems failure that you had in mind and that you say was a cause of your absence was the systems failure of policing, a failure of policing protection prior to the murder?
A. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

554 Q. CHA RMAN okay. The second thing you say is, and I have in relation to the, what you say was the unfair disciplinary process, that was another feature that was keeping you out of work?
A. Yes, on the -- piggy-backed on the fact-find process which I found unfair to --
CHA RMAN Well we won't worry about anything else, we'11 keep it simple. You say the disciplinary process was unfair, and you say that Superintendent Curran fell down by not having a file detailing your unhappiness with that process?
A. Yes.

556 Q. CHA RMAN And the third thing you say he should have had a file about, which was another cause of your absence, was system failure in the investigation or in the period after the murder insofar as it failed to
deal with the system failure prior to the murder?
A. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

557 Q. CHA RMAN Is that about it?
A. And, no, there's also the pay issues; in other words my pay was being reduced and it was well reduced by the time I met Superintendent Curran.

558 Q. CHA RMAN But the reason -- sorry to interrupt you -the context we're talking about is injury on duty.
A. Yes.

559 Q. CHA RMAN And the relevance of the pay to injury on duty is the reason for your absence.
A. Yes.

560 Q. CHA RMAN And you're complaining specifically now, not about the reduction of your pay, we know that that's a consequence --
A. Yes.

561 Q. CHAI RMAN -- of time --
A. Yes indeed.

562 Q. CHA RMN -- but what could stop it and prevent it was a definition, a declaration of injury on duty, this much we know?
A. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

563 Q. CHA RMAN And you say you're criticising Superintendent Curran for failing to make investigations into three items that represent the
A. Yes, indeed.

564 Q. CHA RMAN Is that correct?
A. And ancillary to that then would be my feelings of
isolation, workplace isolation, and bullying and harassment, et cetera.
565 Q. CHA RMAN which also, you say, were part of the reasons for your absence?
A. Yes.

566 Q. CHA RMAN So the fourth one then is feelings of isolation, et cetera, if I can put it that way?
A. Singling out, targeting.
Q. CHA RMAN okay. And what wouldn't be sufficient, if I am understanding where you are coming from, what wouldn't be sufficient was for Superintendent Curran to say: Look, I have medical reports from Dr. Reilly and from his partner and from Dr. Fernandez and so on, and they explain why he's out of work. That wouldn't be sufficient in your view?
A. It wouldn't be, Mr. Chairman, because I don't think Superintendent Curran would have access to those reports anyhow.
568 Q. CHA RMAN I see. I see. Very good. Thank you very much.
A. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

569 Q. MR. OHGGN: Could you get them for him?
A. The medical reports?

570 Q. Yes.
A. If he requested them, I'd look into it, okay.

571 Q. Did it occur to you that's something you might do?
A. No, not at the time.

572 Q. Can we just widen the lens a little bit and look at perspectives from two inspectors that covered this
period? And I am going back a bit in time now, but just to give it that perspective. We mentioned already D/Inspector Hanrahan who arrived in Coolock in November of 2007?
A. Yes.

573 Q. And I think left in May 2009?
A. Yes.

574 Q. He was requested by Chief Superintendent Gerry Phil1ips to meet with you and to provide support to you?
A. Em, sorry can -- do we have that instruction on screen? statement:
"Det ecti ve I nspect or Willi am Hanr ahan, Speci al Det ective Unit Harcourt Square.

In Novenber ' 07 stationed in Cool ock I was inspector, arrived at Cool ock on around 28th Novenber 2007. My first awareness of Sergeant Li am Hughes was on the 14th Decenber. I became aware of a Hi gh Court application made by the legal representatives of Sergeant Hughes. The Hi gh Court appl ication was secured at the superintendent's of fice in Cool ock. "

What was that about?
A. I think it was to tackle the pay issue, the reduction in pay.

576 Q. A11 right.
"I was requested by Chi ef Superintendent Gerry Phillips at this time to meet with Sergeant Hughes. I was requested to address any of the issues he had and to try and make pathway for his ret urn to work. I examined the Hi gh Court affidavit, fromthe documents vi ewed I i medi at el y carried out an eval uation concerning the possible threat to the life of Sergeant Hughes and Garda Nyhan. On the 26th December 2007 on my own initiative having concerns for the personal saf ety for Sergeant Hughes and Garda Nyhan I went to Swords Garda Stati on where I was gi ven access to the i nvesti gation file concerning the murder of Bai ba Saul ite."

He says he had full access to the material, examined al1 aspects of the investigation, particularly interested in any aspect where there was information or intelligence surrounding a threat to either Sergeant Hughes or Garda Nyhan. The examination lasted a number of hours.
"Later that ni ght I ret urned to Cool ock where I
exami ned the Garda file for the DPP. Al so exami ned the Pul se intel li gence surrounding Mr. A the person that Ser geant Hughes and Garda Nyhan bel i eved the threat to I ife was coming from At this time l was al so aware
that Sergeant Hughes had a meeting surrounding his personal safety. I was aware that Superintendent Kelly from Bal briggan had put members of Sergeant Hughes's local station on notice of this apparent threat.

During this period of time l contacted the National Criminal Intelligence Unit al ong with Crime and Security to enquire as to any information or i ntelli gence they may have had concerning the threat as reported. Fromenqui ries I was aware that following a court case in August of ' 05 Sergeant Hughes recei ved a threat from[somebody el se]. This report was made in the Garda Pul se system by Sergeant Hughes."

I think that is Mr. A, is it?
A. Sorry, I think?

577 Q. The blank there is Mr. A, is it?
A. Yes, perhaps, yes.

578 Q. "Frommy investigations I could not find any definitive threat to the life of Sergeant Hughes or Garda Nyhan."

So were you aware that all these work was going on in the background --
A. I wasn't, no.

579 Q. -- to try and help you?
A. I wasn't, no.
Q. But sorry, didn't he meet you subsequently in the Carnegie Hotel?
A. My recollection of meeting Inspector Hanrahan was on foot of receiving the pay reduction notices or the attendances to meet the various medical personnel. They were casual meetings. He didn't say that he was there to obtain reports from me in relation to my sickness absence. That's my recollection, anyway, of
those meeting.
581 Q. Well did you advise him not to get involved?
A. No, I would never say that to an inspector.

582 Q. You see, he indicates his first communication with you was on the 26th December, where he asked you that he cal1 to your residence. You requested that he was not to attend at your home and instead requested that you meet at the Carnegie Court Hotel?
A. I think that was decision that we both reached that was convenient to both.
We11 no, no, his statement indicates that his request that he go to your home?
A. Yes. And if that was the case and I would have suggested well why not halfway? and we meet the Carnegie Hotel, and he would have agreed, and there was 15:09 no issue about that.

584 Q. We11 except that it indicates you weren't in agreement with going to your home?
A. Well I'd prefer to meet him off-site; that would be my preference at the time.

585 Q. He says:
"At the meeting in the Carnegie Court Hotel he stated at the time that all materials in the possession surrounding the murder of Bai ba Saulite were al ready in 15:10 the hands of legal advi sers. All matters were now the subject of Hi gh Court proceedi ngs. He advi sed me not to get i nvol ved for my own sake. "
A. No. I don't recollect that at all. I don't think I
would have said that. I know I wouldn't have said that to an inspector. And I don't know what context he is saying that.
586 Q. Do you see the next sentence:
"I informed himof the actions 1 had taken regarding his personal safety and the possible threat to his life."
A. And this is in December 2007. I think the matters that were raised there following the murder in relation to press releases, or The Sun articles, I think that had dissipated we11 at that stage.
587 Q. Are you forgetting this conversation?
A. I don't recollect the conversation in the context that he has it here.
588 Q. Well he goes on. He says -- first of all, he says:
"I informed him of the actions l had taken regarding his personal safety and possible threat to his life. While he appreciated what I had done he was not in agreement with my assessment."

Do you recall that? Did you push back on his assessment that there was no threat to your life?
A. No. I don't remember any lengthy conversations with
don't know whether it was just a general conversation we were having surrounding some delivery of a document from headquarters or... But I don't recollect the train of conversation in that context.
589 Q. All right. He treats of something that did cause you irritation, and I want to, in fairness, bring it up. The last paragraph there -- the next paragraph:
"Sergeant Wlliam Hughes alleges on page 20 of his statement that he recei ved notice that he was declining 15:12 to meet with local management and that al communi cations would be conducted by way of tel ephone."

He says:
"I can confirmthat I met with Sergeant Hughes on the 8th October 2008. Following the meeting I reported to seni or management that Sergeant Hughes had serious concerns froma letter he recei ved addressed from HRM to state he had ref used to meet with local management.
I conveyed to management on the 13th October that Sergeant Hughes had not ref used to meet with Iocal management at any time or occasion. He had made hinself available to both Superintendent Curran and I since my arrival at Cool ock Garda Station."

So the record is being corrected on your behalf.
A. Yes. With respect to Inspector Hanrahan, I didn't receive any feedback from that report.

590 Q. He says that you informed him that you'd attend any appointments with Superintendent Curran. And he said:
"I al so notified management that he was not avoi ding any correspondence or communi cations recei ved through Superintendent Curran or me. In my report dated 13th October 2008 I requested that a copy of the report be furni shed to Sergeant Hughes. I don't recall any reply to this correspondence."
A. And that's the position. I didn't receive a response. 15:13 591 Q. We might just look briefly at page 3965, please. And this is a communication of the 12th January 2008. If we scroll down a little bit. It's a report that you have met with the Sergeant Trevor Shields Community Relations, and this is from, as $I$ understand it, it's from Inspector Hanrahan to the Superintendent R District, and he refers to meeting you:
"I al so met with Sergeant Hughes about security matters, having served in the Speci al Detective Unit for 15 years, I have experi ence concerning this issue."

He makes reference to his reading the Book of Evidence.
"Fromthese interviews I can find no reference being made regarding a threat to Sergeant Hughes."

If we just scrol1 down there.
"I have conveyed this to hi mand he seems to accept what I have said. He has al so informed re that the local detective unit from Bal briggan have called to him and are aware of his address. He has al so spoken to Superintendent Kelly Bal briggan who is aware of his
situation. I have al so exami ned the Pul se system concer ni ng Mr. A and agai $n$ can find no reference of a threat to Sergeant Hughes. I found however a threat recorded by Sergeant Hughes on the 25th August ' 05 after Mr. A was charged with abduction and remanded in custody. I al so forward a report from D/Inspector Walter O Sullivan and the threat to Sergeant Hughes and Garda Nyhan. He states in his report the dangers of Mr. A but has no intelligence of a threat to either mentber."

And the Pulse is referred to.
"As members of An Garda Sí ochána and persons we core into contact with on a day-to-day basis we should accept that there is al ways a need concerning matters of personal safet $y$."

So he reported up the line the assurance that he sought to give you at his meeting with you, isn't that right?
A. Yes, I see that here.

592 Q. So the authorities were taking your personal safety very seriously and drilled into that issue and sent appropriate officers to check that out to ensure that there was no intel of a threat to you?
A. Yes. That would appear to be the case by that report,
yes.
593 Q. The inspector says that in your statement on page 22, sergeant, you claim that as local management had not visited -- you complain that local management had not visited you as per the code. And he points out that he called to see you on the 26th December '07 in order to call to your residence in accordance with the Code, and you asked him not to. So he says you're just incorrect about that.
A. I was correct about that?

594 Q. Incorrect about that.
A. Oh, sorry, no, we agreed to meet in the Carniege Hote1. It wasn't an issue at the time. He didn't say I must meet you at your house as per Code regulations; he never said that. So it was just an agreement between the two of us to facilitate him and myself there that I'd benefit from a meeting off-site and he would benefit from having to travel less. statement at page 1295, please. If we scroll down a 1ittle bit, paragraph commencing on page 22 of the statement, it says:
"On page 22 of the statement Sergeant Hughes clains --"

Sorry, you have it there:
"On page 26 of the statement Ser geant Li am Hughes states that he made a protected di scl osure on the 17 th

December 2006. He states that he 'have di scussed these matters with the indi vidual s'. I am named as one of the i ndi vi dual s."

The inspector says.
"'I can state that I have never di scussed a protected disclosure with Sergeant Hughes'."

Do you see that, sergeant?
A. I do.
Q. What do you say to that?
A. I don't know the context of what he's saying there. He states that he never discussed matters of protected disclosure with me, I think that's what he's saying?
Q. He says he wasn't stationed in Coolock until late November '07.
A. Yes.
Q. He didn't become aware of any PD made by you whilst stationed in the R District. And he says if, as stated by you, he was told of a protected disclosure, he would have made a note of it, and he didn't.
A. Yes. But my recollection of meetings, as I said, with Inspector Hanrahan were to the effect of either he had notices to serve on me in relation to attendances at medicals or reductions in pay or to that effect. I do recall the meeting in the Carniege where $I$ discussed with him in relation to my alleged failures to meet with management, and he obviously took action in
relation to that. I don't recal1, with Inspector Hanrahan, sitting down with him and talking about systems failures and such -- those matters.
599 Q. You see, sergeant, there's a pattern here because if you scroll down he makes reference to a similar claim you made concerning what you were asserting was the second protected disclosure. He says:
"On page 27 of the statement of Sergeant Li am Hughes he states that he made a second protected di scl osure on the 16th Decenber 2008. On page 28 he states that he spoke to me about a second protected disclosure. I can state..."

The inspector says --
"... I had no conversation with Sergeant Hughes that was the subject of a protected di scl osure."
A. Yes. If he has noted that I am talking about the 16th September 2008, that is the date that I made the confidential recipient report, and perhaps I told him that I had made that report, I am not sure.

600 Q. He says that on page 29 of your statement you state that you made a third protected disclosure on the 29th October 2008. And on page 30, you state that he would have discussed the protected disclosure with him, the inspector. He says he did not have any conversation or discussion with you surrounding a protected disclosure.
A. I don't recal1 in my statement saying that I discussed
these protected disclosures with Inspector Hanrahan.
601 Q. You see, there seems to be a pattern of quite a few people to whom you say you are making protected disclosures to don't tumble, don't under -- don't realise that you are. It's possible, isn't it, that you are mistaken therefore?
A. Of course the term 'protected disclosure' is something that's used in, may I say with respect, Tribunal language. It wouldn't be a term I would have used back in 2007, '08 and '09.
602 Q. Well even 'whistleblowing'?
A. Reports.

603 Q. He concludes his statement on page 1299, and he says that he wishes to state that at all times from his arrival -- it's the next page on -- at all times from
his arrival in the R District to his return to the Special Detective Unit, all interactions he had with you were on your part -- on his part conducted with the strictest of confidence and in good faith. Do you accept that?
A. We were -- yes, he was -- very affable meetings, I have to say, a very affable person, you know.
604 Q. And he says that he's not aware of any targeting of you by senior management or any other persons involved during his interactions with you?
A. Yes, he says that.

605 Q. And he left the picture on the 9th April '09 and he transferred to the Special Detective Unit in Harcourt Square, isn't that so?
A. I think so.

606 Q. When we mention perspective, we might ask you to deal with the perspective of Inspector Lacey who was assigned to Swords Garda Station on promotion in April of 2009.
A. Yes.
A. That's correct.
Q. He says that as part of his induction on his arrival, Superintendent Curran outlined the position regarding Garda members on sick leave, including yourself --
A. That's correct.

