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CHAL RMAN Good morning.

THE WTNESS: Good morning.

## SERGEANT WLLI AM HUGES CONTI NUED TO BE CROSS- EXAM NED

 BY MR. O H GG NS, AS FOLOVE:MR. O H GG NS: Sergeant, good morning?
A. Morning.

2 Q. I want to ask you about the period for a moment, the period after your court case was settled?
A. Yes.

3 Q. Am I correct that just prior to that, on the 17 th June 2011, as part of your court proceedings in the civil matter that, $I$ suppose, paralle1 was brought by your colleague, Garda Nyhan, who also brought his claim, you served an additional notice of, $I$ won't say grievances, but additional Notice for Particulars of your
allegation, isn't that right, in a formal pleading?
A. Yes, I will have to be reminded of that one, please.

4 Q. All right. We might just very briefly look at it. It's particulars of claim of the 17th June 2011. Actually my document $I$ have here doesn't have the
screen there, but it is -- it made allegations at this point in June 2011 that the actions of -- sorry 5308. I am obliged to Ms. Horan. 5308 for the particulars.

Chairman, there seems to be a problem with the -CHA RMAN why don't you ask the questions, Mr. O'Higgins -- oh here we have it, it's coming up.
MR. OHGG NS: So, if we just scroll down please, and we will see this is the action that Sergeant Hughes brought against the Commissioner and the Minister for Justice equality and law reform?
CHAN RMAN Don't mind all that. I'm sorry, Mr. O'Higgins. He served additional particulars and you want to refer to the additional particulars.
MR. OHGGN: That's it. Under the heading of "the grounds" you will see we have them broken down into alphabetical pleas. So $A$ is:
"The actions and activities on the part of the first-named def endant (the Commi ssi oner) his servants or agents were willfully done and were cal cul at ed to cause the pl ai ntiff inj ury and danage. B, a pl an was hat ched and pursued with the object of scapegoating the pl ai ntiff, that steps taken in the further ance ther eof were consci ous and del i ber ate and/ or conducted in reckl ess di sregard of the plaintiff. C, a wanton abuse of authority. D, actions were malicious."
skip over E and F.


#### Abstract

"G. Activities were perpetrated by persons in position of trust. I, perpetrated in condtramedi us di sregard of


the plaintiff's legal, human and personal rights." CHA RMAN In what? In contramedius? well there is a new one on me. They might possibly mean contumelious but contramedius, I stand corrected, but that is a new one on me. Contramedius. How dare you contramedius, I'11 have you know.

I am sorry, I am a pedant when it comes to these things.
MR. O H GG NS: "J, necessarily becare invol ved in the di stortion of facts or the suppressi on of facts and/or the conceal ment of fact. K, outrageous abuse of process."

L I think is directed to the fact that a defence was put in. And the last one:
> "The actions and activities were corrupt and were criminal in character."

So, it is pretty high, the case you're making; you know, hatching of a plan by, you know, the top, the Commissioner. As I understand it, Garda Nyhan pulled back on that, I appreciate yours is a different case, but I just wonder could I ask you, from your point of view, Garda Nyhan actually ultimately did not persevere with that to that extent and that was commented upon by the High Court judge who heard the case, which again is not directly relevant but that was the context. And I
am just wondering, do you differ with Garda Nyhan? Would you be happy to pull back from any of these?
A. No, that was my case going into court and on settlement I wasn't asked to withdraw any of those allegations.
6 Q. I see. Well my question now to you is, would you be happy now at this remove, now having had the overview, the helicopter view of all the correspondence, all the medical reports, the steps that were taken to try and he1p you, all of that, do you want to pull back on any of this or do you want to leave it?
A. I don't think so, no.

7 Q. A11 right. Can I ask you then to deal with the period after you settled your High Court proceedings? You settled, am I right in May of 2012?
A. That's correct.

8 Q. Al1 right. And then would it be fair to say you embarked upon a process of bringing your campaign to a wider audience?
A. Following retirement, yes.

9 Q. Yes. And you entered into a lengthy series of correspondence, particularly the Department of Justice?
A. That's correct.

10 Q. And the Minister's office. And that was, broadly speaking, from 2013 to $2017 ?$
A. I think so, yes.

11 Q. The Garda Inspectorate in 2013, and maybe later, you were also writing to them?
A. I think so, yes.

12 Q. The policing authority 2016?
A. Correct, yes.

13 Q. A four-year period between 2014 and 2018, as I understand it you were also writing to the office of the Taoiseach and also a range of parliamentarians?
A. That's correct.

Did you seek meetings with parliamentarians?
A. I did, yes.

15 Q. You obtained meetings with, I think I saw reference in your letters to Clare Daly TD, and no criticism of her for that, but you met her, did you?
A. No, I never met her personally, just e-mails.

16 Q. Just e-mails, all right?
A. Yes.

17 Q. And I don't mean to pick her unduly, but a range of other TDs you had correspondence with, you were seeking 10:36 to lobby to promote your cause, is that fair?
A. That's correct.

18 Q. Al1 right. The purpose of all of that, I mean on one view it might be thought that the settling of your High Court action in 2012, perhaps most particularly from your point of view, might bring a degree of closure, you know what I mean? Might, might -
A. I understand what you are saying, yes.

- might put some sort of balm on the wounds. That wasn't the case. You went bigger, you went wider.
A. I remain consistent in my views in relation to what I perceived to be the systems failure within the organisation that exposed Baiba Saulite and John Hennessy to a viable peril, and that would be the core
element of the -- and, of course, then the treatment of me by Garda management as a result of my raising those issues.

Can I ask you to look at just very small bits of the correspondence because it is relevant to the issues the 10:38 Tribunal is investigating. Could I ask you to look at a letter you wrote to then minister Alan Shatter on the 22nd May 2013. We might have page 271 on the screen, please. This is book 2. So this is a letter, if we might scroll up the top, there's a slightly indistinct date on the top right-hand but hopefully it'11 give the date. Maybe it didn't come out, there it is, 22/5/2013.
A. That's correct.

21 Q. And it's writing to, as I say, Alan Shatter TD, minister, who at that time I think was the Minister for Justice?
A. Correct.

It sets out the context at the beginning. The bit I am going to ask you to deal with, sergeant, is a few pages ${ }_{\text {10:39 }}$ in, on page 274 of the materials, 1 think it's four pages in to the letter, 274, and the paragraph commencing:
"I do not understand why..."

We have it there. It reads:
"I do not understand why gi ven my personal i nvol vement
with the abduction case whi ch preceded Bai ba Saulite's murder and the fact that I was one of the last Garda witnesses to have deal ings personally with her I was not subsequently requi red to provi de a witness statement as part of the murder investigation file whi ch was forwarded to the DPP in respect of the mur der.

I was approached in 2007 by a menber of seni or management in that regard and I informed himthat I wi shed to include my concerns in my statement of evi dence. No statement was taken and I was not asked for a statement subsequently. "

Sergeant, I suggest to you that letter, that contents there that you were providing to the Minister is seriously misleading and incomplete.
A. No, that's the way things happened at the time.
Q. That you didn't understand why you were not required to provide a witness statement as part of the murder investigation. Are you standing over that? You were not required to provide a witness statement?
A. Yes, and if I can qualify that: In 2008, in the papers there, I approached Superintendent Curran in the same vein and he sent a report to Chief Superintendent Phillips stating that Sergeant Hughes wants to be interviewed in relation to the murder investigation and that correspondence remained unanswered.
24 Q. You know very well, don't you, that the murder
investigation assigned a specific job number, job number 734 and tasked a senior member with getting a statement from you, you know that?
A. Yes, I see that.

25 Q. The incident room coordinator created the assignment and issued it to Inspector walter O'Sullivan on the 4th July?
A. Yes.
Q. 2007. The job was called at conference on a number of dates, Ju7y, September, October and November of 2007?
A. I see that in the papers, yes.
Q. Walter O'Sullivan rang you on the 20th September '07 and requested you prepare a formal statement, comprehensively outlining your dealings with Mr. A and Baiba saulite and covering the investigation undertaken 10:41 by you in relation to the abduction of the children, isn't that so?
A. I don't recall that narrative, but I do recall him requesting a statement from me, yes.
Q. And this was for inclusion in the file to go to the
A. Yes.
Q.

And you had useful information because you were, on your own case, central to the lead prosecutor in the abduction and you perhaps were the person best placed to say and give background detail of the relationship between Mr. A and the deceased, isn't that so?
A. Yes.
Q. So do you recall now the call of the 20th September?
A. I do.
A. I received a call. I was in a house in clonee at the time and the call -- when $I$ answered the call it was Detective Inspector O'Sullivan was saying that he had a 10:42 job sheet and he required a statement from me. And as I've said previously, I told him I had absolutely no problem providing a statement and I would be structuring it in such a way that $I$ will be including details of what I perceive to be the systems failure surrounding the murder of Baiba Saulite. And he said he would get back in touch with me in relation to that and I received no further cal1.

And just to qualify that, if there was --
Q. Sorry, can I ask you this, how was it left at the end?
A. That he would get back in touch with me.
Q. All right. Have you left anything out?
A. Em...

Was that the extent of the call?
A. Excuse me, sorry?
Q. Was that the extent of the call?
A. That he would -- he rang me on another occasion then and --
Q. No, no, that call. Don't move off that call?
A. Sorry.
Q. Was that the extent of that call?
A. I think so, yes, subject to recollection.
Q. Did you not answer Inspector o'Sullivan by saying you'd
have to take legal advice on the matter?
A. No, I did not. I don't think so. No. I can't recall if I said that or not.

39 Q. We11, might you have said that, that you'11 have to take legal advice?
A. No.

40 Q. We11, can I ask you this: Were you happy to give a statement?
A. Absolutely.

41 Q. Because isn't it curious, therefore, that at the end of 10:44 the day everybody is agreed you didn't give a statement?
A. I didn't.

42 Q. Yes.
A. Is correct, yes.

43 Q. Yes.
A. But if $I$ can qualify that: He was to contact me again in relation to the matter and if there was anything untoward he just need lift the phone to my superintendent, my line manager and discuss it with him 10:44 if there was any difficulties. And I would have been called in by Mark Curran or Inspector waters at the time and I would have discussed any difficulties in that regard. There were no difficulties.
44 Q. Didn't Walter O'Sullivan chase you up for the statement 10:44 subsequently?
A. He did. And I repeated the matter about the systems failure in the telephone call he made to me, or sorry the statement he made in the office that morning and
his response was, I didn't exactly use those words, I didn't use those exact words.
Q. It's just that in your Tribunal statement, in the interview, you don't mention the detail that he chased you up for the statement?
A. No. I don't. No. But they're my -why has that been left out?
A. Well, the subject-matter of my statement to the Tribunal was that he may contact me in relation to obtaining a statement, and the subject-matter of my response is there, and his response.
47 Q. Let's go through it. In early October didn't he ring you and ask you to make a statement?
A. Well, that would have been a second phone call, yes, when he said -- he used that term, I didn't use those exact words.
Q. No, no. So we are agreed, there is a phone call where is phoning you proactively, not you phoning him, he's phoning you, can I have a statement?
A. Yes. And my response to him would be, do you want me to include the systems failure in the statement? And you know, what I perceived to be the systems failure. And he said he'd get back to me. But at no point did he say, look, are you receiving to make a statement or there was no communication like that.
49 Q. Didn't you state in this phone call, the statement was with your solicitor and that you'd hand him the statement within the next week or so?
A. There was never a statement I made for the murder
investigation file. I never created statement.
50 Q. Did you indicate the statement or the matter was with your solicitor?
A. I can't recall that, no. I can't recall.

CHA RMAN Sorry which, the matter is with -- is that what you are saying?
51 Q.
MR. OHGGN: what I am putting actually, in fairness, is: You said the statement was with your solicitor?
A. No, I never created a statement in the respective murder inquiry.
52 Q. All right. Just slightly broaden that, in case there is a misunderstanding: Did you say that the issue or the matter was with your solicitor?
A. Well, I --

53 Q. That you were waiting to hear from your solicitor?
A. I don't recall discussing, you know, at this juncture, that I suggested -- I said anything about my solicitor to Detective Inspector o'Sullivan.
54 Q. We11, you see, I wish to suggest to you that you did because he came back again in October, chased it up again, and $I$ am talking now about the middle of October. I don't have the precise date, but the middle of october; is that right?
A. well, I can't recollect the precise dates but I do know 10:47 that I was in conversation with him in relation to the matter and he was to get back in touch with me in relation to clarifications as to what should be included in the statement.

55 Q. And I am suggesting to you that it was during this third call that you now slipped into the conversation, the conversation you claim that you and he had regarding the bombshell information on the 20th November 2006, you now sought to weave that into the ca11 and suggest to him that he had said that, for the first time?
A. My recollections are that there was two calls and I did actually discuss that aspect with him then.
CHA RMAN Sergeant, do you agree there was a third call? what Mr. O'Higgins is saying is, call number one, 20th September '07; call number two, early October; call number three, when he says he alleges that the statement is with my solicitor or the issue is with my solicitor, something like that; and then call number three, mid October - do you agree that that is the sequence?
A. I only recollect two calls.

57 Q. CHAN RMAN You on7y remember two calls?
A. Two calls.

MR. OHGGN: If you are mistaken about that, wouldn't it tend to indicate that Inspector o'sullivan is coming back to you looking for the thing?
A. Yes, but I looked for clarifications from him and the clarifications didn't arrive.

CHA RMAN You looked for clarification, what was the clarification you were looking for sergeant?
A. Clarification as to what should be included in the statement, what structure it should form and whether it
should include -- would I include my allegations that I had already made in relation to systems failures, et cetera.

60 Q. CHA RMAK And why were you asking his permission to put that in ?
A. Well, that's the questions I asked him. I told him of my concerns in relation to a systems failure and that I wanted to include it in the statement and he said he'd get back to me. And that's the way both conversations ended; that he would actually look for clarification. CHA RMAN So you say the ball was in his court in the end of the day, is that the system?
A. Precisely.

62 Q. CHA RMAN I'm sorry, the ball was in his court at the end of the day?
A. And just to qualify it, Mr. Chairman: If he thought there was anything irregular about me not cooperating with him, he would take it up with my supervisor, who would call me and ask me to account for myself, which never happened.

MR. O H GG NS: Is there any reason you waited a full 11 months before, on your case, revisiting the conversation, the bombshe11 conversation?
A. Sorry, the bombshel1 conversation? The conversation I had with him in the office on that day? Sorry, can you clarify when --

64 Q. Yes, I am suggesting to you that in this third cal1, that's the occasion on which you bring up for the first time the bombshe11 information and you seek to persuade
him that he had told you this?
A. Yes. And he replied, well, I wouldn't have used those exact words. That was his response.
65 Q. And you know his position, that that is not what he said, he made it perfectly plain to you he had said no such thing.
A. No. What he said was, he didn't use those exact words.
A. There is a dispute certainly, yes.

My question to you was: what has happened in your life 10:50 or in your chronology that has caused you now, and let's locate it in the chronology, because it's not too far away from the date of the conversation, the 8 th November 2007, when you also had the disputed conversation with Chief Superintendent michael Feehan, in which you asserted and we dealt with it yesterday, that you had claimed you had told him you wanted to know why you were being targeted when it was obvious there were system errors - do you remember that?
A. I do.
A. I recall that, yes.

69 Q. That was the 8th November 2007, that disputed a11?
CHAN RMAN The 8th November '07?
MR. OHGGNS: The 8 th November.
CHAL RMAN Thank you, yes.
70 Q. MR. OHGGN: This disputed call is mid October '07, so three or four weeks back?
A. Yes.

71 Q. Am I correct that you're off work at this time on sick 1eave?
A. That's correct.
Q. You're ruminating obsessively at this time, it would seem, from the medical reports?
A. I am deeply concerned as to the issues within the workplace at that time.
73 Q. You're drinking heavily?
A. No. Not --

74 Q. You're getting Séan Costello to write letters to HRM raising issues about your salary, and I don't criticise you for that, about your salary reduction?
A. That's correct.
Q. It's hugely in your mind, and you feel you're being oppressed?
A. I feet?

76 Q. You are being oppressed?
A. Yes, indeed.

77 Q. So what trigger causes you around this time to now for the first time, 11 months later, bring this up with walter o'sullivan and for the first time claim to him that he had said these things?
A. Well, I think it's the first time he had contacted me in relation to any matter concerning the investigation, so when he contacted me that's what I told him.
78 Q. So was it -- are you asking the chairman to accept that it was the first opportunity you had to --
A. Well, nobody had spoken to me in relation to any matters really apart from the fact-find investigation
and the discipline -- the service of the disciplinary papers, so there was no contact being made by other members in authority in relation to this matter.
79 Q. You see this, is a phone call that he had placed?
A. Yes, I understand.

80 Q. This wasn't one where you had sought him out to get this bombshell off your chest, you deployed it in the cal1 where he was chasing you up for the statement, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

81 Q. Can we move to a separate matter please, and that is the 16-page report you gave to Inspector Mangan and more particularly the later report that you provided to the Tribunal as exhibit WH 10 to your statement. We might have, please, page 482 of the materials. And just to locate it for you, sergeant: As you are probably aware, as distinct from being a 16-page report, this is the 19-page report that you furnished to the Tribunal?
A. Oh yes.

82 Q. Though it carries the same date on the top right-hand corner, we see there. So when did you complete this document?
A. This particular document here?

83 Q. Yes.
A. This is the one I furnished to the Tribunal, is it.

84 Q. Yes.
A. Yes. The substantive content of that document was completed prior to meeting with Inspector Mangan in Store Street.
Q. Would you mind looking at some of the differences and we can do this fairly briefly. You have added in, you will be aware of this yourself I think, you have added in the word 'isolation' in dispatches within the report that was not original that was given to Inspector Mangan; isn't that so?
A. That's correct.

You might look, for instance, at page 491. The paragraph starting "a few weeks later", if we could scroll down a little bit. You see there, the last line of that paragraph reads:
"Matter was attended to by the DDU Swords."

