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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVS ON THURSDAY, 19TH MAY 2022:

CHA RMAN Good morning, Mr. Barry, thanks very much. Sit down there, Mr. Barry. Thank you very much.

## MR. PAUL BARRY CONTI NUED TO BE DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NNESS, AS FOLLOVS:

MR. MEGU NNESS: Good morning, Mr. Barry?
A. Morning, Mr. McGuinness.

2 Q. We had just left it yesterday evening at the stage where arrangements were being made for you to see the CMO in late January, in the last week of January 2013?
A. That's correct.

3 Q. But I think early in 2013 Assistant Commissioner Nolan had been in touch with you in connection with the investigation. Could we look at page 2489. I think he was contacting you to seek your permission to extend the period, in this case. If we look at 2489. This is 11:01 addressed to you, if we scroll down. He states there, that he had been appointed by the assistant commissioner to investigate your complaint of unacceptable behaviour alleged against Superintendent Comyns.
"Further to a meeting with Superintendent Lordan on 21/ 11 in accordance with the provisions of section 58.5 of the above pol icy, l wi sh to seek an extension to 1st

March 2013 to conduct my i nvestigation. Pl ease advi se if this extension of time is agreeable to you."

You recall receiving that, I take it?
A. That's correct.

4 Q. What was your attitude to that, at that point in time?
A. We11 I wasn't happy with the delay, because I was still out sick and it meant that $I$ would continue on without my allowances.
5 Q. Yes. Did you have an understanding at this stage, as to whether there would be a different number of investigations to 1,2 or 3 ?
A. No, myself, my personal view was, having spoken with my solicitor at the time, was that there would be a bullying investigation and then a criminal investigation.

6 Q. Yes. That's the sequence that you thought would happen and it did happen that way?
A. Yes.

7 Q. Subject to issues about delays obviously that we will come on to?
A. Yes.

8 Q. I think you made your position known about pay in an e-mail to Ms. Egan, isn't that right? You sent an e-mail on the same date. If we look at page 1638
first. If we scroll down there. You knew obviously from Inspector o'sullivan there was a case conference going to be held and you sent on material to Ms. Egan. If we go down to 1640, two pages further down. You
said:
"Dear Cl aire, pl ease bring the following to the attention of those attending your case conference on whatever date it takes place.

When I deci ded to report Superintendent M chael Conyns for bullying and attempting to coerce me into perverting the course of $j$ ustice, $I$ was told that my ill ness would not be cl assified as being work rel ated and that l would be starved into submi ssion."

Can I just pause there? Is that recounting something that somebody in authority said to you?
A. No, it would have been a colleague of mine.

9 Q. A colleague of yours?
A. Yes.

10 Q. Was this somebody who had advised you not to make a complaint because it would become long drawn out?
A. Yes, it was somebody who had been through the complaints procedure before.

11 Q. Okay. You go on to say then:
"I did not bel ieve this but neverthel ess I instructed my auctioneer to advertise 15 acres of my land for sale 11:04 and he this he is in September 2012. I have an of fer on my land for hal f of its current val ue and quarter of its peak val ue. The I and was supposed to provide a means to support my wife and family when l retire. If

HRM do not classify my ill ness by February 2013 l will be forced to sell my land to continue my fight for justice. I will hold the State and its agents responsi ble for this loss at bel ow market val ue and the I oss of future earni ngs frommy land. I have supplied medi cal reports to the CMD from Dr. Margaret Ki el y, Dr. J Dennehy, consultant psychi atrist. I have provi ded a statement to Superintendent Patrick Lordan together will all documentation and proofs of same. I have al so had my phone contents stand to support and prove my compl ai nt. HRM have sufficient proofs to cl assify my injury as work rel ated and yet they ref use to do so. I believe thi s conference is another del aying tactic and nothing will come of it. I have been informed by Cl ai re Egan, HRM that my presence is not requi red at this conference. I understand that the di visional officer Cork north is to attend even he has nothing to do with the investigation al ong with the CMD, who appears to have no input into classifying my injury. The file representatives will be from HRM who 11:05 are supposed to be investi gating the matter but have thus far taken one statement in four months. Wth in excess of ten witnesses to interview, this will take at least three years to get a file together at the current rate of progress, provi ded of course it can be deci ded if and by whoma superintendent can be investigated when he is alleged to have committed a criminal act.

I request confirmation of recei pt of my above views and

I want to be informed imedi atel y if there is a result of this conference so as l can make arrangements to deal with having my pay cut in half. l can assure all in attendance cutting my pay will not deter me and in the end justice will be done. It is not surprising to me that my colleagues who attempted to expose alleged penal ty points abuse by seni or gardaí had to go to an Oi reacht as Committee to get results."

Can I just ask you a couple of questions about that e-mail?
A. Yes.

12 Q. You refer on the previous page, as we have seen, to having the contents of your phone downloaded, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

13 Q. Was that done by an officer in connection with the investigation?
A. That's correct. Mary Gilmartin I believe.

14 Q. Yes. And the phone was returned to you on that date, 11:06 isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

15 Q. And Chief Superintendent Kehoe had nothing to do with either retaining your phone or returning it back to you at that point, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

16 Q. Now, insofar as your position was concerned, you were still actually on full pay at this point in time?
A. Full pay but I was on basic pay without allowances.

17 Q. Without the allowances?
A. Yes.

18 Q. But you were foreseeing that if the investigation got extended, as would seem necessary, you may be going on to half pay if you were to remain certified out of work 11:07 into February and beyond, is that right?
A. That's correct. I think Inspector o'sullivan met with you on 8th January 2013 and you emphasised to him that you were under great stress, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Perhaps we would just see a report of that meeting, at 1642 on the next page. This was confirmation that you would attend the appointment which had been sent on up to HRM. If we look at Inspector O'Sullivan's report then on the next page, 1641. In the second paragraph he reports:
"In rel ation to non-medi cal issues, Sergeant Barry requested me to incl ude the following. The del ay in the investigation and the prospect of half pay from February 2013 is causing me consi derable stress and anxi ety. My illness is still not classified despite my full cooperation with the Chi ef Medical Officer, human resource and the investi gation peopl e team"

Can I ask you, did you stil1 regard it as being necessary that the investigation had to be completed before the issue of injury at work would be addressed?
A. No, I didn't. I had sent in a report from my doctor and my psychiatrist and both of those had stated they believed that my illness was work related.
21 Q. Yes.
A. So I did not see why the CMO could not -- I had attended with the CMO as well, he knew the position.
Q. Yes.
A. He said he couldn't classify my illness until HRM concluded their investigation but I couldn't see why.
23 Q. Yes. But did anyone advising you not say, well, the fact that the doctors think it is work related isn't conclusive or may not be regarded as sufficient for it to be classified as an injury on duty?
A. No. Well, I assumed that when the CMO looked for my medical reports from my specialist that that was what he wanted those reports for, to conclude whether or not my illness was work related.
24 Q. okay. Well in any event a case conference took place between a number of different parties on the 22 nd and we have put the notes of that in the documents.
Perhaps we will look at 1515. And this is a summary there on your position on the left, it says:
"Menber was sanctioned due to being late for start of shift. Menber's compl aint agai nst superintendent that initiated sanction. Menber was of fered transfer to Glanmire. Ref used. Member seeking IOD cl assification for absence. Member seeking medi cal retirement as well. Menber has clai med he will institute legal
proceedi ngs for any financial loss he suffers as a result of ongoing circunstances."

The reference there to retirement, can you just assist us as to where that came from? Did it come from you to 11:10 somebody?
A. which is the retirement now, sorry?
Q. It says it there, sort of six lines up from the bottom of the left-hand column?
A. "The menber is seeki ng nedi cal retirement as well"?
A. That did not come from me. That came from a conversation $I$ had the evening before this at an AGSI conference, where the AGSI then president, willy Gleeson, came up to me and said, you should talk to your solicitor about a medical pension. I made a note of it in my diary at the time and I never heard any more about it until I saw discovery and saw this reference. That reference was not ever put forward by me.

27 Q. Okay. It doesn't seem to have got any consideration at that stage and certainly your solicitor never applied on your behalf. You initiated ultimately the retirement application?
A. No, but it doesn't make -- it makes it look like I'm going through this just to get a medical pension, which would be more than an ordinary pension, which was not the issue.

28 Q. All right. Anyway, in the middle column it notes that
you're to see the CMO on the 25th, " may need i ndependent medal advi ser assessment". And then on the management side it says "nothing can be done in rel ation to IOD cl assification until official i nvestigation complete. A/C wrote to menber extending investigation until March 2013."

And is it the position as of this time you hadn't consented yet to extending the investigation time?
A. I don't believe I had.

29 Q. In any event, you attended the CMO on the 25th. Did you have a discussion with him about him signing off at that stage on injury on duty?
A. Yes, I asked the CMO why my illness hadn't been classified as work related.
A. He said he cannot make a decision until HRM conclude their investigation.
A. It was a surprise to me, because I said to him, why did 11:13 you look for the medical reports then from my psychiatrist and my doctor. If you couldn't make a decision, why put me through that?
32 Q. Yes. But he explained the procedure to you that he couldn't sign off on it until there had been a factual investigation, as it were, in relation to your issues?
A. Yes. That was his opinion.

33 Q. You later referred to this meeting, where you described him in an e-mail as having been upset, did you recall
putting that in an e-mail?
A. Yes. When I said to him -- when I pointed out to him that both my medical team had said that my illness was work related, he said they cannot decide it's work related until there is an investigation complete. And I said, they were independent people, they can form an opinion from assessing me, they don't have to have an investigation.
Yes. He provided a report, which you've seen, it's at page 157, dated 31st January. Perhaps we would just ask you to have a look at that. He offers the advice as follows:
"1. The member continues to present with features of di srupted health and sense of well being for whi ch he is 11:14 in recei pt of treat ment and follow up by appropriate specialist. Recent updates from his treating doctors have been noted.
2. The member's clinical status is significantly
i mpacted by grievances whi ch rel ate to certain events he reports as occurring in the workpl ace, whi ch I understand are currently the subject of an of ficial i nvest i gat i on.
3. In rel ation to the official investigation, the menber expressed his grievance with what he described as the slow pace of the investigation to date. It is a matter for Garda management to progress such processes
in a timely and appropriate manner to dimi ni negative i mpact on well being and to expedite obj ective and constructive resol ution whi ch benefits recovery in such circunstances. Based on the inf ormation available to me, while some progress in recovery has been made, the nember is recommended as temporarily unfit to attend regul arly, render effective service.
5. The member is due revi ew by his treating speci al ist in early February 2013, maybe a ret urn to work could be recommended at that time. In that context a return to work in a safe and supportive workpl ace envi ronment facilitated by local management is recommended."

And he said he intended to offer further advices on receipt of relevant updates. And did the CMO explain to you really that's what he was doing at that point in time?
A. Yes, he seemed frustrated that -- to me he seemed frustrated that he couldn't decide, his hands were tied basically, that he would have to let the internal investigation continue. There wasn't much he could do in relation to classifying my illness.

35 Q. Yes.
A. But that he would agree to temporary workplace accommodations.

36 Q. Was there any discussion with him about what a temporary workplace accommodation could be?
A. No, I don't recal1. I don't recall suggesting anything
to him in relation to it.
37 Q. I mean, you hadn't raised directly with him any difficulties about any particular person that you were working with or any particular place where you had to work?
A. Well I had told him my problems with Superintendent Comyns, that I didn't want to have any contact with him. But I was stationed in Mitchelstown, which was ten miles away, $I$ didn't see it as an issue at the time.

38 Q. Yes, okay. In any event we know the CMO sent his report on to Assistant Commissioner Fanning to Chief Superintendent Dillane and to HRM. But your solicitor had written in the interim to Assistant Commissioner Nolan in relation to the delay on the 1st February, isn't that right?
A. I believe so.

39 Q. Perhaps we would just look at that letter. 2498. It is marked "Urgent", and recites obviously in the first paragraph that you had provided a full statement to Superintendent Lordan and you had been advised that
"Assistant Commi ssi oner Nol an, due to vital factors, incl uding workl oad, is not in a position to concl ude the investigation, whi ch leaves my client in an i moossi ble position in circumstances where a deci si on concerning his absence from duty reduces his pay si gni ficantly impacts on himfinancially with the attendi ng stress that brings."

I think a reply was sent to Mr. Costello on the 7th, did he inform you of that? If we look at page 1655. You see this is addressed to Mr. Costello. It's from Assistant Commissioner Fanning. He's really referring to the scheduled appointment, that you are still currently recommended as being temporarily unfit, you wee due for review. I think that review was intended to be with your own specialist and it didn't take place in February, is that right?
A. I believe so, yes.

40 Q. And I think before this was sent to Mr. Coste11o, you had been on to Chief Superintendent Grogan in HRM, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

41 Q. You sent him an e-mail on the 4th February, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

42 Q. And perhaps we would look at a series of e-mails then, starting at 4081. And if we just scroll down to see the body of your e-mail there. If we go back to get the start of it. You are reciting that you had to attend the Chief Medical Officer in Dublin.
"He stated that the sole reason he wanted to see me was 11:20 to di scuss the redi cal reports submitted by Dr. Ki el y and Dr. Dennehy. The CMD is upset because both

Dr. Ki el y and Dr. Dennehy expressed the opi ni on that my medi cal condition was work rel ated. "

Now, you have probably seen a statement from the CMO where he doesn't agree that he would have expressed that in those terms at all. Have you seen that in his statement?
A. I have, yes.

Do you have any comment to make on that? Do you accept the way he explained it in a statement?
A. No, I don't because that was my view of what occurred in that meeting I had with him at the time.
44 Q. You do go on to recite what he has said in his statement:
"He not bel ieve that they could do so without first conducting an investigation. Dr. Oghuvbu stated that he could not give an opi ni on on my ill ness until HRM concl uded the i nvesti gation. Both Dr. Ki el y and

Dr. Dennehy as private sector workers are entitled to express thei r opi ni ons and Dr. Oghuvbu cannot express an opi ni on until HRM gi ve it to him Dr. Oghuvbu did mention a safe working environment and it is to this end that l want to ask the following questions

1. Does HRM find it acceptable that I should have to work with a person agai nst whoml have made an allegation of bullying and criminal behavi our?
2. What steps have HRM taken to provi de me with a safe working envi ronment. "

Those two questions. Did you ever receive a direct answer to those questions?
A. I believe the only answer I received to it was Chief Superintendent Grogan said he forwarded my concerns to the Assistant Commissioner Southern Region. That was the only response I recall getting to those questions. Yes. You do recite there that you had spoken to him, in the paragraph there on the screen at the end:
"I spoke with Chi ef Superintendent Grogan on 29th January 2013 and outlined the above concerns. I al so expressed my view that a transfer was not an option for me because of the nature of my complaint and the persons mentioned therein. "

I take it there was discussion with him about the possibility of a transfer?
A. That's correct, and I outlined why I would not feel that a transfer would have been suitable for me at the time.

46 Q. Yes. But this is the first occasion now where we have to ask this question: If the CMO was contemplating accommodations in the workplace, as it were, just to put it in that general way, would a transfer not be an obvious solution to your problem?
A. I didn't think so. I thought the CMO was recommending temporary accommodations in my workplace, which was Mitchelstown, to facilitate me remaining at

Mitchelstown, because I had outlined those to Dr. Tobin.

47 Q. Yes. Well, I don't think the CMO mentions Mitchelstown as such in his recommendation?
A. No, he doesn't. But when I spoke with the CMO, I told him I wanted to remain at Mitchelstown, that was where I wanted to return to work.
48 Q. Yes. But I mean there were no difficulties for you in Mitchelstown?
A. No.
A. Yes.

51 Q. So was it your position at this point in time that anything other than staying in Mitchelstown wasn't a temporary workplace accommodation?
A. No. As I had outlined to Chief Superintendent Dillane when I met with him in Glanmire, I was not going to apply for a transfer but should I be transferred I would have accepted going to a district where I would not have contact with Superintendent Comyns or other persons mentioned.

52 Q. Yes. Well perhaps we will just go up this page, up to 4080. Scroll up the page. We can see that Chief Superintendent Grogan forwards it on for his observations in respect of points 1 and 2 . And he
says:
"When I spoke with Sergeant Barry last week I offered hi ma transfer, he declined."

Now, you've raised an issue obvious7y, part of your complaint, about the fact that this was forwarded to the Assistant Commissioner Southern Region, but he was the regional commander, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

53 Q. And leaving aside any issue of connection to any other person arising from the events of February 2012, you had made no allegation against the Assistant Commissioner?
A. No.

54 Q. And you had no basis for making one, isn't that correct?
A. No.

55 Q. Right. If we just scroll up the page then to see what happens. It's sent on to Chief Superintendent Grogan then for his views and observations, and then Superintendent Dillane sends a report up back to the commissioner. He's reporting firstly about when you first went out on illness. And then in the second paragraph there he refers to his meeting with you on the 13th October. And I think we've seen the text of that in a previous report that he sent up before. If we go down on to the next page then. But he is recording there at the end of the page:
"I mredi atel $y$ he ref used my offer and told me that if anyone was to move it would be the superintendent."

So, I don't know, does that assist your memory as to whether you had in fact raised that issue about the superintendent?
A. I never raised the issue about the superintendent. The on7y issue I raised with Chief Superintendent Dillane was that the bullying and harassment policy stated that 11:26 neither the superintendent nor I should be transferred unless we applied for same. That didn't mean that I was looking for the superintendent to be transferred. I was just merely referencing the policy document.
56 Q. okay.
A. And he took it to mean that.

57 Q. okay. In any event he says:
"I told himl could not facilitate that scenario. He's reporting then I made it very clear to himmoffer was 11:27 without prejudice to the outcome of his compl aint. I had in mind to facilitate Sergeant Barry at Glanmire whi ch is Cobh district. He is resi ding [blank] in Glanmire and it would have made his commeting time to work much shorter. I was al so aware he is originally 11:27 from [bl ank] and a move to Glanmire station would not have been a breach of Code 8.30."

And that is forwarded for his information. That's of
the Assistant Commissioner. So if we just scroll back up then, it's sent on to the Assistant Commissioner, and then the Assistant Commissioner sends it on to Chief Superintendent Grogan saying:
"Pl ease see attached from di visional officer Cork north, I believe you have al so offered to facilitate this menber with a transfer to ease his plight. I do not know how the nenber can be facilitated in any other way pending out come of $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{C}$ Nol an's investigation. "

How did you see yourself being facilitated?
A. Just in relation to Chief Superintendent Dillane's report there, he said that a transfer to Glanmire wouldn't have been in a breach of code 8.3, and it would have been because of my relations, it would have been in breach. So Glanmire wasn't an option at the time and that was the station he was looking to transfer me to.

58 Q. Yes.
A. But he also offered to transfer me to Carrigtwohill at that meeting on the 13th October.

59 Q. But had Glanmire not been assimilated into the Cork City division?
A. Not yet.

60 Q. At that point in time?
A. No, not at that point in time.

61 Q. Could he not also have sought an exemption in relation to any issue concerning 8.3?
A. He could have looked for an exemption if Glanmire had been assimilated into the Cork City division.
62 Q. Yes.
A. Because $I$ would then be in a different division.

63 Q. In any event, you have referred to meeting with Chief Superintendent Dillane, he had been informed of the outcome of your appointment with the CMO, in terms of what the CMO had recommended, you met him on the 14th February, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

64 Q. Perhaps, we will just look at -- well, perhaps could you give your own evidence about the circumstances of that meeting?
A. The meeting on the --

65 Q. On the 14th February.
A. The 14th. I'd have to refer to my statement.

66 Q. Have you a memory of the meeting yourself?
A. Not really, no.

67 Q. Okay. Well perhaps I would open what the chief superintendent has said about it. If we go to page 336 11:30 of his statement for the moment. Sort of about ten lines down he says there:
"On 14th February 2013, I recei ved a sick report from Ms. Mbni ca Carr."

Et cetera et cetera. He says:
"On the 14th February at 10aml spoke to Sergeant

Barry. "

You'd have been on duty at that stage.
A. No, I was still on sick leave.

68 Q. You were still on sick leave, of course.
A. I just brought my diary in today, there where I recorded the conversation $I$ had with him, my recollection of it.
Q. Do you want to tell us what that is from your diary there?
A. Yes. I noted this: "First day on hal f pay, €393." And then I have "At 9. 59am Chi ef Superintendent Dillane rang to say he was trying to contact me yesterday on an 087 prefix. My phone is 086 . He offered me a transfer out of concern that I was going on hal f pay. He suggested unit $A$ or $E$ in Glanmire until it goes into the city in June. He says the CMD says I cannot work in Mtchel stown. He said he would create two positions for a ser geant in Carrigt wohill. I then rang Séan Costello, solicitor, who is sending a fax to Chi ef Superintendent Dillane to accommodate me in M tchel st own. "

70 Q. Pardon?
A. Sorry, I said, "I rang Séan Costello solicitor, who is sending a fax to Chi ef Superintendent Dillane to accommodate me in Mtchel stown".

71 Q. Yes. And is that what you said to the superintendent on the day?
A. That I was going to send a fax to my solicitor?

72 Q. Yes.
A. No, I didn't refer that to --

MR. COSTELLOE: Excuse me, Chairman, I beg your pardon Mr. McGuinness, and, Chairman, forgive me for interrupting.
CHA RMAN No problem.
MR. COSTELLOE: Again this is something that is due to my lack of the system, but it is recording Chief Superintendent Grogan, and I heard the witness to say Chief Superintendent Dillane, and in case that is not something that is not clarified, is that something that needs to be pointed out to you now or is that something that gets picked up later in corrections?
CHA RMAN No, thanks very much.
MR. COSTELLOE: It would appear to be an important distinction on this particular point.
CHA RMAN Sorry, my understanding of the situation, correct me if I am wrong, gentlemen, including Mr. McGuinness, and Mr. Barry, my understanding is that Mr. McGuinness asked about a meeting or an encounter, an engagement a conversation between Mr. Barry and Chief Superintendent Dillane. That happened on the 14th February 2013. And Mr. Barry said he had no memory of that. And Mr. McGuinness said, let me remind you of the chief superintendent's statement about that. 11:33 And Mr. Barry said, well, I'm referring to my diary and my diary says the following. And I thought that his diary referred to his conversation with Chief Superintendent Dillane. That's where we are at this
stage. Mr. Barry, am I right in understanding that that's where we are?
A. That's correct, Chair.