609 Q. -- and Garda Declan Nyhan, who were both out on long-term sick leave. He says Superintendent Curran informed him briefly about the reasons as to why you were out on sick leave and told him that it was related to the murder of Baiba Saulite in 2006. Also, that you felt there was a threat on your 1ife, and also, that you'd felt had you been treated badly by the Garda organisation, and that you felt there was a subsequent cover-up. A11 right? That was the gist of what was said to him by Superintendent Curran, he says?
A. Okay.

He indicates that Superintendent Curran instructed him that he should make contact with you and Garda Nyhan and that the inspector should deal with you from a welfare perspective and do so in a sensitive manner.
A. Yes, indeed.

611 Q. And he says that Superintendent Curran was very strong on this.
A. Yes.

612 Q. That was the instruction he gave to the inspector: deal with these mean respectfully and sensitively.
A. I understand, yes.

613 Q. Because it was his aim to have them return to work at the earliest opportunity?
A. Yes, indeed.

614 Q. He said that he subsequently made contact with you by telephone and introduced himself to you as the new inspector at Swords?
A. Yes.

615 Q. He knew you professionally, having worked alongside you 15:24 in the North Central Division, particularly at Croke Park?
A. Correct.

616 Q. Where you had been a sergeant in the events office?
A. I was traffic sergeant there in Fitzgibbon Street, yes. 15:25

617 Q. Right. And would have been one of the principal organisers of Garda duties at Croke Park events?
A. Correct.

618 Q. He believes that he had a relationship with you that was cordial?
A. Absolutely.

619 Q. And he doesn't recall having any negative dealings with you?
A. Any?

620 Q. Negative.
A. Not at all.

621 Q. And he recalls telling you that he'd assist you in any way he could and that -- his expression -- "we' re working froma clean slate".
A. Yes.

622 Q. And he meant by that, that he -- that's Inspector Lacey -- had no involvement in whatever had happened previously, and as far as he was concerned he'd like to see you back at work at the earliest time.
A. Yes.

623 Q. And he says his dealings with you were then related mainly to keeping you informed of medical appointments and such matters, because obviously if you're not in the station, you needed -- somebody needed to phone you 15:26 to keep you in the loop?
A. That's correct.

624 Q. He says, on the 26th September 2009, he informed you of a medical appointment with the CMO, and you said you'd attend. And then in November, he informed you, on the 13th November, of another medical with the CMO that was due to happen on the 19th November. Do you recall the gist of these calls?
A. Not specifically, no, but that would be in line with his duties at that time.
625 Q. Right. You return to work on the 21st December, that's just before Christmas, of 2009, when you took up your position as the staff sergeant in Coolock?
A. Correct.

626
Q. He believed that he dropped into you informally on a regular basis and as far as he was concerned, you appeared to be doing well and you'd a good relationship with your colleagues?
A. That's -- yes, that's what he said, yes.
A. That's correct.

So again in February of 2011, he informed you -- he made contact with you and informed you of a medical appointment with the CMO that was due to happen on the 24th February 2011?
A. That would be in line with events, yes.

629 Q. And then in April 2011, moving the matter on, he made arrangements to meet with you at Swords Garda Station for what was intended as a welfare meeting?
A. Yes.

630 Q. And at this meeting you presented him with a prepared typed report outlining a number of issues "regarding his absence on sick leave", is that right?
A. That's correct.

631 Q. And he forwarded that to the superintendent's office in Coolock Garda Station. And then later again in this ongoing contacts he was having, he met you in July, do you remember that, in the summer of 2011?
A. I don't recollect that.

632 Q. Well the purpose of the meeting, he recalls, was to inform you that his period of sickness had exceeded 183
days and to ensure that the medical certificates were to be in the correct format, otherwise your pay would not be sanctioned. Does that ring a bell?
A. It would be in line with the occurrences in 2011, yes.

633 Q. He says that he handed you a copy of the minute of $A / C$ Fanning, and it's his recollection that you gave him a prepared typed report regarding sick leave and regarding your reduction in pay?
A. That could be correct, yes.

634 Q
And also, you provided him with an abstract of a letter 15:29 from Dr. Quigley, the CMO, to what I think -- a document that had been sent to your solicitor?
A. Yes, okay.

635 Q. And Dr. Quigley -- this is the thing that Dr. Quigley subsequently clarified -- was in fact sent to your GP rather than the solicitor, but you handed him that at any rate?
A. Okay, yes.
Q. And again, he forwarded this correspondence to the superintendent's office. And then there was another meeting provisionally set for the 18th July, and the purpose of which was to enable you submit an outline of what you contended were the failures of An Garda Síochána in relation to your illness?
A. Yes.

637 Q. You were to get back to him about this meeting but you never did, is his recollection. And then in August he had to speak with you regarding the matter, and you said to him that An Garda Síochána were fully aware of
the circumstances that led to the illness and you didn't intend to outline them again.
A. No, that wouldn't be my form. If he wanted information, I would have provided it for him.
So this now is a meeting of the 11th August 2011. He's 15:30 asked you -- he's called a meeting. He's looking for details from you and he's saying you're saying "management are fully aware of the circumstances that led to my illness, I don't intend to outline them again".
A. I don't recollect saying that to him.

639 Q. Al1 right. He says he reports this to the superintendent Coolock on the same day. And then in January of 2012, he spoke to you by telephone and he brought to your attention the contents of a minute from 15:31 HRM, Assistant Commissioner's office HRM, he can't recall the specifics of the minute, and you requested that he forward a copy of the minute to his home address by ordinary post, which he did.
A. Okay.

640 Q. Does that ring a bell?
A. No, it doesn't at this stage.

641 Q. All right. In July he contacted you again, and informed you of an upcoming appointment with the chief Medical officer on the 26th July 2012. Again, you indicated you'd attend, and he relayed this to the superintendent's office. And then on the 12th February 2013, moving matters along, he met with you where you completed official documentation relating to your
retirement?
A. I recall that, I think, yes.

642 Q. He also -- you also gave back your identification card and other items?
A. That's correct.

643 Q. And the inspector himself left the Coolock district himself in June 2013. It's his recollection that you may have changed your number a few times because there was a few times he couldn't get you. During this period did you change your number?
A. My telephone number? No.

644 Q. Your mobile, is it?
A. My mobile, yes.

645 Q. Did you change your mobile number?
A. Not during that time, no.

646 Q. It's also his recollection that he didn't at any point get an e-mail from you during this period. You didn't seem to be proactively looking to keep in contact yourself; the contact that was happening was management or inspectors contacting you, would that be fair?
A. In his case he was contacting me mostly in relation to notifications from HRM and such, and pay reductions and such, and obviously I was furnishing him with reports that went up the channels. So...
Al1 right. It's quite clear, I am suggesting to you, 15:33 that the series of contacts that were had with you were respectful and were inclusive and were caring, do you accept that?
A. Oh yes. The people -- like, the -- no question of
any -- it was cordial and, you know, there was no, no question of bad manners or anything like that.
648 Q. And they were contacts that were directed by and had the backing of Garda management, including Superintendent Curran?
A. They were, but I was also aware there were correspondences from Assistant Commissioner Fanning during that time specifically requesting investigation files to be forwarded, and these were not brought to my attention by local management. move on. They make it clear that, at the instigation of Superintendent Curran, they were having these fair and reasonable and inclusive and caring contacts with you. And I am just suggesting to you if that is so, that is not consistent with any suggestion that Mark Curran had an animus against you or was targeting you?
A. Well the visits by the inspectors, as appreciated as they were, and I mean that in all honesty, didn't extend to actually resolving the problem of taking full details off me in relation to my absences from the workplace.

650 Q. Superintendent Curran, in his conclusion remarks to his statement, states that the allegations that you have made against him of targeting and discrediting are
entirely without foundation.
A. Yes, I think I read that.
Q. In his interactions with you he always treated you with respect and due courtesy. His interactions and his intentions were genuine?
A. I think I read that, yes.

652 Q. Do you accept that?
A. I think I read that, but I -- the targeting --

653 Q. Do you accept that?
A. The targeting, discrediting I am speaking about is the fact that there was no investigation into my workplace absences conducted by Superintendent Curran.
654 Q. Do you accept his intentions towards were genuine?
A. If they were, he would have carried out the investigations which would have gone some way to resolving my difficulties in the workplace.
655 Q. I thought we might be able to finish with an agreement on this --
A. Excuse me?

656 Q. I thought we might be able to finish with an agreement on this: his intentions towards you were well meaning and were genuine, would you agree with that?
A. He was always cordial towards me. would you at least accept that -- Mark Curran had genuine intentions towards you?
A. Em, apart from the matter of not interviewing me, Mark was always cordial and respectful.

658 Q. And well intentioned?
A. I can't really answer that. I am sorry.



Q Clancy. I don't really want to involve her in something if you are not, but at one point you seemed to, certainly in your written materials, include her in the crossfire. When did she leave the Guards, do you know?
A. I am not sure.
Q. We11 in the 1ist of issues, Issue 2 is:
"Did Assi stant Commi ssi oner HRM or Chi ef Superintendent 15:38 Phillips or Superintendent Mark Curran target or di scredit Sergeant Hughes because he made a protected di scl osure by (a) failing to carry out an investigation into his condition of work rel ated stress (b) failing to establish whet her the work rel ated stress was injury 15:38 on duty (c) treating his absences as due to ordinary ill ness so that his pay was subj ected to reduction?"

So, Assistant Commissioner Catherine Clancy is, perhaps like some of her colleagues, really quite unclear as to 15:38 why she's been drawn into this.
A. I see that, yes.

661 Q. She has no animus against you. Never has. would you accept that?
A. It's, em -- she was in charge of a department that I with a view to resolving those matters as soon as possible.
662 Q. A11 right. Would you just, would you just recount,
specifically now with respect to her, what do you say she did to target you? Her now.
A. The issues in relation to my sickness absences were --

663 Q. No, her, what did she do to target you?
A. Well she was in charge of HRM I think during a period when my sickness absences weren't investigated properly and it was her responsibility to procure those files, to assist the CMO and themselves in determining my situation in relation to my absences on duty.
664 Q. It is her belief that during her time in HRM she didn't 15:39 know you, she didn't ever meet you, she didn't interact with you. Do you accept that?
A. I accept that, yes.
Q. And yet, you visit her with improper motivation of being involved in an organised cover-up to do you down and target you. Do you understand that that doesn't seem to make sense?
A. Yes. From the perspective of my pay reduction, my absences on duty not being investigated, these are matters that fall within Assistant Commissioner
Clancy's remit. I understand in her statement she says that most of the time she wasn't at HRM, that's perfectly understandable, she didn't know me personally. But from my perspective I didn't know what was going on behind the scenes, I didn't know who was pulling strings in relation to getting things done or not done, and from my perspective HRM were cutting my pay without having the -- and not resolving the issues of the investigation files going forward at my expense.
Q. Does it provide you with any consolation or assurance that one of the people, and I am taking just this example, this A/C, Assistant Commissioner, she had no knowledge or acquaintance or desire to do you down; she simply didn't know you.
A. With respect, I think she, in her statement I think she's taken -- although she doesn't know me and she doesn't deal directly with these matters, she was taking responsibility for her department's performance in that regard.
Q. She retired from An Garda Síochána on the 1st October 2008?
A. Yes.
Q. As I understand it, your primary grievance in relation to her, perhaps because she was the titular head of the responsible unit as you see it, your primary grievance relates to the reduction in your pay?
A. And the non-procurement of the investigation files.
Q. The non-procurement of the investigation files?
A. The sickness absences investigation files, which I think she requested on a couple of occasions with local management.
Q. I see. So just dealing with the pay issue for a moment and, to an extent, we have been over this but, ordinary il1ness and injury on duty, you'11 be aware, because presumably you would have received professional legal advice on this issue, it is an issue that is capable of being complex; it's a complex issue.
A. I understand that.

671 Q. Yeah. So you can have the bog standard situation, which is not complex, of a garda being injured, a member being injured involved in a -- being hit by a getaway car mid robbery. Physical injury, straightforward injury on duty.
A. Correct.
Q. That's one end of the spectrum?
A. That's correct.

673 Q. The other end of the spectrum perhaps is your situation of a psychological injury that does or doesn't arise from an injury on duty. It's a more grey area, just to use neutral terms; it's less clear cut.
A. I understand that.

674 Q. It is an issue which has troubled policing authorities not just in Ireland but in neighbouring jurisdictions?
A. I accept possibly, I don't know.

675 Q. Right. Without going into the law on the issue, there's quite complex case law around the issue, you are aware of that?
A. I am.

CHA RMAN You are?
A. Well --

CHA RMAN Good man if you are. I'm sorry --
A. I should say I accept that. I don't have any argument with that.
CHA RMAN There are complications, Mr. O'Higgins, you are quite right.
MR. O HGG NS: A11 right.
CHA RMAN And then there is the case of a garda
tripping on the stairs. Anyway, that didn't happen in this case.
MR. OHGGNS: A big component of the investigation that needs to be done is, of course, the medical element?
A. Yes, indeed.

677 Q. And the CMO, based upon the reports he had got, and looking at the matter carefully, determined that your difficulties arose from -- I am paraphrasing here -but ordinary policing duties?
A. I think he said that, yes.

678 Q. That may not have been music to your ears but it was a bona fide decision reached by him, would you agree with that?
A. I agree. But just to use your analogy there in relation to a garda that unfortunately had been hit by a car, and in my case a PTSD case, you can be assured that the CMO, in relation to the garda suffering physical injuries, will have received the full investigation file up at HRM for him to rely on in relation to that member of the Garda, for instance, that, did he walkout in front of the car or what caused injury? He would have to have a full investigation file up there. In my case there was no investigation file as to the circumstances of my absences made available to HRM to make any determination on the non-medical issues.
679 Q. Are you aware, sergeant -- presumably you are from the Tribunal documentation -- that assistant commissioner
in HRM directed local management to interview you in accordance with the Code?
A. I learned that after 2012.

680 Q. So do you not therefore accept that A/C Clancy was not targeting you at least in that regard?
A. In that regard, I think she made two -- I think she sent two reports down to local management requesting the investigation of my absences.
well if that is so, is it not therefore -- would it not have been reasonable to withdraw any criticism of her under that heading? she had asked if that would be done, so it'd be wrong, or perhaps worthy of withdrawing any criticism that accused her of targeting for failing to do that?
A. well, in my view, one of the worst forms of sanction probably in respect of a member of An Garda Síochána is a $50 \%$ reduction in pay. And I think, with the greatest respect to Assistant Commissioner Clancy, that should have been forefront in their minds at the time, that before this major impactful process begins, let's make sure we have all the information here in front of us that will justify such a procedure. And unfortunately that didn't happen. It seemed to be left to an automatic system whereby a number of days were counted up and the pay is automatically reduced, which I find unsatisfactory, particularly being a victim of that process I believe that there should have been more of an input from Assistant Commissioner Clancy in that regard.
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Q. There's just a few things there. You've mentioned the automated system?
A. Seems to be. I'm not sure.

683 Q. No, no, I think that's the word you used. You're aware that under the system it's automatic that after $x$ number of days, unless something else happens, it's automatic that there is a reduction of the pay. So Catherine Clancy didn't make a decision to dock your salary.
A. It's automatic unless there is an intervention from HRM.

