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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLONS, ON TUESDAY, 14TH J UNE 2022:

ME. MCGRATH Now, good morning, Chairman.
CHAN RMAN Good morning.
MG. MCGRATH Chairman, the first witness this morning is retired Chief Superintendent Catherine Kehoe. CHAI RMAN Thanks very much.

Mb. CATHERI NE KEHOE, HAV NG BEEN SUDRN, WAS
DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY MS. MEGRATH, AS FOLLOVG:

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Sit down, chief superintendent. Thank you very much. Good morning.
THE WTNESS: Good morning.
Q. MS. MEGRATH Good morning, chief superintendent. And I think you have very kindly agreed that in ease of everyone we will refer to you as chief superintendent, is that okay?

Now, Chairman, the chief superintendent's statement is at page 929 of the book and there's an additional
statement at page 5667. Also, Chairman, just by way of housekeeping, on Day 181 of the hearings, you'11 recal1 that counse1 for Mr. Barry withdrew issues 6 B to F in respect of the chief superintendent, and the on1y issue remaining for us to interrogate this morning is issue 6 A.

Chief superintendent, 6A on the issue paper is:
"Di d Chi ef Superintendent Catherine Kehoe target or di scredit Sergeant Barry as he alleges, A: By taking an inordi nate time to compl ete her investigation. "

So, chief superintendent, that is effectively what we will be looking at this morning.
A. Thank you, counsel.

1 Q. Now, I think in relation to -- you just outline there at the start of your statement, and it's a very comprehensive statement that you provided to the tribunal, you say that you were in the force for 36 years, is that right?
A. That's correct.

2 Q. And you tell us that you were allocated to Tipperary at the rank of chief superintendent on the 25th February 2010, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

3 Q. And you say that you were at various ranks and positions but you retired on the 4th May 2019, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

4 Q. Okay. Now, for our purposes, chief superintendent, I think we start the process really effectively where you 11:06 start it in your statement, on the 7th February 2013. And I think this was the day that you met with Assistant Commissioner Jack Nolan, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

5 Q. Now, you have a note of that meeting on the 7th February and it's in your statement at CK1 and it's at page 947. So if we can just open that note there at 947. Now, you say there, you spoke with assistant commissioner -- this is your own note, isn't it?
A. That's right.

6 Q. That's right. You spoke with Assistant Commissioner Nolan, asked me to conduct investigation into alleged bullying and harassment and sexual harassment complaint under the policy. Complainant, Sergeant Paul Barry, Mitchelstown, complaint against his district officer, Superintendent Michae 1 Comyns, Fermoy. There's some further details there. Just in relation to that, did you know either of the parties --
A. No.

7 Q. -- in any capacity?
A. No, I did not.

8 Q. okay. Skipping down to the next paragraph, you say that you asked to be formally appointed and that your terms of reference be clearly identified, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

9 Q. You were told by the assistant commissioner that Superintendent Lordan had already done probative enquiries and we know at this stage that on the 21st November 2012 he took a very detailed statement from Sergeant Barry at the time, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

10 Q. Now you also note, finally, for a particular date, the
assistant commissioner told you that he did not have time to fully investigate the case himself, is that right?
A. That's correct.

11 Q. And is that really the essence of the conversation that 11:08 day? Is there anything further that you can assist in relation to that meeting with the assistant commissioner?
A. No, that was the essence of the conversation on that day.

12 Q. Okay. As you say there, you asked for your terms of reference to be clearly identified and that came in to you effectively on the 18th February 2013, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

13 Q. Again, if we can just please open that up, at 949. This is the 1etter, we11, we'11 cal1 it the appointment effectively you got in respect of the issue from the assistant commissioner, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

14 Q. Now, this has already been opened, so we won't dwe11 too long on it. But you are told that by the assistant commissioner that he had been appointed on the 9th October 2012, would you have been aware that the complaint from Mr. Barry had come in on the 2nd October 11:09 2012 at that stage, originally?
A. No, I wasn't aware until I got the papers exactly when Sergeant Barry made his initial complaint.

15 Q. okay. He outlined then that he had appointed

Superintendent Lordan. Going down again, just flicking through it, we see there, a couple of paragraphs down, Mr. Kavanagh, if you can just scroll slowly, that, as we say, Superintendent Lordan took Sergeant Barry's statement. You're also told that he had sought advices 11:10 on the 4th January in relation to the remit of the investigation, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

16 Q. And if we move on to the next page, this is where we just might stop for a moment at the first paragraph. не also tells you that on the 4th January 2013, that he had asked Mr. Barry for an extension of time and Superintendent Comyns, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

17 Q. And he was looking for an extension of time to the 1st 11:10 March. We don't need to open it, that's at page 962 of the papers. And he tells you on the next paragraph:
"You will note fromthe file that Sergeant Barry has not agreed to this request."

Isn't that right
A. That's correct

18 Q. Now, if we can just open there, we will be coming back to this letter, but if we can just open by way of context, you got some papers with this letter, isn't that right?
A. Yes, I got a number of papers with it.

19 Q. Right. You got some e-mails and correspondence, is
that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So, if we could just look at 957, please. Now, this was one of the e-mails that the assistant commissioner gave you. And you will see there on the 14/1/2013 he gives you the e-mail response from Mr. Barry in relation to the extension of time, isn't that right?
A. That's right. And if we just go down to the bottom of that page, Mr. Barry is saying there, just there at that last paragraph:
"I amaware that you have been appoi nted by assi stant commi ssi oner HRM as I recei ved a letter from hi mated 9th October 2012, stating that he had forwarded my correspondence to you. That was three months ago and it is al most two months since l made my statement to Superintendent Pat Lordan, therefore l do not agree to your proposed extension of time."

If we can just keep going on to the next page. He says:
"I am currently on sick leave due to the unacceptable behavi our of Superintendent $M$ chael Comyns and as such, 11:11 to agree to your proposed extensi on of time would mean that l am willing to agree to have my pay cult in half. I am under consi derable stress at the moment due to this investigation and the fact that my ill ness has not
been classified as work rel ated. My ability to provide for my family has been limited with the loss of my allowances and now you want me to sanction having my pay cut in half." He says:
"There is no reason gi ven for seeking this del ay but I assume it is the allegation of criminal behaviour by me agai nst Superintendent $M$ chael Comyns whi ch is causing you to seek more time. This is unacceptable if this is so." He goes on to say:
"I want this investigation to be done within the timeframe set out in the Garda policy."

And we will come to the policy separately. So, you get 11:12 this e-mail, isn't that right, from the assistant commissioner? And if you can also then look at a further e-mail that $I$ believe you were provided, at 954. Sorry, it's the next page, it's 955. So, two days later, Mr. Barry is writing to HRM in relation to this extension of time. And if we just go midway through the paragraph, if can you see, chief superintendent, where $I$ am starting "I amsuffering severe anxi ety" do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.

22 Q. He says: "I amsuffering severe anxi ety and stress due to this del ay and as of today's date my ill ness has not been desi gnated as work rel ated. I face the prospect of having my pay reduced to half if this matter is not
resol ved by early February 2013. I feel I am being treated unfai rly in this process and I amsending this e-nail as I contacted your office by phone yesterday."

He goes on to say the call had not been returned. So, I think it is fair to say that the assistant commissioner put this on your table effectively. You knew at that stage that there was an issue with regard to an extension of time and you saw that the complainant effectively wasn't happy with what had happened to date, is that right?
A. That's correct.

23 Q. okay. And if we go back then to your letter at 950, the letter that had been sent to you. So, we know there he's telling you about the extension of time, he's telling you that it has been refused, he encloses the e-mails and then he appoints you, he appoints you to investigate Sergeant Barry's complaint under the Garda policy and procedures on harassment, sexual harassment and bullying, and any criminal offences identified in Sergeant Barry's complaint, isn't that right?
A. Correct. He goes on, if we are scrolling slowly down, and we stop there. You see the last paragraph:
"Your attention is drawn to the provi si on of the Garda pol icy procedures on harassment, sexual harassment and bullying document and the timelines for the conduct of
the i nvesti gation."

Now, would you have noted this at the time, that there was an issue with regard to time, that it was already outside the policy timeframe? Can you help the
Chairman? what was your view taken about this at the time, when you saw all of this?
A. At the time $I$ received it the clock was starting again, Mr. Chairman, because $I$ was getting it as a fresh appointment. So I received the appointment on the 18th 11:15 February 2013. And I immediately was aware, as you correctly say, that Sergeant Barry was concerned for the fact that it hadn't been dealt with more swiftly at that time. So that formed my opinion to take the bullying and harassment aspect first.
25 Q. okay. And as you say, you saw the clock starting?
A. Yes.

26 Q. And I think there's notes of a meeting you subsequently had, we will be seeing them later, where you saw the clock starting for you in any event?
A. Yes.
A. That's correct.

And 28 days running from the 18th?
A. That's correct.

29 Q. Okay. Again, we will come back to that, we will be looking at the policy shortly. But he continues there, if we go down a little bit more, he's looking for, he says, an expeditious investigation, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

30 Q. Now, he goes on then to appoint you under Regulation 14 of the Garda Síochána Discipline Regulations 2007, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
A. That's correct. When I received it, I was very conscious, as I said, in relation to the bullying and harassment and the timeframe, 28-day timeframe, which is a very ambitious timeframe to meet. And I also was aware of item number 9 of Sergeant Barry's complaint of the 21st November 2012, that he made a very serious allegation against his senior officer, and then there was a the discipline aspect of it. So you are correct in saying, yes, $I$ saw three component parts of an investigation.

32 Q. okay. As you say there, there were eight complaints which effectively fell under the policy and you saw the 11:16 ninth complaint, that's where you saw coming under "any ot her criminal of fence"?
A. Yes, indeed.

33 Q. okay. Now, before we move on then, so we have your appointment and in fact attached to that letter, we've already seen it, at page 951, that was your appointment under Regulation 14, is that right, of the discipline regulations. Sorry, that is at 951. It's on the next page actually, if you just scroll down, Mr. Kavanagh,
keep going. And effectively you will see there:
"Details of the conduct alleged: Superintendent Comyns interfered with the investigation into alleged sexual abuse which was reported at Mtchel stown Garda station on 2nd February 2012."

And it is signed on the 11th February 2013?
A. That's correct.

34 Q. okay. Now, you do make the point in your statemen that even though it's dated the 11th February, you saw yourself starting on the 18th, isn't that right?
A. That's the date I received it.
Q. Okay. Now, if we can look briefly then at the policy document first and we take the $\mathrm{B} \& \mathrm{H}$ investigation first. The policy document is in the papers, Mr. Kavanagh, at 3498. And effectively it's a very long document and I am going to cherry-pick to some extent, I just want to ask you about a couple of sections of it. If you look at 3506, and if you go down to the last, the black box, it says:
"Instances of bullying and harassment and sexual harassment will be treated seriously and will be dealt with in accordance with disciplinary or criminal procedures, where appropriate."

And I think that's what was happening in this situation, is that right?
A. That's correct.

36 Q. okay. And if you go to 3519 , and this is something that I want to ask you about, because it's something that Mr. Barry raises in the context of what he's calling inordinate delay. If we are at 3519 , under paragraph 8.2, can I ask you to look at the second black box there? It's not that one, Mr. Kavanagh, keep going.
"Where a compl ai nt amounts to a crime, the matter should be the subject of a criminal investigation. This will take precedence over these procedures."

What is effectively intended by that?
A. As it says there, that the criminal will take precedent, and that's what $I$ understood it to be. In those circumstances, Chairman, I appointed an officer to run a parallel investigation at the time of the appointment to my bullying and harassment. I was acutely aware that criminal would take precedent over the bullying and harassment and I saw number 9, as I correctly identified, was the criminal aspect of it and I appointed a detective inspector to commence the enquiries into the criminal matters while I dealt with the bullying and harassment matters.
37 Q. It is one of Mr. Barry's complaints in the context of inordinate delay, that the criminal should have started first effectively?
A. He was appointed at the same time as I appointed
members to the bullying and harassment, both of them commenced at the same time.

38 Q. okay. If I can ask you then to move on to 3523. The Chairman will have seen this before in other modules, it's in relation to the timeframes for these bullying and harassment investigations, and if you look at the paragraph there "suitable investigator will be chosen", and in particular it says, midday down:
"The investigation should be conducted thoroughl y, obj ectivel $y$, with sensitivity, ut most confidentiality and with due respect for the rights of both the compl ai nant and the person compl ai ned of."

It says:
"The investigator will report their findings within 28 days of the compl ai nt being recei ved at the di vi si onal of fice. "

And I suppose that's just what I wanted to ask you about, just in the context of what you said you saw your clock starting when you were appointed, but the policy may suggest or could plainly suggest there that it's when the complaint is received?
A. I received the complaint on the 18th February 2013.

39 Q. okay. So that's how you read the obligation there?
A. Yes.

40 Q. As opposed to running from the 2nd October 2012?
A. I had no knowledge of the report on the 2nd October '12. I on7y got knowledge when I received the documentation on the 18th February 2013 and that was the date I commenced my investigation.
41 Q. okay. Now, I think that it uses that language a couple 11:21 of times, " 28 days fromthe compl ai nt being recei ved that the di visi onal office" could it be read as the initial date of the receipt of the complaint?
A. I'm sorry, I just don't understand the question there, could you repeat?
42 Q. So it's your evidence that you are reading it as from your receipt of the complaint?
A. That's correct.

43 Q. Or your appointment effectively?
A. Yes.

44 Q. Okay. Now, the final section of the policy that applies for the purposes of today is at 3525, and it deals with the extensions of time. And I think we've seen already there was one application for an extension of time, which Mr. Barry refused, and I think you subsequently did have to use this section, didn't you, and we will come to it in due course, but it's paragraph 8.5 and it says:
"Extensions to the timelimits outlined are acceptable 11:22 once there is a clear justification and both the compl ai nant and the person compl ai ned of have i ndi cated that they have no obj ection to the extensi on. It is i mportant to mai ntain a record with reasons for the
del ay in time limits."

So I think you would have been aware of that and, as you say, you did subsequently use that --
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. We're still really at the time of your appointment and as you just briefly mentioned there, you say that you went on to make a number of appointments very quickly after you were put in place. You say that you appointed Superintendent Patrick Lordan to continue with the bullying and harassment complaint, is that right?
A. That's correct.

47 Q. Then you also appointed Detective Inspector william Leahy, Detective Garda Mary Gilmartin, Sergeant Susan O'Brien and Detective Sergeant James white, is that right?
A. That's correct.

48 Q. Now, you had a meeting with some of that team on the 26th February 2013. And again, if we can just have a look at the notes of that meeting, they are at 5682. And there's your meeting. You outline who you met
with. Matters arising, you note the timeframe, 28
days. And as I say, it's your evidence that your 28 days was running from the 18th February to the 17th March, is that right?
A. That's correct.

49 Q. okay. Now, you task Superintendent Lordan, you say, to address other exhibits and take additional statements from members associated with the bullying complaint only, is that right?
A. That's correct.

And then the D/Inspector, which is D/Inspector Leahy, and yourself, you were going to investigate discipline, is that right?
A. Yes, the criminal and discipline aspect of it, yes.
A. That's right.

52 Q. And the compilation of the file, is that the bullying and harassment file?
A. The bullying and harassment, Sergeant O'Brien.

53 Q. Was opened with Sergeant O'Brien, is that right?
A. That's correct.

54 Q. Now, you say later, at 5684 , you then spoke with Mr. Barry, is that right?
A. Yes, I think I spoke with him on the phone initially and then I had a meeting with him after that.
Q. So it's 5684, you take a note of that meeting. And, if you just keep going down. Now, you note there, there's just some things there noted at the outset,
appointments with the CMO; for example, he would not be returning to work until the investigation complete. There's a mention there of a medical certificate. Is this where you are getting a fuller picture of what the
background to all of this is and what has been going on since the bullying and harassment complaint was made?
A. This was a conversation $I$ had with Sergeant Barry at the time and he gave me an outline of what was occurring.

56 Q. Okay. And did all come up that he had been on sick 1eave?
A. Yes, I was aware he was on sick leave.

57 Q. Okay. And what was the nature of the discussion you had with him? Is it reflected there or was there more said?
A. No, it was reflected as I say it there in those notes. It wasn't a lengthy conversation, but, as I say in the notes there, he just informed me in relation to the fact that he was on sick leave and that he wasn't inclined to give an extension of time, because he would be on half pay. And I was conscious of that fact.

58 Q. okay. And you note there at the bullet points, you say:
"At last this investi gation has started and someone is goi $n g$ to do something for me."

That's Mr. Barry, is it?
A. That's Mr. Barry.

59 Q. You told Sergeant Barry that "I will do my utmost to adhere to the timeframe for such investi gations under pol icy of harassment, sexual harassment and bullying whi ch will expire around the 17th March 2013."

However, you said you would "not compromise the thoroughness of the investigation process to expedite matters premat urel y."

Is that right?
A. That's correct.

60 Q. Then he said he could not give an extension of time because he was reduced to half pay. Did you fully take al1 of that on board? Were you fully cognisant of what was going on with him financially in relation to all of 11:27 this?
A. No, this was my first time speaking with Sergeant Barry. I wouldn't have known any in-depth information in relation to his sickness absence.
61 Q. okay. And you indicate at the outset that the matter 11:27 did not arise at that stage?
A. At that stage.
A. That's correct.
okay. Now, at around this time, as we11, subsequent to 11:27 your appointment, there's two letters I just want you to look at, one is at page 305. Now, this is where you write to Sergeant Barry after you'd just been appointed. And you're very much confining it to -- we don't have to open it, but you very much confine your 11:28 correspondence with him in relation to the bullying and harassment, is that right?
A. That's correct.

64 Q. Okay. And you tell him you've appointed Superintendent

Lordan to continue with the investigation and you tell him about the other appointments as well. But you don't go into any other aspect of it, criminal or discipline, is that right?
A. That's correct, not in that correspondence, no.

65 Q. Okay. But there's a letter of the same date that goes to Superintendent michae 1 Comyns, it's at 654. And I just want to ask you about it, chief superintendent, because it is very different in its context, because this is sent to him in the context of the discipline. You say that you have been appointed as deciding officer in respect of the discipline and you're asking him if, if you look down the third paragraph, for all official documentation touching on the matter. You're looking for a detailed report. And you say at the very end of that page that it's possible he could be called for interview. And then you say on the next page that you're looking for a response to this before the 11th March and you're anxious to bring this matter to a conclusion with reasonable expedition.

Now there's very different focuses, your contact with sergeant Barry, it would seem, at this stage, that the discipline is being effectively kicked off straightaway by you, is that right?
A. Part of the discipline regulations, you have to put the officer on notice at the earliest opportunity. That's under the regulations, so that is the reason that minute went out. But I also sent him out a second
minute in relation to the bullying and harassment and I outlined the allegations 1-8 and asked him for a response within one week, I think.
66 Q.
okay. We know that it's a part of Sergeant Barry's complaint in this inordinate delay category that in fact the discipline didn't start effectively, it was quite late, the end of 2015 --
A. Yeah.

67 Q. -- into 2016, when this effectively became any way substantive. what do you say to that?
A. That's correct, number one. Number two, the fact is that criminal will always take precedent over discipline and this was a standard letter that would go out to notify people, notify an officer that he was -that discipline regulations were being invoked. It was 11:30 just a standard letter. What would you say that the discipline effectively hadn't started at that stage, in reality?
A. No, it hadn't started other than the fact I was -- it was started in the context of an appointment but the criminal discipline was running paralle1 to each other. So the matters that $I$ was investigating under criminal were going to be relied on for my discipline investigation. So it was a parallel investigation. okay. Now, if we go back to your statement, you say that you had meetings during that month and into early March with your team, we've seen one of them there, the 26th February. You also met on the 6th March. You make a point in your statement, you say that "The
investigation team was not desi gnated sol el y to this investigation, they were drawn fromthe di vision of Ti pperary and continued to hold a significant number of responsi bilities or portfolios in addition to this investigation as I did." Is that right?
A. That's correct. They weren't a designated team. I didn't have the luxury of a designated team, I had to pull people from across Tipperary division in order to conduct this investigation. They had, all of them had a very heavy workload and portfolios themselves and they only could prioritise this as the need arose in relation to it. we kept it always on the agenda but also they had their own roles and responsibilities. The superintendent and the district officer and inspector had his own portfolios as well.
70 Q. I think this is then during, effectively, March where you start your correspondence with Superintendent Michael Comyns in relation to the bullying and harassment. This has already been opened previously by counsel for the Garda Síochána, Mr. Murphy. But you effectively engaged in correspondence with the superintendent, you put the eight complaints to him, he comes back to you, I think you look for clarification, and again he comes back to you, is that right?
A. That's correct.

71 Q. And that's during the March period?
A. That's correct.

72 Q. But also during March, on the 12th March, now you trigger paragraph 8.5 we looked at in the policy and
you're looking for an extension of time from both the complainant and Superintendent Comyns, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

73 Q. Okay. And we know that Superintendent Comyns agreed to 11:32 the extension and I think that Mr. Barry doesn't come back to you formally immediately. You do meet him on the 14th March, is that right?
A. That's correct.

74 Q. And you took notes of that and if we could look at page 11:32 1062. We11, 1062 is a letter just dated, if you see there at the top, Mr. Kavanagh, dated 12th March, so this is two days before you meet him you are writing to him, is that right?
A. That's correct.

75 Q. Now, this letter, there has been some emphasis placed on this letter because of the reference to parallel investigations. So if you just bear with me, we will just open it briefly, chief superintendent.

So you're writing to Sergeant Barry. You're advising him that the investigation is progressing expeditiously, is that right?
A. That's correct.

76 Q. And you're telling him you wish to meet him on the 14th 11:33 March. You go on in the next paragraph, you say:

> "I have al so been appoi nt ed under Regul ation 14 of the Garda Sí ochána Di sci pl i ne Regul ations 2007."

> Isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

77 Q. And you te11 him you've appointed Detective Inspector William Leahy to assist you, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. I don't have it in front of me.

78 Q. Now, this is where you say:
"As you will appreciate, this is a compl ex investi gation that requires parallel investigation
under both the Garda pol icy and procedures har assment, sexual har assment and bullying, working toget her to create a positive working envi ronment and the Garda Sí ochána di sci pl i ne regul ati ons 2007."

Now, we know from Mr. Barry's direct evidence and cross-examination, he puts some emphasis on the use of your language of "parallel investigations". It's his view that in fact they were effectively sequential and went on for three years but you say here they are paralle1. Can you just tell the Chairman what you mean by that?
A. Chairman, at the time, as I said earlier, when I received those documentation I appointed Detective Inspector Leahy in relation to the criminal discipline 11:34 aspect of it, and I appointed Superintendent Lordan and Sergeant O'Brien in relation to the bullying and harassment aspect of it, and that sincerely as per my notes that have just been opened to the tribunal. So
that was the paralle1 investigation that I was referring to.

79 Q. Okay. So is it your evidence to the Chairman that you always saw them as running parallel from the outset?
A. That was my hope and aspiration at that time.

80 Q. Okay. And also, in fairness, chief superintendent, could it be aspirational, the last paragraph you say?
"As you are aware, the matters subject to the di sci pline regul ations are not governed by the same timeframes. However, it is mine intension to ensure this aspect will al so be expeditiously investigated."
A. It was always my intention to ensure that all aspects of the investigation would be dealt with as expeditiously as possible.

81 Q. Okay. Now, you had notes then of the meeting two days later with Mr. Barry and we'11 look at the typed ones please, at 1086. Now, at 1086, you have notes, you're telling Mr. Barry -- you explain your appointment. We've gone through a lot of this, if you go down, your appointment under Regulation 14. Details of Superintendent Lordan. You say you outline the process of the two investigations and the progress being made."

Can I just ask you, yes at this stage you had been corresponding with Superintendent Comyns in relation to the bullying and harassment, but in reality what progress was being made in respect of the other
investigations?
A. Detective Inspector Leahy was taking statements in relation to the criminal investigation.
82 Q. okay, and that's the progress. Was that outlined to Mr. Barry, do you recall?
A. I don't recal1. I can't say with any degree of certainty. But if I've said it there, the possibility is that, yes, it would have been outlined.
83 Q. Okay. Now, if you go down a couple of lines, there. This is Sergeant Barry:
"...indi cated that he was not satisfied with the del ay brought by an Assi stant Commi ssi oner Nol an. "

And you informed him that there were avenues for this but it does not form part of this investigation. Can you just tell the Chairman what you meant by that?
A. Sergeant Barry at that point in time was quite annoyed by the fact that there was a delay of four months in relation to the investigation and I wanted to make it clear to him that, you know, if he making a complaint in that nature, he would have to make a separately to the fact that I wasn't investigating that, I was investigating the complaint as per my appointment from Assistant Commissioner Nolan.
Is it your evidence that Sergeant Barry understood that you were proposing to do the bullying and harassment investigation and then move on to the others? would that have been made clear at this meeting?
A. I made it clear at the meeting that there was a parallel investigation. At that point in time that was what was actually happening. There was a detective inspector appointed and, as I say, superintendent Lordan was appointed for the bullying and harassment, 11:37 that would have been made clear at that meeting.
85 Q. Okay. You go on to say you explained to him that you required an extension of two weeks, would ask him to confirm consent for the same or otherwise. "I require this additional time in furtherance of the investi gation and to ensure its thoroughness", isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

86 Q. "Asked if he was satisfied with the content of his statement of compl ai nt. He said he was satisfied. Additional amendment is in order."
okay. So that was your meeting on the 14th March with him. He comes back to you on the 15th March and I think he agrees to the extension of time, the following 11:38 day, is that right?
A. That's correct.

87 Q. Page 1246, please, Mr. Kavanagh. I think he e-mails, at the very bottom there, he e-mails a colleague of yours, that's sergeant O'Brien at the end. If you just 11:38 scroll down the page, please. Now, again he's outlining a lot of personal circumstances there and I think at this stage, would you say you were acutely aware that there was this extenuating background with
regard to Sergeant Barry?
A. Yes, I was aware that Sergeant Barry was out sick at that particular time.

88 Q. And he says midway down, he says:
"As you onl y recei ved your appoi nt ment on 18/ 2/ 2013 and you are seeki ng a two-week extensi on, l her eby agree to your request. This extensi on will bring the combi ned del ay to the 1st April, which is exactly six months si nce $A / C$ Nol an was appoi nted to deal with this matter."

Do you believe that is a legitimate statement on his part?
A. Yes, I do believe it is a legitimate statement on his part.

89 Q. "My wife wanted me to object to your extensi on and has given me and my authorities an ultimatumthat if this matter is not fully resol ved by 1st April 2013, Fools Day, he she will be making a formal compl ai nt to the Garda Sí ochána Ombudsman Commi ssi on on that date."

I think Sergeant O'Brien sent that on to you, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

90 Q. Okay. So you got the extension and you proceeded to continue with your work. In accordance with the policy, I think you met with Sergeant Barry on the 8th April, you put everything to him, all the material you
had, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

91 Q. Now, I omitted to say that it was after he agreed to the extension of time you interviewed Superintendent Comyns in relation to the bullying and harassment, is that right?
A. That's right.

92 Q. And that was on the 22nd March?
A. That's correct.

And as I said, you then sat down with Mr. Barry, put everything to him and then you put your file together on the bullying and harassment complaint on the 30th May 2013, isn't that right?
A. On the 30th May.

94 Q. 30th May?
A. Yes, that's right.

95 Q. That file, again, it's at 1085, we don't need to open it. But it was an extensive file, I'd say, chief superintendent and you did not uphold any of the 1-8 complaints, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So at this stage, chief superintendent, the bullying and harassment matter, do you effectively see that that's off your desk, is that right?
A. Yes, it was off my desk at that point in time. I sent 11:40 it back to the appointing officer.

97 Q. Okay. Then you turn your attention, it seems, then to the discipline and criminal matter, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

98
Q. Okay. In particular, you notice, you're aware that Inspector Leahy had moved on and you were looking for a replacement for him, is that right?
A. That's correct.
A. That's correct.

100 Q. We don't need to open it but he looks for an update and he effectively corresponds with HRM plus Assistant Commissioner Nolan, and he's looking for an update on the status of the investigation, that comes in in July, but also in July you are looking for an update yourself 11:41 from Superintendent Leahy, is that right?
A. That's correct.

