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THE HEARI NG RESUMED, AS FOLLOVG, ON WEDNESDAY, 22ND JUNE 2022:

CHA RMAK Thanks very much. Now, Mr. McGuinness, just before we begin, I have a pleasant task, which is to welcome a guest here is Judge Faroshi Hashimi, who is more than welcome. She has come to Ireland from Afghanistan, which represents a place where there are great difficulties for judges and, more particularly, for women judges. Judge Hashimi is a judge and is more 11:02 than welcome in Ireland and a particularly welcome guest at our tribunal. So thank you for coming. Thank you.

Now, Mr. McGuinness.
MR. MEGI NNESS: Chairman, good morning. Our first witness this morning is Mr. John Barrett.
CHAN RMAN Yes. Thanks very much. Where is Mr. Barrett? Ah yes, good morning, Mr. Barrett.
THE WTNESS: Good morning, Judge.
CHA RMAN Nice to see you again, Mr. Barrett. THE WTNESS: Thank you, sir. Good to see you.

## MR. J OHN BARRETT, HAV NG BEEN SUORN, WAS

 DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NNESS, AS FQLLOVG: 11:03CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Sit down, Mr. Barrett. Now, Mr. McGuinness.
MR. MEGU NNESS: Mr. Barrett, I think you were
appointed to the role of executive director in HR \& PD, Human Resources, People Development in An Garda Síochána on the 3rd October 2014?
A. Yes.

2 Q. And I think you still currently hold that office?
A. I do.

3 Q. You held that office in the period that we're concerned with in connection with Sergeant Barry, as he then was, until he left the force on retirement in June 2016?
A. Yes.

4 Q. You had that position during the entirety of that period?
A. Yes.

5 Q. Just to clarify matters so that everyone is absolutely clear, you were appointed to that position as a civilian coming from -- not from within the ranks of An Garda Síochána, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

6 Q. And you held and hold and never held any rank within An Garda Síochána as a policeman?
A. That's correct.

7 Q. In any sense. None of the powers, duties or responsibilities of a member at any rank?
A. That's correct.

8 Q. There had been, I think, an executive director with the 11:05 same title, who was a member before your appointment, isn't that correct?
A. No, he was titled assistant commissioner HRM. The role became executive director $H R \& P D$.

9 Q. Yes. And certainly any references to that position prior to your taking that up do not refer to you?
A. That's correct.

10 Q. And any references in the transcript to an earlier --
A. Yes.

11 Q. -- action in that regard or any step taken is not a reference to you as such?
A. It's not.

Yes. Now, you identified to our tribunal investigator, Mr. Ryan, who you met recently for interview, that your 11:06 earliest knowledge relating to Mr. Barry appeared to stem from a memo that was sent to you by Chief Superintendent Tony McLough1in in November 2014, which appeared to be a summary of the outcome of a bullying and harassment complaint made by Sergeant Barry, which had concluded at that stage, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

13 Q. And I think, as appears from the document, we don't need to look at it, but that seems to have been sent to you in connection with informing you of the institution of proceedings by Mr. Barry and for onward transmission to Mr. Ken Ruane, a legal adviser, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

And presumably that would have been a routine communication through to you in connection with that?
A. Matters going before the personal injuries board would have been routinely put through my office.

15 Q. Yes. Just at that point in time, did you know anything about Mr. Barry, or Sergeant Barry as he then was, and
in particular any complaint that he had made about criminal conduct alleged to have taken place in connection with another investigation?
A. That was the first occasion that any of that matter became something I became aware of.
Q. Yes.
A. It was an appended report by Inspector Downey that set out some of the history.
17 Q. Yes. Now, you were asked by the investigator a number of questions and perhaps we will just get you to confirm your answers to them. I think you had no knowledge or involvement of any kind in Chief Superintendent Kehoe's investigation of the alleged bullying and harassment, isn't that correct?
A. I had none, correct.

18 Q. At any stage?
A. At any stage.

19 Q. And I think the same position obtained in relation to her investigation, which we are calling just the criminal investigation, you had no...?
A. Yes. Item 9 on that list, no, I had no knowledge or engagement with it.
20 Q. Yes. And insofar as she was then tasked to and did also complete a disciplinary investigation, you had no knowledge, involvement or participation at all in any aspect of that?
A. Correct. All that was in train before I arrived.

21 Q. Yes. Just on the point at issue in terms of a protected disclosure, obviously the Protected

Disclosures Act had been passed earlier in 2014, but was anything that Sergeant Barry had complained of identified to you as a protected disclosure?
A. I've read, Mr. McGuinness, what Sergeant Barry says in relation to his letter to me and I read that simply in the context of it being a transfer and dealt with it as such.
22 Q. Yes. And we will come to that in due course. Just in terms of the transfer process, I think you've described that in your interview with the investigator and perhaps we will just look at that briefly, at page 5780?
A. Okay.

23 Q. And I should state for the transcript, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Barrett's interview with our investigators commences at page 5761 of our papers, but this is at 5780.
A. Is this to appear on my screen?
Q. Yes, if you just bear with us, Mr. Barrett. We are just checking a technical issue. But just to continue
while we're bringing that up. I think the investigator, Mr. Ryan, asked you to provide a brief overview of your role with respect to transfers of Garda members from one district or division to another and appeals relating to such transfers?
A. Mr. McGuinness, I have my statement copy here, if you could direct me to which page.

25 Q. If you look at page 20 of your interview, 1ine 287?
A. Very good.

I think you answered him in the following way, you said:
"Transfers for garda members were dealt with by the transfers office (now called the resources allocation of fice) then led by Inspector Si néad Power. Ther ef ore I gave the transfer process autonomy and l put it in the hands of Chi ef Superintendent McLoughlin (HRM) to whomthe transfers office reported and onl matters of controversy or appeal would come to me."
A. That's correct.

28 Q. Then you go on to say:
"Chapter 8 of the Garda Code (on transfers) of fers no gui dance for the parameters within whi ch the executive di rector of $H R \& P D$, as the hearer of the appeal s should deci de appeals or what rel evant matters should be taken into account when deci ding the appeal. If a di visional officer makes a decision and the person subject to the transfer makes an appeal, the executive director of $H R \& P D$ is the first stage of appeal. The Code provi ded that the $A / C$ HRM woul $d$ be the person to recei ve appeals agai nst a transfer. There was no A C HRM following my appoi nt ment as executive director HR \& PD. I stepped into this position (A/C HRM following a di rection fromthe commi ssi oner in this one specific case."

I think you confirmed that you had been delegated expressly that function by the commissioner on, I think, 20th May 2015?
A. Yes.

11:11
That's at page 5833 of our papers. We don't need to, I think, look at that. And I think you make the pint subsequently, that also required a statutory instrument?
A. It may not have been a statutory instrument or required a change of regulations or the code, there had to be an amendment because of the anomaly created by the change of title.
Q. Yes. Just to be clear then as to your participation or nonparticipation in anything that had taken place before that, you had not been either consulted or took any part in any decision-making relating to any proposed transfer of Sergeant Barry or any step in any appeal prior to that point in time?
A. That's correct.

31 Q. And insofar as any personnel bulletins issued on behalf of A/C HRM prior to that, that would have been Chief Superintendent McLough1in's responsibility at that time?
A. Yes.
Under, I think, Assistant Commissioner Fanning?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I think you received an appeal in the matter
following your designation, isn't that correct?
A. Yes. I may have had the appeal in advance and then the matters arose as to how $I$ could be got to stand into the role.
Q. Yes.
A. But I did receive an appeal, yes.

If we look at page 57 -- I beg your pardon, page 5801, this was Sergeant Barry's appeal, a five-page, a
six-page document I think, going to page 5806. And you received that. Now, insofar as that appeal referred to Superintendent Comyns and the allegation against him, did you have any understanding that was an allegation stil1 continuing at that point in time?
A. I did, I was aware that allegation 9, is it, or as it was set out in Inspector Downey's report, was ongoing at the time.

37 Q. Can you describe generally how you decided to and how you did deal with that appeal?
A. I dealt with it, Mr. McGuinness, by reference to the file. I think $I$ am on record as having asked Chief Superintendent McLoughlin for a comprehensive report on the entire matter.
Q. Yes.
A. I don't recal1, frank7y, whether I received the report and what form it came in. And I'm at a disadvantage in not being able to have access to my papers and my office, I think you're aware of that.
A. Yes.
Q. You say:
"I revi ewed the file in this matter in rel ation to the transfer of Sergeant Barry from Mtchel stown Garda Station to Angl esea Street Garda Station. I have taken i nto consideration all of the facts and advi ces recei ved fromthe Chi ef Medical Officer, in which he stated that a self and supportive workplace envi ronment should precl ude obl i gat ory inter action bet ween Ser geant 11:16 Paul Barry and Superintendent M chael Comyns."
A. Yes.

43 Q. "I n order for the above to be achi eved and for a supportive structure to be in place for Sergeant Barry it is my recommendation that he transfer to Angl esea Street Garda Station. "

Now, I think you had received in the course of that appeal, prior to your decision, a report from Chief

Superintendent Dillane of some length, isn't that correct?
A. I did.

44 Q. That's annexed to the papers, we've seen that. And there were a number of other reports enclosed with that 11:16 also, isn't that correct?
A. There were, from various staff members in the division. okay. You were asked about the rationale for your decision by our investigator and perhaps we will just look at your response to that, at 5784. Line 353 records there:
"I have been asked with regard to my decision in the above extract that Sergeant Barry be transferred to Angl esea Street Garda Station, can I el abor ate further, 11:17 if possible, with regard to the matters that informed my deci si on-making. "

And you say:
"I will make three points about that particular decision. The first one was, by thi s date the matter had been ongoing for a number of years. Various accommdations offered, such as a more to Glanmire, cl ose to Sergeant Barry's resi dence, had been declined by Sergeant Barry."

Now, can I ask you, had you considered or did you consider it necessary to see whether he would accept a
transfer to somewhere else or did you consider yourself bound just to look at the particular transfer being proposed and appealed?
A. The rationale, as set out there in those three points, Mr. McGuinness, also is referred to in a prior answer, where I deal with supportive input from the chief medical officer, who at the time was Dr. Donal Collins. The view taken was that various efforts had been made to accommodate an alternative to mitchelstown.
Glanmire was one. The original that Fintan Fanning proposed, was originally Fermoy in 2014, January 2014. Anglesea Street, however, is distinguished by the fact that it's a regional headquarters, based in the regional headquarters are staff of the Employee Assistance Service, Mr. Landy was then one of those staff. And I felt that Sergeant Barry would be in a position to have a number of different options open to him greater than would exist in a smaller substation such as either Glanmire or Mitchelstown.
46 Q. Yes. And I think you make that point as your second point with the interview with the investigator. You go on to make a final point then:
"The final point was irrespective of where M chael Comyns was, in Fermoy or Mayfiel d, where he was subsequently posted, Angl esea Street was essentially in a different orbit, a different place."
A. Yes.

47 Q. "To me, those factors dealt with what Mr. Oghuvbu was proposing and di dn't of fend ei ther gentleman. "
A. Yes.

## A. That was really the extent of it, yes.

And in terms of Superintendent Comyns, had you any that stage?
A. I had a number of meetings where he and I would have been in attendance together at large group meetings of
supers and chiefs.
Yes.
A. But I don't have any real intimate contact with Superintendent Comyns either.
Q. Yes. And Chief Superintendent Dillane, at whose instance the proposed transfer had been authorised, had you any dealings or knowledge of Chief Superintendent Dillane?
A. With increasing seniority I would have been meeting people at more senior ranks with more frequency, so at chief superintendents meetings $I$ would have come across Ger Dillane, there would have been fewer people present. I would have attended occasionally meetings of the chief superintendents in the Cork region or in the Southern Region. So I would have more knowledge of 11:22 Chief Superintendent Dillane.

56 Q. Yes. The decision that you made was then the subject of an appeal --
A. It was.

57 Q. -- by Sergeant Barry, as he was entitled to do. Was it 11:22 your function then to assist in processing that appeal onwards?
A. I asked that the paperwork, the file essentially that I had relied upon and a briefing note would be prepared for the private secretary, the commissioner or the deputy Commissioner, whoever in effect was delegated by the commissioner to ask for the papers. This was done on my definite by Chief Superintendent McLoughlin.

58 Q. Yes. The appeal was rejected by the commissioner and
then subject to a further appeal by Sergeant Barry, as he was entitled to, in the context of having it considered by the transfer appeal body?
A. That's correct.

59 Q. Established by agreement with the representative bodies, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

60 Q. Was it your function to prepare the briefing document for that?
A. Again, I have no particular memory of this,

Mr. McGuinness, but my assumption is that there was a direction from the commissioner's office and I would simply have delegated that to Chief Superintendent McLough1in to prepare the briefing note.
61 Q. Yes. Perhaps we will just look at that document, it's page 5822. That extends over a number of pages, which summarises every step of the position, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

62 Q. And obviously you're including there at page 5827 your own rationale for your own decision?
A. That's correct.

63 Q. If we just look at that, it then details the onward progression of it to the commissioner then, isn't that correct, from 5827 onwards? And you sign that, in any event, at page 5831, it having been prepared for you?
A. Yes, I think I would have seen an early draft of that and I think I would have perfected it and signed it, that's correct.

64 Q. Yes. Ultimately Sergeant Barry, as you became aware, appeared before the transfer review body, as is common, and they issued their recommendation in the circumstances that the appeal not proceed and that was accepted by the commissioner?
A. Correct.

65 Q. Now, Sergeant Barry has identified to the tribunal, indeed, in the initial appeal to you and in the initial appeal from you, what he said are protected disclosures within the context of the body of those matters. But as I understand your responses to the investigator, you dealt with the appeal on the basis of the material relating to the appeal?
A. I did. I sought, however, Mr. McGuinness, a report on these other matters and I have no recollection of whether or not I received it.

66 Q. Yes.
A. It was a report I sought from Chief Superintendent McLough1in and I was, you know, alive to the fact that there were issues that I wanted to have further investigated.

67 Q. Yes. He had raised a number of other issues and I think your reference to that resulted in a letter that you separately wrote, at page 5808, just to make that clear. If we just go to page 5808. But you presumably 11:26 still knew at this stage that the other investigations being conducted by Chief Superintendent Kehoe, the criminal/discipline, were still ongoing?
A. I presume it was in September 2016, yes.

68 Q. Yes. Now, in terms of any issue concerning the time period in which the appeal was taken and decided upon, either by you and/or subsequently, would you accept that there was any delay in dealing with the matter on your part, in the first instance?
A. The only delay arising and I suppose in reality, because this was the first occasion that we had this issue concerning A/C HRM versus executive director, recently appointed, there was a little bit of time lost between May and perhaps August while those matters were 11:27 being ironed out. The correspondence, I think, identifies Superintendent Gerry o'brien as having flagged these in the office of the chief administrative officer. But there was no inordinate delay, I would suggest.
69 Q. Obviously from the point of view of Sergeant Barry, the transfer is deferred automatically by the putting in of an appea1?
A. Yes.
A. He did.

71 Q. An issue arose about the context in which changes were made to the Pulse system, which apparently showed, notwithstanding the putting in of the appeal and the deferral of it, that he had been shown on Pulse to have 11:28 transferred. Had you any knowledge or insight into how that had occurred or might have occurred?
A. No, I have no knowledge at all about how that might occur and how it would be unique to a single
individual. I have no knowledge of that. I would have no hand, act or part in that administrative process.

Did any aspect of it appear to you to be related to the targeting of Sergeant Barry as a result of any of the complaints he had made?
A. No. I saw nothing in this, other than, truthfully, an example of the Code working to its fullest, including the decision by the transfer review body to overturn the commissioner, who had agreed with my view on the first level appeal.

74 Q. Yes. I think you were asked directly about this by the investigator, Mr. Ryan. If we perhaps just look at page 5787, at line 395. The question being asked is:
"I have been asked was it the view of seni or Gar da management Sergeant Barry had been intransi gent or recal citrant in his approach to the issue of a
"I have read the report of Chi ef Superintendent Dillane and concl uded that a reasonable effort had been made to find an alternative to the original suggestion that he nove to $G$ anmire. When that was declined, gi ven it addressed all of the issues in a like with like comparison, the policing duties would have been similar, he was advantaged by his geography, and it was taking away issue of contact with Superintendent Comyns, I felt that was a reasonable effort by Chi ef Superintendent Dillane."

So, can the tribunal conclude, you saw nothing untoward or improper either in motive or action?
A. No, no. In fact, it was from Chief Superintendent Dillane's report that I read that there had been an effort made to accommodate him closer to his residence in a way that he would be in a station comparable to Mitchelstown. And I felt that was a reasonable effort in the circumstances by Chief superintendent Dillane.
75 Q. Yes. Did you know of any hostility or otherwise directed towards Sergeant Barry either at local level, management level or HQ level which related to this process?
A. Yeah, I can certainly say there was no knowledge on my part as I addressed this issue of anything other than what was revealed by the papers, right. So, it's not as if this was a matter of watercooler conversation or anything of the like; it was just simply the papers told their story. I certainly didn't engage in any
hostility towards Sergeant Barry and I would say none of my staff, to my knowledge, did likewise. I think we dealt with it purely, administratively and properly per the code.
76 Q.
I think you confirmed to our investigator that you had no role in relation to the civil action that you had learned was being taken by Sergeant Barry, is that correct?
A. No.

77 Q. No role in it?
A. No role.

78 Q. From your point of view. And insofar as the provision of a retirement certificate or a rating of his service is concerned, I think that is an administrative process that you had no role in yourself?
A. I had no role in it at all.

79 Q. Thank you, Mr. Barrett?
A. Thank you, sir.

END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Now, Mr. Costelloe.

MR. J OHN BARRETT WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. COSTELLOE, AS FOLLOVG:

80 Q. MR. COSTELLOE: Good morning, Mr. Barrett. My name is Shane Costelloe, I am one of the barristers instructed to represent Mr. Barry at this tribunal. I have very
few questions to put to you, sir, I am going to predominantly rely on the letter which I understand you wrote to the transfer review body, which is to be found at page 5822 of the materials, it's already been opened to you this morning. And in that you set out a chronology of dates in respect of the effort to transfer Mr. Barry from Mitchelstown to Anglesea Street Garda Station and the various appeals which were brought on foot of that transfer request. Okay?
A. Yes.