684 Q. But under the process, if that's not done -- and it'11 for the Mr. Chairman to decide the combination of the circumstances that brought that about and whether that was targeting or not. Parking that, because those various required things didn't happen, it meant automatically, without Catherine Clancy making a positive step to do you down, it meant, automatically, that your pay was docked?
A. But again it's just -- and respect to Assistant Commissioner Clancy, that's the position, that's the system over which she presided and, you know, the reduction of a member's pay is a very serious matter and it shouldn't be left to automation and that she should have been involved in that process from the
medical point of view it was preferable that you could discuss matters with your own doctors rather than management discussing it on your behalf?
A. I could always discuss matters with my own doctor but it wouldn't further the investigative process that our local management were obliged to undertake.
But you see, in order -- when an effort is being made to move this on by Dr. Quigley, you seem to take umbrage at you being referred to a psychiatrist?
A. As, sorry?

CHA RMAN As what?
MR. OHGGN: Being referred to a psychiatrist. CHAL RMAN oh yes.
687 Q. MR. OHGGNS: You were taking umbrage at the various steps towards progressing the matter?
A. Yes, I was recognising that I was being sent repeatedly to psychiatrists when Dr. Quigley knew at the time that there was input, and a serious amount of input required from HRM which was not forthcoming, and I don't think it was possible to make a decision, a proper decision in relation to my pay -- we're talking about pay here -- unless those matters were dealt with properly and I think in the circumstances, and I see there through papers there, there was confusion between HRM and the CMO as to who should determine the injury, and in that case then, if there was confusion, I think they should have opted and deferred to leaving the pay on full tap until they make their decision. Now, if there was any monies owing as a result of arriving at a
decision that would be against me, well then we can come to an arrangement to recoup that for the State.
Q. Just staying with the interconnection with the medical appraisal, you objected to being referred to a psychiatrist, but what I am wondering is: did you not want to get to the bottom of the medical position so that you'd get better?
A. But I knew perfectly well what the problems were. The problems were of a non-medical nature which were not being investigated by my local management.
Q. But your medics were prescribing particular medical remedies and some medication and psychotherapy and counselling, and you were spurning each of them?
A. Well I didn't avail of those psychotropic decisions or recommendations, and I felt that -- my own opinion was to stay away from work was the best remedy until matters were resolved in the workplace.
690 Q. On one occasion, amn't I correct, Dr. Quigley wanted to send to you a psychiatrist but you refused and you stated you had no choice but to admit yourself to St. Patrick's?
A. To admit myself to St. Patrick's?

691 Q. Isn't that what you said?
A. No. That was the first meeting with Dr. Quigley when he had no information from Garda authorities as to my with work related stress and in my -- I am not a medical person, but in my estimation work related stress is not a psychiatric illness, and when he
mentioned going to a psychiatrist, I thought at the time it was unnecessary, that if I am reporting with work related stress, that the stressor should be removed from the workplace, and the only way to do that is to have the matter investigated on-the-ground. bristling at being referred to a psychiatrist, even though you seem to have sought it yourself, and then when that is pointed out, you take umbrage of the mention, and you particularly take umbrage at the referral to another psychiatrist?
A. Well the matter of a psychiatrist was a recommendation by my -- by Séan Costello, solicitor. So I followed his advice on that.
693 Q. I thought you --
A. That was Dr. Corry.

CHA RMAN That was Dr. Corry. But I think he's talking about Dr. Fernandez, who is Dr. Reilly's referee.
A. Yes. And I didn't comment on this. With Dr.

Fernandez, I quickly saw that, you know, despite Dr. Fernandez's qualifications, but I knew from my meetings with him that it wouldn't resolve the issues in the workplace.
694 Q. MR. O H GG NS: Your own GP referred you to Dr. Fernandez, isn't that right?
A. He did.

695 Q. Not your solicitor?
A. Not my solicitor, no. This was in the earliest days of
the debacle.
696 Q. And referred you because you asked to be referred?
A. To? By -- to Dr. Reilly, is it?

697 Q. To Dr. Fernandez.
A. Dr. Reilly was -- he suggested that I go, yes. CHAI RMAN I'm sorry, he suggested you go to Dr. Fernandez.

MR. O H GG NS: Yes.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN And the solicitor suggested you go to
Dr. Corry.
A. Exactly.

CHA RMAN okay.
698 Q. MR. OHGGNS: was this done against your wishes?
A. No, no. Initially when Dr. Reilly suggested that I
went to see Dr. Fernandez, it wasn't anything my will, I just went to see, but I quickly saw that -- I think I had two meetings with Dr. Fernandez -- it wasn't going to -- from my perspective, it wasn't going to resolve the matters in the workplace.

699 Q. Do you not agree that these were difficult issues that required input from a number, particularly in your case, a number of specialists and obviously, regrettable from your point of view, required more than one consultation?
A. This is with Dr. Fernandez, is it?
Q. With the range of issues which you reported to your various medics over the period?
A. Yes. And the issues that I was reporting throughout,
they were work related and the resolution of my problems to a large extent lay in the workplace.
Q. You see, in fairness to a general practitioner, they can only, first of all, rely on what you report and, second of a11, psychiatric disorders aren't their specialty, they have to send it on to a specialist?
A. Yes. And when I turned up to see, say, for instance, Dr. Devitt, if I was able to report to him, yes, management have sat me down, $I$ was totally wrong in my assertions, they pointed out where I was wrong and I accept fully now I was mistaken and I feel a lot better about it now, but management never called me in to actually discuss the problems that $I$ had, and as a result of that then the situation deteriorated.
702 Q. Doubtless you were advised by your own lawyers that this is a difficult grey area, injury on duty classification?
A. Sorry, I beg your pardon?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. Yeah. So you didn't take a court case over this issue until much later on?
A. 2010 I think it was.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

706
Q. And I am suggesting to you that on an overall reading
of the materials, and I know there's a lot of them, and the correspondence, the enquiries that were needed stalled in large measure because you didn't cooperate?
A. Excuse me?

707 Q. You didn't cooperate and your medical position changed?
A. I didn't cooperate with - sorry - who?

708 Q. You didn't cooperate with your own treating doctors in terms of your treatment?
A. Yes, because I strongly believed that the resolution of the matters lay in the workplace, to the greatest extent.

709 Q. You had a staff association and Employee Assistance Service?
A. Yes. AGSI and the Employee Assistance Service, yes.

710 Q. Inspector Lucy [sic], we now know, met you in July of '11 specifically to tell you had gone over the 183 days and to make sure your medical certs were in the correct format?
A. Yes.

711 Q. Management were looking to keep you on side on this, were trying to help you?
A. Again they were not investigating my reasons for my absences on duty and also, the reports I furnished to Inspector Lacey, I think you mentioned three of them there, went unanswered.

712 Q. Thank you.

Chairman, I have a little bit more to go.
CHA RMAN Yes, that is no problem. On this topic?

MR. OHGG NS: On this topic.
CHA RMAN That is fine.
MR. OHGGN: And I don't anticipate actually that I'11 be too much longer tomorrow, Chairman. I actually think --

CHA RMAN whatever happens, whatever happens, I am sure -- and Mr. Lynn is ready I am sure to take up the situation and I have no problem with any of that. And whether you're long or short, again, sorry -- whether you are long or short doesn't matter either, do you know what I mean. We've set it out, and for reasons of convenience to be able to tell other witnesses, look, for definite when they were, it seemed sensible to block out the week, which doesn't mean we have to take the week. And be assured that if we finish early, we in the Tribunal have plenty to keep us occupied, just as I am sure that you have plenty to keep you occupied, other than perhaps this case. So don't be under any difficulties about that.

Can I just clarify one point before we go, Mr. O'Higgins? When you say that Sergeant Hughes didn't cooperate with his own medical professionals, you're talking about getting counselling, taking the antidepressants, et cetera, et cetera, is that what you 16:00 are talking about?

MR. OHGGN: Yes, that is what I am referring to, Chairman.

CHA RMAK And Sergeant Hughes agreed with that and he
explained why he didn't want to do that. okay. well we will continue on this topic for some time tomorrow and then you will proceed with any other subjects. Thank you very much.
MR. OHGGN: Thank you.
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:29 } \\ & \text { appearance }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { area [4] - } \\ & \text { 124:27, 167:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 120:25 } \\ \text { articles [10] } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 170:20 } \\ & \text { assistant [3] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:5 } \\ & \text { author [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:25, 144:27 } \\ & \text { 145:5, 145:17 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 134:3 } \\ & \text { appeared [6] - } \end{aligned}$ | $175: 16,175: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 67: 28,67: 29, \\ & 78: 22,78: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:20, 77:24, } \\ & \text { 168:29 } \end{aligned}$ | $66: 26,66: 28$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150: 4,150: 5 \\ & 152: 19,154: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 38: 7,45: 29,78: 4, \\ & 78: 18,86: 18, \end{aligned}$ | areas [5] - | 84:23, 87:7, | assisted [1] - | 11:5, 13:26, | 159:29, 160:8, |
|  | 64:24, 66:13, | 87:10, 87:15 | 60:13 | 13:28, 14:3, | 162:6, 166:25, |
| 158:3 <br> appearing [1] - | ```80:8 arena [1] - 20:3 argument [2] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 98:24, 147:11 } \\ & \text { articulates [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { assisting [2] - } \\ & \text { 26:6, 79:3 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:28, 15:29, } \\ & \text { 17:9, 26:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 167: 19,168: 28 \\ & 170: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 79: 7 \\ & \text { application [4] - } \end{aligned}$ | $87: 13,167: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:22 } \\ & \text { artifa } \end{aligned}$ | associated [1] - | 29:12, 29:26, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { awareness [1] - } \\ & \text { 143:19 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 71: 15,71: 18, \\ & \text { 143:20, 143:22 } \\ & \text { apply [2] - 4:18, } \end{aligned}$ | arise [1] - | 51:26 | association [1] - | $66: 5,95: 2$ | awful [5] - |
|  | 167:10 arising [6] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { artistic [1] - 70:8 } \\ & \text { AS }_{[3]}-6: 1,6: 7, \end{aligned}$ | 176:12 <br> assume [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:14, 121:14, } \\ & 132: 6,132: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:28, 112:16, } \\ & \text { 114:11, 115:17, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $56: 8$ applying [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 13,66: 16, \\ & 67: 19,81: 26, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:24 } \\ & \text { ascertain }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $63: 10,79: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150: 25,167: 14, \\ & 172: 25 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 37:26 } \\ & \text { appointed [2] - } \end{aligned}$$8: 28,74: 26$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:11, 133:23 } \\ & \text { arose [1] - 168:9 } \end{aligned}$ | 76:24 | 130:15 assumption [4] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { authority [2] - } \\ \text { 100:18, 130:22 } \\ \text { automated [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | B |
|  | arrange [1] - | $35: 14,101: 6$ | 69:22, 69:24, |  | back' [1] - 42:24 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { appointment [4] } \\ -24: 14,157: 19 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:17 } \\ & \text { arranged [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 129:22, } 144: 1 \\ \text { aspects [5] - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:27, 69:29 } \\ & \text { assurance [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 170:2 } \\ & \text { automatic [5] - } \end{aligned}$ | backdrop [1] - |
| 158:12, 160:24appointments | 87:27 <br> arrangement [1] | 19:13, 62:7, | $150: 22,166: 1$ | 136:23, 169:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:7 } \\ & \text { backed [3] - } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 27,131: 25, \\ & 144: 16 \end{aligned}$ | assure [1] - | 170:5, 170:7, $170: 10$ | 11:26, 12:1, |
| $157: 13$ appraisal [1] - | $-172: 2$ <br> arrangements | 144:16 assert [1] | 99:19 | automaticall | 140:18 |
|  |  | 130:6 | 168:17, 177:15 | [3] - 169:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { background }[1] \\ & -145: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 172:4 <br> appreciate [6] - |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { asserted [2] } \\ 83: 14,117: 3 \end{gathered}$ | AT [1] - 178:8 | 170:17, 170:18 <br> automation [1] | backing [3] - |
| 25:4, 40:25, 68:9, | 158:16 <br> arranging [1] - | asserting [2] | $9: 28,22: 8$ | 170:24 | 10:17, 10:26, |
| 85:24, 103:23, |  | $64: 2,153: 6$ | attend [14] - | autumn [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:4 } \\ & \text { bad }[4]-29: 13, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:21 } \\ & \text { appreciated [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { arrest [6] - } \\ 71: 14,84: 26, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { assertion [6] } \\ \text { 100:8, 103:26, } \end{gathered}$ | 90:6, 107:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 81:18 } \\ & \text { avail [4] - 18:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $32: 13,33: 21,$ |
| $147: 20,162: 22$ <br> appreciating [1] | 85:12, 85:26, | 108:23, 108:25, | 114:10, 114:17, | 41:22, 124:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:2 } \\ & \text { badly [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & -49: 16 \\ & \quad \text { approach [6] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85: 28,86: 6 \\ & \text { arrested [1] - } \\ & 17: 4 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:20, 115:15, } \\ & \text { 131:13, 134:9, } \\ & \text { 146:7, 149:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 172:14 available [14] 15:15, 15:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 155:21 } \\ & \text { baffled [1] - } \\ & \text { 125:25 } \end{aligned}$ |