101 Q. Okay. He comes back to you on the 9th August with an update and we will open this one, it's at 1093. Now, at 1093 you will see, this is his response to you, as I 11:42 say, you had looked for an update on progress and he tells you a number of jobs were identified were where persons including members of An Garda Síochána had to be interviewed. A number of these persons, members of An Garda Síochána have been interviewed to date. And 11:42 he outlines effectively five statements that he had taken, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Would you accept that he's still at a very preliminary
stage at this juncture?
A. I would accept that at the time I received that report I was disappointed with the level of progress that had been made.

103 Q. okay. He tells you about the connection, now we have been using this word in relation to the 2012, the ninth complaint, if we call it that, and he tells that he's had difficulties in securing cooperation from the connection, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

104 Q. So he's telling you this on the 9th August 2013, is that right?
A. That's correct.

105 Q. Now, we'11 mention this briefly later on, because you may have heard from Mr. Barry's evidence that he is expressing frustration in relation to this, that this was identified as a problem in August 2013 and we know it's some time before, shall we say, communications are established with the connection, is that right?
A. I'm sorry, can you repeat that question, I'm not following your...?

106 Q. So I suppose what I am asking you is: The problem in relation to the connection is highlighted here in August 2013?
A. That's right that's right.

107 Q. Okay. Now, that was the update that you had but what happens then is things slow down effectively, would you agree, because at this stage you are asked by Assistant Commissioner Twomey do you have any views in relation
to the appeal that's been lodged in the bullying and harassment claim, isn't that right?
A. Yes, I received that on the 12 th August, just days after I received the updated report.
Now, you come back on the 9th October to him. Now you had been on annual leave, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

But you say that it's your view that that wasn't appropriate, for you to be giving your views on the grounds of appeal, isn't that right?
A. Yes, I sought advices in relation to it, because I hadn't ever received a report of that nature previously. I sought advices and I was told that I shouldn't have viewed that report. And I returned it to the assistant commissioner indicating same and I put 11:44 no advices on it.

110 Q. Okay. But on the same day there's another problem that has arisen on the 9th October 2013, because this is where you have the concern under Regulation 14(5) of the discipline regulations, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

111 Q. And you write to Assistant Commissioner Nolan. We will open page 1108. We've already come across the issue here, 14(5), as to what it is. And just in ease, it says at subsection (5):
"The appointing officer shall ensure that the deciding officer.." which is you "... has not been invol ved in in any capacity in relation to an earlier aspect of the
case. "

Isn't that right?
A. That's right.

112 Q. That is an issue that has arisen as far as you are concerned. And at page 1108, if we just look at it, and this is you writing to your appointing officer, you're outlining that you have been appointed, both under the discipline and under the $B \& H$, you are saying that you have submitted your completed file. Sorry, do I have the right page? Sorry, it's my fault, chief superintendent. Sorry, it is 1101. Sorry, that's my fault. And that's the 9th October 2013. And that's your letter, just by way of background you tell him you have submitted your report on bullying and harassment. You say that you became aware -- "In correspondence recei ved from Assi stant Commi ssi oner Tworey dated 13th August 2013, I have become aware that an appeal has been lodged and the vi ews sought under the specific grounds put forward by Sergeant Barry. Having revi ewed the content of this document whi ch --"

Sorry, the next page.
" - - I have addressed under separate cover of $9 t h$
October 2013, I amfirmy of the view that to continue with the criminal investigation as directed by you would be prejudicial to any findings of the case."

Now, do you just want to tell the Chairman a little bit more about that?
A. I believed for the fact that I received this documentation, having spoken with Ms. Hassett in HR, that it may be perceived, this was a view I had, that 11:47 it may be perceived that $I$ shouldn't continue with the investigation as I had -- I was relying on 14(5) in any capacity in area aspect of the case, $I$ had made an adjudication on the bullying and harassment, I had received the grounds of appeal and I asked for advices 11:48 in relation to that.

113 Q. Now, and you say you're firmly of the view, so that is very strong language, isn't that right?
A. Well that was my view at the time.

114 Q. okay. And I think there's some correspondence back and 11:48 forth between you and Assistant Commissioner Nolan?
A. Yes.

115 Q. You write to him again on the 31st October, at 1106, because he looked for specific reasons, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

116 Q. And at 1106, you outline these. You outline what you called your rationale there in the letter. And essentially your rationale was, if you go on to the next page, really it's number 5, that "as part of the
appeal process l was supplied with Sergeant Barry's grounds of appeal. It was evi dent fromexamining this document that Sergeant Barry had access to my findi ngs. "

You say:
"To continue my investi gation into the di sci plinary matters and any criminal matters arising could in my 11:48 vi ew compromise the investigation as l am now fully aware of Sergeant Barry's views in respect of my i nvesti gati on into the bullying and har assment aspect of the case and hence my i mpartiality could be brought into question."

Isn't that right?
A. That was my view.

117 Q. I think you're told effectively to press on, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. At that stage.
A. I think on the 18th November, I was written to by the appointing officer and asked to press on.
119 Q. okay. But you go back, you're still uncomfortable I 11:49 think with the situation because you go with on the 21st November, it's page 1111, is that right? We will just open that up. So, you go back on the 21st November. Now, as you say, you have been told to press on, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

120 Q. You say:
"I note that you have requested that I continue with
this investigation and while l have no difficulty in doing so, l must bring to your attention the provisions of Regul ation 14(5) of the di scipline regul ations 2007, which I believe has a barring on my appoi nt ment under di sci pline regul ations.

In seeking my excl usion fromthis investigation of the 31st October 2013, I omitted the reference to the regul ations that I was rel ying on."

So, was it effectively -- so, I mean, I think it's there in black and white, you believed that it wasn't appropriate for you to continue, that was your position?
A. That was my position.

121 Q. Okay. Again, you were told again to press on on the 23rd November 2013, isn't that right, by the assistant commissioner?
A. 23rd December.

122 Q. 23rd December?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. So, at this stage now I suppose Sergeant Barry is here, the bullying and harassment file was submitted in May and now it's six months later and effectively, would you agree, everything has stalled because of this issue at this stage?
A. Well, this clarification was required in order for me to continue with the investigation and that was my view.
Q. Now, I think Mr. Barry accepted when he was being cross-examined on Day 179, he said it was reasonable for you to check this, I think in fairness to Mr. Barry. But as we say, effectively you're looking at a six-month period now has passed and nothing has effectively happened substantively, would that be fair to say?
A. That would be correct.
okay. Now, Mr. Barry is coming back to you, he writes to you on the 8 th December, 2681. So, at 2681 , if you just go down there, he writes again to your colleague. If you just keep going down, please. He writes to Sergeant O'Brien. He's referring to an e-mail, saying:
"In rel ation to the criminal investigation this conti nues and is progressing."

That's an e-mail that he had received in May. And then he says at the very end, he said:
"I would appreci ate a response from Chi ef Superintendent Kehoe to clarify whether it is a di sci plinary or criminal matter that she is i nvesti gating and to account for her del ay in deal ing with same bef ore I compl ai $n$ di rectly to Commi ssi oner Martin Calliinan."

And you reply to him with your clarification on page 3150, a couple of days 1ater. So, a couple of days
later you come back to him and really, again you set out a background that you've submitted the bullying and harassment report. But if we could look at the next page, 3151, you say:
"The di sciplinary and criminal investigations is continui ng but I wi sh to advi se you that I have sought clarification fromassi stant commissioner, Southeastern Regi on, in respect of finalising the di scipline/criminal investigation as the provisions of Regul ation 14(5) of the Garda di sci pline regul ations 2007 may have a bearing on my appointment under the di sci pline regul ations.

I will keep you informed of any devel opments in this regard. "

So, I think is the word "finalising" somewhat premature, I suppose, at that stage?
A. I would accept that.

126 Q. Okay. And so, you are telling him that you're going to again be pressing on. This now has brought us in to effectively January of 2014. I suppose here we can see where Mr. Barry's complaints are building up with regard to delay, do you accept that that's the reality ${ }_{11: 53}$ of the situation?
A. I'm sorry?

127 Q. That by December 2013 he is complaining about delay to you?
A. Yes, he is complaining about delay.

128 Q. Okay. Now, in January 2014, you appoint Inspector Paul O'Driscoll to come on board from Clonmel Garda Station, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

129 Q. You appointed him under the disciplinary regulations and I think it is not really until the 15th January where you're effectively told that you are to press on with the criminal and discipline investigation by Assistant Commissioner Nolan, isn't that right?
A. Sorry, on the 15th January?

130
Q. On the 15th January 2014. So we're now in January 2014?
A. I don't believe on the 15 th January '14 that -- if I could see that document, $I$ don't believe --
Q. We will open it, 1117, please.

CHA RMAN Could we see the date of that letter?
MS. MEGRATH It's 15th January.
CHA RMAN If you scrol1 down. 15th January. Is it 25th January? 15th January. Thanks very much.

132 Q. MS. MEGRATH Sorry, that is my error, that is not a 1etter to you?
A. No.

133 Q. You were copied on this letter, I think?
A. That's correct, yeah.

134 Q. This is a letter from your appointing officer to HRM and it says there in the middle paragraph:
"Chi ef Superintendent Kehoe has queried whet her or not
she is compromised in continuing the criminal / di scipline investigation which is al most two thirds complete..."

Again, would you accept, chief superintendent, is that a generous description of where the stage of the criminal/discipline investigation was at at that stage?
A. I would accept that it probably wasn't as advanced as suggested there.
135 Q.
He seeks advice "as to whether Chi ef Superintendent
Kehoe should be replaced in this discipline/ criminal investigation at this time based on the original advice I sought in this regard on the 4th January 2013." so it does seem to suggest that by the beginning of 2014 the issue continues to rumble on, is that right?
A. That's correct.

136 Q. In relation to you. And, in fact, you say in your statement that it wasn't until the 2nd April 2014 that you were notified by the assistant commissioner to continue with the criminal investigation, is that right? Now, I know you pressed on in the interim, but effectively when it came back from the appointing officer, it was April, is that right?
A. If I could say on the 2nd April was my formal notification, but I had spoken with the appointing February 2014 in respect of the matter.
137 Q. Okay. I think you have journal notes for that meeting at 1119, if we can look at those. Again, during his
evidence -- if we can look at this in a little bit of detail because Mr. Barry took issue with some language in these notes. Effectively we'll start with the first one, the first note of the 19th February 2014, you say:
"At 7pml spoke to assi stant commi ssi oner, Sout heastern Regi on, and advi sed that l was pressing on with the i nvestigati on of Sergeant Paul Barry despite not recei ving any clarity of my query concerning appoi nt ment."

Were you experiencing some frustration at this stage?
A. Well, I was conscious of the fact that $I$ had already made an appointment during the month of January with Sergeant Barry and I was anxious to meet that appointment and I wanted clarity in relation to the matter. So I spoke to the appointing officer on the 19th February 2014, and he advised me to check it with HR to see what the position was. Not being able to get to get Chief Superintendent McLough1in, I then phoned
A/C Nolan that evening and I spoke to him again in relation to the matter. I asked him had I authority to continue on, notwithstanding we hadn't got the advices back. And he agreed for to allow me to continue.
138 Q. So effectively, you had raised the issue first on the 9th October 2013, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

139 Q. And is it effectively then correct to say what you say in your next note, is that everything had been parked
during all of that period, is that right, you used the word parked?
A. I used the word parked in the context that it hadn't progressed pending the outcome of the query, the clarification that was sought in relation to 14(5). you had submitted the bullying and harassment, your report in May 2013, nothing substantively really has happened to this date effectively, is that right?
A. That would be fair.

141 Q. You say in the next note, on 20th February, the following day, you met with Sergeant Barry by appointment, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

142 Q. And he had his AGSI representative with him, isn't that 11:58 correct?
A. That's correct.

143 Q. Okay. You explained that you had "....parked the criminal investigation, di scipline investigation for advi ce under the regul ations, as I was concerned that 11:59 in vi ew of the fact that I conducted and made findi ngs in the investigation into the alleged bullying and harassment, sexual harassment policy, that a question may arise by himor other party, Superintendent Comyns, that I was not impartial."

And then you said:
"I asked him Sergeant Barry, if he had any --"

Sorry, I am paraphrasing, I should don't that.
"Any difficulty with me continuing the investigation under the criminal/di sci pline aspect."

Okay. So, to be fair to you, you said on the 19th to the appointing officer you were pressing on, you meet Mr. Barry, you tell him you had parked it but now you were continuing, is that right?
A. That's correct.

144 Q. You use the word continuing?
A. Yes.

145 Q. You said then, and let's just stay with that note:
"He sai d that he had not --"

So this is he had no objection to you continuing, is that right?
A. That's correct.

146 Q. okay "but was annoyed that I had parked the i nvesti gation for some months without informing himof my deci si on to do so."

Now, what do you say to that?
A. I accept the fact that I didn't speak or didn't consult with him until maybe the end of that year in relation to the matter, but at all times $I$ was expecting an earlier response to the query that $I$ placed in relation
147 Q. And he said to you, he said:
"He al ways understood that I was running both
investigations in tandem I said l did not."

Now, this may seem to conflict with your earlier evidence, that you always saw yourself as carrying out paralle1 investigations. So what do you say to that?
A. That was my initial -- as I said, when I initially got this investigation to do, it was my intention that it would run as a parallel investigation. In other words, the bullying and harassment would have to take precedence in the context of the timeframe and, therefore, Detective Inspector Leahy was appointed at the outset to conduct enquiries. And my thinking was then, that as soon as the bullying and harassment was completed, that al1 the personne1 that were appointed could concentrate on the criminal/discipline aspect of it. Therefore, it would be continuing in that sequential order. But, as I say, the bullying and harassment was always going to have to take precedent over the my criminal/discipline, for my functionality in relation to it.
148 Q. His statement there, that he always understood they were running in tandem, was that a fair understanding of the position by him?
A. Yes, it was.

149 Q. But you say in your notes "I said l did not"?
A. No, I didn't -- I wasn't able to bring both of them to a conclusion at the one time, obviously. As I say, one had to take precedent over the other from a decision-making process.
okay. You say "I inf ormed hi m that I i nvestigated the bullying and harassment compl ai nt under the policy initially as it concerned ei ght grounds and the policy governing the same imposed a strict timeframe from instigation of proceedings. It was my intention to compl ete the criminal/di scipline aspect and to this end 12:02 I did appoint D/Inspector WIIIam Leahy to carry out i nvesti gations and obtai $n$ statements fromwitnesses."

And you explained "I was not at the juncture of deal ing with the substantive parties, i.e. Superintendent
Comyns and the connection, however the latter was spoken to by D/Inspector and apparently not cooperating presently."

Now, that was what we opened earlier, that was the previous August you knew that, is that right?
A. That's correct.

151 Q. So again at this stage you're saying that there's no contact with substantive parties by this stage?
A. No, there wasn't.

152 Q. February 2014?
A. That's correct.

153 Q. You say at the end, you say:
"We concl uded the meeting cordially and he said he could contact me if he had any issues. I said I would endeavour to expedite the investi gation without compromising on its thoroughness."

And in fairness to you, I think repeatedly that was something that you made very clear to him, is that right?
A. That's correct.

154 Q
okay. Now, in relation to that then, I think there are 12:03 letters which I just might ask you to have a quick look at. He writes to you after this meeting at page 1207, on the 20th March, so this is a month later. Now, this has already been opened by Mr. McGuinness to Mr. Barry, but this is him saying still, he's maintaining the position on the 20th March, if you go down to the second paragraph, he says, he's referring to your meeting. Midway down:
"I expressed my surprise that you would not investigate 12:03 the sexual compl ai nt at the same time as the bullying compl ai nt due to the serous nat ure of the sexual complaint. Chi ef Superintendent Kehoe made it clear once agai $n$ that you never intended to deal with the sexual compl ai nt until the bullying compl ai nt and its appeal were final ised and you apol ogi sed for not making this clear to me at the outset."

Is that a correct reflection of your conversation?
A. Yes, it would have been a correct reflection of the conversation in the context, as I explained already, that I couldn't deal with both of them at the same time, one had to take precedent over the over. The bullying and harassment was taking precedent over the criminal for the purpose of decision-making. I think he brings it up again in the next paragraph that you had told him that it was a complex investigation that required parallel investigation under the Garda policy and procedures, the bullying and 12:04 harassment policy effectively, is that right?
A. That's correct.

156 Q. Now, he goes on to say in the next page, the second paragraph, he says:
"Your i nvesti gati on to date under the Garda Sí ochána di sci pline regul ations 2007 has not been parallel or expeditious and is contrary to what you promised me on the 12th March 2013. It is exactly one year later now and I would appreci ate an expl anation as to why you di d 12:05 not conduct this investigation in the manner whi ch you alluded to in your letter to me of the 12th March 2013. "

Now, what do you say to the Chairman about that?
A. I don't accept the full content of that last correspondence. I certainly set out to conduct a paralle1 investigation at the outset. I appointed the detective inspector to do so in the context of the
criminal. I dealt with the bullying and harassment given the sensitive timeframe. And that's how I went about my business at that time. Unfortunately I couldn't have anticipated the other difficulties that arose as a consequence of that.

157 Q. But I mean, you're clearly at odds with each other. He has taken a certain position in relation to how they should have been investigated or conducted, isn't that right?
A. I'm sorry, I don't understand the question.

158 Q. He has taken the position that they had not been paralle1 or expeditious and it was contrary to what you had promised him?
A. Yes, no, he took that position, but I don't hold with that view. I hold with the view that at the time of appointment I certainly conducted a parallel investigation for a period of time.
159 Q. Okay. Now, in relation then, you reply on the 9th Apri1 2014 and your reply is at 1210. And again, this was previously opened by Mr. McGuinness to Mr. Barry on 12:06 Day 177 . This is where you come back to him with a more detailed report and he does accept in his evidence that this gave him some comfort. You tell him -- you outline in 1 to 10 what has been happening and you say at the bottom of page 1211, the next page, that "It would be incorrect to interpret that a parallel investigation has been inactive. However, it would not have been possible for me to interview Superintendent Comyns on both the human resource policy issue and al so
on the di sci pl inary issue, as a di stinct difference appl ies in the approach governing both investi gations."

Is that really what the difficulty was in essence?
A. We11, as I pointed out, both investigations were running paralle1 for a period time and I couldn't make a determination on a criminal investigation that hadn't been fully investigated and send a file to the DPP at the same time I was doing bullying and harassment.
And in relation then to -- he comes back, at page 1214, in July. And again he is complaining at the outset of the letter, he is saying to you -- he's referring to your letter of the 9th April, he says:
"I wish to report that I have not recei ved any progress 12:07 report on the current stat us of this investigation and would like to know how long more this investigation will be del ayed for."

What do you say to that? Do you accept that position that he is maintaining at that stage in July 2014 ?
A. In relation to what point?

161 Q. In relation to the progress report. Would you consider that the progress report was the 9th April?
A. Yes, the progress report was definitely the 9th April.

162 Q. And he says at the end:
> "I would appreci ate an update on the current i nvestigation and a possi ble date for my concl uding
this investigation. It will be two years and two mont hs since I made my initial complaint."

So what do you say to that?
A. Yeah, his point in relation to the lodging of the complaints is correct, but I would point out that my investigation was queried by the fact that $I$ had to make a query in relation to $14(5)$, that's what caused what you could call a time gap in relation to the investigation, but it was being progressed in that context. I don't accept that there was an inordinate delay, I think it was important and I think it was pointed out that it was important to establish that I had proper grounding for the second arm of the investigation.
163 Q. Now, it's during this period of time, I think we have seen in the papers, that there was substantive work started in relation to the criminal investigation in seeking telephonic records, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

164 Q. Around March 2014. If we could look at 2686. This is just an example, I mean we saw a lot of these applications. A number of applications were made under the Communications Retention of Data Act 2011, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

165 Q. And I should say, I should mention that at this stage Sergeant Brian Sheeran has come on board in the investigation?
A. That's correct.
Q. I think he was quite instrumental in relation to this part of the criminal investigation, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

167 Q. And I think you were seeking telephone records for a number of mobile numbers, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. I think you received telephone records from Superintendent Comyns plus Sergeant Barry, but not every request that you made to what you called persons of interest provided their phone records, is that right?
A. I think both the principals to this investigation provided their phone numbers.
170 Q. Both principals?
A. Yes.

171 Q. But other parties that you were requesting records from did not, is that right?
A. To my knowledge, $I$ don't -- I'm not quite sure if that's correct.

172 Q. Okay. But we'11 see here at the top of that page, at this stage the request for the telephone data, you're being told that the data is no longer available in respect of a particular number that a request that had been made?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. I think Sergeant Barry observes in some papers that were provided to this tribunal that was one of the aspects of the complaint in relation to delay, that this situation arose, what do you say to that?
A. Well, it was unfortunate that it happened as it did but it is unavoidable in the context the query took as long as it did to come to fruition. But, as I say, we applied for the telephone data, it was outside of time and we quickly corrected that by seeking biliing instead.

174 Q. Okay. And what would you say to the fact that should this telephone data have been applied for many months previously?
A. It couldn't have been in the context of -- that was the progress that we made in relation to the investigation. As I say, by the time Detective Sergeant Leahy had 1eft, he had been doing this investigation, he had left the division, I had made strenuous efforts to have him returned to assist in this investigation. Not being able to do so, I then had the query in relation to the 14(5) and by the time that was clarified we were in a situation where once I applied for that data under the Data Act we weren't able to get it and we quickly corrected it by seeking the billing and got the details 12:12 from the billing.

175 Q. Okay. Now, I think at this stage in relation to the request for billing, we know that a billing request went to Superintendent Comyns. I think Superintendent

Comyns at this stage was also raising issues with regard to delay, is that right?
A. Well, he was raising issues in relation to status and was concerned about delay.
176 Q.
We don't have to open that, it's page 796 and 797 , I think you go back to him and you say -- we might look at 797. You go back to him acknowledging his letter where he had raised concerns about the delay in the investigation and this is at 797. So we're still -we're in the middle of 2014 at this stage. You say to him:
"I fully accept that these matters have been ongoing for some length of time and lill endeavour to ensure that all matters are dealt with as expeditiously as possi ble."

So, I think again in fairness to you, I think you are acknowledging that there's an issue with the ongoing nature of matters, is that right?
A. That's correct.

177 Q. Okay. So then, as you say, you outline in your statement, you say that there was ongoing monitoring, several avenues were explored, and this is in your statement, you say that you got technical data from
phone billing of suspect and persons of interest, fingerprint analysis, interview of witnesses. And I think that's clear from the file that went to the DPP's office, there was an extensive analysis of telephonic
records, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And again, Mr. Murphy would have gone through a lot of the covering of the DPP report at page 2823, I am not going to do that again, but it was a very extensive file and I think Sergeant Sheeran had a significant role in helping you collate all that material, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
A. That's correct.

182 Q. And you outline in your statement, and my colleagues can look at it in more detail if they wish, but you outline in your statement that you were then dealing with Superintendent Quilter in relation to his phone evidence and interview, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. the connection in relation to similar requests, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

184 Q. And again, on Day 179, it is Mr. Barry's contention, at page 31 of his evidence, that this should have been done at least 12 months, if not more, previously, what do you say to that?
A. I don't agree. The process was the process. We dealt with it as expeditiously as we could. As I say at the outset and I have said it already this morning, that it was unavoidable, that the documentation I received from A/C Twomey was the catalyst for me making an enquiry under 14(5), it took as long as it took. I didn't delay the investigation, $I$ progressed the investigation at the earliest opportunity when I got clearance to do so.
185 Q. Would it be fair to say, you do write a letter, I should have opened this actually, just the previous October, and it's at page 2729. It's 2nd October 2014. Now, sorry, I had jumped into 2015, but near the end of 2014 you're writing to your appointing officer and you say -- you're outlining an update, you're telling him Superintendent Comyns has been interviewed, he's cooperative, however you're saying a number of further statements must now be obtained by way of corroboration of facts. You go on to say:
"While my earlier indi cations are that this matter be concl uded on bef ore 30th September 2014, in the light of the new inf ormation lill require an additional period to interview pertinent witnesses."

And that's effectively what happened in 2015, is that right?
A. That's correct.

186
Q. You say:
"I amacutel y aware that this has been a lengthy i nvesti gation. Nonethel ess it continues to be hi ghly prioritised by me on a weekly basis in an effort to ensure its compl etion while not compromising on its t hor oughness."

You say:
"It is earnestly anticipated the file will be with the DPP withi $n$ one month. "
A. That was an ambitious timeframe, that couldn't have been met.

187 Q. Okay, and that was October 2014?
A. Yes.

188 Q. But I think, I suppose it reflects your approach and frame of mind at that time in 2014?
A. Yes, indeed.

189 Q. Now, in relation to, as you say, we go into 2015, you have the interviews, you have the technical data, we should -- I should recall, it was something that came up again during Mr. Barry's evidence, when he was meeting with Inspector $0^{\prime}$ Driscoll in the latter part of 2014, I think Inspector O'Driscoll does notes also that Sergeant Barry is very vocal at this stage about the
delay in relation to matters, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

190 Q. I mean, we don't have to accept the inspector's notes, it's at page 5383, just for reference, but he is vocally complaining at this stage in relation to how long everything is taking, isn't that right?
A. No, I accept that.

191 Q. okay. Now, as you say, into 2015 the various interviews are carried out, requests for fingerprints, and I think it culminates in August 2015 with the submission of the file to the Director of Public Prosecutions, isn't that right?
A. That's right, the 28th August.

192 Q. 28th August 2015, and that file is at 2823. And again, Mr. Murphy looked at the covering letter, if you look on the next page, and flick down through the covering report and the subsections, the level of work that went into that file I think is evident on the file?
A. That's correct.

193 Q. Now, I think you were awaiting DPP directions and you got those on the 17/11?
A. 17th November.
Q. 2015. Now, what I want to ask you is this, chief superintendent: At this stage at 2015 the file has been submitted to the DPP's office, would it be fair to 12:18 say to you that at this stage with regard to the disciplinary matter it has effectively been -- has that been parked, to use the word you used yourself?
A. It would be normal practice to allow the criminal
aspect of it to be dealt with before you take on the discipline.
okay. Would it also be, and it's simply an observation which I might ask for your views on for the Chairman, when the DPP file was submitted in August 2015, in reality was the only matter left the matter of interviewing Superintendent Comyns for the discipline?
A. The only matter --

198 Q. Only substantive matter, sorry, I should say be clear?
A. -- substantive matter left was the discipline.

199 Q. Now, we saw in a letter previously that you had said to Mr. Barry that the interview of Superintendent Comyns for the criminal matter and the disciplinary matter were two entirely different things?
A. That's correct.
Q. So again, are you telling the Chairman that you accept that the only substantive matter at that stage in August 2015 was to interview the superintendent?
A. We11, it was to take statements and interview the superintendent. There may have been other statements to be taken in the discipline aspect of it that weren't in the criminal aspect of it, but the substantive matter was on the discipline aspect of it was

Superintendent Comyns and an interview with him at some stage when we had the discipline file together.
Q. Okay. And can I ask you this, can I ask you to look at -- just before you got the DPP directions, I think you wrote to Superintendent Comyns on the 29th September in 2015, and you sought to have the discipline matters placed in abeyance, pending the directions of the DPP, is that right?
A. That's correct.

202 Q. That's at page 847, we don't need to open it. But he came back to you on the 5th October and we will have a look at that, at 1178. He comes back to you and he says:
"As I have previ ously indi cated, this investigation has 12:20 had a huge effect on my personal and professional life si nce 2012. I wi sh to have all matters complet and final ised wi thout any further del ay. I would be obl iged if you would continue with the di sci plinary investigation in order to bring this to a concl usion."

And that was his view, is that right?
A. That's correct.

203 Q. Would Sergeant Barry have been aware that you were seeking to put matters into abeyance?
A. I can't say.

204 Q. okay. Now, you say in your statement that after this, late October, you wrote to the assistant commissioner, you updated him on the position on the disciplinary proceedings and this is where you sought an additional appointment under the regulations?
A. That's correct.

205 Q. Now, can we look at that, at 1181. Sorry, it's 1180. You say that in the light of the response really from 12:21 Superintendent Comyns, you said you're going to proceed without any further delay. And you refer to the investigation, just at the very bottom there, and this is the complaint by Mr. Barry, you say:
"Withi $n$ that aspect of the compl ai nt, however, Ser geant Paul Barry has al so alleged that having compl et ed his i nvesti gation into the alleged sexual assaul t and submitted it to his district officer."

## Next page

"That within two days he was subj ect to di sci pline proceedings under Regul ation 10 for his failure to be on time for duty despite his expl anation to the contrary."

And you say:
"I amto request an additional appoi nt ment to allow me
to expl ore all avenues of the compl ai nt as set out in the ni nth ground of Ser geant Barry's compl ai nt."