81 Q. Before I do that, I think this has to be the case, but I just want to clarify it before $I$ go any further. If we go to the very end of that particular letter or report, depending on how we wish to refer to it, it's page 5831, that's obviously a typographical error, I'd suggest to you, at the end, that it's dated Apri1 2015, it must in fact have been April 2016. I'm sure you will agree with me that that's correct, yes? Thank you. Okay. So, as I understand it a request is made to transfer Mr. Barry, issued by the chief superintendent north Cork, that's Chief Superintendent Dillane on the 5th February and four days later an appeal is made by my client against that transfer, correct?
A. Yes.

82 Q. Okay. And then we have various appeals brought therefrom. Could I just in general terms see if you agree with this proposition: You were supportive of the effort to transfer Mr. Barry from Mitchelstown to

Anglesea Street Garda Station?
A. That was the decision that $I$ reached at the first level appeal stage, yes.
83 Q.
Yes. And did that decision, that conclusion that you reached change at any stage in the process of the various appeals thereafter made by Mr. Barry?
A. No. I had no role in any of the appeals thereafter made by Mr. Barry.
84 Q. Insofar as you wrote that report to the transfer review board, do you fee1 that that expresses an opinion or a position by you with regard to his appeal or, if I phrase it differently, whether or not you still supported his move from Mitchelstown to Anglesea Street?
A. Yes. I supported the move and the reasons I think are as I described to Mr. McGuinness.

85 Q. Yes, absolutely, and I understand those to be your reasons. I will ask you about one of them in a moment?
A. Sure.

86 Q. But again, I'm trying to be concise but equally as fair 11:35 as I can be and I don't want to assume anything until I ask you a few questions. So, insofar as you sent that letter in April 2016, it seems to me that we might be able to agree that by this stage Superintendent Comyns had moved to Mayfield. For the record, he told us, he 11:35 told the Chairman, I beg your pardon, he told the Chairman that he moved on the - I have it here - it was March, I think 9th March 2015. Yes, 9th March 2015, and he had known about it a day or two previously.

You've no reason to doubt that as being correct?
A. No, no.

87 Q. okay. So he moved to Mayfield from his district in Fermoy. By the time, therefore, that you sent that letter to the transfer review board, he had long since moved from the district, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.
would you agree also with me that it was apparent from the papers that you had been furnished throughout the course of your dealing with the issue in relation to Sergeant Barry that underlying all of it, or the foundation for all of it, appeared to be an issue between him and Superintendent Comyns? Now, I am not asking you to comment on the validity of that, but a perceived problem that he had with superintendent Comyns?
A. That's a central theme, yes.

89 Q. Yes. And insofar as, for example, chief Superintendent Dillane is writing to you, referring to issues of discipline and the inability of Superintendent Comyns to run his district because of the way in which sergeant Barry is conducting himself, all of that is material that's brought to your attention, you're aware of it at the time at which you write this letter in April of 2016, isn't that correct?
A. I am.

90 Q. Yes. So what I guess, I think you can probably anticipate where I am going, what $I$ want to know is: At the point at which Sergeant Barry has pursued, it
looks like, three different appeal processes in respect of this transfer and you're writing a letter maintaining the position that you, as the director of Human Resources and Personal Development, are saying that he should be transferred in April 2016, given that ${ }^{11: 37}$ the source of the issue between the two men was no longer there, why didn't you just say in your letter to the review board, it's done, it's over, it's not necessary to transfer him, anything like that?
A. I think the third point that I addressed with Mr. McGuinness may help illustrate the essence of the answer.
91 Q. Do you mean the third point in what you said to the tribunal investigator?
A. Yes.

92 Q. If you want to move --
A. I think --

93 Q. Sorry, you can go ahead with your answer if you want, but if it does help you, that's to be found at page 5827 and into page 5828 --
A. Yes.
A. Mr. Ryan.

95 Q. Yes. First of all let's see I have got the right pages, because it is entirely possible I didn't in you mind going to 5784 please, Mr. Murphy. Yes, thank you. So we have -- in fact, yes, the very bottom of page 5784 has the part of your interview that refers to
your rationale and the third of the three is at the bottom of that page and it continues on into the next page. Do you see that there?
A. Yes, I have it.
Q. Yes.
A. There would be a substantial number of sergeants relative to district offices or sub-offices. And so, in that regional headquarters there is also employee assistance personne1, Morgan Landy was one who was there at the time, he worked exclusively on assisting people who had difficulties and issues of all sorts. And the opportunity that was being created in a move to Anglesea Street served to address the prospect of doing all of the things that the CMO had proposed, providing a safe working environment, and the support services that simply would not be available anywhere else.
Q. Yes.
A. And that was irrespective of where Superintendent Comyns was based at any point in time.
100 Q. At the point at which you're writing that letter -- no criticism is being made of you, Mr. Barrett, okay. Just so we are clear?
A. Sure.

101 Q. You're not being criticised and if that is in any way
being inferred by the way I am asking these questions?
A. No, no.
Q. I want to be clear, you're not being criticised?
A. No, I fully accept that.

103 Q. Al1 right. So at the point at which you were writing that letter to the transfer review board in April 2016, have you been in contact with chief superintendent North cork?
A. I don't think so. Not specifically but in relation to Sergeant Barry at all.
104 Q. Given that it seems from your evidence this morning you were aware that Superintendent Comyns had moved to Mayfield, would it not perhaps have been advantageous to contact or to initiate contact with Chief Superintendent Dillane in order to see whether or not he still wanted to proceed with the move, with the transfer?
A. No, I didn't do that.

No. And certainly, as far as you can recollect, you received no contact from Chief superintendent Dillane, certainly there's nothing in the papers that I have seen before me to suggest that at this stage, as in after Superintendent Comyns has moved, he contacted you to say actually, we'11 drop the transfer, we'11 leave Paul Barry in Mitchelstown?
A. Yeah, the only letter that I have from Chief Superintendent Dillane is that lengthy letter which sets out the chronology as he was involved.
106 Q. Yes. And you have quoted in fact, directly quoted from
that --
A. Yes.

107 Q. -- in that letter to the review board?
A. Yes.

108 Q. I understood that to be the only correspondence you'd received from the chief superintendent. It seems to be the case then that regardless of the fact that Superintendent Comyns has moved in March of 2015 to Mayfield Garda station, the position of chief superintendent north Cork remains that he wants the transfer of Paul Barry to continue, he wants him to go from Mitchelstown into Anglesea Street?
A. I had no representations to say otherwise and my decision was based upon the supportive working environment as referenced by the cмo.
109 Q. Yes. I understand that you reference the fact that Anglesea Street, being a larger station, a regional office in fact, a regional headquarters, had perhaps greater facilities to assist Mr. Barry, but can I just suggest that his necessity for assistance was now
obviated by virtue of the fact that the issue was no longer relevant or apparent because the person with whom he had an issue was no longer in his district? Do you understand my point?
A. I do, indeed, I understand your point.

110 Q. And in the sense that you make the observation that Anglesea Street is in fact its own district, the simple reality is that in the hierarchy of districts Anglesea Street had not just regional but also divisional --
A. Yes.

111 Q. -- supervision of Mayfield Garda station?
A. That's correct.

112 Q. Which is where Superintendent Comyns was now moved to. Thereby clearly creating a situation where

Superintendent Comyns would have to be reporting in to Anglesea Street Garda Station?
A. Occasionally, yes, into the chief superintendent. So, in fact, if the transfer of Sergeant Barry had continued and he had moved from Mitchelstown into Anglesea Street, he would then be in a somewhat similar position to the position which had now ceased to be the case but which had predominated in the previous number of years, whereby he was in one Garda station and within the same district the man with whom he had an issue, Superintendent Comyns, was working out of Fermoy. Do you follow me?
A. The division and the district are two different things. Mayfield is a district.
Did I say division? Did I? I beg your pardon?
CHA RMAK However, I understand.
A. You got it.

115 Q. MR. COSTELLOE: I beg your pardon. It's not the first time I have made that mistake, Mr. Barrett.
A. It's understandable.

116 Q. Without getting into districts and divisions, a situation exists were Paul Barry is in Mitchelstown and Superintendent Comyns is in Fermoy. Superintendent Comyns moves, the situation no longer persists.

Efforts are being made to move Paul Barry into Anglesea Street, a similar situation will now generate or exist again whereby the two of them are in the same reporting structure, in the same district?
A. They're in the same hierarchy.

CHAN RMAN It's not the similar situation.
A. Yes.

118 Q. CHAI RMAN It's not the same district.
A. Correct, Judge.

MR. COSTELLOE: Sorry, Chairman.
119 Q. CHA RMAN However the point, as I understand it, the point that Mr. Costelloe is wishing to make is that given that Superintendent Comyns had gone to Mayfield, there is a very limited possibility --
A. Yes.

120 Q. CHA RMAN -- of interaction between Superintendent Comyns and Sergeant Barry. Never say never, but broadly speaking they're not going to meet.
A. Yes.

121 Q. CHA RMAN However, he says, given that Mayfield is in the division of Anglesea Street, there exists at least the possibility --
A. That's correct.

CHA RMAN -- that Superintendent Comyns will show up at some time at a time when sergeant Barry is present.
That's essentially the point, if I am understanding what Mr. Costelloe is saying, and why -- so he's at an increased possibility, there's an increased possibility of an encounter between the two of them.
A. I accept your point, Judge.
Q. CHA RMAN Sorry, it's not point.
A. Mr. Costelloe's point is correct.

CHA RMAN I am endeavouring to clarify --
124 Q. MR. COSTELLOE: It's a more eloquent expression of the point that $I$ have been struggling to make for the last five minutes, Mr. Barrett. That's what I was trying to get to.
A. I am accepting your point, Mr. Costelloe. There is the possibility but it's a very role dependent and it's a very much limited affair. Counterbalanced in my view and in my judgement at the time, Mr. Costelloe, that the supportive structure that exists within a large entity like a regional headquarters, where there are employee assistants, dedicated personne1, where there are many roles for sergeants, some of which can be completely office bound and insulated, if you like, from what I would call operational policing activities, opportunity could have been created for Sergeant Barry to rebuild his career and to move on and probably even greater opportunity to seek promotion and development. 125 Q. Well, I will leave it at this, Mr. Barrett, but I suppose all of that is in the context, first of all, of, as you've already agreed with me, the fact that Superintendent Comyns has now moved.
A. Yes.

126 Q. But secondly, where it's quite apparent in fact it can only be the case that Mr. Barry, my client, has continued to express a desire to stay at

Mitchelstown --
A. Absolutely.

127 Q. -- to remain at Mitchelstown, where he has written to the assistant commissioner as recently as January 2015 and it's referenced in your own letter there, to say he 11:47 thinks Mitchelstown is the only place for him, where he feels supported and safe?
A. And in my response, Mr. Costelloe, I make it clear that I didn't find that tenable, I think the words I used were "in that regard" --

I wil1 just find what it is that I wrote in response to that. "The second poi nt is, Ser geant Barry mai nt ai ned that the onl y safe working envi ronment that he felt available to himwas M tchel stown. I can't agree to that in circunstances where the regi onal headquarters, Angl esea Street, had many facilities not available in smaller stations, such as the onsite presence of empl oyee assi stance personnel and a I arge pool of available jobs."

So I was cognisant of that point that he was making, the case that Mitchelstown was the only safe working environment. I couldn't agree with that.
128 Q. I will leave it at this, but had you any information to 11:48 the effect that Mr. Barry wanted a different job?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Was there anything precluding him from availing of the employee assistance at Anglesea Street by virtue
of the fact that he was in Mitchelstown? I mean, I am assuming, but tell me if I have this wrong, that whatever employment assistance personnel are operating out of Anglesea Street, work for all of the gardaí?
A. They do.

130 Q. You don't have to be stationed at Anglesea Street to avail of them?
A. You are quite correct, it was the advantage of proximity that was my consideration.
131 Q. Thank you very much, Mr. Barrett, good morning?
A. Good morning to you, sir.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Mr. Costelloe, are we clear that you're not levelling any criticism at Mr. Barrett?

MR. COSTELLOE: One hundred percent, yes.
MR. DONAL MEGU NNESS: No questions, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Anybody else? Mr. Harty?
MR. HARTY: No questions.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.
ME. CALLANAN Sorry, Chairman.
CHA RMAN who are you for?
MS. CALLANAN I was just going to tell you, Chairman. Helen Callanan, I appear for Mr. Barrett with Mr. Byrnes, instructed by Mr. McTiernan.
CHA RMAN Certainly Ms. Callanan, have you any questions you would like to ask?
MS. CALLANAN Yes, if you wouldn't mind, Chairman.

CHA RMAN Sorry Ms. Callanan, I foolishly assumed that there was nobody here. I'm sorry, it didn't occur to me.

MS. CALLANAN There was nothing foolish about it, given that you couldn't have seen me behind all of the screens et cetera and Mr. Costelloe had blocked my full vision.

CHA RMAN Let's agree that we'11 proceed, Ms. Callanan.

MR. JOHN BARRETT WAS QUESTI ONED BY MS. CALLANAN, AS

## FOLLOVG:

132 Q. MS. CALLANAN I just want to ask Mr. Barrett a couple of issues in relation to what was raised by
Mr. Costelloe with him in relation to the appeal.
Mr. Barrett, do you know whether you knew that, and apologies if I am getting people's roles wrong, Superintendent Comyns had moved to Mayfield, do you know when you knew that?
A. I don't recall when $I$ knew that, but $I$ knew that it was, first of a11, rumoured before it happened and then it happened circa March 2015, Mr. Costelloe has reminded me.
133 Q. And then in relation to the points that Mr. Costelloe has just put to you, saying that in fact there was a greater risk because he was now in -- he would have been in a division with Superintendent Comyns.
A. Yes.

right. I understand that, thank you very much.
MS. CALLANAN Mr. Byrnes has very helpfully isolated where that occurs and we will put it in a letter and send it in, because I think it is more helpful to do it that way. But I don't have further questions for Mr. Barrett. Thank you, Chairman.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Thanks very much
Ms. Callanan. Thank you very much, Mr. Barrett, and thank you for facilitating us and making the arrangements to come and be interviewed and give evidence.
THE WTNESS: And finally, as I said on the last occasion I appeared before you, Chairman, I would like to particularly thank the investigators, I think their approach to this has been particularly helpful. I have enjoyed it for the last occasions, it wasn't made available to me on the first visit but I really do appreciate it.
CHA RMAN Well, I am sure Mr. Ryan, who is no relation of mine, but $I$ am sure that Mr. Karl Ryan will take this as an unsolicited testimonial of which he is most grateful. Thank you very much, Mr. Barrett.

## THE WTNESS THEN W THDREW

CHA RMAN Now, Mr. McGuinness.

MR. MEGI NESS: I think Mr. Marrinan has the next witness.

CHA RMAN Yes, Mr. Marrinan.
MR. MARR NAN The next witness that's listed is
Sergeant Jerry Quinn.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MARRI NAN He's here this morning.
CHA RMAN He was here this morning, I met him this morning. Come on Sergeant Quinn.
MR. MARR NAN I don't intend to examine him as such. 11:53 CHA RMAN We will get him sworn in first of all, Mr. Marrinan, and then we'11 see where we're going. Good morning again, Sergeant Quinn, as I say, we bumped into each other in the yard this morning.

## SERGEANT J EREM AH QU NN HAM NG BEEN SVDRN, WAS

 CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. COSTELLOE, AS FOLLOVS:CHA RMAN Sit down there, Sergeant Quinn. Now, Mr. Marrinan, you're saying you're not intending to --
MR. MARRI NAN I don't intend to examine him, his statement is at page 1345 of the material and I have indicated that to Mr. Costelloe. Mr. Costelloe does require him, so I will merely tender him.
CHA RMAN Very good. So now, Mr. Costelloe, any questions.
MR. COSTELLOE: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, sergeant.
A. Mr. Costelloe.

139 Q. I act for Paul Barry, I have one or two very short questions to put to you and then I'll be done, okay. The first pertains to a matter that strictly speaking the tribunal isn't concerned with at a11, but it raises its head in the context, which will become apparent in a second, of an allegation that my client makes. So, to perhaps explain that a bit better, you had made a complaint about a case completely -- nothing to do with, completely removed from the circumstances of Mr. Barry, nothing at all whatever to do with him, and that was a complaint that you had made internally about the way in which that particular case had been conducted?
A. That's correct.

140 Q. Mr. Barry makes a complaint that he was accused by Chief Superintendent Dillane of inciting you to revive or resurrect that complaint at a date in, I think, 2015?
A. That would be incorrect. Sergeant Barry never asked me to make a complaint, never advised me nor passed any comment on it.

141 Q. I am trying to be as careful as I can not to go into the context of that other complaint.
A. Yes.

142 Q. Because it's got nothing to do with anything really for 11:55 the purposes of this, as far as I can see, this tribuna1. It's obviously a matter for the Chairman, not for me, but that is the approach I am taking. But insofar as you did resurrect or you did continue
subsequently with that complaint, Mr. Barry had nothing to do with that decision?
A. Correct.
okay. In relation to -- bear with me one second please, sergeant. There was an instance in May of 2015 where my client sought to go -- sorry, April 2013 -May of 2013, I am confusing myself. In any event, May of 2013, my client sought to go on annual leave and an issue arose as to whether or not there was cover available for him as a sergeant at Mitchelstown. He has stated that you offered yourself as being available to provide some cover for him, do you remember anything to do with that?
A. I do. I think Sergeant Dunne and myself said we would cover to facilitate Sergeant Barry's family holiday. And I think there's a report and that matter was forwarded.

144 Q. Yes. And insofar as you said you said that, to whom did you say it, to whom did you communicate that?
A. I would have spoken with Sergeant Dunne, who was my direct boss, he was the IC, and I think we sent a report in writing to the district office to that effect.
Q. Yes. We have had that opened to the Chairman, I don't propose to ask for it to be opened again. But to the extent that you were in a position to provide cover, it's set out in that report and your willingness to do so is set out in that report?
A. Yes. Sergeant Barry would have been a colleague, we
would have shared one office and we would try and facilitate each other with changes in duty or hours if something cropped up. And it was kind of just what another colleague would do for someone else.
146 Q. In order to avoid any ambiguity -- sorry, just bear with me one second please, sergeant, if we go to page, I think it's 160. Could you scroll down a small bit please, for me. We will find in that statement the reference -- keep going, please. Continue down, please, Mr. Murphy. Keep going. After that. There. 11:58 Just there at the bottom of that page, sergeant, in your statement to the tribunal you say:
"I recall Sergeant Barry looking for annual I eave and I of fered to change tours of duty in an attempt to enable 11:58 Ser geant Barry to get annual I eave."