| Baiba [35] - | behalf [12] - | 92:17, 92:29, | 83:25, 84:5, | 123:17 | 98:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16:12, 22:25, | 7:23, 21:2, 57:14, | 98:20, 168:3 | 108:12 | capable [1] - | Catherine [4] - |
| 23:1, 23:5, 50:17, | 67:6, 70:9, 74:22, | biggest [1] - | Bridewell [1] - | 166:27 | 164:1, 164:19, |
| 51:5, 51:24, | 88:4, 96:21, | 95:11 | 100:23 | capacity [3] - | 170:8, 170:17 |
| 53:12, 58:17, | 99:23, 121:15, | Bishop [1] - | briefly [4] - | 27:24, 27:25, | caused [3] - |
| 60:1, 61:5, 62:10, | 148:27, 171:3 | 68:21 | 78:22, 100:21, | 31:28 | 30:21, 43:19, |
| 62:12, 62:19, | behaviours [1] - | bit [21] - 16:27, | $149: 11,155: 17$ | capital [5] - | 168:22 |
| 62:24, 64:3, 64:9, | 105:29 | 32:7, 34:3, 37:22, | bring [1] - 148:6 | 85:6, 85:17, 86:2, | causes [1]-20:5 |
| 71:23, 72:13, | behind [4] - | 47:9, 54:13, 60:6, | bringing [3] - | 86:20 | causing [3]- |
| 92:9, 92:23, | 8:14, 13:22, | 60:29, 68:9, | 24:18, 63:13, | car [4]-17:3, | 14:1, 48:6, |
| 93:19, 95:17, | 86:15, 165:25 | 71:21, 73:17, | 118:26 | 167:4, 168:17, | 101:10 |
| 99:12, 99:25, | belief [10] - | 78:15, 102:16, | bristling [1] - | 168:22 | cement [1] - |
| 104:13, 117:17, | 22:15, 50:2, | 104:16, 106:3, | 173:7 | card [1] - 161:3 | 27:2 |
| 121:25, 131:27, | 92:21, 92:23, | 127:21, 142:28, | broadly [1] - | care [1] - 121:28 | Central [1] - |
| 139:27, 140:3, | 97:27, 102:13, | 143:1, 149:13, | 38:21 | career [3] - | 156:16 |
| 144:12, 146:25, | 131:17, 135:23, | 151:21, 176:28 | broke [1] - 6:10 | 36:16, 100:21, | certain [6] - |
| 155:19 | 136:10, 165:10 | BL [1] - 3:5 | brooding [2] - | $137: 25$ | 14:1, 58:17, |
| Baiba's [1] - | beliefs [1] - | blame [7] - | 106:5, 106:6 | carefully [1] - | $120: 14,121: 13$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:15 } \\ & \text { bail [2] - 71:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:26 } \\ & \text { believes [6] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:26, 14:2, } \\ & 46: 11,49: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { brought [12] - } \\ \text { 21:27. } 24: 27 \text {. } \end{gathered}$ | 168:8 | $\begin{gathered} 121: 15,130: 20 \\ \text { certainly [12] - } \end{gathered}$ |
| 71:18 | 36:28, 37:7, | 83:27, 84:1, 84:3 | 25:2, 25:5, 51:6, | 161:27, 162:18 | 10:3, 15:9, 15:19, |
| Bailey [1] - 79:1 | 121:7, 121:22, $121: 27,156: 24$ | blamed [1] - | 57:6, 83:18, | Carnegie [4] - | 18:2, 28:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { balance [1] - } \\ & 35: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 121:27, 156:24 | 83:23 | 90:27, 117:20, | 145:23, 146:8, | $32: 14,33: 21,$ |
| $35: 7$ | bell [2] - 159:3, | blaming [2] - | 160:15, 162:9, | 146:15, 146:23 | 51:7, 57:21, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Balbriggan [3] - } \\ & \text { 144:28, 150:3, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:21 } \\ & \text { bemused [1] } \end{aligned}$ | $46: 5,46: 7$ <br> Blanchardstow | 170:14 <br> brown [1] - 96:5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Carniege [2] - } \\ \text { 151:12, 152:27 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 28,106: 26, \\ & 164: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 150:5 | 104:16 | n [1] - 62:9 | Buckley [2] - | carried [8] - | certainly.. [1] - |
| $\mathbf{B A R}_{[1]}-3: 8$ <br> based [11] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { beneath [1] - } \\ & 39 \cdot 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { blank }[6] \text { - } \\ 70 \cdot 23 \quad 70 \cdot 25 \end{gathered}$ | 68:20, 69:16 | 50:26, 67:10, | $91: 13$ |
| based [11] - | 39:7 | 70:23, 70:25, | built [3] - 49:14, | 67:14, 78:29, | certificates [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7: 10,10: 22 \\ & 12: 13,13: 7,14: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { benefit [9] - } \\ \text { 20:22, 41:15 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 29,71: 14 \\ & 121: 8,145: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $49: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87: 3,138: 19 \\ & 144: 6,163: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 159:1 } \\ & \text { certified }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 62:15, 76:16, | 41:23, 42:6, | blank's [1] - | bullet [2] - | carries [1] - | 121:29 |
| 95:7, 124:12, | 42:13, 42:23, | $71: 16$ | $42: 18,43: 1$ | 91:16 | certs [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 130: 24,168: 7 \\ & \text { basic [1] }-98: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 27,151: 17 \\ & 151: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { blind [2] - 133:2, } \\ & 133 \cdot 4 \end{aligned}$ | bullied [1] - | carry [2] - 28:27, | 176:17 |
| basis [10]-31:1, | beside [1] - | 133:4 <br> blind-sided [2] - | 65:16 bullying [8] - | 164:13 carrying [4] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { cetera [6] - } \\ \text { 119:6, } 135: 2, \end{gathered}$ |
| $35: 28,38: 13$, $44: 12,97 \cdot 27$ | 127:17 | 133:2, 133:4 | 16:8, 34:9, 54:14, | 56:26, 56:29, | 142:2, 142:7, |
| 44:12, 97:27, <br> 102:8, 103:10 | best [15] - 6:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { block [1] - } \\ & 177: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 134:23, 134:28, | $66: 24,81: 19$ | 177:25 |
| 137:16, 150:18, | 50:18, 62:13, | blown [1] - | 135:5, 135:12 142:1 | 12:21, 23:7, 33:2 | $55: 5,79: 15$ |
| 158:2 | 73:23, 98:4, | 119:16 | buried [1] - 98:8 | $35: 14,54: 15$ | $79: 25,80: 27$ |
| $B E_{[1]}-6: 6$ <br> bearing [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 18,99: 22, \\ & 103: 1.103: 12 \end{aligned}$ | bluntly [1] - | business [2] - | 60:12, 60:17, | 81:14, 102:1, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { bearing [1] - } \\ & \text { 125:28 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 103: 1,103: 12, \\ & 115 \cdot 11 \quad 116 \cdot 1 \end{aligned}$ | 15:16 | 46:11, 62:22 | 61:4, 62:6, 63:16, | 103:23, 103:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 125:28 } \\ & \text { beat }[1]-77: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 115: 11,116: 1, \\ & 172: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{body~}_{[1]}-30: 18 \\ & \text { bog }_{[1]}-167: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { button [1] - } \\ & 133: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:25, 80:21, } \\ & \text { 85:7, 94:2, 94:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:25, 106:22, } \\ & \text { 106:27, 111:9, } \end{aligned}$ |
| became [6] - | better [7] - | bog [1] - 167:1 <br> bona [2]-63:10, | 133:15 BY [3] - 3:6, 5:7, | $94: 14,95: 3,95: 9$ | 111:21, 113:19, |
| 39:15, 45:15, | 39:22, 106:17, | 168:13 |  | 105:29, 106:1, | $116: 24,117: 2$ |
| 49:1, 49:23, 50:2, | 128:7, 128:9, $138: 1,172.7$ | Book [1] - | Byrne [1] - 69:12 | 119:11, 128:15, | 117:10, 125:28, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 143:20 } \\ & \text { become [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 138:1, 172:7, } \\ & 175: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $149: 23$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 135: 16,145: 6 \\ & 146: 13,150: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:7, 138:5, } \\ & \text { 138:19, 138:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { become }[3] \\ & \text { 27:1, } 86: 4 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | 175:11 <br> between [12] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { bottom [5] - } \\ 7: 29,36: 7,39: 24 . \end{gathered}$ | C | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:13, 150:29, } \\ & \text { 161:21, 167:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 138:19, 138:21, } \\ & \text { 138:24, 138:27, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 152:19 <br> becoming [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 28,51: 23, \\ & 53: 12,82: 12, \\ & 82: 27,84: 3,9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 87:8, 172:6 } \\ & \text { bottom-out [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{C} / \mathbf{S}_{[1]}-81: 29$ campaign [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & 167: 29,168: 2 \\ & \text { 168:17, 168:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:20, 140:1, } \\ & \text { 140:13, 141:2, } \\ & \text { 141:22, 142:16, } \end{aligned}$ |
| befallen [2] - | 108:12, 109:2, | breach [3] - | $48: 17,49: 2$ | $175: 24,177: 18$ | 142:21, 170:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 34: 8,39: 18 \\ & \text { beg }_{[1]}-175: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:2, 151:15, } \\ & \text { 171:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $24: 28,65: 29$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:24 } \\ & \text { cannot }[3] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { casual [2] - } \\ \text { 125:21, 145:27 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 176:28, 177:4, } \\ & 177: 28 \end{aligned}$ |
| began [1] - 42:3 | beyond [1] - | break [3] - 27:7, | $70: 6,70: 13$ | categorically [1] | CHAIRMAN ${ }_{\text {[122] }}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { begins [1] - } \\ & \text { 169:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 5 \\ & \text { big }[5]-59: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $101: 15,101: 20$ <br> breakdown [3] - | 115:28 capability [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & -55: 26 \\ & \text { categories [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -6: 4,79: 12 \\ & 79: 18,79: 20, \end{aligned}$ |