CHA RMAN Okay. Mr. McGuinness, am I right in understanding that's where we are?

MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes, Chairman. what then occurred is, I understood Mr. Barry to say in evidence that he -CHA RMAN Have you got your microphone on?
MR. MEGI NNESS: Yes. That he then decided to instruct his solicitor to sent a fax and I think he first said

Chief Superintendent Grogan and then corrected it to Chief Superintendent Dillane.
CHA RMAN Sorry, I thought Mr. Barry said that he phoned Mr. Costello, his solicitor, and from that emerged Mr. Costello's intention to send a fax about it 11:34 to say that he was saying he needed to be accommodated in Mitchelstown.

73 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: And your intention was that it would be sent to Chief Superintendent Dillane and it was so sent?
A. That is correct. It was sent the same day. CHA RMAN So are we all clear on that?

MR. MRPHY: Chairman can I raise one brief question, if I might. Just in relation to the witness, he appeared to refer to his diary, as you indicate, and I 11:35 wonder is there a page reference for that document?

74 Q. CHA RMAK I am sure you provided that to us, did you, Mr. Barry? I am sure you provided that.
A. I provided the diary.
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN Do we have that, Mr. McGuinness, or can we come back to it?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes. We have diary entries.
CHA RMAN That's all right. well look in due course, Mr. Murphy, in due course we will identify the particular page and we will refer you to it. okay. MR. MRPHY: Thank you, Chairman.
MR MEGUNNESS: But my understanding, again it's from Chief Superintendent Dillane's statement, is that you undertook to consider his offer. You didn't reject it out of hand and you said you would get back to him?
A. That's correct.

But in fact you got on to your solicitor and he sent the letter the same day then?
A. Yes.

78 Q. And perhaps if we just look at that, at page 382. If we scroll down, at the end of the first paragraph he says:
"I nordinate del ay in progressing that investigation. In the meantime my client remains certified unfit to work. As he said in correspondence, he would agree to return to work if that were to be a safe environment tel ephone conversation with himthis morning you i ndi cated that you woul d transfer himto Glanmire Garda station. With due respect and having regard to the
circumstances of this matter, it would not be proper or appropriate to have our client transferred. As a compromise and so that our client may return to work, he would accept such return on the basis that he would not come under the direct command of the party whose identity is known to you, about whomsuch complaints have been made by him In this respect therefore my client wi shes to return to work under the direct management of Inspector O Sullivan. I would be obliged if you would confirmthis is in order and represents a without prej udi ce compromise on his part."

I just want to perhaps put this suggestion to you at this stage: Chief Superintendent Dillane, it would appear, having received the CMO's advice, as it were, more or less, phoned you within a couple of days to offer you an accommodation in a different station, which would have taken you away from contact with the person you didn't want to have contact with.
A. That wasn't the CMO's advice. The CMO's advice was temporary workplace accommodations. There was only one accommodation offered, and that was transfer.

79 Q. Well, you seem to be construing the interpretation as you had to have an accommodation by remaining and being in Mitchelstown?
A. Well I was guided by the advice I received in relation to making my complaint, that if I made it under the bullying and harassment policy document that I would not be transferred until I applied for same. Until I
applied for same. So I could see no accommodation being offered under that policy.

80
Q. We11, was it your interpretation of the bullying and harassment policy that it precluded the exercise of the normal transfer provisions?
A. Yes.

81 Q. And that you had veto over where you might be transferred to?
A. It wasn't that I had veto, it's just the policy document was stating that would you not be transferred, 11:38 even if the bullying and harassment complaint was not upheld, that neither the superintendent nor I could be transferred unless we applied for same. That was my reading of the document.
82 Q. Yes. But it gave you an option -
A. To apply.
A. No, no, but I outlined to Chief Superintendent Dillane that I was not going to apply for a transfer, because if I applied then would I have to incur the costs of that transfer. And it was to suit management, then I believe they should have transferred me at public expense.

84 Q. So the cost issues obviously in your circumstances was a significant factor?
A. Of course. Yes.

85 Q. In any event, if we look at page 382 , the chief
superintendent reports on the contact with you up to HRM, at page 383. Page 383 is the next page down. нe's reporting -- if we keep going down, you see on the second page?
A. Sorry, Mr. McGuinness, just back a line there, please.
A. In that report he states, Chief Superintendent Dillane states that he met me on 13th September 2012 by appointment.
A. That meeting did not happen. That was a phone call conversation. It was not a physical meeting.
88 Q. You think that was not a meeting?
A. No.

89 Q. Yes. But this is what we had some discussion about yesterday?
A. That's correct.

90 Q. You seem to be recalling the details of the October meeting by reference to the --
A. That's correct.

91 Q. -- September. So what is your recollection of the conversation you had with him on 13th September 2012, if you want to go back to that?
A. Just in relation to that conversation, I think Chief Superintendent Dillane rang me just to know how I was and I told him, at that stage I hadn't made my client, so I wasn't willing to discuss anything with him.

92 Q. Yes.
A. And we arranged then to meet again on the 21st

September.
A. I cancelled that meeting, yes.

94
95
Q.

CHA RMAN Could you help me. Mr. McGuinness, asked you what's your recollection of the exchange, however it took place, on the 13th September. what happened?
A. From my recollection -
Q. CHAN RMAN Yes.
A. - it was just a phone call to see how I was and he wanted to discuss my welfare and I didn't want to discuss anything with him.

97 Q. CHA RMAN But sorry, he wanted to discuss your welfare, why wouldn't you discuss your welfare with him?
A. Because I didn't want to speak to him.
Q. CHA RMAN Can you remember who said what, as best you can?
A. As best I can, I would have told him --
Q. CHA RMAN I mean, I know it's not -- don't worry about 11:42 that part.
A. Yeah. I was wary of saying anything to him because I hadn't yet made my complaint and I didn't want to say anything.

CHA RMAN Can you remember what he said and what you said?
A. Not really, no.

101 Q. CHAL RMAN Can you remember anything of what he said and what you said?
A. I can remember telling him I didn't want to speak to him in relation to anything to do with the case.
Q. CHA RMAN You say, I don't want to speak to you about?
A. About this case because you're stationed in the same station as the person I am making my complaint about. CHA RMAN okay. Can you remember what he had said that gave rise to your answer?
A. He was enquiring as to how $I$ was and was I going to come back to work or whatever and I said I didn't want to discuss it.

CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MEGU NNESS: You may recal1 yesterday I did ask you about this and you did agree with me at that stage that he said he didn't want to discuss the details of the case with you and you agreed with that, that you didn't 11:43 want to discuss it?
A. Sorry, that was the meeting on the 13th October in Grandons that I was referring to, when I met him physically in his car. He said he didn't want to know about my complaint. Because I had made my complaint at 11:44 that stage, he said he didn't want to know the details of the complaint.

We11 I better just for completeness open the portion of his statement where he deals with this meeting in September again. If we go to the bottom of page 333. He says:
"At the start of the meeting he tol d me that he was suffering from work-rel ated stress and he informed me
that he did not want to di scuss the details of his absence with..." you, as you were stationed in the same Garda station as Superintendent Comyns.

And do you agree with that?
A. I would.
Q. Yes. He then goes on to say that you said you wanted an officer from outside the Cork north division to investigate the matter, and he informed you that he had requested a chief superintendent from outside the division to be appointed to look into his complaint. Do you agree that --
A. That could have been said, yes, I would agree.

107 Q. Okay. He then says:
"I encouraged himtolet me hel p himand to come back to work. I told himhe could be facilitated somewhere. He woul dn't have contact with Superintendent Comyns until the issues were resol ved."

De make that offer?
A. I don't recall that on that phone conversation.
Q. You don't recall that. He says:
"At the time he was on basic pay and l was conscious he 11:45 a wife and three children to support. We then arranged to meet again on the 21st after he had some time to reflect on matters."

Isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yes, we had arranged to meet.

109 Q. So he must have said something to you on which you did have to reflect and it would seem perhaps logical that he must have floated the idea of facilitating you not coming into contact with Superintendent Comyns by means of a transfer elsewhere?
A. I don't recall that.
Q. Okay. But would you agree that it's possible or probable?
A. I think I would have made a recording in my diary had he said something in relation to transfer at the time.

111 Q. Can I go back to the account that he forwarded to HRM of his meeting with you in February of 2013. If we go back to page 383 , 384. If we go on to 384 , I don't want to go back over these other dates again. You see, what he's saying about the 22nd January there is when he attended the case conference regarding Sergeant Barry at Garda headquarters, he spoke with Dr. Oghuvbu and informed him he was in a position to facilitate Sergeant Barry in Glanmire "which l believe was a safe working envi ronment for him pending the outcome of the i nvesti gation. Dr. Oghuvbu indi cated to me that he felt this would be reasonable but he needed time to di scuss it with Sergeant Barry."

So, it doesn't seem that Chief Superintendent Dillane floated the idea of leaving you in Mitchelstown as an accommodation?
A. No.

112 Q. And that he made this clear to the doctor, it would seem?
A. In relation to the 22nd January?

113 Q. Yes.
A. Sorry?

114 Q. Yes.
A. But he also told the doctor I was looking for a medical pension on the same date.
115 Q. We11, I am not sure who said that. We will come down 11:47 to the meeting then on the 14th or the conversation, if we just scroll down there. He reports as follows:
"At 10am on 14th February 2013 I spoke with Sergeant Barry. I enqui red about his wel fare and expressed my concern he was now reduced to hal f pay and informed him that I had met Superintendent Patrick Lehane, Cobh district on 13th February and we agreed that if
Sergeant Barry was agreeable he could be facilitated on either unit $D$ or unit $E$ at $G$ anmire Garda station."

Do you recal1 mention of Superintendent Lehane then?
A. No.

116 Q. Okay "I stressed the offer was made for the well being of his family, it was felt there was no need for him 11:48 being on half pay when he could be facilitated in a station much closer to his home."

Did he explain that to you in those terms?
Not that I recal1

117 Q. okay. In any event, he does record that you requested some time to consider the offer and undertook to contact him in a day or two. Then he refers to the fax that we have seen from Mr. Costelloe. And it just goes 11:48 on then, if we scroll down further. He makes reference to receiving the sick report and then expresses the view that he believes "Sergeant Barry is fit to work and carry out his duties, however I feel it would be i nappropri ate to have hi mstationed in Mtchel stown pending out come of the investigation whi ch is currently bei ng carried out by Assi stant Commi ssi oner Jack Nol an. I consi dered the offer made by Ser geant Barry through Séan Costello is not practical at this time."

And it is forwarded on for directions. In relation to the first sentence there, you I think, perhaps I am wrong in suggesting it to you, you felt that you were fit to work and carry out your duties in Mitchelstown provided you didn't have contact?
A. No, I didn't believe I was fit to return to work at that time.

118 Q. okay.
A. I was enquiring if I was to return to work in the future, what accommodations would be made for me.
119 Q. Yes.
A. But I was certainly in no position to return to work at that stage.
120 Q. Yes. And going into March, I think you had previously
given the CMO permission to refer you to a specialist, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

121 Q. You were due for review by the CMO and the specialist and a date was fixed I think for the 11th March, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

122 Q. And I think you received a reply from Chief Superintendent Grogan on the 8th March to one of your e-mails and perhaps we would just look at page 4074. If we just go down the page. You referred to Chief Superintendent Grogan's earlier e-mail there that we see on screen, that he said he would ensure it would be brought to the attention of all concerned. You had asked him then to tell you to whose attention you brought it and why you are not being given to answers to questions that you have asked. And you say:
"I ambeing deni ed the right to work and provi de for my family by the inaction of HRM "

If we just scroll up there, to see the start of that e-mail. You sent that to him on the 18th. And then he replied, I think he had been away or in the High Court, and if we go back up, if we scroll up, rather than
down, you can see his reply to you on the 8th March there, that he had forwarded to Assistant Commissioner Southern Region for his views and observations and he said he understands that Chief Superintendent Dillane
was willing to facilitate you with a transfer to Glanmire and to enquire if you wished to make an application for Glanmire. And you replied to that then I think, we just see it there now.
"In my e- mail to your office of the 7/2l stated that a transfer was not an for me because of the nature of my complaint and the persons mentioned therein. As Assistant Commissioner southern regi on is one of the persons mentioned therein, I find it strange you would forward my e-mail to himfor his vi ews and observations. Mtchel stown Garda station is my workpl ace and has been for the past 13 years and it is to this workplace I will return when and if HRM provide me with a safe working envi ronment to which I can
return. I will not be facilitated with a transfer to Glanmire. It is my viewthat transfer is not an option for me because of the nature of my complaint, the persons mentioned therein and the fact that I have rel ations in the $G$ anmire sub- di strict. The del ay in inaction by HRM in addressing my complaint is causing me consi derable financial and welfare hardship and I now for the fourth time want HRM to answer the following questions."

And you set out the same two questions there, 1 and 2, and yours sincerely. Now, I am not sure you got a reply directly from Superintendent Grogan to that, but you saw Dr. Tobin on the 11th March, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

123 Q. And the CMO had, as it were, asked Dr. Tobin To address five questions. Perhaps we would look at those, page 1532. And the CMO is looking for the following, he says:
"I would be most gratef ul for your assessment and opi ni on in respect of the following:

1. His formal clinical di agnosis or clinical status.
2. What specific clinical consi derations are present 11:54 that preclude himfroma return to work or policing duties at this time.
3. What, if any, extra safeguards will foster his well being and effectiveness should a return to work be indi cated at this time.
4. His longer termclinical prognosis in rel ation to his effectiveness in undertaking policing duties.
5. Any ot her advi ce that would be usef ul in fostering his well being and facilitating occupational rehabilitation both in the short and the longer term" 11:55

Did Dr. Tobin sort of raise issues relating to these questions with you when you saw him?
A. Yes. Dr. Tobin asked me if I wanted a transfer or did I want to remain where I worked. And I told him that I 11:55 wanted to remain at Mitchelstown Garda station and he said we11, if you do, then we will have to look for temporary workplace accommodations to be put in place to facilitate it. And he also told me that if what I
was telling him was true in relation to my complaint, to continue with it, because it wasn't the first time that something like this came out of that division.
124 Q. Yes. Perhaps we would look at -- I think you saw the CMO in advance of that, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

125 Q. And do you know whether they consulted together afterwards?
A. I believe they did, indeed, there was a new list of recommendations carried out following the meeting with Dr. Tobin.

126 Q. Perhaps we would look at page 1534. This is report from Dr. Tobin. He goes into different details there. At the bottom of the page on screen, as you say, he describes your mood, according to yourself there. He goes into more detail in your background, but in his conclusion on page 1535, he offered this opinion in his conclusion.
"Fromthe mental health point of viewit appears that Sergeant Barry has devel oped a mixed anxi et $y /$ depressi ve reaction secondary to events that occurred at work. These events are to be the subject of formal investigation. In the meantime, without prejudice to the findings of the inquiry, I would recommend that Sergeant Barry returns to work when a mutually agreed safe supportive working envi ronment is available for hi m " So, I think you were informed of that at the time?
A. Yes.

127 Q. Or thereabouts, is that correct?
A. Yes.

128 Q. I think in the meantime you had been informed of Superintendent Kehoe's appointments, isn't that correct?
A. If I may refer to my diary entry for 22nd February 2013.

129 Q. Yes.
A. "9. 54am Chi ef Superintendent Dillane rang to say that Chi ef Superintendent Catherine Kehoe is investigating my compl ai nt. He al so sai d I wasn't to ret urn to work until the investigation was complete on the instruction of $t$ he CMD. "

And then he says he got his ass kicked by HRM.
130 Q. He got his what?
A. He got his ass kicked by HRM.

131 Q. In any event, the chief superintendent was in touch
with you on the 12th and perhaps we'd just look at that, page 1062 into 1063. She had formally notified you of her appointment in an earlier letter, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

132 Q. And then in the second paragraph she wants to arrange a meeting with you, and she informs you in the third paragraph that she has also been appointed under Regulation 14 of the Garda Síochána Discipline

Regulations to conduct an investigation in respect of your complaint dated 21st November 2012:
"...specific reference to the allegation that Superintendent Comyns interfered with the i nvesti gations into the alleged sexual abuse reported at Mtchel stown Garda stati on on 2nd February 2012. I have appoi nted Detective Inspector William Leahy in accordance with Regul ation 14.6 to assist you.

As you will appreciate, this is a complex investigation that requires parallel investigation under both the Garda policy and procedures and the bullying har assment one, and the Garda di sci pl i ne regul ations 2017. To this end l would ask for further forbear ance in allowing a further extensi on of two weeks in respect of the matters 1-8 subject to the policy of harassment is fully complied with in rel ation to this investigation.

As you are aware the matters subject to di sci pl ine regul ations are not governed by the same timeframes. However, it is my intention to ensure this aspect will al so be expeditiousl y investi gated. "

You were conscious of the time constraints under the bullying and harassment policy yourself, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

133 Q. Presumably you knew from your ordinary knowledge and
experience as a sergeant that there was no specific timeframe set out in the discipline regulations for the conduct of an investigation?
A. Pardon?

134 Q. There was no specific timeframe laid down in the discipline regulations as opposed to the bullying and harassment policy?
A. No, there was a timeframe stated for the bullying and harassment, but there wasn't a timeframe stated for the discipline regulations.
Q. And the same position obtained and obtains in relation to a criminal investigation, there's no set specific timeframe laid down for the conduct and completion of a criminal investigation?
A. Well, while there's not -
A. - if I took three years to investigate a sexual assault, I would be in trouble.

137 Q. Yes. Well there's no doubt that it should be done expeditiously. I don't think anyone would say that any 12:01 delay should be avoided where possible?
A. Yes.

138 Q. But there is no specific timeframe as such?
A. No, not that --

139 Q. Now, you've mentioned there the investigation of a
related to what Superintendent Comyns was suspected of having done or alleged by you to have done, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q.

We11, at no stage were you, or were you, was it
conveyed to you by Chief Superintendent Kehoe at any stage, in writing or otherwise, that she was investigating the original offence?
A. No.

142 Q. In fact, she said the contrary to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Chief Superintendent Kehoe wasn't appointed to investigate the original sexual assault offence, isn't that correct?
A. That is correct, but when Superintendent Patrick Lordan took my statement in November of 2012, he felt that the original investigation should be revisited because of the allegations $I$ mentioned in my statement.
Q. Isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, I think you did meet Chief Superintendent Kehoe on the 14 th and an additional statement was taken from you on the 14th, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. On the 15th Chief Superintendent Grogan sent an e-mail then to Assistant Commissioner Fanning, perhaps we would look at that, at 4073. At 4073. Just if we go down to the bottom. This starts with an e-mail from you on this page. And we have seen this just a moment ago, but it goes to Chief Superintendent Grogan and then he forwards this on, if we go back up to 4073 , and he's saying:
"Pl ease see e-mail bel ow. Sergeant Barry was offered a transfer to Glanmire by Iocal management. He rejected this offer. I amat a loss to identify a sol ution in Iight of the nenber's refusal."

So it seemed to have been causing some concern that following the meeting with the CMO, following Dr. Tobin's recommendations and following your conversation with Chief Superintendent Dillane, what was being proposed by way of a workplace accommodation was being required by you to be left in Mitchelstown and nothing else would do?
A. Sorry, that is what I discussed with Dr. Tobin and he said he would recommend temporary workplace accommodations to facilitate me to remain in Mitchelstown. That was my conversation with Dr. Tobin.
146 Q. Yes. Well I am not criticising Dr. Tobin, but he doesn't appear to have expressed it in any way in relation to any specific management action or any specific Garda station?
A. That's correct.

147 Q. I mean, it would be fair to say that?
A. Absolutely.

148 Q. He wasn't laying down, as it were, for Garda management ${ }_{\text {12:06 }}$ what that meant?
A. No, no.

149 Q. Okay. were you concerned that he hadn't gone as far as what you had expressly wanted of him, as it were?
A. No, I wasn't. Because I understood temporary workplace accommodations would relate to my place of work, that they would be accommodations for where I worked, in line with the Garda bullying policy document. Garda Station?
A. Not to my knowledge.

151 Q. Pardon?
A. Not to my knowledge.

152 Q. You'd attended -
A. Sorry.

153 Q. - the briefings then?
A. Absolutely, yes, but I was stationed in Mitchelstown, Mitchelstown was my --
154 Q. Yes. But you had performed duty as a sergeant in Fermoy and you would attend the PAF meetings there, as we previous7y discussed?
A. Yes, but I would have performed my duty out of Mitchelstown. I would have attended a half-hour meeting in Fermoy, but Fermoy wasn't my place of work.

155 Q. You're a sergeant attached to a district -
A. That's correct.
Q. - in a division, in a region. Does your duty not require you to be available to work within your district and your division?
A. Yes, it did.

157 Q. You had worked within your division, not just at Mitchelstown, but all over your division at different stages?
A. Yes.

158 Q. Throughout your period of what was to become 16 years?
A. That's correct.

159 Q. Isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

160 Q. That had included going to Fermoy, being in Fermoy, attending meetings in Fermoy and being on duty in connection with your position as a sergeant in the district and division?
A. That's correct. But my allocated station was 12:07 Mitchelstown.
Q. Okay. If we just go on up to the page then. Chief Superintendent Grogan seemed to be at a loss to identify a solution there. Assistant Commissioner Fanning writes as follows:
"Thanks, it's a pity to see this man is in the position he is especially as he was given so much of his life to An Garda Sí ochána. I amglad that he is utilising the
agreed policy and at this remove a few issues arise."

Now, he appears to be sympathetic there to your position, you'd agree with that, I take it?
A. I didn't think so.

164 Q. You didn't think so?
A. Because it was my understanding that he would have been told that if they were to transfer me to Mallow I would not have objected, but there was no mention of that in any of the correspondence from HRM, either Chief Superintendent Grogan or Assistant Commissioner Fanning. So at the time I thought they were ignoring that, that that hadn't been relayed to them.
165 Q. Okay. He does identify issues obviously here as set out:
"1. I don't accept that the Garda station in M tchel stown is an unsafe working envi ronment nor can l concl ude in the absence of the investi gation/revi ew that there is any finding of bullying/harassment.
2. However, the policy does set out that Sergeant Barry can appl y for a transfer if he wi shes to. Can you establish if he would wi sh to be consi dered for a transfer to any Garda station to hel p himduring the period of investigation? I can give the matter very serious consi deration and then at the final outcome of the process l can transfer the menber back.
3. On the investigation of the file, is it close to bei $n g$ concl uded?