This is what you communicated to the IC?
A. Yes.

147 Q. To Sergeant Dunne?
A. Yes.

148 Q. To your knowledge was that then communicated up the chain, if you will?
A. I presume so.

149 Q. Al1 right. Thank you very much, Sergeant Quinn. 11:58

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Any questions. No questions? No questions?

No questions. Ms. Callinan, no questions?
ME. CALLANAN No questions.
CHA RMAN It was nice to meet you and have a word about golf and congratulations on your prowess.
THE WTNESS: Thank you very much, Chairman. CHA RMAN Thank you very much, Sergeant Quinn.

## THE WTNESS THEN W THDREW

MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, the next witness is
Dr. Oghuvbu.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much.

DR. OGENOVO OGHVBU, HAV NG BEEN SUDRN, WAS
DI RECTLY- EXAM NED BY MR. MEGU NNESS, AS FOLLOVG:

CHAN RMAN Good morning again, doctor.
THE WTNESS: Good morning, Judge.
MR. MEGI NESS: Chairman, just for the benefit of my colleagues, Dr. Oghuvbu's statement is at page 1480 of our papers.

150 Q. Thank you, doctor. Could you just pull the microphone towards you slightly or sit into it. Thank you very much. I think you're a specialist occupational
physician?
A. Yes, I am.

151 Q. And you've been employed by An Garda Síochána as such since May $2010 ?$
A. Yes.

152 Q. And I think you've been the chief medical officer since Ju7y 2017?
A. Yes.
Q. And just to clarify, you don't hold any Garda rank within the force as such?
A. No, I don't.

154 Q. You're not trained or wishing to be a member of An Garda Síochána?
A. No training.

155 Q. You've set out your qualifications at paragraph 2 of the statement and you've got a number of specialist training qualifications, and you have a fellowship at the Faculty of Occupational Medicine, and you're a registered specialist on the Medical Council's register of specialists?
A. Yes I am.
Q. Inter alia, is that right?
A. Yes.

157 Q. Now, in connection with Sergeant Barry, I think he was referred to you in the normal way by HRM for assessment, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, he was.

158 Q. And that occurred in October 2012. We11, in fact the reference came through slightly earlier from Assistant Commissioner Fanning, isn't that correct?
A. The normal practice would be that the division would have sought, requested a review appointment with the CMO's office and it would be routed through the office of the then commissioner.

159 Q. Yes. And just to confirm that, that was Chief Superintendent Dillane's request, if we look at page 1495 of the documents, which will come up. And if we just scroll down the page there.
A. Yes, that's correct.

160 Q. He had exceeded a number of days absence due to illness and was referred then, the system caught it and referred him automatically up, isn't that correct?
A. That would be correct.

161 Q. And the documents that would be attached to that would be all the normal documents?
A. Yes, they would be.

162 Q. And you've referred to them and provided copies, we don't need to look at all of them. In the second there line it's saying he's suffering from work-related stress?
A. Yes.

163 Q. And then it says "However, subsequent medical certificates are reporting member is suffering from medical illness." That was referred to the chief medical officer at the time, who was Dr. Collins, and referred on to you for assessment?
A. If I may just make a correction there? Just as a general rule, just the way An Garda Síochána uses offices, because the CMO is the head of the Garda Occupational Health Service, the referral is made to the CMO.

164 Q. Yes.
A. But the occupational physicians in the office had the
divisions allocated to them. So even though it comes to the CMO normally, he may not even see the document at all, it's the occupational physician who is managing that division that sees the documents. The Смо may never see the document at all.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

166 Q. Now, I think you saw him in your role then on the 11th October?
A. Yes.

167 Q. In your offices, in your clinic, as it were. And you had received from his doctor, I think that was Dr. Kiely and noted that he had been certified with a reactive depressive episode being attributed to grievances relating to interpersonal difficulties with his local senior management?
A. Yes.

168 Q. I think you found him to have features consistent with mixed anxiety, depression and you deemed him temporarily unfit for work, pending clinical management ${ }_{\text {12:04 }}$ and evaluation?
A. That would be correct.

169 Q. Yes. I think, did you discuss with him at that time the possibility of a referral for assessment with an independent medical adviser?
A. I would have done that as to be normal practice, particularly when it has to do with mental health issues, I would say that, look, this may happen, but it is all dependent on additional medical information that
may be provided by the doctors and I would consider those and make a decision as to whether I am going to refer them. So I would not refer them at that particular time.
170 Q. Yes. I think he signed consents obviously in that regard to allow you to seek any such additional medical information?
A. Yeah, that would be required for me to communicate with his own doctors. Regardless of the fact that there was a letter from his doctors submitted, I would still require the consent.

171 Q. You would stil1 require the consent even though you had a letter from the doctor?
A. Yes.

172 Q. Of course. I think you issued as a report, as would be 12:05 normal, on the next day then, the 12th October, if we look at page 1513. I think this is in the normal form in the sense that it doesn't include your diagnosis or any details from your detailed consultation notes, which have been available to the tribunal?
A. No.

173 Q. And you would expect this to have gone then to Sergeant Barry himself, is that correct?
A. In the normal process, this would have gone to his divisional management through the $A / C ' s$ office again, and it would go down to the district and the normal process would be that they should make it available to him so that he can have a copy of it. But even if he doesn't get it from the district, he can actually
request it from HRM themselves and they will provide it to him.

174 Q. Yes. So it goes from you to the A/C HRM, to divisional to district to him?
A. Yes.
Q. And he was the subject-matter of a review then which was intended to take place in January of 2013. I think you received a report from his doctor in advance of that, if we look at page 1511. I am sorry, I beg your pardon, 1517. 1517. Had you been aware that he had also been referred to and seen by a Dr. Dennehy previous7y?
A. That would have been communicated in the report from his doctor.
Q. And if he didn't get it, he could request it?
A. Yeah. Pardon?
A. That would have been communicated in the report from his doctor.
Q. In the report from his doctor, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you receive in addition to this report a report from Dr. Dennehy on the 18th December. If we look at that, page 4783? Just to note, in passing there, from that --
A. Yes.

180 Q. -- Dr. Kiely had said that she felt his current mental health illness had been triggered by work-related events and he's suffering from a work related
condition. And I think, did you get this report from Dr. Dennehy then?
A. I had sight of that report.

181 Q. Pardon?
A. I had sight of that report by the time I arranged the next review appointment.

182 Q. And if we just scroll down there. Did you note any particular aspect of Dr. Dennehy's report here?
A. There was nothing unusual in it that hadn't come up from a clinical point of view in my earlier consultation with Mr. Barry. There was nothing unusual in it from my perspective that hadn't come up in my consultation with Sergeant Barry in October, so I wasn't really -- it was just bringing me up to speed in terms of the details from a medical point of view of what his own doctors had picked up.
183 Q. Yes. But in advance of this subsequent reassessment, which I think took place on the 25th January, you attended a case conference relating to him. Could you just explain to the tribunal how that would come about and whether it was a normal circumstance in this case?
A. If you go back to my report, the last, penultimate paragraph of my report in October.

184 Q. Yes.
A. I had referred to issues that had come up in the consultation. Now, the original referral said that the absence was work-related stress and then medical illness, and then in the context of the issues that came up at the consultation, I felt that, okay, he was
telling me of what his own perception of the difficulties with his line management, and usually in those cases I give the opportunity to have a case conference with line management and HR so we will organise those, we will request those, we will convene those. And the objective of them to is to explore the issues and to alert local management usually to say, look, this is what the member is asserting, can you, you know, initiate the relevant processes to explore those issues, those concerns that have been raised by the member and see how you can address them.
Q. Yes.
A. Because they are not for me to address as an occupational physician, they are management issues. So that was the purpose of the case conference; to see how 12:10 can you, you know, explore those consents and manage them.

186 Q. Yes. The way you had put it at paragraph 4 of that earlier report was that "The service was aware of certain reported workplace rel at issues that arose
prior to his absence. Garda management advi ce during this time is as acknow edged, as per paragraph 3 of your of the $8 / 3$. In the circunstances the menber should be advised of confidential supports available to garda members and avail of same if required."
A. Yes.

187 Q. "Further advice will be offered following revi ew of the file in four to six weeks time."
A. Yes.

188 Q. But the case conference I think took place on the 22nd January?
A. Yes.

189 Q. There's a note of that, if we just look at page 1515, which is contained in your papers obviously as well. So this would be the interaction then of HRM divisional input?
A. Yes.

190 Q. And Garda occupational health and yourself, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

191 Q. And this is the note then which is prepared by the GOHS?
A. Yes.

192 Q. Isn't that correct? So it says there:
"Menber was sanctioned due to being Iate for start of shift. Menber has compl ai nt in agai nst superintendent that initiated sanction. Member was offered transfer to Glanmire - refused. Menber seeking IOD
cl assification for absence. Menber seeking medical retirement as well. Menber has clai med he will institute legal proceedings for any financial loss he suffers as a result of ongoing circumstances."

So, was all that information brought by management, as it were?
A. It was brought by management.

193 Q. Yes. Had you any prior knowledge that this issue of
injury on duty, that is IOD there is short for that, injury on duty?
A. Well, I wouldn't have until it comes up from management, because essentially the member has to say that he wants to apply for injury on duty in relation to an absence. So that's something that comes up from a local management member issue, it's not something that comes to me directly. So if that issue is in the background, it will be flagged by management that there is a request for injury on duty.

194 Q. Yes.
A. For the absence to be classified as injury on duty, for the medical absence to be classified as injury on duty or due to injury on duty.
195 Q. Yes. We will come back to that. The occupational health action then in the middle column is just noted, to see you on the 25th January, "may need i ndependent medi cal advi ser assessment"?
A. Yes.
Q. That was presumably your indication of that being a possibility?
A. Yes. And that was taking into consideration the reports that $I$ had received subsequent to the consultation in October.

197 Q. Yes.
A. So the report from his GP and the report from his own treating specialist, Dr. Dennehy.
Q. And then management actions, it's recorded there, in the third column:
"Nothing can be done in rel ation to IOD cl assification until official investigation comple. A/C wrote to menber extending investigation until March 2013."

Do you remember any particular discussion about that or did you take note of that to any great extent?
A. Not really, because at that point in time if there were -- if management was seeking clarification from me in relation to whether the absence, the medical
circumstances could be classed as work related, the causation, causality is really what that is about, and the circumstances would be such that if those circumstances were not there, he would not have developed the medical condition that resulted in his absence, I would not be able to offer any opinion on that until they had completed their investigation. So I wouldn't even have paid much attention to that in the course of my discussions.
199 Q. You wouldn't have made much attention --
A. Yes.

200 Q. -- okay, at that time because of that?
A. Yeah.

201 Q. Obviously part of the original documents that you had been provided included a report from Superintendent Comyns saying that he had triggered HQ 139/10 sort of investigation into work related or attempted to do that?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you understand that that was the on1y investigation or that there was a much wider investigation into complaints that he had made, apart from that?
A. The issue of injury on duty and the classification would be the only thing that would be really relevant to me. I wouldn't be -- the other investigations, if there were any, would not be really particularly relevant.
Q. Yes.
A. As you can see, the extent of our discussion at the case conference was limited to things that had to do with his medical absence and the medical issues around his absence and nothing else. I didn't really go into any of the other things there.
Yes. So I mean, perhaps this is something that didn't arise in your mind at the time, but did you consider that there was an active 139/10 investigation going on, apart from everything else that was happening?
A. Well, I was told that an investigation was ongoing and that was a11 I needed to know, because if they were going to be seeking clarification on injury on duty, it was important that that investigation was conducted and a finding made available to me to assist me in determination as to whether the absence could be classified from a medical point of view as injury on

205 Q. Yes. And I mean, I suppose sort circuiting to the end, you never got the result of any such investigation communicated to you or a request for a further opinion
on that basis?
A. I can't recal1, unless $I$ look at my reports and see what $I$ am reading, but $I$ can't recall specifically whether I got a report back saying that the investigation had been concluded.
A. And this was the finding.

207 Q. Yes.
A. I can't recall that.

208 Q. We will come to that in due course. In any event, you 12:17 saw Mr. Barry again on the 25th, you provided your detailed notes of consultation, which I don't intend to open in any detail, but you did record "A mixed reactive anxi ety effective state, associ ated with si gni ficant grievances about certain events reported by 12:17 nember to have occurred in the workpl ace". And you record 'The member's compl ai nt is subject to of ficial i nvesti gation, but was not happy with the progress of same"?
A. Yes.

209 Q. That's at page 1526. You furnished a report then to Assistant Commissioner Fanning in the usual way, and perhaps we'd look at that, at page 1527. And you offer the advice as follows, under the five paragraphs set out there. At number 5 at the bottom, just to conclude, you say:
"As the member is due review by his treating specialist in early February 2013, it may be that a ret urn to work
could be recommended at that time. In that context, a return to work in a safe and supportive workplace envi ronment facilitated by local management is reconmended. "

From your consultation with him, did you have anything in particular in mind at that point in time?
A. No.

Had you had any discussion or did Sergeant Barry raise any question with you of perhaps being facilitated in any particular way by local management?
A. I can't recall. I think at that point in time I didn't have enough medical information to know that he was going to go back to work or when he was going to go back to work. I knew that he was going to be seeing his treating specialist and it is my expectation that possibly a return to work would be possible. He would still have to see me for me to provide detailed advice to management based on the medical information that was available. But I didn't have it at that time, so I wouldn't have gone into detail, it was just my way of flagging that there was a possibility of a return to work.
211 Q. Yes. Just on another topic, you do comment on how Sergeant Barry described or attributed a degree of upset to you in the way he has phrased it certainly as upset, being upset. If we could look at page 1482 of your statement. If we go down to paragraph 16 at the bottom. Paragraph 15 concludes by reciting that you
deemed him "...further unfit pending update froman upcoming revi ew by his treating specialist and he should advi se to HRPD by way of report." which we've just seen.

You then comment:
"Sergeant Barry gives his account of the consultation for a revi ew with me on the 25th January in a referenced e-mail to assi stant commissi oner HRM dated 4th February 2013, paragraph 1, exhi bit T8: E- mail dated 7th February 2013 from Sergeant Barry to Chi ef Superintendent Grogan. He describes me as 'upset because both Dr. Ki el y and Dr. Dennehy expressed the opi ni on that my medical condition was work rel ated.'

Wile l cannot recollect the specific details of the consultation other than what is recorded in my consultation notes, I would have reservations about the menber's assertion that the opi ni on of his doctors about the basis of his absence caused you to be upset."

You say your notes don't record any communication in that regard. On the next page you go to set out the basis of your ability, or otherwise, to advise on work-related stress on paragraphs 17 and 18.
A. Yes.

212 Q. Is that how you understood what he was attributing his interpretation of you being upset about, that you
weren't dealing with that issue perhaps as he saw it. you're setting out here how and in what circumstances you can deal with it, is that right?
A. Well, I think I was just trying to put a clarification on my approach. When the issue of work related attributions or assertions had been made, I take on board the assertion that had been made by the individual but that doesn't translated into a definitive position because I did not have sufficient information as to what may or may not be going on.
That is why I tend to use language that says the member asserts, or the individual is asserting, rather than this is. What I think might have happened and, like I said, I can't say beyond what I have written in my notes, was that his doctors were taking a definitive stance in their communication.

213 Q. Yes.
A. He took that view that that was the definitive position and I was saying that I couldn't take that position until the investigation by management had been completed, so that I got a fuller picture of what exactly what was happening before I made a definitive decision.

214 Q. Yes.
A. So it was just really a fine point between myself and himself. But it was just the characterisation that I was upset. That I wouldn't be upset by it, I would make my points clear, that I don't agree with that position, but that's really about it.

215 Q. I mean, the doctors, his other doctors appear to have laid perhaps some stress on their view that this was all work related --
A. Yes.
-- and therefore could be of assistance in what is a different issue, a certification of injury on duty?
A. Yes.

217 Q. It appears that Sergeant Barry had forwarded an e-mail to the commissioner, which you've included in your papers at 1528 , if we could just look at that. This is 12:23 where he refers to the issue of being upset and this is an earlier e-mail than the one you reference in paragraph 16. But he says there, after that sentence, in the fourth line:
"He did not bel ieve that they could do so without first conducting an investigation. Dr. Oghuvbu stated he could not give an opi ni on on my ill ness until HRM concl uded thei $r$ i nvestigation. Both Dr. Ki el $y$ and Dr. Dennehy as private sector workers are entitled to express thei r opi ni ons and Dr. Oghuvbu cannot express an opi ni on until HRM gi ve it to him Dr. Oghuvbu did mention a safe working environment and it is to this that I want to ask the following questions.

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

I spoke with Chi ef Superintendent John Grogan on 29th J anuary 2013 and I outlined the above concerns. I al so expressed my vi ew that a transfer was not an option for me because of the nature of my compl ai nt and the per sons mentioned therei $n$. Chi ef Superintendent Grogan sai d he would pass my concerns on to Assi stant Commi ssi oner Jack Nol an. I have not heard anything since. I would like an answer to above and I bel ieve that the actions of HRM are prol onging and contributing 12:25 to my illness."

Now, can I ask you, did you receive this at the time?
A. No, I did not.

218 Q. Okay. Al1 right. You've included it in your papers at 12:25 a stage just before you go back to Assistant Commissioner Fanning, scheduling a further review. And if we look at page 1530, it's your letter to Assistant Commissioner Fanning of the 1st March. Now, it is in the first instance apparent that you were doing it because the expected clinical update wouldn't be available?
A. Yes.