But, of course, chief superintendent, would you agree
that that's not new, that this was effectively clear from day one when you got the papers?
A. Absolutely not new, no.

206 Q. Okay. And you were seeking an additional appointment, you got your additional appointment. Moving on then to $12: 22$ the end of the year, you wrote to Sergeant Barry, you went on to -- I will just get the date of the interview. I think there was a slight delay again, whereby you were asked to call a halt again, is that right?
A. That's correct.

Because civil proceedings had been instituted?
A. That's correct. I think it was by the 9th January I was asked not to proceed because civil actions were being taken?
208 Q. Okay. And on the 25th February you were told to press on?
A. That's correct.
Q. okay. Then you interview the superintendent on the 27/4/2016?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, if we can just look at that. The interview is at page 3120. And if we go along to 3133. 3133. And there, down by the very end, there is the memo of interview, you concluded your inquiries there at the end, you say: That concludes my enquiries into this investigation. 17:25 Superintendent Comyns goes out for a break while you consider the breaches. And at 17:40 you have the result of the disciplinary
investigation and you found him not in breach in relation to all three, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

211 Q. So, it was in one way a very rapid conclusion to a very long process, effectively, would you agree to that?
A. Well, yes and no. I was acutely aware of all elements of the criminal investigation which $I$ was relying on in this discipline investigation.
Q. Now, you then put in your final report on the 12th may to the appointing officer, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q.

I am going to finish up very quickly, chief superintendent, Mr. Barry wrote to the minister, and you will have seen the letters in the brief, they're at page 96 and 104, we don't have to open them, but he made very serious allegations in relation to your investigation and he categorised the delay as a perversion of the course of justice, have you seen that?
A. Yes, I have.

214 Q. What do you have to say to the Chairman about that?
A. I believe I conducted a diligent and very thorough investigation and any elements of delay were justified in the context of making sure that I was properly appointed to conduct all arms of this investigation.
This investigation had three arms to it. It was a very serious investigation, this is a very serious matter against senior officers, it took the time it took. It was very important to me that it was thorough, and it
was thorough. And I covered every aspect. Indeed, up to 2015 I was taking statements on the request of Sergeant Barry in relation to this matter. Now, the Chairman, on Day 179, directly asked Mr. Barry in what way did she target you in this investigation? And he answered, one of his answers was:
"I bel ieve the del ay taking three years to investigate the serious allegation was targeting."

So what do you say to that?
A. I don't believe it was targeting. Under no circumstances did I target Sergeant Barry. All I ever did was to make sure the investigation was thorough at every aspect of it, whether it was the bullying and harassment, the criminal and the discipline. I certainly did not target Sergeant Barry in any shape or form, nor would I.
216 Q. Okay. Thank you chief superintendent.
A. Thank you.

217 Q. If you would answer any questions, please?

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHAI RMAN Thanks very much. Now, who goes first?

MR. PERRY: I'm happy to do so, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Isn't that the formula we have been appointing?
MG. MEGRATH Yes.
CHAN RMAN very good.

## MS. CATHERI NE KEHOE WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. PERRY, AS

 FOLLOMS:MR. PERRY: Good morning, Chief Superintendent Kehoe, my name is David Perry I represent retired Sergeant Paul Barry. I just wanted to be clear, it's probably unnecessary for me to do so because I know that Ms. McGrath covered it at the outset of your evidence as well, but just to be clear, Sergeant Barry has confirmed in his evidence to the tribunal that the only complaint that he is now advancing that relates to you at all is that your investigations took an inordinate amount of time to complaint. So that is issue 6A in the schedule of issues.

There were other complaints that formed the balance of the matters in issue 6 , he's not proceeding with those, I just wanted to confirm before I ask you any questions, you understand that to be the case?
A. Yes, I do, counsel.

Yes. And for that reason, the only questions $I$ am going to ask you touch on the length of time that your investigations took and matters that would appear to be
delay during the course of those investigations, does that make sense?
A. Yes, indeed.

Can I ask you, I suppose in rapid sequence, just a few questions just to make sure I understand certain
fundamental matters about what you said before I get into the nuts and bolts of each of the investigations. So, just to be clear first of al1, am I correct in saying that your evidence is that in effect you conducted three separate investigations; there was the bullying and harassment investigation, there was a criminal investigation and then there's the disciplinary investigation pursuant to Regulation 14 , is that understanding correct?
A. That's correct.

221 Q. Yes. And just in terms of how those investigations took place, each of them were separate, but your evidence has been that effectively you were conducting parallel investigations, is that right?
A. That's correct.

222 Q. But just in terms of how exactly those paralle1 investigations took place, am I right in saying that you made a decision to prioritise the bullying and harassment complaint first, is that right?
A. That's right.

223 Q. Or that investigation first? And page 3519, an extract from the bullying and harassment policy, that was opened to you, you saw what that said in terms of, if a criminal complaint is made that perhaps that should be
prioritised. You made the decision nonetheless in the circumstances to prioritise the bullying and harassment complaint, is that right?
A. No, what I said in my direct evidence and I continue to say, at that time I appointed a detective inspector to conduct the criminal aspect of the investigation. That's where the paralle1 -- I was dealing with the bullying and harassment because of the time span. But at that time, at the time of the appointment, the 26th February, I appointed Detective Inspector willy Leahy to conduct the investigation into the criminal aspect. Hence the paralle1 investigation that $I$ am alluding to here.

224 Q. I will come back to it in terms of what exactly Detective Inspector Leahy did. But, I mean, is this a fair comment for me to make: You certainly appointed Detective Inspector Leahy to do certain things in relation to the criminal investigation, but the majority of the manpower and certainly your focus were on the bullying and harassment investigation?
A. At the outset my focus was on the bullying and harassment and allowing the detective inspector, who is a qualified senior investigating officer, to conduct the criminal.

225 Q. Yes, and in that sense, would you agree with me, that the bullying and harassment investigation was prioritised over the criminal investigation or over the disciplinary investigation?
A. I don't accept it was over it, I accept that it was
done as a parallel investigation at that time.
Q. Yes. Then in terms of the disciplinary investigation and criminal investigation, and again, you can tell me if this is a fair characterisation of the evidence that you have given, I understand from what you have said is that effectively the disciplinary investigation was parked until such a time that the criminal investigation was concluded. Is that a fair summary of what you said?
A. The normal practice is criminal will take precedence over discipline.

227 Q. Yes. Just a final preliminary matter then I want to touch on, just to be clear to make sure I don't have to revisit it again throughout the course of the questions I am going to ask, I think there is probably no distance between us on this, you probably accept that Mr. Barry, or Sergeant Barry complained to you throughout the process about delays that he saw as taking place in the investigations, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

228 Q. Yes. Well, I might just ask you then a series of questions about the bullying and harassment investigation. The first thing I wanted to look at, I just wanted to have a look back at the time limits that are set out in the relevant Garda policy. I know that Ms. McGrath took you in detail through this, I don't need to go in a huge amount of detail back through it. I am going to ask that we look at page 3532, please, and just bring you down to the paragraph that we were
looking at headed -- sorry, Mr. Kavanagh, if you go back up to the paragraph headed "Suitable investigat or will be chosen". So, you had discussed this paragraph with Ms. McGrath and your attention had been drawn to the final sentence, which says:
"The investigator will report their findings within 28 days of the complaint bei ng recei ved at the di visional of fice. "

Isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

229 Q. You had said to the Chairman that essentially the way that you understand that sentence or you understood it at the time, was that that time limit of 28 days commences essentially on appointment of the investigator, is that right?
A. My understanding of it was, the date $I$ got the appointment was the 18th February 2013, and that's the date I commenced, the clock started on that date for me.
Q. Yes.
A. The day I became aware of it.

231 Q. Your reading of the policy is that the time limit of 28 days started on your appointment as an investigator, is ${ }^{12: 33}$ that right?
A. Yes, when I became aware of it.

232 Q. I just wonder and it might not be something that we agree on, but I just wonder if that is the correct
interpretation. I wonder if we might read that paragraph. So, you see it starts off saying that the district officer/chief superintendent will select a suitable investigator. It says that that investigator
should be of higher rank than the complainant?
A. Yes.

233 Q. It deals with possible conflicts of interest, the need for appropriate training and experience, and then the way in which the investigation should be conducted. You see all that, isn't that right?
A. Yes, I do, yeah.

234 Q. And that all comes before this sentence then about the investigator needs to report their findings within 28 days, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

237 Q. Yes. And then it seems to envisage that after the complaint has been received, a suitable investigator wil1 be appointed?
A. Yes.

238

239 No, and it may be an area where blame does not fall on you, the policy is relating to how complaints are to be handled by the organisation as a whole, by An Garda the findings of an investigation on a complaint, that they would be made available or would be returned within 28 days of the complaint having been received?
A. Yes, in normal circumstances, that's what the policy says.
Q. Yes.
A. But --

245 Q. You agree with that interpretation of the policy?
A. We11, yes, the 28 days was an ambitious timeframe for this policy that An Garda Síochána have, it's a very ambitious timeframe. But nonetheless, you can only deal with it from the time you become aware of it. I couldn't possibly have dealt with it in October, when I 12:36 wasn't appointed to it. I was appointed to it from a date, the date $I$ received it I interpreted it, and that's from the date I continued with the investigation.
246 Q. No, absolutely, there's no possibility obviously that you could have dealt with it before you had been appointed to deal with it?
A. No.
Q. I think we couldn't possibly disagree with each other on that. But I think you do agree with me then in terms of what I am saying about the policy, that the policy seems to envisage that 28-day time period would run from the date on which the complaint was actually received and in this case that was the $2 n d$ October 2012, is that right?
A. As I say, I can only say how it was interpreted by me in relation to this investigation.

248 Q. Yes. Mr. Kavanagh, I wonder if you can go then to page 3525. Again, it's something that you already referred
to, I don't need to bring you through it in a great amount of detail. That's the provision of the policy dealing with extensions. I think you'll agree with me that it makes clear that if there's going to be -- if the investigation is going to take longer than that 28 days, it's important, an essential fact that the complainant and the person complained of are both canvassed to see if they have objections to that extension, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

249 Q. So that is what the policy says in terms of time limits and extensions. I just want to move to talk about something a little bit different, and really it's the overall picture here in relation to how long the bullying and harassment investigation took, how long
that all took. Now, I appreciate that your involvement started in 2013 and I'11 talk in a moment about your involvement, about certain things that happened during the course of your involvement in that investigation. But I just want to take a step back for a moment and just take an overall look at the length of time it took to investigate that bullying and harassment complaint. we touched on this already. The complaint was received by HRM on the 2nd october 2012, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

250 Q. In terms of when findings were made and the investigation was concluded, that was on the 30th May 2013, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Overal1, it took about eight months for the investigation to be concluded following the receipt of that complaint, is that right?
A. No, I don't accept that.
Q. Why don't you accept that?
A. Because I was only appointed on the 18th February -sorry, I was appointed on the 11th under discipline, it was part of the discipline, I received it on the 18th, that's the day the clock started for me in relation to the bullying and harassment.
Q. No, no, I fully accept that.
A. Yeah.
Q. But the complaint was received in in October 2012, A/C Nolan is originally appointed to deal with the complaint, isn't that right?
A. That's my understanding, yes.
Q. And then you're appointed at a later point in time, isn't that right?
A. Exactly.
Q. Between all matters in terms of the organisation dealing with that complaint as a whole and reaching a situation where an investigation had been carried out and findings had been made under the bullying and harassment complaint, it took eight months?
A. When that bullying and harassment complaint came into headquarters, I don't know what actions were taken in relation to that. A11 I know is the actions that I took from the time I was appointed.
A11 right. We11, I suggest to you it did take eight
months from start to finish to deal with it. That's in a context where the policy dictates a period of 28 days. I just suggest to you that that is the case?
A. Okay.

And you may agree with me or disagree with me on that. Now, in terms of your own involvement then in the bullying and harassment investigation, you're appointed in February 2013, on the 12th March 2013 you requested an extension from Sergeant Barry, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

We have already seen that document, it's at page 1062, I don't think we need to open it. The request was for an extension of two weeks to 29th March 2013, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

260 Q. I think he consented to that request, he noted that you had been recently appointed and that was the essentially the reason for him providing that consent, isn't that right?
A. That's right.

261 Q. Now, I think the investigation was not in fact completed though by the 29th March 2013, is that right?
A. The investigation process only was completed by the 29th March. The investigation process was completed by then.

262 Q. Your findings had not been generated at that stage?
A. No, my findings, I set out -- I met with Sergeant Barry in early April and I gave him the documentation that I was required to under section 8.6 and I awaited a
response from him. Sergeant Barry took some time to make his submissions. He made a submission within a month, I think it was the 6th may he returned the documentation to me.

Yes. But just in terms of that time limit that we looked at under the policy, I think it is a 28 -day time limit in terms of you reporting your findings, is that right?
A. That's right.

So, I appreciate what you say about the investigation process was complete, but I don't know if you are trying to draw a distinction there, but the obligation was actually to have your findings in, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, but I would have no control over the length of time it would take for any person to make a submission in the matter at that point in time, and was entitled to give -- natural justice and fair procedures would be that they would be entitled to make whatever submissions they wished to make in relation to the matters and have those considered as part of my decision-making process.
265 Q. No, I understand. I think in any event there were no further requests by you for extensions of time?
A. No, there was not.

266 Q. So that wasn't something that was canvassed with either Sergeant Barry or Superintendent Comyns, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can I just ask if you are aware of a certain background
factor in matters. I think in fact it's clear already from the evidence that you have given, that you were aware of matters. I think you're aware that Sergeant Barry had been on sick leave for a period of time, that he had reached a point where he was going onto half pay 12:42 because his sick leave had not been certified as workplace injury, is that right?
A. That's correct. Sergeant Barry made me aware of that.
Q. I think you're aware that in the ordinary course, if someone was going on sick leave and they were saying that that was the result of workplace stress caused by bullying and harassment, the outcome of the bullying and harassment investigation would be of importance in terms of certifying that sick leave as a workplace injury or not, is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So the timely outcome of your investigation was of particular importance to Sergeant Barry, is that correct?
A. That's correct.

Yes. Can I turn then to the criminal investigation, and again, 1 might just ask you just certain preliminary matters to see if there is any distance between us on them. I think without getting into the substance of what was alleged, I think you accept that 12:43 there was a serious criminal allegation made by Sergeant Barry against Superintendent Comyns, is that right?
A. That's correct.

And insofar as there had been a need for prioritisation of the bullying and harassment investigation, that was no longer a factor by the 30th May 2013, is that right?
A. No, yeah, the investigation file for the bullying and harassment went in on the 30th May, that's correct.

273 Q. Yes. In terms of the timeline for the investigation, your appointed to investigate in February 2013, your investigation $I$ think commenced, this is at least how you describe it in your statement, with the appointment of the investigation team on the 21st February 2013, is that right?
A. The 21st and the 26th, yes.
Q. And then that investigation concluded on the 28 th August 2015 with the submission of your file to the DPP via the State solicitor, is that right?
A. That's correct.
A. Approximately.
Q. I just want to see if you accept the proposition that on any analysis that's a very considerable period of
A. Investigations take whatever time they take in the context of what is required of them. This investigation was a very serious investigation, as you
correctly say, against a senior officer. Every aspect of the complaint was thoroughly investigated. It took the time it took in the context of having to analyse critical data, which took a considerable period of time to do. It was essential to do it as thoroughly as possible, to make sure that every aspect of this investigation was done to the highest standard and that's what I set out to do and I did. yes. Now, there are just certain issues arising during the course of the criminal investigation that I wanted to touch on. I suppose a lot of my focus is going to be on what happened during the course of the first year of the investigation, so from February 2013 up until February 2014. And I just want to deal first of all with issues that arose with Detective Inspector Leahy. so, just in terms of the timeline here, on the 21st February 2013, I think some members of your investigation team were appointed. So that was Superintendent Pat Lordan, Detective Inspector William Leahy, Detective Garda Mary Gilmartin, they were all appointed on the 21st February 2013, is that right?
A. That's correct.

278 Q. And then I think you further appointed two members on the 26th February 2013, so that was Sergeant Susan o'brien and Detective Sergeant James white, is that right?
A. That's correct.

279 Q. On the 26th February 2013 then you had a meeting with your investigation team and I think during the course
of that meeting Detective Inspector Leahy was tasked with carrying out enquiries into the criminal matter, is that right?
A. That's correct.

280 Q. Can I just confirm my understanding, that no one else who was in your investigation team was tasked with carrying out enquiries into the criminal matter or doing anything in relation to it?
A. No, that wouldn't be correct. He was appointed as the lead investigator. He was a senior investigating officer, he was trained in this area. He was my detective inspector for the Tipperary division. I selected people that had good qualifications in order to conduct this investigation. That's the seriousness I took about this investigation. Detective sergeant white was also available to the detective inspector at the time, as was other members, if the need arose. But he was the lead investigator and that's why he was appointed and he was appointed under 14(7), because he could do criminal and discipline with me.
281 Q. Yes. Detective Inspector Leahy was given --
A. Yes.

282 Q. -- responsibility for that aspect of the investigation?
A. Exactly, he was the lead investigator.

283 Q. Yes. Now, I think that over the course of 2013 certain 12:47 issues took place with Detective Inspector Leahy's continued involvement with the investigation. And I think, I am referring to him as Detective Inspector Leahy, I think in fact it's because he became chief

Superintendent Leahy, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, he got promoted on the 20 th -- well, he got promoted, I'm not quite sure what date in February, but he got promoted -- sorry, in May, and he was transferred on the 23rd May 2013.
Q. Yes.
A. I wasn't aware of that at the outset when I appointed him obviously.
Q. Yes. I just wonder if we could look at some correspondence in relation to that particular issue?
A. Of course.
Q. It's an e-mail dated 10th May 2013. It's sent by you to assistant commissioner, Southeastern Region, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

289 Q. And what the e-mail notes, it notes your investigation that's being carried out and in the third paragraph it says:
"As part of this investigation Chi ef Superintendent Kehoe di rected Detective Inspector Leahy to undertake enqui ries mentioned in Regul ation 14(5).

In light of the fact that Chi ef Superintendent Leahy, now pronoted, is being transferred to Listowel, a new inspector will be required to assist as part of the i nvesti gation. "

Isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So that was a matter that you were raising to the attention of the assistant commissioner, you raised this issue in terms of Detective Inspector Leahy having 12:49 been promoted to superintendent and having been transferred, isn't that right?
A. Well, hadn't been transferred at that point in time, it was 10th May I think I raised that issue.
291 Q. Yes.
A. Before his transfer.
Q. Yes. Mr. Kavanagh, could you just go up a page, to page 1088. Could we just have the bottom of that page please. I think then that's the -- just there is fine. would you mind just scrolling up a bit. This is the response that you received in any case on the 16th May 2013, and essentially what you're being asked is:
"Is there any reason why Superintendent Leahy cannot complete his investigations commenced in this matter?"

Isn't that right?
A. Yes, that's correct.

293 Q. Mr. Kavanagh, could you scroll up to then the top half
of the page. And this is your response, chief superintendent?
A. That's correct.

294 Q. Where you say that you considered seeking to retain Chief Superintendent Leahy for the completion of the investigation. You say you are minded, however, to seek an SIO from the region for the following reasons. You set out two reasons there and you say, "Should you be of the view that neither of these grounds bar Superintendent Leahy continuing the criminal investigation, l ki ndly ask for permission sought for assistant commissioner, southern region to afford him time to complete this investigation, which is at an early stage." Isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

295 Q. Now, I am sure one of the other lawyers here will point out to me if I have missed something in the papers, but I couldn't see a response to that e-mail in the papers that we have received. Did you receive a response to that e-mail?
A. No, I did not, to my knowledge.
Q. So where was the situation left then at that stage with Superintendent Leahy?
A. I continued to make enquiries in relation to the matter and I spoke with the chief superintendent in Tralee, where he had transferred to, in June of 2013, in an effort to have assistance being given to the investigation. The chief superintendent in Tralee wasn't able to help me further in the matter other than
to give me some number of days for the completion of that investigation, completion of his portion of that investigation. In other words, to tidy up any matters there might be outstanding. But he was attached to Tralee at that stage, $I$ had no influence on bringing him back from a division, a region, at all. The only control I have is in relation to my own division, in relation to personnel.
So if I just understand what you said correctly, the result of your enquiries is that Superintendent Leahy was assigned a certain number of limited days to conclude his involvement in your investigation?
A. That's correct.
Q. And there was no allocation of him to your investigation beyond that, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So, is it the position that from May 2013, is it fair to say something along these lines, that Superintendent Leahy was not a full member of your investigation team or was certainly not in a position to fully participate 12:52 in it?
A. No, Superintendent Leahy then was still a part of the investigation in the context that he had still seisin of the file, the file hadn't been returned, efforts were being made to endeavour to have him back as part of the investigation team. That wasn't successful and, therefore, in July I asked him for an updated report in relation to the matter.

300 Q. Yes.
A. Which I received in August. Yes.
A. So it wouldn't have been May that he finished, it would have been further than that and, as you know, he did endeavour to make some other enquiries during the period of time between May and July.
Q. Yes.
A. Before he returned my file.
Q. Yes. involvement in the investigation from May onwards?
A. I beg your pardon.

304 Q. There were difficulties with his involvement in the investigation from May onwards?
A. We11, after May he wasn't attached to my division.

305 Q. Yes.
A. But nonetheless, as I say, he still had seisin of the file until August.

306 Q. Yes. And when did his formal investigation as part of your investigation team, when did that cease?
A. In August.

307 Q. In August?
A. When he returned the reports and files to me.

308 Q. Yes. Now, it seems, and perhaps I am wrong about this, but it seems from the papers and from the evidence that you have given this morning that no replacement for Detective Inspector or Superintendent Leahy was appointed until January 2014, when Inspector Paul O'Driscoll was appointed?
A. Yes, because it coincided with the documentation I
received from A/C Twomey, in which I sought clarity in relation to my status within the investigation. So that triggered a series of correspondence, which we've already gone through this morning, in relation to my position as part of the investigation team under 14(5) and clarity around that.
309 Q. I will come to that documentation in a moment, but as I understand it, you saw that documentation and those issues came to light in September 2013, when you returned from annual leave?
A. No, on the 12th May I saw them, before I went on annual leave.
Q. I am sorry, I thought you were referring to the appeal documentation?
A. The appeal documentation, sorry the 12 th August, excuse ${ }^{12: 54}$ me. The 12th August, before I went on annual leave.

311 Q. Yes. So sorry, you saw it in August at that stage?
A. Yes.
Q. But it was clear from May, it's clear from the e-mails that you were sending to the assistant commissioner that there are issues in terms of Superintendent Leahy's continued involvement with the investigation?
A. That is correct, but he hadn't been dismissed or taken away from the investigation at that time. As I said to you, he still had seisin of the investigation until 12:54 August of 2013.

313 Q. Would it not have been appropriate, starting in May 2013, to try to secure a replacement for Superintendent Leahy?
A. I didn't need to secure a replacement until I got a definitive answer in relation to that and that was in Ju7y and, as I say, in August I got the correspondence from A/C Twomey.

Yes. Well, were you satisfied with that situation that arose, where Superintendent Leahy was essentially being allocated just a certain limited number of days to continue to have an involvement in your investigation? Was that a satisfactory position from your point of view?
A. It would have been fine had I been able to have control
-- Detective Inspector Leahy was attached to Tipperary division, he resided there, it would have been an ease to him to conduct this investigation on an interim basis with the assistance of the team. It wouldn't have been a difficulty. But the difficulty was that he wasn't released to do that. Inspector O'Driscoll, I think that was 30th January 2014?
A. 30th January, but I met him on the 6th January and on 30th January, before we met Sergeant Barry on the 20th February, he was appointed.

317 Q. Yes. I just, and I promise that I won't continue to push it, but I just want to ask you just some further
questions about what you are saying about how those legal queries that you had held up appointing a replacement for Superintendent Leahy. Essentially, as I understand it, the way that you presented it was that while those difficulties were ongoing, you didn't think 12:56 it was appropriate to appoint a replacement, is that what you are saying?
A. Yes, unless I got clarity in relation to those points.

But do I understand the dates correctly, that you appointed Inspector O'Driscoll on the 30th January 2014, you've told us that you had discussed his appointment with him earlier in the month --
A. That's correct.
-- but, to come back to your evidence from earlier, you told the chairman that you didn't have clarity on your legal queries at that stage and that you just simply in February decide to push ahead with matters?
A. I had clarity on the legal issues on the 23rd December 2013.
Q. Al1 right. So from that point forward, from the 23rd December 2013, you were satisfied in your own mind that you had clarity on the legal issues arising and that you could proceed with all matters?
A. On the 23 rd December I got clearance to go ahead. on the 15th January 2014, I was copied on correspondence. I wasn't given those directly, I was copied on correspondence where the appointing officer sought a second opinion.
321 Q. Yes.
A. But I had met with my -- at that point in time I had met with -- excuse me, I just lost my train of thought there. I met with Inspector O'Driscoll and I had met him on the 6th January, I had spoken to him actually before $I$ went on leave for Christmas on the 23rd December. I met him on the 6th January and we were -he was appointed, as you correctly say, on the 30th January. I had already made arrangements to meet in about that time with Sergeant Barry for the 20th February. That arrangement was in place. And on the 12:58 15th January I received a notification, which I was copied on, in relation to that matter. I didn't take any action with it other than the fact this process was already on and I was expecting to hear from the appointing officer in relation to the matter prior to 1 12:58 meeting with Sergeant Barry. When I hadn't on the 19th February, I made those enquiries, as I set out this morning.
322 Q. Yes.
A. And that was the chronological order of how it occurred.
Q. Yes. Just in terms of the involvement of other personnel in the investigation throughout the course of 2013, I think a note that you make in your statement, and it's at page 932 of the materials, we don't need to 12:59 bring it up on the screen, but you say that in the course of 2013 other members of your investigation transferred as well, is that right?
A. That's correct. Superintendent Lordan transferred and

Detective Garda Mary Gilmartin transferred.
324 Q. Yes. So they ceased to act in the investigation as well?
A. They ceased to act and, therefore, I brought in new people into the investigation: Sergeant Brian Sheeran ${ }_{\text {12:59 }}$ and Superintendent O'Driscoll. James white remained part of the investigation.
Q. Yes. Chairman, I see it is just coming on to one o'clock, I was going to move on to new matters. CHA RMAN Thanks, Mr. Perry, if that is convenient for ${ }_{12: 59}$ you, not a problem.

MR. PERRY: Yes.
CHA RMAN Very good, we will say two o'clock.

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

CHA RMAN Now everybody ready? Now, Mr. Perry.
326 Q. MR. PERRY: Good afternoon, Chief Superintendent Kehoe.
A. Good afternoon, counsel.

Where we left off before lunch, we had been talking about detective inspector, who became Superintendent Leahy. I want to ask you about the update that he provided to you in respect of the things that he had done during the course of the investigation. And I just before we turn to the substance of that document, just in terms of you receiving the document from Superintendent Leahy, the position was that you had
wrote to him I think on the 24th Ju7y 2013 and the 4th August 2013, asking him for an update in terms of what he had done during the course of the investigation, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. That's correct, Chair.

And I presume the reason that you were writing those requests was because he hadn't been updating you in terms of what had been taking place during the investigation?
A. Well, not necessarily. And it's very hard for me to recal1. It's nine years ago. But, I do believe that he had indicated that he had taken some statements. But I hadn't got the up-to-date position, as you correctly say, until $I$ received that report.
329 Q. Yes. And I think just the date at the top of that document, it's 9th August 2013. I don't think any issue arises in respect of that.
A. No, the 9th August, I would have got it maybe a couple of days after that.
Q. Yes. It seems to be stamped?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr. Kavanagh, would you mind just scrolling up so we can see the date on the stamp. It seems to be stamped 13th August 2013?
A. The 13th, that would be the date I received it.

332 Q. That would be the date that you received it?
A. So he would have sent it from his offices on the 9th.

333 Q. Yes. Just in terms of this document, Superintendent Leahy sets out the things that he did during the course
of the investigation. Mr. Kavanagh, would you mind just scrolling down, and you can just pause there, if you didn't mind. He sets out the identity of various different witnesses that he interviewed, is that right?
A. That's correct.
we can see the date. The dates on which those statements were taken by Superintendent Leahy, they all appear to be dates in March and April 2013, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

335 Q. And the last one in time is the 25th Apri1 2013, that was an interview with Garda Henry Ward, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And I think then in the remainder of the document Superintendent Leahy summarises contact that he had with the connection on the 29th July 2013 and the 31st July 2013, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

And he essentially, we can go into the details of it if required, but I think in broad thrust what he said happened was that he spoke with the connection by phone and he was trying to make arrangements to meet the connection, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

338 Q. And he ultimately concluded saying that he could not progress the voluntary interview with him at this point in time, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

339 Q. That was the extent of the update that you got from

Superintendent Leahy in terms of the things that he had done during the course of the interview -- or the investigation?
A. That's right.