Let us know if there is anything el se l can do."

And then if we go up the page, Chief Superintendent Grogan replies back:
"All parties have agreed to an extensi on of timeframes for the investigation up to the 1st April.
I will agai $n$ advi se Sergeant Barry of the policy and the right to apply for a transfer."

Do you recall having a conversation afterwards or not with Chief Superintendent Grogan after that?
A. I don't recall it now, $I$ don't know if $I$ have a record of it.
166 Q. I think you did send a further e-mail to Chief Superintendent Grogan yourself on the 15th. If we look at page 4100. If you go down the page, because it starts off with you're forwarding a copy of an e-mail that you had sent to Chief Superintendent Kehoe here, where you say:
"Pl ease bring to attention of Chi ef Superintendent Kehoe.

On Mbnday 11/3 I attended the CMD in the Phoeni x Park where there l was assessed by Dr. Tobin. Dr. Tobin encour aged me to di scuss and share the probl ens l have to endured with my family. This is what lid following my meeting with you in Mtchel stown. We
realised that I amnot the only victimand that my wife and children are suffering al so because of
Superintendent Comyns's actions and subsequent inaction by HRM A/C Nol an. As he onl y recei ved your appoi nt ment on 18/2/2013, you are seeki ng a two-week extension. I 12:12 hereby agree to your request. This extension will bring the conbi ned del ay to 1st April, which is exactly six months since A/C Nol an was appointed to deal with this matter. My wife wanted me to object to your extension and has given me and my authorities an ultimat umthat if this matter is not fully resol ved by 1st April 2013 (fools day) she will be making a formal compl ai nt to the Garda Sí ochána Onbudsman Commission on that date."

So that speaks for itself, but you sent that on to Chief Superintendent Grogan. And I am wondering, there's no mention there of any Garda station or workplace accommodations at all. Is there any reason why you omitted that, particularly in the context of the advice from Смо and Dr. Tobin?
A. Because $I$ had already indicated to Chief Superintendent Dillane that I would not apply for a transfer and if I had applied to a transfer to HRM and nominated a station, then if I looked to return to my original for the transfer, you stay where you are, you were the one who looked to get out of there. And if I looked -nominated a station or looked for a transfer, then it
would be at my own expense?
167 Q. Yes.
A. So I had relayed that I wanted my transfer to be directed, that $I$ would be going at public expense.

168 Q. Yes.
12:13
169 Q. CHA RMAN what expense would there be? If you were to transfer, for the sake of argument, to Glanmire?
A. Yes.

170 Q. CHA RMAN what expense would there be?
A. You're entitled to 15 months of allowances when you go on transfer and suppose I was transferred to Mallow, as I had hoped, I could se11 my house without paying stamp duty and purchase another place without incurring --
171 Q. CHA RMAN So there would be considerable advantages?
A. Yes.

172 Q. CHA RMAN If you were doing it?
A. Same as when I moved from Dublin in 2000, and I was aware of that.

173 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Would that happen if you applied for
a transfer?
A. No.
Q. CHAI RMAN okay.
A. You debt nothing.

CHA RMAN So there was a big advantage to being assigned rather than to voluntarily do so?
A. Yes. And because of the financial situation $I$ was in. 176 Q. CHA RMAN I understand, yes. Thanks very much. No, when you mentioned expense of travelling I wasn't entirely sure what was involved but now you have
explained it?
A. It's considerable.

177 Q. CHAN RMN Thank you very much.
A. And solicitors fees as well.

CHA RMAN Yes, thank you very much.
Q.

CHA RMAN Sorry, can I just come back for a moment, I'm sorry. Am I understanding then, if Glanmire was nearer to your home than mitchelstown, this wouldn't arise, no matter who ordered it?
A. I don't think so, because initially there used to be a 15-mile --
Q. CHA RMAN I follow.
A. If you were living outside 15 miles of your new station you wouldn't get your costs but that was changed in 1999 I think.

181 Q. CHA RMAN okay.
A. So that he's how I got my costs when I moved to Mitchelstown, I was living more than 15 miles from the station.

182 Q. CHA RMAN I understand that. But my question is this: If it had happened that you were assigned or volunteered, or whatever, if you went to Glanmire, am I 12:15 right in thinking that wouldn't apply because it was closer to your home?
A. That's correct.

183 Q. CHAI RMAN So for this benefit to be gained you needed saying that you wrote to Chief Superintendent Kehoe on the 20th March in connection with the prioritisation of the investigation?
A. I believe so, yes.

186 Q. I will come back to that later. But following that, you did return to work in Mitchelstown?
A. That's correct.

187 Q. I just want to get the sequence right, for every reason. But at that point in time you hadn't been, as it were, certified by the CMO as being fit to return to work?
A. That's correct.
Q. You had been to your doctor on the 28th and she hadn't given you a certificate on the 28th?
A. No, she said I wasn't fit to return.

189 Q. And you did return to work then without a certificate from either on the 29th?
A. That's correct.

190 Q. Was it on the night of the 28th?
A. 29th. Friday, 29th.

191 Q. Okay. First of al1, why did you do that?
A. For financial reasons.

192 Q. A11 right. Obviously if you went back to work, as you
did, and then you continued at work, you were restored to full pay and allowances -
A. That's correct.
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Q. - for your duties?
A. Yeah.

194 Q. Whatever duties you were doing. I think factually speaking, you never had any further extended periods out on sick leave, you had the odd day here or there I think until your actual retirement?
A. Yes, but nothing --

195 Q. Nothing substantial -
A. No.
Q. - anyway from the end of march 2013 until the middle of June 2016?
A. That's correct.

197 Q. You saw your doctor. Did she refuse you a certificate on the 28th?
A. Yes. She didn't want me to return.

198 Q. Pardon?
A. She didn't want me to return.

199 Q. Perhaps we would just look at her note of that. You've probably seen a statement from her that has become available in the last few days?
A. That's correct.
Q. But if we look at page 4773. For that date there, the 12:18 $28 / 3$, it seems to be saying:
"Patient brought letter fromAssistant Commissioner, same scanned. Feel he has no option but to return to
work. I have spoken with a colleague who is awaiting a Hi gh Court date for the last five years as garda will not agree sick leave was work rel ated. Stated will not have admitted that it is work rel ated. He was sent to consultant psychi atrist by Garda Dr. Tobin on the 25/2 due to see Dr. Dennehy 14/4. Under severe financial pressure not being able to pay mortgage. Has to return to work for financial reasons. Doesn't feel able but feel $s$ he has no choice. Tearful during consultation. Deni es that with sleep currently broken...annual leave, 12:19 work ni ghts as long as possible to avoid superintendent."

Then there is just her own sort of notes there about that. You seem to have, correct me if I am wrong, I am 12:19 just trying to ascertain the position, you seem to have realised that the investigation could take a substantial period of time
A. Absolutely, yes.

201 Q. And you'd correspondence to and fro with chief
Superintendent Kehoe and a meeting with her as well on the 14th?
A. I'd said it in an e-mail to, I think it was to John Grogan.
202 Q. Yes.
A. That they had only taken one statement in so long and that if they if they continued with it at this pace it could be three years. And as it turned out that was right.

203 Q. Obviously that concern and the financial position seems to have propelled you to consult with your doctor to try and persuade her to give you a certificate and then go back to work with the certificate?
A. Yes.

204 Q. But she didn't give it to you on that date?
A. No.
Q. And then you did return and you met Inspector o'sullivan on the 29th?
A. Pardon?

206 Q. You met Inspector O'Sullivan on the 29th?
A. No. I returned to work on the 29th.

207 Q. Yes. Sorry, you returned to work on the 29th?
A. I think it was the following night that I met Inspector o'sullivan.
208 Q. Okay. In your statement you describe it as sort of an inspection and a demand on his part that you produce a medical certificate. I mean, from his point of view he must have known or suspected that you hadn't in fact been certified as fit for coming back to work?
A. No. When I met with him he asked me had I a certificate.

209 Q. Yes.
A. To say I was fit to return and I told him I hadn't, that my doctor wouldn't issue it, she didn't want to give me a cert.

210 Q. Yes.
A. And he said why, and I told him that she didn't want me coming in contact with the cause of my stress.
A. No. But she had said to me that she didn't think it is safe for me to come back in contact with the superintendent.
213 Q. Okay. But in terms of Inspector O'Sullivan, you may not have intended it to be portrayed in this way, but you sort of suggest inferentially anyway that it was a sort of oppressive action by Inspector o'sullivan, that he was inspecting you formally and that he was making an unreasonable demand for a certificate. Surely he was entitled to see had you been certified fit for work?
A. Absolutely. But it was the timing of his visit and the fact he could have rang me and say, Paul, I want to meet you tonight, are you working tonight. But to arrive unannounced, $I$ felt that that was an inspection.
214 Q. Okay. Well he said he was actually there by chance. And he hadn't arranged to meet you, isn't that right?
A. That's not right.

215 Q. But he hadn't arranged to meet you?
A. No, he hadn't arranged to meet me.

216 Q. No. And you didn't --
A. What I am saying is, he wasn't there by chance, he was
there to tell me that I needed a cert before I could resume.

217 Q. okay. We11, I mean, just to be blunt about it, you should have had a cert, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

Under normal circumstances?
A. I agree.

219 Q. Okay. But I mean, you're not suggesting he did anything improper?
A. Not in the least.

220 Q. Okay. All right. He reported that to the superintendent and presumably you wouldn't fault him for doing that?
A. No, that was his job.

221 Q. The superintendent rang Chief Superintendent Dillane and there was contact then made with HRM and it happened to be the Easter weekend, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

222 Q. There seemed to be an expectation that, let him back to work and the paperwork will follow afterwards?
A. Yeah.
Q. Isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

224 Q. But is it clear in your recollection that you told Inspector o'Sullivan that your doctor had refused to give you a certificate?
A. Absolutely. I told him she wasn't going to issue me with a cert. He said, you have to have a cert or you won't be put back on full pay.

225 Q. Over the next few days then, whatever, the 30th, 31st, 1st, 2nd, 3rd you still didn't have a cert?
A. No, I think it was because of the Bank Holiday.

226 Q. Right. Okay. You went to see the doctor then again on the 4th, isn't that correct? Or did you phone in? The 12:25 note says you phoned actually, but presumably you then went to collect the cert from the doctor?
A. Yes, I probably would have phoned to make an appointment with her first and went in and told her I needed a cert.
227 Q. Perhaps you would look at the note there on the 4th. It seems to be saying:
"Patient phoned. Pl anned to return for financial reasons. Was told by inspector today that he cannot return with a letter for me stating he is fit to work. Mr. Barry told inspector that I said l could not provi de sare as in my opi ni on he was not fit to return to same position. Inspector said to put conditions on letter. Discussed with patient and happy with wor di ng. "

So, do you recollect that discussion then happening in the doctors surgery?
A. I recollect discussing with the doctor because she didn't want me to go back to work, I told her I had to and I needed a cert to go back. And she said I couldn't have contact with the superintendent if I was to go back or else she wouldn't certify me.
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Q. She saw it as a health issue, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you got a cert from her on the 4th Apri1, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Perhaps we would just look at page 388. And if you just scroll a little bit back up so you can see the heading there. The 4th April is crossed out. You crossed that out I think, did you?
A. No.
Q. Did she cross it out?
A. I don't recal1 whether she crossed it out or her secretary or whoever, but it wasn't me. That's not my writing.
Q. Okay. Do you recollect looking at it when you got it and was it crossed out when you got it do you think?
A. No, it wasn't crossed out. When she handed it to me in the clinic, it came out as the 4th April and I told her that I resumed on the 29 th and that that cert wouldn't cover me from the 29 th.
Q. okay.
A. And I believe that's why the cert was amended.
Q. Yes.
A. The computer, because it's computerised, the computer spits out the date when she issued the cert, that's what she told me.
Q. Okay. So you then had possession of this on the 4th April and you brought it to Inspector O'Sullivan and he --
A. No, I gave it to a garda, Garda wall and he took it from my station and he handed it to the district officer's secretary.
236 Q. I see. okay.
A. Inspector O'Sullivan rang me that day again looking for it and told him that Garda wall had taken it to Fermoy. 237 Q. Yes. He certainly refers to a phone call, Inspector o'Sullivan, on the 3 rd. The chief superintendent says that he received it at 4 pm on the 4 th and it was sent off to the CMO then. On the 5th of April then, Assistant Commissioner Fanning sent an e-mail, I don't know have you seen this in the discovery? Page 1666. This is back to Chief Superintendent Dillane there. He says:
"I am di rected by Assi stant Commi ssi oner Fanning to acknow edge recei pt of your e-mail. He understands a case conference is continuing for Mbnday morning to di scuss this matter, can you pl ease confirm Assi stant Commissi oner Fanning has di rected that arrangements should be made to have an inspector establish the non- medi cal nat ure of this certificate with the person who issued same, the non- medi cal issues are those whi ch concern local management, redical issues cannot be di scussed. "

And that is sent at 8.51 in the morning. Now, we know Inspector O'Sullivan did visit Dr. Kiely to enquire whether she had issued the certificate and obviously
the issue was raised about the date which was struck out on the copy that you had produced, isn't that right?
A. From Assistant Commissioner Fanning?

No, no. The certificate you produced had the date of

240 Q. Yes, but Inspector O'Sullivan was concerned with the date also himself?
A. Perhaps he was. He said that. And the signature.

241 Q. And Chief Superintendent Dillane?
A. Yes, he says he couldn't -- the doctor's signature which -- I don't think anyone can read a doctor's signature.

242 Q. Yes, perhaps you're right about that. But in any event, Inspector O'Sullivan went back and maybe we'd just revert back to Dr. Kiely's notes. 4773. On the 5th, is says:
"I nspect or Ant hony Ó Sullivan called to surgery to
speak with me, he wanted to check medi cal letter stating fit to work was fromme and had not put date of return to work on it. Aware I cannot speak about the patient. I amjust the middleman. I amfriends with Paul. Says Chi ef Medical Officer phoned me as he feels 12:32 letter will not be accepted. Letter amended with date of return to work on it."

She issued a new certificate on that date, is that correct?
A. I believe so, yes.

243 Q. Perhaps we would look at that, it's on page 4109. If you just scroll up a little bit, the date is now on the left-hand side of the 4 th, dated $4 / 4$. The text has been amended to include the phrase after the words "under circunstances", "from Thursday 28/3/2013
Mr. Barry should not work or attend Fermoy Garda Station and he should not come into contact with Superintendent M chael Conyns."

It is again signed by Dr. Kiely and there is a date stamp further down in a slightly different position. But Inspector o'Sullivan says he didn't seek to speak about your medical condition.
A. That's correct.

244 Q. And Dr. Kiely refused to speak about the circumstances in which it was issued, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, I believe so.

245 Q. She told you that?
A. Yes.

246 Q. The issue of the date and when it was effective from to allow you to go back to work from the 29th, the certificate was amended there in the way we have seen there, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct. Dr. Kiely rang me that morning.
Q. Yes. She rang you that day to tell you that?
A. She rang me after Inspector o'sullivan visited her.

248 Q. Yes.
A. And she thought he was asking was the cert forged, that's what she understood.

249 Q. Well, he was looking for confirmation that it had been issued by her?
A. Yes. She said he asked her was the cert issued by me or her.
Q. Well, Inspector o'Sullivan apparently says otherwise, but that's a matter --
A. I understand, but that's the conversation I had with Dr. Kiely at the time.

It's a matter we may need to clear up, or not. Inspector o'Sullivan wrote a report about the matter, perhaps I should open that, at page 5353. He's referring -- if we just go up the page, it's a report to the Chief Superintendent and it says:
"W th reference to above the instructions of 4/4, I called to Dr. Margaret Ki el y at the Glanmire Medical Centre on the 5/4 in rel ation to medical certificates from Ser geant Paul Barry on the 4/4. I informed

Dr. Ki el y l wasn't there to di scuss any matters of patient confidentiality and onl y to di scuss the val idity of the medical certificate. Dr. Ki el y informed me that it was a valid certificate issued by herself on the $4 / 4$, al beit it was dated $28 / 3$.

I queried the work rel ated conditions attached to the medi cal certificate but she declined to di scuss them

For your information, I nspector Ant hony Ơ Sul I i van. "

Can I just ask you about the extent of discussions you had with your doctor about what are referred to as the work related conditions. I mean, presumably all she knew about your position and your working position and your duties was what you had told her yourself?
A. That's correct.

252 Q. Would it be fair to say that effectively the conditions put down in the letter are what you told her you would require?
A. No, that would be incorrect.
Q. okay.
A. Dr. Kiely made her own decision. She did not want me to return to work. She refused to issue me a cert on the 28th. I requested a cert off her to return to work, she refused, she didn't think $I$ was fit to return.

254 Q. Yes.
A. And she said I couldn't return until certain conditions
were part of the cert.

255 Q
Q. But I mean, I take it that there must have been discussion between you and her, led factually by you, about what conditions would make you happy to return to work?
A. And consultations between her and my psychiatrist who were dealing with me at the time in relation to what was causing my work-related stress.
okay. In any event, did you expect any reaction from Garda management when presented with such a certificate?
A. We11, naturally I would.

257 Q. Yes. Chief Superintendent Dillane describes it at page 337 in the papers. Firstly, in the middle of the page, further down on the screen, he says there, the second last line on screen at the moment:
"I asked Inspector O' Sullivan to find out from
Dr. Ki el y if the certificate was genui ne and al so to expl ai $n$ how she could say that a member of An Garda Sí ochána coul d not work at Fermoy Garda Station. I interpreted the certificate by Dr. Ki ely as saying that Fer moy Garda Station was an unsafe place for a member of An Garda Sí ochána to work in. I wanted to know the basis for that statement as I believe there is nothing per son working in Fermoy Garda St at i on. "

He then refers to Inspector O'Sullivan there. But I
think later that day you received a letter from Inspector o'Sullivan?
A. That's correct.
Q. Dated 5/4?
A. Yes.

12:39
259 Q. And perhaps we'd look at that on page 5348. And he says:
"I wi sh to acknow edge recei pt of medical certificate recei ved at Garda station Fermoy at 4pmon Thursday 4th 12:39 April 2013 from Dr. Margaret Ki el y, Glanmire Medical Centre in rel ation to your return to work. The contents of this medical certificate have been noted. However, I must informyou that all Garda menbers are subject to and operate under the authority of local gar da management and the Garda Sí ochána Code di rectives and instructions. Accordingly, while your return to work is wel comed, the non-medi cal as set out in the medi cal certificate submitted cannot be acceded to. Any medical issues can be referred to the Chi ef Medi cal 12:40 Officer by your medical doctor.

As you are aware, di rections have issued from Superintendent Comyns that all sergeants and gardaí are to attend a district briefing at Fermoy Garda Station are requi red to attend at Fermoy Garda Station at the above time to brief your unit when you are working."

So, you received that and can I ask you, how did you take that?
A. I was half expecting something like it because of the attitude of management up until that point. I didn't see they were going to change their view that there'd be no accommodations offered or put in place.
Q. I mean, it goes back to a question I asked earlier, did you not regard the discussions about transfers, wherever they might be or however they might be achieved, as in fact a genuine attempt to provide workplace accommodation for you?
A. We11, accommodations plural didn't apply, it was one accommodation, from the outset, from everyone, from Chief Superintendent Grogan, Chief Superintendent Dillane, and HRM. The only accommodation was a transfer. There was nothing else. The offer by my solicitor to have Inspector O'Sullivan deal with me directly wasn't even entertained.
Q. Well, would that have dealt with your attendance at Fermoy, for instance, the mere fact that you might be under Inspector O'Sullivan, as it were?
A. It would affect me coming in contact with Superintendent Comyns, yes.
Q. Did you consider sort of remaking that offer at any stage?
A. In relation to?

263 Q. Inspector O'Sullivan.
A. No, because it was dismissed.

264 Q. okay. I mean, Inspector O'Sullivan here and in the
last paragraph particularly, seems to be expressing a clear view about the extent of what your duty requires you to do vis-à-vis Fermoy. You were now in possession of a medical certificate, did you see it as shielding you from/excusing you from doing your duty?
A. No, I saw it as protecting my mental health.

All right. Is it the position then that you weren't at that stage and didn't ever get to the stage where you thought you could protect it by taking yourself out of, as it were, the caldron where the danger was, into an other district?
A. Well Chief Superintendent Dillane already had the option of another district and I clearly outlined to him that I would not apply for it but I would take a transfer at public expense.

266 Q. That view, did you ever put that in writing?
A. No, and I never would. I would never mention a station in writing, because as soon as $I$ would it'd be taken as that's the station I want to go to and you'd be transferred at your own expense.
267 Q. Well I mean, it could be done without it being regarded as your application to transfer. Would you not agree that that was a real possibility?
A. I didn't think management would do that. That's why I wouldn't mention it in writing.
268 Q. Okay. We've seen from the papers, did you get to learn that a case conference was held on the 8th April in relation to the matter? Perhaps if we look at page 390 of the papers. And in the left-hand column it says:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { "Medi cal certificate from GP. Menber should not work } \\
& \text { with superintendent. Recommendations of GP not } \\
& \text { consi dered reasonable and practical by local } \\
& \text { management. No medi cal issue to precl ude hi mfrom work 12:44 } \\
& \text { once mut ually agreed safe supporting working } \\
& \text { environment provided as recommended by an independent } \\
& \text { specialist. Member has declined officer of work } \\
& \text { location of divisional chi ef that would precl ude him } \\
& \text { from working with the superintendent in question." }
\end{aligned}
$$

Do you agree factually with that last comment there, that a transfer would preclude from working with the superintendent in question?
A. It would have. It would have precluded.

269 Q. A11 right. Under the middle column then it says:
"Management actions: Meet with member to put in place suitable arrangements - informthat GP's recommendations cannot be met on the basis of reason ability and practicability.

All commini cation with mentor should be in writing.

If member rejects offers made follow organi sational management procedures to manage situations.

Check transfer rules - can member be transferred wi thout appl ying for same?

HRM awai ting report from OHP. Action compl et e. "

And then:
"Occupational heal th actions: Make appoi nt ment for mentor if new medi cal issues emerge. "

Now, I think on the evening after that conference Chief Superintendent Dillane met with you, isn't that correct?
A. I wouldn't say he met with me, I would say he inspected me.
Q. He inspected you?
A. He arrived unannounced with Inspector O'Sullivan at my place of work at ten to nine, I arrived at Mitchelstown to find the two of them sitting in the car park at Mitchelstown.