219 Q. So it wasn't triggered, it wasn't triggered by the other e-mail; it was triggered by Dr. Dennehy's unavailability, is that correct?
A. Yes. It was treated by the fact that the appointment in February did not take place. So I felt that I needed to move things forward. I had no sight of that
e-mail until when documents were provided to me and because of -- in relation to the tribunal. I wouldn't have had cause to see that again.
220 Q. Yes. In any event, you decided to seek the view of Dr. Tobin?
A. Yes.

221 Q. Who is a specialist, he's a consultant psychiatrist?
A. Yes.

222 Q. Who is often employed to give an independent view on matters relating to mental illness, isn't that correct? ${ }^{2: 26}$
A. Yes, that would be correct.
Q.

And you had Sergeant Barry's consent for that obviously?
A. I would have. Because I had mentioned it before and I did meet with him prior to the consultation, to say that this is what was going to be happening.
Q. Yes.
A. And this was the nature, yes.
Q.

But anyway, this was the letter seeking Dr. Tobin's views and you set out the five issues that you wanted him to address there. If we go down to paragraph, you see the -- sorry, we should go to page 1532. The letter to Dr. Tobin, I beg your pardon. You recite the ${ }_{12: 27}$ history, give a summary in the first couple of paragraphs there and then you are looking for his view on a number of different issues there. Obviously you didn't get a reply to it at that point in time because
obviously Dr. Tobin hadn't seen him?
A. No.

227 Q. You arranged the appointment for Sergeant Barry on the same day --
A. Yes.
-- as meeting with Dr. Tobin, you met with Sergeant Barry beforehand --
A. Yes, I did.
Q. -- and consulted with him and then he consulted with Dr. Tobin, isn't that correct?
A. Yes, he did, correct.

230 Q. I think he issued a report to you then on the 11th, I think it's wrongly dated but if we go to page 1534, the report is there. It recites the date of the interview of the $11 / 3$, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct, yeah.

If we just go down then, he recites the previous treatments and reviews. There's an assessment of his mood, et cetera there. And then on the next page there's background set out. But his conclusion then is at the bottom of that page. He says:
"It appears that Sergeant Barry has devel oped a mi xed anxi ety - depressi ve reaction secondary to the events that occurred at work. The events are to be the subject of formal investigation. In the meantime and
he wi thout prej udi ce to the findings of the inquiry, I woul d recommend that Sergeant Barry returns to work when a mutually agreed safe supportive working envi ronment is available for him"

You received that and did you give any consideration yourself at that stage to what those mutually agreed, safe, supportive working environment might involve?
A. I think I would have issued a report following the receipt of Dr. Tobin's report and I think that would have to a certain degree captured, I hope fully captured my thoughts on how he could be supported in the workplace. I am not sure what that report is -the date for that report now.
233 Q Well, can I ask you a couple of other questions?
A. Okay.
Q. Would you have sent or did you send this on to his doctor, Dr. Kiely?
A. If I recall, I think I sent her a copy of the -- I'm not sure if I sent her a copy of the report actually.
I can't recall correctly. I can't recall whether I did. Sometimes I do, sometimes I don't, I'm not sure I did in this particular circumstance.
Q. Yes. In your statement you refer to Dr. Tobin's conclusion at paragraph 25 , on page 1484, if we look at 12:30 page 1484. And then you say at paragraph 26:

[^0]2013, stating Ser geant Barry was medi cally fit to ret urn to work under certai $n$ circunstances."

Firstly can I ask you, do you know when you would have
received that?
A. I wouldn't be able to say correctly at this point in time. I would have to check the date stamp on the document.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

237 Q. The copy that you've provided to the tribunal is at page 1537?
A. Yes.
Q. I don't see a date stamp on it myself but, I don't know... Obviously the evidence is that this was
produced and sent to -- came to the chief superintendent on the 4th April of 2013. So he couldn't have got it before then, I think. But do you recall getting it before you had a conversation with Dr. Kiely a couple of days later?
A. I think I had -- I think -- the conversation with Dr. Kiely would have followed the receipt of this.
Q. Followed the receipt of that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Perhaps we will just look at her -- she has a note of -- a short note of a conversation with you, at 4773. If we just scroll down the page. You see there's an entry for 05/04/2013?
A. Yes.
Q. "Recei ved phone call from Dr. Oghuvbu, chi ef medi cal officer, earlier today."

Now, just before I go into the next portion of it, the certificate that you had you think you had it when speaking to her?
A. I would have had it when I was speaking to her, yes.
Q. Did you regard that, as it were, coming within what Dr. Tobin had recommended, a mutually agreed safe, supportive work environment?
A. In my view she was stating -- I mean, as a primary care physician she's his advocate, so she was advocating a position for him.
Q. Yes.
A. It wasn't entirely disagreeable with the position that Dr. Tobin was -- that a supportive workplace environment was required. I had already said that in my report in October.
Q. Yes.
A. So the whole thing would then come down to exactly what 12:34 that supportive workplace environment would be.
Q. Yes.
A. And it would be taking into consideration all the factors and information that was available to us.
Q. But presumably you must have seen what Dr. Tobin was recommending, a mutually agreed one, as involving Garda management before it would be put into place?
A. Yes, it would be.
Q. Yes. And I suppose from the face of Dr. Kiely's
certificate, and there's no criticism of her or the way it's worded, but you couldn't necessarily infer from that, that that had been agreed with the management?
A. No, I think I didn't read it in that way. I just took it that she was expressing her opinion as to how she felt her patient should be supported.
A. My role as occupational physician would be to take all the information and, you know, advise management on how, you know, supportive -- how supportive workplace accommodations should be in place. But they would require engagement, that's why the word mutual is important, it would require engagement between the member and his management. So it wasn't going to be anything by dictate, whether it was from his doctor or myself. I wasn't going to dictate; I was going to give parameters within which they could have discussions and arrive at something that was mutually acceptable both from protecting his wellbeing and also from an operational -- maintaining operational integrity, which 12:35 is what I always would do.

249 Q. Yes. Just looking at the note, obviously it is just a note, but it says:
"Di scussi on re patient. Have patient's permission. 12:35 Plan to di scuss Paul at case conference on Mbnday. Dr. Oghuvbu states his interest in patient's medical wel fare not being invol ved in any management issues. He has report from Dr. Tobin. He feel s management
shoul d be able to come to a mutually agreeable situation for a return to work for Paul while the i nvesti gation is taking pl ace. He is aware that there are issues rel ating to work and the work envi ronment."

So it seems -- do you disagree with any of that, for a start?
A. No, I don't.
okay. Just trying to flesh it out, it would appear that you were obviously alerting her to Dr. Tobin's view, there's a reference to a mutually agreeable situation. She gave evidence yesterday, Dr. Kiely did, that she saw you as essentially taking on board what she had put in her certificate and that you were in essence agreeing with it and not disagreeing with it. Is that a fair and accurate portrayal?
A. No.

251 Q. Or do you want to comment further on that?
A. My comments on it would be that what she was saying, I understood where she was coming from but I wasn't endorsing the recommendation she was making. She was, as his primary care physician, you know, trying to look out for him in the best way she could, but I would look at things a bit differently because of my training, in terms of, you know, balancing the tensions that usually 12:37 exist between maintaining the member's wellbeing and protecting the professional integrity of the organisation. And that would be the way I would approach the advice that I give. So I wouldn't be -- I
wouldn't say that advice was unusual, I get a lot of that in terms of from individual's doctors.
Q. Yes.
A. But I have to take that as well as other information into consideration in terms of forwarding the advice to 12:37 management.
Q. Yes.
A. And that's the way $I$ was going to approach it. So it was really wasn't about that, I'm going to do or follow what you have prescribed.

257 Q. Certainly from the point of view of looking at the principle or the objective to be achieved, you were all 12:38 ad idem, Dr. Tobin, yourself and Dr. Kiely, in assessing that supportive, safe arrangements had to be come to?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that a fair way of describing it?
A. That would be a fair way of describing it, yes.
Q. In any event, you had told her you'd hold a case conference or there was one being organised, then you'd held it, again in HQ , on the 8th. Perhaps we will look 12:39 at the note from that. Page 1539. Obvious7y everyone there had the certificate, $I$ take it?
A. Yes.
Q. And from management side it said:
"Medi cal certificate fromGP - nember should not work with superintendent. Recommendations of GP not consi dered reasonable or practicable by Iocal management."

Just pausing there. Were you asked to comment on that or did you?
A. No, this is not a -- this is -- because at the beginning of the case conference we set out what are the issues we wanted to discuss.
Q. Yes.
A. So this was just basically management's view of the certificate that they had received.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. That's really my question, perhaps badly phrased, did you offer your own view of the certificate?
A. I don't know. I can't recollect what I say specifically or not about that certificate at that
point in time.
Q.
yes. okay. It goes on:
"No medi cal issue to precl ude hi mfrom work once 'mutually agreed safe working envi ronment' provi ded."

That's a quotation from Dr. Tobin?
A. Yes.
Q. So either management have that or you must have made that clear --
A. Yes.
Q. -- as you say you did.
"As recommended by independent specialist. Member has decl ined offer work location by di vi si onal chi ef that would precl ude hi mfrom working with the superi nt endent."

So, it would appear that management was bringing to the table here, as it were, the fact that they had a work
location that would preclude him from working?
A. That would be correct, and it was obvious at the case conference that they were having difficulties because he had declined on the offers. So they were kind of like, how do you we progress it from here?

267 Q. Yes.
A. Yeah.

268 Q. Can you recall any particular location being mentioned? Because you had earlier, I think, learned that he had
declined a transfer, had you?
A. Yeah, I couldn't recall. I couldn't recall what area, what location he had declined. Under management actions, just if we scroll back up, it says:
"Meet with menber to put in place suitable arrangements. Informthat GP's recommendations cannot be met on the basis of reasonability and practicability.

All commi cations with member should be in writing.

In member rejects offers made, follow or gani sational management procedures to manage the situation."

Can you offer any insight into what that meant?
A. Well again, because this is really within the management domain, their responsibility was to act on the advices that we had given them. So the advice here 12:42 was a safe, supportive environment, they had already communicated to us that they had offered the location to him, which he declined. So they were to go back to him and it would appear, if my recollection is correct, that he -- the recommendations of his GP, he was
insisting that those recommendations be implemented as they were set out by his GP. Management were trying to facilitate, that was my view, by offering a location that would preclude that interaction as described by
his GP. So essentially what I was saying was, what we agreed was that, go back with other options, discuss them with him and if there was a rejection of these other options, then whatever management processes, which I wasn't familiar with, they needed to trigger those to manage the situation. Again, it is not a specific saying do $X$ because $I$ am not in a position to do that.
Q. Yes.
A. But to say that they need to progress that.
Q. Yes.
A. Because they need to facilitate the member back to work.

272 Q. Yes. It then goes on:
"Check transfer rules - can member be transferred without appl ying for same? HRM awaiting a report from OHP - action compl ete."

Under the occupational health action, it says:
"Make appoi nt ment for menber if new medical issues emer ge. "
A. Yeah.

273 Q. You hadn't yourself, as it were, certified him as fit 12:43 to return to work?
A. I have to check what this -- by the time we're having this case conference, $I$ need to check if I had done a report, a further report from the --
Q. Well no, your last one, he was still out of work, as it were, at the time you saw him with Dr. Tobin, earlier in March?
A. In March, yes.
Q. On the 11th March?
A. Yes.
Q. And you hadn't reassessed him in the interim?
A. No, I hadn't.
Q. As far as I understand it?
A. No.
Q. Can I just ask you this: In circumstances where you had last, as it were, certified him unfit, and this is a systems question first: Is it a requirement that you would have to and only you would have to certify him as fit to return to work or could his own GP do that and would that be acceptable?
A. His GP can certify him fit to return to work.
Q. Yes.
A. Generally if a member is certified fit to return to work by their doctors and they are not adding any conditions to it, management usually don't have any difficulty taking them back, whether they have seen the CMO as a follow up appointment or not.
Q. Yes.
A. In this case, the reason why we had the case conferences was because of the issues that were raised by the return to work certificate that had been received.
Q. Yes.
A. So it was like saying -- it was a bid to try and address and put in place measures, because based on the report I had already received from Dr. Tobin, there was no medical reason that we could say that he couldn't come back to work.
Q. Yes.
A. We had already -- I already had that based on the assessment of Dr. Tobin.
Q. Yes.
A. And his own GP appeared to have already issued a certificate saying that he was fit to return to work, only that she had attached conditions to it.

284 Q. Yes.
A. So, at that point in time, I think there wasn't anything that $I$ was going to be advising in terms of a return to work other than that $I$ found him fit to be at work. And that was reflected in my subsequent report, I think, on the 9th April or thereabouts.
Q. Yes. I was just going to come to that, but just sticking with the position at this point in time. Did you see the conditions as being non-medical conditions or did you see them as an inextricable and indivisible part of the medical certification by Dr. Kiely?
A. Sorry, I am not clear about that?
Q. I mean, just looking at Dr. Kiely's certificate with the so-called conditions attached?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you see them, those conditions as a non-medical issue or did you see them inextricably bound up as part
of the medical certification by the doctor?
A. Okay, I will answer it in this way: There are two things, one is that the individual, they have a medical condition, it's being treated, they've responded to the treatment, are they fit to come back to work without any, you know, consideration of any other factors? So is there any medical consideration that precludes them from coming back to work? In the circumstances, based on all the information that $I$ had at that point in time, the answer was no. Are there issues that may impact on his wellbeing should he return to work and those issues are present, whether they are physical or psychological? Yes, there were, we had been dealing with this since October. So in other words, whatever advice we are going to be given now will not be about the return to work, will be about making sure that the environment at work prevented a deterioration or decompensation in his wellbeing. So that is where those issues would come from in terms of work location, supportive workplace arrangements, so that it was reduced hours or restricted duties, that's where that comes in, because what you are trying to do is to protect wellbeing and support effectiveness.
288 Q. Yes.
A. But they are two separate issues and I always keep them 12:47 separate, because when a condition is treated, the individual becomes fit to return to work. The situation in which they return to work is another issue that you have to address and that's what my advices
take into consideration, all the factors at play.
289 Q. So it's sort of a regime of working conditions which support the continued fitness --
A. Yes, of the individual.
Q. -- of the employee?
A. Yes.

291 Q. And are necessary for that?
A. Are necessary, as may be the case, and I would have to kind of look at them and say, okay, are they valid or not and what they are, yes.
292 Q. Yes. Your report then of the 9th April, at 1451, perhaps we will just look at that. You say there in the first substantial paragraph, in the final sentence of it:
"In addition, following certain devel opments since 29/3/2013, I have al so had si ght of a medi cal certificate for return to work issued by the nenber's doctor dated 28/3/203."

And then in brackets:
" 04/ 04/ 2013. Case conf er enci ng i nvol vi ng HRM Si ckness Absence Section, seni or local management and this service was undertaken on 8/4 to appropriately progress 12:49 the menber's return to work in the context of the recommendations of both the IMA and the menber's doct or.

Based on the information currently available to me, l offer opinion and/ or recommendations as follows in rel ation to medical fitness for policing duties:

1. There are no compelling medical impairments to debar the menber returning to work and policing duties. 2. Ci rcunstances whi ch are currently subject of Garda management processes are regarded as plausible stressors for the menber at this time and this would i mpact on the nenber's sustai ned well bei ng and effectiveness. On this basis, facilitation with certain workpl ace accommdation has been recommended. "

Now, that wasn't, if I am reading it correctly, intended by you to be an explicit endorsement of Dr. Kiely's certificate?
A. We11, at that point in time, what was becoming obvious was that there was a fixed view by the member that working with the superintendent presented a challenge for him and would impact negatively on his wellbeing. And I will use the analogy of when you identify a hazard, even if it's a perception, so $I$ perceive you as a hazard and I am saying that even though you don't feel you are a hazard but I perceive you as a hazard.
A. And I feel then that under health and safety considerations and the hierarchy of controls that with go with that, you remove the person from the hazard or remove the hazard away from the person. So in that
context, my understanding was that, you know, the person who was having difficulty had said, we11, I can't work with this person, was sergeant Barry, and so in that context the whole thing was to find an alternative means where he wouldn't have to work with Superintendent Comyns, and that would be for local management to determine because I wouldn't be very familiar in terms of the operational structures.
A. So that had kind of been understood at this point in time and the whole thing was going to be about trying to see how they could facilitate that in a reasonable and practical way.
295 Q. Paragraph 3 perhaps helps us understand that, because you say:
"In the context of providing an agreeable safe and supportive workpl ace as has been recommended to foster the nenber's well being and effectiveness (without prej udi ce to the outcome of the af oresaid processes), the menber should be facilitated with appropriately reasonable and practical temporary workplace accommodations in rel ation to his place of work."

May I focus on that phrase "as has been recommended" in 12:51 the first line. were you intending to refer to the recommendations of offering him a safe location other than mitchelstown or as has been recommended by Dr. Kiely?
A. No, I wouldn't have been in into a particular location.
Q. Yes.
A. It was about a place that was mutually agreed as safe.
Q. Yes.
A. Or a system of work that was reasonably agreed as safe. So it could be a system of work or it could be a place. I wasn't particular about whether it was a place or system of working.
Q. Yes. But you weren't opting for one or the other of recommendations that had been made either by management 12:52 or Dr. Kiely?
A. No. Because that would have to form the subject of an engagement between the member and his management and that's why we kept coming back to that phrase "mitually accept able". That means they are mutually agreeable. There had to be an engagement, there had to be a discussion.

299 Q. Al1 right?
A. Yeah.

300 Q. Number 4 then:
"The nember is recommended medically fit for normal policing duties, facilitated with temporary workplace accommodations per point 3 above.
5. Should there be any cl ini cal consi deration presently undi scl osed to the service or new clini cal devel opments following these advi ces, this service should be notified on a priority basis."

I think you didn't see him again after that, is that right?
A. No, I didn't.