And then in brackets "isol ation" and then to help you the next paragraph commencing "over the following months" the last line:
"Bai ba Saulite arising fromthese devel opments --"

And then in brackets "(isol ation)" and then control down a little bit:
"I then learned of an ores on attack."

And then last line:
"I was not approached at all concerning this inci dent."

And then "isolation."

So when did you add those words in and when did you add 10:57 those words in?
A. I can't recollect when I actually added those words to the document, but I think I made a statement to the Tribunal investigators late last year clarifying that issue as to why those words appeared and effectively I think they're in papers at the moment, the response I gave to the Tribunal investigators.
89 Q. If we go a few pages on, to page 493, we have it there, so the paragraph commencing "I contacted the DPP's of fice..."

Ending with the words "Cool ock for onward transmi ssi on to bl ank."

You have added in "(no response)" there.
A. That's correct, that would have been in line with the work I was doing with the document at the time, I added in the words isolation.
90 Q. There are other changes, we needn't perhaps dwell on
this too long, but would it not have been better to -first of all, because you want to rely on this, you're going to rely on this later on and had provided it to the Tribunal, was there was not a danger that you might inadvertently give them to understand that this was in the original?
A. Em, it was an error on my behalf, which is explained in my statement to the Tribunal in that regard, and I agree that the document produced by An Garda Síochána was the actual document I produced to Inspector Mangan in December 2006 to allay any confusion in that regard.
91 Q. Was this part of the ruminating that you were going back to this document repeatedly over a long period?
A. No, I would have relied on that document there with transactions in other documents then further on throughout the process over the three or four years and unfortunately that was a draft rather than the actual statement or the report I gave to Inspector Mangan. But as I said, I agreed with the investigators that the one that they produced on behalf of An Garda Síochána was the one, the actual report I furnished to Inspector Mangan.
92 Q. And I think it's the case that, if we look at page 16 of this report, page 497, it's pretty well at that point that you have added on completely new material that is wholly absent from the original?
CHA RMAN 497? okay.
93 Q. MR. OHGGN: Maybe the bottom of 496 will -- we see the sign off, I think that was in the original
document, the last line there:
"On the 19th November 2006, Bai ba Saulite was murdered at her home at bl ank."

Am I correct?
A. Yes, I think that's at the end of the original document, yes.
Yes. So thereafter, pages $16,17,18,19$ of this additional report, of this later report is all new?
A. Yes. And if we were to look at the disciplinary investigation report you will see that type of content is in it there, so obviously I just cross contaminated those two.

CHA RMAN Sorry, can I just clarify: "The following morning I attended at" is that in the original?
A. Not in the original report given to Inspector Mangan.

96 Q. CHA RMAN Yes. "And I ater that morning I contacted", is that new?
A. That's new to the Mangan report, yes, it's not included 11:01 in the original Mangan report. The Mangan fact-find was on7y concerned with matters up to the murder of Baiba Saulite.

97 Q. CHA RMAN okay. Anything you want to ask, Mr. O'Higgins?
MR. OHGGN: So the new material is covering conversations you're having with Inspector O'Sullivan, Inspector Cryan and other matters that postdate the murder?
99 Q. Postdate the murder?
A. That's correct.

100 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, can I ask a question? I understood when I saw this document first, I thought it looks like 11:02 there's a commentary here because it's different from the original, there's extra material in it and it's written in a different font, in a different typeface. So, it struck me, I suggest it struck other people in the Tribunal, that there was no question -- sorry, on the face of it, it did not appear that there was any question of misleading?
A. Oh no.

101 Q. CHA RMAN If you follow me?
A. I do.

102 Q. CHA RMAN I am just saying what it looked like. And the investigator, Mr. Ryan, invited you in to confirm that that was the position and that in fact happened, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

103 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. But why did you use a different typeface for the following morning, a point I missed when I was reading it "the following morning l attended", why did you include material in the original typeface and then the commentary? I see the point about the commentary because it's in a different typeface and it is obvious to anybody reading it?
A. Yes.
Q.

CHA RMAN But why did you put in the original stuff,
if you know what I mean, similar to the original typeface?
A. It's just the word processing of a draft over the years following the submission of the report to Inspector Mangan, it obviously became -- I can't explain, but obviously I saved it along with Inspector Mangan's report as onto the original, but, em, I can't explain the font.

CHA RMAN But you had it up on a word processor?
A. Yes, I did.

106 Q. CHA RMAN okay. And when it came to the sort of gloss or commentary, you used what appears to be a different --
A. Yes.

107 Q. CHA RMAN Did you use a different colour or something like that? I am not sure that the typeface is all -but it looks as if the typeface is different. Do you know what typeface you used, as it happens? I mean it is not Calibri, $I$ know that, it's probably aerial or something like that?
A. I can't explain it, Mr. Chairman, when I was cooperating with the Tribunal inquiry there I just downloaded it, I didn't read it in its entirety.

108 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. My question is: why would you use different ones? Sorry, did you do it at a different time?
A. Yes, that's what I am saying. I am saying when -- for instance, when I was preparing --
109 Q. CHA RMAN Do you know what I mean?
A. Yes.

110 Q. CHA RMAN I just want to get to the bottom of it if I can. I am not sure there is any big significance of it, frankly.
A. Yes.

11:04
111 Q. CHA RMAN But let me ask you this: we have changes in this document -- -
A. Yes.

112 Q. CHA RMAN -- additions to it --
A. Yes.

113 Q. CHA RMAN -- did you do all the additions, whenever you did it, did you do them all at the same time?
A. Well, Mr. Chairman --

114 Q. CHAN RMAN As best you can remember?
A. -- I created a number of documents with similar type narrative in it and obviously I used the introduction part of the Mangan report up to the end of -- sorry, up to the murder of Baiba Saulite, that narrative, and obviously when I was saving it, I saved this additional material into it under a different font. I can't explain it.

115 Q. CHA RMAN Did you do some cutting and pasting in it?
A. Yes, I would have done cutting and pasting.

CHA RMAN Maybe that's the explanation.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN okay. Anyway, if there is anything you want to ask, Mr. O'Higgins, feel free. I am now realising something that I didn't realise before, is that the additional material appears to be in the same font as
originally, so it looks like it was done at different times.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Maybe, that's the way it looks to me.
MR. OHGGN: My last question on that document,
sergeant is: Did it occur to you as an experienced officer providing statements for investigations, that it might be useful and appropriate to note the date upon which you're making the substantive changes?
A. No. It didn't occur to me then in relation to that. As I said, I was working off the Mangan report as a draft for developing other reports, rather than having to retype the whole thing again, and obviously there was a cross contamination between the two.
117 Q. Can I ask you to look at a separate document altogether, it's in the same booklet, page 284, please. This is a letter sent to the private secretary of the Minister for Justice in November of 2013. Towards the beginning of what $I$ am suggesting is a very lengthy correspondence that we won't be going through in any extensive way. But it begins, and I am just wondering, was this the pattern, this was now the seventh anniversary of the murder of Baiba Saulite, you're into your retirement and you're writing letters to public bodies.
A. That's correct.

118 Q. You're urging the Minister to take certain steps, to carry out a review of your case, is that it?
A. That's correct.

119 Q. I think I saw in later correspondence you repeated the exercise on another anniversary of Baiba Saulite's death, was that a feature?
A. It was that I wasn't receiving the responses that I thought were appropriate and I was actually writing back to say well this is another year gone by, more or less, you know, and any chance of getting a full response in that regard.
120 Q. We might look at that. Page 289, please. Another letter to Mr. Quattrociocchi, I think is his name, in 11:08 any event a public servant in the Department of Justice, whom you sent a letter to on the 8th May, this is something in the nature of an upbraiding or a scolding of the department for not, as far as you're concerned, dealing properly with your complaints, is 11:08 that right? You're giving out to them?
A. Did you say scolding, is it?

121 Q. Yes, I used the word upbraiding, you're scolding them?
A. Well, I just said I'm entirely unhappy with the quality of the response received.
122 Q. You say there in the second paragraph down:
"It's over a year now since l first raised the issues with the previous $M$ nister and I amentirely unhappy with the quality of response recei ved inthis extremely 11:08 i mportant matter.

I cannot understand why it has taken so long for the justice department to procure the necessary information
fromthe Garda authorities that would possibly permit the answering of the enquiries I have made and al so --"

I think it may be a typo.
" -- I have made and al so to address the Parliamentary Question al ready pl aced on record by Cl are Daly TD. "

Had you got tDs to place things on record in the Dáil?
A. I did, yes.

123 Q. And I think if we turn over to page 300, you're giving out further and you write a letter, I'm not clear to whom, I think it's the department as well, in September 2014, 23rd September. And you say:
"I must state that l found the level of response from The Department of Justice and Equality to be entirely unsatisfactory. "

A few paragraphs down:
"The one-line response to my last e-mail al ong with recei ving now foll ow up inquiry si nce regarding the issues rai sed clearly demonstrates to me a coul dn't be bothered attitude fromthe Department of Justice and equal ity."

You weren't happy with the response you were getting?
A. No.
Q. I think if we look over the page to page 302, you're again giving out to them in November of 2014:
"I am writing to you on the ei ghth anni versary of the murder of Bai ba Saulite to ask if there has been any progress made towards having the serious allegations i ndependently revi ewed as referred to in your correspondence of August ' 14 . I wi sh to bring to your attention the fact that your office has not responded to the queries I put forward."

Then in the next sentence:
"I wi sh to agai $n$ ask, will the $M$ ni ster forward the reported allegations of mal practice, corruption, et cetera to the Garda Inspectorate for examination gi ven that the allegations concern alleged serious failings in internal Garda command and control structures."

Am I correct, you were looking for the Garda Inspectorate to get involved in matters?
A. Yes. I had communicated with the Garda Inspectorate and they informed me that they couldn't take any initiative unless they were requested to do so by the Minister for Justice. were responding to you throughout this period and at page 304 --
CHA RMAN Am I concerned with this, Mr. O'Higgins? I
mean, am I concerned with whether the nature of the response of the department, whether it was good or bad, or whether Sergeant Hughes was criticising or complaining, am I correct with any of that?
MR. OHGGN: I think it is relevant in this way, Chairman.

CHAI RMAN Yes.
MR. OHGGN: The correspondence is going to show, and I am not going to go through it extensively, the department actually took a proactive step and sent, the 11:11 materials will show, the materials that were furnished by Sergeant Hughes to an independent review mechanism. CHA RMAN Yes.
MR OHGGN: This is where I am going with this and I needn't really dwell on it much more than that. But to show that in fact there was a further independent appraisal of matters and it remained the case that -CHA RMAN okay. I see your point, okay, thank you. Thanks for that.
126 Q. MR. OHGGNS: So just looking at page 304 there, sergeant, this is the department writing back to you in December of 2014. It's alerting you to the fact that the Minister, second paragraph, established a mechanism following a Government decision that an independent review of allegations of Garda misconduct or inadequacies be undertaken by an independent panel of counsel, of barristers, isn't that right?
A. I see that, yes.

127 Q. I think on page 306, you're responding to that and
you're indicating your anxiety that that would happen. But I think you were giving out in the third line, third paragraph down:
"I wish to reiterate that I wel come any process
available--"

Do you see it there?
"I wi sh to reiterate that I wel come any process
available that would progress the issues at hand.
However, the correspondence from your office states the revi ew will consist of an examination of papers in the compl ai nt and does not i nvol ve oral evi dence, hearings or any ot her form of investigation. "

So, am I to take it, you weren't content with an independent review by a panel of independent barristers, that wasn't good enough?
A. No. I just wanted to -- I was enquiring into the
mechanism involved and would I be interviewed personally and would statements be required and it didn't seem to be that case.

128 Q. I think if we move matters on to page 320 , we have the final decision made by the Department of Justice, you having sent on what you asserted was your evidence of your assertion of conspiracy --
A. Yes.

129 Q. -- and cover-up. This is a letter from the Department
of Justice, private secretary to the Tánaiste and Minister for Justice and Equality. You see page 321 that it is dated 13th Ju7y 2016. And it says:
"I refer to your compl ai nt agai nst Garda management in 11:14 particular to my letter to you of the 22nd January 2016, requesting that you forward evi dence whi ch you sai d you possessed in rel ation to your compl aint. Your compl ai nt was referred to the independent revi ew mechani smestabl ished by the Government. The purpose of the i ndependent revi ew rechani sm was to provi de an i ndependent assessment of outstanding allegations of Gar da mi sconduct.

A panel of barristers was appointed to conduct the revi ew. "

If we skip down to the next line:
"The additional material whi ch you provi ded was al so
for war ded to counsel. Having consi dered this additional material, counsel has now issued a recommendation in your case.

Wth regard to your compl ai nt, counsel summarised the
i ssues as concerning allegations that you were scapegoated for a systems fail ure within An Garda Sí ochána in deal ing with information agai nst the endangered Iife of a citizen and that subject to the
death of the citizen you bel ieve that thi s systems failure was covered up by Gardaí. "

And this is the recommendation:
"Having consi dered all of the papers provi ded in your case, counsel does not recomend further action by the M ni ster.

The reasons for the decisi on are that the matters compl ai ned of have been ventilated in the Hi gh Court and settled or compromised by you. In these circunstances it would not be appropriate to reopen the matter. In addition, the matter of alleged systens failure are outside the remit of the IRM The M nister has asked me to let you know that she has accepted the recommendation of counsel."

And that was the determination, isn't that right?
A. That's the reply I received, yes.

130 Q. And I think that kick started a further round of correspondence that perhaps we needn't go into. You were unhappy with that and that led you to writing a further ream of correspondence to the Department of Justice?
A. Yes. I think the settlement or the decision there was to say that it was ventilated in the High Court and it was my understanding that matters of such gravity reported to the Minister should have been reported to

GSOC perhaps, you know, for independent investigation. That's really the nub of it.
131 Q. And you said that, if we just look briefly at page 339?
A. Yes.

132 Q. At this point you had written to the Taoiseach concerning the matter and also to Micheál Martin?
A. That's correct.

133 Q. This is a letter of November 2017, more up-to-date. You say in this correspondence:
"I bel $i$ eve that the uni nvestigated allegations are more serious than those raised in the McCabe matters."
A. That's -- Yes, that's what I said at the time, yes.

134 Q. That's a reference to Sergeant McCabe, I take it, is it, Maurice McCabe?
A. Maurice McCabe, yes.

135 Q. Yes. And then you embarked upon a series of correspondence with the Attorney General, isn't that right? Page 342, February 2017. You include in this a reference that you were not formally requested or approached to make a statement following the murder, do you remember that?
A. Yes, if I have it in that.
Q. So you were telling people, public bodies, public officials, that you were not approached to take a statement?
A. Sorry, where's that in this here?

137 Q. Isn't that right?
A. Is that in this document here?

138 Q. I just wonder, is that fair from what we have seen, what I understand you to be accepting concerning your contact with walter o'sullivan when he was trying to implement the assignment of the job number, getting a statement from you?
A. Sorry, is it in this document here?

Are you holding to the position --
CHA RMAN Mr. O'Higgins, sorry, in fairness, you've cited this document and produced it, and you've said something that's in it, and Sergeant Hughes has said please refer me to it. I don't know, in the bit that is before me, $I$ can't see it, is there a bit in it and should Mr. Kavanagh scroll down?
MR. OHGG NS: I am sorry, of course, chairman, at the bottom of page 343.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
MR. O H GG NS: The Baiba Saulite murder, do you see the last paragraph there?
CHA RMAN Thanks very much. You see that, Sergeant Hughes.
"As the leading of ficer invol ved with the child abduction case, $I$ was not formally approached to make a 11:19 statement following her morder. It is worthwhile noting that i mredi atel y following the murder I began rai sing the issues."

And my question to you: whatever about the wording of that, isn't it just really unfair now? You're turning, what I am suggesting to you was, actually bluntly your failure to assist the investigation and you're twisting it and you're saying to public officials years later, they didn't bother getting a statement from me - isn't that a twisting and --

CHA RMAN Well, let him answer that, Mr. O'Higgins.
A. I don't agree with that at a11. That formatted -- what I'm putting there, I wasn't formally approached in relation to the murder investigation to obtain a statement, was also reported in the confidential recipient process, was also reported in the disciplinary process, was also reported to Superintendent Curran who actually conveyed that to Chief Superintendent Phillips in 2009, I think it was. CHAN RMAN Sergeant Hughes.
A. And all of those requests were --

CHA RMAN Sergeant Hughes, can I stop you for a second?
A. Sorry.

142 Q. CHA RMAN Mr. O'Higgins' question is simple: was that sentence true?
A. The sentence was true insofar as they didn't make a formal request for a statement, in that, what I received from walter O'Sullivan I wouldn't consider a formal request in that he had to come back with clarifications for me.

143 Q. CHA RMAN Do you think that gave a true picture to the

Attorney General of what happened?
A. Possibly I -- what I wanted to convey to the Attorney General was that a statement wasn't taken from me in the murder investigation.
CHA RMAN Do you think that gave a true picture to the 11:21 Attorney General?

MR. LYNN Sorry to interrupt, Chairman.
CHAN RMAN Mr. Lynn, sorry.
MR. LYNN I haven't interrupted yet and I wish to
interrupt.
CHA RMAN No problem.
MR. LYN: Could the italicised part be read out?
CHA RMAN I can't hear you, sorry, say again.
MR. LYN: Could the remainder of the paragraph be read out, please.

CHA RMAN Certainly. Mr. O'Higgins, please read out the remainder of the paragraph. Thank you, Mr. Lynn. MR. OHGGN: "It's worthwhile noting that i mmedi at el y foll owing the morder I began raising issues with Garda management that there had been in my vi ew a systems failure that had exposed Bai ba Saulite and her sol icitor to avoi dable peril. I made the Garda authorities aware that I would be including details of the percei ved systens failure in my statement of evi dence for the murder investigation file.