271 Q. You make it appear, perhaps unintentionally, that he shouldn't come without telling you that he is going to be coming?
A. I think it would have been a courteous thing to do.
Q. You used the phrase in your statement a number of times "i nspected you" what do you mean by that?
A. Because it was the commencement of my tour of duty, that's why I believed the previous inspections by Inspector o'sullivan and Chief Superintendent Dillane were to inspect me at the commencement of my tour of duty. They could have arrived at ten o'clock.
273 Q. Right?
A. Half nine.
 that meeting, what was said by you and him and how did it go?
A. Chief Superintendent Dillane referred to the meeting he had with the CMO in Dublin and he asked me was I aware of the content of the report from the CMO and I told him I was familiar with it, I had already received it. And because he had arrived with Inspector O'Sullivan, I 12:48 told him I didn't want to discuss any further matters unless I had a rep, my own rep present. It was a short meeting.
Q. You do seem to emphasise, you may not have intended it, that he seemed to your way of observing him to be in full uniform?
A. That's correct. When I saw him that night he was wearing his tunic with the Sam Browne belt and his cap under his shoulder.
Q. We11 what conversation was there between you? arranged to have Inspector O'Sullivan with him. He didn't give me any opportunity to have a representative with me and at the hour of night as we11, the chance of me finding someone to sit in on the meeting with me would have been diminished.
A. The conversation was in relation to the recommendations put out by the CMO in relation to my return to work. He said there was temporary workplace accommodations and he offered me a transfer.

Is there anything else you want to say from your
A. I terminated the meeting when I said I did not want to discuss any further matters with either of them until I had a rep with me. And my rep at the time was Inspector Gallagher.

286 Q. Yes. Can I just sort of open Chief Superintendent Dillane's account of it for the moment, and it's at page 338. You have probably seen the account but I would like to get your response to what you say there. You see where it starts in the middle of the screen there, 9th Apri1. It says:
"On the 9th April 2013 at 9pm accompani ed by Inspector O Sullivan, I met Ser geant Barry at Mtchel stown Garda station. I knew Sergeant Barry was due to be on duty at 9pmand was ref using to attend the briefings in Fer noy as di rected by the di strict officer. At the outset I wel comed Ser geant Barry back to work and enqui red about his heal th."

Do you agree with that?
A. I wouldn't dispute it, no.

287 Q. Okay. "I inf ormed Sergeant Barry I had attended a case conference in rel ation with the Chi ef Medical Of ficer 12:52 previ ously day at Garda headquarters."

He told you that, do you think?
A. Sorry?

288 Q. Did he say that to you?
A. He did, yes.

289 Q. okay. "I al so inf ormed Ser geant Barry that I had recei ved correspondence from Assi st ant Commi ssi oner Human Resource Management on that date. I handed Sergeant Barry a copy of his correspondence and then read the correspondence over to hi m"

Do you agree with that?
A. I do.
Q. okay. slightly further up, thank you. He says as follows:
"I told Sergeant Barry that anything we do in respect of provi ding himwith a temporary safe workplace accommodation has to be done by mutual agreement but al so must be reasonable and practicable."

Do you recall him saying that?
A. I don't. But I wouldn't dispute that he did say it. .
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Q. $\quad$ I l told Sergeant Barry that the conditions set out in hi s GP's medi cal certificates cannot be met on the basis of reasonability and practicability and that his current work arrangements had to cease immedi at el y."

Do you recall him saying that?
A. No.
Q. It would seem, we11, perhaps logical that there ought to have been some discussion about whether --
A. I don't dispute that he said it, I just don't recall it.
Q. Okay, you don't recal1 it, okay. At the bottom 1ine there, continuing down it says:
"I told himthat as far as l was concerned as
di visional officer the conditions outlined in the medi cal certificate whi ch stated that he should not work or attend at Fermoy Garda Station and should not come into cont act with Superintendent M chael Comyns were neither reasonable or practicability."

Do you recall him saying that?
A. I don't. I don't he went into -- I think his conversation on the night was in relation to the instructions from the CMO. I didn't go into a conversation, a long conversation. It was a short meeting.
Q. Yes.
A. Because I didn't have a rep with me, I wasn't
discussing everything and anything, especially my doctor's cert with him.
Q. He then goes on to refer to Superintendent Comyns and says:
"I hold himthat Superintendent $M$ chael Conyns was the appointed di strict officer for Fermoy district by the Garda Cormi ssi oner. As such, Superintendent Conyns was in charge of Fermoy Garda District in accordance with the Garda Sí ochána Code. I told hi mthat a di strict officer's authority and responsi bility cannot be taken fromhimby me, Dr. Ki ely or any other person. "

Do you recall a discussion -
A. No.
Q. - about the position that Superintendent Comyns had?
A. No.
Q. Pardon?
A. And that's why I believe he brought Inspector O'Sullivan with him. He can say whatever he wants. Hes had a witness. I had nobody.
Q. But are you saying that this is an account which is
made up or one which didn't happen or...?
A. I say it's one that didn't happen.
Q. okay.
A. The meeting was very short. We went through the certificate from the CMO. As far as I recall, the meeting lasted about ten minutes. It wasn't a long, drawn out conversation. Yes. He goes on to say that he referred to what the duties and responsibilities of a district officer were and they're well documented and that he referred you to 12:56 the findings of the Morris Tribunal report. Does that ring a bell with you?
A. No.
Q. Okay. He records you as saying:
"Sergeant Barry told me he was compl ying with the superintendent's instructions. He then asked Ser geant Barry if he had attended the briefings at Fermoy Garda Station as di rected by Superintendent Comyns since his return to work and he said that he had not as his doctor had certified he could not attend at Fermy Garda St at i on. "

Do you recollect any discussion about that issue?
A. Yes, I think I mentioned that to him, yes.

304 Q. Okay. He says:

[^0]to parade and brief the working units."

Is that something he said to you?
A. Not that I recall.

Is that factually correct?
A. I cannot say it is factually correct, whether he would be there, there are circumstances he may be in, I know of occasions where he was there.
Q. But you wouldn't expect him to be normally there?
A. Not normally, no.

307 Q. Not normally?
A. But then I couldn't predict when he would or wouldn't be there.

308 Q. Yes. He says:
"He agai $n$ replied that Dr. Ki el y said he coul d not attend at Fermoy Garda Station. I then outlined the i mportance of the briefings for the policing of the di strict and said in my opi ni on he could not give the correct policing service to the people of Fernoy di strict without conducting the briefings."

Was there mention made of that by him, in your recollection?
A. No, but I find it strange that he would mention policing service to the district without conducting the briefings". I had been sick for 139 days and I was not briefed when I returned to duty, and he wasn't worried
about that.
309 Q. But it is in the context of the letter you had received the previous week from Inspector o'sullivan, the last paragraph, which we opened, and referred to the issue of briefings and that it was, as he was putting it, your duty to attend for the briefings?
A. That's what he says, yes, but I don't recall this conversation.

But I am saying in the first instance this was put in writing to you by Inspector o'sullivan?
A. Oh by Inspector O'Sullivan, yes, but not on the night of the 9th April.
311 Q. You don't recollect it being put on the 9th?
A. No.

312 Q. Okay. He then says:
"I then outlined to Sergeant Barry it was he who i nvoked the policy and procedure and in doing so he had an obl i gation to abi de by the policies and procedures as outlined. "

And he says he told you that he:
". . .bel i eved Fer moy Garda St ation and working with Superintendent Comyns was a safe working envi ronment. However, if he honestly felt it was not a safe working envi ronment, he would respect his opi ni on."

Do you recollect anything like that being said?
313 Q. "I then outlined to hi mthat if he really bel ieved he could not work in Fer moy Garda di strict or with Superintendent Comyns, he had an option under Section 8. 8 of the Bullying and Harassment policy to apply for a transfer temporarily or permanently to another station."

Do you recollect any mention of that possibility?
A. No. The only mention of that possibility was in October 2012 when I met him.
Q. He then said that:
"I offered Sergeant Barry the opportunity to be facilitated at Cobh or Mallow Garda Stations, where there was a vacancy for a unit sergeant at the time and l assured hi mthat a transfer application would be gi ven every consi der ation under the circunstances."

Do you recal1 any mention of that?
A. No, I don't. But he would have known -- he would have mentioned Cobh, not Cobh, but Carrigtwohi11, which was in the Cobh district, or Mallow, in our conversation in October 2012.
A. I don't recall saying that.
Q. Is that something that did represent your view, that
you weren't going to take the option and you weren't going to go anywhere?
A. I wasn't going to apply for a transfer. That would have been my view. I would not apply, and he knew that already.
Is it likely that you would have said to him this was your position, I am not going to go anywhere voluntarily?
A. My view would have been, I would have said I would not apply for a transfer, as I already said it to him previously. That was my position, I was not going to apply for a transfer.
MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, I see it's just one o'clock.
CHA RNAN I thought you might finish with the conversation with Chief superintendent Dillane, it might be convenient, if it seemed like that, Mr. McGuinness.
MR. MGGI NESS: Yes. He then says that he tried to explain the complexity of the situation and that, in his words, you couldn't have it both ways, as it were. And he said that you then accused him of trying put him back into the situation that was under investigation. Do you recollect any of that?
A. No. I would have told him that I did not want to discuss matters without having my rep with me. This was a very, very short meeting.

319 Q. Okay.
A. And all this conversation could not have taken place in that timeframe and discussing the cert as well.

320 Q. How long do you think that the meeting took?
A. Maximum ten minutes. I know it was very brief, because I was conscious I didn't have someone with me.
Q. This took place inside in the station?
A. That's correct.

322 Q. Yes. In what part?
A. In the sergeant's office, as far as I remember.

323 Q. He said that he informed you that he was offering you the option of removing yourself from the situation, but that if you wanted to work in the Fermoy Garda District you had to obey all the instructions and directions of the district officer. Did he put it to you in those terms?
A. No.

324 Q. "I then requested Ser geant Barry to reflect on the situation and he said that he was not going anywhere. He then requested time to consult with his AGSI represent at ive. "

And you did do that?
A. I did.
Q. Now, if he didn't say some of these things to you and the conversation was very short, just to be clear, what do you say represents the targeting of you then on this night when he came to Mitchelstown Garda station?
A. The fact that he was there at the commencement of my tour of duty.

326 Q. okay.
A. I believe that was an inspection.
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Q. Okay. And I mean, looking at it, I suppose, from this point in time, you had got the CMO sort of view, he had got the CMO view, the CMO view was about safe, supportive environment, temporary workplace accommodations, you had got Dr. Kiely's certificate and 13:04 was it not entirely both reasonable and logical and proper for him to come to talk to you about the situation as it then existed?
A. Absolutely. I can see why he would have come with the certificate, it's the time that he came is what I was -- what disturbed me and the fact that he came with an inspector with him. He didn't give me an
opportunity to have somebody with me to reflect this conversation that was allegedly said.
328 Q. So is it an unfair procedure rather than anything improper he did or said to you?
A. Procedure, I would say.
Q. It's a procedural unfairness, is that it?
A. Yes.

330 Q. But it would appear from his account that at the time when you said you wanted to consult with your AGSI, that that's when the meeting ended?
A. That's correct.

331 Q. okay. And presumably you did go off and consult with your AGSI at that point in time?
A. Yes.

332 Q. And was that with Inspector Gallagher?
A. Yes.

333 Q. And what did you te11 him or what did he say to you
about it, about the matter, at that point in time?
A. I reflected the conversation at the time and I asked Inspector Gallagher if he could attend with any future meetings I would have with Chief Superintendent Dillane, as I didn't feel comfortable without having someone with me for these meetings and he recommended that I do that, that he would attend meetings in future with me.

There was some slight delay $I$ think in you getting to meet Inspector Gallagher?
A. Yeah, because he's in the clare division and he was involved in the AGSI association itself, so with his duties and other commitments, it would be hard to arrange a time.
MR. MEGI NNESS: Perhaps, Chairman, we would leave it at that until whenever you think appropriate. CHA RMAN Thanks very much. We will say ten past two. Thank you.

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

CHA RMAN Yes, thank you, Mr. Barry.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Mr. Barry, you referred before lunch to Inspector O'Sullivan's account and I think pointing out that it is a recent statement from him in relation to this meeting that we are talking about on the 9th April 2013. Perhaps I should ask you to look very briefly at that. Page 5317. I think you were
observing he didn't seem to have any note of this, is that right? If we just go down to his answer there, which is at the bottom, he is being asked to describe the interaction. He wasn't sure that Chief Superintendent Dillane was in full uniform. And if we go on to the next page then. He thinks it took ten to 15 minutes, he didn't take any entries, but he sort of summarises it as Chief superintendent Dillane offering you another station, and said that you couldn't work in mitchelstown as you were refusing to work with the superintendent and to his recollection, you said "I'm goi ng nowhere, the super will have to go", you don't recall that or you think you did say that?
A. I do recall that that was not said.
Q. You do recall that you didn't say that?
A. Yes.

337 Q. In any event, just going back to the previous day, just to note that I think on the 8th April Chief Superintendent kehoe met with you and she read over all the statements that she had obtained in the bullying and harassment inquiry, and gave all copies of the statements to you in order for you to formulate your response, in particular to Superintendent Comyns's accounts in relation to the eight incidents, isn't that right? she gave you all the statements?
A. She did.

338 Q. To enable you to reply, which you did in due course?
A. Yes.

339 Q. Now, this night of the 4th April, I think later that
night you had cause to be called to the scene of what turned out to be a fatal fire?
A. Sorry, that was the 9th.

340 Q. The 9th, yes, on the 9th. I beg your pardon?
A. Yes, it was almost immediately after Inspector
A. It was in relation to what could possibly be a fatal fire in our district.

342 Q. I think you attended there with a number of uniform gardaí?
A. I attended there with Garda wall and Garda ward.

343 Q. I think Inspector o'sullivan was off duty but I think you phoned him at some stage and spoke to him?
A. No, it was Garda ward phoned him.

344 Q. Garda ward phoned him?
A. Yes.

345 Q. Did you not speak to Inspector o'Sullivan at all that night?
A. No, I tried to contact him after I returned to the station after the fatal fire, but he didn't answer. 346 Q. Okay. Now, it would appear that Chief Superintendent Dillane wrote on the 11th April, wondering why he hadn't received a critical incident report about the matter. Did you see a copy of that? If we could go to 14:14 page 392. Perhaps if we could try page 147 instead, it might be a better copy. This is to Superintendent Comyns, the district officer. And he says:
"Communi cations fromthis office dated 3rd August 2012 clearly states a report on all critical incidents should be reported to regi onal office within 30 mintes of the inci dent occurring, with a follow up report bei ng submitted to regi onal office by 8. 15amthe following morni ng.

Thi s was not adhered to in this case and l require a full expl anation as to why this direction was not complied with in respect of this inci dent."

Do you agree that he's correctly reciting what is required there under --
A. No.

347 Q. You don't?
A. No.

348 Q. Okay. what do you disagree with?
A. That the report should be submitted, a full report -that a report should be submitted to the regional officer within 30 minutes of the incident occurring, by me.
Q. No, was he not more concerned with the follow-up report?
A. Well it's the 30 minutes that's indicated in that.

351
submitted to the regi onal office by 8. 15amthe following morni ng"?
A. I understood it was "wi thi $n$ the 30 mi nutes" because the subsequent report was submitted by Garda ward. But my understanding is that Garda ward provided what is required for notification to a coroner?
A. It's also notification to the superintendent, that says clearly it's a report to the coroner and the superintendent.
Q. Yes. But I think this was referred on to you, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

354 Q. Perhaps we will look at page 14 -- is it 147. 146. If we go up a page. Superintendent Comyns is referring this on to the sergeant in charge in Mitchelstown, who is not you, isn't that correct?
A. No.

355 Q. But he refers to the correspondence and says:
"I have not recei ved a report on this fatal fire as of today's date.

An i mmedi ate and full expl anation is requi red as to why a report was not compl eted and forwarded. I have will to rely on the Pulse incident and the formC 71 when details rel ating to fatal fire were requested."

I think it was referred on to you, was it? If we look at page 145. And is this your report endorsed on it
here?
A. Correct.
Q. Perhaps we'11 just look at that. It says:
"With reference to attached, on the 10/4/2013,
following a fatal fire, I requested Garda hard to complete a detailed report on formC 71 and told himto he was to leave a copy for the di strict officer Fermoy and that he was to take the other with himto the post mortem Wen Garda Ward compl et ed his report, he pl aced a report for the di strict officer in the sergeant in charge's post box and not in an envel ope ei ther to be del i vered by himelf or the oncoming unit to Fermoy. Forwar ded for your information. "

And you sent that look to the sergeant in charge, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

357 Q. And if we just scroll up the page. That was received then in Mitchelstown. And if we go up to the previous page, 144, Sergeant Dunne reports to Superintendent Comyns then:
"Report of Garda Ward forwarded for your i nformation pl ease. "

Isn't that right? And then this is -- is this your writing here as well?
A. No, that's Superintendent Comyns'.
Q. That's Superintendent Comyns' writing, yes. He says:
"A sergeant and five gardaí attended this scene. I require a full explanation as to why a report on the i nci dent was not compl et ed and forwarded bef ore the end 14:19 of the tour of duty."

Was that forwarded on to you then?
A. I think it was sent to Garda ward.
Q. Okay. If we continue up then to the previous page, 143. Superintendent Comyns reports up to the chief superintendent:
"Sergeant Barry was working and attended at this fatal fire. His report in rel ation to your query of 11th
April is attached."

And that was your endorsement about what had happened, is that we have just seen, is that right?
A. Pardon?

360 Q. Your handwritten endorsement on the form, that was your report?
A. That was my report, yes.

361 Q. And he says:
"Due to the ongoing investigation will not be making any comment/recommendation in rel ation to the matter."

And then if we go up to page 142 , and this is Chief

Superintendent Dillane writing back to Superintendent Comyns, who refers to this:
"I have noted Sergeant Barry's report. In future for any critical incident that occurs in your district । expect a comprehensive report to be submitted by the working sergeant in line with Assistant Cormi ssioner Quilter's minute dated 3rd August 2012."

Now, you've asserted in your statement that it wasn't your duty to provide a report?
A. No, sorry, within the half hour. It wasn't my duty to notify the regional office within half an hour of the critical incident occurring. Yes. But do you accept that it was your duty to ensure ${ }^{14: 21}$ there was a report by the following morning?
A. I did, I instructed Garda ward to complete his report.
Q. well, there's a difference of opinion, it would seem, between yourself and Inspector o'sullivan. You suggested it was Inspector o'Sullivan's duty to provide 14:21 that report?
A. No, no, no, sorry. I said I could not have notified the regional office within half an hour of the incident occurring.
Q. I am not talking --
A. Not that I would submit a report, the report for the following morning.
Q. I am not talking about the report within a half an hour. My question is: Do you accept that it was your
duty to submit a report by half eight the following morning?
A. No, it was Garda ward's responsibility to submit the report.

And what do you say to the assertion by Superintendent Comyns and Inspector o'sullivan that it was in fact your duty as the senior sergeant there to produce that report, not a C 71 that Garda ward had produced?
A. It was Garda ward was supposed to submit the report. He completed the C 71, he was then to forward a full report afterwards.
Q. Yes.
A. which he did.
Q. But in any event, what Chief Superintendent Dillane was looking for was for an explanation about the reports and you were asked to provide an explanation and my question then is: In what sense do you say that's targeting of you?
A. Because he clearly indicated that I was to submit the report within 30 minutes of the incident occurring. In 14:23 his initial correspondence 30 minutes is mentioned.
Q. Is that not a different sort of, just an oral notification to the Assistant Commissioner's office that --
A. It's a report to the regional office. As far as I was ${ }_{\text {14:23 }}$ concerned I was being questioned as to why the regional office was not notified within 30 minutes of the incident occurring.
Q. Well, Superintendent Comyns's query seems to be why
there wasn't a report for him by 8.30 the following morning, on the basis of which he could have forwarded it to Chief Superintendent Dillane. Did you not understand that from the request?
A. From the...?
A. No, I was referring to Chief Superintendent Dillane's initial query as to why the report wasn't submitted within 30 minutes.

CHA RMAN Could we go back to that for a moment please, Mr. McGuinness?

MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAK Just go back to the original --
MR. MEGUNESS: The original request?
CHAN RMAN The original request, yes.
372 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. If we can look at page 147. The paragraph in the middle is referring to two forms of reporting, one is within 30 minutes.
A. That's the one mentioned in his...

373 Q. And was that done by somebody, to your knowledge?
A. Pardon?
Q. Was that done by somebody to your knowledge?
A. That should have been done by the divisional office in Fermoy to the people who take the 999 calls. That is who I would understand would report that to the regional office within 30 minutes of the incident occurring.

375 Q. Yes. And the second thing is the follow up report submitted to the regional office by 8.15 the following
morning. Now, is that not what you understood you were doing required to account for, why you hadn't made such a report the following morning?
A. Garda ward had submitted a report on the C 71 and as he explained, he didn't have time to fill out a written or 14:25 typed report.
Q. Yes.
A. Due to his having to attend the coroner's court the following morning.
377 Q well, isn't this the point, that he attended the fire with you?
A. That's correct.
Q. He filled out the C 71. He went off to the postmortem in Limerick with the report, with a copy of the report?
A. With a copy of it.

379 Q. And you yourself didn't provide any report the following morning?
A. I didn't understand it was my -- it wasn't my obligation to supply the report. It was Garda Ward who would supply the report following the postmortem, where 14:26 he could include all the details relevant to the report, to the C 71 which weren't in the C 71s.

380 Q. Yes. But the issue, was it not your duty as the sergeant at the scene to ensure that the district office and the divisional office had a report from you 14:26 the following morning?
A. No, it was not to be a report from me. It was a report from Garda ward, and Garda ward could not submit his final report until he had attended the postmortem.

Okay. Now, in the context where, I suppose, Chief Superintendent Dillane is concerned, he's writing his request two days after the fire and it seems that he didn't regard the $C 71$ as a report that complied with the critical incident reporting directive?
A. His complaint relates to the matter not being reported to the regional office within 30 minutes of the incident.