301 Q. Now, I think Chief Superintendent Dillane raised a query with you subsequent to this. If we could look at his e-mail to you of the 15th -- of the 9th April. Perhaps I have got the date wrong. If we look at page 393, 394 of our documents, sent on the 12 th Apri1. And this is sort of a recitation of his meeting with him
later that night. Firstly, have you any view as to whether it was appropriate to tell him of the outcome of the conference straightaway or as soon as possible?
A. No, I don't have any particular view. I think Sergeant Barry knew there was a case conference happening, so if 12:54 the chief superintendent, you know, decided to communicate that, okay, look we had a case conference and this is -- I wouldn't have any particular views on that.
302 Q. Yes. And if we just scroll down there, this obviously expresses his views about the issues and the documents, but at the end of that, it's quite long, it goes on to page 394. Sorry, we should just maybe look at the last line on page 393. He says:
"I then requested Sergeant Barry to reflect on the situation but he replied that he was not going anywhere. He continued to refer to Dr. Ki el y's certificate whi ch that she clai med does not allow him
to work in Fer moy Garda Station or have any cont act with Superintendent Comyns.

I am now requesting cl arification of this situation as a matter of urgency."

I think that came to you and you reply to that, if we go to the next page, 395. You reply the following Monday morning -- I'm sorry, that is a very poor copy. I made this mistake before, I'm afraid to say.

Perhaps, Chairman, we might leave at that and we will come back to that after lunch. I will be some time more with the doctor.
CHA RMAN Yes, that seems like a very sensible
suggestion, Mr. McGuinness. That is very sensible suggestion. Thank you.

THE WTNESS: Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN If that's all right with you, that's not too inconvenient?

THE WTNESS: No, no, thank you.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. So two o'clock.

# THE HEARI NG THEN AD OURNED FOR LUNCH AND RESUMED, <br> AS FOLLOWS: 

CHA RMAN Thanks very much, whenever you are ready, doctor.

MR. MEGU NNESS: Doctor, before 1unch I had asked you
about the case conference on the 9th April and then the letter you wrote to Assistant Commissioner Fanning, and then I was just about to ask you about your reply to Chief Superintendent Dillane. But before I do that, you had also in the interim sent a letter to Dr. Kiely about the outcome of the case conference?
A. Yeah.
Q. Could I ask you to look 5673. That's your letter of the 11th April 2013, and it's slightly differently worded that the letter to Assistant Commissioner Fanning. We will just have a look at that. We'11 get the system up and running there. Just bear with us, please, thank you.
CHAI RMAN Thank you very much.
305 Q. MR. MEGUNESS: This is sent to Dr. Kiely on the 11th. 14:02 It says:
"Further to our commication on the 5/4/2013, I have now provi ded recommendations to Garda management in rel ation to the above Garda menber's medical fitness for policing duties. I have taken into consideration the report of the independent nedical advi ser in this case, Dr. John Tobin, consultant psychi atrist and medical certificate issued by you dated 28/3/2015."

Then you set out the five matters that we've seen in your letter to Assistant Commissioner Fanning. Again, without being prescriptive or necessarily either agreeing or disagreeing with Dr. Kiely's certificate?
A. Yes.

306 Q. But I was asking you then about Chief Superintendent Dillane's e-mail to you of the 12th April. If we go to the bottom of page 1553 . We've seen how this letter ended after a long récitatif about his meeting and the difficulties he perceived he had in relation to the position. He was requesting clarification of this matter as a matter of urgency. I think you wrote this reply. You said you're "... not in a position to offer further medi cal advice in this case, as the medical i ssues have been adequatel y addressed in previ ous correspondence. Based on the inf or mation currently available to me there are no compelling medi cal issues that precl ude the menber attending at work and undertaking assi gned policing duties in a safe and supporti ve workpl ace envi ronment.

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

Could I just ask you, could you just perhaps explain what you intended by that short paragraph there?
A. Okay. I think, it may be important to put it in some context here. Because really, by this time what was becoming obvious to everyone and we had all the case conferences and everything that we had looked at, all
the information available, was that there was clearly an established difficulty between the member and his superintendent who has oversight of the district, and the question was, with all the processes that were going on, in order to protect his wellbeing in the workplace and his effectiveness as well as maintain professional integrity, what would be the best thing? And so, the thing was, in terms of a supportive workplace accommodations, it was either a change in the system of work or a change in the location. Now, Dr. Kiely had said change the location. I don't know whether she said change the location, but he should not work in Fermoy. She was very specific he should not work in Fermoy.
307 Q. Yes.
A. So when I was writing this letter, it was on the basis that I had already deemed him fit to be at work and the issues seemed to be a disagreement as to how or what supportive arrangements were going to be mutually acceptable to his management and himself.
308 Q. Yes. You do go on to say in the third paragraph:
"As the menber appears to be refusing to agree with or cooperate with Garda management efforts to progress his return to work in what appears to be fraught circunstances, I believe that this is issue best addressed by Garda management utilising rel evant garda code, garda di rectives or empl oyment contractual processes."

That seems to be leaving open a scope of possible ways to progress the matter. Had you anything more specific in mind under either of those?
A. I couldn't tell a more specific thing to do, because if I said, oh well, move him to X place and that was committed to writing and then there was a difficulty with that or they could agree with that.
A. I didn't feel it was a discussion that I should involve myself in. I felt they had the framework in terms of supportive mutually agreeable, work that out together and find something that would work. And I wasn't really -- there wasn't any medical question for me to answer.

310 Q. Yes.
A. The medical question there would be that if you put him in a situation that there was a continuous exposure to perceived or real hazard, then that would be impacting on his health. So it was really about saying, look at the framework and decide on what is going to work best, I can't tell you, prescribe anything. And I wasn't going to do that and I don't actually do that.
311 Q. Yes. Obviously from the point of view of Chief Superintendent Dillane, he was seeking your assistance insofar as he thought he might be able to get it. But he was also seeking it from HRM. He forwarded you an e-mail slightly later in the month of May that he had sent to HRM. If we could look at the bottom of page
1559. I am not going to open the content of his e-mail to HRM, it contains a lot of the material that was sent to you, but a slight bit more detail about management issues. But he says here at the bottom of 1559 , if we scroll down, please. He says:
"With reference to the above, please see min nute bel ow whi ch I sent to HRM on 1st May 2013 for directions and I amstill awaiting reply. As the situation is now dragging on and the interest of the running of $t$ hi $s$ organi sation, l wi sh to seek your di rections on the following matter. If I direct Sergeant Barry to attend at Fermoy Garda Station and to deal with Superintendent Comyns, will it adversel y affect his health? Forwarded for your professi onal advi ce, please. "

I think that was sent off at 14:19 in the afternoon of the 24th. And you reply very quickly, almost within the hour, if we go to the top there of the page. The first substantive paragraph says:
"The member reported and presented to his GP with Ioss of well being whi ch he associ ates with certai $n$ issues in hi s workpl ace, incl udi ng his workpl ace i nt er personal rel ationship with his di strict officer, Superintendent
Comyns. Medi cal recommendations (incl udi ng from i ndependent specialist medical assessment at the request of this service) have been provided in the context of what is quite a fraught situation. There
are no further advi ces that I can offer froma medi cal perspective in this case.

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

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

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

So again you are reasserting the line you've explained to the tribunal there?
A. Yes.

312 Q. Chief Superintendent Dillane, he came back to you later that afternoon with the a further direct query that he had first asked you to address. If we look at the bottom of page 1566. 1556, I beg your pardon, Mr. Murphy, apologies. 1556. So if we scroll down to the bottom of the page, at 17:05 it says:
"Thank you for your qui ck response. However, l still seek your professi onal medi cal opi ni on."

If we just go back up there.
"Pl ease cl arify, if I direct Sergeant Barry to attend Fermoy Garda Station to deal with Superintendent Comyns will it seriously affect his heal th?"

And then you replied slightly later, 17:41, if we go to 14:10 the top there, it says:
"My opi ni on is as indi cated in the last sentence at paragraph 2 of my e-mail response to your original enquiry. I have no further opi ni on froma medi cal perspective in this matter."

And that's the third time you have said that to him?
A. Yes.

313 Q. It says:
"In the presence of an identifiable for established stressor (hazard) in the workpl ace, appropriate hi er archy of control measures would be to either el iminate stressor, remove worker fromfurther exposure 14:11 to stressor or modify the worker's exposure to stressor where there are ot her measure reasonabl y practicable."

So that would seem to be a guideline for how they have
to deal with it one way or another? I mean eliminating -- let's assume that certainly from Sergeant Barry's point of view Superintendent Comyns was the stressor, so eliminating the stressor would be dealing with Superintendent Comyns in some way to get him out of the 14:11 district?
A. No, what I said there was that at the end of the day whatever measure was implemented had to be reasonably practicable.
Q. Yes.
A. There had been lots of discussion back and forth in terms of how to manage this, especially because there seemed to be a difficult agreeing on what was feasible. This is just a general principle in terms of how the hierarchy of control works, is that you remove the stressor or you remove worker's exposure to the stressor.

315 Q. Yes.
A. In this circumstance, the member perceived his relationship with Superintendent Comyns as particularly 14:12 fraught, to the extent that he felt it impacted -- he believed it impacted on his health. We were saying that in the context of a supportive arrangement, find something that removes the need for that interaction. And that was all we were saying. It wasn't a question of move Superintendent Comyns. I couldn't direct them to remove the superintendent or anything.

316 Q. No.
A. It was really about saying, we seem to have a problem
here, can we find a solution that removes the requirement for both of them to have or for him to continuously interact with the superintendent. Because by that time $I$ had come to understand that as a sergeant in the district there was always going to be obligatory interactions between himself and the superintendent. And I think it would be obvious that, you know, they had to kind of look for a way to modify that interaction between the two of them, whatever that way worked out. So this was just giving them a framework to say, look, this is what the problem is.

317 Q. Yes.
A. Use this framework to try and sort out the problem.

318 Q. Yes.
A. That's all I was really saying to them.

319 Q. Obviously you're identifying in principle how it should be dealt with, if possible?
A. Yeah, because the hierarchy of controls kind of worked that way.
Q. The second option there "remove worker fromfurther exposure to stressor", I know you're not saying that you could or you would, as it were, either decide to or recommend a transfer, but a transfer would have achieved that objective number two, remove the worker from further exposure?
A. It was reasonable to expect that a transfer would have achieved that objective.

321 Q. And the third one is again obviously still a matter for management, as to whether that could be done?
A. Yeah. And I'11 give an example: when you talk about that, you talk about administrative arrangements, it may be that, okay, you locate him a role that does not require him to report directly to Superintendent Comyns. So there are different ways around that. In some places they would use a roster arrangement, where the two people kind of work at the same time, so they don't have any necessity -- there's no necessity for them to directly interact or communicate with each other.

322 Q. Yes.
A. It al1 depends on, you know, what is reasonable and practicable from an operational point of view. And that would rest, in my opinion, fairly with management. why I kept saying that from a medical perspective I had 14:14 no further opinion here, there was no clinical consideration that said to me that Sergeant Barry was unfit for work. What we were having an issue here with was about how best to facilitate him in the workplace, and that was really going to be based on management taking into consideration all the operational matters they have to consider when making those decisions?
323 Q. Yes. Matters don't seem to have been progressed further in relation to a transfer to Fermoy until you were then asked directly by Assistant Commissioner Fanning to -- he enquired whether there were any medical reasons. And perhaps we will look at his query to you, 1566. It's a letter of Assistant Commissioner Fanning from 1st th March 2014, in which he is now, as
it were -- I think you're probably being formally informed of this.
"Chi ef superintendent cork north has sought to transfer Ser geant Barry from M tchel stown garda station to Fer moy garda station for operational reasons. Sergeant Barry has appeal ed his transfer to this of fice.

I amto enquire are there any medical reasons that I need to consi der regarding thi s transfer and the appeal 14:16 the same by Sergeant Barry. If so, should medi cal confidentiality be wai ved?"

I think you reply to that by letter of the 1st April, if we look at 1563. And it's a three-point reply. If we just look at the letter there.
"As per mine of 9/4--"

Which is the previous letter to Assistant Commissioner Fanning, the previous year.
" -- following the menber's last revi ew at thi s service on the $11 / 3$, there are no compelling clini cal consi derations to debar the menber undertaking normal
pol icing duties in the safe and supportive working envi ronment.
2. The temporary accommdations advi sed in poi nt 3 of
mine of 9/4/ 13 were specifically in the context of subsisting local workplace situation at the time.
3. On the basis that appropriate risk assessment has determined that the new or proposed station is a safe and supportive workpl ace envi ronment, there are no clinical considerations to debar the menber working there based on the information currently available me."

And you sent that back to Assistant Commissioner Fanning. It turned out then that Chief Superintendent Dillane was in Dublin and went in to the CMO's office on the 3rd April. That's Dr. Collins himself, as I understand it. I'm not sure whether you were there, whether you were in or joined any conversation between the two of them?
A. I think I might have been called by Dr. Collins.

324 Q. Pardon?
A. I think I might have been called in by Dr. Collins.
Q. Yes. What's your recollection of that meeting?
A. I can't recall the meeting until I saw documentation on it.
Q. Yes. I mean, I know you do refer in your statement to him making reference to it, in a later e-mail of 2015, but he's quoting you essentially as saying that, it is a health and safety issue for Sergeant Barry if he were to be sort of sent to Fermoy? (phone ringing)
A. Sorry about this.
Q. Not at all.
A. Sorry, Chairman.

CHA RMAN No problem. Don't worry.
MR. MEGI NNESS: Do you recall saying something along those lines, that you did consider a move to Fermoy could impact on or raise health and safety issues for Sergeant Barry?
A. Again, I think I would approach this from the point of view that we had identified -- the member was presenting a hazard, what he considered a hazard to us, 14:18 and whether that hazard was actually a hazard or not was not really the issue, the fact he was presenting something to us that this was a hazard for him. And so, the decision in terms of facilitating him in the context of a supportive workplace would be to take that 14:19 into consideration and provide arrangements that would work around that.
329 Q. Yes.
A. And that was what I had consistently said in the context of, you know, the supportive work arrangements. 14:19
It was the fact that he was reporting something as a hazard. Whether anybody else viewed it as a hazard or not was not really the issue. If it was present as a hazard to him, then we had to take that on board, that was his concern, we had to kind of say, okay, how can 14:19 we address his concern? That is what supportive means. Mutual in this case would be that we would sit down with him and say okay look, how can we address this concern on the basis that whatever was going to be
arrived at was going to have to be something that was reasonable and practicable.
330 Q. Yes.
A. And I wasn't in a position to be saying do $X$ or do that, it was to give a framework to enable that discussion to take place.
331 Q. Yes. I mean, he perhaps was looking for something more specific, but it certainly wasn't within your purview or scope of expertise to manage the force in that way?
A. No, I wouldn't. And even if I had my views about, oh, do something that we are not -- professionally I wouldn't really kind of do that, because it's not really appropriate.
332 Q. Yes. I'm not sure whether you were made aware of it, but Chief superintendent Dillane at that stage sought to withdraw the application to transfer him to Fermoy, which appeared not to be accepted by HRM at the time. But Chief Superintendent Dillane subsequently wrote to you later in the year by e-mail, in fact, if I am correct, he wrote on the 5th January 2015. If we look at page 1568 , at the bottom of that. He says there:
"I wi sh to make enquiry as to the present stat us of the attached medi cal certificate which is still live on Sergeant Barry's file. During the last meeting I had with you on that matter, which was in Dr. Collins' of fice, you advi sed me that after consulting with Sergeant Barry's GP, you were of the bel ief that if he were to have contact with Superintendent Comyns at

Fer moy Garda Station that it may have a detriment al effect on his health. As the certificate was issued on the 28th March 2013, I wi sh to enquire as to the current status of the medical certificate as Sergeant Barry is continuing not to engage with Superintendent Comyns in Fermoy Garda Station. Forwarded for your attention, please."

I think you got that and you replied later in the afternoon, if we just go up the page slightly. And you 14:21 say:
"Chi ef Superintendent Dillane, I issued a report by return 18th Novenber 2014 to Chi ef Superintendent Ant hony MELoughl in in rel ation to this matter. He would be in a better position to update you on the current status of things."

Can you just help me with this enquiry. Can you recollect what had prompted you to issue that report to $14: 22$ Chief Superintendent McLoughlin at that time, if you can recall?
A. I think the chief superintendent had written to me seeking clarification on something again. By this time I hadn't seen Sergeant Barry since April or March 2013. 14:22 333 Q. Yes.
A. This was in 2014, and this issue seemed to have been going on, all these issues I wasn't even party to any of these issues, neither did I know they were going on
until I was getting these letters. So I think I had written to him a letter dated 18th November 2014. And again, from my view, there was no medical -- you know, no additional medical advice that $I$ felt was needed in the situation, that it was really about management sorting out the supportive workplace arrangement. So I think I just referred to that, because I was a bit taken aback that in 2015 I was getting this query on the certificate that was issued in 2013. And that's why I said, look, I think I provided a response to an enquiry from the chief superintendent HRM at that time. 334 Q. Yes.
A. And I asked him to go and follow that up with the chief superintendent.
335 Q. Yes. I will come back to that in a moment, but you do refer in that to the previous case conference, which you had held on the 17th April 2014. Perhaps we should look at that first. That's at page 1574. This was after your earlier reply on the 1st April to Assistant Commissioner Fanning. There was then a case conference 14:24 called on the matter on the 17th. Perhaps we will just look at that. On the management side, in the left-hand column it says:
"Bullying and harassment cl ai m agai n superintendent i nvestigated - none upheld. Menber submitted GP certificate saying he cannot work with superintendent. Member to be transferred - appeal agai nst transfer currently being revi ewed by A/C HRM Member has
declined transfer office. Superintendent reports that member is undermining him Member will not engage with superintendent at all - will not attend meetings report to him-organi sational risk. Member having detrimental effect on station and colleagues."

Do you recall that being reported to you at the time?
A. This was part of the case conference, it wouldn't have been part of a specific report to me. This is at a case conference, again they outline the current status of things or the issues. And that's what this was. It wasn't like it was a big report to me or anything. This is just to kind of give the framework for the discussion at the case conference.
336 Q. It says:
"Chi ef superintendent to meet with member to di scuss agai n transfers (option of M dl et on, Mal low and Glanmire).

Di scuss hazard and risk management issues.

Three i ssues:

1. No bull ying and harassment cl ai $\mathrm{m} \$$ uphel d .
2. Superintendent willing to work with member.
3. Member reporting difficulty working with superintendent through doctor.

Opt i ons:

1. Superintendent cannot be noved. No basis to transfer. No compl ai nts agai nst uphel d.
2. Can of fer medi ation to resol ve menber's percei ved difficulties with superintendent. LRC will provide service for free, both menbers must agree.
3. Mbve member away fromsuperintendent - health and saf ety issues three points above.