340 Q. Isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

341 Q. You made a remark earlier in your evidence to Ms. McGrath that you were disappointed in the level of progress that Superintendent Leahy had made during the course of the investigation, is that right?
A. That's correct.

342 Q. Had you expected that he would do more within that timeframe that he had to progress the investigation?
A. We11, I said it in the context of the seriousness of the investigation, I was hoping that, yes, more would have been done by the team, not just by the detective inspector, but by the team at that particular time. I hadn't got an update in the previous month, so it was in that context, I was just hoping that there was more had been done in relation to the investigative process.
343 Q. You would have had an expectation that more would have been done to progress the investigation?
A. Yes.

344 Q. Given the amount of time that was available?
A. To be fair, it wasn't going at the same speed as I would hope. But then, I could understand also, and it has to be justified by the fact that he had moved, he was my detective inspector, before he moved he would have a lot of work to do. These weren't dedicated to
this matter, there were other jobs that they had and other portfolios as the detective inspector would have had at that time before he left. So he went on transfer. He had seisin of the file. He was hoping to come back, as I said already, to the division to continue this investigation, it didn't occur, and therefore I sought the report to see what the status was in relation to how things had been progressed in the interim.

345 Q. Yes. There were ultimately a number of steps taken in the investigation, including obtaining phone evidence, fingerprinting of documents?
A. Yes, fingerprint.
Q. Statements were taken from some further witnesses as well. Steps in relation to all those matters could have been taken in 2013, is that fair?
A. No, I don't think that's fair and I don't think that's correct. Quite a significant number of statements were taken in 2014 and '15 in order to progress this investigation.
347 Q. Yes. Am I correct in saying that just from this point in time, the next substantive step taken in the investigation was when you met with Sergeant Barry on the 20th February 2014?
A. That's correct.

348 Q. So is it the situation that a number of statements are taken, the last one in time is taken on the 25th Apri1 2013, is that right?
A. That's correct.

349 Q. There are two phone calls between Superintendent Leahy and the connection in July 2013, and then the next step taken in the investigation is you meeting with Sergeant Barry on the 20th February 2014, is that right?
A. Yes. There was an interim period, which I outlined this morning, in relation to the clarity around my status within that investigation. Yes. But there we have it. In terms of what I've outlined, that's a summary of all the investigative steps that were taken in the criminal investigation between February 2013 and February 2014?
A. I can't speak for Detective Inspector Leahy and what steps he took within that investigation, that's the report I am relying on and that's the report I had when I was preparing my statement in this matter.
351 Q. Yes. Well, on getting this report and feeling that disappointment in the level of progress that had been made, did you consider asking anyone who was part of the investigation team to progress matters further, to do that as a matter of priority?
A. As I said, the timeline in relation to all matters, as I outlined this morning, was the fact that from the time I got that report, immediately I also got the report from A/C Twomey, which was the catalyst for causing further enquiries to be done in relation to my status. That wasn't clarified until the end of December 2013, and I immediately took steps then to meet with Sergeant Barry and, as I spoke this morning, then there was the 15th January report that I was
copied on that caused further clarity to be made and on the 20th February I got -- the 19th February actually, I got clearance and I met on the 20th February. I have given this outline already this morning in relation to it.
Q. Yes. No, absolutely, you have. I don't mean to --
A. Yeah.

353 Q. -- be getting you to repeat yourself, that is certainly not my intention?
A. No, no.
Q. Can I just ask this in relation to the investigation, I am going to come on to ask you about the efforts that you made to clarify your position and matters of that nature. Those matters are ongoing for a period of time, is there anything stopping the members of the investigation team going off and continuing to investigate the matter while you take time to clarify your position and whether you can continue to act?
A. well, as lead investigator it was either going to -- it was my decision to take this issue and I would have -it would have caused perhaps a difficulty in relation to whether it would have been a new investigation team that were going to do the criminal and discipline.
355 Q. Yes. But say, for example, in August 2013, obviously a number of members have moved on, Detective Sergeant white is still around, is that right?
A. Detective Sergeant white is still around, yeah.
Q. Is there anything stopping Detective Sergeant white going off and continuing to interview witnesses, trying
to set up interviews, obtain phone evidence while you're spending time trying to clarify your position? Is there anything stopping that from happening?
A. That didn't occur to me. I took the decision to make these enquiries myself in relation to -- as a lead investigator, otherwise, I was going to be part and parce 1 -- Detective Sergeant white would have taken his instruction from me from time to time. So I was still going to be part of an investigation that I might not have been properly before, that I mightn't be properly appointed to at that particular time. That clarity was required.
357 Q. Yes. We really are bleeding over into the next issue I wanted to talk about?
A. Yes.
Q. Which is this period where you're trying to clarify your position?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.

359 Q. But I think the way that you characterised it earlier in your evidence was that effectively you had a situation where between August 2013 and February 2014 you had a situation where -- I think the proposition you agreed with was that nothing effectively happened substantively, is that correct?
A. Well in relation to -- from the time that I sought the clarity, I was waiting for that clarity to be obtained to give me clearance to go ahead, properly to go ahead and to deal with this matter, if I could.

360 Q. Yes. I just want to ask you about the issues that
arose and how they arose. So, just to make sure I understand this correctly, in terms of the first issue that arose, the position was that you receive Sergeant Barry's papers appealing your determination in his bullying and harassment investigation, is that correct?
A. That's correct. You read the contents of that and you were concerned that having read that, that you had somehow been compromised then in terms of investigating the criminal or disciplinary matters, is that right?
A. Yes, to a degree, but also $I$ was concerned in relation to $14(5)$ of the discipline regulations, which says the deciding officer should have no -- in any capacity would be involved in a previous aspect of the case.
Q. Yes.
A. Therefore, I was concerned that I had already made an adjudication on the bullying and harassment and, therefore, I interpreted that as being a previous aspect of the case and $I$ asked for clarity in relation to that. So yes, to a degree, A/C Twomey was the catalyst, that report was a catalyst for me asking those questions but it was under 14(5).
Q. Yes. We11, that's the exact point that I wanted to touch on. So, I wonder could we just look at page 1101, please. So, this is your letter of the 9th October 2013, where you raise certain issues with A/C Nolan, isn't that right?
A. That's right.
Q. But the issue that you raise, could we just go down to
the next page, 1102 , you say there:
"Having revi ewed the content of this document --"

You're referring to the appeal grounds.
" -- I amfirmhy of the view that to continue with the criminal investigation as directed by you would be prej udi cial to any findings in the case."

Isn't that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. What you're referring to there is that you feel you might be compromised by having read the appeal document?
A. That's correct.

366 Q. You don't refer to having a concern about --
A. 14(5).

367 Q. -- that your appointment might not be correct under Regulation 14(5), isn't that right?
A. No, I didn't cite it there. Therefore, later on, when I got the full instruction in November 2013, I realised that that wasn't cited in the report, even though that's what I meant, that it was a previous aspect of the case, and I sent it back for that clarity.
368 Q. Yes. Well, I think you're getting to the point that I intend to get to, but just for completeness, can we look at 1106. This is your letter of the 31st October 2013. Essentially you have been asked to provide
specific reasons for consideration to be given to the appropriateness of you not continuing with the investigation. we can go through the letter, but do you agree with me that again, the issues that you raise in that letter are all issues in relation to you having seen the appeal grounds and you don't mention anything about the appropriateness of you deciding on the criminal investigation, having already decided on the bullying and harassment investigation?
A. I think I've just addressed that in my last answer. That I had omitted to say 14(5) and I sent it back very quickly after receiving instructions on the 18th November, I sent it back within a couple of days and said, I omitted to say 14(5) of the regulations and I asked for the clarity and I got the clarity on the 23rd December.

369 Q. Could we just look at page 1111, please. I think this is the letter that you are referring to, 21st November 2013, isn't that right?
A. Yes. And I said I omitted that.

370 Q. Yes, I appreciate what you say about having omitted it. It appears to be the first occasion in the correspondence on which you raise this issue about your concern about the appointment under Regulation 14(5), isn't that right?
A. No. All of the aspect of -- the appeal file was a part of the decisions that I made under the bullying and harassment guidelines and, therefore, I was concerned in relation to the continuance of the
criminal/discipline as a consequence of that. It was 14(5) was always in my mind. I realised I didn't say it and I wanted clarity in relation to the fact that I hadn't said it, and therefore I said I omitted it.
371 Q. Yes.
A. That was the clarity I brought to bear on that minute.

372 Q. All right. I suggest to you, the impressions that you are raising for the first time in this correspondence, you're saying it was always on your mind?
A. Yeah.

373 Q. And you fee1 that you hadn't made it clear in your previous correspondence?
A. That's correct.

374 Q. Can I ask you about that issue though, wasn't that always going to be an issue? You knew that when you were appointed in February 2013 you were being appointed to conduct three different investigations, isn't that right?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. And we had spoke about this when I commenced my cross-examination of you.
A. Yes.

376 Q. That your intention was that you were going to prioritise the bullying and harassment matter and then go on to criminal matters and other matters of that nature. Surely you knew in early course after your appointment in February 2013, that by necessity you were going to have decided on one matter and then go on to decide another matter. You knew that in early
course after your appointment?
A. That's correct, I did, but I didn't realise I was going to receive the documentation that $I$ received, which was the catalyst for me questioning whether that was appropriate or not, and it was on7y at that time that I 14:15 made that query.

377 Q. Yes. In any event, this is the first occasion it appears in which you directly raise that $14(5)$ issue, do you accept that?
A. The first time that I cited it in papers.
Q. Yes, yes. Now, we have had an exchange just before lunch about how the correspondence progressed from here, $I$ think if I can just cut to the chase in terms of where we left off: You received a letter from $A / C$ Nolan on the 23rd December 2013 --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- telling you to continue the investigation, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

380 Q. And what had you said to me before lunch is that from that point forward you saw no difficulty in terms of progressing the investigation?
A. That's correct, Judge.

381 Q. The position then is that nothing substantive happened in the investigation until the 20th February 2014, when 14:16 you met with Sergeant Barry, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

382
Q. So that period of time, that close to two-month period elapsed, is that right?
A. Pardon.
Q. Close to a two-month period elapsed between you being satisfied that it is appropriate to continue and you actually doing anything in the investigation?
A. We11, I did the appointment and then I got the minute from the A/C again, that minute of the 15th January 2014 caused me some disquiet in relation to whether -was this investigation going to be stopped again. So I wanted clarity in relation to that. But I was continuing to make efforts to make sure I could meet with Sergeant Barry to bring him up to speed in relation to the investigation and $I$ felt that was important to do.
384 Q. Yes. We discussed a lot there, things that happened during the course of the first year of the criminal investigation?
A. Yes.
A. Correct.
Q. Apart from that, very little of substance happened during the course of the criminal investigation up until 20th February 2014?
A. I can't speak for the work that the detective inspector 14:17 did during the period that he had seisin of the investigation, al1 $I$ can say is $I$ relied on that report for the purposes of making my statement here today, this is nine years ago, I can't recall what other
enquiries he did before he made attempts to meet with the connection, I have no idea.
387 Q. Yes.
A. But all I can tell you is, as I cited already, that in August, when I received that report, that was the first 14:17 time I considered whether it was appropriate or not for me to continue with the investigation and I asked those questions. As I say, I omitted to say 14(5) in relation to my documents, I cited that just very quickly at the end of November and I got clarity on the 14:18 23rd December.

388 Q. Yes.
A. And then I went from there.

389 Q. I mean, just in terms of that point that you make about Superintendent Leahy --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and not knowing what exactly what he during the course of the investigation. I mean, I hope this doesn't sound unfair as a proposition, but do you accept you had overall responsibility for the investigation?
A. Absolutely, I do accept that, fully. But bearing in mind, I hadn't got Superintendent Leahy, at that point, or Detective Inspector Leahy, as he was when I was dealing with him, I had -- he had transferred, as I day-to-day basis to talk to him in the context of this matter. He wasn't available to me in the same way as he would have had prior to that. He had transferred.

I was making efforts to have him returned, as I said this morning, and that wasn't successful.
391 Q. Yes. The responsibility as on with you to check in with Superintendent Leahy?
A. Yes.
A. Well, I did do it, but, as I say, it's nine years ago, it's very difficult for me to say with any great degree 14:19 of conciseness what exactly, how many times I checked in with him on that. But of course I was aware of it. I wouldn't have wanted him back if I hadn't -- that I knew he was a fundamental part of this investigation, and he was.
394 Q. Insofar as there might have been a failure by Detective Inspector Leahy to progress the investigation, that is your responsibility, do you accept that?
A. I don't believe there was a failure by Detective Inspector Leahy, and I do accept fully that it was my responsibility to further this investigation.

395 Q. Yes. Now, the investigation obviously did continue then from the 20th February 2014 onwards, it took another year and a half after that to complete I think, is that right?
A. It did. It was a very technical investigation, relying a lot on data and, as you said, fingerprint data, taking additional statements. There was 31 statements altogether I think taken in this investigation and 34
Q. exchanges between us about how certain things could have been done faster or not, 1 am not sure how valuable it is to use our time in that way. So just what $I$ intend to do is just put a blanket proposition to you in terms of what happened from February 2014 onwards. There were various investigative steps that were taken and I suggest to you that they took an inordinate amount of time to complete and they could have been done faster?
A. I disagree totally with you in relation to that matter. This was a very, very complex investigation, it required time, it required a number of pieces of data to be examined. I think it has been accepted that that 14:20 data was very, very useful in this investigation. And it was presented very, very comprehensively.
397 Q. Yes.
A. That didn't happen just by chance. It took a lot of time and effort to do that, and we did that very, very thorough7y. And we exhausted every avenue, indeed up to December 2014 we were taking statements for Sergeant Barry on his request, which we took in 2015. That brought it up to February 2015. So I don't accept that there was an inordinate delay at all in this investigation.

398 Q. Yes.
A. I think it was very, very thoroughly conducted.

399 Q. Just in terms of gathering up the mobile phone
evidence, that's something that you present as being something that took a long amount of time?
A. It did. It took a length of time to do. It always would have taken a length of time to do and you couldn't do it any faster than having to tediously go through that.

400 Q. We11, I just wanted to -- and this is the final thing I want to ask you about the criminal investigation, but I just want to suggest one way in which it could have been done quicker. You had tried to make a request here under the Communications Retention of Data Act 2011 for the relevant phone records, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

401 Q. At the point in time that you made that request you were outside of the time for making it, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

402 Q. Because the records that you sought under the legislation can only be retained for two years, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

403 Q. If that request had been made at an earlier point in time, you would have been successful in securing the records under the 2011 Act, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

404 Q. And I suggest to you that that would have been a far faster way of getting the relevant records than the path that you had to eventually go down in terms of requesting that different parties voluntarily hand over
their records?
A. I disagree with that assertion. Getting the telephone details through billing was by -- didn't make a difference in relation to the time it would take to analyse that data, regardless of whether it came from C \& S or came from our own internal billing through our finances office, which is the way we did obtain it. You still had to analyse that data regardless of what source it came from.

405 Q. Yes. Can I finally then turn to ask you about the disciplinary investigation. There was a preliminary matter that I wanted to ask you about the disciplinary investigation that you conducted. I should say, in terms of what I am going to ask you about, I'm not saying that necessarily you decided it was going to be this way or not. You were appointed to conduct a disciplinary investigation under part 2 of the disciplinary regulations, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

406 Q. And I think part 2 involves an investigation into what's termed in the disciplinary regulations as less serious breaches of discipline, is that right?
A. That's correct.

407 Q. And I think just in terms of how the regulations work, you could also be appointed to conduct an investigation 14:23 under part 3 of the regulations into a serious breach, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

408 Q. There are different sanctions attached to a finding
that you're guilty of a part 3 breach as opposed to a part 2 breach, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

409 Q. And obviously for a part 3 breach there are more serious sanctions attached?
A. Yes, up to dismissal.

410 Q. Who decided that this was going to be a part 2 investigation?
A. Pardon?

411 Q. Who decided that this was going to be a part 2
A. Who decided?

412 Q. Yes.
A. I was appointed by the appointing officer, A/C Nolan.

413 Q. So A/C Nolan decided it was going to be a part 2
A. He appointed me under part 2 of the regulations.

414 Q. So he would have decided that this should be characterised as being an investigation into less serious alleged breaches of discipline?
A. That was the appointment I received on the 11th February.

415 Q. There are ultimately in end three disciplinary allegations here. Obviously the most serious one was effectively an allegation of perverting the course of justice, isn't that right?
A. I'm sorry, I missed what you said.

416 Q. I'm sorry. There were ultimately three disciplinary allegations that you were investigating, is that right?

417 Q. One was clearly a very serious one, which was an allegation that Superintendent Comyns had perverted the course of justice, effectively?
A. Well, one was in relation to interfering with the investigation.

418 Q. Yes. We already had an exchange earlier in terms of the seriousness of that allegation because it overlapped with the criminal investigation?
A. That's correct.

419 Q. I think you accept that was a very serious allegation?
A. Absolutely.

420 Q. Do you agree that that's something that could be characterised as being a less serious breach of discipline?
A. It was investigated -- it was an allegation of serious misconduct and it was investigated as such and a file went to the DPP.

421 Q. Well, can you just explain what you mean, that it was investigated as being an allegation of serious misconduct? You were appointed under Regulation 14, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

422 Q. And under Regulation 14 you're being appointed to conduct a part 2 investigation?
A. That's correct.

423 Q. which is a less --
A. It's a less serious.

424 Q. An investigation into a less serious alleged breach of
discipline?
A. Yes, I was referring to the criminal investigation.
Q. Yes. But your disciplinary investigation was under part 2?
A. That's correct.
Q. The disciplinary investigation had been characterised or had been constituted as being an investigation into a less serious breach of discipline?
A. That's correct. That was the appointment.

427 Q. And what I am asking you is: Do you agree with that characterisation, that what you were investigating as a disciplinary breach constituted a less serious breach of discipline as opposed to being a serious breach of discipline?
A. Having sent the file to the DPP and having received the 14:26 directions, $I$ felt it was appropriate to remain as a section 2 , which is the less serious breach of discipline.
Q. I see. Can you just explain that to us? So you received a direction and that influenced your view in terms of whether or not --
A. Yes.

429 Q. -- this was a serious or non-serious breach?
A. Yes. The DPP directions influenced me in the context that I didn't believe that it was necessary to escalate 14:26 that with the consent of the appointing officer to regulation 3 , which is a serious breach of discipline.

430 Q. Why not?
A. Because I didn't believe that it constituted it,
because I didn't believe the evidence was sufficient to escalate it to a part 3.
431 Q. So are you saying that at the start of your -- during the course of this the disciplinary investigation, before you had reached your conclusion, you thought that the evidence wasn't serious enough that this could amount to a serious breach as opposed to a less serious breach?
A. Sorry, in relation to --

CHA RMAN Is this something that is properly before the tribunal? How is this allegation -- suppose Chief Superintendent Kehoe was wrong, just suppose.
MR. PERRY: Yes.
CHA RMAN How is that within 6A? what notice is she on that this is a matter on which she is likely to be condemned by the tribunal?

MR. PERRY: Yes. I take your point entirely, Chairman. I am going to move off from that issue.
CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Perry, and the other matters have now been dropped, taking an inordinate time to
complete, that's the beginning and the end of the allegation.
MR. PERRY: Yes.
CHA RMAN Isn't that right.
MR. PERRY: Yes.
CHA RMAN I mean, that's what it is that she is facing. Yes.
MR. PERRY: You're absolutely correct, Chairman.
In terms of the timeline for the investigation, the
disciplinary investigation, am I correct in saying you formally commenced that disciplinary investigation on the 21st February 2013?
A. Yes, by putting Superintendent Comyns on notice on the 21st, but the criminal aspect of it took precedence over the discipline, as it would.

433 Q. Yes.
A. Therefore, it was after the criminal was concluded that the discipline commenced in the context of making further investigations.
Q. Yes. The disciplinary investigation concluded on the 12th May 2016, is that right?
A. 12th May 2016, that's correct.

435 Q. Yes. I take your point in terms of the time accounted for by the criminal investigation?
A. Was part and parcet.
Q. The criminal investigation ends at the end of August 2015, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

437 Q. So essentially you're left with -- it takes nine months 14:29 after that then to complete the disciplinary investigation?
A. Yes. Well, it took -- yes, approximately I think maybe six, seven months to complete it.
438 Q. Yes. In total you're talking about a period of three years and three months to carry out that disciplinary investigation?
A. I wouldn't agree with that assertion, Chairman. It took a period of time of two years, two and a half
years to do the criminal investigation and arising out of the criminal investigation the disciplinary investigation was undertaken, relying on documentation from the criminal investigation. So, you know, I don't necessarily take the point that it took three years and 14:29 three months to do the discipline investigation, because I was doing three parts of an investigation over that period.
Yes. Now, Ms. McGrath touched on this already with you in terms of what had to be done during the course of the disciplinary investigation after you concluded the criminal investigation. You remember that exchange that you had with her on that?
A. Yes.

440 Q. I think what you said essentially was that statements had to be taken and then Superintendent Comyns had to be interviewed, is that right?
A. Correct.

441 Q. I just want to touch on the nature of the statements that you had to take. Is this a fair characterisation, that by and large, while had you to take additional statements, by and large they were statements from witnesses confirming the correctness or validity of earlier statements that they had given and giving their consent for them to be used as part of the disciplinary 14:30 investigation?
A. That's correct.

442 Q. They were essentially in the nature of formal statements, is that right?
A. The majority -- from my recollection, the majority of statements would have been statements that were already part of the criminal investigation with consent, as you correctly say.
I just want to be fair to you just by referring to one document, because there's one exception $I$ think to what I am saying there. It's page 3106, please. That's a statement from Garda wall that was taken during the course of the disciplinary investigation?
A. Yes.

444 Q. And this isn't simply a confirmation of something he had said earlier, that effectively appears to be a new statement taken during the course of the disciplinary investigation, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

445 Q. But do you agree with me that beyond that, the rest of the statements that were taken were these kind of formal statements where witnesses were adopting earlier accounts that they had given?
A. I accept that.

446 Q. Yes. So those are the statements needed to be taken. There was then an interview with Superintendent Comyns. And just my suggestion to you is that it took nine months to do all that and that that was an inordinate amount of time?
A. I don't accept it was an inordinate amount of time.

447 Q. Thank you very much.
A. Thank you, counsel. Thank you, chair.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN So basically, just to clarify that, Mr. Perry, what you are saying, what you're querying is the work that had to be done in the discipline
investigation over and above what had already been achieved being investigated. Is that essentially the point you're making?
MR. PERRY: Yes.
CHA RMAN Okay. Now, Mr. O'Higgins, yes.
MR. OHGGN: Thank you, Chairman. Before I commence my questions, can I seek one matter, seek to have it clarified? My request is of Mr. Perry. You're aware, Chairman, that on Day 181, the 27 th May last, the bulk of the allegations were abandoned.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. O H GG NS: Bar 6A, with respect to Chief Superintendent Kehoe.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. OHGGNS: Mr. Perry has maintained on his
client's behalf, in fairness, he's acting within his client's instructions.

CHAN RMAN of course, yes.
MR. O HGGN: Has maintained stoutly the criticism of the delay as alleged.
CHAL RMAN Yes.
MR. OHGG NS: However, 6A is not just delay and what I am seeking to have clarified is, because it hasn't been put certainly to the witness: Is it being
abandoned that she deliberately targeted and discredited Mr. Barry by reason of the delay?

CHA RMAN I hear what you are saying, Mr. O'Higgins, and surely it's a matter for me to draw such inferences as I think are appropriate from a failure to allege straight up to the witness that she deliberately targeted Sergeant Barry. If Mr. Perry wants to make an addition, but I am not interrogating Mr. Perry, I am taking his cross-examination to be what it is, but I have noticed, I have to say, I have observed that there 14:34 has been no allegation put to Chief Superintendent Kehoe that she deliberately victimised Mr. Barry by delaying her investigation. I have noted that.
MR. OHGGNS: May it please you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN So if that is any comfort to anybody, or if there's any suggestion or, indeed, if -- but now that you have raised it, Mr. O'Higgins, you could have assumed that I would have noticed that, but that's -sorry, this is not a criticism of you, but I don't want to be challenging Mr. Perry or putting him in a difficult situation, but if Mr. Perry chose to make an application to return to the matter, $I$ would entertain such an application. And if he's going to do -- but I don't want to put him in a position where it looks as if he's avoiding the situation. So, I am simply going to say what I said to you, Mr. O'Higgins, I think that's the best to do and to leave it at that.

MR. PERRY: I wonder, Chairman, if I can provide this clarification: Just in terms of whether aspects of the
issue are being abandoned or not --
CHA RMAN If you want to come back on that, Mr. Perry, if you want to come back on that, feel free to do so. But I am just keen, I don't want to put you on the spot to feel that you must respond and make some specific allegation that in your judgment you have not chosen to -- I don't want to put you in that situation. MR. PERRY: No, absolutely. I just want to explain Sergeant Barry's position, explain the position -CHA RMAN I don't need you to. Sorry. MR. PERRY: Absolutely.

CHA RMAN Mr. Perry, sorry, you heard what Mr. O'Higgins said. I don't need an explanation. We will come to a time in due course when people can make submissions and arguments. Simple as this:
Mr. O'Higgins says, Mr. Barry's counsel did not put straight up to the witness that she had deliberately victimised his client by delaying her investigation. That's what he said. I said to him, I will draw such inferences as seem appropriate and proper and in light of the evidence and the submissions. But since it happened, since he raised it, in case it was something -- it's not something that I am sure that responsible counse1 would have forgotten, but we have al1 made mistakes in our day, myself as much or more than anybody else.

So I am not looking for an explanation. I am not looking for anything else. All that can be done later.

But if there was a question that you felt you wanted to put or a suggestion that you wanted to make, I said I would give you an opportunity of doing that.
MR. PERRY: Yes. I will just say this: The reason that proposition wasn't put --
CHA RMAN I am not asking for a reason why it wasn't put. I'm sorry, I am not. I am trying to be fair to everybody here. Mr. Perry, have a think -- Mr. Perry, I'm sorry, you're taking instructions. Have a think about this, Mr. Perry.
MR. PERRY: Yes.
CHAN RMN Have a think about this.
MR. PERRY: yes.
CHAI RMAN Can you see my position?
MR. PERRY: No, I can.
CHA RMAN I am not asking you to make the decision for me, but I just want to say, I am not looking for explanations, I am responding to Mr. O'Higgins's comment and I don't want to be unfair to anybody. So at the end of the questioning, if you want to say
please, may I say something else, not an explanation, but ask a question or put a suggestion, I will be sympathetic to it, and obviously that would mean that anybody else could have another go themselves.
MR. PERRY: yes.
CHAL RMAN So, Mr. O'Higgins, proceed. Have a think. MR. PERRY: May it please you, Chairman.

CHA RMAN I don't want to, as I say, put you in the situation where you have a to decide instantly, so take
your time and some back to me, if necessary.
MR PERRY: I am obliged.
CHA RNAN If no application is made, nothing wil1 happen. But submissions can of course be made in due course.

MR. PERRY: Yes.
CHAN RMAN All right.
MR PERRY: Thank you.
CHAl RMAN Now, Mr. O'higgins.

## M6. CATHERI NE KEHOE MAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR

 O H GG NS, AS FOLLOMS:448 Q. MR. OHGGNS: Thank you, Chairman. Dealing then with the question of delay, the allegation of delay, chief superintendent, can you give to the Chairman please, as succinctly as you can, your outline of the breadth and complexity of the investigations, plural, that you were tasked with carrying out?
A. Mr. Chairman, I was appointed, as I have already gone ${ }_{\text {14:38 }}$ through this morning, a very complex investigation, involving three arms of an investigation, requiring different approaches to different aspects of it. There was the bullying and harassment, which was under, as you know, the internal Garda policy, which had a very ambitious timeframe of 28 days, very difficult to achieve that and conduct a number of allegations, 1-8, within that timeframe. I did so to the very best of my ability. I certainly did not sit on that investigation
at any point in time. I think the timeline in relation to it, it speaks for itself. I moved it as swiftly as I possibly could and I submitted a file by the 30th May, some three months after the appointment. As I said already this morning, from the time the investigation is finished from an investigative point of view, that report goes out to the complainant and Sergeant Barry had it for just a period of one month, which fed into the timeline. And I had it for three weeks then, making the submissions on it. So all of those things fed into it, but at no time was it purposefully or inadvertently delayed by me or the team.