383 Q. We11, you see, you seem to be ignoring the second part of it in fact there?
A. I have stated that the report submitted by Garda ward on the C 71 would have been sufficient for an e-mail to be forwarded to the regional office the following morning.
384 Q. Yes. But doing back to the issue, you're making a complaint about this, and my question is: In what sense do you see this as targeting, when the chief superintendent raises an issue, it goes up and down the chain of command and there are reports back from, yourself included and the chief superintendent accepts the report or does nothing further, takes no action as
A. Well the fact that he didn't take any further action would indicate that the report should not have been -I shouldn't have been questioned in relation to this
matter, as far as I'm concerned. I did everything that was obliged to do on the night. I attended a fatal fire, having just been inspected by Chief Superintendent Dillane and Inspector O'Sullivan and I wasn't best fit to attend that fire and witness somebody burned in a house. Nobody asked me after that how I felt or how that affected me. But they were only interested to know was a report submitted within 30 minutes or did Garda ward submit a report the following morning.
385 Q. We11, can we just look again at the document that concluded the exchange of requests and reports, at page 142. This goes back down to Superintendent Comyns and he says:
"I have noted Sergeant Barry's report. In future for any critical incident that occurs in your district, I expect a comprehensi ve report to be submitted by the working sergeant in line with Assi stant Commissioner Quilter's min nute."

That seems to be suggestive, at least, that in fact it was your duty as the senior man there, Garda ward having gone off, to submit a report in the matter by the next morning?
A. I had no further information from the scene other than what was contained in the Pulse incident report and the C 71, there was nothing more I could add to a report. Garda ward could, having attended the postmortem the
following day.
Q.

He could, of course. Was this sent back down to you here? If we just scroll down? It's sent down to sergeant in charge, Mitchelstown "for your information, that Sergeant Barry should note and return this file", and did you do that?
A. I would have noted and returned.

387 Q. Now, having looked at the issue, how and who do you say targeted you here in relation to this?
A. Chief Superintendent Dillane by initiating the report. I don't see anyone questioned in relation to the reporting within 30 minutes of the incident occurring if he's not saying that was to be done by me.
388 Q. Well --
A. Because he does query the fact that the regional office 14:30 wasn't notified within 30 minutes and to the best of my knowledge nobody else was queried as to why that direction was not complied with.
Q. Yes. But I mean, I thought you told me it was Garda Ward who had notified them, notified Inspector o'sullivan, and did Inspector o'sullivan notified the regional office, to your knowledge?
A. I wouldn't say so, no.
Q. okay.
A. I would expect the radio room personnel in Fermoy Garda 14:31 station to do that.
Q. Yes.
A. Because I had attended numerous critical incidents in my service and I never notified the regional office
within 30 minutes myself.
Q.

CHA RMAN Is Fermoy the regional office?
A. No, Fermoy is the divisional office. The regional
office would have been Anglesea Street in Cork.
CHA RMAN So the officers, when they go to an
incident, if I am understanding, they're required to notify the regional officer that something terrible has happened, some big event has happened. There's a fire, there's an accident, there's a whatever it is, and they are to do that within 30 minutes, is that right?
A. Well I don't understand that it's the persons who would go to the scene. I would say it's the divisional
office in Fermoy who are aware through radio communication, they would have directed us to the call and they would have been updated from the scene as to what was happening.

394 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, let's go back to basics for a second. Say a big car accident happens, is it your understanding, this is just what you understand, right or wrong, it looks to me as if the gardaí who investigate should notify the regional office within 30 minutes that something big has happened, do you agree with that?
A. No, Chairman.

395 Q. CHA RMAN I mean, don't just agree with me because I am saying it?
A. No, because --

CHA RMAN No, don't te11 me because, just te11 me what's your understanding. Sorry, I don't mean to get
into an argument about it. I just want you to tell me, what's your understanding? A big accident occurs, gardaí, including a sergeant, members and gardaí go to the scene?
A. We would notify the divisional office in Fermoy and they would in turn --
397 Q. CHA RMAN They would pass it on, okay.
A. They would notify, because it is to be done by text.
Q. CHA RMAN But somebody has an obligation, is that what the 30 minutes refers to?
A. Yes, somebody has to notify the regional office within 30 minutes.
399 Q. CHA RMAN okay. And the way you say it's done is that you get in touch with your district office?
A. Yes.

400 Q. CHAN RMAN Or divisional office and they would pass it on?
A. Yes.

401 Q. CHAD RMAN okay, that's the 30 minutes out of the way?
A. Yes.

402 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. Now, there's also an obligation, if I understand, to furnish a report, I think it says a full report is what it says, to furnish a report by 8.30 the following morning?
A. Yes.

403 Q. CHA RMAN Is that clear?
A. That's correct.

404 Q. CHA RMAN Somebody has the obligation to do that?
A. Yes, that's correct.

CHA RMAR And who do you say has the obligation to do that in the situation we're imagining, a big car or lorry accident and sergeant and gardaí go there, who has the obligation to make the report in the morning?
A. The investigating guard or sergeant. If there was -- 14:34 CHA RMAN How am I to know from that, if it is the sergeants or the guards? whose obligation?
A. Well, if a guard went to a fatal accident, the guard would submit the report. If a sergeant was investigating a fatal accident on his own, then he would do it.

407 Q. CHA RMAK On his own? If he's not doing it on his own, if he's doing it with other members, whose obligation is it? As you understand it. I mean it doesn't mean that that's absolutely the case but as you 14:35 understand it?
A. The investigating garda.
Q. CHAL RMAN And who is that?
A. The investigating garda was Garda Henry Ward, and I directed him to submit --

409 Q. CHA RMAN who decides who is the investigating garda?
A. If it was a fatal accident, a car accident, then it's on the sergeant to investigate a fatal car accident, but for a fatal fire, it's okay for a guard to investigate a fatal fire.
410 Q. CHA RMAN The sergeant and the gardaí go there?
A. Yes, but it's the guard who is the investigating member.

411 Q. CHA RMAK who decides who is the investigating member?
A. The district office decided that for fatal accidents that a sergeant would take charge of an investigation.
412 Q. CHA RMAN Right. And the district office said for fatal fires?
A. A guard can investigate, as Garda ward did in this case, he was the investigating garda. CHA RMAN Sorry, I am still lost on this. I am not disputing, it seems obvious that a guard can investigate, but if a sergeant and gardaí go there, whose obligation is it to make the report?
A. The investigating garda.

414 Q. CHA RMAN who decides who is the investigating garda?
A. The sergeant.

415 Q. CHA RMAN Right. So in this case, did you decide that Garda ward would be the investigating garda?
A. Yes.

416 Q. CHA RMAN And you told him that?
A. Yes.

417 Q. CHA RMAN You're the investigating garda?
A. Yes.

418 Q. CHA RMAN okay?
A. And I told him to submit the report.

419 Q. CHA RMAN Very good. The 8.30 report?
A. Pardon?

420 Q. CHA RMAN The before 8.30 report?
A. No, no, sorry, not the 8.30 report. The report before 8.30am.

421 Q. CHAI RMAN Yes?
A. Sorry.

422 Q
Q. CHA RMAN That's the one I am talking about?
A. Oh yeah, not the one within half an hour.

423 Q. CHA RMAN wait now, we can forget the one within half an hour, we know the story about the one within half an hour, we don't have to keep going back to the one within half an hour because that does not apply to the report we are talking about, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

424 Q. CHA RMAN I'm sorry, I sound cantankerous, I am sorry?
A. No, I understand.
Q. CHA RMAN I am not intending that, so please forgive me. If that sounds crabby, it's not intended to be okay, I am trying to get to the bottom of this. okay. So the fact is, you said, Garda ward, you're the investigating garda and you make the report?
A. That's correct.

426 Q. CHAN RMAN And in saying that, you were referring to the report that has to be done before 8.30 in the morning?
A. That's correct.

427 Q. CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
A. Thank you.

428 Q. CHA RMAN Now, as I say, I am not trying to give you a hard time over it, I am trying to get it clear in my own mind.
A. I understand that, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Okay. Now, Mr. McGuinness.
429 Q. MR. MEG NNESS: I mean, the critical incident reporting directive requires the superintendent to send
it to the regional office but he has to have it first in order to send it, isn't that right?
A. Yes, and it's sent via e-mail.

430 Q. Inspector o'sullivan says at page 5323, that in his experience, a C 71 report wouldn't be sufficient to satisfy the requirement in that and that it was your responsibility to furnish a report in the morning that could be transmitted then to the regional office via the superintendent?
A. I had no further information other than what was contained within that, $I$ couldn't determine if this was a crime or how the person had deceased. So therefore I couldn't determine a report into how the investigation should proceed or how I thought the investigation should proceed until the postmortem was concluded.
431 Q. But just looking at the question that Inspector o'sullivan is being asked there:
"I have been asked frommy experience whether a C 71 report (notification to the coroner) would ever have been used to satisfy the obligations of reporting matters to the regi onal office as per A/C Quilter's i nstruction.
A. Not to my know edge, the C 71 is sol el $y$ an internal document to the coroner in cases of sudden death and when the superintendent recei ves that at this stage a copy would be sent to the coroner and the superintendent would write on the C 71, please forward inquest file."

It's a separate process, the reporting ob7igation from A/C quilter is a separate process.
A. The $C 71$ is also to the district officer.

432 Q. He also gets that?
A. It is a report to both persons.

433 Q. He also gets that too, isn't that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.

434 Q. But I mean, is it your answer in the sense that there was nothing to report beyond the C 71?
A. I had nothing I could contribute other than what was contained within the C 71 to enhance any report that was forwarded to the regional office. I had no information other than all the information supplied in the C 71 by Garda ward at that time.
435 Q. Yes. But you do accept, therefore, that the obligation to report does lie on the duty sergeant, such as yourself, who would have been at -- were at the scene?
A. To make the report?
Q. Yes.
A. No.

437 Q. Okay. Well, we will move on. But I mean, if Chief Superintendent Dillane is there in his office, as he appears to have been, without a report, is there anything wrong or unreasonable in him seeking to know
why he hasn't got such a report?
A. But they had. He had the C 71.

438 Q. He had the C 71?
A. And the Pulse incident.

Q. He may well have thought, maybe there's another report or there's some reason why there isn't another report?
A. Garda ward would submit his report once the postmortem was concluded.
Q. You made your explanations, it was reported up and down the line, the question then comes back to: In what sense is that enquiry or any part of it a targeting of you by reason of having made a protected disclosure?
A. Because the 30 minutes was specifically mentioned by Chief Superintendent Dillane when he sent that out and also, if you look at the date of the minute, we'11 say, from the Assistant Commissioner in relation to critical incident reporting, that was issued on 3rd August 2012, I was not present in Mitchelstown Garda station from 2nd August 2012. I was not familiar with that report and I was not briefed on it.
441 Q. Okay. We11, that may be another issue, but that's not something you appear to have raised at the time, that you weren't aware of this requirement?
A. I was submitting -- I was doing my duty on the night as 14:42 I had always done before $I$ had gone sick. As I stated already, $I$ have attended numerous fatal accidents.
442 Q. Yes.
A. Suicides, et cetera, I never submitted a report as was requested there.

443 Q. And when you resume --
444 Q. CHA RMAN And before 8.30? You have never submitted one of those?
A. No. No, if I was at a sudden death I would fill out a

MR. MEGU NESS: We11 perhaps we will pass on then. there anything else you wish to say about that?
A. No, just that there was no reflection by Garda authorities that night having inspected me, where I went out to a critical incident, $I$ had to go up the top of a fireman's ladder to view a body in situ and then return, and to have to deal with that in the immediate aftermath without anyone enquiring as to how I was.

447 Q. Yes. In any event, this isn't a criticism, you don't seem to have reflected that in any of your responses or taken any action on foot of it that at the time, is that fair to say or not fair to say?
A. In response to Chief Superintendent Dillane?
A. That's correct.

451 Q. What contact did you have with him after he arrived in the division?
A. Sorry, after?

452 Q. After he arrived in charge of the division?
A. I had met him prior to he arriving in Cork north division, which he didn't mention in his statement.
453 Q. Right.
A. When he was the superintendent in Mallow, he was sent to investigate a complaint by a person in Mitchelstown, a fella called [redacted], who made a complaint in relation to [redacted].

454 Q. You don't have to name names?
A. Okay. So Superintendent Dillane arrived and met with me because I had been dealing with this person and I advised him not to argue with the person because he was 14:44 prone to making allegations. We went to this person's house, the statement was taken from him and when the person signed the statement, Superintendent Dillane got into an argument with him and then asked him for his pen and the two of them ended up struggling over the pen. I had to separate them. And when we left the house, Chief Superintendent Dillane said to me, I want him done for assault. And I said, there was no assault, there was two adults fighting over a pen. And then he said to me, I want him done for the theft. And 14:45 I said, it's a 20p Bic biro, I'11 get him to send it to you. And then he said to me, you're taking the side of an English man over me. And we returned to the station he didn't speak to me all the way back. And that was
prior to him coming to Fermoy in 2012.
We11, I don't know anything about it but from your account it was his pen and it was taken from him by force, it would seem?
A. But the person posted it to him at Mallow Garda station
 and Inspector o'sullivan is aware of this incident because he was the sergeant in charge in Mitchelstown at the time. But had you any adverse interaction with him yourself in relation to your duties -
A. Well this was an adverse reaction.

457 Q. - in Mitchelstown?
A. That was an adverse reaction, because he accused me of taking the side of an English man, as he said, over him.

458 Q. Okay. Is there anything else?
459 Q. CHA RMAN How did the pen get to be an issue?
A. They started arguing --

460 Q. CHA RMAN Did he give him his pen to sign the statement?
A. That's correct.

461 Q. CHA RMAN And then did your man not give it back?
A. No, they started arguing and he said --

462 Q. CHA RMAN Wait now. Question: what happened to the pen?
A. The person posted the pen to Mallow Garda station.

463 Q. CHA RMAN No, no, no, you know that's not the question I'm asking?
A. Sorry.

464 Q.
Q. CHA RMAN I think you know that's not the question I am asking. what happened to the pen?
A. The person who was being interviewed held onto it. CHA RMAK Held onto it. Yes. And the superintendent wanted it back?
A. That's correct.

CHA RMAK okay. So unhappy differences seem to have arisen between you and the superintendent at that stage, is that right?
A. That was the only interaction I ever had with him before he came to Fermoy.

CHA RMAN It didn't auger too we11 at the same time, okay.
467 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: It would appear that Chief Superintendent Dillane, on the 12th April he wrote to the CMO and was seeking some clarification or assistance about the issue of arrangements that could be made. Could I ask you to look at page 393 and 394 ? Now, in the first instance there's an account of the meeting on the 9th April, obviously this isn't exactly contemporaneous, but it is within a couple of days of it there. If we just go down the screen. It appears to be perhaps consistent with what he put in the statement but if we proceed further down. And down further. He includes in the last paragraph here: situation but he replied he was not going anywhere."

Is that something you would have said to him?
A. Possibly would. As I said earlier, I would understand that I would have said, I'm not going to apply for a transfer.
468 Q. okay.
A. Which he may have interpreted.

469 Q. "He continued to refer to Dr. Ki el y's certificate, whi ch he clai med does not allow hi mwork in Fer moy Garda station or have any contact with Superintendent Comyns. "

Do you recollect whether you did refer to it or not?
A. I don't.

470 Q. "And he is now requesting of the doctor clarification of this situation as a matter of urgency."

He got a reply from the CMO, if we look at page 395. It should be there. 395.
CHA RMAN I think if you rol1 up -- oh no, continue on Peter, and we will see.
MR. MEGI NESS: It may be just a very bad -CHA RMAN It was an e-mail, Mr. McGuinness, I think. MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes.
CHA RMAN And if we just keep going. Just there.
MR. MEGU NESS: It's a very illegible copy, that.
CHA RMAN It looks like it didn't get copied in that one.

471 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. But essentially the doctor replies saying that it's not a medical issue, it's a
management issue for Garda management, rather than something he is prepared to give any further medical advice on. Did you see that reply yourself?
A. I did.

472 Q. So, I just want to sort of understand your position here, to see if I have it correctly. You had been to the CMO and you had explained your position in relation to Mitchelstown and the superintendent to him?
A. That's correct.

473 Q. In the January note that we've looked at, he talks about temporary workplace accommodations, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

474 Q. You're then seen by Dr. Tobin on the 11th March and there's a consultation between Dr. Tobin and Dr. Oghuvbu at that time. He reports to the CMO that there should be a mutually agreed safe and supportive workplace environment for you for a return to work, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

475 Q. And your doctor, you return to work without certification but your own doctor, you having instructed her as to the position, she issued the certificate that we have seen.
A. Sorry, I didn't instruct the doctor on -- I didn't instruct the doctor.

476 Q. We11, you must -- I say that in the sense that you must have told her of the factual position as you saw it in relation to Superintendent Comyns and Mitchelstown and

Fermoy?
A. No, I never mentioned Mitchelstown and Fermoy to my doctor. She knew I worked in Mitchelstown, she knew the superintendent was based in Fermoy.
477 Q. Yes.
A. I did not say Mitchelstown, Fermoy to my doctor, as you're...
Q. Well, she wrote a certificate for you in relation to Fermoy Garda Station, saying that you shouldn't be going there to work?
A. But that would be a matter for the doctor to clarify. I did not instruct the doctor.
Q. She can only write that knowing that or believing that it would be an issue for your mental health, I thought you agreed that that was the position?
A. I would agree to that, yes.

480 Q. So you then are returning to work on the basis of one medical certificate and then the CMO's agreed position with Dr. Tobin that there should be mutually agreed workplace, a safe and supportive workplace environment. 14:53 Isn't the difficulty, that your return to work wasn't on the basis of any mutually agreed position with Garda management? Did you see that as a problem?
A. Dr. Tobin recommended it, that a mutually agreed workplace be agreed, if there was temporary workplace accommodations put in place. My solicitor suggested one such accommodation and it was ignored by management. It wasn't even entertained.
481 Q. Yes. I am looking at it from -- I mean, obviously I am
not going to suggest that you were happy with this, but you were anxious to get back to work --
A. Sorry, I didn't want -- I would never have returned to work if I could have afforded it, I would never.
482 Q. Yes.
A. I hated going back to work.

483 Q. But in any event, your financial position was such that you decided you would have to go back to work?
A. Yes.

484 Q. And you went back to work then with, as it were, conditions that hadn't been mutually agreed by anyone in a sense?
A. Well, they couldn't be. It was a doctor on her volition who issued that cert. She didn't discuss it with any Garda management and would not have.

485 Q. Yes.
A. So it wouldn't be possible for her to issue a cert without discussion.
Q. Yes. We11, having given me that answer, do you see that that created a problem for Garda management in any 14:54 respect?
A. I could see that that was a problem created by Garda management themselves because they weren't willing to entertain temporary workplace accommodations in relation to my safe return to work.
487 Q. Okay.
A. Accommodations is plural. They had only one accommodation, and that was transfer. And transfer only if I applied for it, not if I indicated I'd be
willing to go somewhere.
488 Q. Yes. I mean you've laid some stress on the plurality of accommodations as a way of dealing with it. Had you anything else in mind that you think could have or should have been offered?
A. I was hoping the offer of mallow, as I indicated to chief Superintendent Dillane, would have come instead of a transfer to Fermoy, which, as I indicated to him, I would appeal any transfer that would put me back in those circumstances.

489 Q. But I mean, I am just asking you to sort of narrow the options, as it were. That is a transfer, but was there anything other than a transfer that you had in mind that --
A. That I was to work under the direction and instruction of Inspector o'sullivan. And that was actually put in place, according to Superintendent Comyns' own statement, in 2014, that all dealings with me were to be handled by Inspector o'sullivan. So they weren't able to introduce it when I requested it, and they did then in 2014, when they realised that the medical cert was actually a medical problem.
490 Q. Yes.
A. And not a management problem.

491 Q. Yes.
A. As they indicated.

492 Q. We will come to that. There is a better copy of the Смо's reply to Chief Superintendent Dillane at page 1553. Perhaps we will just look at that. And in the
second paragraph he does confirm there, as I suggested:
"I amnot in a position to offer further medical advice in this case, as the medi cal issues have been adequat el y addressed in previ ous correspondence. Based 14:57 on the information currently available to me, there are no compelling redi cal issues that precl ude the member attending at work and undertaking assi gned pol icing duty in a safe and supportive workplace envi ronment.

In rel ation to the temporary workpl ace accommdations that were recommended in respect of the location of the member's place of work, the basis of accommodations to be agreed and facilitated is reasonable and practicable.

As the member appears to be ref using to agree with or cooper ate with Garda management efforts to progress his ret urn to work in what appears to be fraught ci rcumstances, I bel ieve that this is an issue best addressed by Garda management utilising rel evant Garda Code, Garda di rectives or empl oyment contractual processes.

I hope you find the above hel pf ul as you progress the management of the member's return to work. "

Now, having resumed duty with Dr. Kiely's certificate enabling you to do so, did you consider that there was
still any scope for reaching a mutually agreed position from then on?
A. Absolutely. They could have transferred me to mallow or they could have had Inspector o'sullivan take charge of me.

493 Q. Okay. In any event, just turning to another issue in relation to leave. I think you had had authorised by Superintendent Comyns the carrying over of annual leave from the previous year, isn't that correct?
A. No, that was Chief Superintendent Dillane who authorised that.

494 Q. Chief Superintendent Dillane. And I think you had some, was it 34 days?
A. Yes, it was one less than I applied for.

495 Q. One less. Do you know why that was?
A. No, he didn't give any explanation.

496 Q. Did you ask?
A. No.
Q. In any event, you had this build up of leave and I think you made application in respect of some dates in April 2013, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

498 Q. And I think Inspector o'sullivan dealt with those and was authorised to deal with those, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct, yes.

499 Q. Perhaps if we look at page 154. This is a letter of 12th April 2013. He's replying to your application, it says:
"W th reference to the above, I recei ved your formD 9 on the 4th April 2013 at 3pmin public office, Fermoy Garda Station. Annual leave application must be submitted 16 days in advance to the district of fice. Leave is not granted until signed of $f$ by the district of fi cer.

Had I recei ved your application in advance of the 4/4/2013, I woul d have ref used the dates 4th and 5th bearing in mind Sergeant Ai dan Dunne in charge of Mtchel stown was al ready on annual leave. I have sanctioned both dates retrospectivel y in the ci rcumstances bearing in mind your recent return to work. "

So what did that result in practically for you? Had you worked those days and were you getting them, as it were, restored as annual leave, or are you not worked those days?
A. I had not worked those days.

500 Q. You had not worked those days. Had you been due to work those days?
A. Yes.

501 Q. A11 right. These are the days we have referred to earlier obviously. He says:
"I have sanctioned all other dates with the exception of 15 th and 16th April due to sergeant in charge Mtchel stown bei ng al ready on annual leave."