I am aware of ot her Garda members who were --"

CHA RMAN I think that is sufficient, Mr. Lynn. That does qualify it, Mr. O'Higgins, doesn't it? It does qualify the declaration that he wasn't approached formally. When you read on, Mr. Lynn's implicit point is that it does qualify the simple declaration, which, I have to say, I am not sure I regard as a correct statement.
MR. OHGGN: In my submission, Chairman, it is -CHA RMAN For what it's worth.
MR. OHGGNS: But it is legitimate for Mr. Lynn to
ask for that to be read.
CHAN RMAN I think so too. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Lynn. That seems to be a fair qualification to put on it. Anyway. And this is at a much later stage, isn't it? MR. OHGGNS: It is.
CHA RMAN Have you much more to do on this topic?
MR. OHGGN: No, I am going to leave that correspondence.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. OHGGN: we'11 move off that. Sergeant, you may 11:23 be glad to hear I am moving towards the end of my cross-examination.
A. Thank you.
Q. You are aware, aren't you, that on foot of particularly your CRO investigation -- the Brian McCarthy
investigation --
A. Yes.

146 Q. -- that that necessarily triggered a situation where my clients, a number of my clients were probed and asked
for statements by the investigators tasked with investigating your complaints to Mr. McCarthy?
A. That's correct.

147 Q.
And that was stressful for those members and in some cases there would have been tension arising from that, understandably, Garda officers investigating and probing and questioning their colleagues arising from allegations you had made that were ultimately found to be unfounded, isn't that so?
A. I'm not sure in relation to that, about the stress, but ${ }_{11: 24}$ I'd see that there was a lot of members approached all right in the investigation.
148 Q. And they had to fill out questionnaire responses and answer for their position, isn't that right?
A. They completed those questionnaires, I understand, yes. 11:24

149 Q. Yes. You see, I am just wondering, did you at any point stop to think - and I am not in any sense taking from the agreed position that you suffered in the wake of the murder of Baiba Saulite and it caused very considerable distress to you personally, I am not
taking from that - but did you stop to think that when you embarked upon your path of seeking to draw other people into your difficulties and when that hardened into making allegations against colleagues and management, that that would cause stress upon them? 11:25
A. Em, of course, it caused stress -- it's a stressful situation when the Garda organisation has to account for itself and it should account fully. This was a mechanism I engaged with and subsequently I received no
feedback in relation to what was actually happening in the background on these investigations. Like, obviously any stress on any individual is regrettable, but the aim of the exercise was just to establish facts in relation to the matters pertaining to Baiba Saulite and John Hennessy prior to her murder.
150 Q. I am suggesting to you in conclusion, sergeant, that your view towards management became so poisoned, particularly perhaps after the instigation of the disciplinary investigation, that no matter what management did for you in terms of finding you an alternative role, with lighter duties, with a weekend allowance, no matter what steps they took to keep you involved, even though you were off sick away from the station, no matter what efforts they made to assist you, you weren't happy and you embarked upon a campaign of actually, of actually making serious, unfounded allegations against them.
A. I don't agree. I think my allegations are wel1-founded.

151 Q. And I wish to suggest to you, on behalf of not just the Garda members whom you made unfounded allegations against, I suggest, but the civilian members of An Garda Síochána whom I also represent, and perhaps I shouldn't list them all, but the likes of Assistant Detective Inspector Mangan; Superintendent Curran; Assistant Commissioner McHugh; Dr. Quigley, the assistant CMO; then Inspector Dwyer; Chief

Superintendent Phillips; Commissioners Conroy and Murphy; I don't act for him, but also acting Superintendent Donal waters; then inspector, now Detective Superintendent Cryan Cryan; Detective Sergeant Ciaran NcEneany; Detective Inspector, then Inspector walter O'Sullivan, now retired, now formerly superintendent; even Mr. McCarthy, the CRO himself, and any other persons whom you criticised in your long vendetta, I suggest to you your allegations were unfounded and were grossly unfair to those members?
A. I disagree entirely.
Q. Thanks very much?
A. Thank you very much.

## END OF CROSS- EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Now, how are you doing? Are you still able for a bit more questioning? THE WTNESS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
CHA RMAN Okay. Would you like a break, or are you okay?

THE WTNESS: It's up to the Chair.
CHA RMAN okay. Well 1isten, if you feel you need a break, let me know.
THE WTNESS: Thank you very much Chairman.
CHAI RMAN okay Mr. Lynn, now.

SERGEANT WLLI AM HUGES WAS EXAM NED BY MR. LYNN , AS FOLLOVG:

153 Q.
MR. LYN: Sergeant Hughes, I want to do two things in my examination with you, deal with some of the issues that Mr. O'Higgins raised in his cross-examination and also turn to some other matters that haven't really been raised yet. But to reassure the Tribunal, you're fully aware that the Tribunal is not investigating whether there was a systems failure, that's not part of 11:29 its remit. However, as Mr. O'Higgins, opening his cross-examination on Monday said, context needs to be set. He in fact brought you back to the end of 2004. Now, I am not going to go back that far, but I want to pick up on events in 2006.

There were serious threats to John Hennessy. You're aware of all of this?
A. I am, indeed.

154 Q. Yes. There was information that there was a conspiracy 11:30 to murder him in January 2006 ?
A. That's correct.

155 Q. Do you know what that information was?
A. There was money offered to an individual to assassinate John Hennessy and that information was received in the 11:30 DMR western division in January 2006.

156 Q. In the DMR?
A. Western, that'd be Blanchardstown station, yes.

157 Q. It was received in Blanchardstown station?
A. Yes.
Q. And how was that information then disseminated?
A. Em, I remember reading a copy in the, what's called occurrence book, in the main station room in Swords Garda Station and it set out the particulars of the threat to John at that time.
Q. So was it placed on Pulse?
A. I don't recall that it was placed on Pulse.
Q. Just so we understand the system, how was it circulated to other gardaí then?
A. Back then, it was paper copy, hard copy sent to the district office in Coolock and it would be sent down to Swords station then to be appended to the occurrence book. Sorry, to be appended to what?
A. The occurrence book, it's called. It's a large book in the office, in the public office of Swords Garda Station.
Q. What are gardaí expected to do with the occurrence book?
A. We11, I can't remember the particulars of the report but it would be, generally there would be instructions to pay passing attention to the business or whatever was deemed appropriate at the time, his business premises and his home.

But the occurrence book, was this information drawn to your attention?
A. Not personally, no. I found it when I took up duty and I read it. But it was generally known in the station,
this development was generally known.
164 Q. But were you briefed or instructed in respect of it?
A. No.

165 Q. Now the following month, on the 27th February of 2006, there was an arson on John Hennessy's home?
A. That's correct.

166 Q. who dealt with that? what gardaí dealt with that?
A. It was our district detective unit that dealt with that.

167 Q. And I think that was recorded on Pulse?
A. It certainly was, yes.

168 Q. As criminal damage/arson?
A. It was recorded in a category of criminal damage/arson.

169 Q. And again, were you consulted in respect of this?
A. No. As I said, I was aware of the occurrence but I wasn't personally approached by any of the investigating members in that regard.
170 Q. We'11 come to the third piece of information in respect of Mr. Hennessy, and that was information to do with another conspiracy to murder him on the 13th October 2006?
A. Yes, on the 11th October information was received --

171 Q. 11th sorry?
A. -- at B7anchardstown station. Sorry, between Blanchardstown and Swords Garda Station in relation to a further conspiracy to murder John.
172 Q. That information came to Blanchardstown, did it?
A. I believe that it was sourced in Swords and it transferred to Blanchardstown station
then for processing.
173 Q. And were you involved in that?
A. No, I wasn't aware of that at all, at the time.

174 Q. And was there interaction with $\square$ in respect of this particular information?
A. Yes, indeed.

CHA RMAN I don't think this is a good idea. MR. OHGGN: No.

CHA RMAN I don't think it is relevant and it's
dangerous. We have no notice of it and, Mr. Lynn, we shouldn't be going into this already.
MR. LYN: All right, all right.
CHA RMAN Sergeant Hughes should know that we shouldn't be going into this area. People could be endangered by evidence we give here, casually and so on. Mr. Lynn, we have the story, we know the events that have happened, we know the threats, we know the case that Sergeant Hughes made and makes about a series of events, we do not need to -- you are perfectly right 11:35 in saying that I am not concerned with assessing, evaluating the Garda response. I don't want to be critical, but I am apprehensive. So I am ruling out this evidence and I hope we can move on briskly, because an awful lot of this has actually been given in 11:36 evidence. I am sympathetic to what you need to do, but I am very concerned certainly and I think everybody in this room will be aware of the risks that we could run if we pursue this matter. So I think Mr. O'Higgins's
concern is entirely justified.
MR. O H GG NS: I should indicate --
CHA RMAN Sergeant Hughes, please understand, we have to be very careful here.
MR. OHGG NS: I appreciate you are dealing with the matter, Chairman. On behalf of An Garda Síochána can I indicate in the strongest of terms that a grave concern -- there was grave concern --
CHA RMAN I heard that. What have I just done, Mr. O'Higgins? I have just agreed with you, I have just explained why it is important and I have just explained that we're not going to have any more of it. MR. O H GG NS: And I am content with that, Chairman, thank you.
CHA RMAN So I don't need your further endorsement of it. Okay, Mr. Lynn, we know what the situation is.

MR. LYN: I am sorry.
CHA RMAN There is no personal or professional
criticism intended. It is just to say here be perils, let's be careful, let's move on, deal in general terms, 11:37 please, bear in mind also, $I$ do know what the case is about.

175 Q. MR. LYN: Sergeant Hughes, we need no more information in respect of this, but was this placed on the Pulse system? I don't need to know the information, but was 11:37 the information placed on the Pulse system? That is the sole question $I$ am asking you about it.
A. I didn't see it being placed on the Pulse system.

176 Q. How did you learn of the information, without telling
us what the information is?
A. I was off for a few days at the time and when I arrived at my office $I$ discovered a report addressed to sergeant -- or CPU was written on it, along with all the other units in the station, there's six other units 11:38 in the station.

CHA RMAN Community policing unit.
A. Community policing unit, CPU was written on it at the time.

177 Q. CHA RMAN So it was left for your attention? 11:38
A. Yes.
Q. CHAN RMAN You were the CPU?
A. CPU, yes.

CHA RMAN okay.
179 Q. MR. LYN: were you consulted about the information? 11:38
A. No, I was not.
Q. Now, we know there was an arson attack on Ms. Saulite's car on the 18th August 2006?
A. That's right.

181 Q. And what station investigated that?
A. It's Malahide Garda Station.

182 Q. Were you briefed or instructed in respect of that?
A. Not personally briefed, no.

183 Q. Was that information disseminated?
A. The sergeant in charge of that investigation along with 11:39 his three staff, I think, they sent a report to the superintendent Coolock in that regard.

184 Q. How did you learn about it?
A. I became aware of it and I visited Baiba at an address
that she had prior to her address. So I visited her and spoke to her in relation to it. And I also spoke with the sergeant in charge of the investigation, who I knew very well.
185 Q. But how did you learn about it?
A. I don't recall exactly how I learned about it, I became aware of it though in the days afterwards.
186 Q. And you spoke to Sergeant Ambrose, was it?
A. Sergeant Ambrose, yes.

187 Q. Now, I want to take you to a document in the papers at page 1956, if Mr. Kavanagh could -- It's not entirely clear to us what this document is but we think by the typeface and the format that it may be part of the confidential recipient report. I want to take you through it, because you are mentioned in it and there's 11:40 another relevant part of it. But it starts by saying that:
"The investi gation into the report recei ved fromthe confidential recipient did not find that any formal crime prevention advi ce was imparted to Mb. Saulite, nei ther has it found any reports or directions emanating fromthe di visional and district officers regarding this issue."

That's despite the press release, which we will return to in due course, which the Tribunal is fully aware of. If we could scroll down a little to the next paragraph:
"During the course of the child abduction case Sergeant William Hughes assisted ME. Saulite in obtai ning accomodation in an effort to di stance herself from Mr. A."

I think you already referred to that in the cross-examination from Mr. O'Higgins. Was that part of your community policing duties or simply the fact that you had an involvement with the child abduction case?
A. It wouldn't be strictly speaking a Garda function, but we decided, myself and Garda Nyhan, to actually intervene and contact the council, Fingal County Council in that regard.
188 Q. And then:
"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 investigation undertaken by Sergeant Hughes and his team and it did not incl ude any specific threat to the life of ME. Saulite emanating fromeither a confidential source or from ME. Bai ba Saulite herself."

If we can go down please, Mr. Kavanagh. Thank you.
"Ex Chi ef Superintendent Noel MELoughlin stated that Sergeant William Hughes was the primary investigator in the child abduction case and therefore the primery poi nt of contact for ME. Bai ba Saulite. He stated that

Sergeant Hughes shoul d have gi ven crime prevention advi ce to Ms. Saulite. Stated that he rei nforced on numerous occasions to his staff in general to give appropriate prime prevention advice to the rel evant parties. On the many meetings he hel d with Sergeant Hughes, he rei nforced the instruction to him"

I think that was dealt with yesterday as wel1, so if we can continue to scroll down, please.
"Ser geant WII iam Hughes informed the investigation into the report recei ved fromthe Garda confidential reci pi ent concerning the investigation that in the course of the child abduction investigation Mb. Saulite was conti nually advi sed to i meedi atel y report any matters to the gardaí concerning Mr. A's alleged mi sbehavi our towards her. Stated that Mb. Saulite was assisted by the investigating members of the child abduction case in being rehoused by the local authority in an effort to di stance herself from Mr. A. Sergeant 11:43 Hughes stated that Ms. Saulite was advi sed and assisted in every way necessary by members of the child abduction case. That Ms. Saulite recei ved every assistance, courtesy and gui dance appropriate in the circunstances in the course of the child abduction i nvesti gation. "

I take it you don't take any issue with that?
A. I don't, no.

189 Q. Again, if we can continue down please.
"There was no specific threat or intelligence i ndi cating that there was a real threat to the life of Ms. Bai ba Saulite. Instructions were issued to the di strict force that any calls to Ms. Saulite's home were to be responded to as a priority."

Then there is reference to the report of the 24 th August 2005 that you had forwarded. And if we could continue down. I think we can actually keep going down. Then just stop at this bit:
"Det ective Chi ef Superintendent Kevin Donoghue, who was at the time the Garda Press Officer, stated that all information cont ai ned in the press rel eases was obt ai ned in advance fromseni or investi gat ors invol ved in the investigation of the murder of Mb. Saulite. Seni or Garda management were at all times aware of the various investigations rel ating to Mb. Saulite and
Mr. A. Based on the content of the inf ormation in the possessi on of An Garda Sí ochána, the question of the provision of protection for ME. Saulite had neither arisen nor been consi dered or requested."

If we can continue down. Just go up again, sorry, to the top of that page..
CHA RMAN Can I just clarify?
MR. LYNE Yes.

CHA RMAN what is this document?
MR. LYNE This is a document that's --
CHA RMAN I don't remember and I probably should remember, what is it?

MR. LYN: We think it's a document that is part of
the --
CHA RMAN We wil1 find out now, very soon. Mr. Marrinan, can you help.
MR. MARR NAN It's chapter 11 of the Feehan report.
CHAI RMAN Thank you very much. Yes. Thank you. And 11:45 what is the point of doing this, Mr. Lynn?

MR. LYN: The point I am coming onto now is --
CHA RMAN I mean, there is a question coming, I am sure.

MR. LYN: The next passage --
CHA RMAN Sorry, that sounds rude, I don't mean that. I mean, what is the point of going through this?
MR. LYN: You're going to see an interaction with -CHA RMAN Thank you.
MR. LYNN -- Ms. Saulite by another member of the Gardaí.
CHAN RMAN A11 right.
MR. LYNN In fact, it is this next paragraph:
"Garda Murphy stated that when he had fini shed speaki ng 11:46 with Ms. Saulite he i mmedi at el y tel ephoned Sergeant Hughes on his mobile and he informed Sergeant Hughes of the tel ephone conversation. Sergeant Hughes instructed hi mto notify the station house officer as Sergeant

Hughes was not on duty. Garda Murphy stated that he i nf or med Ser geant Li am Cormin ns. "

Now, Sergeant Hughes, do you recall that?
A. I recall the telephone call, yes.
Q. And it was from a Garda Murphy?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you recall in general terms what the conversation was?
A. No. He didn't -- he just said that Baiba was on the telephone looking for me at the station and I told him to tell her I was off duty and to take a report from her and submit it to his sergeant.
Q. So if we look to the next paragraph -- and Sergeant Liam Cummins, he was the station house office?
A. He was Garda Murphy's sergeant, yes.

193 Q. "Sergeant Cummin ns requested that Garda Murphy compile a report outlining his conversation with Mb. Saulite. Garda Murphy typed the report and handed the report to ser geant Cummíns.

Garda Murphy stated that when Sergeant Hughes ret urned to duty, Sergeant Hughes asked himif he had notified the station house officer as directed. Garda Murphy stated that he did comply with the direction."

Is that correct?
A. I seem to recollect that, yes.

194 Q. And then:
"Garda Murphy stated that he has searched his records and cannot locate a copy of the report he made in Novenber 2006. Garda Mrphy stated that since creating the report he has not recei ved any official communi cation in rel ation to the report."

And if we continue:
"Garda Murphy stated he does not recollect the exact date in Noventber 2006 when he recei ved the call but he is of the belief that it was recei ved days in advance of the court case that was due on 7th Noventber 2006. Garda Murphy stated that Garda Darragh Hynes was al so in the community policing office when he recei ved the phone call from Mb. Saulite."

So that's dating it at around about early November.
A. My recollection of it was that it was in the few days before Baiba was murdered.
195 Q. If we continue down:
"Sergeant Li am Cummins stat ed that he recalled Garda Thoms Murphy calling into the sergeant's office, where Garda Murphy inforned him of the conversation with
ME. Bai ba Saulite. Sergeant Curmins stated that he could not recollect the date of the conversation he hel d with Garda Murphy. Sergeant Curmins stated he informed Garda Murphy to commit in writing the
conversation he had with ME. Saulite for the purposes of submitting the report on the matter to the district office for the attention of all rel evant authorities. Sergeant Curmin ns stated that Garda Mrphy drafted the report."