In relation to the criminal aspect of it, this was a very, very serious allegation made about a senior investigating officer, which had implications for a second senior investigating officer. I took the time it took in relation to making sure that every aspect of Sergeant Paul Barry's complaint was thoroughly
investigated. It was very, very important. I never suggested for one minute that this would take a backseat or put to one side at no time through that investigation. And if you look through the timeline, Chairman, you will see find that at all stages there was paperwork going one place or another in relation to keeping people informed, including my own authorities and also dealing with a series of matters that Sergeant Barry raised during it, or Superintendent Comyns or
indeed, Superintendent quilter. I dealt with the legal teams and I dealt with the members concerned. All of that paperwork had to be done. It took time. It took effort. We gave it that effort, despite the fact I had a very busy workload myself. This was not the only investigation I had. I had a number of investigations during that period of time and I conducted them all to the very best of my ability.

The discipline aspect of it came after because of the fact that that's the course of action that normally that would take in the context of the allowing the criminal to be determined before you take on the discipline. There's a number of reasons for that and it is a part of the discipline regulations, section 8 . I did that to the best of my ability and I made my determination at the conclusion on the 27th April 2016, and I submitted my file in very early stages, by the 12th May 2016.
449 Q. Chief superintendent, in terms of the necessity to 14:42 interview the various protagonists, what methodology did you follow in relation to that process in preparing for interviews and deciding on what questions to ask and so forth?
A. In relation to the methodology I used, counsel, I relied heavily on the data that we had, particularly the telephone data, which was really important to this investigation, and I received briefing documents from Sergeant Sheeran in respect of that, because he had
done excellent work in preparing those details. And also, as I say, we relied on the statements of witnesses and we conducted the interview in that manner, through a briefing document and from my
knowledge of the investigation.
Q. Yes. You've mentioned from time to time the necessity to comply with fair procedures, that was something uppermost in your mind in relation to not just Sergeant Barry, but also the other parties to the investigation?
A. Yes. Natural justice and fair procedures was at the foremost of my concerns in relation to this matter. These were very, very serious allegations, as I said, and I was at pains to ensure that everybody in this investigation were dealt with in a fair and humane manner, sensitive to the investigation and with the utmost confidentiality given to the parties that were involved.

451 Q. You have mentioned already to the Chairman that in the course of 2013, I think you lost three members of your team, whether it was promotion or being allocated a role elsewhere outside of the division?
A. That's correct, counse1.

452 Q. Superintendent Lordan you mentioned, is that right? He was transferred and also Detective Inspector Leahy?
A. That's correct, counsel.

453 Q. And I think also Detective Garda Gilmartin also transferred to Abbeyleix in April of 2013?
A. That's correct, Chair.

454 Q. Now, in terms of keeping Sergeant Barry updated and its
relevance to the passage of time, did you meet with -obviously the file speaks for itself, there was a the love correspondence to and from Sergeant Barry, but in terms of physically meeting him, over the course of
your investigation did you meet with him?

14:44
A. Oh yes, I did meet with Sergeant Barry on a number of occasions. off the top of my head, I would say I met him maybe three or four times during the investigation.
Q. Yes.
A. And possibly more, but I just haven't counted them.

456 Q. I think just broadly speaking, I see from my own timeline there's dates of the 3rd April 2013, a phone conversation; the 8th April 2013 in person; 20th February 2014; and also December 2014 at Mitchelstown Garda Station. Does that assist in jogging your memory?
A. Yeah, that's correct, all of those times would I have met with Sergeant Barry.
Q. All right. Were you aware at any stage that sergeant Barry had made a protected disclosure?
A. I was not aware until I received the documents in November 2020 that Sergeant Barry had made a protected disclosure.

458 Q. okay.
A. I want to correct myself. It was in November 2020 when 14:45 I received the documents from sergeant Barry. It was correspondence dated 4th September 2020, Chairman, when I was first notified that there was a tribunal of inquiry.
Q. Yes. In terms of --

CHA RMAN Sorry, I am not entirely following that. Sorry, Mr. O'Higgins says when did you become aware that Sergeant Barry had made a protected disclosure?
A. Sorry. That would have been the 4th November, when I received the documentation from Sergeant Barry, from the tribunal. Thank you, Chairman.

CHAN RMAN Thank you.
MR. OHGGN: Thank you. Just in terms of headline dates and many of these will already be noted by the Chairman, but just to frame my question in this way: We know that you completed your investigation into the bullying and harassment and forwarded your adjudication to the appointing officer, that was 30th May 2013, is that right.
A. That's correct, Chairman.

461 Q. You forwarded the file in terms of the second phase, the criminal phase, you forwarded your file to the State solicitor for onward transmission to the DPP, I think that was 28th August 2015?
A. That's correct, Chairman.
Q. And as to when you received back the directions from the DPP directing no prosecution?
A. 17th November.

463 Q. of?
A. 2015 .

464 Q. 2015, thank you. Just in relation to that then and the next phase, the disciplinary, can I ask you just to deal with that timeline at that stage. There is a
process, is there not, of notifying a complainant of the outcome of the DPP's deliberations and there's a right of review, isn't that so?
A. That's correct.

465 Q. Was that something you notified the sergeant about?
A. Yes, I notified them when I received the directions on the 17th November, I think shortly after that I notified all the parties of the outcome of the DPP directions.

So you wrote to Superintendent Comyns, you wrote to Superintendent Quilter and you wrote to Mr. Barry?
A. That's correct.
Q. Around about this time as well, in October of '15, you spoke and raised a concern with Superintendent Nyland regarding your continuing involvement in the disciplinary process, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

468 Q. And you received the DPP's directions via the State solicitor in November 2015, I think you've told us. After that then, I think you've already said in
evidence to Ms. McGrath, in December of '15 you wrote to Sergeant Barry in furtherance of the discipline proceedings. Can you just explain that to me. what was the necessity for that at that stage? I am speaking now about December '15.
A. I am sorry, could you just repeat the question, counse1?

469 Q. Certain1y. So you have now received the outcome from the DPP, there is to be no prosecution, you've written
to the various parties and you told Mr. Barry of his right of review of that decision?
A. That's correct.

470 Q. You then takes steps in relation to the disciplinary process?
A. That's correct.

471 Q. Isn't that right? And you corresponded with various parties, isn't that so?
A. Sorry, yes. That's correct.

472 Q. All right. What was your thinking at that stage? What 14:49 was the purpose of your corresponding with the various parties at that point?
A. I was putting all the parties on notice that I was continuing with the discipline aspect of the investigation and if they wished to add any statements, 14:49 additional statements, or they wanted to interview any further witnesses, which they're entitled to request, I would take those statements.

473 Q. Yes.
A. So I gave them a list of statements and I asked them was that the entirety of them or did they want to add more to them.

474 Q. And as we moved into 2016, I think it's the case that you sought advice as to the appropriateness of your continuance of the disciplinary investigation in light of your involvement in the earlier phases and also the issue about seeing the appeal?
A. I raised the issue again because of an unreported case of Gavin v. Newman, which had connotations or issues in
relation to an earlier aspect of the case, and I brought it up. But at that point in time, Chairman, I was already after being, I think, advised in relation to the fact that there was a civil aspect to this.

Sergeant Barry had raised a matter that -- or sorry, my authorities had raised a matter that Sergeant Barry had instigated a civil action and they asked me to stop the investigation to allow time for them to consider that matter.

475 Q. Yes. Moving the timeline on then into later in 2016, I 14:50 think you entered into correspondence with the appointing officer regarding issues and you also made preparations for interviewing of the protagonists in the context of the disciplinary process?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

476 Q. And I think you conducted an interview with Inspector O'Driscoll of Superintendent Comyns in April of 2016, is that so?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

477 Q. And there was also a process of involving the return of 14:51 exhibits and tidy up matters such as that?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

478 Q. And I think in terms of the submission of your final report to the appointing officer, that was on the 12th May 2016?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

479 Q. As to the sequencing of matters, chief superintendent, could I ask you this: As far as you're concerned, why would the disciplinary process have had to await the
outcome of the criminal process?
A. Because there's a number of reasons, it's provided for in the regulations in relation to the matter, once -had the DPP directed a prosecution in this matter, it may have been of --
CHA RMAN I would have thought criminal preceded discipline in most circumstances, Mr. O'Higgins. Am I out of date on that?

MR. OHGGN: Certain1y, Judge, sorry, the way I
phrased the question and I hope reasonably --
CHA RMAK No, there is nothing wrong with the way you phrased the question. But I just thought, maybe I am wrong, I would have thought that a criminal investigation took precedence over a discipline investigation.
MR. O H GG NS: Undoubted7y.
CHA RMAN I would have thought.
A. That's correct.

MR. O H GG NS: I would respectfully agree.
Q. CHAN RMAN Is that your understanding?
A. That's correct.

481 Q. CHA RMAN And apparently the regulations, I'm sure they do, $I$ just don't remember specifically which.
A. Oh, they do.

482 Q. CHA RMAN But I thought they specifically provided for 14:52 that.
A. Section 8.

483 Q. CHA RMAN But even if they hadn't specifically provided for that, I would have thought you would be in
trouble if you proceeded with the disciplinary investigation.
A. Yes.

484 Q. CHA RMAK And sent to the file to the DPP, I think there would be questions in the house.
A. There would be.

CHA RMAN And people would end up being red faced. MR. OHGG NS: Yes, I will move on from that.

Now, can I ask you to look at one or two documents, please, Chief superintendent Kehoe. The first of these ${ }_{14: 53}$ is at page 109, Mr. Kavanagh, please. And this is I think a letter written by Mr. Barry to the Minister for Justice or to the department at least of the 20th, we see it there on the top right, 20th January 2016. Sorry, it's page 109. If we go back up to the --
that's it there, it commences "Dear Chris" 20th January 2016. If Mr. Kavanagh might scroll down to the last paragraph on this page, please. So this is what it says:
"I wi sh to formally make an allegation to the Mister for Justice that Chi ef Superintendent Kehoe has perverted the course of $j u s t i c e ~ b y ~ d e l i b e r a t e l y ~$ del ayi ng her investigation and by conducting a bi ased i nvesti gation devoid of the morality, sentiment and consci ence and she has conducted thi s sham i nvesti gation without informing the injured party."

First of a11, can I ask you this: Were you notified or
alerted to the fact that this letter would be sent making this allegation against you?
A. No, I was not, Chair.

486 Q. You weren't copied on the correspondence, we can take it?
A. No, I wasn't, Chairman.

487 Q. Does it follow from that, you weren't given an opportunity to respond or rebut the allegation?
A. I wasn't notified in any form and I wasn't given an opportunity to respond, Chairman.
488 Q. If we might briefly have page 46, please. This is the interview Mr. Barry gave to the tribunal in July and August of this year. Sorry, not this year, recently in any event. And we see here that he accuses you of deliberately targeting him but not treating his complaint properly or promptly, is the gist of the allegation. And similarly, on page 48 there's an allegation of a deliberate cover up. We needn't perhaps open them up, but they're there. When was the first time that you were made aware that those serious allegations were being levied against you?
A. I became aware of it on the 4th November 2020, when I received the documentation from the tribunal.

489 Q. We know that in the course of this tribunal, on Day 181, allegation 6B to 6F were abandon, formally, Mr. Barry notifying you of that or providing you with an apology in relation to that withdrawal?
A. No, I haven't, Chairman.

490 Q. Lastly then, chief superintendent, can I ask you, can you, perhaps as succinctly as you might, can you tell the Chairman what effect he is serious allegations had, the making of these serious allegations upon you, chief superintendent?
A. Mr. Chairman, I have 36 years loyal and dedicated service to An Garda Síochána and I retired on the 4th May 2019. As I said, I only became aware of these very serious allegations, some of a criminal nature, when I received the documentation, $I$ had no idea prior to that. I was very disturbed and hurt by the allegations that are totally unfounded and I totally deny. I worked hard and diligently all of my career, from the time I joined the gardaí and from the time I became a sergeant, I never worked nine to five, I worked nine until $I$ finished work, I made sure that everything under my control was dealt with in an expeditious and very well presented files to the DPP on many, many occasions, which I was complimented for.

So this allegation was very, very upsetting and disturbing for me, particularly that $I$ had no knowledge of and particularly at a time when $I$ note that the allegations were made in 2015, while I was continuing to investigate Sergeant Barry's complaints for him. I found that extremely disturbing indeed.
491 Q. Thank you very much.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHAL RMAN Now, who else?
MR. OBRIEN I have no questions.
CHAN RMAN Anybody over there?
MR. GORDON Chairman, Breffni Gordon for
Superintendent Quilter, just to say, I have no questions either.
CHA RMAN Thanks, Mr. Gordon. And thanks for saying hello, Mr. Gordon.

ME. MEGRATH Nothing arises, Chairman. Thank you
chief, superintendent.
CHA RMAK Thank you very much. No questions, no questions, no questions, no applications, very good.
Thank you very much, chief superintendent. Thank you for coming to help us and you're now finished, thank you very much.
THE WTNESS: Thank you very much, Chairman.
CHAN RMAN You're free to go, thank you.

THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

ME. MEGRATH Now, Chairman, the next witness this afternoon is Inspector Anthony o'Sullivan.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much.

# I NSPECTOR ANTHONY O SULLI VAN, HAV NG BEEN SUDRN, WAS DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY ME. MEGRATH, AS FOLLOVE: 

CHAI RMAN Thanks very much, sit down, Inspector

O'Sullivan.
A. Thanks. Good afternoon, Chairman.

MS. MEGRATH Good afternoon, inspector. Chairman, the statement of the inspector is at page 1308 of the brief and the inspector was also interviewed by the tribunal investigators and that interview is at page 5304 of the brief?

CHA RMAN 5304 of the brief.
ME. MEGRATH Yes, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much.
ME. MEGRATH Now, inspector, just starting, as it were, at the very beginning, I think you outline in your interview that you joined An Garda Síochána in 1987, is that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman.

493 Q. And you do say, just taking things chronologically, you do say that you worked with Paul Barry since 1990, is that correct?
A. I think that was a typographical error.

494 Q. okay.
A. I went to Mitchelstown in 1999.

495 Q. Oh, okay.
A. As the sergeant in charge and Mr. Barry would have joined me the following year, I don't know what month, I think it might have been May 2000.
496 Q. Let's go back then and again stay chronological. You started with the force in 1987. You went to Fermoy district in 1994 and you say that you have always worked within that district, is that right?
A. That's correct. I have given 28 years in Fermoy district, I moved around the stations but I have never left the district.

Okay. You came to Mitchelstown in January 1999 as sergeant in charge, is that right?
A. That's correct.

498 Q. As we know, as you've just clarified, you started working with Paul Barry at around that time, is that right?
A. That's correct. I think Paul Barry, Mr. Barry would have been the third sergeant I got. Paul would have been in Dublin, $I$ was in Dublin as well for seven years, from '87 to '94, and I think Paul Barry transferred on promotion, maybe very early 2000.

499 Q. Okay. So you were working in that capacity as sergeant 15:00 in charge until you took over as inspector in Mitchelstown in 2007, is that right?
A. That's correct. Me and Mr. Barry shared the one office for seven years.

500 Q. Okay. And I think initially you would have been the only inspector, is that right, before you were joined by Inspector Joseph O'Connor, have I got that right?
A. I would have been the first inspector. Well, when I went there in 2007 I would have replaced Inspector Pat McCarthy, who got promoted to super. It was later Inspector o'Connor would have joined, maybe 2013 or '14.

501 Q. Okay. So, for the period under consideration by the tribunal you were the inspector in Mitchelstown, isn't
that right, effectively?
A. I was the inspector in Fermoy, which covered the Mitchelstown sub-district.

502 Q.
okay. I think we know also from the papers that Superintendent Comyns came to the Fermoy district as the district officer in July 2010, is that right?
A. That's correct, Superintendent Comyns joined us in 2010, replacing Superintendent Myers.
Q. Okay. So again you worked with him for a substantial period, is that right?
A. That's correct. I worked with Mr. Comyns, I wouldn't have known him before that, but I worked with him for five years.
504 Q. okay. And you were the acting district officer at times, isn't that right?
A. I would be the acting district officer if Superintendent Comyns was doing something else or wasn't in Fermoy Garda Station.

505 Q. Okay. Just to be clear, when you are, when that duty is triggered, precisely, I mean I know it seems clear that if he's on annual leave or on any type of leave?
A. Yeah.

506 Q. You are the acting district officer?
A. And Superintendent Comyns would let me know in advance, I'm not available Thursday, I'm doing something else on 15:02 Friday, and I had a portacabin in the backyard of Fermoy Garda Station, but when I would be made aware that I was acting superintendent, I would go straight to Superintendent Comyns' office in the morning.

507 Q. Okay. So it's simply when he's out of the Fermoy district, you're acting district officer?
A. Yeah. That's correct, Chairman. You only become acting district officer if the district officer is unavailable.

508 Q. Is absent?
A. Is absent.

509 Q. Is that the clearest way to put it?
A. That's correct.

510 Q. Okay. Now, you say in your interview with the investigators, you say that you were based out of Fermoy Garda Station and you also tell the investigator that "I woul dn't be in Mtchel stown that much" is that that right?
A. Well, that would be correct. I think if we were coming 15:03 back from some place, we could call into Mitchelstown Garda Station, our boss people would tell us if we saw a garda station, if we were passing en route we may cal1 in, but other than that my job was Fermoy, I would go straight to Fermoy every morning, unless there was some reason not to.

511 Q. Okay. You were asked also about the relationship to your knowledge between Sergeant Barry and Superintendent Comyns, and your response was "Obvi ousl y the matters bet ween Sergeant Barry and Superintendent
Comyns caused difficulties, there was no doubt that there were tensi ons because of that". Now, that's at page 5314, we don't have to open it up, but that's what you said in your interview. Can you tell the Chairman
a little bit more about that?
A. Yes. I suppose, Mr. Barry wouldn't be communicating with the district officer. It was his job to run his district and sometimes I might be trying to sort documentation and whatever. There was. It did cause difficulties because $I$ could be in court two days a week.

512 Q. Yes, but what timeframe are we talking about here? was this from the very outset? You had shared an office with Sergeant Barry for seven years, Superintendent Comyns comes in July 2010, can you put a timeframe on this, what you are talking about there?
A. Yes. Sorry, I shared an office with Mr. Barry from 2000 to 2007, that's in Mitchelstown, some 16 kilometres from Fermoy.
A. But in 2007 I was promoted to inspector, in May 2007. I then went the 16 kilometres to Fermoy district, Fermoy station, and I had a new office, it was a portacabin in the backyard.
514 Q. okay.
A. So I was in Fermoy. So Superintendent Comyns didn't arrive to Fermoy, I think it might have been July 2010. It was 2010 in any event.
515 Q. okay. But, inspector, what I am asking you to do is, if you can, put a finger on when exactly you say these difficulties or tensions were there?
A. Oh yeah. In August 2012, Superintendent Comyns did tell me one day in the superintendent's office that he
had given Mr. Barry a Regulation 10 for being late for work. He did say it was the second occasion that he had gone to the garda station in mitchelstown and that unit had come in late on both occasions. And he as much as said he had to do something about it, he couldn't go to stations and ignore units coming in 20 minutes late. He said it was the second occasion and he gave him a Regulation 10. Other than that, I saw no difficulties -- I saw no difficulties prior to August 2012.

516 Q. Okay. So prior to August 2012, no difficulties. But, as I say, to use your exact language, you say there was no doubt that there were tensions because of that. And you are saying --
A. Because of that, but I didn't say in 2010 there was tensions. I don't believe there was any issue between Mr. Comyns and Mr. Barry.
517 Q. So you are putting it around August 2012, is that right?
A. To my know7edge.

518 Q. Okay?
A. Correct.

519 Q. You also say that you knew that Sergeant Barry had made a complaint against Superintendent Comyns under the bullying and harassment policy, is that right?
A. I think if I went on then, it was the 4 th September -Mr. Barry went sick on the 2nd August 2012, that's my understanding. And the sick form would have been sent in by Garda Clifford and it mentioned work-related
stress. I think on the 4th September 2012, I met Mr. Barry by appointment in Watergrasshill because I had been appointed under HQ 139/10 to investigate that. And I did meet Mr. Barry there on that day.
520 Q. okay. We will go through that in a moment, the work-related stress issue. But you were aware that a complaint had been made against the superintendent, isn't that right?
A. At the time? No.

521 Q. Well, I am asking you when you were aware of that?
A. Oh no. Oh it was -- it could have been the following year. You're saying that in August 2012 I knew there was a complaint of bullying and harassment? No.
522 Q. No. You say that you knew that a complaint had been made against the superintendent, I am just asking you when you got that knowledge?
A. Sorry, that would be the following year, probably. 2013.

523 Q. okay.
A. Or 1ate 2012. It certainly wasn't August or September.

524 Q. Okay. Now, you also were asked about your relationship with Paul Barry in your interview and again, you say:
"I never had a cross word with him However,
ci rcumstances changed and I would say his attitude changed towards me."

## Is that right?

A. I think that happened in 2013.

525 Q. Okay, so around 2013.
A. March he returned to work, after his return to work, and then there was a visit to the station by the chief superintendent, and yes, I can say to the tribunal -and the man, I shook hands with him today as soon as I arrived in here, he was my best friend or one of my friends, and that was the first time I saw Mr. Barry having an issue with me.
526 Q. Okay. So you're saying that's around March 2013. We have looked at a letter here, this was a letter from Séan Costello Solicitor on behalf of Mr. Barry and it's 14th February 2013, so the month previous7y. At page 4082 , if that can be opened. And this is where the proposal is put that Mr. Barry would be happy to work under your direct supervision. So this is February 2013, do you see that?
A. I do.

527 Q. Again, we have opened this a number of times. And it says, just the third last line in:
"In this respect ther ef ore my client wishes to return to work under the direct management of Inspector O Sul I i van. "

So, just given what you've just said in your direct evidence and that attitudes didn't really change until following month, at this time in February 2013 your relationship with Sergeant Barry, would you describe it as cordial and as normal as before?
A. A hundred percent.
Q. In relation to this, did this ever come to your knowledge, looking now at February 2013, when this letter comes in?
A. I was aware of that letter but what I would say in relation to letter, that Superintendent Comyns was running Fermoy district, I could be off the air five or six hours in the day and it would be totally impracticable to have that letter be produced. So if I was doing Mallow court on a Tuesday and there was a fatal collision in Mitchelstown at two o'clock, by that letter $I$ would have to wait for a phone call from Mr. Barry at five o'clock to ring my superintendent at 5.05. I think it would be totally impractical.

529 Q. Can I ask you, this letter came in, came in from the solicitor, it was directed to Chief Superintendent Dillane, did this make its way to you then? was there a discussion with you about this letter?
A. There was a discussion.
Q. By whom?
A. Chief Superintendent Dillane, I would say.
Q. okay.
A. But what I will say, I was aware of that letter or I was aware that there was an offer in that letter. I think actually I didn't see that letter until maybe the disclosures. But I was aware that there was a proposal by Mr. Barry to have I supervise him. And I just say to the tribunal, it would be totally impractical. It couldn't be done. .
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Q. Is that what you told Chief Superintendent Dillane? Is that your view or is that what you said?
A. I had a discussion with him at some stage. I cannot give you the date of it.
Q. But was it in around this time?
A. It would have been.
Q. Okay. And again, specifically what you exactly said to Chief Superintendent Dillane about this letter?
A. The same as I would have probably said to you now. It would be a totally impractical situation.
Q. Okay. Now, moving on then, we're in the period of around -- we've stepped a little bit forward, we're just talking about the general background and relationships you had with Sergeant Barry. You'11 see that there's a number of issues on the issue paper that 15:11 you may be in a position to help the tribunal with.

The first one I am going to ask you to look at is issue 3C and this is an allegation in respect of the work-related stress investigation. You'11 be aware of that, that it's on the issue paper and that you were centrally involved, at least at the beginning, in relation to this issue, is that right?
A. That's correct.

536 Q. Okay. Now, we know on the 9th August 2012, Superintendent Comyns appointed you under the HQ Directive 139/10, isn't that right?
A. I'm not sure of the exact date now.

537 Q. Well, the letter is at page 5366 , we can open it, inspector.
A. Thanks.
Q. If you go down there?
A. Sorry, yeah, 9th August, I wasn't sure of the date of it. Yeah.
Q. He attaches the SR1 form and he says:
"Sergeant Barry's work-rel ated stress should be i nvesti gated in accordance with HQ Directive 139/10. A full file to be submitted for forwarding to assistant commi ssi oner, HRM for the attention of the CMD."

Now, did you have any conversations with Superintendent Comyns at around this date or was it just the letter of instruction that you got?
A. I have no recollection of having a conversation with him, but what Superintendent Comyns would do, if I came back from doing other stuff during the day, there could be three or four things in my tray for me to do and I certainly got that document and I made an appointment to -- I don't believe I discussed it with Superintendent Comyns.

540 Q. Okay. He attaches the SR1 form, which is just on the next page, and you will see that he --
A. I was aware of what he reported to Mr. Clifford, or Garda Clifford.

541 Q. Okay. That it was work-related stress, is that right?
A. That's correct.

542 Q. As you say, you knew that he had been off sick at that stage, isn't that right? You would have been aware of
that in any event?
A. I would have been aware of that, yes.

543 Q. Now, you referenced it briefly a moment ago, on the 4th September 2012 you met with Mr. Barry by appointment, is that right?
A. That's correct, in Watergrasshill.

544 Q. That's right. You say in your statement it was at 4pm in watergrasshil1. And in your statement you refer to yourself having been appointed in accordance with the Directive. You say, and just to use the precise words you say:
"Sergeant Paul Barry decl ined to di scuss these i ssues with re."

Isn't that right?
A. That's correct, Chairman. I met Mr. Barry that day and I told him why I was there, that I had got a report to investigate his work-related stress. He said he did not want to discuss -- didn't wish to discuss it with me, and he said because he had some issue with the superintendent and he wanted somebody outside of Fermoy Garda Station, outside of that building to investigate it.
Q. Okay. And was this a long discussion?
A. No, a couple of minutes, but Mr. Barry was not forthcoming with what the issue was about and I headed back to Fermoy Garda Station.
546 Q. You were asked in your interview did he understand your
role and why you were there, and you said you explained the role to him but he just wished for someone outside of Fermoy district to investigate it?
A. I did say, quoted HQ 139/10, I think most members of An Garda Síochána would be well aware of what that HQ is, and I explained that I was appointed under HQ 139/10 and Mr. Barry said he was not discussing the issue with me and he wanted somebody from outside Fermoy Garda Station to investigate it, because we all worked together.
A. I was aware of that. Superintendent Comyns would have told me in the district office, just inside the door of the district office one evening when I came back from somewhere. And it's a small district. I would have been well aware. Even if Mr. Comyns hadn't told me, but I can assure you Superintendent Comyns did tell me.
548 Q. Okay. Did you discuss that with Mr. Barry? Did it come up?
A. Is it didn't, because I was sent to there investigate under HQ 139/10. Mr. Barry was not forthcoming with any information to me. So we said good-bye and parted our ways and I headed back to Fermoy Garda Station.

549 Q. Okay. Now, you made a report to Superintendent Comyns,
it's 10th September 2012, and this is at 5368, if we can open that one. You see there that's your report, is that right, inspector?
A. That's correct.

550 Q. You say you met him on the 4th September 2012. You say:
"He declined to di scuss any issues in rel ation to his non- ef fecti veness. "

So, is that very broad? Is that effectively why you're not turning up to work or is that why you're citing work-related stress?
A. What he said was he wasn't prepared to discuss -Mr. Barry will tell you why, he wasn't prepared to discuss with me what the issues were.