So that was three or four days coming up as and from the date of this letter. It says:
"Resubmit your application for the 17/ 4/ 2013.

I attach copy of Superintendent Comyns's gui del ines in rel ation to new roster whi ch incl udes annual leave i ssues."

Did you get that then on the 12th, do you recall?
A. It may have been that day or the following day. I'd say it would have been the following day.
502 Q. Would that normally have come by e-mail at this point in time?
A. No. Post.

503 Q. It's suggesting you resubmit the application, can you just en7ighten us as to why that might have been requested?
A. Because he had refused the 15 th and the 16 th.

504 Q. Okay. And did you resubmit one for the 17th?
A. I can't recal1. I may have, I'm not sure.

505 Q. okay. I think did you have a telephone call with Inspector o'Sullivan?
A. I did.

506 Q. Subsequent to this or prior to this?
A. Prior to this. He rang me and he explained to me that he was going to have to refuse my leave for those dates and I told him that my wife had been suffering from
chronic back pain for a couple of months and I was taking my leave on my early tours just in case she had a recurrence, as I was the only one at home to take my kids to college or school at the time. envisaging, that you had a stock of leave and you thought --
A. If she was not sick, I would have come to work. okay. You were due to work, I mean having been refused annual leave for these dates, you were in fact then due 15:02 to appear for duty, is that right?
A. That's correct. The same as the 4th and the 5th previously.
509 Q. Al1 right.
A. I was due to appear for those dates and I did not appear.

510 Q. Yes. I think there's no factual dispute about it, you didn't appear for duty on the 15th, 16th or 17th?
A. That's correct, due to force majeure.

511 Q. Due to force majeure. I think you subsequently signed a force majeure form, which is provided for under the Parental Leave Act, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

512 Q. You signed that on the 18th, isn't that correct?
A. As soon as I returned, yes.

513 Q. Now, Superintendent Comyns reported to Chief Superintendent Dillane on the 19th, if we perhaps just look at page 397. There's two reports, this is the first one about the Dr. Kiely medical certificate. And
in the first paragraph he says:
"I amseeking advice and directions of how I amto performmy duties as district office taking into account the conditions set out in the medical certificate. In my opi ni on, Sergeant Barry cannot performthe duties which l as district officer require himto performwhile these conditions are accepted as part of his medical fitness to return to work. Neither can I performmy duties as district officer by having a 15:05 medi cal doctor certify that l cannot come in contact with a sergeant over whoml have supervisory and managerial responsibility. This certificate, if it was taken at face val ue, means that l cannot call to Mtchel stown Garda station at any time while Sergeant Barry is on duty. It al so means that Sergeant Barry cannot work or attend at Fermoy Garda Station even in the middle of ni ght when he is on duty.

A number of issues have arisen since Sergeant Barry's return to work and I have not been able to deal with thembecause of his medical certificate.

I would be obliged to recei ve advi ce and di rection on how I amto performmy duty in the above ci rcumst ances."

Would you like to comment on that, as to whether it is a reasonable and appropriate response to the position
he found himself in as a district officer?
A. Well I can't understand how a district officer wouldn't take a medical certificate on face value. Is there something wrong? Is he saying there's something wrong with my certificate, that my doctor shouldn't have doubt for my mental health welfare?
A. As what it should have been classified as, work related, in which event $I$ would never have returned to work.

517 Q. In the sense that if it had been certified as injury on duty at some earlier stage, you simply just wouldn't have gone back to work?
A. No.

518 Q. You would have considered yourself based upon such certification as being permanently injured?
A. I would have been able to support my family without having to return to work. I wouldn't have been forced into returning.
519 Q. The second letter that Superintendent Comyns wrote on the same date relates to the force majeure form that you received. And it's on page 398 there. He says:
"I refer to the above and attach notice of force maj eure I eave from Sergeant Paul Barry.

I recei ved this notice at 10.05am on the 19th April 2013.

Sergeant Barry had applied for annual leave on the 15th, 16th, 17th April 2013, al ong with numerous ot her dates. Due to the ongoing i nvesti gati on by Chi ef Superintendent Kehoe, I did not deal with this application. The annual leave for the 15th and 16th April 2013 was ref used as Sergeant Dunne in charge of Mtchel stown was al ready on annual l eave. Inspector O Sullivan who ref used the leave, attaches this report. I nspector O Sul Iivan al so tel ephoned Sergeant Barry and expl ai ned why the annual leave was ref used to him

On the 15th, 16th and 17th April Sergeant Barry did not 15:08 report for duty. Neither Inspector O Sullivan nor I were contacted, nor had we any i dea why Ser geant Barry was not at work. Agai $n$ due to the ongoing i nvesti gation l could not performmy duty as district
office in rel ation to member at that time who, as far as I was concerned, was absent without leave.

Ser geant Barry's notice of force maj eure l eave now expl ai ns his absence for these three dates in question but in my opi ni on cont act should have been made with Inspector O Sullivan on the 14th and 15th April to expl ai $n$ this absence."

That last point on its face seems reasonable.
Obviously you knew that Inspector O'Sullivan had refused you the leave as annual leave. And then, you don't in fact appear on the 15th. Is there any reason why, if this is correct, why you didn't phone Inspector o'Sullivan about the matter?
A. I contacted the Garda station to report it, Mitchelstown Garda station. And I supplied phone records to the investigating officer to show that I did. I also supplied him with phone records to show that I rang the district office in Fermoy when I was ceasing my force majeure duty. And I wasn't obliged to make either of those calls but I did. And when I was absent from duty on the 4th and 5th April, I also rang the station to them that I didn't know whether my leave was sanctioned or not and I would not be turning up for 15:10 duty. Because on those dates I would have been looking after my wife as well.

520 Q. On the 4th and the 5th; is that right?
A. Yes. .




521
A. Absolutely.
Q. And where would such a phone call be noted? should it be noted, first of all?
A. When a guard rings sick, as I rang sick in August, I rang my work station and I reported to the garda who was on duty.
526 Q. Is that the public office?
A. In Mitchelstown, yes.

527 Q. And was it the public office then you rang on the 15th or can you recall?
A. It would have been the public office in Mitchelstown,
yes.
528 Q. Presumably that is manned by -- I mean, obviously the sergeant in charge wouldn't be there, but it could be a station orderly a guard assigned to public office duties?
A. That's correct.

But it would be somebody you knew obviously fairly well?
A. It would of course. The work party at Mitchelstown, I would know them all.

530 Q. CHA RMAN Would it be somebody on your own unit?
A. I don't think it was. I don't think it was somebody on my --
531 Q. CHA RMAN You be would ringing in to say, I can't come in because?
A. Yes, but I would have rang the prior unit because --

532 Q. CHA RMAN So who did you speak to?
A. I don't recall.

533 Q. CHA RMAN why not?
A. As I said, I wasn't asked about this until nearly six months later.

534 Q. CHA RMAK Is that not something you would remember?
A. No. Not for me anyway.

535 Q. CHAN RMAN okay.
A. Unless I made a note of it in my diary, which I didn't. 15:12

536 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: I was just going to ask you, I mean you returned -- did you return back into the station on the 18th?
A. I would have been back working on the 18 th.

537
Q What do you do with an F M1 form? Do you serve it on anyone or file it somewhere?
A. You don't serve it. You complete a form $F$ M1 to report that you have availed of force majeure under the Act. trouble about this?
A. No.

542 Q. CHA RMAK Given that you applied for leave and been refused and you were now availing yourself of force majeure leave, was that not something might alert you that there could be a bit of trouble about this?
A. I didn't think so, Mr. Chairman, because I had told Inspector O'Sullivan in the phone call that my wife had been suffering from chronic pain.

543 Q. CHAN RMAN Yes, of course, I understand that?
A. And I told him, if she is sick on those dates I will not be at work.

544 Q. CHA RMAN Okay. So you had alerted him to the possibility?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN That you wouldn't be around?
A. Yes.

546 Q. CHA RMAN In other words, and he would have understood that was force majeure, is what you were talking about?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN okay.
MR. MEGI NESS: I mean obviously I just have to ask you about your contention here, because part of your complaint to the Tribunal is that you say,
"Superintendent Comyns manufactured a reason to
di scipline" you. Could you just explain the basis of that, why you want the Chairman then to consider that assertion?
A. I believe his report to Chief Superintendent Dillane was without foundation under the force majeure act, as you say. I complied with what I was supposed to, I didn't do anything illegal or against code, I didn't breach any code, regulation or otherwise.
548 Q. I mean obviously there's a number of factual assertions in the letter, but the first paragraph, the first substantive paragraph there, that's entirely correct, isn't it?
A. That's correct.

549 Q. I mean that's what Inspector O'Sullivan wrote to you and --
A. And reiterated in the phone call as wel1, yes.

550 Q. There's nothing made up in that?
A. No.

551 Q. The first couple of sentences there, you didn't report for duty, that's factually correct?
Q.

The first sentence on the next paragraph, that's factually correct as well, you didn't turn up for duty. And then the second sentence:
"Nei ther I nspector Ó Sullivan nor I were contacted nor had we any i dea why Ser geant Barry was not at work."
would you like to comment on that, whether that is actually correct?
A. It is not actually factual because it says I did not report for duty, but I did report that I was not available for duty.
Q. And what's the difference you're stressing there, sorry, just to help me?
A. I had made contact with the station to tell them that I would not be available to carry out my duty, that I was availing of force majeure leave.
Q. Okay. So there's nothing wrong with the bare statement in the first sentence, you didn't report for duty?
A. I was not on duty but I did report the fact that I would not be reporting for duty. So it wasn't out of the blue.
Q. And the second sentence, I mean, it's correct to say that you didn't contact either of those two officers, Inspector O'Sullivan or Superintendent Comyns?
A. I didn't have to. I wouldn't have contacted Superintendent Comyns.
Q. CHAI RMAN Anyway.
A. Pardon?
A. Anyway.

557 Q. CHA RMAN You weren't going to contact him anyway?
A. And I felt I didn't have to contact Inspector o'Sullivan as I already told him that if my wife was sick on those dates I would not be on duty.

558 Q. CHA RMAK Did you ring each day?
A. No, I rang --

559 Q. CHA RMAK How did you know she was going to be sick for the three days?
A. I didn't.

560 Q. CHA RMAN So how were they to know how long you were going to be out?
A. Because I reported I was taking force majeure initially.
561 Q. CHAN RMAN For how long?
A. I couldn't say how long.

562 Q. CHAN RMAN Okay. So you didn't ring the next day to say, $I^{\prime \prime m}$ still on force majeure?
A. No.

563 Q. CHAN RMAN or the next day?

564 Q. CHA RMAN why not?
A. Because I wasn't obliged to. I would have taken it that --
565 Q. CHA RMAN Is that the way it works? 15:17
A. Yes.

566 Q. CHAN RMAN If it's force majeure, it stays force majeure until some such time as the force stops?
A. Well, the limit is three days in any one year.

567 Q. CHAN RMAN In any one...?
A. One year. It's five days in three years.

568 Q. CHA RMAN Right. Does that mean three days together?
A. You could take three days together or three separate days. You only take three in one year.

569 Q. CHA RMAN Three days together. I'm sorry, three days is okay?
A. Yes.

CHA RMAN okay.
570 Q.
MR. MEGI NNESS: Obviously you don't know whether
Superintendent Comyns or Inspector O'Sullivan made any enquiry as to why you weren't there?
A. No.

571 Q. But this seems to suggest that they had no idea, do you think it's possible that they didn't know why you weren't there?
A. Well it's not possible for Inspector O'Sullivan not to know.

572 Q. You think he -- do you think he should have foreseen that if you didn't turn up --
A. Which I had told him.

573 Q. That you would be on force majeure?
A. No, I told him that if my wife was sick on those dates I would have to avail of force majeure.
574 Q. You told him that expressly?
A. Yes.

575 Q. In the phone call?
A. Yes, I told him the reason I was taking my leave at that time, was because my wife had suffered chronic
back pain for months previously. Not continuously, but intermittent. Some days she would be fine, other days not.
Superintendent Comyns seems to suggest that your notice explained the absence but he's offering an opinion that 15:19 you should have contacted Inspector o'Sullivan on the 14th, 15th to explain the absence. Is that opinion a kind of fair opinion or a reasonable opinion?
A. Do you know, I don't think so.

577 Q. You don't?
A. Because Inspector o'sullivan was already aware of it and while $I$ had no obligation under the Act to ring the station, I did ring the station to report I was taking force majeure and when I completed my force majeure on the 17 th I rang the station again and I supplied those phone records to Superintendent Lehane.
578 Q. Now, I am just going to ask you the question: The contention you made that the superintendent manufactured a reason to discipline you, is that based on this report alone or is it based on something else as well?
A. It is based on fact.

579 Q. Pardon?
A. It's based on fact.

580 Q. And what fact are you particularly --
A. I availed of a legitimate reason under the force majeure act to take leave for those dates. I did not do anything legal or otherwise and I should not be subjected to an investigation. There were no grounds
to investigate me for what happened. I previously took force majeure under the previous superintendent and completed the F M1 when I returned, and there was no problem with it, it was sanctioned. I could have been investigated. Why wasn't I investigated for the 4th and the 5th of that month?
581 Q. I can't answer these questions.
A. I was absent.

582 Q. Yes.
A. And I wasn't on force majeure.

583 Q. We11 you have a retrospective grant of annual leave for them, from Inspector O'Sullivan I think?
A. And I was retrospectively cleared by Superintendent Comyns for the force majeure.
584 Q. Yes, we will come to that in due course, but is there
anything else you want to say in support of your suggestion that this represented a targeting? Are you including Chief Superintendent Dillane in that as well?
A. Yes, because he initiated the discipline investigation.

585 Q. All right.
A. Or he sanctioned it.

586 Q. Yes. And I think that started sometime later. We will come to it in due course. Now, we have seen Superintendent Comyns' report to Superintendent Dillane of the same date, on the 19th. He wrote to the assistant commissioner on the 1st May. Perhaps we will just look at that letter. Page 399. This is a somewhat lengthy letter, you probably remember reading it. He sets out the history which he had set out
before in previous correspondence and he gives his account of the meeting on the 9th April that we have discussed already. At the top of page 401, he had recited on the previous page that he had spoken with Superintendent Comyns, that he was experiencing serious ${ }^{15: 22}$ difficulties in the administration of Fermoy district due to work practices of Sergeant Barry. It continues then at the top:
"Superintendent Conyns has a practice in pl ace whereby all menters working in Fernoy district at 7. 30amand 9. 30 come to Fermoy Garda Station for briefing and det ai ling.
The present situation where Sergeant Barry as a
supervisory menber is going on duty without being
properly briefed placed both Superintendent Comyns and
me in a position of corporateliability as his employer
if anything were to happen to him

This situation is likely to be a protracted one as when the bullying and harassment investigation is completed di sci plinary investigation is due to commence arising from Sergeant Barry's compl ai nt.

As the di visional officer of Cork north division I cannot allow this situation to continue. I amnot in a position to override the doctor's certificate, which in my viewis both impractical and unreasonable and I
amseeki ng your di rections as to the correct course of action to be taken."

And he refers to the correspondence from Superintendent Comyns there. Did you take any comfort from the fact that he was, as it were, accepting that he couldn't override the doctor's certificate?
A. No.

587 Q. Did you consider whether the issue about supervising members could have been dealt with if they paraded for duty in Mitchelstown?
A. Pardon?
Q. These were your units going to Fermoy, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

589 Q. Did you consider suggesting that the easy way to deal with this was just to have them parading in Mitchelstown rather than driving back and forward to Fermoy?
A. That would have been logical, yes.

590 Q. Had you thought of that at the time or did you consider whether that --
A. Any suggestion I had made up to that point was ignored. So I wasn't -- that's a management decision, beyond my control. But it could have been done.

591 Q. Pardon.
A. It could have been done.
Q. Al1 right. Is that something you discussed with your AGSI supervisor or when there was a discussion about
mediation to take place?
A. Pardon?

593 Q. Did you have any consideration of putting that forward when mediation was being talked about?
A. But mediation was -- Superintendent Comyns wouldn't enter into mediation.

594 Q. We will come to it in due course, but you had indicated an agreement to consider mediation, isn't that right, yourself?
A. I was willing to enter mediation.

595 Q. And what were the elements of mediation that you could have lived with, as it were?
A. That would have been one of them.
Q. And is that something that you discussed with your representatives?
A. No.

597 Q. You wrote a letter to the Assistant Commissioner HRM yourself on the 5th May, isn't that correct? Perhaps we will look at that, at page 195 and 196. You refer to the meeting here on the 9 th, and you say in the middle there:
"I don't bel ieve Chi ef Superintendent William Lehane is willing to offer anything other than transfer. That is not acceptable to me for the following reasons: The Garda policy on bullying and harassment provi des l can appl y for transfer to hel p me during the period of investigation and this would be fine if we were only tal king about bullying. I made an allegation that the
di strict officer in Fermoy at tempted to coerce me in perverting the course of justice in rel ation to the rape and sexual assault of a child. It is because of his behavi our that l made this allegation, as it is my duty within the I aw of the I and to serve the whol e community and protect the peopl e whoml have proudly served for the past 13 years fromall unl awf ul and harmf ul acts from what ever source."

It just carries on there onto the next page,
Mr. Kavanagh, if you scroll down.
"I made my compl ai nt as I bel ieve that I have an obl igation to be faithf ul to the principles of integrity and honour in the exercise of my duties. Thi s obl i gation supersedes any perverted or misplaced loyalty in support or protection of any member of the force whoml bel ieve may be guilty of unethical or criminal behaviour. I can onl y protect this community I have proudly served for the last 13 years by remai ni ng in M tchel stown. It is incumbent on me to see the law of the land is uphel d and that no member, regardless of thei $r$ rank, steps outside the limits of his or her authority."

We11, was that intended by you as a very clear signal that you just weren't going to be moving from Mitchelstown? Or how did you intend this to be taken?
A. That was taken -- or that was meant by me to indicate
why I wished to remain in Mitchelstown.
598 Q. Yes.
A. That something like this could happen again.

599 Q. okay. I think the following day, just to put things in sequence, I think you provided Chief Superintendent

Kehoe on the 6th May with your response in relation to all of the statements she provided to you in the bullying and harassment investigation, isn't that correct?
A. I believe so, yes.

600 Q. We don't need to open them, they're at page 1078. Now, on the 17th May -- you had previously put in an application more annual leave, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

601 Q. And I think it came to Superintendent Comyns and he granted leave for several days but refused it for four particular periods or days, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

602 Q. Just to be clear about that, at page 557, in the middle of that page. The procedure is you put in a form, a D 9, which you sign and specify the dates, the periods that you are seeking. He granted it for four of the periods and refused it for three particular dates there. The 3rd to 9th July, 13th to 19th Ju7y, and 20th, 21st May, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

603 Q. The July dates, I think you had envisaged taking holidays for some of the periods certainly, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Had you booked the holidays already?
A. My wife had booked the holiday and I told her that I may not be able to get leave for those dates.
605 Q. A11 right. Okay. The officers, you've seen in their statements, they say that it's sort of better practice not to book a holiday until you know whether you have the leave, but is that something that most members follow or sergeants or...?
A. I know that, yeah, but it was my wife who booked the holiday because she was worried about me.

606 Q. Okay. In any event, this went through a large number of sort of different reports. You've exhibited them a11 in your Exhibit $R$ to your statement, which is part of your complaint, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

607 Q. And they proceed from Exhibit R 24, going backwards down towards $R$ 9. We can open them if necessary, but perhaps we'11 try not to, if we can agree on the to-ing and fro-ing, as it were. You applied for leave, you sought to get a re-consideration of these dates that had been refused for?
A. For the holiday, yes. Pardon?
A. For the dates that reflected the holiday, I wasn't worried about the other dates.

609 Q. Yes. You were told essentially, and if you feel the need to go into the documents, that leave would be granted provided there was cover, adequate cover for the different dates?
A. Provided I supplied cover.

```
610 Q. Yes. And isn't that the normal practice?
```

A. No.

611 Q. No? Okay.
A. The normal practice is if there wasn't covered, then you wouldn't take leave. Pardon?
A. The normal practice would be that the superintendent would provide cover. I can't allocate a sergeant to cover. But I asked sergeants to change and accommodate me, my own two sergeants in Mitchelstown especially.
613 Q. Yes.
A. They were agreeable to change their shifts to accommodate me on those dates.

614 Q. Well, did it not come down to some dates that you couldn't identify any particular sergeant to provide cover for?
A. It did come down to one or two dates I think.

615 Q. Yes. ultimately it went to Chief Superintendent
Dillane on the basis of a recommendation from Superintendent Comyns that annual leave could be granted subject to cover and you weren't able to identify, correct me if I am wrong, who would cover for those particular dates?
A. No.

616 Q. That's not right?
A. Pardon?

617 Q. Is that not right?
A. No. I am saying no, I couldn't provide cover for those dates.
618 Q. Yes. At the end of the day you took your leave on the 2nd July?
A. That's correct.

619 Q. The chief superintendent hadn't made a decision on it at that point in time, if $I$ am understanding the documents correctly?
A. I understand he granted it if cover was provided.

620 Q. Yes. And Superintendent Comyns was anxious to ensure that there was a cover, do you accept that?
A. Absolutely.

621 Q. And when you returned he made enquiries to attempt to determine whether cover had been achieved for the dates in question?
A. That's correct.

622 Q. And you told him in a response that, I am paraphrasing it now, and correct me if I am wrong, you said more or less, how would I know if cover was provided because I was out of the country?
A. Yes, because I knew that Sergeant Quinn and Sergeant Dunne had --

623 Q. Sorry?
A. I knew that Sergeant Quinn and Sergeant Dunne had tried to explain the cover to him, to no avail, is what they said.

624 Q. Yes.
A. He wasn't accepting their explanation as to the cover provided while I was on leave.

625
Q. Yes. Perhaps we will just look at the sort of documents that brought this to a conclusion. I think it's an explanation of yours of the 7th August to the sergeant in charge, at page 160. This is the last point you are referring to there, that Sergeant Dunne is just reporting, if we go up to the top of the page, to you, this is the report:
"Sergeant Qui nn and I tried to explain it to the di strict office but to no avail."

And then you provide this report here, isn't that correct? At the bottom. "Re application for annual I eave, Ser geant Barry. With reference to above, I would Iike to thank the di strict officer for granting me my leave. I cannot comment on cover arranged for my absence as l was not in the country for that period. Forwarded for your inf ormation and attention please."