And then if we continue:
"Sergeant Curmin ns stated that he forwarded Garda Murphy's report to the district office under his own covering report. Sergeant Cummins stated that there is no survi ving copy of the report in Swords Garda Station as in January 2008 a metal filing cabi net bel onging to hi m was inadvertently di sposed and destroyed during a refit of Swords Garda Station. This metal cabinet contai ned a substantial amount of original documentation bel onging to Sergeant Curmins. No copy of the report made by Garda Thomas Mrphy was I ocated in Cool ock di strict office."

That appears to be the position, that this report went missing in 2008?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Where are you going with this Mr. Lynn? we have this document, there's nothing to stop you referring to it, it's the report of Assistant Commissioner Feehan, but what is the point of asking sergeant Hughes, what does it matter what he thinks of it?

MR. LYN: Because it is relevant, Chair, to what's called the fact-find, by --
CHA RMAN In what way is it relevant, Mr. Lynn?
MR. LYN: Because --
CHA RMAN I mean, I am not trying to be difficult here.

MR. LYN: No, no.
CHA RMAN But having you read extracts from this is a pointless exercise, with respect. Because, you can refer to the document, we can refer to it. Assistant Commissioner Feehan will be giving evidence. If there's any dispute about it, any disagreement, and Sergeant Hughes complains that the report represents targeting of him in any respect, there's no objection to criticising it or anything like that, but I don't see the point of me sitting here while you read this, to be honest.
MR. LYN: well --
CHA RMAN I mean, if you say, what's the relevance to the fact-finding?
MR. LYN: The relevance is the fact-finding scoping as Mr. O'Higgins put it --
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. LYN: -- by Inspector mangan and the subsequent investigation into what knowledge --
CHAN RMN The disciplinary -- yes.
MR. LYN: -- was held.
CHA RMAN yes.
MR. LYNX Sergeant Hughes's position is that he was
scapegoated, he was targeted.
CHA RMAN Absolutely. Now how is it relevant what Assistant Commissioner Feehan reported?

MR. LYN: It is very --
CHA RMAN what's relevant in that?
MR. LYN: It's very important context to know --
CHA RMAN I don't agree, Mr. Lynn.
MR. LYNN -- what other --
CHA RMAN I don't agree. Let me make it clear:
There's nothing to stop you making any case you want to 11:52 by reference to the Feehan report, nothing to stop you saying look here, look at what it says, that is supporting material as to the scapegoating allegation. No problem with that. Reading out this report to the witness, who didn't write it, referring to different people, is, with respect, a waste of time. And I don't think there's any useful purpose in doing so. But it is not to inhibit any possible case you wish to make based on the report, either to agree with the report or to challenge it.

MR. LYN: well, firstly, the --
CHA RMAK Do you see -- I mean, am I making myself clear? I am eager to establish that I am not trying to make things difficult for you, but I simply don't see the point of reading this report.
MR. LYNL Well, firstly, Sergeant Hughes is mentioned in the report and it's only right and proper that he has an opportunity to comment on what is recorded in respect of his activities.

CHA RMAN If you want to ask him to agree or disagree with what's in the report relating to him, that's not a problem.

MR. LYN: Yes. And that is part of the purpose -
CHA RMAN That's not a problem.
MR. LYN: - of reading this out.
CHA RMAN I mean, if there is a statement referring to him and you say, look, did you agree with that, did you say this or did you not say this, that's not a problem. MR. LYNN Yes. And that is part of what I have done. And Sergeant Hughes has confirmed that he took a call from Garda Murphy.
CHA RMAN But does it matter if he took a call from Garda Murphy? I mean, he doesn't disagree with this.
MR. LYNN Yes.
CHA RMAN So he took a call from Garda Murphy.
MR LYN: Yes.
CHA RMAN So what?
MR. LYNN We11 --
CHA RMAN what difference -- what possible relevance could it have, good, bad or indifferent? Am I missing something here, Mr. Lynn? I feel I am not -- I feel there is a chasm of understanding that $I$ am failing to bridge. It's obviously my fault. I am not making myself clear. I am trying to be helpful. But I don't want to sit here while you read a report to Sergeant Hughes that has little to do -- if there's anything he disagrees with, that's not a problem. He disagrees with the report, he disagrees with the findings, we
heard all that, he disagrees with that, and the officer is going to be giving evidence.
MR. LYN: We11, the report refers to Sergeant Hughes taking a call from Garda Murphy, I have asked him -CHAL RMAN If you think that is a logical basis for the 11:55 question, I am afraid we disagree. So, Sergeant Hughes took a call, big deal. He doesn't disagree that he took a call. But suppose he even said, I don't remember taking a cal1 and it says he took a ca11, what difference does it make to anybody?
MR. LYN: The relevance is that there was information before other gardaí in respect of Ms. Saulite. She was having --
CHA RMAN I am not concerned with that, as you fairly pointed out at the beginning. what am I inquiring
into? I am inquiring into whether Sergeant Hughes was targeted or discredited after making protected disclosures. Now, can we please focus on that? MR. LYNE But an issue is, chair, if I might just continue this -

CHA RMAN Yeah.
MR. LYNE - so that I am clear about the Tribunal's position. An issue.

CHA RMAR Yes.
MR. LYNE An issue is the manner in which the Garda Síochána.

CHA RMAN A11 right, 1et's get on to that.
MR. LYNA Yes. And this report is evidence that at
least two other members of the force, Garda Murphy and sergeant Cummins had information about Ms. Saulite's circumstances --

CHA RMAK Right.
MR. LYN: -- in a period very close --
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. LYN: -- to her murder, and would be officers to be consulted, spoken to --
CHA RMAN In relation to the fact-finding.
MR. LYNE -- by any investigating authority.
CHAN RMN okay. All right. That seems reasonable enough, okay.
MR. LYN: well, what I will do is --
CHA RMAN That seems reasonable enough, I must say, Mr. Lynn, that's fair enough. That's a rational basis 11:58 for asking a question.
MR LYN: Judge --
CHA RMAN But how can Sergeant Hughes help us on that?
MR. LYN: Well, he was --
CHA RMAN He got a phone call. Sorry, carry on, 11:58 Mr. Lynn, carry on. Yes, I see your point.
MR. LYN: He has confirmed --
CHAI RMAN I see your point.
MR. LYN: -- this interaction with Ms. Saulite --
CHA RMAN I just agreed with you, Mr. Lynn, I see your 11:58 point.
MR. LYN: she had asked to speak to him.
CHAI RMAN What do I have to do, Mr. Lynn, to say I agree with you, I accept your point and please carry
on.
MR. LYN: Now, yes, we have established that unfortunately those records are no longer available. To give another example of another officer who had dealings with Ms. Saulite, the three or four Pulse records that were handed to you on Monday by Mr. O'Higgins' team included a Pulse record from another -- I don't know whether those hard copies are still --
A. I am actually familiar with them so, yeah.

197 Q. Okay. I can deal with it very quickly then. But within those documents, which -- yes. There is a Pulse record from -- and I say this is in the hard copies, it's got 8462 written at the bottom right of the page, the Pulse record from I think another Garda Murphy, a different Garda Murphy, entered on the 15th February of 2006 and it states:
"Report recei ved from Di strict Sergeant Gerry Feeney stating that --"

It's redacted
"A separated mother of two young [bl ank] resi des at the address... has expressed concern for her saf et y and the 12:02 saf ety of her children."

Now, if I could refer you to page 856, this was referred to by Mr. O'Higgins I think on Monday,

Sergeant Hughes, 856, and this is the letter from Inspector Mangan to Assistant Commissioner Feehan. This is the summary of Inspector Mangan's investigation. If we can -- the first paragraph says when he was requested to do it, if we can spool down, you will see at paragraph 3 he contacted Detective Superintendent Michael Byrne. And paragraph 4, if we can go down, you were requested to submit a report, which you did, Sergeant Hughes. Garda Nyhan was requested to submit a report, Detective Sergeant Ciaran 12:03 McEnaney was requested to submit a report. If we continue down, he spoke to Inspector Donal Waters. Then you see -- we are familiar with this document, Sergeant Hughes, it was opened I think on Monday. Paragraph 8, he researched the provisions relating to 12:04 victim impact reports. Examine and consider the victim impact report. Looked at a case called DPP v. o'Donoghue.

If we continue down, research and consider previous victim impact statements, interrogated the Garda Pulse information system, examined statements made to Garda McNally, and spoke to Garda Alan Campbell.

Now, Sergeant Hughes, Mr. O'Higgins described this as only a scoping exercise, just an initial dig to see if there was further investigations required, and it was decided that there should be a formal investigation.

Now, you complain of scapegoating and targeting, are those -- is that scoping exercise in your view a fair one?
A. In my view it's not, and if $I$ can give reasons?
A. There were a large number of Garda personnel that were omitted from this scoping exercise who had personal dealings with Baiba Saulite prior to her death and they were apparently left off the list. There are persons, senior officers, that they were spoken to and they denied having any knowledge in relation to Baiba Saulite, when it's clear that they did have knowledge of -- they were in positions of authority whereby various reports and various occurrences would be known to them in relation to Baiba Saulite, and they were in a position to assist that inquiry. The level of knowledge in relation to Baiba Saulite extended beyond our district to other divisions. And as we can see, it doesn't appear to have any input there from what I would consider crucial members who had dealings with Baiba Saulite prior to her murder.
199 Q. Can you be more specific about particular incidents or members?
A. Well, I would start at, in our own district at the time, detective -- sorry, retired Superintendent Noel McLough1in, who lives in the vicinity there, he would have been available to that fact-finding inquiry, as would retired Inspector Bob Melvin. Sergeant Patrick Ambrose and three of his staff had dealings with Baiba

Saulite in relation to the arson attack on her car in August 2006. They don't appear to have been approached in this factfinding investigation.

If you move on then, you mentioned the collating reports there, I think there was a Garda Joan Scott and Garda Olivia Fleming also had dealings with Baiba and they entered it on Pulse. I don't think they were interviewed in this process.

Just to recollect then, the gardaí in Blanchardstown who had information in relation to matters concerning Baiba and John Hennessy were not interviewed in this process. I may recollect some more, if I can add to that later on, it is just not coming to my head at the moment.

200 Q. And as I say, this is at the scoping stage and then there's a formal investigation commences?
A. Yes, I saw that in the papers, yes. mentioned, were they the subject of any interviews, questioning, in the course of the formal investigation?
A. I don't have any knowledge of a formal investigation following the scoping exercise. The senior officers I referred to in the scoping exercise were merely asked if they had any knowledge and the ones that were asked said they hadn't.

202 Q. But is it your understanding that the on7y real consequence of the formal investigation was the
disciplinary process against you and Garda Nyhan?
A. Yes. My -- obviously I didn't see documents in relation to the scoping exercise or the fact-find investigation until 2012, but I could clearly see that it was really pointing towards the victim impact report 12:09 aspect of my investigation. Based on that investigation, I think the basis of the disciplinary process was based on this scoping exercise. Now just to go back a little to the press release, that's at page 795. You've given evidence that you felt scapegoated by this at a very early stage following the murder. And if we look down just to the final complete paragraph at the bottom of this page, it says:
"Due to the links bet ween Ms. Saulite and the solicitor in question, Mb. Saulite was al so given crime prevention advi ce regarding her property and personal saf ety. "

Now, when you read that, you thought that was correct, is that --
A. I thought it was -- I was puzzled, because it wasn't brought to my attention that she had been given crime prevention advice, and I mean, the formal crime prevention advice that was provided for John Hennessy in the weeks before the murder wasn't brought to my attention at the time.
Q. we11, we now know in any event that that is inaccurate,
but if we read further on in the press release:
"At no time prior to her tragic death were gardaí aware of any specific threat against the life of Mb. Bai ba Saulite and no complaints were recei ved by gardaí from any person in this regard."

And then it continues on:
"As part of the murder investigation, house to house enqui ries are ongoi ng in the area and the Gardaí have now I ear ned that ME. Saulite expressed concerns to friends and nei ghbours regarding her safety. We have al so established that in the course of preparing a document for court use in the sentencing of her husband, ME. Saulite expressed concerns for her saf et y and appeared to be somewhat in fear of him"

Now, how did you respond to that?
A. Yes, I could see that the article seemed to be ignoring
the fact that Baiba Saulite had reported on many occasions that she was in fear of mr. A and she expressed that in the -- quite clearly in her opening statement of the child abduction case, in the child abduction case, which was -- the file was created two stated that she was in fear for her life and her fears was that she was going to be killed. This information was with management at the time of the preparation of
this press release and it seems to ignore those allegations, albeit that they were made a considerable time before they issued the press release. But also then with all the other reports that were received, that Baiba had reported to individual members there, I would imagine that if anybody had looked at the information in its entirety, I don't think that paragraph there relating that she'd only expressed fears at a recent juncture is appropriate.
when you say expressed fears, you mean expressed concerns for her safety?
A. Yes, sorry. Yes. It says here "as part of the house to house enquiries", that they understand that Baiba had expressed concerns to friends and neighbours regarding her safety. To me, my reading of that is that that was probably the first time, according to the Garda authorities, that she had expressed some concern for her safety, when that was not true. well in the next sentence Sergeant Hughes refers to the document, the draft report?
A. Yes.

207 Q. So to summarise your evidence there, you're saying that this gives the impression that this is the first occasion on which the force became aware that she had concerns for her safety?
A. Yes. And then it's pointing to the preparation of the document, which obviously is the victim impact draft statement. It's pointing to that. which had been procured that day from me at Swords Garda Station and
forwarded to the Commissioner.
208 Q. How did you feel when you read that?
A. I was shocked to read that. That, you know, it seemed to be pointing just solely at my investigation and the Garda Nyhan's investigation and our interaction with Baiba in the days before her murder.

209 Q. All right, then there is the scoping exercise and then the disciplinary process is commenced against you. And just to return, and I know there has been fair discussion on this, the wording of the disciplinary allegation made and $I$ think that's at page 908. If we could spool down a little, please. And it's there in italics, sorry to read out again, Chair?
CHAN RMAN No, there is no problem. If it's relevant there's no problem, Mr. Lynn. Don't have any apprehensions about relevance, about reading anything relevant.

MR. LYN: "It appears that Sergeant Wiliam Hughes was in possessi on of documentation and information as a result of meetings with ME. Bai ba Saulite and being in possession of same knew or ought to have known at the time of the existence of a real and imedi ate risk to the life of Mb. Bai ba Saulite and failed in his duty to take measures that might have been expected to avoid that risk."

Now again it's slightly repetitive but it's important, you received legal advice that that was akin to manslaughter
A. Yes, manslaughter, recklessness, yes.

211 Q. And the Chair has pointed out that that's a matter that can be canvassed at a later date between the lawyers and -- but Mr. O'Higgins explained to you that Chief Superintendent Feehan had consulted European Convention on Human Rights case law in drafting this; isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that relates to a person's right to life and whether that right has been violated?
A. I understand.

213 Q. And any suggestion that this would be something other than very serious is something I know you would discount.
A. That's correct.

214 Q. And as Mr. Marrinan pointed out and as was confirmed, we don't need to go back to the correspondence, but it is page 2106, it was actually alleged against you that you had failed to take the necessary measures to avoid the risk posed to Ms. Saulite.
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, I want to turn now and move on to the disciplinary process and the interview. Now firstly, in your evidence you have contended that there was no need for a disciplinary inquiry and that this could have been all dealt with within about six weeks.
A. That's correct.

216 Q. That was your evidence. And again, sorry to repeat, and this was canvassed at length yesterday, you phoned

Chief Superintendent Feehan on the 8th November 2007, you made contact with him?
A. That's correct.

217 Q. Now, you were interviewed on the 29th October of 2008?
A. Yes.

12:20
218 Q. And that's at page 954. Now, you recall this very clearly, I think, Sergeant Hughes?
A. I do.
Q. And we can see Detective Inspector Sweeney, Inspector Inspector Dwyer, Detective Sergeant Bailey are assisting in the investigation. It was a short interview, is it fair to say?
A. It was.
Q. Five questions?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. We will go through them.
"Q. Can you confirmthat you were invol ved in the i nvesti gation of the abduction of the children of Bai ba Saulite by Mr. A?"

That was hardly a controversial question, was it?
A. It was known before the establishment of the disciplinary inquiry.
222 Q. And then second question:
"In your report you make reference to a 12-page report."

And Inspector Dwyer hands that to you and you are asked to confirm it is a copy of the document and you say:
"It looks like it, we don't have the original for compari son.
Q. Did you ever read the 12-page document in its ent i rety?
A. No, I never read the whole document at that time.
Q. Why di d you photocopy this document?
A. We were assisting the State in drawing up a victim 12:22 i mpact report, so we were not expecting Bai ba to arrive at the station with such a detailed document. So in the meanti me she was going away to obtain a GP report and we would go through that document and that anything fromit that was rel evant to accompany the GP report to 12:22 hel p formul ate a proposed victimimpact report."

And that was then read over to you. Sergeant Hughes, were you asked anything that you hadn't replied to previously in interactions with officers?
A. The vast majority of those answers to those questions were already included in the fact-find report I submitted to Inspector Mangan in December 2006.

223 Q. Sorry, there's further questions here. The last paragraph of the 12 -page document was read to you and you were asked had you read that and you said:

[^0]And the report of Superintendent Walter o'Sullivan was read over to you and you were asked:
"Can you comment on this?
A. It was dealt with in my report. I was never
invited to be part of the investigation team case conference. I never said that this would lead to professional difficulties for me. My report deals with the issue. The substantive inf ormation that's contai ned in my report was forwarded to Detective Inspector Mangan, Store Street in mid Decenber 2006."