| 79:28, 80:5, | chance [1] - | 72:3, 72:7 | 113:7, 116:27, | -49:21, 135:19 | 141:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80:12, 80:14, | 104:27 | choice [6] - | 117:19, 123:18, | commencing [1] | complains [1] - |
| 80:16, 80:18, | hange [6] - | 25:20, 41:11, | 129:20, 137:8, | - 151:2 | 16:29 |
| 80:20, 81:1, 81:3, | 13:20, 13:21, | 41:22, 41:27, | 139:3, 161:25, | commend [1] - | complaint [22] - |
| 81:5, 81:11, | 13:22, 161:10, | 125:22, 172:20 | 162:16, 167:12 | 50:23 | 41:17, 54:28, |
| 81:24, 101:15, | 161:14 | Christmas [2] - | cleared [1] - | comment [2] - | 57:10, 57:19, |
| 101:18, 101:22, | changed [4] - | 137:26, 157:27 | 49:16 | 93:13, 173:20 | 74:27, 77:17, |
| 101:27, 106:13, | 11:2, 23:2 | chronology [2] - | clearest [1] - | commenting [1] | 81:15, 82:8, |
| 106:20, 106:23, | 161:8, 176:5 | 93:16, 117:28 | 111:25 | - 127:19 | $82: 18,83: 2,87: 8$ |
| $110: 27,110: 29,$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { changing [2] - } \\ \text { 11:4. 13:27 } \end{gathered}$ | circumstances | $\begin{gathered} \text { clearly [5] - } \\ \text { 14:28, 16:3 } \end{gathered}$ | comments [1] - | 87:26, 87:27, <br> 88:14, 88:25, |
| 111:13, 111:17, | channels [1] - | 103:20, 160:1, | 64:26, 84:2, | Commissioner | 118:19, 118:25, |
| 111:19, 111:22, | 161:24 | 160:8, 168:25, | 105:19 | [12]-77:3, 88:21, | 122:3, 123:1, |
| 111:26, 111:29, | charge [6] | 170:14, 171:23 | clerical [1] - | 162:7, 162:12, | 134:23, 135:7 |
| $112: 2,113: 12$, $113: 17,113 \cdot 21$ | 58:28, 66:21, | cited [1] - 31:24 | 137:17 | 164:1, 164:10, | Complaints [9] - |
| 113:17, 113:21, | 81:8, 121:26, | citing [1] - 88:5 | client [1]-89:3 | 164:19, 165:20, | 7:5, 19:13, 55:29, |
| 113:23, 113:27, | 164:25, 165:5 | civil [1] - 48:3 | Clinic [1] - 8:2 | 166:3, 169:18, | 56:4, 66:6, 67:13, |
| 114:1, 114:3, | charged [1] - | civilian [1] - 28:4 | close [1] - 20:4 | 169:28, 170:21 | 67:14, 67:16, |
| 114:6, 114:14, | $150: 10$ | claim [9] - 46:12, | CMO [26]-7:5, | commissioner | 84:23 |
| 114:16, 114:19, | charter [5] - | 108:18, 108:27, | 7:23, 8:28, 21:19, | [4] - 74:23, 77:24, | Complaints [1] - |
| 114:22, 114:24, 115:3, 115:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 19,94: 21, \\ & 94: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 110:23, 112:28, | $21: 20,22: 6,$ 27:19. 44:18. | $83: 3,168: 29$ | $16: 16$ |
| 115:11, 115:14, | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 22,119: 20, \\ & 119: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 119: 2,119: 14 \\ & 151: 3,153: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 27:19, 44:18, | Commissioner' | $36: 17,39: 1$ |
| 115:17, 115:19, | Charter [2] - | claiming [1] - | 111:3, 115:1, | committed [1] | 99:23 |
| $115: 21,115: 29$, $116 \cdot 3,116: 7$ | 94:27, 94:29 | 128:13 | 116:3, 116:9, | 136:4 | completed [4] |
| 116:10, 116:14, | chasing [1] - | claims [1] - | 116:11, 118:8, | common [1] - | 54:20, 123:3, |
| 116:17, 116:20, <br> 116:25, 117:5, | 77:15 <br> CHEALLACHÁI | 151:24 <br> Clancy [8] | 157:19, 157:21, | 104:14 communicated | 124:28, 160:29 completely [3] - |
| 117:12, 125:24, | $\begin{gathered} {[1]-3: 6} \\ \text { check } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:2, 164:19, } \\ & \text { 169:4, 169:18 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 158:12, 159:11, } \\ & \text { 165:8, 168:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-39: 28} \\ & \text { communicati } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 3,48: 4, \\ & 136: 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| 126:2, 126:9, | 150:27 | 169:28, 170:8, | 168:18, 171:25 | n [15] - 23:22, | complex [6] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 126: 14,126: 18, \\ & \text { 126:22, 126:25, } \end{aligned}$ | chief [6]-28:25, | 170:17, 170:21 | CMO's [1] - | 82:12, 83:25, | 12:22, 22:13, |
| 126:27, 127:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 23,112: 29, \\ & 117: 24,119: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Clancy's [1] - } \\ & \text { 165:21 } \end{aligned}$ | 10:24 code [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 84:6, 87:22, } \\ & \text { 88:18, 92:3 } \end{aligned}$ | 166:28, 167:2, 167:18 |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:29, 40:13, } \\ & 40: 27,166: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 26,22: 26, \\ & \text { 28:6, 63:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $32: 15,34: 8,55: 1$ | discrediting [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:26, 149:17, } \\ & \text { 152:20, 154:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 86:13, 147:20, } \\ & \text { 165:26, 165:27, } \end{aligned}$ |
| despite [2] - | 63:15, 63:16, | $65: 27,76: 15$ | - 162:29, 163:10 | district [7] - | 168:4, 169:12, |
| 78:21, 173:21 | 96:22, 118:29 | 84:15, 84:19, | discuss [5] - | 58:28, 58:29, | $170: 12,174: 14$ |
| detail [7]-34:7, | difficult [13] - | 100:11, 105:2, | 19:27, 129:24, | 59:1, 60:11, | door [3] - 40:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 34: 23,38: 8, \\ & 38: 15,39: 14, \end{aligned}$ | 31:27, 34:19, | 108:10, 110:5, | 175:13 | 127:8, 135:8, 161:6 | doubt [1] - 54:4 |
| 39:17, 84:22 | 34:22, 38:13, | 114:12, 115:9, | discussed [19] - | distrust [4] - | doubtless [1] - |
| detailed [1] - | 40:25, 80:7, | 115:10, 115:24, | 8:17, 9:9, 10:13, | 31:14, 31:25, | 175:15 |
| 10:3 | 119:7, 174:21, | 115:26, 116:4, | 19:23, 20:29, | $36: 29,102: 28$ | down [42] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { detailing [1] - } \\ & \text { 140:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 175:16, 175:22 } \\ \text { difficulties [13] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 116:21, 117:7, } \\ & \text { 118:27, 119:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:27, 91:9, 96:9, } \\ & \text { 113:3, 127:6, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { distrustful [1] - } \\ & 35: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 16,27: 20 \\ & 28: 9,34: 3,34: 4 \end{aligned}$ |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45:13, 50:24, | 44:6, 47:5, 48:8, | 35:17, 47:27, | either [7] - | - 119:28 | $39: 18,156: 19$ |
| 51:29, 52:10, | 142:12, 142:13, | 50:4, 101:6, | 60:26, 71:9, | engaging [1] - | 156:22, 158:14 |
| 53:15, 57:8, | 159:11, 159:14, | 102:13, 123:18, | 124:24, 144:18, | 39:11 | eventually [1] - |
| 63:18, 65:8, 71:7, | 171:8, 171:17, | 137:18, 156:22, | 150:14, 152:24, | engine [1] - | 22:5 |
| 72:4, 72:6, 72:10, | 172:18, 172:24, | 157:25, 168:10 | 177:10 | 13:22 | Evidence [1] - |
| 72:11, 73:15, | 173:16, 173:17, | duty [19]-7:3, | element [2] - | English [1] - | 149:23 |
| 77:16, 89:12, | 173:18, 173:20, | 27:24, 40:9, | 97:28, 168:5 | 55:13 | evidence [9] - |
| 89:23, 101:11, | 173:21, 173:25, | 101:9, 116:12, | elephant [2] - | enquire [1] - | 35:4, 50:12, |
| 103:7, 126:24, | 174:3, 174:4, | 141:8, 141:11, | 39:21, 45:23 | 145:3 | 51:25, 55:5, |
| 127:19, 139:17, | 174:5, 174:6, | 141:20, 158:7, | elicit [1] - 132:4 | enquired [1] - | 67:22, 67:23, |
| 140:23, 143:11, | 174:11, 174:15, | 164:16, 165:9, | ELIZABETH ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 71:9 | 78:16, 93:16, |
| 149:13, 149:28, | 174:16, 174:18, | 165:19, 166:25, | 3:6 | enquiries [2] - | 117:4 |
| 151:20, 153:2, | 174:26, 175:8 | 167:5, 167:11, | else] [1] - 145:7 | 145:5, 176:2 | ex [4]-61:2, |
| 153:5, 165:15, | draw [3] - 16:27, | 175:16, 175:19, | elsewhere [1] - | enquiry [2] - | 61:6, 61:8, 61:11 |
| 166:4, 169:7, | 34:29, 49:9 | 176:23 | 51:1 | 132:7, 137:23 | Ex[2]-61:15, |
| $170: 18,175: 9$ | drawn [1] - | Dwyer [23] - | Em [1] - 40:16 | ensure [3] - | 62:25 |
| down-in-the- | 164:21 | 56:21, 74:27, | em [10] - 11:27, | 59:13, 150:27, | exactly [5] - |
| mouth [1] - 28:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dreamt [1] - } \\ & 33: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $75: 6,75: 26,$ | 15:18, 21:8, 59:5, | 159:1 | 7:14, 11:10, |
| 52:5, 53:9, | 33:11 <br> drew [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 27,76: 1, \\ & 78: 29,81: 28, \end{aligned}$ | 104:2, 110:25, | entering [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 22,86: 13, \\ & 174: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 144:22 | 129:26 | 82:4, 82:16, | $163: 26,164: 25$ | entire [3]-23:4, | examination [1] |
| Dr [120]-6:14, | drilled [1] - | 82:20, 83:4, | emanating [3] - | 41:12, 65:22 | - 144:19 |
| 7:11, 7:14, 7:20, | 150:26 | 83:13, 86:29, | 60:10, 60:25, | entirely [1] - | Examination [1] |
| 7:24, 8:1, 8:4, | drink [3] - 33:15, | 87:20, 88:22, | 61:15 | 163:1 | - 16:15 |
| 8:10, 8:13, 8:18, | 33:28, 33:29 | 89:15, 89:18, | eminently [1] - | entitled [1] - | examined [6] - |
| 9:3, 9:13, 10:18, | drinking [5] - | 89:20, 89:25, | 21:6 | $124: 1$ | 65:13, 144:5, |
| 11:11, 11:13, | 30:8, 30:9, 32:24, | 90:1, 90:4 | emotion [4] - | entrenched [1] - | 144:15, 144:22, |
| 11:14, 11:15, | 32:29, 33:27 | Dwyer's [1] - | $26: 18,31: 7,32: 9$ | $27: 2$ | 150:6 |
| 11:18, 11:20, $11: 27,12: 6,12.8$ | drinks [2] - <br> $31 \cdot 15$ <br> 23.7 | 89:2 | 39:28 | envelope [1] - | EXAMINED [2] - |
| 11:27, 12:6, 12:8, 12:9, 12:12 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 31: 15,33: 7 \\ \text { dropped }[1] ~-~ \end{array}$ | $E$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { emphasis [1] - } \\ & \text { 13:20 } \end{aligned}$ | ```96:5 environment [1]``` | $5: 7,6: 6$ <br> examining [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:10, 13:11, } \\ & \text { 13:13, 13:14 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 158:1 } \\ & \text { dropping }[1] \text { - } \\ & 99: 17 \end{aligned}$ | e-mail [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { emphasised }[1] \\ & -131: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $-14: 29$ <br> envisage [1] - | 106:24 <br> example [7] - |
| 13:16, 14:7, 14:8, | drugs [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:15, 124:19, } \\ & 161: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { employed [1] - } \\ & \text { 121:26 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 14:18 } \\ \text { equation }[1] \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 29,63: 14, \\ & 64: 20,86: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:13, 14:14 } \\ & \text { 14:15, 14:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $69: 28,70: 2$ | earliest [4] - | Employee [2] - | $10: 22$ | $98: 25,127: 25$ |
| $14: 25,14: 28$ | DUBLIN [1] - 3:8 <br> Dublin [2] - | 81:23, 156:9, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 176:12, 176:14 } \\ \text { employment [1] } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { equipment }[2] \text { - } \\ & 28: 5,127: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 166:3 <br> exceeded [1] - |
| $15: 1,15: 2,15: 3$ $15: 25,16: 4$ | $69: 26,76: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 157:10, 173:29 } \\ & \text { early }[7]-60: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $-25: 18$ | eroded [1] - | 158:29 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | due [10] - | 68:2, 99:16, | enable [2] - | 35:21 | exceedingly [1] |
| 18:25, 19:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:13, 107:17, } \\ & \text { 109:24, 114:28, } \end{aligned}$ | 112:20, 118:11, | $48: 14,159: 22$ | error [1] - 61:19 | $-35: 15$ |
| 19:21, 19:22, | 115:4, 124:29, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 124:29, 177:15 } \\ \text { earnestly [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $-38: 2$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { errors [5] - 22:2, } \\ 57: 29,58: 4,58: 8 \text {, } \end{array}$ | 106:18, 122:22, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:24, 19:27, } \\ & \text { 19:29, 20:1, } \end{aligned}$ | 157:22, 158:12, | earnestly [1] - 56:5 | enclosed [1] - | 58:25 | 123:3, 146:17 |
| $20: 13,20: 24$ | 163:4, 164:16 | ears [1] - 168:12 | 131:8 | especially [1] - | exception [6] - |
| 21:1, 21:2, 21:23, | [1] - 8:5 | effect [4] - | encouraged [2] | 32:15 | 16:23, 76:15, |
| 23:9, 23:12, | $6: 15,30: 17$ | 84:16, 114:19, | end [8] - 10:22 | establish [3] - <br> 77.20, 86:14 | 106:16, 106:17 |
| 23:14, 23:15, | $44: 14,49: 14$ | $152: 24,152: 26$ | $25: 19,40: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 20,86: 14, \\ & 164: 15 \end{aligned}$ | excess [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:21, 23:23, } \\ & \text { 24:7, 24:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 60:12, 84:11, $107: 25,109 \cdot 26$, | 7:13, 9:22, 10:6, | $40: 15,54: 6,57: 4$ | estimation [1] - | 31:15 |
| 24:16, 24:21, | 107:25, 109:26, $125: 4,129: 7$ | $28: 5$ | 167:7, 167:9 | 172:28 | excuse [10] - |
| 24:25, 24:29, | $130: 27,145: 1$ | effectively [1] - | $-123: 14$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { et }[6]-119: 6 \text {, } \\ 135: 2.142: 2 . \end{gathered}$ | $46: 6,59: 1,65: 5,$ |
| 26:13, 26:16, | 154:25, 161:9, | 43:9 | endeavouring | $\begin{aligned} & 135: 2,142: 2, \\ & 142: 7,177: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 95:6, 107:25, |
| 26:26, 26:27, 27:16, 27:18, | 161:15, 161:17, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { effort [2]-60:14, } \\ & \text { 171:7 } \end{aligned}$ | [1] - 87:25 | evaluation [1] - | 133:3, 163:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 27: 16,27: 18, \\ & 29: 10,32: 26, \end{aligned}$ | 162:8, 165:5, | efforts [4] - | ended [1] - | 144:6 | 176:4 |
| $33: 20,35: 24,$ | 165:10 duties | 76:27, 87:8, | 116:15 | event [2] - | exercise [1] - |
| 36:6, 40:4, 40:17, | $9: 21,31: 21$ | $87: 20,123: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { enforce [1] - } \\ & \text { 86:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $74: 21,110: 14$ | 19:26 <br> exonerated [2] - |


| 25:7, 32:17 | 85:22, 86:16 | 50:3, 50:5, 57:13, | fax ${ }_{[1]}$ - 107:15 | 155:20, 155:21, | 101:20, 163:17, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| expected [2] - | face [5] - 86:23, | $57: 20,58: 9,59: 3,$ | fear [6]-17: | 155:22, 172:15 | 163:20, 177:15 |
| expects [1] - | face-to-face ${ }^{[2]}$ - | 95:10, 95:21, | 95:2, 95:7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fergus [3] - } \\ 55: 9,56: 21, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { first [21]-27:16, } \\ \text { 43:19, 49:21, } \end{gathered}$ |
| 129:1 | 134:10, 134:20 | 97:26, 98:19 | feared [2] | 74:27 | 56:14, 61:21, |
| expedite [1] - | facilitate [2] | 98:21, 99:3, 99:6, | 71:24, 72:1 | Fernandez [12] - | 81:13, 83:2, |
| 82:29 | 82:9, 151:16 | 99:15, 99:18, | fears [1]-70:25 | 8:1, 15:25, 18:25, | 86:12, 86:14, |
| expeditiously | facilitated [2] | 99:27, 104:2 | feature | 142:13, 173:18, | 90:28, 113:21 |
| [1] - 81:22 | 26:7, 124:8 | 108:20, 109:8 | 140:16 | 173:21, 173:26 | 120:15, 129:1 |
| expense [1] | fact [28]-23:16, | 109:28, 110:16 | FEBRUARY ${ }^{3]}$ - | 174:4, 174:7, | 139:28, 140:9, |
| 165:29 | 25:3, 28:23, | 117:19, 152:28 | 4:8, 6:2, 178:8 | 174:16, 174:18, | 143:19, 146:4 |
| experience ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 52:25, 53:21, | 153:3, 159:23 | February [5] - | 174:26 | 147:16, 172:2 |
| 149:21 | 55:2, 56:10, 57:2, | fair [19]-27:29 | 6:15, 43:7, | Fernandez's [2] | 175 |
| experiencing ${ }_{[1]}$ | 64:7, 64:8, 64:29, | 59:11, 74:12, | 158:10, 158:13 | - 20:1, 173:22 | firstly ${ }^{[1]}$ - |
| - 17:25 | 67:7, 67:23, | 102:7, 105:10 | 160:27 | few [9]-6:12, | 102:25 |
| explain [6] | 78:18, 82:13 | 105:11, 106:14 | feedback [3] | 72:4, 78:4, 125:1, | fit [10]-19:3, |
| 84:5, 110:2, | 88:9, 89:16, | 106:15, 106:19 | 54:19, 105:17 | 136:4, 154:2, | 30:14, 30:17 |
| 111:21, 111:23, | 93:26, 95:14, | 106:20, 116:12 | 148:29 | 161:8, 161:9, | 30:18, 31:20 |
| 123:14, 142:14 | 100:7, 106:9 | 116:15, 120:19, | Feehan [21] - | 170:1 | 53:28, 102:13, |
| explained [3] - | 110:7, 112:28 | 129:4, 129:6, | 51:1, 54:26, 55:9, | fide [2]-63:10, | 115:1, 116:11, |
| 51:13, 51:14, | 123:3, 139:10, | 137:10, 137:28 | 56:18, 66:20, | 168:13 | 118:10 |
| 178:1 | 140:18, 159:15, | 161:20, 162:17 | 66:27, 74:26, | fierce [2] - | Fitzgibbon [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { explains }[1] \text { - } \\ & 115: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 163: 11 \\ \text { fact-find [2] } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fairly }[3]-10: 13, \\ & 33: 23,33: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $75: 1,79: 4,86: 27,$ <br> 106:29, 107:13 | $108: 10,115: 8$ $\text { figures }[5] \text { - }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 156:20 } \\ & \text { five }_{[3]}-33: 15 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |
| exploring ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 95:14, 140:18 | airness [6] | 107:23, 107:24 | 33:11, 33:13 | 70:1, 124:28 |
| 24:8 | fact-finding [2] - | 12:21, 34:29 | 107:25, 108:4, | 33:17, 33:23 | fixated [1] - 50:2 |
| exposed [1] - | 55:2, 93:26 | 37:22, 102:12 | 108:8, 108:16, | 33:26 | flag [2]-129:16, |
| $23: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { facts [2] - 45:4 } \\ & \text { 113:16 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 148:6, } 175: 3 \\ & \text { faith }[1]-154: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 113: 15,116: 29, \\ & 120: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { file }[13]-10: 3, \\ 52: 4,52: 11,54: 8, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:18 } \\ & \text { flatly }{ }_{[1]}-94: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| 132:15 | factual $[7]$ | faithful [1] - | Feehan's [3] | 119:4, 140:23, | flaw [1]-59:21 |
| expression [2] - | 12:26, 12:27, | 122:3 | 49:17, 49:20, | 140:27, 144:12, | flawed [2] - |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { 28:15, 157:4 } \\ \text { extend [1] - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:1, } 13: 2,13: 3 \\ & \text { failed }[5]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fall }[1]-165: 20 \\ & \text { fallen }[1]-38: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 81: 29 \\ \text { feel' }[1]-78: 15 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:22, 168:20, } \\ & 168: 24,168: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { 49:1, } 98: 26 \\ \text { flow [3] - } \end{array}$ |
| 162:24 | 48:21, 55:11, | familiarised [1] - | feelings [6] - | files [23]-22:8, | 109:11, 109:19, |
| extended [5] - | 119:1, 132:14 | 19:12 | 17:3, 26:23, | 48:23, 51:26, | 111:15 |
| 114:27, 115:3, | 140:29 | family [3] - 8:3, | 40:21, 49:11 | 52:24, 104:4, | flowing [1] - |
| 116:8, 118:4, | failing [7]-48:5, | 90:6, 92:10 | 141:29, 142:6 | 123:4, 138:2 | 136:12 |
| 118:22 | 59:13, 66:6, | family's [1] | fell [3]-136:18, | 138:3, 138:6, | flown [1] |
| extending [1] - | 141:24, 164:13, | 92:12 | 139:17, 140:22 | 138:8, 138:11, | 118:17 |
| $58: 26$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { 164:14, 169:14 } \\ \text { failure [41] - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { fanning }[1]- \\ 159: 6 \end{array}$ | fella [1] - 118:14 <br> felt [45]-8:26, | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 138:14, 138:15, } \\ \text { 138:20, 139:18, } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { focus [2] - } \\ 72: 19,117: 18 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { extensive [5] } \\ & \text { 10:19, 14:12, } \end{aligned}$ | 23:1, 49:27, 50:6, | Fanning | $\begin{array}{r} \text { fett }[45]-8: 2 \\ 14: 16,18: 14, \end{array}$ | 139:22, 139:25, | focusing [2] - |
| 38:16, 56:16, | 51:16, 56:7, | 162:7, 162:12 | 21:17, 27:5 | 162:9, 165:7, | 46:26, 46:27 |
| 62:20 | 58:11, 58:21, | $\boldsymbol{f a r}[18]-9: 1$, | 31:26, 34:16, | 165:29, 166:18, | followed [2] - |
| extensively ${ }_{[1]}$ - | $59: 7,59: 8,92: 21,$ | 14:14, 53:3, 56:1, | $41: 11,41: 14$ | 166:19, 166:20 | $78: 14,173: 13$ |
| 42:3 | 93:1, 93:5, 93:7, | 57:11, 57:28, | 56:5, 58:25, | files' [1] - 37:8 | following [24]- |
| extent ${ }^{[5]}$ - 14:1, | 94:13, 95:12, | 58:7, 59:8, 95:15, | 65:16, 78:12, | film [1]-127:2 | 9:14, 16:12, 20:1, |
| 56:2, 166:24, | 96:27, 97:29 | 104:15, 119:7, | 78:26, 79:16 | final [3]-47:6, | 22:29, 23:6, |
| 175:2, 176:11 | 98:16, 99:11, | 121:16, 128:7, | 80:11, 80:13, | 82:17, $88: 24$ | 23:15, 32:14 |
| extreme [1] - | 99:21, 99:23, | 128:9, 136:14, | 80:28, 81:4, 81:7, | finalise [1] - | 52:20, 62:17, |
| $124: 29$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 103:8, 103:17, } \\ \text { 103:21, 103:26, } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:22, 157:9, } \\ & \text { 158:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 81:10, 84:11, } \\ \text { 84:17, 84:23, } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 48: 2 \\ \text { finalised [2] - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { 64:15, 69:19, } \\ \text { 71:6, 97:4, 99:20, } \end{array}$ |
| $27: 4,35: 20,$ | 104:3, 104:12, | faster [1] - 79:23 | 101:5, 105:29, | $25: 6,48: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 6,97: 4,99: 2 \\ & 105: 16,111: 29 \end{aligned}$ |
| 36:11 | 122:23, 138:28, | Fatal [2]-65:29, | 108:11, 109:14, | financial [2] | 112:13, 119:28, |
| eye [1] - 21:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:5, 139:9, } \\ & \text { 139:10, 139:26, } \end{aligned}$ | 66:8 fathom [1]-7:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:12, 115:9, } \\ & \text { 115:13, 115:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 23: 27,25: 20 \\ \text { financially }{ }_{[1]}- \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:5, 122:6, } \\ & \text { 145:5, 147:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| F | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:3, 140:5, } \\ & \text { 140:9, 140:11, } \end{aligned}$ | fault [6]-47:29, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:25, 115:27, } \\ & \text { 118:3, 118:20, } \end{aligned}$ | 24:17 | $148: 17$ <br> FOLLOWS |
| fabrication [2] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { 140:28, 141:1 } \\ \text { failures [28] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 59:16, 84:2, } \\ & 103: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:26, 119:28, } \\ & \text { 127:22, 139:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { finish }[6] \text { - } \\ 90: 17,100: 15, \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { 6:1, 6:7, 101:25 } \\ \text { follows.. [1] - } \end{array}$ |