And then there's a report from Superintendent Comyns I think on foot of that, at 159, if we go back, of 16th August 2013. And he says:
"I refer to the above.

Sergeant Barry's report on 17th August 2013 is forwarded for your inf ormation.

Unit B Fermoy di strict were not adequatel y supervi sed
during Sergeant Barry's period of absence."

He maintains that he was unable to determine who had in fact provided cover for the days that were at issue. would you like to comment on that?
A. I think that's best left to the report by Sergeant Dunne, where he says both he and Sergeant Quinn tried to explain this to the superintendent, without avail.
626 Q. Yes. And the superintendent, the chief superintendent there at the bottom has simply noted it. Can we just go back up to the bottom of the previous page. You had thanked the superintendent for granting -- the chief superintendent for granting the annual leave and he has looked at this, he has noted it and he has returned the file. That appeared to conclude the matter in terms of the to-ing and fro-ing in relation to the annual leave. Are you satisfied that I have summarised it as fairly as possible in the circumstances or would you like to lever to any other parts of the documents?
A. No, it's just that you would have seen the report I submitted in relation to the initial request from Superintendent Comyns, I outlined the report for the whole period of my leave.
627 Q. Pardon?
A. I submitted a detailed report outlining who would be working on all dates that I proposed taking leave.
628 Q. Yes.
A. It wasn't that I didn't -- that I just said I was out of the country, I had --

629
Q. No, you are perfectly right to emphasise that point, you did provide details for a number of different days. Some of them, and this is not a criticism, didn't identify specifically who would be providing the cover, I think, is that fair?
A. That's correct.
A. I believe it was.

Would you like to explain to the Chairman what you would like to say about the basis for that and the reasons why you say it is targeting?
A. Because no matter what I supplied or what Sergeant Dunne or Sergeant Quinn said, he was still not accepting the explanations given. It had to go to Chief Superintendent Dillane to see reason and grant my 1eave.
632 Q. Yes. And what would you say to the proposition, as they justified the decision, that all the decisions are to grant you leave provided there is cover and that it is entirely legitimate proposition to expect cover to be maintained during the absence of a senior sergeant such as yourself?
A. And I did that, I got Sergeant Quinn and Sergeant provide cover for any dates in dispute.
633 Q. Is it unfair to suggest that Chief Superintendent Dillane seems to have accepted that, he simply noted
the outcome?
A. Oh I believe he accepted it, yes.
Q. Al1 right. So anyway, that took place over a protracted period, but I suppose a point that you would like to make is that this related to a family holiday and wasn't resolved, in fact wasn't resolved until you had actually then departed on it?
A. Yeah, it ruined the holiday.
Q. How long did you go away for in that period then, from the 2nd?
A. Over two weeks and I spent that two weeks preparing the appeal of the bullying file.
636 Q. CHA RMAN Did you go abroad?
A. Pardon?

637 Q. CHA RMAN Did you go abroad or were you here?
A. Yes, went to Cyprus and I spent the two weeks there --

638 Q. CHA RMAN with your bag of papers with you, your briefcase with you?
A. Yes, for an appeal.

639 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: In the interim, part to this was going 15:41 on, Chief Superintendent Dillane was again in correspondence with the Chief Medical Officer, if we could look at page 1681, and if we just go down the page for the --
CHA RMAN That's the reply.
640 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: That's the reply. And we've seen the minute of the 1st May that he refers to there earlier, I opened that some minutes ago. He's awaiting a reply. He says:
"As this situation is now dragging and in the interest of the running of this organi sation, I wi sh to seek your directions on the following matter. If I direct Sergeant Barry to attend at Fermoy Garda Station and to 15:42 deal with Superintendent Conyns, will it adversely affect his health? Forwarded for your professional advi ce. "

And the reply is as above here.
"Chi ef Superintendent Dillane, I note your enquiry and the clarification being sought. The member reported and presented to his GP with loss of well being which he associates with certain issues with his workplace, incl udi ng his workpl ace interpersonal rel ationship with his di strict officer, Superintendent Comyns. Medical recommendations (incl udi ng fromindependent specialist medical assessment at the request of this service) have been provided in the context of what is quite a fraught ${ }_{\text {15:43 }}$ situation. There are no further advi ces that I can offer froma medical perspective in this case.

As I have previ ousl y advi sed, the management of the member's ret urn to the workpl ace and the arrangements to facilitate these are the responsi bility of Garda management in the context of workpl ace accommodations that are reasonable and practicable.

In the light of what appears to be an impasse at this time, further rel evant processes available to Garda management should be deployed to resol ve the matter in a timely and constructive manner that would preserve the member's well being and Garda operational integrity.

I have copi ed the above addresses in the context of previ ous communi cations in this matter issued by this servi ce. "

It would appear that Chief Superintendent Dillane is being told that this isn't a medical issue, it's perhaps susceptible to further relevant processes available to Garda management. Were you made aware of that enquiry and response at the time?
A. No.

641 Q. If we just scrol1 up the page, to see who the doctor copied it to at the time. So it's gone to Assistant Commissioner Fanning as well, and Monica Carr and Donal Collins, who is the titular Chief Medical officer.

On the 27th then, the chief superintendent appointed Superintendent Lehane to conduct a disciplinary investigation into the force majeure leave, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

642 Q. Perhaps we'd just look at page 422.
CHA RMAN Just give me the date of that, I can't read it here.

MR. MEGU NNESS: It's 27th May. CHA RMAN 2013.
643 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: He says in the second paragraph:
"Having consi dered the content of this file, I feel it's appropriate the matter be investigated under the Gar da Sí ochána Di sci pl i nary Regul at i ons 2007... deci ding of ficer under Regul ation...to i nvestigate the alleged breach of discipline as outlined...in respect of Ser geant Barry, Mtchel stown. You should ensure that 15:45 the timeframe and procedures..."

Et cetera, et cetera. Can you recall when you were informed of that?
A. The date that -- it's in Superintendent Lehane's statement, the first I was aware of it was when he went to Mitchelstown Garda station. He had rang prior to that to make an appointment to meet him, but he didn't say what it was about.
644 Q. He provided a report ultimately on 17th October 2013. 15:46 You've probably seen that report. You were interviewed on the 14th yourself of October, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

645 Q. Which was some months afterwards. Perhaps we would just look at his report there, page 426. In the first page he's just talking about the process there, the arrangements being made to interview you. That was done in the presence of Inspector Gallagher, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

646 Q. He records at the bottom of the page:
"He subsequently provi ded me with a copy of tel ephone record for April 2013, whi ch shows a call made 10. 59 to 15:47 tel ephone number."

And it gives there.
"Thi $s$ is a tel ephone in the public office in Mtchel stown but unable to name the member he spoke to in the morning."

He then goes on to say:
"He subsequently establ i shed four members were working there."

He gives their names. He says he interviewed them all. CHA RMAN Would you go up the page, please, Peter. MR. MEGU NESS: I beg your pardon. CHA RMAN Just keep going down the page. Thanks very much. So we can read the next bit. Okay, thank you.
647 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: And he just roads there that they have no recollection of receiving a telephone call from you
on the morning. But you had a record to show you certainly appeared to have, from your own house phone, is it?
A. I think it was, yes.

648 Q. To phone the station number?
A. Yes. It was the house phone.

649 Q. Anyway, he goes on to consider the provision and at the end of the paragraph, at the bottom of the page, he considered the labour relations practice et cetera and he says:
"While it is inconcei vable that an empl oyee in particular a member of An Garda Sí ochána could absent hi nゅel f/herself from work on force maj eure leave without notifying thei $r$ authorities in advance or during the absence. The legislation under the Garda Code regul ations make no reference to a requi rement to gi ve advance notice. On that basis I found that the menber was not in breach of discipline on the 16 th October 2013. I have notified himof my decision. He acknow edged recei pt of same."

He makes a recommendation then on the following page. CHA RMAN Surely he doesn't mean it's inconceivable, does he? "While it is inconcei vable that an employee, in particul ar a member, could absent themsel ves from thei $r$ work wi thout notifying thei $r$ sergeants in advance".
MR. MEGU NNESS: "Or during the absence".
CHA RMAN All right. It makes no reference to give advance notice, okay.
650 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: He seems to have not accepted your assertion that he made contact?
A. Yes.

651 Q. Do you know on what basis he did or didn't?
A. He only refers to the call that I made when I was taking it, not to call when I was -- he didn't reference the cal1 I made when I was ending the force majeure.

652 Q. Yes. I think that may be because of the nature of the charge that he was asked to investigate, it was a neglect of duty. As I understand it, you weren't being investigated for taking the force majeure leave, you were being investigated, as it were, for neglect of duty, being absent from duty and then not notifying people why you were absent at the time. Isn't that right?
A. But I did notify them.

653 Q. But I am just talking about the form of the charge?
A. Oh the form of the charge that's set out, yes.

654 Q. Yes. And I take it you've no complaint against Superintendent Lehane?
A. No.

655 Q. who didn't find you in breach of anything obvious7y?
A. Just, he doesn't reference the duration of the call.

656 Q. Do you know how long the call was?
A. Well it commenced at 10.59 , I gave them the phone records. Like if I rang for --

657 Q. CHA RMAN You gave your phone records?
A. Yes.

658 Q. CHA RMAN And while the officers interviewed and on duty didn't recall any such call, the record showed
A.
that you had made a -- sorry that a call was made from your home?
. Yes, to the gardaí.
CHA RMAN To the station number. And the relevant station number, that'd be the one?
A. Yes.

660 Q. CHAI RMAN How long was that for, did it say?
A. I don't --

661
Q. CHA RMAN As far as you can remember?
A. I don't recal1. I would say a minute, two. Two 15:51 minutes max. That's all it would take.

662 Q. CHA RMAN That's al1 it would take, but you mentioned the time and I wondered, do you know what time it was?
A. Yes, I think it was 10.59 or something.

663 Q. CHAI RMAN He gave the time at which you --
A. He gave the time I made the call, yes.

CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
664 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: And obviously had you been asked prior to the initiation of a discipline inquiry, presumably he would have given the same explanation at a much earlier time?
A. I would have -- I believe if I was asked when I resumed duty on the 18th that I would have known who I spoke to on the 15th. I would have a better recollection.
665 Q. CHAN RMAN when you saw the names, did that ring a bell? Or when you see them here, does that ring a be11?
A. No.

666 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: In any event, this was the outcome of
the process that was started on the 27th May and you were interviewed on the 14th October?

667 Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, I am just asking Mr. Kavanagh to go up a tiny bit, up the page a little. Thanks very much. That's what he decided anyway. Whether he was right or ${ }_{15: 52}$ wrong doesn't matter, we're not concerned with that, but that's what he decided. And you're satisfied with that.
A. I was satisfied, yes.

CHAI RMAN Thanks very much.
MR. MEGUNESS: I think just shortly after this Chief Superintendent Kehoe submitted her completed file, investigation file into the bullying and harassment to the appointing officer, Assistant Commissioner Nolan, on the 30th May, were you informed of that at the time or close enough to it?
A. I believe I was, by Chief Superintendent Kehoe.

669 Q. Yes. I think Assistant Commissioner Nolan conducted a review of the bullying and harassment investigation and concluded on the 17th June that all appropriate steps had been taken and there had been a thorough and impartial investigation and upheld the findings of Chief Superintendent Kehoe in that regard?
A. That was his report, yes.

670 Q. Now, you submit an appeal in relation to that -
A. Yes.

671 Q. - on the 23rd July, we don't need to look at the grounds. The grounds were then conveyed in a later document of 12th August 2013, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, I submitted an appeal while I was on holiday to HRM direct.
A. That's correct.
Q. Perhaps we would just look at that, on page 313, 314 and 315. We don't need to read it all there, it's in the papers, you have seen that yourself?
A. I have seen it, yes.

676 Q. It was obviously a disappointment to you at the time, I am sure?
A. It was.

677 Q. He does address all of the allegations one-by-one as 15:55 they were set out. And if we go to the end of, I suppose, 315, just to see his ultimate conclusion. And he says in relation to allegation 9 , which is the criminal one:
"As you have hi ghl ighted you have been informed of the position regar ding this matter bei ng consi dered by another for um and theref ore it is not within the remit of this revi ew to comment any further."

And he just says he has completed that at that stage. You were continuing to work obviously in Mitchelstown?
A. That's correct.

678 Q. On full pay, with allowances, with a certificate, as it were, protecting you, as you saw it, and your mental health?
A. Yes.

679 Q. In accordance with the one, two or three doctors
involved in consulting with you?
A. That's correct.

680 Q. You make I think no complaint really about any other events at this point in time for quite a while, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

681 Q. And you weren't coming into contact with Superintendent Comyns, isn't that right, or going to Fermoy?
A. No.

682 Q. Okay. The issue that we saw Chief Superintendent Dillane raising with Dr. Oghuvbu about how or what he would think if he were ordered to Fermoy became more relevant in the context of Superintendent Comyns requesting a sergeant for Fermoy, did you become aware of that?
A. Yes.

683 Q. Okay. Perhaps we would look at that, because you were nominated for Fermoy. Perhaps we'd look at 5422 first. This is Superintendent Comyns' questions and answers
there. If we just go down there. He's asked about this portion of his statement, about having consulted with inspectors and sergeants in 2014. But if we just go back there, further on to the next page. If we scroll down a bit more. Sorry, that is not the right page. I will come back to it. If we go to page 430 because on the 10th December Chief Superintendent Dillane nominated you for Fermoy. Had you been consulted in advance of that?
A. Could I see the date on it, please?

684 Q. Yes. It's the 10/12, if we just go slightly up. CHAN RMAN Yes, 10th December.
A. Yeah, I can't be sure of the exact date but I think I did meet with Chief Superintendent Dillane at his office in Fermoy, where he indicated to me that he was going to transfer me to Fermoy.

685 Q. MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes. He just sets it out here. I would ask you to comment on it. He says:
"The reason for this transfer is to try to ensure the del i very of efficient policing service in the new Fermoy di strict, whi ch has been expanded in the recent di strict amal gamations. The min mum requi rement for Fer moy Garda Station, which is di vi si onal di strict headquarters, one unit sergeant on each of the five units. Si nce the reduction of the new roster system there is one unit at Fermy Garda St ation without any supervi sing sergeant. I bel ieve that it is more i mportant that the unit sergeant is based in Fermoy
rather than in M tchel stown, County Cork."

Was that correct as far as you knew at the time?
A. No, that wasn't correct. That's in relation to his application to transfer?
Q. Pardon?
A. In relation to his application to transfer me?

687 Q. We11, this seems to be a general statement about the requirements of Fermoy and there being an unsupervised unit there?
A. This may have been, I had no control over how a unit became unsupervised in Fermoy, so I don't know.

688 Q. Okay.
A. I don't know if I was aware of it at the time.

689 Q. Okay. He refers back to a similar proposal in 2004 there on the second paragraph, and that was the one we discussed I think early on in your evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. You appealed successfully on that?
A. Yes.

691 Q. By reason of a breach of Code 7.5 , et cetera. But he points out now that "On 11th Novenber 2013 G anmire sub- di strict became a part of Cork City di vision and those grounds shoul d no longer be valid as a different di visi on exempt the terns of Code 8.3."

And I think you knew that that had happened by this stage?
A. Yes, but it wasn't truthful.

692
Q. Pardon?
A. It wasn't truthful.

693 Q. Which element is not?
A. His report saying that I am exempt of the terms of Code 8.3.
Q. okay.

695 Q. CHA RMAN He said Cork City?
696 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: He said the division is exempt from it?
A. Oh Cork City division is.

697 Q. Yes.
A. But I had a relation living in Watergrasshill, which he was aware of, which would have precluded me from moving to Fermoy because he wouldn't have been far enough away.
698 Q. okay.
A. So I --

699 Q. CHA RMAK I am sure somebody is going to ask you this, but if I am understanding this correctly, the Chief Superintendent is basing his decision or his application on the location of Glanmire in the Garda structure, and not on the question of how close the person is living, am I understanding that correctly? Anyway, don't mind that, we will tease that out in due course.
A. No, I had relations living in the Glanmire sub-district.
Q. CHA RMAN I understand. And when that was the case, you say you successfully appealed on the basis that
your relations were living too close?
A. Yes.

701 Q. CHA RMAN That was then?
A. Yes.

702 Q. CHA RMAN And what I am understanding Chief Superintendent Dillane to be saying in this memo is, that divisions have now changed so Glanmire is now in Cork?
A. Yes.
Q. CHA RMAN I understand that. But you weren't going to Cork City, you were staying here?
A. Yes, in Fermoy, but $I$ had a relation living in Watergrasshil1, which is still Fermoy.

705 Q. CHA RMAN I am understanding the point. I mean it is a bit complicated but I think I have it, yes, okay.
A. So I e-mailed then Assistant Commissioner Fanning to point out I had a first cousin living in Watergrasshil1 district, which was in Fermoy subdistrict, and he granted that exemption that morning and rescinded it that that evening.
706 Q. CHA RMAN That was back in '04?
A. No, this date.

CHAL RMAN Sorry, Mr. McGuinness will get to that.
707 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: It's perhaps a comment on the e-mail that he sent, there's no reference to the doctor's certificate or any issues connected with that and I am
not clear to what extent it was being considered when this e-mail was sent?

CHA RMAN Well, he can tell us all that, Mr. McGuinness.
MR. MtGU NESS: we will hear. But are you surprised not to see any reference to it yourself in the --
A. Absolutely. I couldn't understand it.

709 Q. According to Chief Superintendent Dillane's statement, he met with you on Sunday the 19th January to discuss this?
A. Perhaps it was. I'd have to check my notes.

710 Q. Okay. Have you got your diary there?
A. Not with me, no, sorry.

711 Q. Pardon?
A. I would take it, if he says that was the date.

712 Q. CHA RMAN You can have a look at it overnight and tell us in the morning?
A. Yes, I accept that was the date.

713 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: Yes. And he furnished a report in relation to it, which was sent to Superintendent
Comyns. Perhaps we will just look at page 432. He says he met you:
"... at his office at 10.45. After enquiring about his well bei ng, I expl ai ned to himthat I had deci ded to
transfer to himFernoy Garda Station as they required a min num of one sergeant on each unit in di vi si onal headquarters. I outlined the reasons for transfer to hi $m$ and $m y p l a n$ for the distribution of sergeants in
the Cork north di vision.

I told hi mthat after much consideration l bel i eved that he was the best man for the job. I al so informed I was of the bel ieved that an investigation into his bullying and harassment compl ai nts had now come to a concl usi on and that the constrai nts pl aced while the i nvesti gation and appeal were under way have now been renoved. He told me that there was still one aspect of the allegations outstanding that he needed an e-nail
from Chi ef Superintendent Kehoe to prove this. I told himif this were true that 1 would not be able to go ahead with the proposed transfer but l would check it out with human resource management at Garda Commi ssi oner. "

Do you recal1 that discussion?
A. Yes.

714 Q. What were you in a position to tell him about Chief Superintendent Kehoe's enquiries?
A. I felt that there still was a bullying element in the ninth complaint that hadn't been the subject to -- the 1-8 bullying complaints that were concluded, that it was never referenced by Chief Superintendent Kehoe.
715 Q. It would seem that he wasn't aware of that at the time?
A. Yeah, that appears so, yes.

716 Q. Do you accept that -
A. I do.

717 Q. - was that evident from the conversation you had with
him?
A. I do.

718 Q. okay. He then said:


#### Abstract

"During our di scussi on suggestion he informed me that he did not wi sh to work in Fermoy. I expl ai ned to him


 that with the shortage of manpower, especially at sergeant rank, that I need one sergeant on each unit and I could not afford I uxury of having three ser geants in M tchel stown. I expl ai ned that this was in linewith my overall di visional pl an and part of my vision for the Mallow di strict, for l planned on having one sergeant in each unit di strict headquarters and onl y two sergeants in Cant urk and Charl eville.

I further tol d himthat if he did not wi sh to come to Fer moy Garda Station, I could facilitate himin Mallow Garda station, where at present there are two unit sergeant vacancies which l hope to fill in the near future and informed himthis would be a matter compl etely up to himelf.

I have si nce been informed by human resource management at Garda headquarters that the bullying and har assment part of Sergeant Barry's compl ai nt has been fully compl et ed.

The present working situation of Sergeant Barry cannot continue and in order to run the Cork north di vision in
a cohesi ve manner. I intend to advi se commissi oner of Human Resource Managenent that I wi sh to have Sergeant Barry transferred to Fermoy Garda St ation imedi at el y. "

He follows that on the same day with a letter to HRM, if we just look at page 434. CHA RMAN Before we leave that. Do you recal1, was there a discussion about Mallow?
A. At that meeting, yes, I said to him, transfer me to Mallow, but, I said, I'm not going to apply for it.
720 Q. CHA RMAN when he said, I forget the exact words, it's a matter entirely for yourself, he was happy to do it.
A. He wanted me to apply.

721 Q. CHAI RMAN He wanted to you apply for Mallow?
A. Yes, but I wouldn't.

722 Q. CHAN RMAK And you said, I wil1 go to Mallow if I am sent to mallow, is that right?
A. That's correct.

723 Q. CHAI RMAN You have to send me?
A. I have already said it to him numerous times.

724 Q. CHA RMAN I understand that?
A. I won't apply for it.

725 Q. CHAN RMAN But that's the meaning, that's what I am to understand about this, when it's entirely up to yourself, is, if you want to do it well and good, okay?
A. Yes, that's exactly it.
Q. CHA RMAN Thank you. But the transfer to Fermoy that was in question, there was no question of you applying for a transfer to Fermoy?
A. No.

727 Q. CHA RMAN That was going to be -- that was going to be done?
A. Forced.

728 Q. CHA RMAN That was going to be force majeure, if you like. okay.

729 Q. MR. MEGU NESS: He says that he met you then again on the 30th January to explain the reasons for the transfer, is that correct?
A. That could be correct, yes.

730 Q. Have you any recollection of that.
A. A vague recollection.

731 Q. He says in his statement at page 344 , we don't have to look at it, I will just read it out:
"On Thursday, 30th January, at 4pm I spoke again to Sergeant Barry and cl arified some issues regarding our meeting on the 19th January 2014. I have informed him as per Code regul ation 8.1.3 I was obliged to gi ve him reasons for the purported transfer."