So you're saying that you have already provided that information?
A. I did, indeed, yes, and I could have clarified any aspect of the report I furnished to Inspector Mangan in that regard.

224 Q. And the memo is then read to you, and you agree it's correct. Now, was that the extent of the interview that afternoon?
A. That was it. I had furnished them with a 25-page document I think as well and -- but as far as the interview was concerned, that was the questions in their entirety.
225 Q. The questions in their entirety?
A. That's it.

226 Q. And I know that the investigators spoke to a friend of Ms. Saulite and Ms. Saulite's general practitioner, and were you asked anything about those enquiries?
A. I wasn't. I understand the two witnesses were visited after I had answered those questions, I think in 2009.
Q. It was after this interview?
A. After this interview, yes.
A. Yes, that was my mistake. a statement of a redacted name and you will see the first, in normal typeface:
"I have been informed by Inspector Fer gus Dyyer that he 12:26 is enquiring into an internal Garda disci plinary i nvestigation in respect of Sergeant Li am Hughes."

And you were unhappy about that.
A. I think so. I don't think it should have been included 12:26 in the statement. It wasn't relevant to the actual taking of a statement, so it shouldn't have been included because disciplinary matters are internal affairs and not really for public consumption.
Q. Disciplinary matters you think are internal affairs, they're not wholly confidential recipient surely Sergeant Hughes?
A. I imagine not, I'd say word could get around, but this is obviously a written record, where they entered into a written record, and I think that shouldn't have happened, in my view.
Q. And to the best of your knowledge in respect of your internal disciplinary proceedings, to the best of your knowledge would that have been well known to people or was it relatively discreet?
A. It would have been known obviously to the people involved in the investigation process. Not too many people approached me and said it in that respect and asked me questions in relation to it. So it was kept pretty discreet, yes.
Q. So to the best of your knowledge it was kept discreet?
A. From my point of view, yes.
Q. But, of course, it found its way into the article in the Star newspaper?
A. Yes, it did.
Q. All right. I want to bring you a -- to move on a little to the confidential recipient investigation and your complaint and a letter that hasn't been opened that you wrote to Brian McCarthy on the 4th December of 12:28 2008. And it's at page 558 of the papers. Do you recall this letter, Sergeant Hughes?
A. I certainly do, yes.
Q. And you say in the second paragraph, last sentence --

MR. OHGGN: Chairman, I am sorry to interrupt Mr. Lynn, I don't wish to knock his train of thought, just I have an apprehension and I am sure it won't arise, but there is a danger that this document may
lead us into the dangerous area that was spoken about 20 minutes ago. So I just think we need to be very careful with this area altogether.
CHA RMAN I do not have that document, this document in front of me, so if there's a question about it that you think -- do you think it shouldn't be referred to, is that what you are saying?

MR. OHGGN: I think this is a document of the 4th December 2008?

MR. LYN: yes.
CHAI RMAN 4th December '08, yes.
MR. OHGGN: To Mr. Brian McCarthy. So I do accept the CRO communications are broadly speaking relevant. CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. OHGGN: But there is a reference in this document, that I am aware of, that could lead into the dangerous area we were speaking about earlier. CHA RMAN Yes. Are you aware of that, Mr. Lynn? Do you understand what Mr. o'higgins is referring to?
MR. LYN: I do. But I mean, I can see it's 12:30 and what I could do is leave this over -- of your examination, then you can simply leave -- we won't produce the document, but you can ask your relevant questions without referring to the sensitive
matter that Mr. O'Higgins -- is that all right? Are you happy with that?
MR. LYNN Yes.
CHA RMAN And if anything arises that you think is necessary to refer to the sensitive matter, then come back to that.

MR. LYN: Very good.
CHA RMAN But for the moment proceed. Is that okay?
MR. LYN: Very good.
CHA RMAN Are you happy with that?
MR. O H GG NS: I am happy with that. Thank you, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Al1 right.
237 Q. MR. LYNN Sergeant Hughes, we're not going to go into the details of what is in the letter but the Tribunal 12:31 has the letter and they can see that you have conveyed certain information to Mr. McCarthy.
A. That's correct.

238 Q. Now, the question for you is: Do you think, without going into the information, that the information that you relayed was properly dealt with?
A. I don't believe that.

239 Q. And why is that, without, if you can, going into the actual nature of the information?
A. Well the individuals, the individual Garda members
referred to in the document at the first instance weren't approached in the fact-find investigation and neither were they seemingly approached in the confidential recipient investigation process. And I
believe that information in that document there was critical to Garda management's viewpoints in relation to systems failure within the Garda Síochána, in relation to John Hennessy and Baiba Saulite prior to the murder. And I believe, I believe that a proper investigation of the document there would have shone the spotlight considerably and substantially towards other members of An Garda Síochána, particularly of senior rank.

240 Q. And when you review the final report, does it appear to ${ }^{12: 32}$ you that this information was engaged with at all?
A. It doesn't appear so.

CHAI RMAN So the question can be, so to speak, neutrally put in this way, I think, Mr. Lynn, if I am understanding, that the information provided that
Sergeant Hughes provided information to the confidential recipient and his complaint is that that wasn't addressed in the Feehan report.
MR. LYNE Yes.
CHA RMAN That's essentially the point.
MR. LYNE Yes.
CHAN RMAN Is that --
MR. LYN: yes.
CHA RMAN Everyone clear on that? is that a reasonable summary of the situation? And to the extent ${ }_{12: 33}$ that we need to, if necessary, delve more particularly into it, that matter remains to be debated as to how it might be done. Is that okay?
MR. LYN: very good. Thank you, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Everyone clear? Are you happy with that, Mr. O'Higgins?
MR. OHGGN: Yes, thank you, Chairman, thank you for that.

CHA RMAN Okay.
12:33
MR. LYN: We will continue on the issue of this report because Issue 3 in the opening statement of the Tribunal asks whether you were targeted or discredited by a failure to carry out a proper investigation into the report you had made to the confidential recipient. Now it's a broad question, Sergeant Hughes, I am sorry to ask a broad question, we may tailor it as we go along, but do you believe that there was a failure to carry out a proper investigation?
A. I do.

242 Q. And can you say why?
A. On a number of counts there. I actually made notes there, from my reading of the confidential recipient report from Chief Superintendent Feehan, or Assistant Commissioner Feehan at that time, to the Commissioner. There are many aspects of the report which I have noted should have been looked after, should have been attended to or were not, or that I would have a difference of opinion in relation to the decisions arrived at in various elements of the report. I have 12:35 the notes there, I don't know whether it would be -would it be permitted to actually refer to the notes as we read through the report?
CHA RMAN The Tribunal asked for details of the
complaints that you made.
A. Yes, indeed.

243 Q. CHA RMAN And you gave them to us. You said:
"Pl ease refer to the report submitted to Superintendent ${ }_{\text {12:35 }}$ Gabriel O Gara and the report submitted to Inspector O Boyle in relation to the confidential reci pient i nvesti gati on. "

That's not terribly specific. Anyway. Then you say: ${ }^{12: 35}$
"The investigation failed to uncover irref utable wrongdoings with regard to the alleged Iack of investigation, correl ation of crimes or offences prior to the murder, pre Novenber 2006."

I hope this is correct. I am referring to my note of what the letter said, so you'11 have to -- this is the letter of particulars. And then:
"Once the systems failures had been established in Chi ef Superintendent Feehan's investigation, then a full and proper investigation of the remai ning allegations should have uncovered wrongdoi ngs in rel ation to misinformation in the Garda press rel ease, issues in the fact-finding investigation, issues in the di sci plinary investi gation, I ack of response from Garda reports of systens failure, failure to investigate sick leave absences, the grossly unfair act of reducing his
sal ary without proper --"

And so on. And then D was lack of feedback, and so on, in respect of the confidential recipient investigation, and failure to forward the file to others. Those are the details that you gave us.

Now, are they all included in your list or is this a new list?
A. That would cover the vast majority.

244 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes.
A. But having read the report from the -- which I hadn't got at the time of making the statement to the Tribunal, having read the report from the confidential recipient to the Commissioner, I just made notes there which could assist me in -- if we are in the -CHA RNAN That's okay. It's not a problem. Did you tell those to Mr. Marrinan when he was asking but it, I mean a few days ago?
A. No.

245 Q. CHA RMAN Let me tell you exactly what my concern is. My concern is that if this is new material, Mr. O'Higgins doesn't know about this material, so we're sort of adding as it goes along. I am also concerned that you say you didn't have the Feehan details?
A. At the time I made my statement to the Tribunal, yes.

246 Q. CHA RMAN No. At the time you gave these details, the
ones I just read out from your solicitor. I think you should have had the Feehan report at that stage. But anyway, listen, most of the complaints are included in this?
A. Yes, indeed. better hear what they are?
A. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

248 Q. MR. LYNN Sergeant Hughes, you said the vast majority have been covered by the Chair.
A. Yes.

249 Q. CHAN RMAN Te11 us what they are.
A. Sorry, just as you read out, Mr. Chairman.

250 Q. CHA RMAR You tell us the ones, those are the ones that everybody should know about, because they're the ones your solicitors notified us about?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN Now they may complain that they're not sufficiently detailed or whatever it is, that is not my concern. You have some additional --
A. Sorry, I just see, I had an aide memoire there, if I was asked questions in relation to the specifics, it's quite a lengthy document.

252 Q. CHA RMAR Your document now is an aide memoire, is that right?
A. Yes. If I was asked questions in relation to it, I was on7y going to use them as an aide memoire.
Q. CHA RMAN Is it useful for identifying for you or us the complaints you make about the Feehan investigation?
A. Oh no, just to assist me in answering the questions in relation to the extensive report submitted to the Commissioner.
Q. CHA RMAK Unless somebody wants to ask you specifically for a copy of your aide memoire, I am not getting into that?
A. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN And I have the point that you say that the matters in your subsequent letter of December weren't dealt with, $I$ have that point?
A. Yes.

257 Q
CHA RMAN Now, are there other complaints that you --
A. No, that's it Mr. Chairman, that's it.
Q. CHA RMAN okay. I want to make sure. And then there's the ones you told us about, that's the ones you have been over with Mr. Marrinan and there's the ones you have been over with with Mr. O'Higgins, and if there are any more let's have them and then we'11 debate them.
A. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

259 Q. CHA RMAN So you think we've pretty well covered them?
A. Yes, Mr. Chairman, yes.

CHA RMAN okay. All right.
MR. LYN: Now, I think we can save time on another issue, you'11 recal1 a letter from Assistant
Commissioner Clancy, the 19th September 2008, it's at page 502, but we don't need to look at it, and you said there were inaccuracies and one was identified in your examination by Mr. Marrinan, that it was asserted that you weren't going to deal face-to-face with local management and were there other inaccuracies. And in 12:41 fact, just for the record, there has been correspondence with the Tribunal on that. We don't need to go into it, but for reference purposes, it's at page 7937.
CHA RMAN And what are the other inaccuracies,
Mr. Lynn?
MR. LYN: We11, Sergeant Hughes.
A. Sorry, the inaccuracies were submitted in a letter to -- which is in the documents there, and if we can put it up there, $I$ can go through it.
261 Q. Well, it's at 7937.
CHAN RMAN 7937. Thanks very much.
262 Q. MR. LYN: And if we can go down please, Mr. Kavanagh. Further down. Further down. Further down. Sorry the next. This is it, the letter here. And you will see, 12:42 Sergeant Hughes, I think it is your position that concerns you'd expressed at Dr. Griffin were largely lost in the transactions between his office and the ACMO and that as a result Dr. Quigley did not have the
fullest and most accurate information to hand when arriving at the decision for medical discharge. He did enumerate several matters for the assistant commissioner HRM's attention. And you assert that the ACMO's advices were largely ignored by the assistant commissioner HRM and only quotes the disciplinary issues as a possible resolution to matters.
CHA RMAN I am not understanding that. Can you explain that, Sergeant Hughes?
A. I think we covered one of the inaccuracies there previously.
Q. CHA RMAN Yeah.
A. And I was asked to explain the other inaccuracies and it's set out there and I think we can scroll back up again, I think is there further information?
264 Q. CHAN RMAN The question really we're addressing is this, sergeant, and it's a relevant question, and the question is this: what complaint are you making about Assistant Commissioner Clancy? That's the question. And I have the point that you say that her letter says that you were unwilling to speak face-to-face and wanted only telephone communication?
A. Right.

CHA RMAN Okay. You said to us, to the Tribunal that there were numerous inaccuracies and that represented targeting of you. And we said what were the numerous inaccuracies. And the letter, the response was:

[^1]to numerous inaccuraci es anounting to abuse of process, harassment of Sergeant Hughes."

Now, that baffling statement was your response to our query to say, tell us what the numerous inaccuracies were. So, is that the height of it? Is it that she referred in her letter, mistakenly as you say, and as appears to be in the case -- sorry, wrongly, I should say, to the fact that you were only willing to have telephone communication rather than face-to-face interviews. Is that the only problem with Assistant Commissioner Clancy?
A. In relation -- yes, that was the primary problem in that report.
CHA RMAN And while we're on the subject, I don't want to sort of -- well, I do want to sort of corral you in a way into saying what else, have you any other complaint about Assistant Commissioner Clancy?
A. We11, arising from that document I was asked what were the numerous inaccuracies because that was only one.
267 Q. CHA RMAN Correct and you pointed out to one, okay.
A. I have them set out here, in this document here. You see it, Issue 8 , $I$ think that's the way it was --
268 Q. CHA RMAN That's okay.
A. Yes. So do I read it out or is it just accepted that --
269 Q. CHAN RMAN No, no, just tell me what you --
A. Basically it's -- if we can just scroll down a slight bit there, it's in relation to when I visited

Dr. Griffin, I would furnish him with an extensive report setting out my concerns and most of them to do with non-medical matters but that report didn't find its way to the CMO.
Q. CHAN RMNE That report didn't find --
A. Any reports I actually furnished didn't find their way to the CMO.

CHA RMAN Sorry, how was Assistant Commissioner Clancy responsible for that?
A. No, just that in her letter, in the correspondence she refers to not receiving information, or $I$ can't recall exactly.
Q. CHA RMAN That's okay.
A. Yes. But I said there's numerous inaccuracies and this is one of the numerous inaccuracies here, along with the telephone issue. And I think we scroll down -CHA RMAN Can you see what I am trying to do is to try to say, against whom is there a complaint and what the nature of the complaint? That's what I am trying to do.
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN So I see Assistant Commissioner Clancy, who doesn't appear to have a whole lot to do with this case, to be honest, that's my provisional feeling, subject to what anybody else says, and I am just concerned it know what you say. Now, your lawyers may say something different. Mr. Lynn and Mr. Dwyer may say, hold on, there is a difference, there is a case against you. But I am just wondering, from your point
of view, your complaint against Assistant Commissioner Clancy, the one I know about at the moment is that she was wrong in saying you were only willing to meet to talk by telephone?
A. Yes, Mr. Chairman. If we can see the document itself that emanated -- I don't know whether we raise the issues about inaccuracies or other inaccuracies, but we were asked to clarify them. And this letter here clarifies the inaccuracies from Issue 8.
Q.

CHA RMAN This is your letter, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. CHAN RMAN This one here?
A. I was contacted to actually clarify these matters by my solicitors.
277 Q. CHAN RMAN Thanks very much, okay.
A. I sent my response back to the solicitor and he created the correspondence.

278 Q. CHA RMAN Let's go through it then. You say down at point 8 , is that right?
A. Yes, Issue 8.

279 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Can you go down to Issue 8, please? Issue 8, now. So the typed -- okay, tell us about this:
"The typed report furni shed to Dr. Griffin..."
which typed report? whose report is that?
A. That's my report to Dr. Griffin.

280 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Thank you. Very good. Now, down you
go, Peter, thank you.
MR. LYN: I think it is down at number 4, is it?
CHA RMAN Sorry, say that again Mr. Lynn.
MR. LYNE I think it is down to number 4.
CHAI RMAN Down to number 4, thank you. Now. Okay. 12:49 That's the case, all right thank you very much. Very good. Have that.
A. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHA RMAN Thanks for your help. Okay.
281 Q.
MR. LYN: Now, Sergeant Hughes, part of Mr. O'Higgins'
12:50 cross-examination was to do with the pay cut imposed after 183 days absence.
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. And I just want to refer you and the Tribunal to page 3875?

CHA RMAN Yes.
283 Q. This is a letter from you and if we can just go down, you will see that you ask, final sentence:
"I respectfully request that this issue be referred to the Chi ef Medical Of ficer for determination as to whet her my case falls under the category of injury on duty."

And that letter is dated the 7th May $2007 ?$
A. Yes, indeed.

284 Q. We11 in advance of the 183-day --
A. That's correct.

285 Q. And 3874 above, that was that are was forwarded by

Sergeant Curran to Gerry Phillips, Chief Superintendent Phillips, on the 14th May 2007. So Sergeant Hughes, you had in good time looked for this issue to be addressed?
A. Yes, indeed.
Q. You were asked in cross-examination why you hadn't divulged the information that you say you received from Detective Inspector o'Sullivan until the confidential recipient procedure was put in place. Can you explain to the Tribunal why that new procedure was important to 12:53 you?
A. This is the Charter, is it?

287 Q. Yes, the Charter.
A. Well, it clearly set out -- the Charter clearly set out protections there, the Government were introducing
protections for members of An Garda Síochána who wished to step forward and make complaints of irregularities or malpractice within the organisation. And it recognised, it seems to have recognised, it seems to me to have recognised that there was an environment
whereby members of the An Garda Síochána couldn't really actively do that without having some fear or trepidation in that regard. of course the Charter document was issued, published in 2007 and the confidential recipient process $I$ don't think commenced until mid 2008 or so.

So during the interim time, that would -- the Government's view on those matters would have been very
much my view in relation to stepping forward and pointing out irregularities in relation to matters where I saw that there didn't seem to be the same opinion on behalf of the majority of the offices I was dealing with or members of the Garda Síochána.
MR. LYNN Chairman, I see it is five to one, I am wondering if we could just --
CHAL RMAN Have you much more to go?
MR. LYN: No, I don't think so but if I could take the Tunchtime.