Menber can say yes or no - if member deci des to remai n in current role, must comply with organi sational procedures and deal with superintendent as any sergeant is obl iged to deal with thei r superintendent."

Then under your heading:
"CMD. Fit for work."

That is obviously subject to the caveats, the qualifications we have been discussing, obviously?
A. Yes.

337 Q. But I am wondering then, in relation to the response to Assistant Commissioner Fanning in October, what was the -- can you remember any particular trigger for that?
A. The one to Assistant Commissioner Fanning or to Chief Superintendent McLough1in.

338 Q. Pardon?
A. The one to Chief Superintendent McLoughlin.

339 Q. Yes. I should say, it's at 1564, if we have a look at
that. You think he was just enquiring as to your view on the current status?
A. There might have been -- there should be an e-mail he had sent to me that made me write that response.
340 Q. Yes.
A. I think I refer to an e-mail of the 15th November. So he had obviously sent an e-mail to me.
341 Q. Yes. In any event, you point out you hadn't had cause to review the member's medical fitness since $11 / 3 / 13$. Your advices of the $9 / 3 / 13$ refer in that regard.
"2. As there has been no new clinical circunstances reported to the service, my previ ous advice on the mentber's medi cal fitness of mine of 9/4/2013 stand.
3. Without prej udice to the outcome of any investigations into the reported workplace interpersonal rel ationship issues, based on the information available to me it would be appropriate to facilitate the menber with a safe and supportive workpl ace envi ronment that precl udes obl i gat ory interactions bet ween the parties concerned insofar as reasonably practicable.
4. There are no clinical considerations known to this service at this time to precl ude the menber from attending regul arly and undertaking normal policing duties in an appropriate workplace envi ronment in keeping with point 3 above."

And you say:
"I hope this clarifies the position of the service."

Did you see that or did you intend that to be seen as a modification of your view in any respect?
A. No. I wasn't saying anything different to anything I had said before.

342 Q. Yes.
A. Sorry, I don't know if you can hear me. I wasn't saying anything different to anything I had said before. One was that he was medically fit for work, in my opinion; there is no new information suggesting that there was new clinical developments, there is no new information suggest new clinical developments to change that opinion. The issue remained that it appeared that -- I mean, by the time this e-mail was coming in November, a lot of the -- some of the issues that had presented in terms of some of the investigations had been concluded and my understanding of whatever the outcomes were. But the fact that if the member was still having difficulty in terms of his perceived perception of his relationship with his superintendent, then the same supportive workplace arrangements were still going to be the recommendation.
343 Q. Yes.
A. And there wasn't anything to suggest that there had been any conclusion on that. So it was basically going back to them to say that from my medical perspective there was nothing changed in my opinion about his
fitness for work.
344 Q. Yes.
A. But that supportive workplace arrangements should still be taken into consideration.
Q. So from your point of view, you intended to achieve the $14: 29$ objective as before?
A. As before, yes.
Q. You have seen obviously Sergeant Barry's criticism of this view, which is sort of twofold. One is that it is an amendment of your medical advice and it seems, on his case, to have been done to facilitate and advance the transfer of him out of Mitchelstown to elsewhere. You've responded to that in your statement and obviously everyone has it, but would you like to either summarise what you said or add anything further. It's dealt with extensively --
A. I am just trying to find which paragraph in my statement that refers to.

347 Q. Yes.
A. Okay, I think paragraph 46 of my statement.

348 Q. Paragraph 46 onwards
A. Yes.

It's dealt with there.
A. okay, in paragraph 46 of my statement, I am not sure what page it is on the tribunal's documents.
A. But he suggests, he alleges that $I$ had cause to review my medical fitness, and I give my explanation. I say:
"At a formal revi ew of Sergeant Barry on the 25th January 2013, I had been of the vi ew that Sergeant Barry was unable at that time to return to work due to medical fitness."

That was January 2013.
"Following a further consultation with Sergeant Barry on the 11th March and the recei pt of the report of the IMA, independent nedi cal advi ser, I had formed the opi ni on --"

This is in April now, three months later or thereabouts.
" -- that he was medically fit to return to work."
351 Q. Yes.
A. "My opi ni on and advices of 9th April 2013 were purel y based upon my medi cal assessment findings and the additional information then available to me, including the report of the independent medi cal assessment by Dr. Tobi n. "

352 Q. That's paragraph 47 of your statement?
A. Yes.

353 Q. Perhaps we will just put the page on screen?
A. Yeah.

354 Q. If we go to page 1489.
A. Okay. And then in paragraph 48 I say:
"I confirml did not revi ew Sergeant Barry after 11th March 2013. A case conference was hel d on the 8th April 2013 and I made recommendations to HRPD in May, report dated 9th April 2013. My e-mails to Chi ef Superintendent Dillane were merely to clarify the advi ce/recommendations I had al ready made. I did not have any further information which was referred to occupational health after 9th April 2013 to cause me to change the opi ni on I had previ ously provi ded on 9th

April 2013.

My subsequent letters to A/C Fintan Fanning on the 1st April 2014 and to Chi ef Superintendent Anthony MELoughl in on the 18th Novenmer 2014, clearly stated that based on the information available to me the member remai ned fit to return to work and recommended that he should be accommodated with safe and supportive workpl ace envi ronment."

So in my letter of -- I have moved on to paragraph 50 now. My 1etter of the 21st March 2014, I was asked in a letter on the 21st March 2014 I was asked by A/C Fanning about the transfer of Sergeant Barry to a new station.

And again I refer to my letter in paragraph 51, I think in particular the last part of that letter where $I$ said:
"On the basis that appropriate risk assessment has determined that a new or proposed station is a safe and supporti ve workpl ace envi ronment, there are no clinical consi derati ons to debar the member working there based upon the information currently available to me."

So, I think in my view I have been consistent to say that he was fit for work, he should be facilitated with a supportive workplace environment. And if it was made -- if a determination was made that the considerations for a supportive workplace environment in this instance, that Fermoy ticked that box, it wasn't an issue for me whether he worked in Fermoy, in Mitchelstown, in Glanmire. The most important thing was that wherever he was put to work in, if the decision was that a relocation was a solution to the problem, then as long as it met those criteria then it was fine. I couldn't say, oh this one was better than the other
A. Yeah.

356 Q. You summarise your position at paragraph 56 then, at the bottom of page 1490, if that's fair to say that?
A. Yes. And I think I said there that:
"I strongly ref ute any assertion that I changed Ser geant Barry's origi nal certificate for a non- medi cal reason. I did not alter or change any document to facilitate his transfer to another di strict. I
entirel y ref ute any assertion that my advi ces mi ght have been in some way provi ded as a means to enable management achi eve a determined end, to facilitate his transfer."

Again I think it is important to say that I was dealing with the perception of the member and not actually the -- I mean, this was his perception of documentation that $I$ wasn't even aware of at that point in time.
Q. Yes.
A. But I was very clear that, in January I said he was unfit, January 2013, and in Apri1 2013 I said that he was fit to go back to work and that he was fit to go back to work in a supportive workplace environment. And I have held that position consistently through every communication that had been sent to me.

358 Q. Yes. You address the points again as they're made in another portion of Sergeant Barry's letter. If we look at page 1491, the middle of the page there. But it's essentially the same issue as I see it, but you may disagree or not.
A. Which one are you referring to?

359 Q. We11, paragraph 58, for example?
A. Okay. And again he makes an assertion, an allegation there, and I just think in that paragraph 59, he says that -- he's saying that I was trying to facilitate HRM and Chief Superintendent Dillane, and I say that:
"I deny that I sought to accommodate Chi ef

Superintendent Dillane. I did not seek to prescribe to An Garda Sí ochána management what management specific deci si on should be implemented to provi de a safe and supportive workpl ace envi ronment to Sergeant Barry. Neither did I advocate a particular sol ution as to how he was provi ded with a safe, supportive workpl ace envi ronment."

360 Q. Yes. At the conclusion of your statement, paragraph 64 , you say that:
"I consistently stated that Sergeant Barry should be provi ded with a safe and supportive workplace envi ronment. Any vi ew whi ch I expressed to Garda management about the fitness of the member to ret urn to 14:37 work at any particular tire was as an independently formed medi cal opi ni on based upon the evi dence known to me at that time."
A. Yes.

361 Q. There's only just one other issue then that I would like to ask you about. Shortly before Sergeant Barry retired --
A. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q.

And it was the subject of discussion between yourself and Sergeant Barry at the consultation of the 25 th January 2013. This appears to be the next reference by him directly to you about that, is that correct?
A. Yes.

365 Q. So he says:
"Wth reference to the above, I wi sh to report that havi $n g$ tendered my notice to retire on 19/06/ 2016, I have contacted Garda pay section to find that you have still not classified my illness in rel ation to the above compl ai nt. You stated to me that you could not do until this matter was investigated by Chi ef Superintendent Catherine Kehoe. Thi s i nvestigation was compl eted and a file was submitted to the Di rector of Public Prosecutions on the 28th August 2015 by Chi ef Superintendent Kehoe. On the 24th November 2015, Chi ef Superintendent Catherine Kehoe wrote to me in rel ation to the DPP's directions and informed me of my entitlements in accordance with the Vi ctims Charter as she deened me to be a victimof the actions of Superintendent Comyns. These actions were the cause of my ill ness and were work rel ated. I assume you are aware of this and yet you have not reclassified my ill ness.

I request that my sick leave from August 2012 until March 2013 be now cl assified as work rel ated and that
my pay and allowances for thi s period be restored as it is affecting my gratuity and pension. Please treat as urgent and should you have any queries re same you can contact me at [blank]. I attach correspondence from Chi ef Superintendent Catherine Kehoe dated 8th January 2016, confirming l was the victimof this criminal al I egation. "

Can I ask you a couple of questions about that? Had anyone at all approached you to reclassify his illness or issue any sort of report which could be used in an 11.37 certification?
A. When I wrote, I think in November 2015, I think the last communication I would have done was 2015 in relation to Sergeant Barry, I had not received any further communication about any of the issues that were present and there was no request seeking clarification, or any request seeking clarification on injury on duty or advices on injury on duty. All this, I think it's instructive to see that the first thing, I think it's
the last paragraph, the last sentence of the second paragraph, it is instructive to look, it says "। assume", he assumes I was aware. And that's the reason he wrote to me. I wasn't aware of anything and I didn't know anything about all the issues that he writes in his letter.

366 Q. Okay. You did reply to him obviously?
A. Yeah.

367 Q. If we look at the reply, page 1690. If we go back two
pages. You say:
"Having consi dered the inf ormation provi ded in both documents, l offer a response as follows:

1. Neither I nor the service were aware of or notified 14:41 that the investigation under the reference policy or for any ot her cause had been initiated. The same would apply to findi ngs and/ or concl usi ons fromthe i nvesti gation.
2. Thi s service has no role in the convening of such i nvesti gations, such matters coming under the remit of Garda management/HRM and peopl e devel opment.
3. There has been no correspondence bet ween HRPD and this si nce November 2014, when advi ce on fitness to work and clarifications thereof were sought by HRPD in provi ding a response to thi s service.
4. I am not in a position to know whet her the issue of recl assification you have rai sed has either been brought to the attention of HRPD by your I ocal management or if it is still deemed outstanding by your 14:41 I ocal management/HRPD. This is wi thout prejudi ce to the findi ngs and/ or concl usi ons you reference in your response.
5. The issue of recl assification of absence would be a matter for HRPD in conj unction with local management foll owing consi deration of al rel evant inf ormation."

You then go on to say:
"6. I would advi se you appropriatel y progress your concerns with and seek clarifications fromyour local management HRPD on this matter.

For reference purposes I have provi ded a copy of your 14:42 minute, excl udi ng the correspondence to HRPD, to facilitate appropriate further action in respect of your concerns.

I trust the above sets the record strai ght insofar as it pertains to the invol vement of this service and allows you suitably progress your concerns."

I think you also wrote to Ms. Monica Carr in that regard, isn't that right?
A. Yes, I did.

368 Q. If we look at page 1689. If we just scroll down there. That's a letter I think sent on the same date. You refer to the correspondence and in the third paragraph you say:
"It would appear that the menber was expecting a recl assification of the period absence referenced in his minute on the basis of the concl usion of the investigation and the correspondence bet ween himself and Chi ef Superintendent Kehoe. The issue of recl assification of absence would be a matter for HRPD in conj unction with local management following consideration of all rel evant information.

If it is that the reclassification is an outstanding matter on the basis of the findi ngs and/or concl usions fromthe investigation, this should be appropriately addressed in a timely fashion and commui cated to the menber. If clarifications fromthis service are deemed as necessary, these should be sought formally in accordance with the usual practise.

I thank you for your expediting necessary action in the ${ }^{14: 43}$ matter."

Now, can I ask you this: Presumably you didn't intend to exclude the inclusion of your service should be it necessary to come to a determination that it might be an injury on duty?
A. It's normal practice that the determination as to whether causality is going to be ascribed to an absence lies usually with the chief superintendent, local management and HR. If they need clarification from the 14:44 office of the CMO, they write formally to the office of the CMO seeking that opinion.
369 Q. Yes.
A. And so, basically I was leaving it open to them to make the decision if they wanted to seek that clarification. 14:44 Because they hadn't sought the clarification, so I wasn't going to be offering any advice in that regard.
370 Q. Yes.
A. Because it may not be an issue for them, they may
already have made a decision. It's just that I wasn't aware of any decision they might have made or not made about it.

371 Q. Yes. You weren't otherwise formally made aware of the outcome of any of the investigations, were you?
A. I wasn't and that would not be unusual.

372 Q. Pardon?
A. I wasn't and that would not be unusual.
Q. And I think you had no further involvement with the matter, is that right?
A. I think after that, I don't think there was any further communication to me.

374 Q. Okay. Thank you, Dr. Oghuvbu.

END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHAI RMAN Thanks. Now, Mr. Costelloe.

DR. OGENOVO OGHVBU WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. COSTELLOE, AS FOLLOVB:

375 Q. MR. COSTELLOE: Good afternoon, doctor.
A. Good afternoon.

376 Q. My name is Shane Costelloe, I am instructed as one of the barrister to represent Mr. Barry. You will be happy to know that after that in-depth examination by Mr. McGuinness, I just have one or two questions to put to you. I want to go back to one thing in particular and ask you a couple of days about it, okay?
A. okay.
Q. In order to hopefully usefully set the scene and to give any assistance that I can to you before I ask questions, I'm going to ask Mr. Murphy to put page 1539 up on the screen in front of you. This has already been opened to you. We understand these to be the notes of a case conference that was held on Monday, 8th April 2013, at which you attended along with Garda management. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. I think you have already stated to Mr. McGuinness that you recognise this document, you understand the context of it as reflecting what went on at that case conference, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, at this stage you have gotten the report back from Dr. Tobin and you have gotten the medical certificate from Dr. Kiely. Mr. McGuinness asked you this morning in relation to the first column, the comment there about "The recommendations of GP not consi dered reasonable and practicable by local management". You explained that that was an assertion made by Garda management, not by you, that this was stated by Garda management at the case conference meeting, isn't that correct?
A. Yes.

380 Q. And you will remember that Mr. McGuinness asked you whether or not you were asked or offered any view in respect of that particular assertion and your response
as I understand it was that you don't remember if you did or didn't?
A. I can't recall.

381 Q. Certainly there doesn't seem to be anything in the note there to suggest that you did, would you agree with me? 14:47
A. I can't recal1. The only account I have is what's on that.

Do you remember whether or not there was any discussion around that particular assertion by Garda management that the recommendations of Dr. Kiely were not considered reasonable and practicable? So, if you understand my question, I'm not asking you now if you were asked to provide an opinion, I am asking you if there was any discussion at the case conference around that?
A. I wouldn't recall that. I wouldn't recall that.

384 Q. I beg your pardon?
A. I wouldn't recall that. I can't recall that.

385 Q. You don't recall?
A. Yeah.

386 Q. Do you remember whether or not any Garda management offered a view as to why they were of the view that Dr. Kiely's letter or recommendation was not reasonable 14:47 and not practicable?
A. They may have and I wouldn't be -- it wouldn't be unreasonable to think that they would have said why that recommendation would have been deemed
reasonably -- or not reasonable and practicable for them to implement, but I wouldn't recall the specifics of that.

Fair enough. The conclusion of Dr. Tobin, which is very succinctly, if I you will excuse the tautology, reflected there in that that column "mutually agreed safe working envi ronment was to be put in pl ace", correct?
A. Yes.

Now, it is apparent, and I am suggesting to you that it is apparent that Garda management were of the view, as expressed at this case conference, that the only way in which to proceed was by transferring Mr. Barry from mitchelstown to a station outside the district where Superintendent Comyns worked?
A. It's possible they held that view.

389 Q. Well, I mean, if you look at the second column right there, they say that "all commuication with menber should be in writing - if menber rejects offers made", that's clearly a reference to the other column, the first column, where they talk about offers of a work location by divisional chief that would preclude him from working with the superintendent in question, isn't it?
A. Can you scroll to the bottom of $i t$, just so I can see. 14:49

390 Q. Yes, Mr. Murphy, would you mind coming down a little bit. You should be able to get more or less all of it on the screen there. Yes. Does that help, doctor?
A. Yes.