| - 16:9, 65:17, | helped [1] - | hoped [1] - | 125:8, 143:19, | 169:20 | incredible [1] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 65:25, 65:28, | 60:17 | 24:11 | 143:21, 144:2, | impart [2] - | 95:11 |
| 66:1, 66:5, | helpful [1] - | hopeful [2] - | 144:8, 144:10, | 92:15, 92:29 | indeed [18] - |
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| 16:27, 17:7, 32:7, | on | 112:24, 119:13, | 126:6, 126:12, | 34:6, 38:12, | 46:2, 46:19, |
| 33:20, 35:25, | procurement [2] - | 124:27, 139:27, | 127:6, 132:26, | 45:15, 51:4, | 102:6, 124:24, |
| 36:7, 40:29, | 166:18, 166:19 | 143:3, 143:17, | 142:22, 167:28, | 57:13, 94:12, | 124:25 |
| 42:15, 43:1 | none [3]-46:10, | 143:18, 152:17, | 168:3, 171:12, | 108:20, 130:26 | offering [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 45: 11,47: 6 \\ & 60: 29,88: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 48:26, 80:22 | 157:20, 157:21, | 171:14, 173:25, | obviously [17] - | $34: 14,63: 7$ |
| 89:20, 91:8, | $\begin{gathered} \text { normal [2] - } \\ 31: 27,50: 4 \end{gathered}$ | 157:22 | 177:1, 177:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:23, 11:14, } \\ & 11: 18,12: 26 \end{aligned}$ | 63:11 |
| 102:16, 111:16, | normally [1] - | 29:23, 30:9, 33:2, | 177:27, 178:5 | 15:3, 26:28, | 160:16 |
| 122:6, 147:4, | 28:27 | 42:17, 42:19, | O'Higgins' [1] - | 46:15, 101:19, | office [22] - |
| 148:7, 154:15 nice [1] - 74:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { north [2]-69:25, } \\ & 76: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:1, 43:4, 43:8, } \\ & 47: 7,47: 20, \end{aligned}$ | 111:13 <br> O'Sullivan [12] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:22, 116:6, } \\ & \text { 117:27, 119:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:24, 26:8, 28:5, } \\ & 67: 3,67: 26, \end{aligned}$ |
| night [4]-6:10, | orth | 67:28, 88:10, | 51:9, 51:11, | 136:11, 152:29, | 74:22, 75:22, |
| 33:29, 99:19, | 91:16, 156:16 | 89:17, 92:1, | 52:21, 53:6, | 157:14, 161:23, | 75:29, 90:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:21 } \\ & \text { nightmares }[2] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | note [21] - 20:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:23, 136:23, } \\ & \text { 139:4, 139:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 71:17, 93:7, } \\ & 93: 11,93: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 174:23 occasio | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 29,113: 8, \\ & \text { 113:28, 127:1 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 17:3, 17:25 | $91: 5,91: 9,96: 3$ | 144:19, 158:20, | 94:13, 95:16, | 44:23, 75:18, | 127:14, 134:3, |
| nights [1] - | 110:10, 110:18, | 161:8, 161:10, | 100:1, 150:12 | 93:9, 105:16, | 134:9, 135:3, |
| 33:16 | 110:24, 111:24, | 161:11, 161:14, | O'Toole [3] - | 113:19, 122:23, | 143:23, 156:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { nighttime [1] - } \\ & \text { 30:11 } \end{aligned}$ | 112:3, 112:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:24, 170:6, } \\ & \text { 174:22, 174:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $76: 3,76: 5,77: 21$ | $148: 23,172: 18$ | 158:23, 159:20, |
| nobody [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:22, 112:25, } \\ & \text { 112:27, 113:7, } \end{aligned}$ | numbered [3] - | $41: 28$ | $8: 2,8: 5,16: 18$ | Officer [2] - |
| 99:9 nobody's [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 120: 4,131: 4 \\ & 136: 9,152: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 42:18, 92:7, 97:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { objected [1] - } \\ & \text { 172:4 } \end{aligned}$ | 17:26, 61:9, | $112: 19,160: 25$ |
| 45:3 | noted [5] - | 61:9, 101:10 | objecting [1] - | 133:9, 166:21 | 7:13, 9:23, 10:7, |
| Noel [8] - 57:15, | 12:21, 30:8, 98:3, | NYHAN [1] - $3: 5$ | 81:29 | occupation [1] - | 21:6, 25:29, |
| 59:23, 61:2, | 106:29, 153:19 | Nyhan [13] - | objective [1] - | 127:24 | 58:27, 58:29, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:20, 61:28, } \\ & \text { 63:29, 64:1. } \end{aligned}$ | notes [17] - 69:6, | $68: 25,71: 6,$ | $37: 25$ | occupied [2] - <br> 177:16, 177:17 | 59:1, 62:15, |
| 64:26 | $72: 16,73: 7,73: 9$ $73: 21,73: 23$ | 73:11, 144:8, | $112: 27$ | 177:16, 177: | 68:29, 97:17 |
| nominated [1] - | 73:24, 75:16, | 144:10, 144:19, | obligations [2] - | 142:26 | 108:7, 110:8 |
| 8:23 | 91:3, 91:7, 96:7, | 144:24, 145:15, | 108:5, 112:18 | occurred [3] - | officers [8] - |
| Non [2] - 65:29, | 98:14, 129:26, | 150:13, 155:15, | obliged [2] - | 24:28, 130:17, | 56:10, 56:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 66:8 } \\ & \text { non [19] - 9:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 130:16, 130:25, } \\ & 131: 17,137: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 155:27 } \\ & \mathbf{N I ́}_{[1]}-3: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 123: 18,171: 6 \\ \text { obsessed [3] } \end{gathered}$ | 130:28 | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 28,67: 10, \\ & 67: 18,73: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| 14:11, 15:13, | nothing [3] - |  | 15:10, 15:12, | - 159:4 | $103: 20,150: 27$ |
| 21:10, 21:25, | 76:28, 95:24, | 0 | 49:23 | October [19] - | offices [2] - |
| 24:4, 37:3, 38:18, | $95: 25$ |  | obsession [1] - | $13: 4,15: 5,16: 19$ | $60: 11,68: 20$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 95:6, 95:7, } \\ & \text { 123:22, 136:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { notice }[3]-4: 19 \\ 144: 29,148: 10 \end{gathered}$ |  | $27: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 11,39: 5 \\ & 40: 19,40: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { official [3]- } \\ & \text { 118:18. 118:25. } \end{aligned}$ |
| 138:26, 139:5, | NOTICE [1] - 4:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 56:24, 78:29 } \\ & \text { O'Donnell [4] - } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |




| 24:18, 32:15, | promotion [1] - | 77:21, 82:9, | 73:25, 128:23 | quite [16]-16:3, | 76:12, 146:9, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32:19, 40:6, | 155:4 | 109:24, 123:8, | PURSUANT [1] - | 17:14, 33:1, | 168:13 |
| 41:12, 46:14, | prompt [2] - | 129:13, 159:10, | 4:7 | 38:12, 39:15, | read [25] - 10:3, |
| 54:24, 54:29, | 98:11, 118:14 | 160:4 | pursue [3] - | $78: 15,86: 5$ | 10:21, 22:23, |
| 55:15, 56:6, | promptly [1] - | providing [5] - | 12:7, 41:15, 42:7 | 94:29, 100:25, | 32:1, 34:29, |
| 56:12, 58:14, | 78:13 | 51:15, 52:1, 53:1, | pursuing [3] - | 117:21, 137:8, | 37:22, 66:2, |
| 64:12, 64:19, | proper [12] - | 54:2, 89:21 | 13:29, 23:8, | 154:2, 161:25, | 73:24, 73:28, |
| 65:15, 65:17, | 22:12, 28:1, | provisionally [1] | 48:17 | 164:20, 167:18, | 77:28, 78:22, |
| 65:22, 67:27, | 28:10, 32:1, | - 159:21 | push [1] - | 167:27 | 85:15, 96:23, |
| 78:5, 78:10, | 37:11, 48:10, | psychiatric [4] - | 147:23 | quiz [1] - 40:24 | 96:29, 97:13, |
| 94:28, 97:29, | 53:28, 54:1, | 11:21, 12:14, | put [14]-7:9, | quotations [3] - | 98:17, 98:24, |
| 105:18, 105:19, | 81:13, 104:4, | 172:29, 175:5 | 18:28, 29:5, | 29:16, 36:14, | 112:6, 122:9, |
| 115:10, 115:25, | 104:5, 171:20 | psychiatrist [32] | 53:19, 63:7, 66:2, | 37:14 | 130:23, 137:27, |
| 115:26, 116:4, | properly [11] - | -7:11, 7:20, 7:22, | 69:29, 86:22, |  | 163:2, 163:6, |
| 117:7, 119:28, | 23:21, 36:1, | 8:7, 8:21, 8:23, | 89:6, 90:2, | R | 163:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:16, 133:1 } \\ & 135: 2,136: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 11,37: 24, \\ & 39: 2,48: 21,6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 25,8: 27,9: 1, \\ & 9: 7,9: 8,9: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:28, 126:24, } \\ & 142: 7,144: 28 \end{aligned}$ |  | 57:11, 122:13, |
| 136:26, 138:29, | 67:4, 67:26, | 9:13, 9:25, 13:8, | puts [2]-36:14, | $\begin{gathered} \text { races }[2] \text { - } \\ 30: 16,30: 17 \end{gathered}$ | 149:23, 162:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 139:6, 139:12, } \\ & \text { 140:16, 140:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 165:6, 171:22 } \\ \text { property [1] - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:4, 16:10, } \\ & \text { 16:11, 18:17 } \end{aligned}$ | $37: 13$ <br> putting [5] - | 30:16, 30:17 racing [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 175:29 } \\ & \text { reads [3] - 43:4, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 140:21, 140:24, | 64:18 | 21:23, 26:14, | 15:16, 46:11, | 16:29 | $46: 17,97: 5$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:20, 169:27, } \\ & \text { 170:12, 170:25, } \end{aligned}$ | proposed [3] - | $36: 6,44: 7,48: 1$ <br> 171:9, 171:12 | 52:16, 87:12, | raise [1] - 52:23 raised [21] - | $\text { ready }[1]-177: 7$ |
| 170:12, 170:25, 171:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 9,90: 5, \\ & 107: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 171:9, 171:12, } \\ & \text { 172:5, 172:19, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 22:25, 39:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { realise [1] - } \\ & \text { 154:5 } \end{aligned}$ |
| processed [1] - | propriety [1] - | 173:1, 173:7, | Q | $\begin{aligned} & 64: 6,82: 25, \\ & 91: 19,91: 26, \end{aligned}$ | realised [1] - |
| processes [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:8 } \\ & \text { prospect [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 173:11, 173:12 <br> Psychiatrist ${ }^{[1]}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:9 } \\ & \text { realistic }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
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| $\begin{array}{r} \text { 124:9, 126:21 } \\ \text { procure [1] - } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 22,94: 24, \\ & \text { 119:21, 119:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -21: 4,171: 17 \\ & \text { psychological } \end{aligned}$ | $28: 29,80: 17$ | 119:3, 122:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 7,20: 4,25: 16 \\ & 25: 25,27: 8,57: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| $165: 7$ | protected [16] - | $[2]-43: 8,167: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 28,84: 10 \\ & 93: 10,101: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:7, 129:8, } \\ & \text { 134:14, 134:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 73:22, 86:5, |
| procurement [2] | $96: 14,128: 13,$ | psychosis [1] - | 93:10, 101:3 QUAY [1] - 3:7 | 134:14, 134:16, 147:10 | 103:10, 104:14, |
| $\begin{gathered} -166: 18,166: 19 \\ \text { produce }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:29, 152:7, } \\ & \text { 152:14, 152:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $35: 4$ <br> psychotherapy | QUAY [1] - 3:7 queried [1] - | 147:10 <br> Raised [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:13, 106:14, } \\ & \text { 123:16, 126:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:17 } \\ & \text { produced [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:7, 153:10, } \\ & \text { 153:12, 153:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[11]-18: 7,18: 11,} \\ & \text { 18:12, 18:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $24: 17$ <br> questions [6] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91:25 } \\ & \text { raising [6] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 127:27, 162:15, } \\ & \text { 163:29, 164:2, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 94:27, 133:20 } \\ \text { product [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:24, 153:26, } \\ & \text { 153:28, 154:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:11, 19:18, } \\ & \text { 19:24, 20:12, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:19, 86:27, } \\ & 98: 3,98: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:7, 119:17, } \\ & \text { 131:29, 132:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $164: 20$ <br> reason [19] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:7 } \\ & \text { professional }[6] \end{aligned}$ | $154: 3,164: 12$ protection [1] - | $21: 3,172: 12$ psychotropic | 102:24, 109:2 quickly [6] - | $\begin{aligned} & 133: 8,134: 18 \\ & \text { rang }[9]-70: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:10, 22:19, } \\ & 41: 5,43: 29,63: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & -8: 16,14: 4, \\ & 50: 27.121: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $140: 12$ | [4] - 8:4, 19:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 19,34: 6 \\ & 45: 15,120: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 23,97: 18, \\ & 98: 24,108: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $63: 13,82: 10$ <br> 88:7, 89.15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 50: 27,121: 29 \\ & 137: 4,166: 26 \end{aligned}$ | protections [1] - 94:26 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 20:11, 172:14 } \\ \text { PTSD }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | 173:21, 174:17 | 108:7, 113:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88:7, 89:15, } \\ & \text { 93:20, 103:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| professionally | protracted [4] - | $168: 17$ | Quigley [31] 7:24 11:13 | $113: 28,114: 4$ <br> range [1] - | 106:23, 108:6, |
| $\text { [2] }-51: 2,156: 15$ professionals | 31:5, 65:28, 80:28. 81:9 | public [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 24,11: 13, \\ & \text { 11:14, 11:18, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { range [1] - } \\ & 174: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 110: 1,138: 23 \\ & 138: 25,139: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\text { [2] }-49: 28,177: 23$ | $\begin{gathered} 80: 28,81: 9 \\ \text { provide } \end{gathered}$ | 76:14 pull | 11:27, 12:6, 12:8, | rank [4] - 69:20, | 138:25, 139:4, 141:7, 141:11 |
| profound [1] - | $25: 17,51: 8$ | pulling [1] - | 12:9, 12:12, | 77:3, 77:24, | reasonable [5] - |
| $17: 4$ | $52: 12,53: 13$ | $165: 26$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:10, 13:14, } \\ & \text { 14:8, } 14: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:15 } \\ & \text { rant }[1]-71: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 24:1, 86:9, |
| progress [1] - | 53:16, 54:6, | Pulse [4] - | 14:8, 14:14, 14:15, 14:25, | rate [5] - 16:25, | 162:18, 169:10, |
| 107:9 | 82:21, 88:12, | 144:23, 145:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:15, 14:25, } \\ & \text { 15:2, 15:3, 21:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rate }[5]-16: 25, \\ & 23: 28,57: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 170:29 } \\ & \text { reasonably }[4] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| Progress [1] - $42: 16$ | $143: 9,166: 1$ | 150:6, 150:16 purpose [10] | 23:21, 24:21, | $63: 3,159: 17$ | reasonably $[4]-$ $9: 6,23: 21,30: 17, ~$ |
| progressed [1] - | provided [17] - | 7:27, 9:3, 11:19, | $24: 25,24: 29$ | rather [4] - | $30: 18$ |
| 24:19 | 17:19, 38:16, | 92:28, 107:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:18, 43:7, } \\ & \text { 159:11, 159:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 81:17, 130:18, } \\ & 159: 16,171: 2 \end{aligned}$ | reasons [12] - |
| progressing [2] | $56: 5,56: 23$, $57 \cdot 12,58 \cdot 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:22, 134:17, } \\ & \text { 137:22. 158:28 } \end{aligned}$ | 171:8, 171:17, | reach [1] - 55:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 20,10: 20 \\ & \text { 123:24, 125:27, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} -24: 11,171: 15 \\ \text { prohibited [1] }- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 12,58: 22, \\ & 62: 20,62: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:22, 158:28, } \\ & 159: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 172:18, 172:24 | reached [6] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:24, 125:27, } \\ & \text { 138:26, 139:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $4: 15$ | $64: 9,65: 14$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quigley's [1] - } \\ & \text { 23:9 } \end{aligned}$ | 55:21, 69:1, | 139:22, 141:26, |