551 Q. Okay. You say:
"He informed me he had some issue with Superintendent Comyns but declined to di scuss the matter further."
A. That did come up. My report is a hundred percent accurate.
552 Q. Okay. And were you completely at a loss as to what that issue was or not?
A. Regulation 10 is a very minor, trivial thing. I think 15:16 it's just a verbal warning. It goes into your discipline file, a loose page, and it's pulled out of it after three years. But I didn't know what the issue was. If he wasn't going to tell me, I didn't ask any
more questions.
553 Q. Now, in his documentation to the tribunal and also during his direct examination on day 175, Mr. Barry took the view that the reason for this meeting was that you were sent to find out exactly what his complaint in 15:17 respect of Superintendent Comyns was. Now, first of al1, did you ask him about his complaint?
A. No, I did not. I told Mr. Barry -- you see, Garda Clifford took a report from Mr. Barry that he was suffering from work-related stress, and I think it is the duty then, the file has to be created under HQ 139/10 that goes up to HRM. And that paperwork came to me. I went to Mr. Barry on the 4th September 2012 and I told him why I was there, under HQ 139/10, and he told me that he wasn't going to discuss it with me. And I couldn't do any more. But he did say he had an issue with Superintendent Comyns. He wasn't discussing it with me any further, he wanted somebody else outside of Fermoy Garda Station to investigate it, because we al1 worked in the one building.
554 Q. Just to put it to you in very blunt terms, inspector, on Day 175 , at page 145 , line 14 , there is no need to open it, he is asked about this and he says:
"He asked me what my compl ai nt was and lold himl wasn't telling it to him"

Do you recal1 that?
A. I didn't. I well recollect in my report in relation to
my meeting with Mr. Barry, he declined to discuss any issues with me.
okay. Now, also in relation to that meeting, Mr. Barry -- there's a note taken by his GP on the 10th september, and we'11 just bring that up, it's at page 4771. If you just go down there, for the 10th September. If you keep scrolling, please, Mr. Kavanagh. If you just keep going there. Now, if you see that, you see about midway through he says:
"It's recorded there by the GP:
"He met inspector on an of $f$ the record basis, who Paul says advi sed himto remain out of work until case further advanced. Solicitor advi sed himof similar."

Is that right, an off the record basis? Is any of this familiar to you?
A. That's incorrect.

556 Q. Did you advise him to stay out of work?
A. I'm 35 years in the Garda Síochána, I don't believe that I would advise anybody to stay out of work. I have never disciplined anyone myself or I have never been disciplined. Never initiated discipline proceedings to any member or I have never been anybody to stay out of work. And that statement to the doctor -- or the doctor, whoever wrote it, is totally incorrect. I would never tell someone off or on the
record. I have great admiration for the Garda Síochána. And that is incorrect, never said it. 557 Q. Okay. Now, we have also noted in the papers that on that same date, on 10th December 2012, there was an Employee Assistance Committee meeting, and if we can just bring up the minutes for that, at page 3278. If we just scroll down. The Employee Assistance Committee. You see there:
"Meet i ng - 10/9/2012."

Can you see that, inspector?
A. Yes.

558 Q. Can you just tell the Chairman first, what is the Employee Assistance Committee?
A. Well, it's basically meetings that were held every month. It's for the welfare of members on duty and off duty, people who have sickness or injured. It's basically the welfare of all concerned. And retired members as wel1.
559 Q. We see there the attendees, and you're one of the attendees, is that right? Are they the normal attendees?
A. They are. It's always chaired by the chief, and you have Superintendent Comyns, the inspector. I had Morgan Landy is the welfare officer and John Conway would have been a detective in Fermoy, who is retired, he would be on behalf of the retired members, if some
retired member had a problem, he would bring it to the table for us to try and help.
Q. If you just scroll down there, please, Mr. Kavanagh. It says:
"Si ck nenbers: Di scuss menbered mentbers on I ong-term sick. "

And one of them is Sergeant Paul Barry.
A. Yeah, I see the name there.

Can you tell the Chairman a little bit about that meeting. I mean, you had just met him a couple of days previously and he had said he wouldn't discuss his sick leave with you. He was obviously discussed at this meeting?
A. I wouldn't remember exactly what was said at that meeting, but if his name is mentioned there, it obviously came up and it would come up, because anybody who was out sick, it would be discussed.
562 Q. But can you tel1 us anything about the discussion?
A. No.
Q. I mean, he had obviously just said a couple of days earlier he wouldn't discuss --
A. I would probably have said the same thing at the meeting, that he had declined to discuss the issues
with me. And I would have been none the wiser, so I couldn't bring any more information to that meeting.

564 Q. Okay. With regard to outcomes of meetings such as this, was there any outcome, any plan, any decision
9
made in relation to Sergeant Paul Barry at that stage?
A. I would say not, because nobody knew what -- nobody knew what was going on and what was going to happen. Mr. Barry had not discussed his issues with anybody at the time. So I don't think they could preempt the issues.

567 Q. So in relation to the HQ Directive 139/10, that's where
it stopped, is that right, as far as you were concerned, is that your evidence?
A. As far as I am concerned, yes. But I complied with HQ 139/10. I met had man in Watergrasshi11. And again I say to the tribunal, he said he didn't want anything to 15:23 do -- he didn't disclose his issue. He said he had some issue with Superintendent Comyns. He wanted somebody outside of Fermoy district Garda to investigate it because all three of us were in the one building, the chief super and the inspector.

568 Q. Now, we know from the papers that after this date you would have met Paul Barry on a number of occasions, is that right?
A. Sorry, I missed that.

569 Q. After the 10th September, you would met Mr. Barry on a number of occasions?
A. Yes, I would have delivered documentation. If there was something to be delivered to Mr. Barry, I would ring him and I'd meet him and deliver the documents to him. And there was never any issue.

570 Q. Okay. Now, we have dates of the 30th September 2012, the 7th November 2012, the 5th December 2012, and these are all meetings where, as you say, you were updating him or delivering documents, is that right?
A. Something that had -- I would ring Mr. Barry, there was 15:24 no issue at the time with, I'd ring Mr. Barry, say to him I had such a thing, and I would meet him wherever we met.

571 Q. Okay. So did you see your role as simply keeping him
updated? I mean, would you accept Mr. Barry's proposition that this wasn't a work-related stress investigation that was going on or anything to that effect?
A. You see, I can't comment on that at the moment, because 15:25 my answer is: The HQ 139/10 asked me to investigate Mr. Barry's work-related stress. I believe I did every effort to do that. I met him in Watergrasshill on the 4th September 2012, and he told me he wasn't discussing the issue with me.

572 Q. But I suppose what I am asking you to clarify, inspector, is that whilst you were meeting him, it was more in the nature of updating him from time to time?
A. Oh yeah, I was delivering documents, I was updating him, I accept, I had nothing more to do with the investigation into his alleged stress.

573 Q. Okay. Now, on the 8th January 2013 you met him, this would have been before he returned to work. If we can just open this, at 5374. Now, this is a report, it's dated 9th January 2013, and it's to the chief superintendent, Cork North, and this is from you, isn't that right?
A. Yes.

574 Q. And you say --
A. Yeah.

575 Q. Second line there: "I wi sh to report that I met Ser geant Paul Barry on 8/ 1/ 2013 by appoint ment. I advi sed hi mof the content of this report."

That was a report from HRM, isn't that right?
A. That's correct. And Mr. Barry would have told me to make sure to include that and anything he asked me to do, I did it
576 Q. Okay. You say:
"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 chi ef medical officer, Human Resource Management and the investigation team"

So, would you accept that on the 8 th January he is telling you that he is under considerable stress?
A. That's what he told me, to include it in the report, and I did.
Q. I assume there were more Employee Assistance Committee meetings after this, would that not be normal course?
A. They would be, there would have been meetings on a regular basis but Mr. Barry asked me to include that and I included it.

578 Q. Okay. Did you see your role in any respect as bringing this to the attention of anybody else, the Employee Assistance Committee or welfare officers, did you see your role in that regard?
A. I suppose again, I find myself a very independent person, I was appointed to investigate it, Mr. Barry
did not give me any information. From the outset he didn't want me investigating it. So I suppose there's little more $I$ could do.
579 Q. But I am asking you, did you do anything with this information?
A. oh.

580 Q. Other than report it up?
A. Mr. Barry asked me to include that in my report, that's what he asked me and that's what I did.

581 Q Okay. So just from a local management perspective, had 15:27 you been appointed before on previous occasions for other members --
A. Yeah. Well a few times, yeah.
Q. Okay. Had you ever come against this problem, where it just ran into the sand?
A. No.

583 Q. This was the first time?
A. First time. And I would have probably did four or five of them in the division.
okay. would you agree but from a local management perspective, the work-related stress investigation never got off the ground effectively?
A. Well, I can't comment where it went then, but all I can say in relation to myself, I tried my best. Mr. Barry would be a friend of mine, he wouldn't cooperate with me. And he had his reasons, he said the chief, the super and you work in the one building, and he wanted somebody outside of Fermoy to investigate it.
585 Q. Okay. Now, if we can move on to the next issue, it's
issue 3 E . This is an allegation of targeting. I will just read out the wording of it. It's an allegation against Superintendent Comyns and Chief Superintendent Dillane on the issue paper and issue 3 E says:
"By causing Inspector O Sullivan to attend at M tchel stown Garda Station in full uniformat approxi matel y 9pm on a date bet ween 29th March 2013 and 9th April 2013 and request Sergeant Barry to provi de a return to work certificate."
okay. So, inspector, that's the next issue I want to ask you some questions about.
A. Yes.

586 Q. Yes. In your statement to the tribunal at page 5335, you give the date as being 29th March 2013, is that your recollection?
A. It is.

587 Q. okay. And that was the date that he returned to work at half past eight that evening?
A. I believe that's the date he returned to work.
Q. Do you know what time you were there that evening?
A. I would have said it was -- I thought it was earlier, but if he says it was half past eight. I did adult cautions in Charleville, it was a bank holiday, it was Good Friday, I did adult cautions in Charleville first, because there was no inspector attached to Mallow, I went to Mallow garda station then and cutting across country for me, I accidentally bumped into Mr. Barry in

Mitchelstown Garda Station that evening.
589 Q. okay. And you say in your statement you were not in full uniform, you were without the Garda cap, with an ordinary anorak over your garda shirt, is that right?
A. I was never in full uniform. And I will say this: I was seven years in Dublin prior to going down to the country, we never wore a uniform in the car. For obvious reasons, someone may make a complaint, and any time I get into knew car, my epaulettes and my tie will go into the dash and I will either have a hoodie, a light anorak on me, and when $I$ went in to Mr. Barry that evening, $I$ was not in full uniform with a cap or jumper or jacket. I was doing adult cautions, I wouldn't even have a cap with me.
Now, we know that he came back to work at 8.30 that evening, so it must have been after that, is that right?
A. It was around that time, so we'11 say nine o'clock.
Q. You said yourself at the outset of your evidence you're very rarely in Mitchelstown but you happened to be there that evening, is that right?
A. It would be a route home from me from Mallow to where I live. So if I come back from Mallow, come through Kildarby, the next town would be Mitchelstown, I'11 go straight across the road and head for home.
592 Q. Well, you see, it is Mr. Barry's position that you came there to ask him for a medical certificate?
A. I didn't. But I would have known when Mr. Barry was back that he would need a certificate to come back,
because I knew he had been off sick. And I did say to him, you will require a medical certificate.

593 Q. Now, he accepts there's nothing improper in you asking for a medical cert and he has accepted that in his evidence. But, as I say, he is of the position that you came there for that purpose. And is it your evidence to the Chairman that you did not, it was happenstance?
A. Chairman, I accidentally bumped into Mr. Barry that evening in Mitchelstown Garda Station. Nobody told me to go there.

594 Q. Now, in his direct evidence he says he had a conversation with you, and this is at Day 176, and it's at page 57-58, just for the transcript, he says that he had a conversation with you and you said to -- this is his statement, that "He said, you' re going to have to have a certificate if you want to go back to work on full pay because you will stay on half pay otherwise." Do you accept or reject that?
A. Sorry, could you repeat that again for me, please?

595 Q. He said, as in you, "You are going to have to have a certificate if you want to go back to full pay because you will stay on half pay otherwise." Do you remember saying that?
A. No, I did not. I told him he would require a certificate, a medical certificate. And I would be aware of that in my service, if somebody had been out, you cannot arrive back without a medical certificate. And there was no discussion about half pay. I was glad
to see Mr. Barry back because I knew there was an issue about half pay.
596 Q. He also says that he told you that the general practitioner wouldn't give him a certificate unless what she wants is in it. I am going to quote this, he $15: 32$ said, and he attributes this to you, that you said:
"Whatever conditions she wants she can put in her cert."
A. That didn't happen. That is similar to the last one you asked me about giving advice on an off the record, that the inspector said stay out as long as -- whatever you say said earlier, stay out as long as -- until it's ${ }_{\text {15:33 }}$ sorted. Mr. Barry never discussed conditions with me that evening and I certainly would not be one advising anybody to put in conditions. I don't think I ever saw conditions on a medical certificate, unless light duties. But I certainly didn't advise him to put in any conditions in that medical certificate.
597 Q. Now, one thing I should have asked you just a moment ago is, the terms of the ground at issue E is that you were caused to attend at Mitchelstown Garda Station in full uniform. I think Mr. Barry accepted on Day 180
that Superintendent Comyns had no role in directing you to attend. Did anybody else have any role in directing you to attend that night?
A. What date? The 29th March, is it?

Now, Mr. Barry says that there was nothing improper in your request for a medical cert, but he does call it an 15:34 inspection that night. What do you say to that?
A. I shared an office with Mr. Barry for seven years, seven and a half years, he knows well it wasn't an inspection. I did not inspect Mr. Barry.
600 Q. In particular, he said in his direct examination on Day 176, and also in his cross-examination on Day 178, that it was because it was at the commencement of his tour of duty you arrived unannounced, that you could have phoned him and it was in the manner in which all of that happened that he sees it as an inspection, what do 15:34 you say to that?
A. That's for 29th March?

601 Q. On the 29th March, yes?
A. I didn't know Mr. Barry was there, so I couldn't have rang him, sorry.
Q. He also says in his documentation to the tribunal, he said "I was never inspected by a chi ef superintendent or an inspector" in his career until that night, so what do you say to that?
A. No, I think that relates to the 9th April 2013.

603 Q. Well I think he also attributes an inspection to this encounter with you?
A. Okay. But on the 29th March I was on my own, not in uniform, accidentally meeting, wasn't aware that

Mr. Barry was back at work.
604 Q. okay.
A. That's the 9th March. That's the Good Friday.

605 Q. The 29th March?
A. Bank holiday.

606 Q. Okay. Now, the next issue that I'd like to ask you some questions about is issue $3 F$. And again it's an allegation of targeting or discrediting against Superintendent Comyns and/or Chief Superintendent Dillane. And the language of the issue is:

[^0]okay, inspector, so I just want to ask you about that particular issue. Now, as you've just said, on the 29th March you met Mr. Barry and you asked him for a certificate?
A. That's correct.

607 Q. Okay. In your statement you say you also phoned him on the 3rd April looking for a medical certificate?
A. I did, because I think the certificate hadn't come in and Chief Dillane may have asked me, and I know where I was, I was in Funderland in Cork when I rang him, with 15:36 my kids.

608 Q. Okay. On the 4th April it comes in and I think it's Sergeant Barry's position that Garda ward took it up to the district office in Fermoy on the 4th April, and
that you got it around four o'clock, is that right?
A. I would say it was left in my tray in the public office, that's my recollection of it, and I opened it and brought it up to the chief.
609 Q. okay.
15:36
A. That's my recollection. In any event, a medical certificate arrived in Fermoy Garda Station on the 4th April 2013, of a Thursday.
610 Q. Okay. Now, we do have details in your documentation about your discussions with Chief superintendent
Dillane, but can I ask you this: when Superintendent Comyns was giving his evidence on Day 182, he said he spoke to you on the 4th April about the medical cert that had come in and he spoke to you on the 5th April about the medical cert that this come in, do you remember those conversations?
A. I missed that, sorry.

611 Q. This is Superintendent Comyns. So, you are saying that you took it to straight to the chief superintendent. Do you remember having conversations with Superintendent Comyns about the medical certificate?
A. On the Thursday evening, maybe I did. I thought I got the certificate in my post in the public office, I had a post locker there, and I certainly got -- I certainly had the certificate in my hands on the 4th April, the
Thursday. And maybe Superintendent Comyns was there. I know I spoke to Chief Superintendent Dillane, and if Superintendent Comyns says he spoke to me about it, I accept that.

612
Q. Okay. Can you help the tribunal as to the nature of the conversation? Now we're saying with Superintendent Comyns.
A. It was my understanding from the certificate, it was my understanding from the certificate, it was Chief Superintendent Dillane had the discussion with the about the certificate and it was he told me to go to Dr. Kiely.
613 Q. Yes, but, inspector, I am asking you, can you assist us in the conversations you had with Superintendent Comyns 15:38 about the cert?
A. I have no recollection of that.

614 Q. okay. So you spoke with the chief superintendent that evening, isn't that right?
A. Yeah.

615 Q. So you're on the 4th April at this stage?
A. That's correct.

616 Q. It's your position in your statement to the tribunal that you were asked or instructed to go to the general practitioner the following morning, is that right?
A. That's correct.

617 Q. Okay. I think on Day 180, Mr. Barry accepted that Superintendent Comyns had no role in directing you to visit the GP, is that right?
A. That is correct. I have no recollection of speaking to 15:38 Superintendent Comyns. It was Chief Superintendent Dillane I spoke to in relation to the certificate, and he asked me to call to the doctor. And I did.

618 Q. Okay. So you'11 agree, if you have been 1istening to
the evidence you'11 realise there is an issue as to what you were directed to go to her about. Do you accept that?
A. Yeah, there is, yeah, maybe --

619 Q. Effectively what you were directed to check?
A. Well, the chief would have said -- number one, the certificate was dated 4th April 2013, that was crossed out with a biro and changed to the 28th March.
We11, if we can just take it step-by-step, inspector.
Can we look at the medical certificate of the 4th
April, at 5345. Okay. Do you see there at the top 1eft-hand corner, 1,2 and 3 , signature, amendment, receptionist, is that your writing?
A. Yeah, that's my writing.

621 Q. okay. So start at the beginning. why did you write those three comments on the medical certificate?
A. We11, the signature, I suppose I just see the signature, most doctors you cannot read the signature, but for some reason $I$ put signature on it as well.
622 Q. okay. Can we look at the signature. I think this wasn't the first medical certificate from this doctor from Mr. Barry. Was there a particular reason why this particular signature was in issue?
A. I think that's -- no, that's my own writing. That's what I say, maybe I said something about the signature. 15:40 There was never any issue about the signature being a forgery.

623 Q. Wel1 now, can we just start at the beginning, you wrote signature, why did you writing signature, question
mark?
A. I'd say because I had never seen a doctor's certificate that the date was changed without it being initialed and I was looking down at the signature then and I couldn't mike Kiely out of the signature.
Q. But do you accept -- are you telling the Chairman you questioned the bona fide of the signature, is that what it meant?
A. No, not the bona fide. There was no issue with that when I called to the doctor. I think it was the wording of the certificate. There was no issue about the signature being a forgery.
Q. If we just stay with the signature, it's number 1 , you have written it down, do you have a difficulty with the signature on the document, or is it somebody else who has a difficulty? Is it you?
A. No, no, it's not. That is my writing and if I wrote down signature, that is me. And I see it does probably go -- if you look at it now, it is i-e-1-y at the end of it, but I think that I would have expected maybe initials below the date which was changed. That is my writing, that's what I put in myself. Maybe when I got the job to do I wrote that on it myself before $I$ headed up there.
626 Q. You write at number 2, amendment?
A. Yeah.

627 Q. Why did you write that?
A. Because the date was changed.

628 Q. okay. And then you write at number 3, receptionist,
what does that mean?
A. Maybe $I$ was gathering that the receptionist changed the date on it, $I$ don't know. But that is my writing.
629 Q. okay. Did you see these as the three things you wanted to query?
A. No. I think I had never seen a certificate saying that somebody couldn't -- is fit for work, he can attend work but he cannot enter the workplace, which was Fermoy Garda Station.
630 Q.
I am just asking you, sorry now, inspector, I am just asking you about the three things you have noted, are these your queries, yes or no?
A. Oh they are, but I think you could probably add number 4, that I said as we11. But the chief superintendent would have asked me to check out was that certificate issued by the doctor and what she meant by it, and that's what I done.
631 Q. Okay. But again, just to be clear on your evidence, those three issues you have noted are your issues, has anybody told you to write them down?
A. No.
Q. Did this come from anyone else or just from yourself?
A. No, I think would I have jotted them down before I went into the doctor's myself, because I was the one making the query.
A. And that's my writing. Nobody asked me to do it. That is my own writing.
634 Q. okay. Now, if we can just look at your statement. If
you wouldn't mind opening this up please, Mr. Kavanagh, 5335. If I have the right -- sorry, if you just go back up there, please. All right. You see there in that paragraph in the middle there:
"I was instructed by Chi ef Superintendent Dillane to call to Dr. Margaret Ki el y at the Glanmire Medi cal Centre to check the validity of the medi cal certificate."
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you see that?
A. Yeah.

636 Q. You go on to say "The doctor's si gnat ure wasn't legi ble and the date of issue had been amended by bi ro from 4/4/13 to 28th March 2013".
A. That's correct.

637 Q. So you were directed to check the validity of the medical certificate. Can you just tell the Chairman what you meant by that or what you understood was meant by that?
A. It was always my understanding that it wasn't a forged certificate and Mr. Barry would not do that. I know Mr. Barry, he would not do something like that. But I think the certificate arrived into the garda -- I had never seen a certificate like that, and I'm 35 years in 15:44 the guards now, even at that time $I$ had never seen a certificate like it and I think that the chief was trying to find out what are we going to do with this. we have a sergeant who is deemed fit for work by his
doctor, he can attend work but he cannot enter his workplace. I think that was the reason the chief decided to check out the certificate.
But essentially were you checking was the certificate issued by her? Is that what you were checking?
A. I think the issue, and I go back again to -- I never saw, and a lot has passed through my hands, I never saw a medical certificate with the dates changed on it with biro without being initialed by somebody, just left blank. That's like I getting a certificate, changing it to the week before, just for argument's sake. I had never seen one, and that's my writing in relation to the signature and I must have been deemed -- why wasn't it initialed, is that the same signature. But as regards a forgery, no, that never came into my head. okay, to be clear to the chairman, were you instructed to go out and see was the significant issued by the doctor?
A. I suppose Chief superintendent Dillane, I can't speak for him, didn't know what to do with a certificate that 15:45 arrived to him, that I believe I showed him on the Thursday evening, he didn't know what to do with it, this man is fit for work but he can't enter the workplace. And I suppose he said to go and check the certificate. But it was never an issue about it being a forged certificate, if that's what you mean, it was never an issue.
640 Q. But the question I asked you is, were you directed -you were directed to check the validity of the medical
certificate and I am asking you, were you instructed to ask was the certificate issued by her?
A. I suppose along the lines that basically you cannot enter the work, you're fit to work and you cannot enter the workplace. And I asked Dr. Kiely was that the certificate and I suppose when I brought it back to the chief, at least he knows this certificate says this man can't come into the building.
641 Q. well, look, if we can just move down a little bit there, and if you go down there to "I informed her at the outset", this is when you go to visit the doctor.
"I informed her at the outset l wasn't there to di scuss any matters of patient confidentiality, just to clarify the contents of the medical certificate were correct."
A. Yeah, that the person couldn't enter the building.

642 Q. "Dr. Ki el y informed me it was a valid certificate issued by her."

Is that right?
A. That's correct.

643 Q. "On the 4/ 4/ 2013, al beit it was dated 28th March 2013." You say you thanked her and you went back and advised Chief Superintendent Dillane the medical certificate was valid.
A. Correct.

644 Q. So again I am asking you, do you mean that the medical certificate was issued by her?
A. It's the content of the certificate.

645 Q. Now, can I ask you to look at your interview with the tribunal investigators, and in particular you're asked about this issue by the investigators, 5326, please. And you're asked there in the middle, I mean, we will be coming back to this again, but you're asked there in the middle of the page:
"I have been asked to detail my interactions with Dr. Ki el y on this matter."

And you say:
"I was there for ten to 15 minutes and lold Dr. Ki el y I was asked to make an i nqui ry as to whet her the certificate was valid or not. I asked was it issued by Dr. Ki el y, as the date had been changed and she had no i ssued, she confirmed it was valid."
A. That's correct.

646 Q. So can we agree that that seems to suggest that you were asking was this certificate issued by her?
A. The contents of the certificate. But she said, I issued that certificate and it's valid. But I think it was the contents of the certificate, and also the date was changed in the certificate and it wasn't initialed. 15:48
647 Q. I think in plain -- inspector, we can move on from this, but "I asked was it issued by Dr. Ki el y, as the date was changed", is that right?
A. Yeah, and she clarified, yeah, I did issue that
certificate.
648 Q. Now, if we can look at the doctor's own records in relation to your meeting on the 5th April, it's at 4773. There's a note there for the 5th April, if you just go down, she says:
"I nspector Ant hony O Sul Iivan called to surgery to speak with me, wanted to check medi cal letter stating fit to work was fromme as had not put the date of return to work on it."

Do you see that?
A. Yeah, I do.

649 Q. So again, you're asking was it from her, as the date of return to work had not been put on it. That's a little 15:49 bit different to what we said so far.
A. That's what Dr. Kiely said.

650 Q. Okay. This is her note, that you asked, was it from her, as she had not put the date on it. "Aware I cannot speak about the patient. He said, I amjust the 15:49 middleman, I amfriends " that should I think read I'm friends with Paul, "Said the chi ef medical officer will phone me as he feels the letter will not be accepted." Is that an accurate account of the conversation with the doctor?
A. I had no recollection of saying that I'm friends with -- I never would have been friends with Paul and I still am friends with Paul, I hope. As being saying I'm the middleman, I've no recollection of saying that. Now, can I look at the report you did next after this meeting with Dr. Kiely, it's the 5th April 2013, that's 5353, p1ease. Okay. So you say:
"With reference to the above and your instructions on 4/4/2013, I called to Dr. Margaret Ki el y at Glanmire Medi cal Centre on 5/4/2013 in rel ation to the medical certificate submitted by Sergeant Paul Barry on 4/ 4/ 2013. I i nformed Dr. Ki el y that I wasn't there to di scuss any matters of patient confidentiality and only to di scuss the validity of the medical certificate.
Dr. Ki el y informed me that it was a valid certificate i ssued by herself on the $4 / 4 / 2013$, al beit it was dated 28th March 2013."

Now, you seem to then go on and deal separately:
"I queried the work rel ated conditions attached to the medi cal certificate but she declined to di scuss them"

Is that right?
A. I think the content of the certificate was pointed by me.
653 Q. okay. So would you agree that there are two separate issues there in your report: the validity of the certificate and then the conditions? would you accept
that that is a fair reading of your report?
A. I would, I would accept that, that definitely there was a reference to the contents of the medical certificate. Now can I ask you that, you will have seen the statement that came in there just during the course of the hearings from Dr. Kiely, she describes herself as being slightly unnerved by the formal visit in full uniform. Did you see that, inspector?
A. I did. However, on the 4th April, just the notes that you showed me, when I went to Dr. Kiely that day, it was a Friday, I had court in Fermoy and I knew I had to be back for 10.30. I arrived at the reception in the doctor's. I wasn't in full uniform. Again I was dressed up like the adult cautions and I went over to the receptionist and I asked her, I said I'm a guard, I'm checking about a medical certificate. And maybe ten or 15 minutes had gone on and basically I hadn't seen Dr. Kiely and I went over again to the receptionist and I said, look, if she can't see me, I am going to come back again because $I$ have to be in Fermoy by half past ten. And in fairness to Dr. Kiely she came over to me about three or four minutes after that and called me in.
A. Yeah.

656 Q. If you just go on to the next paragraph?
A. I do, I see it.

657 Q. Mr. Kavanagh, if you just go on to the next paragraph?
A. Yeah.
"On that day I remember being slightly unnerved by the visit as it was hi ghl y unusual to recei ve what seemed to be a formal vi sit by a menber of An Garda Sí ochána to query the validity of a medi cal certificate."

Is that what it was in effect, inspector?
A. I don't believe it was. I wasn't in full uniform. And, as I said to the tribunal, if I was in full uniform I wouldn't be going over to a receptionist and saying I'm a guard. I wasn't in full uniform, and that can be put to Dr. Kiely, and I am not a person that would go into any doctor's surgery in full uniform, while patients would be looking at what is he here for. 15:54 I was not in full uniform that day and I don't believe -- now, Dr. Kiely has said this in May of this year, that I was unnerved or that she seemed unnerved. Certainly she swept onto the next patient, she didn't seem unnerved to me.
659 Q. She said:
A. She didn't show any annoyance to me, I'd be very sure of that.