391 Q. okay. So in the second column there's reference there to "if member rejects offers made follow organi sational management procedures to manage situation", that can only be a reference to the offer to move him out of the district in which he was then working, isn't that
A. It could be a response to a whole lot of arrangements that they could propose. What they have said at that meeting, which is in the obvious in the minutes there, is that they had already made an offer to him which had been declined. The advice then was to put forward further arrangements and that sentence there, "if rember rejects offers made", is in the context of any other arrangements that they propose to him. And that was all that -- as far as I know, that was all that was 14:50 about. So it wasn't about the specific previous location that had been declined, it was about the arrangements that they were going to put in, discuss with him. Because the idea was to engage with him to find what was mutually a supportive workplace environment.
392 Q. okay. You have been, if I may say and suggest to you, very careful in distinguishing between your role as a medical professional and the role of management in finding a way around the problem. And I understand that, $I$ understand your evidence all morning and this afternoon. But what I am really you here is: At this case conference was anything other than a transfer out of Mitchelstown discussed, to your recollection, as a
viable alternative to what had been put forward by Dr. Kiely?
A. I cannot recall the specifics of the discussion in terms of proposals. It was for management to come up with different proposals and discuss them with Mr. Barry, as we had said, so that they could arrive at a mutually agreed safe, supportive arrangements to facilitate his return to work. Whatever those arrangements were, whatever proposals they were going to consider, that was entirely left to them, it wasn't for me to kind of speculate on what they were going to discuss.
393 Q. Wouldn't it suggest to you, doctor, given that you were at this conference, given that there has been reference to a transfer, but according to these notes, no reference to anything else, surely you'd remember if somebody suggested something other than a transfer and other than what Dr. Kiely was proposing, or recommending, I should say, recommending not proposing?
A. Again, I said I can't recall the specifics of the discussion. But the main thing I want to say is that, " meet with menber to put in place suitable arrangements", that was what was agreed, that other considerations, other than the transfer that had been declined, should be discussed with the member. Whether ${ }_{14: 52}$ it was transfer, whether it was change in work systems that would facilitate the member and allow the member to, you know, feel that he was supported and working in a safe environment, there could be a whole menu of
option that could have been put to the member. I can't say specifically ones which were discussed or not. And because they're not recorded there in terms of detail, it may not -- it may have been discussed, it may not have been discussed. I'm not in a position to say that 14:52 because I can't recall that. I am just simply guided by what was recorded, that what we said was that they should meet with the member to put in place, you know, arrangements. So that means that there was - what do I call it now? - a latitude of things that could be discussed with the member in terms of arriving at the goal, which was a mutually agreed safe working environment. That's the goal. At the end of the day, that's the goal. So, there could be a whole load of things that could have been discussed in that context and I don't know, and I was never party to the discussions between the member and management.
394 Q. I am not asking you about that, doctor?
A. Yeah.

395 Q. I am just simply asking you about the content of the case conference?
A. Okay.

396 Q. What I am suggesting to you, doctor, is that given everything that had been gone to date, given your role, given what was being discussed at the case conference, given the fact that Dr. Tobin had provided his report and given the fact that Dr. Kiely's medical certificate was being discussed at this meeting, you would remember if something other than an alternative to a transfer
had been mooted, had been proposed by Garda management at that meeting?
A. I wouldn't, I don't recall and I cannot recall something from nine years ago.

Fair enough. In respect of that case conference, do you recall whether or not there was any discussion about the fact that a solicitor for mr. Barry had previously written to Garda management suggesting a work around? Do you know what I mean by that, a compromise, which might alleviate the situation?
A. I do not recall.
Q. Was there any discussion to your recollection about the fact that it had been proposed that an inspector would be inserted in between Superintendent Comyns and Sergeant Barry, whereby the inspector would take over the functions that Superintendent Comyns might have had, would supervise, would manage Sergeant Barry, thereby getting rid of the need of Sergeant Barry having to report directly to Superintendent Comyns?
A. I wouldn't recall all those details.

399 Q. Again, that's quite a specific proposal, you'd agree with me, I'm sure, wouldn't you?
A. It's a consideration, but $I$ wouldn't recall the details of that.
Q. Yes. Again, I'm not really asking you if you get the details of it, I'm asking you if you remember if the general gist of that was discussed at the meeting?
A. I cannot recollect. If it's not documented, I can't recall whether that specific discussion took place or
not.
401 Q. okay.
A. I just want to make this point: That at the end of the day my view was that management and the member engaged to arrive at a mutually agreeable arrangement.
Whatever proposals that management would consider as reasonable and practicable were up to them to propose. I had already made my decision, that he was fit for work in a supportive workplace environment, and it was up to them to kind of sit down with him and explore all the different options that were available to them. As to the details of them, $I$ didn't expect them to tell me every detail of what they were proposing. They were to look at the framework and say, okay, look, Garda Barry, this is what we were prosing, a transfer, a change in work system, what you are describing as inserting somebody as a filter, all that was going to be between management and Sergeant Barry and I wouldn't really have to be involved in that.
402 Q. I completely understand that answer, doctor. I completely understand what you are saying. Obvious7y it's a matter for the Chairman what he takes from that evidence. But in the context of Garda management at the case conference going so far as to say that they thought Dr. Kiely's medical certificate was not reasonable and not practicable, what I am asking was, did they discuss anything that they thought was reasonable and was practicable other than transferring him. And I understand your answer to be, you don't
remember?
A. I don't recall and I wouldn't expect them to go into that much detail.
Yes. Or any detail, it seems?
A. I wouldn't expect them to go into that much detail because it was purely -- it was clearly in their remit to kind of decide what was operationally feasible. In fact, that day they actually -- when that certificate was submitted, they were so uncomfortable with it that they felt that would I talk with Dr. Kiely, was just a reflection of the fact that it was an unusual type of certificate for them to receive. But other than that, there wasn't any obligation for them to discuss in detail with me what proposals they were going to discuss with him.

And then finally, I understand from what you said here this afternoon, since we came back after the luncheon break, that your view was that an agreeable solution, a mutually agreeable solution which would allow for him to be allocated a role that did not require him, by which I understand you are referring to my client, did not require him to report directly to Superintendent Comyns. That's as I understand your evidence this afternoon?
A. I wouldn't --

CHA RMAN We11, you're probably the only one in the room who thinks that's his evidence.

MR. COSTELLOE: We11, I mean, it's on the transcript Chairman, it'11 be a matter for submission.

CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Costelloe. You're entitled to put that. I've heard his evidence. The doctor's evidence is on the transcript. But I have to say, that comes as a surprise to me, to say that that's his evidence, or that that's in any way an accurate summary of his evidence. Because I am not understanding that. I'm not arguing with you, but if you want to suggest that to him, that that is an accurate summary of his evidence, Dr. Oghuvbu can agree with it. But what I am objecting to and what I don't agree with you about is for to you state as a fact that that is his evidence. I have no problem with you saying, is it your evidence that, but not to preface a question on the factual assumption that that is his evidence, because that's not a factual assumption that certainly strikes me as being correct. Am I making myself clear on that? MR. COSTELLOE: I understand you entirely, Chairman. I'd respectfully disagree but it's a matter that I will make a submission on the evidence, Chairman.
CHA RMAN That's all right.
MR. COSTELLOE: I don't propose to -CHA RMAN Sorry, Mr. Costelloe, wait now, we're at cross purposes here. My problem with your question is that it is based on a fact and it's based, in my opinion, on an incorrect fact. That may or may not be right. But I am very happy for you to say, is your evidence A, B and C. I have no problem with that. My problem is, your assumption that his evidence is that, your assertion in the form of a question, as the
background to a question, that's my only problem. So, I am perfectly happy for you to ask the question, is your evidence, can your evidence be summarised as, just what you said. Do you understand? I mean, it's not a huge quarrel here. It's a disagreement. I don't agree 15:00 with your formulation of it. Now, if you want to say well, fair enough, I'11 forget it, well and good, but I am perfectly happy for you to ask the question, ask it in the form of a question.
MR. COSTELLOE: Yes, Chairman. I'm not saying for a 15:00 moment that I'm forgetting it, I'm just saying that I didn't think there was anything to be gained by challenging what seems to be your recollection of the evidence. But I totally understand your position, Chairman. Doctor, with the Chairman's leave I am going to rephrase the question so hopefully get around any mistake that I have made or any inaccuracy.
CHA RMAN Or that I may have made. Thanks very much.
405 Q. MR. COSTELLOE: Yes, Chairman. So, I was listening to your evidence as best I could, I was trying to make notes as best I could and it's quite likely that I have made an error. So what I am going to do is, I am going to go back and put a proposition to you and ask you if I have got that right or got it wrong okay. Is that al1 right?
A. Okay.

406 Q. So, first of a11, you were happy to work with the recommendation of Dr. Tobin, that a mutually agreeable solution would be found?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I understood from your evidence that as far as you were concerned that would encompass a situation where Mr. Barry would not be allocated a role that would require him to report directly to Superintendent Comyns?
A. I will make a correction on that: I wouldn't have said a role that will not allow him report, I said that will not involve obligatory interactions, that's the word that I would have used.
Q. Okay. We11, I stand corrected, I have a specific note to say you used the word allocated, I misheard, I beg your pardon?
A. I'm not changing the allocated, I am saying that what you said was a role that will not have allowed him to be -- I think you said directly, I am rephrasing you here, and I'm saying what I would have said was obligatory interactions.
409 Q. Thank you very much, doctor.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN I'm thinking, Mr. Costelloe, that you were right. I'm thinking that you were correct on that.
MR. COSTELLOE: It happens every so often.
CHA RMAN I think my recollection of that, I have just been trying to check back and I think subject to a word or two here or there, I think you were correct.
MR. COSTELLOE: Thank you.

CHA RMAN Just to make that clear, Mr. Costelloe. And thank you for clarifying the matter by a question in the form you did.
MR. COSTELLOE: I am very grateful.
CHA RMAN I think that your assumption, the way you phrased it and the assumption that you did, as I say, subject to a change of one or two non-essential words, I think what you said was correct. So forgive me for my interruption.
MR. COSTELLOE: May it please you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN okay. Now, who are we going to? Yes, Mr. Fitzgerald.

## DR. OGENOVO OGHVBU WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY

MR. FI TZGERALD, AS FOLLOVG:

410 Q. MR. FI TZGERALD John Fitzgerald on behalf of the Garda Commissioner. On that, I should say my note is in agreement with Mr. Costelloe's as to what the witness said in the first instance. As I understood it, to put 15:03 that remark in context, in terms of there had been a suggestion that the only alternative or the only solution being considered was a transfer, I understood that it was in that context that you said if Mr. Barry could be allocated a role that didn't involve
obligatory interactions or reporting directly to Superintendent Comyns, that would have been feasible or acceptable to you?
A. I would have used obligatory interactions reporting, I
wouldn't really have used -- I would have said appropriate interactions. I think that is the word I would use and I think it is in the worlds I used in documents that I -- in my correspondence with management.

411 Q. I suppose the point I am getting at is whether the phrase used is obligatory interactions or reporting directly, really the importance of it is, that it's not the case that the only alternative or the only solution being considered was a transfer, is that correct?
A. That would be correct, yes.

412 Q. Thank you. I have no further questions.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAK Thanks very much. So who else?
MR. HARTY: No questions.
CHAN RMAN Thank you very much. Very good. Mr. McGuinness?
MR. MEGU NESS: No further questions.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Dr. Oghuvbu. Thank you for coming and assisting us with your evidence.
THE WTNESS: Thank you, Chairman.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much.

## THE WTNESS W THDREW

MR. MEGU NESS: Chairman, I am proposing to recal1

Mr. Barry briefly.
CHA RMAN Just before we do. Mr. Costelloe, I'm sorry for getting that wrong. I can usually rely on my memory and I am sorry for getting that wrong.
MR. COSTELLOE: Absolutely not a problem but thank you for saying so, Chairman. May it please you. CHA RMAN Now, Mr. Barry, thanks very much.

MR. PAUL BARRY, PREY OUSLY SYORN, WAS DI RECTLY- EXAM NED

BY MR. MCGU NNESS AS FOLOVG:

MR. MEGU NESS: Mr. Barry, good afternoon?
A. Good afternoon, Mr. McGuinness.

414 Q. Just sequentially a couple of matters, $I$ hope to be done within five minutes even. Just on the return to work at the end of March of 2013, it was put to Inspector O'Sullivan that he would have known that you were back at work. I would just ask you to comment on that. How would Inspector O'Sullivan have known that you were coming back to work on the night of the 29th?
A. I don't expect that he knew I was coming -- he didn't know I was coming back on the 29th, nobody did. It's just the fact that I worked the 29th, I expect someone would have told him that I worked.
415 Q. Yes. But he was there on the 29th? when he was there. Like, I started at half eight, my shift would be 9 pm , and that was the time that he turned up. So I presume someone informed him between
Q. It's a presumption on your behalf, is it?
A. On my behalf, yes, because $I$ couldn't explain him turning up otherwise.
417 Q. Okay, and you have heard his evidence on the matter. Just one other matter on that, you heard Dr. Kiely's evidence yesterday. She said she didn't cross out the date on the original certificate that was given to you. Is it possible that you could have crossed it out then?
A. No, I didn't cross it out.

418 Q. Thirdly then, the tribunal asked your solicitors for a copy of your PIAB application and we received it very promptly indeed and thank you very much for them. But could I just ask you a question about that, because we got it just soon after you had given your evidence originally. If we could look at page 5757. This is a form which appears to have been signed by you, you may or may not recall that, having signed it?
A. No, but when I see it I'11 accept it, yeah.

419 Q. If we scroll down. That's the first page. And if we go down to the next page, it's a three-page document, I think. Mr. Murphy, thank you. There's a description then of what is alleged to have occurred. And then on the next page, if you go down to the bottom there. Perhaps there's a fourth page, I'm sorry. Next page. Thank you. That appears to have been signed by you on the 23 rd or it certainly has that date on it?
A. That's correct, July '14.

420 Q. That's your signature obvious7y. Now, we know from

Dr. Kiely's notes that in fact Dr. Dennehy's report, which is dated 31st July, and we looked at that earlier, but on the previous page back up, if we scroll back a whole page, you seem to have made a comment in relation to the report. You probably have had a chance 15:09 to review this in the last few days. You had originally phoned your doctor, Dr. Kiely to see if they could provide an emergency medical report and then Dr. Dennehy was able to provide one while he was on his holidays, according to the note.
A. That's correct.

421 Q. If we just go back up another inch. Stop. Stop. Back down, please. Sorry, Mr. Murphy. In bold it says:
"You are inqui red to submit a medical report fromyour treating doctor with your application. Are you satisfied that the medical report you are attaching adequatel y describes your injury."

You've ticked the box no, is that right? Did you tick that box?
A. I did, yes.

422 Q. Then it is typed in "Dr. Dennehy incorrectly records that I am hoping for a transfer. However, in fact I am seeking to resist a transfer but I am hoping that Superintendent Comyns avails of a transfer or a change whi ch will remove the necessity to work di rectly with hi m"
A. That's correct.
Q. Does that reflect your state of mind in July 2014?
A. Yes, when I saw Dr. Dennehy's notes, it appeared to me that he was saying that I was hopeful to get transferred, and that was not my conversation that I had with him. I had told him that I had appealed the transfer to Fermoy at that time.

424 Q. Yes.
A. It was under appeal at this stage.
Q. Yes.
A. And that I was hopeful of transfer Mallow. But it
wasn't that I was hopeful to be transferred -- if the transfer to Fermoy was unsuccessful, then I expected Mallow to be the next one and that would be at public expense, I expected it. So that's what I was referring to.

426 Q. You see, you just included in your answer there, saying inter alia, that you were hopeful of a transfer to Mallow?
A. Yes, but he didn't refer to any station. He just left it blank that $I$ was hopeful of a transfer. whereas I had actually appealed the transfer to Fermoy at the time, it was still under appeal.
427 Q. I understand that?
A. So I wasn't hopeful.

428 Q. He recorded that earlier in his report, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

429 Q. That it was under appeal?
A. Yeah. And my question from your answer two questions ago is, are you telling the tribunal that you did tell Dr. Dennehy that you were hopeful of a transfer to Ma110w?
A. I would explain to him at the time that I would appeal the transfer to Fermoy and that if they back with a transfer to Mallow, then that would be acceptable to me, and I believe that's what he was saying, without referring to the station. But somebody who didn't know the conversation could think that I was hopeful of a transfer full stop, which I wasn't. I didn't want to be transferred.

432 Q. So he's only incorrect insofar as he has not recorded in his report that you were hopeful of a transfer to Mallow, is that right?
A. And that if the transfer to Fermoy wasn't successful, if there was no more transfer, I would have been happy. 15:12 In the event that I'd have to be transferred, then Mallow would have been acceptable.

433 Q. Now, one other document that's come to our attention, and perhaps should have got it earlier, but

Superintendent Comyns refers to it in his statement, but it was your letter of the 22nd January 2015. I think you were able to provide us with a copy of that when requested, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

434 Q. Could we look at that, at page 5898. This is an unsigned copy, presumably the original was signed by you and sent to the chief superintendent?
A. Through the sergeant in charge.

435 Q. Yes. He does refer to it obviously in his subsequent letter to HRM. You say there in the middle:
"I have been stationed in Mtchel stown garda station for the past 15 years and I consider it to be the only safe and supportive working environment for me to work
in and accordingly lo not wi sh to apply for a
transfer. Chi ef Superintendent Dillane seens to have forgotten that it was Superintendent Comyns who ref used nedi ation by labour rel ations Commission as recommended by HRM to resol ve interpersonal rel ationshi ps.

Forwarded for your information, pl ease."

It was sent on by Sergeant Dunne through the superintendent for Chief Superintendent Dillane, if we look at the bottom of that. But I am just wondering, does that not perhaps reflect your position throughout, that you weren't going to leave mitchelstown, as it were, no matter what?
A. No, I did not want to be transferred, full stop. But if there was to be a transfer, I'd be happy to go at public expense, but not to any station where I had my relations or where Superintendent Comyns or anyone involved in the sexual abuse case were stationed.
A. Thank you, Mr. McGuinness.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thank you. Just stay there for a moment, Mr. Barry. Now does anybody want to ask anything arising out of that? I suppose, Mr. Murphy, you should go first and we'11 come around again to Mr. Costelloe then, isn't that the best way to do it?
MR. MRPHY: Yes, Chairman, thank you.
MR. HARTY: Chairman, I have one or two questions as wel1.
CHA RMAN Thank you very much. Thanks, Mr. Harty.

MR. PAUL BARRY WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. MURPHY, AS

## FOLLOMS:

437 Q. MR. MRPHY: Mr. Barry, I wonder if you could be shown document 5760, please. And I wonder please, registrar, 15:15 could scroll down to the end of that page. Thank you. So, Mr. Barry, I think looking at this document, this was an important document, you agree?
A. Yes.

438
Q. It was important, I think you would agree, in relation to your claim for damages which you were seeking to institute by communicating through PIAB?
A. That's correct.