| 145:29, 158:29, | sleeping [3] - | 58:6, 58:9, 58:29, | 11:20, 19:16, | 72:9 | 92:10, 133:29, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 165:3, 165:6, | 17:3, 17:25, | 61:21, 62:29, | 19:28, 24:15, | stands [2] - | 150:13, 151:29, |
| 166:20 | 17:26 | 68:6, 68:25, | 27:13, 30:25, | 90:8, 126:7 | 152:1, 152:14, |
| side [4] - 82:24, | slightly [2] - | 70:21, 70:29, | 37:19, 44:3, 44:6, | Star [2]-74:7, | 153:10, 153:11, |
| 118:23, 124:3, | 39:7, 83:20 | 71:2, 75:6, 75:10, | 45:3, 45:4, 47:20, | 78:18 | 162:28 |
| 176:20 | slights [1] - | $75: 12,75: 15$ | 175:6 | start [5] - 27:15, | stating [3] - |
| sided [2] - | 48:26 | 75:24, 79:12, | specialists [1] - | 39:21, 39:22, | 65:12, 82:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:2, } 133: 4 \\ & \text { sight }[2]-10: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { slithering [1] - } \\ & 80: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 17,83: 28, \\ & 87: 9,91: 14, \end{aligned}$ | 174:23 specialty [1] - | $\begin{gathered} 54: 25,90: 17 \\ \text { started }[2]- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 82:21 } \\ & \text { station }[11]- \end{aligned}$ |
| 15:4 | slow [2] - 79:17, | $94: 15,95: 27,$ | 175:6 | 25:4, 124:27 | 17:11, 27:25, |
| $\operatorname{sign}[1]-74: 2$ signed [1] - | 79:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 19,100: 3 \\ & 100: 9,106: 13 \end{aligned}$ | specific [5] - | starts [1] - 59:27 | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 11,72: 9 \\ & 91: 20,91: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| 97:16 | so.. [1] - 161:24 | 107:7, 108:24, | 60:25, 67:16, | $45: 12,84: 26$ | 105:12, 127:8, |
| significant [2] - | social [1] - 39:11 | 110:21, 110:29, | 128:29 | 85:11, 86:7, | 127:10, 144:29, |
| 22:27, 98:13 | solace [2]-25:2, | 115:29, 116:8, | specifically [6] - | 86:12, 105:7, | 157:15 |
| similar | 25:6 | 116:25, 117:5 | 101:12, 141:13 | 172:2 | Station [15] - |
| 26:26, 78:22, | solicitor [37] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 117:6, 117:12, } \\ & \text { 118:29, 125:28, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 157: 24,162: 8, \\ & 165: 1,176: 16 \end{aligned}$ | state [9]-25:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:23, 27:12, } \\ & \text { 28:17, 30:28, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 8:8, 8:10, 8:13, | 130:9, 131:2, | 165:1, 176:16 | 34: | 44:12, 44:24, |
| simple [2] - | 68:21, 69:17, | 132:23, 134:7, | $160: 17$ | 152:7, 153:23, | 68:26, 71:24, |
| 139:13, 140:21 | 71:1, 71:3, 71:26, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 135:11, 138:9, } \\ & \text { 139:15, 139:16 } \end{aligned}$ | spectrum [2] - | $153: 25,154: 14$ | 107:13, 128:28, |
| simply [2] - $86.8,166 \cdot 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 15,75: 8,76: 7, \\ & 77: 13,77: 15 . \end{aligned}$ | 141:7, 143:10, | 167:7, 167:9 speedily [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { state.. [1] - } \\ & 153: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $155: 4,158: 16$ |
| 86:8, 166:5 <br> sincere [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 13,77: 15, \\ & 82: 10,82: 19, \end{aligned}$ | 145:11, 145:22, | $12: 18$ | statement [69] - | 158:24 |
| $137: 19$ | 83:6, 83:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:12, 151:26, } \\ & \text { 163:29, 167:23, } \end{aligned}$ | spoken [4] - | $51: 8,51: 11$ | stationed [3] - |
| singling [1] - | 83:22, 84:4, | 171:10, 174:6, | 69:2, 124:24, 139:26, 150:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 15,52: 2 \\ & 52: 10,52: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 143:17, 152:16, } \\ & \text { 152:20 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 142:8 } \\ & \text { sit [1] }-53: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 27,89: 29, \\ & \text { 107:16, 107:26, } \end{aligned}$ | 175:18, 176:6, | 139:26, 150:4 spring [2] - 15:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 52: 10,52: 12, \\ & 52: 15,52: 26, \end{aligned}$ | status [2] - |
| site [2] - 146:19, | 112:14, 113:6, | 177:9 | 41:1 | 53:1, 53:6, 53:10, | 120:17, 121:1 |
| $151: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & 130: 4,131: 4 \\ & \text { 132:18, 159:12 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sort [6]-40:24, } \\ & 45: 25,46: 24, \end{aligned}$ | spurning [2] - $20: 7.172: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 15,53: 20, \\ & 53: 22.53: 25 \end{aligned}$ | stay [1] - 172:16 |
| sitting [3] - |  | $46: 27,83: 25$ | 20:7, 172:13 | 53:22, 53:25, <br> $53 \cdot 27,54 \cdot 2,54 \cdot 7$ | $172: 3$ |
| $153: 2$ | 173:28, 173:29, | $103: 17$ | 143:15, 154:29 | 54:8, 54:10, 65:6, | step [6] - 13:10, |
| situation [28] - | 174:10 | sorted [1] - 22:7 | St [2]-172:20, | $66: 2,66: 17,75: 2$ | 14:3, 21:24, |
| 11:3, 18:16, 20:9, | solicitor's [1] - | sought [13] - <br> 14:16, 24:7, 42:1 | $172: 22$ | $75: 15,75: 26$ | $23: 11,139: 24$ |
| 21:13, 21:18, | 75:22 | 14:16, 24:7, 42:1, | staff [10] - 26:8, | $76: 9,81: 18$ | $170: 18$ |
| 26:3, 27:5, 29:20, | Solicitors [1] - | 42:11, 42:12, | 28:3, 28:4, 28:18, | 81:22, 82:8, | stepping [1] - |
| 32:14, 38:19, | 88:23 | 53:6, 99:29, <br> 100:6, 100:12 | $29: 1,30: 28$ | 82:18, 82:22, | 119:21 |
| 38:25, 39:2, | SOLICITORS ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ | 100:13, 100:14, | 61:10, 122:27, $157.28 \quad 176.17$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 8,84: 13 \\ & 84: 17,87: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { steps [2] - } \\ 86: 28,171: 15 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 49: 11,83: 20 \\ & \text { 100:26, 106:4, } \end{aligned}$ | solo [1] - 10:28 | $150: 22,173: 8$ | 157:28, 176:12 <br> Staff [1] - 28:2 | $88: 14,88: 25$ | 86:28, 171:15 sticking [1] - |
| 114:11, 123:23, | something- | sounded [3] - | stage [3] - | 88:29, 89:3, | 92:28 |
| 123:27, 129:22, | something [1] - | 116:12, 116:15, | 127:29, 147:12, | 90:19, 90:21, | still [9]-31:13, |
| 137:8, 150:6, | 126:4 | 137:19 source [14] - | $160: 22$ | $90: 24,100: 2,$ <br> 100.10, 122•11 | 31:14, 31:15, |
| $165: 9,167: 1$, $167: 9,173: 6$ | sometimes [1] - | $33: 23,33: 25,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stage.. [1] - } \\ & \text { - } 14: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 125:14, 129:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 13,35: 15, \\ & 47: 24,92: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 167: 9,173: 6 \\ & 175: 14,177: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 32:11 | 60:26, 69:20, | 114:25 | 129:6, 133:26, | $93: 25,123: 3$ |
| situations [1] - | 136:23 | 69:23, 69:25, | $22: 21,60: 19$ | 133:28, 134:2, | stood [1] - 39:3 |
| $92: 12$ | soon [2] - 42:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:28, 70:10, } \\ & 70: 13,76: 25, \end{aligned}$ | stairs [1] - 168:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:10, 143:12, } \\ & \text { 146:11, 148:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stop [2] - } \\ & 104: 21,141: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| six [1] - 33:15 skewed [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 164:27 } \\ & \text { sorry [84] - } 6: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 77:14, 84:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stalled [1] - } \\ & 176: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 151:2, 151:20, | store [1] - 28:5 |
| 86:5 | 11:27, 12:29, | $\begin{gathered} 85: 13,87: 18 \\ \text { speaking [3] } \end{gathered}$ | stamp [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:22, 151:24, } \\ & \text { 151:28, 153:9, } \end{aligned}$ | Store [2] - |
| skills [1] - | $13: 14,14: 13$, $18.8,18.9,18 \cdot 19$ | $38: 21,102: 2,$ | 91:17 | 153:23, 153:29, | 107:13, 107:16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 124:26 } \\ & \text { skimmed }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:8, 18:9, 18:19, } \\ & \text { 23:17, 28:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $163: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stand }[3]-84: 8 \text {, } \\ & 95: 1,117: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 154:13, 162:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { storeroom [5] - } \\ & \text { 27:25, 28:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10:21 | 28:29, 33:12, | Special [4] - | stand-out [1] - | $165: 21,166: 6$ | $127: 13,127: 17$ |
| slant [1] - 77:27 | 38:22, 41:9, | $143: 14,14$ | 117:21 | statements [4] - | storm [1]-21:14 |
| slate" [1] - 157:5 | 41:19, 44:5, 46:6, | 154:17, 154:28 | standard [1] - | 53:26, 68:27, | straightforwar |
| sleep [2] - 29:13, | 50:13, 52:3, 55:7, | special [1]-29:3 | 167:1 | $90: 21,162: 14$ | d [3] - 9:6, 40:26, |
| 31:14 | 58:1, 58:3, 58:5, | specialist [13] - | standing [1] - | states [9] - | 167:5 |