I think you were asked by the investigators for the tribunal had you any concerns about the appropriateness of your enquiries and you said "I hadn't really". Can I ask you this: Had you ever made similar enquiries in respect of any other member, any other medical certificate in the course of your career?
A. I hadn't, but I suppose $I$ would reiterate again, that was 2013, so I had 26 years in the guards at that time, 15:54 I had never seen a medical certificate like it, I have never seen one since that or before that, and I suppose I didn't see an issue about what I asked Dr. Kiely, I said about patient confidentiality, I didn't see an issue. And actually, Dr. Kiely had no issue on that day with me. That's my understanding.
661 Q. So is it your evidence to the Chairman that this situation which arose was very unique to Mr. Barry?
A. Well, I certainly had never seen one before anyway.

662 Q. okay.
A. I genuinely had never seen one.

663 Q. No, what I am asking you, inspector, is your role and your instructions to visit the general practitioner, was that unique to this particular case?
CHAI RMAN Absolutely.
A. Yeah, I hadn't seen it, Chairman.

CHA RMAN He says it never happened before in 20-something years.
A. It didn't, Chairman. And I think the chief
superintendent asked me because he couldn't ask obviously Superintendent Comyns to go up to the doctor. не had a case with a certificate in front of him: This man is fit to come to work, however he can't come into your building.
CHAN RMAN Don't tell me again. As a judge used to say, I got that the second time.
THE WTNESS: Sorry, Chairman.
MS. MEGRATH If we can move on to the next issue, it's issue 3G. And again this is an allegation of targeting or discrediting by Superintendent Comyns or Chief Superintendent Dillane, and it's "by confronting Sergeant Barry in the car park of Mtchel stown Garda Station on the 9th April 2013"." Now, you have outlined the details of this in your statement and in your interview with the investigators, and you said you came from your home that night and that you were in the car park in mitchelstown Garda Station in Chief Superintendent Dillane's car, is that right, when Mr. Barry arrived?
A. That's correct.

665 Q. Okay. And you say you came from your own house and you say that he had asked you to be there with him, is that right?
A. That's correct.

666 Q. Can you remember why he outlined that you were requi red?
A. He had said to me that he had been at a case conference in relation to Mr. Barry, or Sergeant Barry, and he
asked me would I attend Mitchelstown Garda Station with him that night at 9 pm and I said I would.
Q. okay. Now there's two things I just want to ask you about, there is a dispute of fact in relation to whether the chief superintendent was in full ceremonial uniform, is that right?
A. Again, no, he wasn't in a full ceremonial uniform, meaning the Sam Browne belt. I think there is a confusion in relation to that. He did not have a Sam Browne belt. I saw Chief Superintendent Dillane only once with a Sam Browne belt on him and that was at the Kent memorial in 2016 in Castlelyons. So it wasn't. What I actually thought he had on was a blue shirt, what I would say half blue, and a blue anorak. Maybe he had a garda jumper. But we certainly weren't -what I class as full uniform is, you know, is full battle dress, there was no Sam Browne.

668 Q. And is that a categorical position? I think you say in your interview that, I'm almost a hundred percent sure to the best of my recollection?
A. That was an error on my part, Chairman. I meant I was sure that he was in full uniform, meaning had he -what attire had he, but he wasn't in full battle dress, being the Sam Browne. And I'm $110 \%$ sure Mr. Dillane did not have a Sam Browne belt on him. Once is all I saw that man in a Sam Browne belt, and I remembered it. 669 Q. Okay. Now, it's also part of Mr. Barry's position to the tribunal that he saw this as an inspection that night, what do you have to say about that?
A. Again, it wasn't an inspection. Mitchelstown Garda Station, I suppose to explain it, it's not open at nighttime, Mr. Dillane had got documents from Dublin and wanted to discuss issues with Mr. Barry and the only time he could meet Mr. Barry was when the units would be starting at nine. If it was ten past nine or if he was a quarter past nine, they could be gone to a call, it might be an hour before they come back. He wouldn't have any access to the garda station. And I think that would be the normal time, they'd be there when they begin to work and they'd walk in the door with him. There was no inspection. He had documents, he had to meet Mr. Barry.
670 Q. Now, Mr. Barry describes it as in effect an ambush, and that was the language he used on --
A. It wasn't.

671 Q. -- Day 176?
A. It wasn't an ambush. Mr. Dillane had documents to give to Mr. Barry and the only way Mr. Dillane saw he would do that was to meet Mr. Barry in Mitchelstown Garda station and he asked me to go with him. It was no ambush. We got out of the car and we spoke. There was no ambush or there was no ceremonial uniform or full battle dress with the Sam Browne.
672 Q. Now, another dispute of fact on the issues is one of your notes, now I think you say in your documentation to the tribunal you did not make a notebook entry of this incident, is that right?
A. I didn't. I didn't think I'd be up here nine years
later either, probably would have had if I did.
673 Q. Would it be standard that you would make a note?
A. It wouldn't have been normal to take notes, maybe officers, supers or chiefs would take notes wherever they go, I saw myself as being more operational, working with the lads and the girls in the force. I didn't take notes in any event.
674 Q. Now, Chief Superintendent Dillane did make a note of the conversation that night, I don't know if you have seen it in the papers, it's at page 2078. We just won't open that for the moment. An issue has arisen in relation to something that you said in your reply to the investigators. I will just read it out to you, it's at page 5317. You said:
"To my recollection Sergeant Barry sai d, I'mgoing nowhere, the super will have to go."
A. That's correct. That was said.

675 Q. "The meeting didn't last long, ten to 15 min nutes max."
A. That was said that night.

676 Q. Now, I think under cross-examination Chief Superintendent Dillane, on Day 185, page 95, his recollection was that Mr. Barry said simply, I'm going nowhere, that he didn't say that it's the super who has to go. So what do you say to that? Do you stand by your recollection?
A. I do. As Mr. Barry got up from the seat, he said to the chief superintendent, I'm going nowhere, and he said going out the door, you can move the super, or,
the super moves. And he was turning around towards the door when he said it. And I was alongside him. And I'm $110 \%$ that was said that night. Whether Chief Superintendent Dillane heard the full extent of it, both things were said. I'm going nowhere, you can move 16:01 the super, or, the super has to move. Mr. Barry also said when he was being cross-examined by Mr. Murphy on Day 178, that he did not mention mallow or that he would consider transferring if expenses were covered during this exchange, do you accept that that's correct?
A. Sorry, I missed that.

Mr. Barry said that he did not mention mallow or that he would consider transferring if expenses were covered. Do you remember any of that? Are you in a position to assist the Tribunal any further as to the transfer discussion that took place?
A. Mr. Dillane was offering a transfer to him and there was a thing about own expense or public expense, because if it's public expense you get your expenses. There was a mention. Mr. Dillane did say to him that night, this thing cannot go on, you're not coming to Fermoy in the morning, you're not coming to Fermoy in the evening for parading times, you won't answer the phone to Mr. Comyns, and he was trying to facilitate him with another station.
679 Q. Now, you may not be able to assist the tribunal in relation to it, it's just not in your statement or interview, do you remember stations being offered to

Mr. Barry?
A. There was stations being offered.

680 Q. Do you remember what they were?
A. I can't. There was stations being offered.

681 Q. okay.
16:02
A. But there was stations being offered. I remember Mr. Dillane saying, I cannot leave this go on. And he was trying to get Mr. Barry to offer to go to another station.
682 Q. One thing Mr. Barry said in reply, in cross-examination, he took issue with what he said was the procedural unfairness of this meeting. Now, as his inspector, can you assist the tribunal in relation to that? What's your view on that position?
A. As I said, I can't see what was unfair about it. Mr. Dillane was in Dublin. It was taking up a lot of our time. Mr. Dillane was in Dublin, he got sent instructions from Dublin, the CMO, and he had to relay them to Mr. Barry. And the only way he could do that was he checked to see if Mr. Barry was working on nights, the following night or whatever and he decided to go there. I can't see what's unfair about that. How is he to relay the message? And in fairness to Mr. Dillane, I was there that night, I was sitting nearest to the door in the sergeant's office and he kept appealing to Mr. Barry, this cannot go on, not complying with Superintendent Comyns's instructions, and Mr. Barry said he was going speaking to his representative and that was the end of the meeting.

And they left in a cordial way, we all went our ways. Now, I should say, inspector and Chairman, that there is three more issues where the inspector has some involvement and I see that it is four o'clock. I am happy to finish it on Thursday morning or we can keep going?
CHA RMAN I think you have a problem? I don't want to limit you, it's not the sort of thing that we will finish in a few minutes.
MR. COSTELLOE: Absolutely not, Chairman.
CHA RMAN okay. Thank you very much. We can't sit tomorrow anyway because of things I have to do. So we will assemble on Thursday morning. I hope that is not too inconvenient for you.
THE WTNESS: No, Chairman, thanks, no. Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN So be it. Thank you.
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| 119:13, 120:18, | 81:25, 82:15, 87:26, | direction [1] - 113:20 | 98:23, 100:12, | 79:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 132:24 | 98:25, 98:27, 98:28, | directions [9]- | 110:22, 111:20, | distinct [1] - 52:1 |
| delays [1] - 70:18 | 99:7, 125:26 | $60: 20,62: 4,62: 7,$ | 112:15, 113:1, 113:8, | distinction [3]- |
| deliberate [1] - | determination [3] - | 113:16, 113:24, | 113:13, 113:14, | 72:17, 72:21, 78:12 |
| $133: 18$ | $52: 7,100: 4,124: 17$ | 127:22, 128:6, 128:9, | 113:18, 113:27, <br> 115:6, 115:9, 11 | district [29]-7:11, |
| 119:1, 119:6, 119:12, | 124:13 | directive [3] - | 118:5, 124:10, | $72: 19,136: 28$ |
| 120:17, 132:23, | developments [1] - | 145:26, 147:10, | 124:14, 124:15, | 136:29, 137:2, 137:3, |
| 133:15 | 41:15 | 154:29 | 128:22, 129:14, | $138: 3,138: 5,138: 6$ |
| deliberations [1] - | devoid [1] - 132:25 | Directive [1] - 146:8 | 131:7, 131:14, | 138:14, 138:16, |
| 128:2 | DIARMAID [1] - 2:6 | directly [4] - 40:25, | 149:27, 151:24 | 138:23, 139:2, 139:4, |
| deliver [1] - 155:19 | dictates [1]-77:2 <br> difference [2] - 52:1, | 66:4, 90:26, 104:8 DIRECTLY [4] - 4:5, | $\text { [2] }-41: 10,43: 11$ | 144:7, 148:3, 148:18, |
| delivered [2] - | 110:4 | 4:11, 5:11, 135:27 | disciplined [3] - | 148:19, 148:20, |
| 155:17, 155:18 | different[11] - 23:9, | DIRECTLY- | 151:23, 151:24, | $155: 8,164: 29$ |
| delivering [3] - | 23:22, 61:20, 75:13, | EXAMINED [4] - 4:5, | 151:26 | disturbed [1] - |
| 155:24, 156:14, 175:2 | $94: 4,103: 17,109: 29$ | $4: 11,5: 11,135: 27$ | disclose [1] - 155:6 | $134: 11$ |
| department [1] - | 174:16 | disagree [4]-74:19, | $126: 20,126: 23,127: 4$ | 134:22, 134:26 |
| 132:13 | difficult [3]-107:10, | $77: 5,108: 12,110: 2$ | DISCLOSURES [2] - | division [11]-25:2, |
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| 26:23, 28:12, 28:16, | 13:13, 14:25, 21:15, | 126:14, 143:12, | 36:28, 37:29, 45:21, | 143:27, 157:8, |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:12, 153:15, } \\ & \text { 153:17, 153:25, } \end{aligned}$ | middleman [2] - | $156: 5,162: 22,182: 11$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:11, 121:13, } \\ & \text { 121:15, 121:25, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 137:2, 142:24, } \\ & \text { 151:23, 151:24, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 153:27, 154:15, } \\ & \text { 156:12, 163:29, } \end{aligned}$ | midway [4] - 11:21, | 56:23 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:27, 122:2, 122:6, } \\ & \text { 122:8, 122:11. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:25, 151:29, } \\ & \text { 152:2, 155:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 174:3, 175:5, 182:19, | 31:4, 49:18, 151:9 <br> might [21]-9:10, | $\begin{gathered} \text { month [15] - 24:26, } \\ 40: 5,44: 14,49: 13, \end{gathered}$ | 122:14, 127:9, 131:9, | 158:22, 160:5, 160:7, |
| 184:12, 184:29 <br> meetings [6] - 24:26, | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 11,56: 6,61: 10, \\ & 70: 21,71: 28,72: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 15,78: 3,90: 12, \\ & 95: 18,104: 28,105: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 131:16, 131:19, } \\ & \text { 132:8, 135:3, 135:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 162:16, 163:22, } \\ & \text { 167:26, 168:2, 169:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 152:16, 153:28, 155:23, 157:20, <br> 157:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 79:22, 86:4, 92:26, } \\ & 99: 9,101: 14,101: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:8, 136:24, } \\ & \text { 143:12, 143:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 185: 10 \\ & \text { MS }[27]-2: 7,2: 8, \\ & 2: 11,2: 12,2: 18,2: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 171:6, 171:7, 171:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEMBER }[1]-2: 2 \\ & \text { member [5] - 86:19, } \\ & 151: 25,153: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 133: 11,134: 2, \\ & 136: 25,140: 4 \\ & 140: 23,181: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 152:17 } \\ & \text { months [19]-10:16, } \\ & \text { 10:17, 29:19, 31:9, } \\ & 39: 24,46: 22,53: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 20,4: 3,4: 5,4: 11, \\ & 5: 4,5: 6,5: 10,5: 11, \\ & 5: 16,42: 18,42: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 171:27, 174:27, } \\ & \text { 178:11, 178:12, } \\ & \text { 178:19, 178:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 177:10, 178:7 } \\ & \text { membered [1] - } \\ & 153: 6 \end{aligned}$ | ```mightn't [1] - 99:10 mike [1] - 168:5 mind [11]-59:21,``` | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 13,58: 3,76: 1 \\ & 76: 24,77: 1,80: 22 \\ & 115: 20,115: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 67: 4,67: 7,122: 11 \\ & \text { 135:10, 135:22, } \\ & \text { 135:27, 136:3, 136:9, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 178:27 } \\ & \text { new [9]-58:27, 64:1, } \\ & 64: 3,84: 2,92: 4,92: 9, \end{aligned}$ |


| ```98:22, 117:12, 140:19 Newman [1] - 129:29 next [34]-7:18, 9:9, 9:17, 10:21, 11:19, 14:28, 23:17, 26:26, 36:23, 37:25, 41:3, 44:29, 45:11, 50:7, 50:13, 51:25, 60:16, 63:16, 96:22, 97:2, 99:13, 101:1, 127:28, 135:22, 146:23, 158:29, 159:12, 160:24, 164:6, 175:4, 177:2, 177:4, 177:24, 179:9 night [12]-162:28, 163:6, 163:23, 179:17, 180:2, 180:29, 182:9, 182:20, 183:3, 183:22, 184:21, 184:24 nights [1] - 184:21 nighttime \({ }_{[1]}\) - 181:3 nine [12]-93:11, 105:29, 107:9, 115:20, 117:23, 134:15, 160:18, 181:6, 181:7, 181:29 ninth [3] - 14:21, 34:6, 63:27 nobody [5] - 154:2, 161:10, 163:2, 169:27 Nolan [15] - 6:28, 7:8, 29:13, 29:25, 31:10, 33:13, 35:22, 37:16, 42:10, 44:21, 76:14, 100:27, 104:15, 111:14, 111:15 non [3]-113:23, 149:9, 157:7 non-effectiveness [1] - 149:9 non-medical \({ }_{[1]}\) - 157:7 non-serious [1] - 113:23 none [1] - 153:26 nonetheless [4] - 59:7, 69:1, 74:8, 87:16 normal [8] - 60:29, 70:10, 74:1, 143:29, 152:22, 157:20, 181:10, 182:3 normally [1] - 124:11 north \({ }_{[1]}\) - 156:21 NORTHUMBERLAN D [1] - 2:26``` |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 96:10, 96:18, 96:26, } \\ & 98: 25,108: 14, \\ & \text { 122:27, 124:6, } \\ & \text { 124:14, 126:6, 131:2, } \\ & \text { 143:18, 145:15, } \\ & \text { 155:12, 155:16, } \\ & \text { 167:6, 168:13, } \\ & \text { 168:25, 168:29, } \\ & \text { 169:13 } \\ & \text { numbers [2] - 54:6, } \\ & 54: 18 \\ & \text { nuts }[1]-68: 7 \\ & \text { Nyland }[1]-128: 14 \end{aligned}$  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 149:2, 150:20, | 153:28 | 132:18, 133:11, | 24:4, 29:16, 31:14, | :13, 148:15, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 152:21, 153:9, 155:9, | outline [13]-6:10, | 133:17, 136:4, 136:6, | 31:16, 37:25, 54:3, | 151:13, 153:9, 154:1, |
| 158:27, 162:12, | 19:25, 21:4, 28:23, | 139:28, 143:12, | 59:27, 76:8, 78:21, | 155:12, 156:27, |
| 162:17, 162:22, | 37:22, 51:24, 56:22, | 145:28, 146:23, | 83:26, 84:3, 86:22, | 174:22, 174:27, |
| 167:6, 169:24, | 57:20, 57:22, 98:4, | 148:12, 149:27, | 86:25, 87:18, 88:5, | 174:28, 175:3, 175:11 |
| 171:12, 178:12, | 122:17, 136:12 | 150:22, 151:5, 152:6, | 92:7, 97:18, 99:6, | PAUL [3] - 2:10, 3:1, |
| 178:19, 178:21, | outlined [10] - 8:29, | 154:18, 159:15, | 99:9, 102:26, 107:14, |  |
| 181:25, 184:10 | 18:25, 24:2, 29:4, | 161:14, 173:7 | 110:17, 110:20, | pause [1] - 94:2 |
| ones [1] - 28:18 | $29: 8,97: 5,97: 9$ | 176:26, 182:10, | 110:26, 111:1, 111:2, | pay [13]-10:27, |
| ongoing [5] - 56:13, | $97: 22,179: 15,179: 26$ | 182:14, 182:22 | 111:4, 111:7, 111:10, | 11:4, 11:29, 21:17, |
| 56:19, 56:23, 90:5, | outlines [1] - 33:26 | PAGE [1] - 4:2 <br> pains [1]-125 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:15, 111:17, } \\ & \text { 112:25. 113:4. 114:2. } \end{aligned}$ | 22:8, 79:5, 157:9, |
| onward [1] - 127:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { outlining [3] - 30:27, } \\ & 36: 8,58: 19 \end{aligned}$ | paper [4] - 6:1, | 115:16, 116:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 161:18, 161:22, } \\ & \text { 161:23, 161:29, 162:2 } \end{aligned}$ |
| onwards [4]-87:10, | outset [16]-20:25, | 145:15, 145:20, 159:4 | 117:3, 124:15, | pending [2] - 45:4, |
| $\begin{gathered} 87: 13,107: 23,108: 8 \\ \text { open [26] - 7:3, 8:16, } \end{gathered}$ | $22: 15,28: 4,47: 16$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { papers [19]-8:27, } \\ 9: 17,9: 26,9: 28, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 180:21, 180:27 } \\ & \text { parted [1] - 148:27 } \end{aligned}$ | 62:7 |
| 9:16, 9:24, 9:25, | 58:7, 67:14, 69:21, | 15:16, 33:6, 53:17 | participate [1] - | 25:8, 82:13, 92:5, |
| 22:25, 26:19, 32:17, | 83:7, 140:9, 158:1, | 55:2, 61:7, 64:2, | 86:20 | 120:14, 123:27, |
| 33:11, 33:19, 35:23, | 160:19, 172:11, | 85:17, 85:18, 87:24, | particular [15] - 7:29, | 132:7, 139:17, 152:18 |
| 38:23, 42:16, 56:5, | 172:13 | 100:4, 104:10, 138:4, | 17:8, 31:3, 33:1, | per [2]-27:28, 29:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 62: 10,65: 15,77: 12, \\ & 133: 19.139: 28 . \end{aligned}$ | outside [12] - 13:5, | $152: 3,155: 11,182: 10$ | 54:28, 79:18, 83:10, 95:17. 99:11, 163:10 | perceived [2] - 37:5, |
| 145:28, 149:2, | 147:22, 147:23, | $123: 26,124: 3,150: 12$ | 164:17, 167:22, | percent [3] - 144:1, |
| 150:23, 156:19, | 148:2, 148:8, 150:18, | parading [1] - 183:24 | 167:23, 173:3, 178:24 | 149:21, 180:19 |
| $\begin{gathered} 176: 24,181: 2,182: 11 \\ \text { opened }[12]-8: 21, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 154:26, } 155: 8,158: 28 \\ \text { outstanding }[1] \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { paragraph [29] - } \\ 7: 18,9: 10,9: 17, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { particularly [3] } \\ \text { 124:26, 134:22, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { perhaps [6] - 68:29, } \\ 87: 23,98: 21,107: 8, \end{gathered}$ |
| $20: 17,25: 19,27: 29$ | 86:4 | 10:11, 11:22, 12:25, | $134: 23$ | $133: 19,134: 2$ |
| 58:15, 68:28, 143:13, | 75:21, 76:1, 80:21, | 23:13, 25:29, 26:26, | 48:15, 48:24, 54:21, | $40: 5,45: 1,51: 17$ |
|  | 106:20 | 28:7, 42:27, 49:17, | 109:29, 125:9, | $52: 6,53: 16,58: 28$ |
|  | overlapped [1] | 50:7, 50:14, 70:29, | 125:16, 128:8, 129:1, | 74:22, 77:2, 79:4, |
| opening [1] - 170:1 operational [1] - | 112:9 | $71: 2,71: 3,72: 2$, $72: 17,72 \cdot 22,72 \cdot 25$, | $129: 8,129: 12,129: 13$ | 80:25, 81:4, 87:6, |
| 182:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { own [15] - 7:5, 25:13, } \\ & \text { 25:15, 77:6, 86:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72: 17,72: 22,72: 25 \\ & 83: 23,132: 18,170: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { parts [2] - 14:17, } \\ & 116: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 5,98: 14,99: 16 \\ & 104: 28,105: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 90:28, 177:28 } \\ & \text { opportunity }[5]- \\ & \text { 23:27, } 58: 12,121: 3, \\ & \text { 133:8, 133:10 } \\ & \text { opposed }[4]-17: 29, \end{aligned}$ | $90: 21,110: 6,123: 27$ | $177: 2,177: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { party [2] - 45:24, } \\ & 132.27 \end{aligned}$ | $105: 26,115: 25$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:11, 163:28, } \\ & \text { 167:24, 169:28, } \end{aligned}$ | parallel [24] - 16:18, | passage [1] - 126:1 | 124:7, 137:28, |
|  | 174:2, 179:22, 183:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 21,24: 24,26: 17, \\ & 27: 10,27: 18,27: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { passed [2] - 40:5, } \\ & \text { 171:7 } \end{aligned}$ | $138: 10,145: 11$ <br> permission |
| $111: 1,113: 13,114: 7$ | P | $28: 1,28: 4,30: 2,47: 9$ | PASSED [1]-1:3 | 85:11 |
| 30:16, 39:27, 47:21, |  | 50:28, 51:12, 51:16, | past [5]-159:20, | 4:6, 67:1, 67:7, 67:10, |
| $62: 20,82: 13,91: 20,$ | page [79]-5:22, 5:23, 7:3, 9:9, 9:16, | 51:26, 52:6, 68:19, | 159:24, 176:21, | $92: 12,92: 19,114: 13$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 96:19 } \\ & \text { ordinary [3] - } \end{aligned}$ | 10:9, 10:21, 11:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 68: 21,69: 7,69: 12 \\ & 70: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 181:6, 181:7 | 114:17, 114:23, 114:25, 114:28 |
| $79: 9,160: 4$ | 14:26, 14:29, 22:22, | paraphrasing [1] - | 81:19, 137:24 | $118: 9,119: 28,120: 8$ |
| organisation [2] - | 23:16, 23:17, 26:10, | 46:2 | path [1] - 109:28 | 120:11, 121:4, |
| 73:25, 76:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 23,30: 26,35: 23 \\ & 36: 6,36: 11,36: 23 \end{aligned}$ | parcel [2]-99:7, | patient [5] - 172:14, | 121:11, 121:13, |
| original [1] - 43:12 |  | 115:16 | 174:20, 175:13, | 121:15, 121:25, |
| originally [2] - 8:26, | $41: 4,49: 12,50: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pardon [3]-87:11, } \\ & 105: 1,111: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $177: 24,178: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:27, 122:2, 122:6, } \\ & \text { 122:8 } \end{aligned}$ |
| OSMOND [1] - 2:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 25,52: 10,54: 25, \\ & 56: 5,57: 4,58: 2, \end{aligned}$ | park [2] - 179:13, | PATRICK [2]-2:7, | Perry [2] - 67:11, |
| OTHER [1] - 1:2 <br> otherwise [4]-30:9, | 58:16, 60:4, 60:16, <br> $62 \cdot 10,63 \cdot 16,64: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:18 } \\ & \text { parked }[8]-44: 29, \end{aligned}$ | ```3:2 Patrick [1] - 19:13``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:8 } \\ & \text { perry [14] - 92:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $99: 6,161: 18,161: 23$ | $65: 15,68: 26,70: 28$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 2,45: 3,45: 18 \\ & 46: 9,46: 21,60: 28 \end{aligned}$ | Paul [25] - 7:10, 42:2, <br> 44:8, 63:12, 67:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 18,114: 19,118: 4 \\ & 118: 13,118: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $74: 28,77: 11,83: 12$ | $70: 7$ | 44:8, 63:12, 67:12, | 119:7, 119:8, 119:20, |
| 128:8, 128:28, 131:1, | 84:17, 84:18, 85:1, | PARLIAMENT ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 136:17, 137:8, | 119:21, 120:2, |
| 153:29 | $\begin{aligned} & 91: 25,92: 26,100: 24, \\ & 101: 1,102: 17,117: 7, \end{aligned}$ | 3:10 |  | 120:12, 121:8, 121:10 |