Do you recall him giving you reasons?
A. Yes, because following this meeting I e-mailed HRM and asked them was it they were looking for me to apply for a transfer or was it Chief Superintendent Dillane.
732 Q. Yes. You don't appear to have had any communication with Superintendent Comyns for some time, but did you receive the text from him to attend PAF meetings in February 2014?
A. No.

CHA RMAN Are you going on to something else?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes, Chairman.
CHA RMAN So we're finished with Chief Superintendent
Dillane exchanges about going to Fermoy, is that right? 16:11
MR. MEGU NESS: Yes, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Thank you. Okay. Well then we will it there until the morning.
MR. MEGU NESS: Very good.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
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| 149:3, 158:16 secondary [1] - | 109:26, 164:19 sending [2] 25.20, 25.25 | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 4,76: 12, \\ & 76: 15,76: 23, \end{aligned}$ | 138:5 served [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:19, 139:21 } \\ & \text { signal [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:15 } \\ & \text { solicitors [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| $41: 22$ <br> secretary [2] - | $\begin{gathered} 25: 20,25: 25 \\ \text { sends [2] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 1,79: 16, \\ & 79: 17,81: 17, \end{aligned}$ | 138:7, 138:20 service [7] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 138:26 } \\ & \text { signature }[3]- \end{aligned}$ | $53: 4$ <br> SOLICITORS ${ }_{[2]}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:13, 62:3 } \\ & \text { Section [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:22, 23:3 } \\ & \text { senior [4] - 9:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 14,82: 16, \\ & 84: 15,90: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15:7, 80:20, } \\ & \text { 80:27, 99:29 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:19, 63:21, } \\ & 63: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -3: 3,3: 9 \\ & \text { solution [3] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 82:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 7,98: 23, \\ & 145: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91:12, 91:16, } \\ & 92: 3,92: 14,93: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 147:19, 148:9, } \\ & 157: 21 \end{aligned}$ | signed [5] - | 19:26, 46:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { section [1] - } \\ & 5: 28 \end{aligned}$ | sense [11] | 93:7, 94:7, 96:24, | set [11] - 39:26, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:21, 109:18, } \\ & \text { 119:5, 121:20, } \end{aligned}$ | 48:24 |
| sector [1] | 14:15, 73:9, | $98: 16,98: 19$ | $44: 2,44: 12$ | 121:24 | $74: 23,84: 3,86: 6$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:18 } \\ & \text { see }[55]-5: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 10,94: 17, \\ & 97: 21,97: 26, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 4,99: 5,101: 3, \\ & 102: 3,102: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 14,49: 21 \\ & 68: 18,77: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \quad \text { significant }[1] \text { - } \\ & 30: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sometime [1] - } \\ & \text { 134:22 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 10:12, 11:5, 11:9, | 106:9, 107:7, | 102:9, 102:23, | 122:5, 134:29, | significantly [2] | somewhat [1] - |
| $13: 1,16: 9,17: 4$, $17: 20,17: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:27, 115:12, } \\ & 123: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 102:26, 103:2, } \\ & \text { 103:9, 103:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 152:17, 155:21 } \\ & \text { sets [2] }-134: 29, \end{aligned}$ | $-14: 20,16: 28$ | $134: 28$ |
| 20:27, 21:19, | sent [38]-6:24, | 106:17, 110:7, | 157:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { signing }[1]- \\ & 13: 12 \end{aligned}$ | somewhere [3] 34:17, 116:1, |
| $23: 6,23: 12,30: 1$ | $6: 28,10: 14,11: 1$ | 111:27, 119:28, | several [1] - | similar [1] - | 128:2 |
| $31: 3,32: 10,$ | 16:11, 17:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:12, 122:20, } \\ & \text { 125:4, 126:14, } \end{aligned}$ | 139:16 | $158: 15$ | soon [2] - 70:18, |
| 35:16, 38:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:12, 17:16, } \\ & 21: 20,21: 27, \end{aligned}$ | 127:3, 141:10, | severe [1] - 56:6 | simply [3] - | 121:25 |


| 25:24, 26:17, | spits [1]-61:25 | 64:2 | 10:27, 17:6, 25:4, | 98:18, 107:24, | SUNLIGHT ${ }^{11]}$ - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27:13, 31:5, | spoken [4] - | Station [23] - | 25:5, 60:2, 103:7, | 107:27, 119:4, | 3:9 |
| 32:13, 33:17, | 6:13, 19:8, 56:1, | 47:6, 64:18, | 118:1, 131:18, | 144:21, 144:25, | super [2] - 75:2, |
| 36:6, 46:14, | 135:4 | 67:21, 67:23, | 145:15, 160:16, | 154:12, 155:1 | 87:12 |
| 47:11, 53:9, | stage [22]-5:12, | 67:26, 67:27, | 162:9, 162:21 | submitting [1] - | Superintenden |
| 53:10, 57:13, | 6:10, 12:22, | 68:25, 68:27, | stock [1] - 121:6 | 107:20 | t [201]-5:24, 5:27, |
| 76:9, 88:3, 93:12, | 13:13, 25:3, 27:1, | 77:18, 79:19, | stops [1] - | subsequent [3] - | 7:7, 8:8, 9:23, |
| 93:22, 100:17, | 29:14, 31:26, | 79:22, 80:17, | 131:28 | 51:3, 90:4, | 16:6, 16:13, |
| 100:29, 103:7, | 33:13, 33:21, | 81:24, 114:9, | story [1] - 104:4 | 120:26 | 16:21, 17:13, |
| 103:26, 103:29, | 37:28, 45:9, | 119:3, 122:17, | strange [2] - | subsequently | 19:5, 19:11, |
| 104:9, 108:2, | 45:11, 69:25, | 135:12, 147:5, | 39:10, 80:25 | [3]-121:20, | 20:20, 20:24, |
| 109:3, 110:29, | 70:8, 88:14, | 157:24, 157:27, | STREET ${ }_{[1]}$ | 150:4, 150:16 | 20:28, 21:20, |
| 113:25, 115:3, | 105:26, 111:9, | 161:26, 163:17, | 3:10 | substantial [2] - | 21:22, 22:9, 23:4, |
| 130:15, 132:6, | 123:25, 156:2, | 164:3 | Street [1] - 100:4 | 55:11, 56:18 | 23:13, 24:6, |
| 142:23, 153:1, | 158:28 | station [57] - | stress [7] - | substantive [1] - | 25:12, 25:21, |
| $154: 3,157: 5$, $160: 26,161: 13$ | stages [1] - | 22:26, 23:18, | 10:10, 10:22, | 129:20 | 25:25, 26:9, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 160:26, 161:13 } \\ \text { sort [19] - 12:8, } \end{gathered}$ | 47:29 | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 29,29: 17, \\ & 33: 5,34: 3,36 \end{aligned}$ | 16:29, 33:29, | successfully [2] | 26:10, 26:22, |
| 24:21, 40:22, | 52:12, 64:22 | 36:27, 39:12, | 116:2 | sudden [4] - | 27:12, 27:19, |
| 56:14, 57:16, | stand [1] - 8:10 | 40:26, 43:7, | stressed [1] - | 105:25, 107:29, | 28:11, 29:14, |
| 58:13, 58:14, | start [4]-11:24, | 46:21, 48:10, | 36:24 | 108:3, 108:4 | 30:20, 31:7, |
| 69:24, 75:16, | 17:22, 33:28, | 49:17, 49:24, | stressing [1] - | suffered [1] - | 31:25, 34:3, |
| 82:25, 85:2, 87:7, | 38:22 | 51:18, 51:25, | 130:14 | 132:29 | 34:18, 35:6, |
| 94:22, 113:5, | started [4] - | 51:26, 51:29, | struck [2]-63:1, | suffering [4] - | 35:27, 36:17, |
| 116:11, 121:5, | 110:18, 110:23, | $53: 16,53: 22$ | 63:6 | $33: 29,51: 2,$ | 36:22, 38:9, |
| 140:6, 140:13, 143:1 | 134:22, 154:1 starting | $\begin{aligned} & 62: 2,68: 10 \\ & 70: 17,70: 19 \end{aligned}$ | structure [1] - | $120: 29,128: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 12,38: 29, \\ & 39: 28.42: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| sought [3] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { starting [1] - } \\ & 17: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $73: 12,75: 25$ | 159:22 | suffers [1] - 12:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 28,42: 6 \\ & 42: 11,42: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| 23:28, 140:21, | starts [3] - | 79:29, 82:7, 84:4, | 109:20 | 8:11, 11:12, | 43:5, 44:27, 45:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 147:13 } \\ & \text { sound [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $45: 25,50: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 84: 25,87: 9 \\ & 88: 21,99: 26, \end{aligned}$ | sub [3] - 39:20, | $97: 16,105: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 5,45: 10 \\ & 45: 18,45: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { sound [1] - } \\ & \text { 104:9 } \end{aligned}$ | 75:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 88:21, 99:26, } \\ & \text { 107:14, 109:28, } \end{aligned}$ | $158: 23,159: 27$ | suggest [6] - | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 18,45: 22, \\ & 45: 27,46: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
| sounds [1] - | $7: 11$ | 110:5, 110:26, | $\begin{gathered} \text { sub-district } \\ \text { 39:20, 158:23, } \end{gathered}$ | 132:14, 133:4, | 48:20, 48:23, |
| 104:12 <br> source [1] | State [1] - 8:3 statement [38] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:9, 122:15, } \\ & \text { 125:16, 125:17, } \end{aligned}$ | 159:27 <br> subdi | $145: 8,145: 28$ suggested | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 11,50: 3 \\ & 50: 12,50: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| 138:8 <br> southern [1] - | 8:8, 8:22, 16:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 125:24, 126:15, } \\ & \text { 126:17, 126:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $160: 21$ | 25:16, 93:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 19,50: 22, \\ & 51: 3,51: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { southern [1] - } \\ & 39: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:2, 18:5, 18:8, } \\ & \text { 18:12, 24:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 127:4, 127:27, | subject [9] - | $114: 26,117: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 51:3, 51:17, } \\ & \text { 51:22, 53:7, 54:7, } \end{aligned}$ |
| Southern [3] - | 24:21, 26:25, | 130:16, 133:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 20,14: 23 \\ & 41: 23,43: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { suggesting } \\ 15: 29,37: 18, \end{gathered}$ | 56:21, 59:15, |
| 19:6, 21:8, 38:28 | 28:11, 33:24, | $\begin{aligned} & 133: 15,149: 17, \\ & 15: 1-153: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $43: 20,68: 15$ | 59:8, 74:7, | 62:13, 63:8, |
| speaking [1] - | 45:6, 45:8, 45:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 151: 1,153: 4 \\ & 153: 5,163: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 73:7, 141:23, | 120:17, 136:16 | 63:20, 64:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 55:7 } \\ & \text { speaks [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 22,56: 26, \\ & 57: 16,67: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 153:5, 163:18 } \\ \text { stationed [5] - } \end{gathered}$ | 162:22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { suggestion }[5] \text { - } \\ & 29: 13,123: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65: 24,67: 13 \\ & 68: 24,69: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| $51: 16$ | $72: 22,74: 1,74: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 8,33: 4,34: 2 \\ & 37: 10,47: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $133: 29$ | 134:17, 136:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:23, 70:12, } \\ & 72: 9,72: 26, \end{aligned}$ |
| specialist [8] | 75:4, 86:26, | Stations [1] - | submission [1] - | 163:5 | $73: 16.74: 5 .$ |
| $15: 9,17: 9,38: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93: 10,109: 6 \\ & \text { 109:17, 109:1 } \end{aligned}$ | 82:15 | $7: 11$ | suggestive [1] - $98: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 16,74: 5, \\ & 74: 11,75: 7, \end{aligned}$ |
| 38:4, 71:8, | 110:20, 111:24, | status [2] - | $93: 26,94: 1,94: 3,$ | suicides [1] - | 75:16, 77:19, |
| $147: 18$ | 116:18, 130:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:20, 40:9 } \\ & \text { stay }[2]-51: 27, \end{aligned}$ | 94:9, 94:19, | 107:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 78: 3,78: 6,78: 8, \\ & 78: 16,79: 19, \end{aligned}$ |
| 40:10, 43:4, 44:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:14, 149:16 } \\ & 157: 2,158: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $58: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 28,98: 9, \\ & 98: 24,102: 9, \end{aligned}$ | suit [1] - 30:23 <br> suitable [2] - | $79: 28,81: 25$ |
| $44: 5,44: 12$ | 161:8, 165:13 | staying [2] 20:18, 160:14 | 102:20, 103:22, | 19:20, 71:19 | $82: 4,83: 15,86: 4$ 87:5, 87:8, 87:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 44: 23,46: 20, \\ & 46: 21 \end{aligned}$ | statements [5] - $87: 20,87: 22$ | stays [1] - | 107:3, 128:6, | summarised [1] | 87:23, 88:6, |
| specifically [2] - | 87:25, 139:7, | 131:27 | submitted [21] - | summarises [1] | $88: 22,88: 27,$ |
| $107: 9,145: 4$ | $140: 6$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { steps }[3]- \\ 18: 28,138: 23 \end{gathered}$ | 17:26, 68:19, | $-87: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 90:14, 91:21, } \\ & \text { 91:29, 92:1, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { specify [1] - } \\ 120 \cdot 21 \end{gathered}$ | states [4]-5:21, | $154: 20$ | 89:5, 89:18, | summary [1] - | 92:11, 93:1, 94:5, |
| 139:21 <br> spent | 31:7, 31:8, 89:2 | $\text { still }[15]-6: 7,$ | 89:19, 90:1, 90:4, | 11:21 | 94:14, 94:29, |
| 146:11, 146:16 | 30:10, 60:16, | 9:28, 10:23, | $96: 4,97: 15,98: 8,$ | 161:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 3,95: 6,95: 7, \\ & 97: 1,97: 6,98: 4, \end{aligned}$ |



|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39:26, 43:16, | unfairness $\mathbf{S} \text { [1] - }$ | $125: 25,126: 11$ | $163: 11$ | $40: 19,147: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 19,29: 21, \\ & 39: 13,39: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 51:5, 72:16, | 85:18 | 129:26, 130:3, | visit [2] - 58:19, | 148:5, 161:25 | 40:28, 46:11, |
| 86:17, 95:17, | unfit [3] - 15:6, | 132:20, 136:23, | 62:28 | whereby [1] - | 46:15, 47:1, |
| 97:7, 109:20, | 17:7, 28:23 | 143:6, 144:11, | visited [1] - 65:8 | 135:10 | 51:19, 69:11, |
| 109:24, 121:28, | unfortunately | 148:17, 150:20, | vital [1] - 16:23 | whole [2] - | 74:28, 76:24, |
| 130:25, 141:12, | [1] - 126:6 | 154:4, 157:11, | volition [1] - | 138:5, 144:23 | 85:4, 113:11, |
| 141:19, 146:11, | unhappy [1] - | 163:21, 164:24 | 115:14 | wife [12]-7:29, | 113:18, 114:20, |
| 146:16, 153:10, | 111:7 | updated [1] - | voluntarily [2] - | $34: 26,51: 1,51: 9$ | 114:25, 115:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 156:10, 163:14, } \\ & 163: 18 \end{aligned}$ | uniform [6] - | 100:15 | $52: 25,83: 8$ | 120:29, 125:27, | 117:9, 117:11, |
| two-week [1] - | 73:26, 74:3, 87:5, | 14:17, 15:16 | - 53:25 | 132:23, 132:29, | 147:25, 147:27 |
| 51:5 | 88:10 | pheld [3] |  | 140:3, 140:10 | works [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Twomey [1] - } \\ & \text { 155:10 } \end{aligned}$ | unintentionally [1] - 72:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 12,138: 22 \\ & 154: 22 \end{aligned}$ | W | $\begin{gathered} \text { William [2] - } \\ 43: 8,137: 23 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:25 } \\ & \text { worried [3] } \end{aligned}$ |
| typed [1] - 96:6 | unit [19] - 25:16, | $\begin{gathered} \text { upset [2] - } \\ 13: 29,17: 27 \end{gathered}$ | wait [2] - 104:3, | willing [7] - | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 29,140: 11, \\ & 140: 26 \end{aligned}$ |
| U | 82:16, 91:13, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { urgency [1] - } \\ & 112: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 110:24 } \\ & \text { Wall }[3]-62: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $115: 23,116: 1$ | worry [1] - 32:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ultimate [1] - } \\ & \text { 155:22 } \\ & \text { ultimately }[3] \text { - } \\ & 12: 23,141: 20, \\ & \text { 149:20 } \\ & \text { ultimatum [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | 143:29, 145:26, | Urgent [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 62: 6,88: 12 \\ & \text { wants }[4]- \\ & 42: 26,58: 5,58: 6, \\ & 78: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 145:26 } \\ & \text { Willy [1] - 12:14 } \end{aligned}$ | 105:28, 114:13 writes [1] - |
|  | $157: 25,157: 27$ | 16:19 |  |  |  |
|  | 158:11, 161:27, | 40:18 |  | wish [8]-5:29, |  |
|  | 163:8, 163:13, | utilising [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ward [27] - } \\ & \text { 88:12, 88:15, } \\ & \text { 88:16, } 90: 4,90: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:23, 68:9, } \\ & \text { 108:6, 147:3, } \end{aligned}$ | 45:11, 61:14, |
|  | 163:18 | 48:29, 117:21 |  | 163:6, 163:16, | $70: 25,71: 23,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 51:11 } \\ & \text { unable [2] - } \end{aligned}$ | $136: 13,157: 26$ | V | $\begin{aligned} & 91: 6,91: 10, \\ & 91: 24,92: 9, \end{aligned}$ | wished ${ }^{2]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 81:10, 91:28, } \\ & 92: 1,93: 1,97: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 144:3, 150:11 unacceptable | 138:7 | vacancies [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 93:17, 94:8, 94:9, } \\ & 96: 4,96: 19, \end{aligned}$ | wishes [2] | written [2] - |
| [1] - 5:24 | $22: 12,30: 13$ | 163:19 | 96:28, 97:15, | with.. [1] - 34:2 <br> WITNESS [1] - | wrote [11]-13:5, |
| nannounced | 58:5, 73:22, | vacancy [1] - | 98:9, 98:23, |  | 54:7, 65:21, |
| [2] - 58:22, 72:14 under [29] 10:10, $29 \cdot 5,29 \cdot 8$ | $127: 25$ <br> unreasonable | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 82:16 } \\ & \text { vague }[1] \text { - } \\ & 165: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 29,99: 20, \\ & 102: 19,103: 5, \\ & 103 \cdot 15 \quad 104 \cdot 14 \end{aligned}$ |  | 88:23, 111:15, |
| 29:27, 30:2, | [3]-58:16, | 165:1 | $106: 15,107: 3$ | witness [5] - 26:9, 27:24, | 114:8, 124:4, 129:23, 134:25, |
| $42: 28,43: 12$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 106:25, 135:2 } \\ \text { unsafe [2] - } \end{gathered}$ | $158: 24$ | Ward's [1] - 94:3 | 98:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:23, 134:25, } \\ & \text { 137:17, 155:10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 43: 25,56: 6,59: 6, \\ & 64: 16,68: 15, \end{aligned}$ | 49:18, 67:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { validity [1] - } \\ & 66: 3 \end{aligned}$ | wary [1] - 32:22 <br> Watergrasshill | witnesses [1] - | Y |
| $73: 29,82: 4$ | [2] - 158:9, 158:12 | value [6] - 7:27, | [3] - 159:12, | 8:23 <br> wonder [1] - | year [5] - |
| 82:18, 83:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{up}[61]-10: 14, \\ & 12: 8,12: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $123: 3,123: 11$ | ways [1] - 83:20 | 27:26 | 108:23, 118:9, |
| 121:21, 128:4, | $14: 16,20: 26$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { veto [2]-30:7 } \\ & 30: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { wearing [2] - } \\ 73: 8,73: 28 \end{gathered}$ | $153: 13$ | $132: 5$ |
| 129:14, 133:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 27,21: 19, \\ & \text { 21:22, 21:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { via }[3]-105: 3$ | wee [1] - 17:8 | wondering [2] - | years [10]-8:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:26, 134:2, } \\ & \text { 149:6, 149:8, } \end{aligned}$ | 23:2, 26:13, 31:1, | $105: 8,155: 4$ | week [4]-5:14, | wording [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 13,44: 17 \\ & 48: 2,56: 2,56: 28 \end{aligned}$ |
| $151: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 22,38: 25, \\ & 45: 28,47: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { victim }[1]-51: 1 \\ & \text { view }[18]-6: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21: 3,51: 5,81: 3 \\ \text { weekend }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $60: 21$ | $48: 2,56: 2,56: 28,$ |
| understood [7] - <br> $27 \cdot 7$ 47.1, 63.13 | $48: 22,50: 3,50: 7$ | $18: 9,19: 13,37: 8$ | 59:17 | 64:15, 83:20, | $138: 7,138: 20$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 27: 7,47: 1,63: 13 \\ & 65: 11,90: 3,96: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 61:7, 64:13, | 39:17, 41:20, | weeks [4] - | 129:2, 164:11 | yesterday [4] - |
| 65:11, 90:3, 96:1, 129:2 | $65: 20,65: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57: 18,69: 5,70: 2, \\ & 70: 16,82: 29, \end{aligned}$ | $43: 16,146: 11$ | work-related [2] | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 12,25: 13 \\ & 31: 16,33: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| undertaking [2] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:4, 76:20, } \\ & 76: 21,79: 1,89: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 16,82: 29 \\ & 83: 4,83: 9,85: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 146:16 welcomed [2] - | - 33:29, 67:8 | you're.. [1] - |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { workers [1] - } \\ & \text { 18:18 } \end{aligned}$ | 114:7 <br> yourself [24] - |
|  |  |  |  | workload [1] - |  |
|  |  |  |  | 16:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:12, 24:17, } \\ & 41: 15,43: 26, \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  | workplace [32]- | $50: 16,66: 16$ |
|  |  |  |  | 14:22, 15:1 | 70:9, 84:9, 93:19, |
|  |  |  |  | 19:24, 19:28, | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 16,97: 24, \\ & \text { 106:18, 110:9, } \end{aligned}$ |


| 113:3, 123:28, <br> 128:17, 137:9, 137:18, 145:24, 149:22, 155:15, 161:6, 164:12, 164:25 |
| :---: |
| € |
| € 393 [1]-25:11 |


[^0]:    "I put it to himthat Superintendent Comyns was never in the station at 7.30am or 9.30am when he was requi red