| strategy [6] - | 87:28, 89:8, | suit [1] - 64:22 | 74:26, 75:1, | support [9] - | 170:2, 170:5, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 46:27, 46:28, | 96:17, 96:20, | suitable [2] - | 78:29, 79:3, 79:4, | 18:7, 21:6, 24:23, | 170:22 |
| 46:29, 47:11, | 98:17, 130:3, | 88:13, 89:21 | 82:16, 82:20, | 67:22, 67:23, | systems [26] - |
| 47:12, 47:14 | 145:22, 156:11, | suits [1]-64:21 | 83:4, 83:13, | 71:11, 129:4, | 23:1, 50:5, 51:16, |
| Street [4] - | 159:15 | summary [4] - | 86:27, 88:22, | 131:17, 143:9 | 58:9, 58:11, 59:7, |
| 68:21, 107:13, | substance [2] - | 6:25, 16:7, 27:29, | 89:2, 89:15, | supported [1] - | 59:8, 92:21, 93:5, |
| 107:16, 156:20 | 71:11, 118:23 | 35:25 | 89:18, 89:20, | 57:19 | 96:27, 98:16, |
| stress [14] - | substantially [1] | summation [1] - | 89:25, 90:1, 90:4, | supportive [2] - | 99:11, 99:21, |
| 103:18, 103:27, | - 36:4 | 17:21 | 90:26, 90:27, | 18:11, 19:10 | 103:20, 104:11, |
| 107:18, 114:28, | substantive [1] - | summer [1] - | 91:10, 91:16, | suppose [2] - | 122:23, 138:28, |
| 115:4, 121:25, | $67: 24$ | 158:26 | 92:19, 93:15, | 63:4, 162:11 | 139:5, 139:9, |
| 124:3, 137:2, | substitute [1] - | summoned [4] - | 93:24, 93:29, | surely [1] - 53:9 | 139:10, 139:25, |
| 137:5, 164:14, | 51:29 | 95:3, 95:9, | 94:25, 95:14, | surfaced [1] - | 140:3, 140:5, |
| 164:15, 172:27, | Suffered [1] - | 119:11, 119:13 | 95:29, 96:16, | 10:24 | 140:9, 140:11, |
| 172:29, 173:3 | 29:8 | summoning [1] | 97:2, 97:23, | surrounding [7] | 153:3 |
| Stress [1] - | suffered [1] - | - 95:7 | 99:13, 100:17, | - 131:26, 144:18, | Séan [10] - |
| 11:22 | 121:24 | Sun [13] - 68:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 101:13, 102:3, } \\ & \text { 102:5, 102:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:23, 144:26, } \\ & \text { 146:25, 148:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 74: 21,75: 28, \\ & 88: 22,88: 27, \end{aligned}$ |
| 173:3 | suffering [4] | 68:13, 68:19 | 103:9, 104:14 | 153:28 | 89:29, 112:14, |
| strictest [1] - | 24:17, 168:18 | 69:16, 85:3, 85:4, | 104:23, 105:12, | suspect [4] - | 113:8, 131:7, |
| 154:19 | suffers [1] - | 85:10, 85:23, | 106:29, 107:13, | $4: 13,51: 20$ | $137: 20,173: 13$ |
| strike [1] - | 31:13 | $85: 25,120: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:22, 107:24, } \\ & \text { 107:25, 108:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $51: 21,101: 1$ | Síochána [30] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 106:25 } \\ & \text { striking }{ }_{[1]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { sufficient }[5] \\ 54: 24,55: 24 \end{gathered}$ | $147: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 107:25, 108:4, } \\ & \text { 108:8, 108:16, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Suspects [1] - } \\ & 126: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 15,27: 24 \\ & 30: 21,30: 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| 99:27 | 142:9, 142:11, | 29:6, 100:27 | 109:23, 113:15, | suspects [1] - | 35:15, 36:29, |
| strings [1] - | 142:15 | Sundays [1] - | 116:29, 119:1, | 73:28 | 42:9, 42:14, |
| $165: 26$ | suggest [12] - | $125: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 120: 3,120: 16 \\ & 123: 13,124: 16 \end{aligned}$ | Sweeney [5] - | 53:23, 53:25, <br> 59:6, 64:5, 73.27 |
| strong [1] - | 7:8, 18:22, 20:13, | superintendent |  | 75:10, 75:14, | $77 \cdot 26,78 \cdot 8,79: 8$ |
| 156:2 strongly [2] | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 18,48: 13 \\ & 48: 14,48: 24 \end{aligned}$ | [29] - 25:16, | 128:29, 129:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 20,79: 1, \\ & 83: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 80:1, 84:20, |
| 137:9, 176:9 | 49:22, 63:14, | 58:29, 59:13, | 129:23, 130:2, | Swords [13] - | 84:25, 85:16, |
| struck [1] - | 86:19, 106:14, | 63:21, 65:4, | 130:7, 131:9, | 8:2, 44:23, 68:26, | 93:18, 94:23, |
| 83:29 | $133: 17$ | $77: 24,83: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:11, 131:14, } \\ & \text { 131:24, 132:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 71:24, 91:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:1, 108:5, } \\ & \text { 110:3, 150:17. } \end{aligned}$ |
| stuff [3]-28:7, | suggested [8] - | 85:2, 99:14, $100 \cdot 24,102 \cdot 26$, | 133:10, 133:20, | 91:22, 93:15, $100: 22,121: 27$ | 159:24, 159: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 134:28, 134:29 } \\ \text { subject [10] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 21,21: 23, \\ & \text { 130:22, 146:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100:24, 102:26, } \\ & \text { 112:29, 117:24, } \end{aligned}$ | 135:9, 136:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100:22, 121:27, } \\ & \text { 144:11, 155:4, } \end{aligned}$ | 166:11, 169:16 |
| 54:28, 75:3, | 174:5, 174:6, | 119:13, 120:11, | 140:22, 141:6, | $156: 13,158: 16$ | Síochána" [1] - |
| 84:19, 90:17, | 174:10, 174:15 | 121:19, 123:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:24, 142:11, } \\ & \text { 142:17, 143:8, } \end{aligned}$ | symptom [1] - | 36:9 |
| 93:19, 106:8, $121: 7,132: 7$, | suggesting [26] $-11: 26,12: 27$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:12, 129:9, } \\ & \text { 130:20, 130:29, } \end{aligned}$ | 144:1, 144:27, | 39:25 <br> symptoms [3] | T |
| subject-matter | $20: 6,22: 10$ | 134:22, 137:24, | 149:6, 149:16, | 38:25 |  |
| [2] - 75:3, 106:8 | 22:21, 25:26, | 160:13 | 150:5, 155:8, 155:12, 155:1 | Symptoms [1] - | 70:17 |
| subjected [3] - | 28:10, 35:25, | Superintenden | 155:24, 155:26, | 29:8 | tackle [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 32: 18,38: 27, \\ & 164: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 23,48: 28, \\ & 49: 13,67: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{t}[136]-25: 21, \\ & 26: 10,44: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 156:2, 162:5, | system [39] - <br> 22:2, 50:2, 50 | 143:26 |
| subjects [1] - | $67: 21,74: 12$ | 44:29, 49:17, | 162:12, 162:17, | 57:20, 57:29, | tactical [1] - |
| 178:3 | 76:26, 82:15, | 49:20, 51:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:27, 163:12, } \\ & \text { 164:10, 164:11 } \end{aligned}$ | $58: 4,58: 8,58: 21,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:25 } \\ & \text { TAKE }_{[1]}-4: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| submit [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 11,96: 8, \\ & 97: 25,101: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 52:22, 52:28, | superintendent | $58: 25,59: 3,93: 1$ | Tanaiste [2] - |
| 53:27, 159:22 <br> submitted [9] - | 105:22, 161:25, | $54: 3,54: 26,55: 9$ | 's [6] - 59:15, | 93:7, 94:3, 94:9 94:13, 95:4, | $94: 20,119: 20$ |
| 10:29, 16:1, | 162:19, 175:29 | $56: 18,56: 24,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:22, 143:23, } \\ & \text { 158:23. 159:20 } \end{aligned}$ | 95:10, 95:11, | $\operatorname{tap}[1]-171: 28$ |
| 16:11, 52:24, | suggestion [5] - | 57:15, 57:24, | $160: 27$ | 95:21, 97:26, | $16: 8,63: 27,67: 5,$ |
| 73:4, 104:29, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:15, 52:19, } \\ & 73: 20,134: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 7,58: 27,61: 2, \\ & 61: 6,61: 8,61: 11, \end{aligned}$ | superiors [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97:28, 98:18, } \\ & 98: 21,99: 3,99: 6, \end{aligned}$ | $70: 7,80: 9,80: 25$ |
| $130: 25$ | 162:20 | 61:15, 62:7, | 31:18, 95:19 | 98:21, 99:3, 99:6, 99:15, 99:17, | 81:3, 164:11, |
| subsequent [2] - | suggestions [1] | 62:25, 64:1, | supervisor [1] - | 99:27, 103:25, | $\begin{aligned} & 165: 2,165: 4, \\ & 165: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| 24:14, 155:22 | $-26: 4$ | 66:20, 66:27, | 155:9 supplied [1] - | 109:8, 140:28, | targeted [24] - |
| subsequently | suicidal [1] - | $68: 3,68: 12$, $72: 17,73: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { supplied [1] - } \\ & 93: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 141:1, 145:8, | 31:17, 31:25, |
| [11]-21:20, 22:5, | 35:5 | 72:17, 73:4, |  | 150:6, 169:24, | $55: 3,59: 24$ |


| 66:16, 66:18, | 131:16, 131:20, | 55:17, 56:15, | 39:12, 129:7, | troubled [2] - | 69:17, 70:8, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 66:19, 66:24, | 134:2, 134:12, | 66:10, 76:2 | 147:27 | 104:16, 167:14 | 70:23, 70:24 |
| 66:25, 84:11, | 134:20, 148:12, | thoroughness | totally [2] - | troubles [1] - |  |
| 108:19, 109:6, | 156:12, 160:14, | [1] - 78:27 | $126: 9,175: 9$ | 64:4 | U |
| 109:14, 109:28, | 161:11 | thoughts [1] - | touch [5] | true [6]-12:3, |  |
| 110:15, 111:2, | telephones [1] - | 16:29 | 116:18, 118:8, | $48: 18,49: 8,$ |  |
| 111:7, 115:10, | 127:15 | threat [20] - | 118:9, 118:11 | $64: 18,122: 11$ | $64: 28$ |
| 117:4, 118:3, | TEMPLE [1] - | 60:25, 62:18, | towards [18] - | $125: 17$ | 64:28 <br> ultimately [3] - |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 118:21, 139:11 } \\ \text { targeted' }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 8 \\ & \operatorname{ten}[1]-51: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 144:7, 144:18, <br> 144:24, 144:29 | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 29,15: 29,17: 9 \\ & 20: 6,25: 19,36: 7 \end{aligned}$ | truly [1]-27:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ultimately [3] - } \\ & \text { 11:2, 41:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $111: 11$ <br> targeters [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tend }[1]-130: 17 \\ & \text { tended }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:4, 145:7, } \\ & \text { 145:15, 147:7 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 8,39: 24 \\ & 40: 12,40: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $103: 12$ trusted [2] - | 136:11 <br> umbrage [4] - |
| $55: 6$ | 30:22 | 147:19, 147:24, | 60:22, 71:15, | 102:14, 102:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 171:9, 171:14, } \\ & 173: 9,173: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| $25: 14,54: 15$ | 85:27, 99:27, | 150:8, 150:12, | 163:21, 163:23, | $85: 29,86: 14$ | unable [3] - |
| 55:19, 55:29, | 154:7, 154:9, | 150:14, 150:28, | 163:25, 171:15 | try [8]-21:20, | 72:10, 76:24, |
| 56:3, 56:9, 59:25, | 155:16 | $155: 20$ | $\operatorname{track}[1]-40: 25$ | 25:17, 25:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 114:19 } \\ & \text { unanswered [2] } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 63: 11,63: 17 \\ & 63: 25,64: 21, \end{aligned}$ | terminated [1] - 124:29 | threatened [2] - $71: 10,101: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { traffic [1] - } \\ & 156: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $25: 27,100: 26$ | $-22: 9,176: 25$ |
| 66:11, 67:11, | terming [1] | threats | train [2] - 119:8, | $145: 20$ | unavailability |
| $67: 18,67: 22$ | 128:19 | 11:24 | 148:4 | trying [8] - | $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-88: 6} \\ & \text { unclear [3] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 78: 2,78: 3,78: 15 \\ & 78: 19,78: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { terms [7] - } \\ 21: 12,41: 16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { three [12] - } \\ \text { 16:18, 26:22 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { trained [1] - } \\ & \text { 127:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:20, 40:15, } \\ & 49: 4,77: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $54: 13,84: 22$ |
| 79:5, 79:6, 79:13, | 41:20, 78:27, | $27: 6,29: 26$ | training [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 4,7: 19 \\ & 79: 20,82: 29 \end{aligned}$ | 164:20 |
| 79:14, 79:18, | 137:1, 167:12, | 30:12, 30:15, | 124:7, 124:13 | 103:1, 176:21 | under [26] - |
| 79:22, 81:5, 81:7, | 176:8 | 38:5, 40:8, 64:15, | transferred [1] - | TUESDAY ${ }_{[1]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:6, 16:15, } \\ & \text { 19:10, 29:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 83:29, 90:14, | terrible [2] - | 128:2, 141:25, | 154:28 | 6:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 10,29: 8 \\ & 31: 10,32: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| 103:7, 103:28, $104: 21,104: 28$, | 32:10, 115:27 | 176:24 | Traumatic [1] - | tumble [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 10,32: 21 \\ & 38: 4,39: 5,42: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 104:21, 104:28, } \\ & \text { 105:8, 105:25, } \end{aligned}$ | THAT [2] - 4:12, | threes [1] - 8:5 | 11:22 | 154:4 | $45: 12,53: 23$ |
| 105:26, 106:11, |  | $-15: 5,45: 19$ | $15$ | tu | 71:5, 84:25, 86:6, |
| 108:11, 109:5, | THE [6] - 4:7, | 48:14, 49:22, | treated [6] - | turned [5] - | 108:1, 108:5, |
| $110: 5,113: 9$, $114: 13,115:$ | 4:8, 6:1, 101:17, | 50:20, 73:26, | 17:1, 26:21, 31:5, | 22:14, 36:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:3, 112:18, } \\ & \text { 121:28, 136:22, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 114:13, 115:6, 115:26. 116:5. | 101:24, 178:7 | 100:21, 131:23, $137: 25,174: 29$ | 135:24, 155:21, | $49: 4,49: 6,175: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:28, 136:22, } \\ & \text { 137:12, 154:4, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:26, 116:5, } \\ & \text { 116:7, 116:21, } \end{aligned}$ | the.. [1]-88:25 | 137:25, 174:29 | 163:3 | turns [1] - 59:18 | 169:11, 170:5, |
| 117:2, 117:8, | theme [1]-31:2 themes [3]- | timeline [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { treating [3] - } \\ 130: 18,164: 16 \end{gathered}$ | twice [1] - 29:5 | 170:12, 177:18 |
| 117:10, 117:15, | $6: 12,50: 7,68: 11$ | $133: 14$ | 176:7 | 17:7, 18:9, 21:4, | undergo [1] - |
| 117:20, 117:23, | themselves | titular [1] - | treatment [5] - | 21:26, 32:15, | $21: 3$ <br> underneath [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:19, 118:25, } \\ & \text { 119:16. 139:1. } \end{aligned}$ | 165:8 | 166:15 | 19:26, 22:12, | 32:18, 38:19, | underneath [1] - $37: 22$ |
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| 121:28, 122:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:1, 154:6, } \\ & \text { 169:4, 169:9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { took }[9]-6: 27, \\ \text { 13:10, 23:11, } \end{gathered}$ | 4:9 <br> Tribunal [16] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:9, 133:23, } \\ & 139: 5,142: 29, \end{aligned}$ | undertake [1] - |
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