CHA RMAN No problem. Take the lunchtime, there is no problem about that. Maybe it's just me, my only complaint is when documents are being read when the witness does not have any real relevance to it. But I understand the point, we've already heard your observations on that, and you were in the right, Mr. Lynn, so consider yourself fully vindicated. So no problem at all. And take as long as you like.
MR. LYNE Thank you.
CHA RMAN As long as you think proper. Thank you very 12:55 much. Okay. Thank you.

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

FOLLOVS:

CHA RMAN Now, thanks, Mr. Lynn, yes.
MR. LYNE I have no further questions, Chair, thank you.
CHA RMAN Sure.

MR. MARRI NAN I have no --
CHA RMAN I am sorry, what did you say, Mr. Lynn?
MR. LYNN I have no further questions.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
MR. MARRI NAN Chairman, there is no matters that have arisen for re-examination.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Anything you want to add at this stage or have you got it all off your chest?

THE WTNESS: I think I have, Chairman.
288 Q. CHA RMAN Let me make a compliment, that you have survived the whole process very well and thank you very 14:03 much for your assistance over the whole period.

THE WTNESS: Thank you.
CHA RMAN You're now day seven and you have been on the go morning and afternoon, which is a tiring experience, certainly as I know, because I find it tiring, so well done.

THE WTNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

CHA RMAN Yes, thank you.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Obviously that is an important phase of the Tribunal's work over.

CHA RMAN Yes.

MR. MEGI NNESS: And as you would expect, Chairman, we intend to review or indicative list of witnesses and I hope to consult with my colleagues in that regard very shortly and, as it were, supply a list of views on whether some witnesses may be dispensed with or not. CHA RMAN Yes.

MR. MEGI NNESS: In the light of the evidence so far. CHAN RMAN I think that is very sensible, if you consult on those issues. while we're on the subject of that, Mr. McGuinness, is there any point in having Assistant Commissioner Fanning represented here until he's giving evidence? I mean, I don't see any issue. I understand that he's entitled to representation for when he's giving evidence, but in the next phase, is there any question of him being required? Because it doesn't seem to me that there is.

MR. MEGI NESS: I can only say, Chairman, that from the point of view of the other witnesses, I don't feel that there are any other allegations as such that have been made.

CHA RMAN No. Who is appearing Assistant Commissioner Fanning? Oh Mr. McGarry, sorry, I didn't see you there. Mr. McGarry, is there any point in dragging you up here for the next phase, except for when your client is giving evidence, which I completely understand, and bear in mind this also, that if any issue were to arise, obviously we would be keeping in touch with you.

MR. MEGARRY: Yes, Chairman -- sorry, there is a problem with the mic. It is not working either. I
don't know if you can hear me, Chairman.
CHA RMAN I can hear you now. It would be better if you have a microphone.

MR. MEGARRY: It's not working.

CHA RMAN That's all right, you speak very clearly, Mr. McGarry, so I can hear you.

MR. MLGARRY: We were going to suggest something along those lines, Chairman. Obviously we don't think we need to be here for almost the vast bulk of what remains. There is an issue surrounding the retirement/pay issue, which you'11 reca11 I asked Sergeant Hughes about.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGARRY: Then obviously if Assistant Commissioner Fanning is going to be called we need to be here, it may be necessary that there are one or two other witnesses around that issue but I think they may come at the end in any event and if so we don't need to be here until that.

CHA RMAK That seems a very, if I may say so, Mr. McGarry, a very responsible attitude and I think it also makes sense. And it doesn't -- we don't have to drag you and your team up here. So what I am suggesting is that we won't need you until such time as your client, Assistant Commissioner Fanning, is giving issue in the event that it arises, which I am not sure it will, but we have your position, is that all right. MR. MEGRRY: Yes, thank you, Chairman.

CHA RMAK Thanks very much. Anybody any objection to that or any problem with that? Very good. Okay. So, that's what we'11 do then. Mr. McGuinness, you will be consulting with your colleagues and if you can make progress in reducing witnesses or issues, so be it. Obviously the Tribunal i.e. I, will be very happy if that happens.

Meantime, that leaves us, because of the efficiency of counsel, that will leave us with no more to do today in 14:07 the forum. So we will get to work in our preparations and analysis, which is what we have to do then in relation to the issue to the evidence that we've heard. So it's a welcome break, as far as I'm concerned, to take stock of where we stand in relation to the evidence. Thanks very much. Okay. So we'11 leave it at that then. Very good. So until Monday, 10:30, is that the position.
MR. MEGI NESS: Yes, Chairman.
CHA RMAN So be it. Thank you very much, that's a 14:07 slightly welcome break, I'm sure, for everybody.
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| $71: 29,72: 5$, $77: 21,80: 25$ | H | hereb | 97:12 | inaccurate [1] - | - 13:23, 18:4, |
| 81:2, 81:3, 81:8, | hand [5] - 11:1 | herself [3] - 53.353 .22 | Hughes's [1] 60:29 | 69:29 | 19:29, 31:29, |
| 81:2, 81:3, 81:8, 83:25, 83:27, | 16:27, 22:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 3,53: 22, \\ & 54: 20 \end{aligned}$ | Human [1] - 73:6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { inadequ } \\ {[1]-34: 26} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 28,46: 20, \\ & 46: 23,46: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 93: 16,93: 21, \\ & 94: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 35:11, 88:1 | high [1] - 8:21 | human [1] - 8:1 | inadmissible [1] | 47:2, 47:26, |
| gardaí [8] - | handed [2] | High [5] - 8:28, | husband [1] - | - 85:10 | 48:18, 48:19, |
|  | 57:19, 6 | 9:13, 10:19, | $70: 1$ | inadvertently [2] | 48:22, 48:27, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 47:10, 47:19, } \\ & 48: 7,54: 16, \end{aligned}$ | happy [10] - 9:2, | 37:11, 37:27 | $58: 14$ | - 25:5, 59:14 | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 5,50: 23 \\ & 50: 25,50: 26 \end{aligned}$ |
| 63:12, 68:11, $70: 3,70: 5$ | 9:6, 15:7, 32:28, | $45: 7$ |  | $13: 5,24: 6$ | 50:29, 51:1, |
| 70:3, 70:5 <br> Gardaí [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 16,80: 2 \\ & 80: 10,80: 11 \end{aligned}$ | hold [1] - 90:28 | I | $\begin{aligned} & \text { incidents [1] - } \\ & \text { 67:22 } \end{aligned}$ | 51:15, 51:24, $55: 16,55: 21,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 37: 2,56: 21 \\ & 70: 11 \\ & \text { general }[4] \end{aligned}$ | 82:1, 98:6 | 39:7 |  | include [8] | $63: 11,64: 2,$ |
|  | ```Marassment[1] -``` | home [4] - 26:4, | idea [1] - 49:8 | 12:11, 16:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 22,68: 12 \\ & 70: 28,71: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $50: 20,54: 3,57: 8$ 76:28 | hard [3] - 47:11, | $47: 25,48: 5,55: 6$ honest [2] - | identification | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 1,19: 8,27: 24, \\ & 38: 19,53: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 28,71: 7, \\ & 72: 19,76: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| 76:28 <br> General [4] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { 65:8, } 65: 13 \\ \text { hardened } \end{gathered}$ | $60: 17,90: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-4: 12} \\ & \text { identified }{ }_{[1]}- \end{aligned}$ | included [9] - <br> 17.29, 18.28 | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 14,80: 17 \\ & 80: 20,80: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $43: 23$ | hope [3] - 49:24, | 87:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:29, 18:28, } \\ & \text { 26:20, 65:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 81:1, 81:11, |
| 38:18, 41:1, 41:3, 41:6 | hardly [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 83:17, 96:3 } \\ & \text { hopefully [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | identifying [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:20, 65:7, } \\ & 75: 22,77: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 81:15, 81:16, |
| generally [3]- | 74:22 | 11:11 | ignore [1]-71 | $77: 28,84: 8,85: 3$ | 88:1, 88:15, |
| 47:22, 47:29, $48: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hatched [1] } \\ & 7: 20 \end{aligned}$ | Horan [1] - 6:29 | ignored [1] - | including [2] - | $90: 11,93: 7$ |
| Gerry [2] - | hatching [1] - | house [8] - 14:3, 56:29, 57:15, | 88:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:9, 41:23 } \\ & \text { inclusion [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { informed [9] - } \\ & \text { - } 12: 10,33: 23 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 65: 19,93: 1 \\ \text { given [10] - } \end{gathered}$ | $8: 22$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 56: 29, ~ 5 /: 15, \\ 57: 24, ~ 70: 10, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ignoring [1] - } \\ & 70: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 13:20 | $54: 11,56: 27$ |
| 11:29, 23:12, | head [1] - 68:15 heading [1] - | 71:12, 71:13 | imagine [2] - | incomplete [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 2,58: 25, \\ & 58: 29.77: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| 26:17, 33:16, | 7:12 | HRM [2]-21:10, | 71:6, 78:4 | 12:17 <br> indeed [9] - | $77: 20$ |
| 49:25, 53:18,54:1, $69: 10$, | hear [7]-17:16, | 88:6 <br> HRM's [1] - 88:4 | immediate [1] - | 21:18, 46:19, | inhibit [1] - |
|  | $41: 13,42: 21$ | hugely [1] - | 72:22 | $49: 6,76: 15,83: 2$ | 61:18 |
| 64.1, $69: 17,69: 24$ glad [1] - 42:21 | $85: 11,97: 1,97: 2$ | $21: 14$ | immediately [4] | $85: 5,92: 13$ | initial [1] - 66:26 |
| glad [1] - 42:21 | 97:6 | HUGHES [5] - | - 39:27, 41:19, | 92:26, 93:5 | initiative [1] - |


| 33:24 | interim [1] - | 81:6, 82:9, 82:14, | $32: 24,35: 11$ | 96:27 | 14:18, 16:7, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| injury [2]-7:19, | 93:28 | 83:8, 83:12 | 36:26, 39:28, | kept ${ }_{[2]}-78: 15$, | 51:10, 67:9 |
| 92:22 | internal [5] - | 83:14, 83:22 | 41:19, 46:5 | 78:1 | gal [4]-8:1, |
| input [1] - 67:19 | 33:18, 77:21, | 83:23, 83:26 | 83:26, 88:7, 91:7, | Kevin [1] - 55:14 | 15:1, 15:5, 72:28 |
| inquiring [2] - | 77:28, 78:1, 78:9 | 83:27, 84:4, 86:4, | 96:9, 98:5 | kick [1] - 37:21 | legitimate [1] - |
| 63:15, 63:16 | interrogated [1] | 86:14 | IT [2] - 4:12, 4:17 | killed [2] - | 42:10 |
| inquiry [8] - | -66:21 | investigations | it'll [1] - 11:11 | 70:28, 75:28 | length [1] - |
| 17:11, 28:22 | terrupt [3] | [5] - 4:14, 30:7, | italicised [1] - | ock [1] - 79:2 | 73:29 |
| 32:23, 67:16, | 41:7, 41:10, 79:1 | 44:2, 55:20, | 41:12 | knowledge [11] - | lengthy [3] - |
| 67:27, 73:25, | interrupted [1] - | 66:27 | italics [1] - 72:13 | 60:25, 63:26, | 9:20, 30:19, |
| $\begin{gathered} 74: 24,77: 14 \\ \text { insofar [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:9 } \\ & \text { intervene [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | investigator [2] <br> - 27:17, 53:27 <br> investigators [6] | itself [2] - 43:28, | 67:11, 67:12, | 85:27 |
|  |  |  | 91:5 | 67:17, 68:20, | less [1] - 31:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40:24 } \\ & \text { Inspector }[12]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:12 } \\ & \text { interview }[7] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | investigators [6] $-24: 14,24: 17$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:23, 68:26, } \\ & 78: 8,78: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lest }[1]-33: 26 \\ & \text { letter }[30]-11: \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:5, 17:19 } \\ & 26: 28,44: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:4, 73:23, } \\ & 74: 12,76: 19, \\ & 76: 23,77: 3,77: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 19,43: 1 \\ & 55: 17,76: 27 \end{aligned}$invited [2] |  | 78:17 | 11:9, 11:22, |
|  |  |  |  | known [7] - | $12: 15,30: 17$ |
| $44: 29,45: 5,45: 6,$ |  | 27:17, 76:6 | JAMES [1] - 3:5 <br> January [4] - | $47: 29,48: 1$ | 31:10, 31:12, |
| $\begin{gathered} 74: 9,76: 11,93: 8 \\ \text { inspector [25] - } \end{gathered}$ | 12:27, 35:21, | involve [1] | 36:6, 46:21, | 74:23, 78:10, | $36: 6,38: 8,66$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:27, 35:21, } \\ & 68: 9,68: 13,74: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $35: 14$ | 46:26, 59:1 | 78:12 | 78:24, 78:27, |
| 13:6, 14:29, | 77:7 <br> interviews [2] - |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Joan [1] - 68:6 } \\ & \text { job [5] - 13:1, } \end{aligned}$ | knows [1] - | $80: 15,80: 16$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15: 22,18: 22, \\ & 22: 12,22: 29, \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 10,33: 21, \\ & 35: 21,39: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { job [5]-13:1, } \\ \text { 13:9, 14:6, 39:4 } \end{gathered}$ |  | 83:18, 83:19, |
| 23:12, 25:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:21, 89:11 } \\ & \text { introducing [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 44:14, 49:2, | $\begin{gathered} \text { John [10] - } \\ \text { 10:28, 44:6, } \end{gathered}$ |  | 87:18, 87:25, |
| 25:18, $25: 21$, $26: 17,26: 27$ | 93:15 | 55:17, 74:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 28,44: 6 \\ & 46: 17,46: 25 \end{aligned}$ |  | $88: 20,88: 27$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 26: 17,26: 27 \\ & 28: 4,28: 6,45 \end{aligned}$ | introduction [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 13 \\ & \text { involvement }[2] \end{aligned}$ | $47: 6,48: 5,48: 26$ | lack [3]-83:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:7, 90:10, 91:8, } \\ & 91: 10,92: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| 60:24, 66:2, 66:3, | 83:28 | $\begin{aligned} & -11: 29,53: 9 \\ & \text { IRM }[1]-37: 15 \\ & \text { irrefutable [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $68: 13,69: 26,$ | 83:27, 84:3 | $92: 25$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 74: 9,74: 10,75: 1, \\ & 75: 23,76: 16, \end{aligned}$ |  |  | judge [1] - 8:28 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { large [2]-47:16, } \\ & 67: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { letters [3] - 10:9, } \\ & 21: 10,30: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| $77: 20,83: 6$ <br> Inspectorate [4] | $-51: 20$ <br> investigating ${ }_{[7]}$ | $83: 12$ | Judge [1] - | largely [2] - | level [2]-32:16, |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 83:12 } \\ & \text { irregular [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 64:17 | 87:27, 88:5 | 67:16 |
|  | - 11:6, 43:2, 43:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:17 } \\ & \text { irregularities [2] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { July [3] - 13:7, } \\ & 13: 10.36: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { last [12]-8:16, } \\ & 12: 2.23: 17 . \end{aligned}$ | Liam [5] - 57:2, |
| $\begin{gathered} 33: 21,33: 22 \\ \text { instance }[3]- \end{gathered}$ | 54:18, 64:10 investigation |  | 13:10, 36:3 juncture [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 2,23: 17 \\ & 23: 24,24: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 15,58: 23, \\ & 77: 12.77: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23: 15,28: 28, \\ & 80: 26 \end{aligned}$ |  | IS [2] - 4:12, | $17: 17,71: 9$ | $24: 14,26: 1,30: 5$ | liberty [1] - 4:18 |
|  | [64]-12:5, 12:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4:17 } \\ & \text { isolation }[4]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { June [3] - 6:15, } \\ & 6: 24,6: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 22,39: 18, \\ & 75: 24,78: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { life }[8]-20: 10, \\ & 36 \cdot 2953: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { instigation [1] - } \\ & 44: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 12:27, 13:1, |  | 6:24, 6:28 <br> Justice [12] - | late [1] - 24:14 | 36:29, 53:20, |
| 44:9 <br> INSTRUCTED | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 15,17: 1 \\ & 21: 24,21: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $24: 8,24: 28$ | $7: 8,9: 21,11: 17$ | law [2] - 7:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 4,70: 4,70: 27, \\ & 72: 23,73: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| [1] - 3:6 <br> instructed [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 12,35: 15, \\ & 38: 1,40: 4,40: 11, \end{aligned}$ | issue [27] - | 30:18, 31:12, | 73:6 | lift [1] - 15:19 |
|  |  | 17:13, 18:14, | 32:17, 32:25, | lawyers [2] - | light [1] - 96:7 |
|  | 41:4, 41:25, | 24:15, 52:24 | 33:25, 35:25, | 73:3, 90:26 | lighter [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 56: 28 \\ & \text { instruction [1] - } \\ & 54: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 42:25, 42:26, | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 28,63: 19 \\ & 63: 23,63: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 36:1, 36:2, 37:25 } \\ \text { JUSTICE [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { lead }[4]-13: 24, \\ 76: 7,79: 5,79: 20 \end{gathered}$ | 44:12 |
|  | 43:12, 44:10, |  | JUSTICE [1] - $4: 8$ | 76:7, 79:5, 79:20 <br> leading [1] - | line [9]-15:20, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 25,52: 3 \\ & 52: 19.53: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 9,82: 6,82: 7, \\ & 87: 4,89: 23, \end{aligned}$ | justice [1] | 39:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 17,23: 24, \\ & 24: 4,24: 26,2 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { instructions [2] } \\ & -47: 22,55: 5 \\ & \text { intelligence [1] } \end{aligned}$ | 52:19, 53:18, | $90: 16,91: 9$ | 31:29 | learn [3] - 50:29, | $32: 22,35: 2$ |
|  | $54: 14,54: 26$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 16,91: 9, \\ & 91: 20,91: 21, \end{aligned}$ | justified [1] - | 51:28, 52:5 | 36:18 |
| ```55:3 intend [1] - 96:2``` | 55:18, $60: 25$,$63: 26,66: 4$, | $\begin{aligned} & 91: 22,92: 20, \\ & 93: 3,96: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 50:1 | learned [3] - | lines [2] - 39:22, |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 93: 3,96: 12, \\ & 96: 26.97: 10 \end{aligned}$ |  | least [1]-64:1 | 97:8 |
| $50: 19$ | 68:18, 68:22,$68: 23 \quad 68: 29$ | 97:11, 97:17, |  | leave [8]-9:10, | links [1] - 69:16 |
|  |  | $97: 27,98: 13$ |  | 21:2, 42:17, | $67: 9,84: 8,84: 9$ |
| 49:4, 56:18, $64: 24.72: 5$ | 69:4, 69:6, 69:7, | issued [5] - | Kavanagh [4] - | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 25,79: 27, \\ & 83: 29,98: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $96: 2,96: 4$ |
| interactions [1] | 74:11, 74:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 6,36: 22,55: 5 \\ & 71: 3,93: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 39:13, 52:11, | 98:16 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { listen [2] - } \\ 45: 23,85: 3 \end{array}$ |
| $-75: 20$ | $76: 6,77: 22,$ | issues [17] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:24, 87:23 } \\ & \text { keep [2] - 44:13, } \end{aligned}$ | leaves [1] - 98:9 | lives [1] - 67:26 |
| interested [1] - | 78:13, 78:23, | 11:3, 11:5, 21:6, | $55: 11$ | led [1] - 37:23 | lobby [1] - 10:16 |
| 4:17 | 80:27, 80:29, | 21:11, 31:23, | keeping [1] - | left [5] - 14:16, | local [2] - 54:19, |