| sensitivity [1] - | 136:23, 137:5, | several [2] - 56:24, | 155:29, 182:23 | 114:9, 114:19, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17:11 | 137:11, 137:15, | 57:14 | sincerely [1] - 27:28 | 119:19, 120:10, |
| sent [19]-12:14 | 139:23, 139:25, | severe [2]-11:24, | SINéAD [1] - 2:7 | 120:12, 121:7, 121:9, |
| 23:10, 23:29, 31:23, | 140:10, 141:23, | 11:26 | SIO [1] - 85:7 | $127: 2,127: 3,127: 5,$ |
| 32:25, 83:13, 83:14, | 143:28, 145:14, | sexual [12]-7:9 | sit [4]-5:13, 122:29, | 128:26, 129:9, 130:5, |
| 83:18, 93:27, 101:25, | 146:7, 153:9, 154:10, | 12:19, 12:28, 15:4, | 135:29, 185:11 | 131:9, 132:15, |
| 102:11, 102:13, | 157:7, 159:9, 164:13, | 15:23, 21:28, 27:12, | sitting [1] - 184:24 | 133:13, 140:13, |
| 113:15, 132:4, 133:1, | 164:28, 170:29, | 45:23, 49:21, 49:22, | situation [17] - | 142:17, 146:3, |
| 141:28, 148:25, | 179:13, 179:29, | 49:25, 63:13 | 15:29, 38:21, 41:26, | 155:14, 161:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:5, 184:17 } \\ & \text { sentence }[3]-71: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 182:16 } \\ & \text { Sergeant [29] - 7:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shall }[2]-34: 18, \\ & 35: 27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 5,55: 23,76: 22, \\ & 85: 22,89: 5,96: 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 163:20, 165:17, } \\ & \text { 169:10, 170:2, 179:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 71:14, } 72: 12 \\ & \text { sentiment }[1] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:18, 19:19, 20:16 } \\ & \text { 20:17, 21:26, 27:27, } \end{aligned}$ | sham [1] - 132:26 <br> SHANE [2] - 2:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 21,99: 22,119: 21, \\ & \text { 119:25, 120:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 183:12 } \\ & \text { sort [2] - 140:4, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 132:25 | 29:10, 30:25, 31:23, $40: 13,44: 8,53: 28$, | $2: 16$ | 121:29, 145:10, | 185:8 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { separate [6] - 14:7, } \\ 36: 25,68: 10,68: 17, \end{array}$ | $55: 17,57: 6,63: 11$ | shape [1] - 66:17 <br> shared [4]-137:18, | six [6] - 31:9, 39:24, | sought [16] - 9:5, |
| 72:22, 175:27 | 81:24, 81:25, 82:15 98:25, 98:27, 98:28, | 140:9, 140:13, 163:7 | $40: 5,80: 22,115: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 11,35: 13,36: 19 \\ & 41: 7,43: 13,45: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { separately } \\ 11: 15.29: 22.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 25,98: 27,98: 28, \\ & 99: 7,123: 20,124: 29 \end{aligned}$ | Sheeran [4] - 53:28, <br> 57.6, 92.5, 124.29 | 144:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 7,43: 13,45: 5 \\ & 62: 6,63: 1,85: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| September [19] - | 147:13, 154:1, | SHELLEY [1] - 2:18 | skipping [1] - 7:18 | 88:1, 90:27, 96:7, |
| 57:11, 58:26, 62:5, | 156:27, 175:11 SERGEANT | SHIP [1] - 2:22 | slight [1]-64:8 | $99: 25,109: 18,129: 24$ |
| 88:9, 126:27, 141:26, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SERGEANT }{ }^{[1]} \\ & 2: 10 \end{aligned}$ | shirt [2] - 160:4, | slightly [2] - 176:7, | sound [1] - 106:19 <br> source [1] - 110:9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 142: 1,142: 20,147: 4 \\ & 149: 1,149: 5,150: 13 \end{aligned}$ | sergeant's [1] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 180:13 } \\ & \text { shook [1] - 143:5 } \end{aligned}$ | 177:8 slow [1] - 34:27 | Southeastern [3] - |
| 151:5, 151:7, 154:17, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 184:25 } \\ \text { series } \end{gathered}$ | shortly [2] - 13:27, | slowly [2] - 9:3, | $41: 8,44: 6,83: 19$ |
| ```155:21, 156:9 sequence [1] - 68:4 sequencing [1] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 3,123: 28 \\ & \text { serious }[35]-14: 14, \\ & 65: 16,65: 27,66: 9 \end{aligned}$ | ```128:7 show [1] - 178:1 showed [2] - 171:21, 176:10``` | 12:24 <br> small [1] - 148:20 <br> SMITHFIELD [1] - 3:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { span }[1]-69: 8 \\ & \text { speaking }[5]-22: 12, \\ & 126: 11,128: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| $130: 27$ <br> sequential ${ }^{[2]}$ - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 79:26, 80:29, 110:22, } \\ & \text { 110:26, 111:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sic }[1]-45: 6 \\ & \text { sick }[18]-10: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOLE }_{[1]}-2: 2 \\ & \text { solely [1] - } 25: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 166: 25,184: 28 \\ & \text { speaks }[2]-123: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| $27: 19,47: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:20, 111:24, } \\ & 112 \cdot 2 \quad 112 \cdot 11 \end{aligned}$ | 21:6, 21:8, 21:15 | solicitor [5]-80:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:2 } \\ & \text { specific [4] - 36:20, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { sergeant }[100]-6: 4, \\ 7: 27.8: 28.9: 4.9: 19 \end{array}$ | 112:14, 112:16, | 31:2, 79:4, 79:6, | 127:19, 128:19, | specific [4]-36:20, <br> 37:19, 102•1, 120.5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7: 27,8: 28,9: 4,9: 19 \\ & 12: 18,12: 21,13: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $112: 20,112: 28$ | 79:10, 79:14, 141:27, | 144:16, 151:15 | specifically [4] - |
| 14:13, 21:3, 22:12, | 112:29, 113:8, | 153:6, 153:7, 153:13, | SOLICITOR [1] - 2:9 | 131:23, 131:25, |
| 22:23, 23:23, 24:4, | 113:12, 113:13, | 153:19, 154:12, 161:1 | SOLICITOR'S [1] - | 131:28, 145:7 |
| 26:21, 29:18, 29:26, | 113:17, 113:23, | sickness [2]-22:14, | $2: 21$ | speed [2] - 95:25, |
| 31:1, 31:2, 31:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 113:27, 114:6, 114:7, } \\ & 123: 16,125: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 152:18 | SOLICITORS [3] - | 105:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 36: 20,37: 26,37: 28, \\ & 38: 7.39: 22.44: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 123:16, 125:12, 133:20, 134:3, 134:4, | side [1] - 123:23 | 2:13, 3:3, 3:9 | speedy [1] - 80:3 |
|  | $134: \text { ? }$ | signature [21] - | someone [5] - 21:21, | spend [1] - 108:2 |
| $55: 2,59: 29,62: 24$ | seriously [1] - 15:24 | 167:12, 167:17, | 79:10, 148:2, 151:29, | spending [1] - 99:2 <br> spoken [4]-37:4, |
| 63:27, 64:6, 66:3, | seriousness [4] - | 167:20, 167:23, | sometimes | $43: 25,48: 17,91: 4$ |
| 66:13, 66:17, 67:11, | 80:1, 82:14, 95:14, | 167:25, 167:26, | $140: 4$ | spot [1] - 120:4 |
| 67:15, 70:17, 77:9, | 112:8 | 167:29, 168:4, 168:5 | somewhat [1] - | SR1 [2] - 146:5, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 77: 27,78: 1,78: 27, \\ & 79: 3,79: 8,79: 18 \end{aligned}$ | serous [1] - 49:22 <br> service [2] - 134:7 | $168: 7,168: 12$ | $41: 18$ | $146: 22$ |
| 79:27, 89:26, 91:9, | 161:27 | 168:13, 168:15, | somewhere [1] | stage [47] - 7:25, |
| 91:16, 92:5, 96:23, | Services [1] - 1:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 168: 18,170: 13, \\ & 171: 13,171: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 148:20 } \\ & \text { soon } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 26,12: 8,22: 16 \\ & 22: 17,23: 23,24: 18, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 97: 3,97: 28,100: 3 \\ & \text { 104:26, 105:11, } \end{aligned}$ | SERVICES ${ }_{[1]}-1: 28$ <br> set [10]-11:13, 41:1 | signed [1] - 15:8 | 143:5 | $28: 26,30: 28,32: 22,$ |
| 108:22, 119:7, 120:9, | 50:27, 63:26, 70:25 | significant [4]-25:3, <br> 57:6, 96:18, 171:17 | sorry [53] - 11:19, | 34:1, 34:28, 38:17, <br> 39:22, 39:26, 41:19 |
| 123:8, 123:28, 125:8, | 77:27, 81:8, 85:8, | similar [4] - 57:27, | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 28,18: 9,34: 20 \\ & 36: 11,36: 12,36: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $43: 6,43: 7,44: 12$ |
| 125:29, 126:3, 126:6, | 91:17, 99:1 | 151:15, 162:12, 178:6 | 41:27, 42:11, 42:21, | 48:23, 48:24, 52:21, |
| 126:18, 126:19, | sets [2]-93:29, 94:3 | similarly [1] - 133:17 | $46: 2,51: 10,58: 17$ | $53: 27,54: 26,55: 27,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:22, 126:26, } \\ & \text { 127:4, 127:6, 128:5, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seven }[7]-115: 24, \\ & 137: 12.137: 19 . \end{aligned}$ | simple [1] - 120:15 | $61: 15,63: 4,71: 1$ | $56: 1,56: 10,59: 29$ |
| 127:4, 127:6, 128:5, <br> 128:22, 130:5, 130:6, | 137:12, 137:19, | simply $[7]$ - 61:9, | $72: 24,76: 7,83: 4$ | 60:5, 60:24, 60:26, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:22, 130:5, 130:6, } \\ & 134: 15,134: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 140:10, 160:6, 163:7, } \\ & 163: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $90: 16,117: 11$ | 88:13, 88:15, 88:17, | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 23,62: 2,77: 26, \\ & 85: 14,85: 22,86: 5 \end{aligned}$ |


| 88:17, 90:16, 126:19, | 129:15, 129:16, | 120:17, 138:28, | suffering [3]-11:23, | $135: 6,138: 5,138: 7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 127:29, 128:24, | 129:18, 129:20 | 139:20, 160:25, | $11: 26,150: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 138:8, 138:17, } \\ & \text { 138:24. 138:29. } \end{aligned}$ |
| $46: 29,154: 1,166: 16$ | 174:8 | 165:1 | sufficient [1]-114:1 | 139:24, 139:25, |
| stages [2] - 123:25, | Station [22]-42:3, | 23:24 | 43:14, 73:15, 76:29, | 140:10, 140:22, |
| 124:18 | 126:15, 138:18, | STREET [3] - 2:14, | 77:3, 103:7, 108:9, | 140:28, 141:24, |
| stalled [1] - 39:25 | 138:27, 139:12 | 2:22, 3:10 | 109:9, 109:26, 173:20 | 144:6, 144:16, |
| stamp [1] - 93:23 | 139:17, 147:23, | strenuous [1] - | suggested [2]-43:9, | 144:21, 145:1, 145:8, $145: 25.146: 12$ |
| 93:23 | 148:28, 150:19, | stress [18] - 10:28, | suggesting [1] - | 146:16, 146:21, |
| stand [1] - 182:25 | 154:27, 159:7, 160:1, | 11:26, 79:11, 142:1, | 73:20 | 148:17, 148:22, |
| standard [4]-24:13, | 161:10, 162:24, | 142:6, 145:19, 146:7, | suggestion [4] - | 148:29, 149:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:16, 81:7, 182:2 } \\ & \text { start [10] }-6: 11,6: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:7, 169:9, 179:14 } \\ & \text { 179:18, 180:1, 181:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 146:26, 147:19, } \\ & \text { 149:13, 150:10, } \end{aligned}$ | 117:23, 119:16, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:6, 150:17, } \\ & \text { 152:25, 154:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $6: 26,24: 6,25: 17$ | station [10] - 15:5, | 154:22, 156:2, 156:7, | suitable [3]-17:7, | $154: 20,155: 7,159: 3$ |
| 44:3, 77:1, 114:3, | 139:18, 140:19, | 156:16, 157:10, | 72:4, 73:2 | 162:26, 164:9, $165: 10.165: 11$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 167:15, 167:28 } \\ & \text { started [12]-16:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 141:3, 143:3, 159:28, } \\ & \text { 181:9, 181:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 157:16, 158:21 } \\ \text { strict }[1]-48: 8 \end{array}$ | Suitable [1] - 71:2 <br> summarises [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:10, 165:11, } \\ & \text { 165:18, 165:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 21:21, 24:18, 24:19, | 183:26, 184:9 | strong [1] - 37:13 | 94:15, 105:19 | 165:26, 165:27, |
| 24:20, 53:18, 71:20, | stations [6]-137:2, | stuff [1] - 146:17 | summary [2]-70:8, | 165:28, 166:2, 166:6, |
| $71: 25,75: 17,76: 9$, $136.27,137.7$ | 141:6, 183:29, 184:2, 184:4. 184:6 | $\text { sub [1] }-138: 3$ | 97:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 166:10, 166:23, } \\ & \text { 166:26, 170:6, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:27, 137:7 } \\ & \text { starting [9]-11:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 184:4, 184:6 <br> status [8] - 33:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sub-district [1] - } \\ & 138: 3 \end{aligned}$ | SUNLIGHT [1] - 3:9 <br> super [9]-137:25, | 171:19, 172:25, |
| 13:8, 13:16, 13:20, | 33:14, 52:16, 56:3, | subject [3]-16:11, | 155:10, 158:27, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:2, 179:11, } \\ & \text { 179:12, 179:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 15:12, 17:23, 88:27, | 88:2, 96:7, 97:7, | $28: 9,63: 18$ | 182:17, 182:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:12, 179:19, } \\ & \text { 180:10, 182:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:11, 181:6 } \\ & \text { starts }[2]-72: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 97:26 <br> stay [10] - 46:14, <br> 136:26, 151:20, | $\begin{gathered} \text { submission [5] - } \\ 60: 11,78: 2,78: 17 \end{gathered}$ | 182:29, 183:1, 183:6 Superintendent [156] | 180:10, 182:8, <br> 182:22, 183:4, 184:27 <br> superintendent [54] |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 73:18 } \\ & \text { State }[3]-80: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 136:26, 151:20, } \\ & \text { 151:22, 151:27, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 80:18, 130:23 } \\ & \text { submissions [6] - } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -5: 7,6: 3,7: 12,7: 24, \\ & 9: 1,9: 4,9: 13,10: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -5: 14,5: 16,5: 18 \\ & 5: 26,6: 1,6: 7,6: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 127:19, 128:18 | 161:18, 161:23, 162:14, 162:15, | 78:2, 78:20, 120:15, | 10:25, 11:8, 15:3, | $6: 24,11: 23,23: 8,$ |
| STATE [1] - 2:21 <br> statement [44] - | $168: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:21, 122:4, } 123: 10 \\ & \text { submit [1] }-33: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:13, 20:2, 22:29, } \\ & \text { 23:7, 25:17, 26:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $25: 14,25: 22,26: 19,$ |
| $5: 21,5: 23,6: 11,6: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { stenographic [1] - } \\ & 1: 25 \end{aligned}$ | submitted [12] - | $26: 5,27: 26,28: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 6,32: 19,32: 22 \\ & 36: 12,43: 5,60: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6: 26,7: 2,7: 26,9: 5, \\ & 10: 17,15: 10,19: 8 \end{aligned}$ | stenography [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 10,36: 15,39: 23 \\ & 41: 2,45: 7,60: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28: 27,30: 4,32: 4, \\ & 33: 7,33: 16,40: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 61:24, 61:26, 63:29, |
| 24:25, 24:29, 30:15, | $1: 23$ | $61: 11,63: 14,123: 3$ | 42:29, 43:10, 44:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 64: 19,65: 13,66: 19 \\ & 72: 3,72: 20,83: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 31:13, 31:15, 43:18, | STENOGRAPHY ${ }_{[1]}$ | $124: 18,146: 9,175: 11$ | $45: 24,48: 15,49: 23$ | 84:11, 85:2, 85:25, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 47: 25,56: 23,56: 25, \\ & 57: 14,57: 20,57: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1: 28 \\ & \text { step [5] - 75:20, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { subsection [1] - } \\ & 35: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 51:28, 54:13, 55:29, | 85:28, 122:16, |
| 62:27, 80:13, 91:24, | 96:22, 97:2, 167:9 | subsections [1] - | $61: 13,61: 18,62: 1$ | 124:20, 130:27, |
| $97: 15,105: 28,117: 8$, $117 \cdot 13,136: 4,147: 7$ | step-by-step [1] - | 60:17 | 62:5, 63:6, 64:27, | 135:14, 138:28, |
| 117:13, 136:4, 147:7, 147:8, 151:27, | stepped [1] - 145:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { subsequent [1] - } \\ & \text { 22:20 } \end{aligned}$ | 81:19, 83:1, 83:26, | 142:7, 142:15, 143:4, |
| 159:15, 160:2, | steps [7]-96:10, | subsequently [3] - | $84: 1,84: 24,85: 5 \text {, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 144:13, 147:22, } \\ & \text { 148:11, 156:21, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 161:16, 164:21, } \\ & \text { 166:18, 169:29, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 15,97: 10,97: 13 \\ & 97: 27,108: 8,129: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 13:18, 18:21, 19:4 | 85:10, 85:23, 86:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 148:11, 156:21, } \\ & \text { 163:22, 165:19, } \end{aligned}$ |
| 176:5, 176:24, | still [15] - 19:9, | $79: 25,92: 27,105: 22$ | 88:21, 88:28, 89:6, | 166:13, 169:14, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:15, 183:28 } \\ & \text { statements }[33]- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 29,38: 20,49: 15, \\ & 56: 9,86: 22,86: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { substantial [1] - } \\ & 138: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 3,91: 29,92: 6, \\ & 92: 19,92: 22,92: 29, \end{aligned}$ | 179:1, 180:5, 182:28 superintendent's [2] |
| $20: 3,29: 2,33: 26$ | 87:16, 88:25, 98:26 | substantive [10] - | 93:28, 94:7, 94:15, | $\begin{aligned} & -5: 21,140: 29 \\ & \text { supers [1] }-182: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48:12, 58:22, 61:25, } \\ & 61: 26,66: 2,93: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 98: 27,99: 8,110: 8 \\ & 157: 11,174: 28 \end{aligned}$ | $24: 10,48: 15,48: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 1,95: 9,97: 1, \\ & 106: 15,106: 23, \end{aligned}$ | supervise [1] - |
| $94: 7,96: 14,96: 18,$ | stop [3] - 9:10, | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 17,61: 15,61: 16 \\ & \text { 61:23, 61:28, } 96: 22, \end{aligned}$ | 107:4, 112:3, 114:12, | $144: 27$ |
| 96:26, 105:20, | $12: 25,130: 7$ | 104:24 | $115: 4,116: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { supervision [1] - } \\ & 143 \cdot 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| 107:28, 108:22, <br> 116:15, 116:19 | stopped [2] - 105:8, | substantively [3] - | 117:22, 118:18, 119:11, 123:29, | supplied [1] - 37:26 |
| 116:22, 116:24, | stopping [3] - 98:15, | 40:6, 45:8, 99:24 | 124:1, 125:23, | suppose [23] - |
| 116:29, 117:2, | $98: 28,99: 3$ | $86: 26,107: 2,109: 23$ | 128:10, 128:11, | $17: 21,34: 22,39: 22,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 117: 17,117: 18, \\ & 111 \cdot .21 \text { 125:? } \end{aligned}$ | stoutly [1] - 118:24 | succinctly [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 128:14, 130:17, } \\ & \text { 132:10, 132:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 19,41: 23,59: 20, \\ & 68: 4,81: 11,114: 11, \end{aligned}$ |


| 114:12, 140:2, | telephone [8] - 54:5, | thorough [4]-65:22, | 185:12 | tray [2] - 146:18, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 154:23, 156:11, | 54:9, 54:12, 54:26, | 65:29, 66:1, 66:14 | took [55] - 7:26, 9:4, | 165:2 |
| 157:28, 158:2, | 55:9, 55:13, 110:2, | thoroughly [6] | 26:10, 44:2, 51:14, | treated [2]-12:2, |
| 167:17, 171:19, | 124:27 | 17:10, 81:2, 81:5, | 55:7, 58:10, 65:28, | 15:24 |
| 171:24, 172:3, 172:6, | telephonic [2]- | 108:21, 108:28, | 67:18, 67:29, 68:17, | treating [1] - 133:15 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 178:9, 178:12, 181:2 } \\ \text { surely [2] - 103:26, } \end{gathered}$ | $53: 19,56: 29$ | $123: 20$ | $68: 22,70: 26,75: 15$ $75: 16,75: 21,76: 1$ | tribunal [31] - 6:13, |
| 119:4 | 176:17, 176:21, | $22: 2,30: 11,49: 4$ | $76: 24,76: 28,78: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 29,55: 3,67: 16, \\ & 114: 11,114: 16, \end{aligned}$ |
| surgery [2]-174:7, | 181:6, 182:19 | 59:10 | 80:21, 81:2, 81:3, | 126:28, 127:7, |
| 177:19 | tensions [4] - | three [30]-10:16, | 81:4, 82:15, 82:26, | 133:12, 133:23, |
| surprise [1] - 49:20 | 139:27, 140:27, | 14:7, 14:17, 27:20, | 97:13, 97:27, 99:4, | 133:24, 136:5, |
| Susan [3]-19:18, | 141:13, 141:16 | 65:2, 65:26, 66:8, | 107:23, 108:9, | 137:29, 143:4, |
| $81: 24,83: 14$ | term [1] - 153:6 | $68: 10,103: 17$ | 108:19, 108:23, | 144:28, 145:16, |
| suspect [1] - 56:26 | termed [1] - 110:21 | 111:23, 111:28, | 109:2, 109:3, 115:5, | $150: 2,154: 9,154: 18$ |
| swept [1] - 177:24 | terms [53]-7:20, | 115:25, 115:26, | 115:23, 115:29, | 155:5, 159:15, |
| swiftly [2]-13:13, | 8:11, 68:16, 68:21, | 116:5, 116:6, 116:7, | 116:5, 117:23, | 163:21, 166:1, |
| 123:2 | 68:28, 69:14, 70:2, | 122:22, 123:4, 123:9, | 123:18, 123:19, | 166:18, 173:3, |
| SWORN [2] - 5:10, | 73:17, 74:21, 75:11, | 125:19, 126:8, | 124:3, 131:14, | 177:15, 178:4, |
| 135:26 | 75:26, 76:20, 77:6, | 146:18, 149:28, | 137:16, 150:4, 150:9, | 180:28, 181:27, |
| sympathetic [1] - | 78:5, 78:7, 79:14, | 155:9, 167:16, 169:4, | 164:28, 165:19, | 183:27, 184:13 |
| 121:23 | 80:10, 81:16, 84:10, | 169:11, 169:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 176:29, 183:17, } \\ & 184 \cdot 11 \end{aligned}$ | TRIBUNAL [3] - 1:1, |
| SÍOCHÁNA [1] - 2:16 | 88:21, 89:22, 91:22, | $176: 22,185: 3$ | 184:11 | $2: 6,2: 9$ |
| Séan [1] - 143:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 92:28, 93:2, 93:8, } \\ & 93: 28 . ~ 95: 1 . ~ 97: 8 ~ \end{aligned}$ | throughout [3] - <br> $70: 14,70: 18,91: 23$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { top }[7]-26: 12, \\ 54: 25,84: 29,93: 15, \end{gathered}$ | Tribunal [1] - 183:16 <br> TRIBUNALS ${ }_{[1]}-1 \cdot 7$ |
| Siochana [16] - 14:3, 25:20, 26:29, 27:14, | 100:2, 100:9, 104:13 | thrust [1] - 94:20 | $126: 7,132: 14,167: 11$ | tried [2] - 109:10, |
| 31:21, 33:23, 33:25, | 104:21, 106:14, | Thursday [7] - | total [1] - 115:25 | $158: 24$ |
| 50:16, 73:26, 74:7, | 108:7, 108:29, | 138:25, 165:8, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { totally [8]-108:12, } \\ & \text { 134:12. 144:8. } \end{aligned}$ | trigger [1] - 25:29 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 134:7, 136:13, 148:5, } \\ & \text { 151:21, 152:2, 177:10 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 109:28, 110:14, } \\ & \text { 110:24, 112:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 165:22, 165:26, } \\ & \text { 171:22, 185:5, } 185: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 134:12, 144:8, <br> 144:14, 144:28, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { triggered [2] - 88:3, } \\ & \text { 138:20 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 113:21, 114:29, | THURSDAY ${ }_{[1]}$ - | 145:10, 151:28 | trivial [1] - 149:25 |
| T | 115:14, 116:10, 119:29, 124:20, | $185: 19$ | touch [5]-67:28, 70:13, 81:11, 100:2 | trouble [1] - 132:1 |
| table [2] | 125:29, 126:4, 127:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tidy }[2]-86: 3 \\ & 130: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $116: 19$ | try [2] - 88:28, 153:2 <br> trying [10] - 78:12, |
| 153:2 | 130:23, 150:21, | timeframe [19] | 116:9 | $99: 16,121: 7,140: 4,$ |
| tandem [2] - 47:5, | 162:23 | 11:13, 13:5, 14:11, | touching [1] - 23:14 | 170:28, 183:25, 184:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 47:26 } \\ & \text { target }[4]-6: 3,66: 5, \end{aligned}$ | thanked [1] - 172:24 <br> that" [1]-139.27 | 14:12, 19:26, 21:27, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tour }[1]-163: 12 \\ & \text { towards [2] }-142: 26 . \end{aligned}$ | Tuesday [1] - 144:10 |
| $66: 13,66: 17$ | $\text { THE }_{[16]}-1: 2,1: 6,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 14,48: 8,51: 2, \\ & 59: 16,74: 6,74: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 183:1 | TUESDAY [2] - 1:17, 5:1 |
| targeted [2]-119:1, | 1:7, 1:12, 2:3, 2:6, | 95:13, 122:26, | town [1] - 160:24 | turn [4] - 32:27, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:7 } \\ & \text { targeting }[6]-66: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 9,2: 16,5: 1,5: 15 \\ & 92: 15,135: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:28, 140:8, } \\ & \text { 140:11, 148:14 } \end{aligned}$ | train [1] - 91:2 <br> trained [1] - 82:11 | 79:21, 92:27, 110:10 |
| $66: 12,133: 15,159: 1$ | 135:20, 179:8, | timeframes [2] - | training [1] - 72:8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { turning [2] - 149:12, } \\ & \text { 183:1 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} 164: 8,179: 10 \\ \text { task [1] - 20:2 } \end{array}$ | 185:15, 185:19 themselves ${ }^{[2]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:5, 28:11 } \\ & \text { timeline }[10]-80: 10, \end{aligned}$ | Tralee [3] - 85:25, 85:28, 86.5 | two [31] - 10:17, |
| tasked [3]-82:1, | 25:10, 121:24 | 81:16, 97:21, 114:29, | transcript [2] - 1:24, | 26:13, 28:17, 28:24, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 82:6, 122:19 } \\ & \text { team [22]-19:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { THEN [2] - 92:15, } \\ & 135: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 123: 1,123: 9,123: 24 \\ & 126: 12,127: 29 \end{aligned}$ | $161: 14$ | $30: 8,31: 7,43: 2,53: 1$ |
| 24:27, 25:1, 25:6, | therefore [14] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:12, 127:29, } \\ & 130: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { transfer }[4]-84: 16, \\ 96: 4,183: 17,183: 18 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 20,63: 18,72: 22, \\ & 77: 13,80: 21,81: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| 25:7, 80:14, 81:18, | 10:18, 47:15, 47:20, | timelines [1] - 12:29 | transferred [13]- | 85:8, 92:13, 97:1, |
| 81:29, 82:6, 86:19, | 86:27, 92:4, 96:7, | timely [1] - 79:17 | 83:5, 84:2, 84:12, | 104:28, 105:2, |
| 86:26, 87:19, 88:5, | 100:16, 100:18, | Tipperary [5] -6:16, | 84:13, 85:26, 91:28, | 109:19, 115:29, |
| 89:15, 95:16, 95:17, | 101:21, 102:28 | $25: 3,25: 8,82: 12$ | 91:29, 92:1, 106:25, | 132:9, 140:6, 144:11, |
| 97:19, 98:16, 98:22, | 103:4, 106:26, 115:8, | 89:12 | 106:29, 125:24, | $175: 27,180: 3$ |
| 123:13, 125:20, | $143: 21$ | today [3] - 18:17, | $125: 27,137: 14$ | two-month [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 157:13 } \\ & \text { teams [1] - 124:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { thinking }[2]-47: 16 \text {, } \\ & \text { 129:10 } \end{aligned}$ | $105: 28,143: 5$ | transferring [2] - <br> 183.9, 183:14 | $104: 28,105: 2$ |
| technical [3]-56:25, | $\text { third }[4]-23: 13$ | together [4]-27:12, | translating [1] - 73:5 | two-week [1] - 31:7 <br> Twomey [7] - 34:29, |
| 59:24, 107:26 <br> tediously [1] - 109:5 | $\begin{gathered} 83: 23,137: 11,143: 19 \\ \text { thirds [1] - 43:3 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 32:11, 62:2, 148:10 } \\ \text { tomorrow [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { transmission }[1] \text { - } \\ & 127: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 18,58: 9,88: 1 \\ & 89: 4,97: 24,100: 20 \end{aligned}$ |



| Y |
| :---: |
| ```year [14]-46:27, 50:19, 57:17, 64:6, 81:12, 105:15, 105:19, 107:24, 133:13, 136:24, 142:12, 142:17, 177:23 years [28] - 6:14, 27:20, 53:1, 66:8, 80:21, 93:11, 105:29, 107:9, 109:19, 115:26, 115:29, 116:1, 116:5, 134:6, 137:1, 137:13, 137:19, 138:13, 140:10, 149:28, 151:21, 160:6, 163:7, 163:8, 170:25, 178:10, 178:28, 181:29 yesterday[1] - 12:3 your.. [1]-34:21 yourself [9] - 15:12, 20:8, 33:15, 47:8, 60:28, 98:8, 147:9, 160:19, 169:22``` |
| É |
| $\text { ÉIREANN }{ }_{[2]}-1: 3 \text {, }$ |


[^0]:    "By causing I nspector O Sullivan to make i nappropriate enqui ries from Sergeant Barry's general practitioner Dr. Margaret Ki el y on the 5th April 2013."