| 87:9 | 82:6, 85:13, 87:3, | Mangan's [2] - | McGarry [9] - | memo [1] - | 27:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| locate [3] | 87:17, 87:23 | 28:6, 66:3 | 96:22, 96:23 | 76:1 | missing [2] - |
| 20:12, 22:16, | 92:2, 92:4, 92:10, | manner [1] | 96:28, 97:4, 97:6, | memoire [5] - | 59:22, 62:21 |
| 58:3 | 94:6, 94:9, 94:19, | 63:25 | 97:7, 97:14, | 85:25, 85:28, | mistake [1] - |
| located [1] - | 94:27, 95:3 | manslaughter | 97:21, 97:29 | 86:2, 86:9, 86:12 | 77:15 |
| 59:18 | Lynn [29]-41:8, | [2]-72:29, 73:1 | McGuinness [7] | mention [1] - | mistaken [1] - |
| logical [1] - 63:5 | 41:17, 42:1, | Mark [1] - 15:22 | - 95:27, 96:1, | 16:4 | 18:21 |
| look [18] - 6:23, | 42:10, 42:12, | Marrinan [5] - | 96:7, 96:10, | mentioned [4] - | mistakenly [1] - |
| 11:4, 11:6, 16:24, | 45:26, 49:11, | 56:8, 73:16, | 96:17, 98:3, | 52:15, 61:26, | 89:7 |
| 19:10, 23:15, | 49:17, 50:16, | 84:18, 86:24 | 98:19 | 68:5, 68:21 | mistreatment |
| 25:23, 26:11, | 56:11, 59:24, | 87:8 | McHugh [1] - | merely [1] - | [1] - 53:17 |
| 30:15, 31:9, 33:1, | 60:3, 61:7, 62:22, | MARRINAN [3] - | 44:28 | 68:25 | misunderstand |
| 38:3, 57:14, | 64:15, 64:21, | 56:9, 95:1, 95:8 | McLoughlin [2] | met [2]-10:10, | ing [1] - 17:13 |
| 61:12, 62:8, | 64:25, 64:28, | Martin [1] - 38:6 | - 53:26, 67:26 | 10:11 | mobile [1] - |
| ```69:12, 87:6 looked [7] - 18:24, 18:26, 27:16, 66:17, 71:6, 82:22, 93:3 looking [6] -``` | 72:15, 79:2, | material [11] - | McNally [1] - | metal [2] - | 56:27 |
|  | 79:22, 81:14, | 25:25, 26:26, | 66:23 | 59:13, 59:15 | moment [5] - |
|  | 86:12, 87:16, | 27:7, 27:24, | mean [21]-8:3, | mic [1] - 96:29 | 6:12, 24:16, |
|  | 90:27, 92:3, | 29:20, 29:29, | 10:14, 10:18, | Michael [2] - | 68:16, 80:8, 91:2 |
|  | 94:17, 94:26, | 36:20, 36:22, | 10:22, 28:1, | 20:15, 66:7 | MONDAY [1] - |
|  | 95:2 | 61:13, 84:22, | 28:18, 28:29, | Micheál [1] - | 98:23 |
| 18:23, 18:27, | Lynn's [1] - 42:4 | 84:23 | 34:1, 56:13, | 38:6 | Monday [5] - |
| 23:8, 33:20, | LYNN.. | materials [4] - | 56:16, 56:17, | microphone [1] | 46:12, 65:6, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { looks [5] - 27:5, } \\ \text { 28:17, 30:1, 30:4, } \end{gathered}$ | ................... [1] - | 11:21, 22:15, | $60: 5,60: 19$ | $-97: 3$ | $65: 29,66: 14,$ |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 11 \\ & \text { matter [31] - } \\ & 4: 18,6: 17,15: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 61:22, 62:7, | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{mid}[4]-18: 16 \\ 20: 27,76: 11 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 98:17 } \\ & \text { money [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $75: 4$ | M |  | 71:10, 79:24, <br> 84:19, 96:12 | 93:26 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:24 } \\ & \text { month [1] - 48:4 } \end{aligned}$ |
| ${ }_{\text {LUNCH }}^{\text {[1] - }}$ | mail [1] - 32:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:18, 15:27, } \\ & \text { 16:8, 16:10, 17:2, } \end{aligned}$ | meantime [2] $75: 13,98: 9$ | 17:22, 17:23 | months [3] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 94:23 } \\ & \text { lunchtime [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | mails [2] - 10:11, | 17:27, 21:24, | measures [2] | $\begin{gathered} \operatorname{might}[18]- \\ 6: 23,8: 3,10: 19, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:22, 21:20, } \\ & 23: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| 94:10, 94:11 LYNN [77] - | main [1] - 47:4 | 22:3, 22:11, | $72: 24,73: 19$ <br> mechanism [6] | 10:21, 10:22, | morning [11] - |
| LYNN [77] - $\text { 41:7, 41:9, } 4$ | majority [4] - | 23:20, 31:26, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mechanism [6] - } \\ & 34: 12,34: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:24, 11:8, } \\ & \text { 11:10, 15:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:4, 6:5, 6:10, } \\ & \text { 6:11, 15:29 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 41:14, 46:1, 46:4, | 75:21, 84:10, | 44:10, 44:13, | $35: 21,36: 10$ | 22:15, 23:15, | 26:16, 26:18, |
| 49:13, 50:17, | $85: 13,94: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 15,49: 29 \\ & 50: 6,59: 2,59: 28 \end{aligned}$ | 36:11, 43:29 | 25:4, 30:8, 31:9, | 27:22, 27:23, |
| 50:23, 51:15, | Malahide [1] - |  | Medical [1] - | 63:19, 72:24, | 75:28, 95:19 |
| $55: 29,56: 2,56: 5,$ | $51: 21$ <br> malicious [1] - | 62:13, 73:2, 80:1, $80 \cdot 5 \quad 81 \cdot 27$ | 92:21 | 81:28 | most [4]-10:20, |
| $56: 12,56: 15$, $56: 18,56: 20$, | 7:24 <br> malpractice [2] - | $80: 5,81: 27$ | $9: 8,21: 5,88: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mind [5]-7:9, } \\ & 21: 14,23: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 85:3, 88:1, 90:2 <br> mother [1] - |
| $56: 23,60: 1,60: 4,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { malpractice [2] - } \\ & 33: 15,93: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 21:29, 26:22, | $90: 3$ | 50:21, 96:26 | 65:24 |
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| $\begin{aligned} & 93: 24 \\ & \text { pull [2] - 9:2, 9:9 } \end{aligned}$ | 86:1, 86:5, 94:27, | 29:28 <br> realising [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & -37: 7 \\ & \text { recommendati } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reinforced [2] - } \\ & 54: 2,54: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 12:28, } 34: 17 \\ \text { remaining }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { pulled [1] - 8:23 } \\ & \text { Pulse [12] - 47:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 95:3 } \\ & \text { quickly [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:27 } \\ & \text { really [10] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { on }[3]-36: 23, \\ & 37: 4,37: 17 \end{aligned}$ | reiterate [2] 35:5, 35:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 83:23 } \\ & \text { remains }[2]- \end{aligned}$ |
| 47:8, 48:10, | $65: 11$ <br> Quigley [2] | 21:29, 34:15, | record [9]-32:7, | relates [1] - 73:9 | 81:27, 97:10 |
| 50:24, 50:26, | $44: 28,87: 29$ | 69:5, 77:6, 77:29, | 32:9, 65:7, 65:13, <br> $65 \cdot 15,77: 6,78 \cdot 5$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { relating [4] - } \\ 55: 20.62: 2 . \end{gathered}$ | $18: 19,20: 19$ |
| $65: 12,65: 15$ | quite [3]-70:23, | 88:16, 93:22 | 78:6, 87:11 | 66:15, 71:8 | $29: 14,38: 22$ |
| 66:21, 68:8 <br> purpose [4] - | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 26,85: 27 \\ & \text { quotes }[1]-88: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ream }[1]-37: 24 \\ & \text { reason }[1] \text { - } \\ & 19: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { recorded }[3] \text { - } \\ & \text { 48:10, 48:13, } \\ & 61: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { relation [44] - } \\ \text { 10:26, 12:27, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 3,47: 21,56: 3, \\ & 56: 4,63: 9 \\ & \text { reminded }[1] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |


|  | ```91:28 reported [9] - 33:15, 37:29, 40:12, 40:13, 40:14, 61:3, 70:21, 71:5 reports [10] - 9:8, 21:5, 30:12, 52:22, 66:16, 67:14, 68:6, 71:4, 83:28, 90:6 represent [1] - 44:24 representation [1] - 96:13 represented [2] - 88:25, 96:11 represents [1] - 60:13 request [3] - 40:25, 40:27, 92:20 requested [9] - 13:13, 33:24, 38:20, 55:24, 57:17, 66:5, 66:8, 66:10, 66:11 requesting [2] - 13:19, 36:7 requests [1] - 40:18 required [7] - 12:4, 12:19, 12:22, 14:6, 35:22, 66:27, 96:15 research [1] - 66:20 researched [1] - 66:15 resides [1] - 65:24 resolution [1] - 88:7 respect [17] - 12:6, 48:2, 48:14, 48:18, 49:4, 50:24, 51:22, 60:9, 60:14, 61:16, 61:29, 63:12, 77:22, 78:8, 78:14, 84:4, 88:29 respectfully [1] - 92:20 respective [1] - 17:10 respond [1] - 70:19 responded [2] -``` | ```33:9, 55:7 responding [2] - 33:27, 34:29 response [19] - 16:1, 16:11, 16:20, 20:3, 24:16, 24:25, 31:8, 31:20, 31:25, 32:16, 32:22, 32:28, 34:2, 49:22, 83:27, 88:27, 89:4, 91:16 responses [2] - 31:4, 43:13 responsible [2] - 90:9, 97:21 result [3]-11:2, 72:20, 87:29 RESUMED [2] - 6:1, 94:23 retired [3] - 45:6, 67:25,67:28 retirement [2] - 9:19, 30:24 retirement/pay [1] - 97:11 return [2] - 52:26, 72:9 returned [1] - 57:22 retype [1] - 30:13 review [10] - 30:28, 34:12, 34:25, 35:13, 35:18, 36:9, 36:11, 36:16, 81:10, 96:2 reviewed [1] - 33:7 revisiting [1] - 19:22 right-hand [2] - 11:11, 22:21 Rights [1] - 73:6 rights[1]-8:1 ring [1] - 16:12 risk[3] - 72:22, 72:25, 73:20 risks [1] - 49:28 role [1] - 44:12 room [3] - 13:5, 47:4, 49:28 round [1] - 37:21 rude [1] - 56:16 ruling [1] - 49:23 ruminating [2] - 21:4, 25:12 run [1]-49:28``` |  | ```scolding [3] - 31:14, 31:17, 31:18 scoping [10] - 60:21, 66:26, 67:2, 67:7, 68:17, 68:24, 68:25, 69:3, 69:8, 72:7 Scott [1] - 68:6 screen [2] - 6:27, 11:8 scroll [9] - 7:5, 11:10, 23:17, 39:13, 52:28, 54:9, 88:14, 89:28, 90:16 searched [1] - 58:2 second [6] - 16:14, 31:21, 34:23, 40:20, 74:25, 78:29 secretary [2] - 30:17, 36:1 see [51] - 7:6, 7:13, 9:5, 13:4, 13:11, 17:20, 22:4, 22:22, 23:17, 25:28, 26:12, 27:25, 34:18, 34:28, 35:8, 36:2, 39:12, 39:17, 39:19, 43:11, 43:16, 50:28, 56:18, 60:16, 61:22, 61:24, 64:21, 64:23, 64:25, 66:6, 66:13, 66:26, 67:18, 69:2, 69:4, 70:20, 74:9, 77:17, 79:24, 80:16, 85:7, 85:25, 87:25, 89:23, 90:17, 90:22, 91:5, 92:18, 94:6, 96:12, 96:22 seek [2] - 10:6, 19:29 seeking[2] - 10:15, 43:22 seem[5]-21:5, 35:23, 57:28, 94:3, 96:16 seemingly [1] - 80:28 senior [7] - 12:9, 13:2, 55:17, 55:19, 67:10,``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 97:12 | 34:11, 34:16 | 55:26, 56:16, | State [1] - 75:10 | stop [7]-40:19, | suggest [8] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SERGEANT [3] - | sick [3]-21:1, | 64:20, 67:25, | statement [61] - | 43:17, 43:21, | 12:15, 17:20, |
| 5:3, 6:7, 46:1 | 44:14, 83:28 | 71:12, 72:13, | 12:5, 12:11, | 55:12, 59:25, | 18:6, 27:9, 44:21, |
| sergeant [27] - | sign [1] - 25:29 | 73:28, 75:24, | 12:12, 12:13, | 61:10, 61:11 | 44:23, 45:9, 97:7 |
| 6:10, 11:20, | significance [1] | 77:9, 79:1, 82:11, | 12:20, 12:22, | Store [2]-23:1, | suggested [1] - |
| 12:15, 18:10, | - 29:3 | 85:17, 85:25, | 13:3, 13:13, | 76:11 | 17:18 |
| 18:27, 22:16, | similar [2] - | 87:18, 87:24, | 13:19, 14:6, 14:8, | story [1] - 49:17 | suggesting [6] - |
| 30:6, 34:21, | 28:1, 29:15 | 89:8, 90:8, 92:3, | 15:8, 15:12, | Street [2]-23:1, | 18:1, 19:27, |
| 40:17, 42:20, | simple [2] - | 95:2, 96:22, | 15:25, 15:29, | 76:11 | 30:19, 40:3, 44:7, |
| 44:7, 51:4, 51:25, | 40:22, 42:5 | 96:28 | 16:3, 16:5, 16:8, | stress [4] - | $97: 24$ |
| 52:3, 52:9, 57:13, | simply [3] - | sort [5]-10:24, | 16:10, 16:13, | 43:10, 43:25, | suggestion [1] - |
| 57:16, 57:17, | 53:8, 61:24, | 28:11, 84:24, | 16:19, 16:21, | 43:26, 44:3 | 73:12 |
| 57:20, 58:23, | 79:27 | 89:16 | 16:24, 16:26, | stressful [2] - | summarise [1] - |
| 58:26, 58:28, | sit [1] - 62:26 | sought [3] - | 16:28, 16:29, | 43:4, 43:26 | 71:22 |
| 59:4, 59:9, 59:11, | sitting [1] - | 18:5, 22:6, 88:29 | 17:1, 17:2, 17:8, | strictly [1] - | summarised [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:28, 88:17 } \\ & \text { sergeant's [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 60:16 } \\ \text { situa } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sounds [1] - } \\ & 56: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:10, 17:29, } \\ & \text { 18:14, 18:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:10 } \\ & \text { stron } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -36: 25 \\ \text { summ } \end{gathered}$ |
| $58: 24$ | 42:28, 43:27, | source [1] - | $19: 8,22: 8,22: 14$ | $50: 7$ | 66:3, 81:25 |
| series [3] - 9:20, | 50:16, 81:25 | $53: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:13, 25:8, } \\ & \text { 25:18, 38:21, } \end{aligned}$ | struck [2] - 27:9 | Superintenden |
| 38:17, 49:19 <br> serious [6] - | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{six}[2]-51: 5, \\ & 73: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { sourced [2] - } \\ 23: 4,48: 28 \end{gathered}$ | $38: 26,39: 5,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { structure [1] - } \\ & \text { 18:29 } \end{aligned}$ | t [20]-12:24, |
| 33:6, 33:17, | skip [2] - 7:26, | speaking [5] - | 39:26, 40:6, | structures [1] - | $40: 15,40: 16$ |
| 38:12, 44:17, | 36:18 | $9: 24,53: 10$ | 40:12, 40:25, | $33: 18$ | $44: 27,45: 1,45: 3$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 46:17, } 73: 13 \\ \text { seriously }[1] \end{gathered}$ | slight [1] - 89:28 | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 25,79: 17, \\ & 79: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:3, 41:24, 42:7, } \\ & 62: 7,70: 24, \end{aligned}$ | structuring [1] - $14: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 4,53: 26, \\ & 55: 14,66: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $12: 17$ <br> servant [1] - | 11:10, 17:12, | specific [6] - $13: 1.53: 20.55: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 28,77: 9, \\ & 77: 11,77: 17, \end{aligned}$ | stuff [1]-27:29 | $67: 25,73: 5,74: 1$ $76: 1.82: 19.83: 5$ |
| $31: 11$ | 72:27, 98:21 | 13:1, 53:20, 55:3, 67:22, 70:4, | $77: 26,77: 27,$ | subject [8] - | 76:1, 82:19, 83:5, 83:22, 93:1 |
| servants [1] - | 18:2 | 83:10 | 82:7, 84:13, | 16:10, 36:29, | superintendent |
| 7:17 | small [2]-11:4, | specifically [1] 86.9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 84:28, 89:4 } \\ & \text { statements }[5] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 68:21, 89:15, | [3] - 15:20, 45:7, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { served }_{[2]} \text { - } \\ 6: 19,7: 10 \end{gathered}$ | 77:5 | 86:9 | statements [5] 30:7, 35:22, 43: | $90: 25,96: 9$ | $51: 27$ |
| 6:19, 7:10 service [1] | sole [1] - 50:27 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { specifics[1] - } \\ & 85: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $66: 21,66: 22$ | subject-matter | $\begin{aligned} & \text { supervisor [1] - } \\ & \text { 19:18 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 22:1 | solicitor [12] | spoken [4] | states [2] - | submission [2] - | supply [1] - 96:4 |
| set [6]-46:13, | $16: 27,17: 3,17: 9$ | 21:28, 64:8, | $35: 12,65: 17$ | 28:4, 42:8 | supporting [1] - |
| $47: 5,88: 14$, $89.22,93 \cdot 14$ | $17: 14,17: 16$ | $67: 10,79: 5$ | stating [2] - | submit [4] - | $61: 13$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 89:22, 93:14 } \\ & \text { sets [1]-11:19 } \end{aligned}$ | 17:18, 18:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { spool }[2]-66: 5, \\ & 7 \cdot 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 12:26, 65:20 } \\ \text { station }[16]- \end{gathered}$ | 57:13, 66:8, | suppose [2] - |
| sets [1] - 11:19 setting [1] - 90:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:15, 41:22, } \\ & 69: 16,85: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 72:12 spotlight [1] - | $44: 15,46: 28$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { 66:10, 66:11 } \\ \text { submitted }[5]- \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:17, } 63: 8 \\ & \text { suppression [1] } \end{aligned}$ |
| settled [4] - | 91:16 | 81:7 | 46:29, 47:4, | $75: 23,83: 5,83: 6$ | -8:11 |
| 6:13, 9:13, 9:14, | solicitors [2] - | staff [3]-51:26, | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 13,47: 29, \\ & 48: 24,48: 29 \end{aligned}$ | 86:6, 87:18 | surely [1] - 78:2 |
| $37: 12$ | 85:20, 91:14 | 54:3, 67:29 | 48:24, 48:29, <br> 51:5, 51:6, 51: | submitting [1] - | surrounding [2] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { settlement [2] - } \\ & 9: 3,37: 26 \end{aligned}$ | SOLICITORS ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { stage }[6]- \\ 42: 14,68: 1] \end{gathered}$ | 56:29, 57:11, | 59:2 | $-14: 11,97: 10$ |
| settling [1] - | somewhat [1] - | 69:11, 85:2, | $57: 15,57: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { subsequent [2] - } \\ & 60: 24,86: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { survived [1] - } \\ & 95: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| $10: 19$ | $70: 17$ | $95: 11,97: 26$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 75: 12 \\ \text { Station [7] - } \end{array}$ | subsequently | surviving [1] - |
| seven [1]-95:18 seventh [1] - | soon [1] - 56:7 | stand [2]-8:4 98:15 | 47:5, 47:18, | $\begin{aligned} & {[4]-12: 4,12: 13,} \\ & 15: 26.43: 29 \end{aligned}$ | 59:12 |
| 30:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sorry [49]-6:28, } \\ & 7: 9,8: 8,14: 16, \end{aligned}$ | standing [1] - | $48: 25,51: 21,$ | 15:26, 43:29 substantial [1] | $4: 13$ |
| several [1] - | 14:21, 14:26, | 12:21 | 59:12, 59:15, | 59:16 | Sweeney [1] - |
| 88:3 | $15: 28,17: 5,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Star [2] - 77:14, } \\ & 78 \cdot 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 71:29 } \\ & \text { step [2] - 34:10, } \end{aligned}$ | substantially [1] | $74: 9$ |
| Shatter [2] - | 19:14, 19:24, | 78:20 | 93:17 | $-81: 7$ | Swords [9] - |
| 11:7, 11:15 <br> sheet [1] - 14:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:25, 26:15, } \\ & 27: 4.27: 10, \end{aligned}$ | start [1]-67:24 <br> started ${ }_{[1]}$ - | stepping [1] - | substantive [3] - <br> $22.28,30.9,76.9$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:20, 47:4, } \\ & 47: 13,47: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| shocked [1] - | $28: 25,29: 17$ | $37: 21$ | 94:1 | suffered [1] - | $48: 25,48: 28,$ |
| 72:3 | $38: 27,39: 6,39: 8 \text {, }$ | starting [1] - | steps [4] - 7:21, | 43:18 | 59:12, 59:15 |
| shone [1] - 81:6 | 39:14, 40:21, | 23:16 | still [2] - 45:18, | sufficient [1] - | 71:29 |
| short [1]-74:11 | 41:7, 41:8, 41:13, | starts [1] - 52:16 <br> state [2]-16:26, | $65: 9$ | $42: 1$ | sympathetic [1] |
| shortly [1] - 96:4 <br> show [3]-34:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 15,48: 23 \\ & 48: 24,50: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { state [2]-16:26, } \\ & 32: 16 \end{aligned}$ | stock [1] - 98:15 | sufficiently ${ }_{[1]}$ 85.23 | - 49:26 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:12, 20:19, } \\ & 47: 9,50: 25, \\ & 50: 26,50: 28, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { THAT }[2]-4: 12 \text {, } \\ & 4: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { transactions }[2] \\ & -25: 15,87: 28 \\ & \text { transferred }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91:25, 91:27 } \\ & \text { typeface }[10]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 4,11: 10,15: 25, \\ & 16: 5,17: 21, \end{aligned}$ | W |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $27: 8,27: 22$ | 19:18, 19:28 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 66:22 } \\ & \text { systems [16] - } \end{aligned}$ | that'd [1] - 46:28 | 48:29 | 27:25, 27:27 | 21:20, 22:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { waited [1] - } \\ & \text { 19:21 } \\ & \text { waitina [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | THE [14]-4:7, | transmission [1] | 28:2, 28:16, | 26:22, 28:9, |  |
| 10:27, 14:10, | 4:8, 6:1, 6:5, | - 24:22 | 28:17, 28:18, | 29:17, 32:23, | waiting [1] - |
| 15:27, 16:21, | 39:21, 45:19, | treatment [1] - | 52:13, 77:18 | 35:29, 37:2, 38:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:16 } \\ & \text { wake [1] - 43:18 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 16:22, 19:2, 19:7, | 45:22, 45:25, | 11:1 | typo [1]-32:4 | 45:22, 46:15, |  |
| $36: 27,37: 1 \text {, }$ | 94:23, 95:13, | trepidation [1] | Tánaiste [1] - | 47:28, 55:26, | Walter [8]-13:6, |
| $37: 14,41: 21$,$41: 24,46: 10$, | 95:17, 95:22, | 93:23 | 36:1 | 75:10, 87:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:12, 15:25, } \\ & \text { 21:21, 39:3, } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 95:24, 98:23 | ribunal [1] - |  | 88:14, 96:24, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 41: 24,46: 10, \\ & 81: 3,83: 21, \end{aligned}$ | THEN [3] - | 4:19 |  | 97:23 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 40:26, 45:6, } 76: 1 \\ \text { wanton }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ |
| 83:28 Séan [1] - 21:10 | 94:23, 95:24, | RIBUNAL [1] - |  | up-to-date [1] - |  |
| Séan [1] - 21:10 | 98:23 | 4:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ultimately [2] - } \\ & 8: 26,43: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 38:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 7:23 } \\ & \text { wants [2] } \end{aligned}$ |
| 4:15, 25:9, 25:20, | 26:9 |  |  | 31:13, 31:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:26, } 86: 8 \\ & \text { WAS }_{[1]}-46: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 36:28, 44:24, | erefore [2] | 16:9, 22:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:26, 43:8 } \\ & \text { unanswered [1] } \end{aligned}$ | urging [1] - |  |
| 50:6, 55:22, | 15:10, 53:28 | 22:19, 22:26, | $-12: 28$ | 30:27 | waste [1] - 61:16 |
| 63:27, 81:3, 81:8, | ereof [1] - 7:21 | 23:3, 24:14, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 83:12 } \\ & \text { uncovered }[1]- \end{aligned}$ | useful [4] - | waters [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 93: 16,93: 21, \\ & 94: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { thinks }[1] \text { - } \\ & 59: 28 \end{aligned}$ | 24:17, 25:4, 25:8, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:23, 30:8, } \\ & 61: 17,86: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $15: 22$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 28 \\ & \text { third }[6]-18: 2, \\ & 18: 10,19: 27, \\ & 35: 2,35: 3,48: 18 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $45: 3,66: 12$ <br> weave [1] - 18:5 <br> WEDNESDAY |
|  |  | 80:15, 82:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 24 \\ & \text { under }[4]-7: 12, \end{aligned}$ | V |  |
|  |  | 82:29, 84:14 | $92: 22$ |  |  |
| tailor [1]-82:12 | Thomas [2] - $58.24,59.18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 84: 28,87: 12, \\ & 88: 24,92: 14 \end{aligned}$ | understandabl | various [4] - | $\begin{aligned} & {[1]-6: 1} \\ & \text { week [1] - 16:28 } \end{aligned}$ |
| TAKE [1] - 4:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 58:24, 59:18 } \\ & \text { threat [5] - 47:6, } \end{aligned}$ | 93:10, 98:6 | $\mathbf{y}[1]-43: 6$ | 55:20, 67:14, | weekend [1] - |
| Taoiseach [2] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { threat [5] - 47:6, } \\ 53: 20,55: 3,55: 4, \end{gathered}$ | Tribunal's [2] | understood [1] - | vast [4] - 75:21, | $44: 12$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:4, 38:5 } \\ & \text { targeted }[4]- \end{aligned}$ | $70: 4$ <br> threats [2] - | $63: 22,95: 28$ | 27:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { vast }[4]-75: 21, \\ & 84: 10,85: 13, \end{aligned}$ | weeks [4] - |
| 20:18, 61:1, | threats [2] - |  | $4: 14,13: 15$ | 97:9 | 20:28, 23:16 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 63:17, } 82: 8 \\ \text { targeting } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 46:17, 49:18 } \\ \text { three }[7]-18: 13, \\ \text { 18:16, 20:28, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { triggered [1] - } \\ & 40 \cdot 28 \end{aligned}$ | $34: 26,53: 18$ unduly [1] - | vein [1] - 12:25 | welcome [4] - |
| 60:14, 67:1, | $25: 16,51: 26$ | true [5]-40: | 10:14 | 45:9 | $98: 14,98: 21$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88:26 } \\ & \text { tasked [2] } \end{aligned}$ | 65:5, 67:29 <br> throughout [2] | 40:24, 40:29, | unfair [3] - 40:2, | ventilated [2] - | well-founded $[1]$ |
|  |  | $41: 5,71: 18$ | 45:10, 83:29 | $37: 11,37: 27$ | - 44:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 13: 2,43: 1 \\ & \text { TD }_{[3]}-10: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:16, 33:27 } \\ & \text { tiring [2] - } 95: 19, \end{aligned}$ | trust [1] - 7:29 | unfortunately | viable [1] - 10:29 vicinity [1] - | WELLINGTON |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11:15, 32:7 } \\ & \text { TDs [2] - 10:15, } \end{aligned}$ |  | $90$ | unfounded [4] - |  | wes |
|  | TO [2] - 4:7, 6:7 | trying [6] - 39:3, | 43:9, 44:17, | victim ${ }_{[7]}$ | 46:26, 46:28 |
| 32:9team [4] - 53:19, | today [1] - 98:10 <br> took [9] - 34:10, | $60: 5,61: 23$ | 44:22, 45:10 | 66:16, 66:21, | WH [1] - 22:14 |
|  |  | $62: 25,90: 17$ | unhappy [4] - | 69:5, 71:27, | whereby [2] - |
| $\begin{gathered} 65: 7,76: 6,97: 23 \\ \text { telephone }[8]- \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 13,47: 28 \\ & 62: 11,62: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $90: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 19,31: 24, \\ & 37: 23,77: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75: 10,75: 16 \\ & \text { view }[14]-8: 26, \end{aligned}$ | 67:13, 93:21 |
| $15: 28,56: 28$,$57: 5,57: 11$, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { turn [3]-32:11 } \\ & 46: 7.73: 22 \end{aligned}$ | uninvestigated | $9: 7,10: 19,10: 21,$ | whole [5] - |
|  | 62:16, 63:7, 63:8, | 46.7, 73.22 <br> turning [1] - | [1] - 38:11 | 41:20, 44:8, 67:2, | $90 \cdot 23,95: 15$ |
| 88:22, 89:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:9 } \\ & \text { top }[5]-8: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $40: 2$ | unit [3] - 48:8, | 67:4, 78:7, 78:18, | $95: 16$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 90:16, 91:4 } \\ & \text { telephoned [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { top [5] - 8:22, } \\ \text { 11:10, 11:11, } \end{gathered}$ | twisting [2] | 51:7, 51:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 96:18 } \\ & \text { viewpoints [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | wholly [2] - |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22:21, 55:27 } \\ & \text { topic [1] }-42: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $40: 4,40: 7$ | units [2]-51:5 |  | $25: 26,78: 2$ |
| 56:26 <br> TEM |  | two [14]-18:8 | unless [2]- |  |  |
| $3: 8$ | touch [4] - | 18:12, 18:18, | 33:24, 86:8 |  | wider [2] - 9:18, |
| tend $[1]-18: 22$tension [1] - | 14:12, 14:17, | 18:19, 18:20 | unsatisfacto $\text { [1] }-32: 18$ | 10:26, 96:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10:25 } \\ & \text { willfully [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 17:27, 96:27 | 26:14, 30:14, <br> 39:22, 46:4, 64: | UNTIL [1] - | vindicated [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { willfully [1] - } \\ & 7: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 43:5 } \\ & \text { term [1] - 16:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $30: 18,33: 6$ | $65: 24,70: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 98:23 } \\ & \text { untoward [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 94:17 | 7:18 <br> WILLIAM ${ }^{31]}$ - |
|  | $42: 21,44: 8 \text {, }$ | $77: 1,97: 16$ |  | violated [1] - | $5: 3,6: 7,46: 1$ |
| terms [4]- | $53: 17,54: 17$ | type [2] - 26:12, | 15:19 | 73:10 | William [4] - |
| 44:11, 50:7, | $69: 5,81: 7$ | 29:15 | unwilling [1] - | visited [4] - | $53: 2,53: 27$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} 50: 20,57: 8 \\ \text { terribly }[1] \end{array} \text { - }$ | tragic [1] - 70:3 | typed [4] - <br> 57.19, 91.22 | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 21 \\ & \text { up [27] - 6:26, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 29,52: 1,77: 1, \\ & 89: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $54: 11,72: 18$ |


| ```89:9, 91:3 wish [9]-17:20, 33:8, 33:14, 35:5, 35:10, 41:9, 44:21, 61:18, 79:2 wished [2] - 12:11, 93:16 withdraw [1] - 9:4 WITHDREW [1] - 95:24 WITNESS[10] - 5:2, 6:5, 39:21, 45:19, 45:22, 45:25, 95:13, 95:17, 95:22, 95:24 witness [5] - 12:4, 12:20, 12:22, 61:15, 94:14 witnesses [7] - 12:3, 77:1, 96:2, 96:5, 96:18, 97:17, 98:5 wonder [2] - 8:25,39:1 wondering [5] - 9:1, 30:21, 43:16, 90:29, 94:7 word [5] - 23:11, 28:3, 28:9, 31:18, 78:4 wording [2] - 40:1, 72:10 words [12] - 16:1, 16:2, 16:16, 20:3, 20:7, 24:10, 24:11, 24:12, 24:15, 24:22, 24:28, 77:12 workplace [1] - 21:7 worth [1] - 42:9 worthwhile [2] - 39:26, 41:18 wounds [1] - 10:24 write [3]-21:10, 32:12,61:15 writing [10] - 4:19, 9:27, 10:3, 11:15, 30:24, 31:5, 33:4, 34:21, 37:23, 58:29 written [7] - 27:8, 38:5, 51:4, 51:8, 65:14, 78:5, 78:6``` | wrongdoings $[2]-83: 13,83: 24$ wrongly [1]- 89:8 wrote [2]-11:7, $78: 25$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Y |
|  | year [4] - 10:2, $24: 14,31: 6$, $31: 23$ years [4] - $25: 16,28: 3,40: 5$, $70: 26$ yesterday [5] - $20: 16,20: 21$, $54: 8,73: 29$, $77: 13$ young [1] - $65: 24$ yourself $[2]$ - $23: 10,94: 17$ |
|  | 6 |
|  | ' $A^{\prime}$ [1] - 4:13 |
|  | - |
|  | -[1]-4:7 |
|  | $\dot{E}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ÉABHALL [1] - } \\ & 3: 6 \end{aligned}$ |


[^0]:    "The morni ng after Bai ba was killed."

[^1]:    "Further clarity is sought in respect of the reference