439 Q. And I think that you would have been aware of the fact, were you not, that filling out this form was something that was very important from PIAB's point of view?
A. That's correct.
Q. And in fact, the importance, I think you'11 agree with me, can be seen where your signature is contained at the end of the page, and just above that, do you see the words which are contained in the form which you've signed and those words say:
"I hereby decl are that the above information is to the best of my know edge true and accurate in every respect."

Do you see those words?
A. That's correct.

441 Q. Did you understand therefore at that time that you were signing was a representation to PIAB and thereafter to the insurers, who are referred to in the next paragraph, and thereafter to the High Court, that what you were saying in your document was true and accurate 15:16 in every respect?
A. That's correct.

442 Q. So turning back then to page 5759, please. Can I draw your attention to the question in the middle of the
page, which reads:
"You are requi red to submit a medical report fromyour treating doctor with your application. Are you satisfied that the medical report you are attaching adequatel y descri bes your i nj ury?"

And you have ticked the box marked no. Is that correct?
A. That's correct.

443 Q. And then it goes on to say:
"If no, pl ease provi de further inf ormation in the box bel ow. "

Is that correct?
A. That's correct.

444 Q. And then the phrase that you use is, and these are your words I think, Mr. Barry:
"Dr. Dennehy incor rectly records that I am hoping for a transfer. However, in fact l amseeking to resist a transfer but I amhoping that Superintendent Comyns avails of a transfer or change which will remove the necessity to work directly with him"

So, I have to suggest to you that that there are in fact two important messages that you wanted PIAB to aware of. First, that in your view Dr. Dennehy was
incorrect because in fact you were seeking to resist a transfer, wasn't that the first message?
A. Yes, the transfer was under appeal at the time.

445 Q. And secondly, that you wanted PIAB to understand that you were hoping to Superintendent Comyns would avail of a transfer or a change which would remove the necessity to work directly with him, namely that Superintendent Comyns would go from the area in Mitchelstown where you were working?
A. No, I didn't say that he would go, I am saying that I was hoping that he would avail of a transfer.

446 Q. Well, you see, I have to suggest to you that if you go back, for example, to document 5126, please, can I just draw your attention to the second paragraph, the one that begins "he has previ ous hi story of PTSD", if I ask 15:18 you, Mr. Barry, to look to the middle of that
paragraph. Do you see the phrase, "He", that's you "is hoping to obtain a transfer and hopefully working with different personnel will enable matters to improve and his stress levels to recede, which should allow further 15:19 i mprovement in his depressi ve symptons", do you see that?
A. That's correct.

447 Q. So, would you agree with me that Dr. Dennehy was expressing his view about the transfer as something which, if it effective, would improve your position and allow your stress levels to recede and would allow you further improvement in your depressive symptoms?
A. That was in the event that I would be transferred to

Mallow, yes.
448 Q. So can we simplify it by saying that you agree with me that Dr . Dennehy indicated that he thought that a transfer would be good for you?
A. Not any transfer, because it wasn't just any transfer would have been good to me.

449 Q. In terms of how he expresses himself, it says "a transfer whi ch hopefully working with different personnel will enable matters to improve." So I have to suggest to you that he is clearly referring to a transfer in general, isn't that right?
A. But I had indicated to him that Mallow would have been the only one I would accept.
450 Q. Can you explain to the Chairman then why you made no reference to Mallow in your correction of Dr. Dennehy in this very important document which you are putting before them, and where you are saying that ultimately your doctor was wrong?
A. I'm not saying he's wrong, I am saying that he could be interpreted as thinking that $I$ was hoping for $a$ transfer, which I wasn't. I had appealed that transfer at that time.
451 Q. Mr. Barry, just again to be fair to you in these circumstances, I have to suggest to you that you were suggesting that Dr. Dennehy was wrong. Can I just draw 15:20 your attention back to 5759, please. And again, if you could go to the box that we referred to a few minutes ago, which begins "if no pl ease provi de further inf ormation in the box bel ow'. Thank you. Sorry, if
we scroll down a little, please. Sorry the other way, I beg your pardon. So, Mr. Barry, what you recorded, your words:
"Dr. Dennehy i ncorrectly records... ."

I have to suggest to you that's saying that Dr. Dennehy was I don't think
A. That I was hoping for a transfer.

452 Q. That's you were saying to PIAB that Dr. Dennehy was wrong?
A. To say that I was hoping for a transfer.

453 Q. And not only was he wrong, that he hadn't recorded the fact that you were hoping that Superintendent Comyns would avail of a transfer or change which would remove the necessity to work directly with him?
CHA RMAN Sorry, I am not sure that's correct, Mr. Murphy. What he says is, he says Dr. Dennehy was wrong, he says Dr. Dennehy incorrectly - I'm understanding that as being - "Dr. Dennehy incorrectly records that I am hoping for a transfer. However in fact । amseeking to resist a transfer and I am hoping that Superintendent Comyns..."

He's not saying that Dr. Dennehy got it wrong in not referring to Superintendent Comyns's -- that's what I -- but it's a matter of interpretation of the words, if you like. But I think that seems to me to be a fairer way of reading it. I think he does say he was
wrong. How was he wrong? He said he was hoping for a transfer. Whereas the situation is different.

MR. MRPH: Yes, Chairman.
454 Q. CHA RMAN I mean, am I understanding that correctly.
A. That's correct, Chairman.

CHA RMAN we can read it and interpret it, if you like. But that's what it looks like.
455 Q. MR. MRPH: Now, when you came to give your evidence here in this tribunal, I think you took an oath.
A. That's correct.

456 Q. And the oath you took was to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?
A. Yes.

457 Q. And I wonder if you could be shown a transcript at Day 178, at page 76. So, can I just ask you to look down the page please, at question 280. And there I think I asked you in the following terms:
"I have to suggest to you that really what you di dn't want to happen was, you didn't want a transfer under any circunstances?"

And you replied:
"No. If you read that cl osel y, you will see that I did 15:23 not want any person no matter what thei r rank or authority to commit criminal behaviour as I sawit." Then at line 27 you said:
"I was not going to reply for a transfer, l keep repeating it until the cows come home, I wasn't going to apply for a transfer."

And over the page, please, to page 77. At question 284 it was put to you that you were re-positioning yourself and the question is:
"Very clearly at the time in everything you sai d, in everything that you wrote, in everything that your sol icitors wrote, your answer was, no, l'mgoing nowhere?"

And you rely:
"I was open, and I gave you the reasons why Mallow woul d have suited re."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.

458 Q. I have to suggest to you that the evidence you gave in these two pages and in relation to this issue in the at tribunal, clashes with what you said in your form to PIAB?
A. Mr. Murphy, in relation to what I said about PIAB, are you referring to Superintendent Comyns's transfer?

459 Q. I am referring to both parts?
A. Both parts. Well the first part I have explained. In
relation to the transfer of Superintendent Comyns, when I came to Mitchelstown in 2000, between 2000 and 2010 there were three superintendents who moved on from transfers. That's an average of three and a half years, you could say. Superintendent Comyns was already there for four and a half years at this stage or four years, whatever. So it was natural to expect that he would be moving on as well. Every superintendent who comes to Fermoy since I was there and since has moved on, and that was what I was referring to. I was hoping that he would be transferred to the city in the coming months or year.
460 Q. Mr. Barry, you may recall that it was put to you that you had indicated that as far as you were concerned you were going nowhere and that you hoped the superintendent would trave1?
A. Sorry, I never indicated I was going nowhere. Chief Superintendent Dillane stated that.
461 Q. CHAI RMAN Yes.
A. I did not agree with that comment.

462 Q. MR. MRPH: And in terms of the issue, I have to suggest to you that it's clear that in terms of the PIAB document, it indicates what you were denying here, it indicates that you were resisting a transfer and you were not hoping for a transfer anywhere.
A. No, I wasn't hoping for a transfer, but what I was referring to was that I was resisting the transfer to Fermoy, that was under appea1, and if there was never a transfer attempt again I would be happy for it. But in
the event that I would be transferred, Mallow was the only place I would be happy to go to.
463 Q. Mr. Barry, I have to suggest to you there is a clash between your testimony here and this box to PIAB, I have to put it to you that one of them has to be correct and the other is correct?
A. No, they're both correct.

464 Q. I see. I have to suggest to you that that cannot be the case?
A. Well, I say it is, to me.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Oh thanks very much. Now, Mr. Heslin -- I'm 15:26 sorry, Mr. Harty, forgive me. Mr. Harty, yes, you want to ask some questions. You're for superintendent Comyns, isn't that right?
MR. HARTY: Superintendent Comyns. Thank you.

MR. PAUL BARRY WAS CROSS- EXAM NED BY MR. HARTY, AS

## FOLLOWG:

466 Q. MR. HARTY: Mr. Barry, if we stick with this document that is open in front of you, you considered carefully what you wrote into that document, isn't that correct?
A. That's correct.

467 Q. And I take it, it's typed out, was that typed out by your solicitor or by you?
A. I don't remember. I don't believe it was me, no.
Q. And "Dr. Dennehy incorrectly records that I amhoping for a transfer", that's the bit that you say was incorrect?
A. The interpretation that someone could take from it, is what I believe is incorrect.
Q. No, but see, the sentence that you say is incorrect is "Dr. Dennehy incorrectly records that I am hoping for a transfer", there is then a "however", so that's is an entirely separate clause with a different meaning and import?
A. Yes, it's what he stated, I believed he was incorrect.
Q. And so, it would be fair to say that at the time of filling out this form you were not hoping for a transfer?
A. No, my transfer was under appeal.
Q. I am not saying the transfer, I am talking about a transfer. At the time of filling out this form you were not hoping for a transfer?
A. No, I didn't want any transfer.
Q. And that's the issue, Mr. Barry. You didn't want any transfer. You then go on to say "However, in fact I am seeki ng to resist a transfer but am hoping that Superintendent Comyns avails of a transfer or a change whi ch will remove the necessity to work directly with
hi m'. You appreciate that where you were and your remaining in Mitchelstown station meant that you did have to work directly with my client?
A. By correspondence, yes.

A. Probably would, yes.
Q. And if we come to his report at page 5126, please, Mr. Murphy, and if we go to that last paragraph we had, 15:30 "he has a previ ous hi story". It is clear, is it not, from that last paragraph that Dr. Dennehy believed that in terms of your wellbeing you should be removed from a situation where there was potentially cause for you to
have interaction with Superintendent Comyns, isn't that correct?
A. Sorry, could you repeat your question?

481 Q. Did you discuss with Dr. Dennehy what it was that caused you to have your symptoms of depression or anxiety exacerbated?
A. Yes, I did, from the outset.

482 Q. What did you say they were?
A. Having contact with Superintendent Comyns because of what he had done.
483 Q. Well, we will come to because of what he had done because that's also present in this PIAB report and we will come to that, Mr. Barry. But before we come to that, did Dr. Dennehy suggest to you that it would be in your interests to work in a different district?
A. Not that I recall.

484 Q. Is Dr. Dennehy a sensible man?
A. Obviously.
Q. And he had formed the view that the reason why your symptoms -- you were suffering from this depression and stress, was because of your potential for contact with my client, isn't that correct?
A. That Dr. Dennehy is saying this?

486 Q. Yes.
A. Yes.

487 Q. And are you saying to this tribunal that Dr. Dennehy never discussed with you that removing yourself from that situation might improve matters further?
A. Dr. Dennehy knew I was not having physical interaction
A. I know that.

Because he deals with the hoping to obtain a transfer and then he goes on and says, "Hopef ully working with different personnel will enable matters to improve and hi s stress level s to recede, whi ch should allow for further improvement in his depressi ve symptons". Did Dr. Dennehy say that to you?
A. No.

490 Q. No. Are you seriously saying that Dr. Dennehy, having formed this view, did not discuss it with you?
A. Dr. Dennehy did not discuss a transfer to --

491 Q. I'm not talking about transfer, I am talking about that particular question - "Hopefully working with different personnel will enable matters to improve"?
A. That could not happen without a transfer.

492 Q. Whose transfer?
A. Mine.

493 Q. Just yours?
A. Well, how could I work with different personnel unless I did transfer?

494 Q. Because, you see, in the PIAB form you say things wil1 improve if Superintendent Comyns transfers?
A. No, I didn't say that. I said I am hopeful --
Q. We'11 come back to the PIAB form in a second?
A. Right.
Q. But in relation to Dr . Dennehy, Mr. Barry, are you saying to us that there was no discussion about how it would be in your interests to transfer out of the district?
A. There was a discussion with Dr. Dennehy in relation to my appeal or my transfer to Fermoy, which I did not want to go ahead and that's why I appealed it. He was also familiar with my doctor's cert where I wasn't having contact with the superintendent. And I expressed to Dr. Dennehy that I did not want to leave Mitchelstown but in the event that the transfer to Fermoy failed, then I expected I may have to go to Mallow and that that would be acceptable to me.

497 Q. I don't understand how Mallow came into that conversation at a11. There hadn't been any move to transfer you to Mallow. The move to transfer you to Fermoy was to get you closer to Superintendent Comyns?
A. Mallow was mentioned by Chief Superintendent Dillane and it was mentioned by me to him as well. have further improvement in your depressive symptoms if you reduced the possibility of interaction with Superintendent Comyns?
A. We11, the doctor refers to medical matters more so than transfers or whatever, that's what he's concentrated on.
501 Q.
Can we come now to Dr. Kiely's notes at page 4771, please, Mr. Murphy. This is dated 10th August 2012:
"Has new superintendent in station in Mtchel stown. He wants one of the sergeants to move to Fermoy and Paul feels he often picks on little things to try to encourage the move."

Was that what caused your depressive symptoms?
A. No. As I've explained to you already, what caused my symptoms was what Superintendent Comyns had done.
502 Q. Oh yeah. You accept that it's the first thing recorded in your notes?
A. That's not my notes.

503 Q. In the notes?
A. The notes, yes.

504 Q. Can we then come to the PIAB form again, please, which I think is 5757. Thank you, Mr. Murphy. And if go to page 5758 and we go to the accident details, which is the next just slightly further down. Thank you. You set out there what was done to you. It states:
"A series of inci dents and circunstances of bullying, har assment and victimisation, the accumul ation of same resulted in psychol ogi cal injury di agnosed on the 7th August 2012 in the course of empl oyment in An Garda

Sí ochána.

I suffered detriment through unfair treat ment by Superintendent Comyns. I have suffered detriment via Superintendent Comyns's application to me of unnecessary admini strative burdens whi ch were not uni versally applied inthe force or by Superintendent Conyns to other members, and further, Superintendent Comyns' i mposition of di scipline and reprimand via ostensi bly objective criteria. "

That is remarkably similar, is it not, to the impression one gets from the opening section of Dr. Kiely's notes, which was that "Superintendent Comyns was picking on little things to encourage a move 15:38 to Fer moy". It's much the same thing, isn't it? Picking on little things, unfair treatment. "I have suffered detriment via Superintendent Comyns application to me of unnecessary administrative burdens whi ch were not uni versally applied in the force",
that's very similar to the suggestion that
Superintendent Comyns had decided to pick on little things in order, you say to Dr. Kiely, to encourage you to move to Fermoy. And in this your complaint is "unnecessary admi ni strati ve burdens whi ch were not uni versally applied and imposition of di sci pline reprimand via ostensi bly obj ective criteria", they're your words, are they?
A. Yes.

505 Q. "Repetitive i nappropriate conduct towards me by Superintendent Comyns was to such an extent that my positi on in An Garda Sí ochána was undermined and I lost all sense of di gnity at work. "

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

506 Q. They're al1 about Superintendent Comyns engaging in management decisions?
MR. MEGU NNESS: Chairman, I am loathe to intervene and I don't want to do so unnecessarily, but I had intended to recal1 Mr. Barry to deal with the issues that I had dealt with and I hadn't intended that it would open up other areas, which seem to have strayed perhaps outside the area for which he was recalled. It may be that Mr. Harty is going to link them back to some or all of the issues that I recalled him on. It's a matter for you, Chairman.
MR. HARTY: We11, Chairman, my understanding is that because this PIAB form was disclosed after Mr. Barry had given his evidence and after I had an opportunity to cross-examine him, this is very central to my client's reputation, contained in this PIAB form, expressed in this way. I am nearly done on all the issues, but the reality is, is that there is a coherence with all of the indications from Mr. Barry prior to the formation of these terms of reference in the tribunal, which is that it has nothing to do with anything other than the management and the desire not
to be transferred. And that is directly relevant, I say, to this expression in the PIAB form.
CHA RMAN In fairness, Mr. Harty, let me see, Mr. Costelloe, have you something to say about this?
MR. COSTELLOE: I have to say, Chairman, that I took the view that I wouldn't object because I thought ultimately we would be better just to let Mr. Harty finish. I had the same concern that Mr. McGuinness has expressed to you, Chairman. But my own view is that we are entering into matters that don't arise under re-examination and if anything they're collateral and if we are strictly applying Rules of Evidence, I don't see how my friend is entitled to put these questions to the witness. But, as I said, I was going to hold my powder for the time being because $I$ just thought it might be more efficient and all round better not to object.
CHA RMAN Thank you. We11, I understand at this moment that -- I'm not going to, Mr. Murphy, because you don't regard you as legitimate contradictor in regard to this area. Certainly I would be opposed to and would out rule a sort of replay of cross-examination. It seems to me in this case that Mr . Harty has confined himself to matters arising out of the PIAB form and since the PIAB form has been produced after the evidence, I don't think it is reasonable to seek to confine cross-examination to a zone that has been selected by counsel for the tribunal or any other counsel. I think that Mr. Harty is
entitled to say, look, I now have seen this for the first time, I mean in the sense of after cross-examination, and I didn't have the opportunity to cross-examine on this, and it seems to me that that zone of exploration is legitimate. I am not particularly -- I don't want to be misunderstood on this, I am not dealing with this on the basis of the importance of the issue or, indeed, the lack of importance of the issue. I am dealing with it, so Mr. Harty mentioned how important it was to his client, 15:43 and I don't want to dismiss that as a legitimate concern but I want to say that it's not relevant to my decision. My decision is based on the fact that this is contained in the form, Mr. Harty is exploring what's in the form, admittedly by reference to some other documents, but that's inevitable and I can't see it's improper.

So as a matter of admissibility and legitimacy of examination, I can't see any reasonable objection. I understand also Mr. Harty says, look, I am nearing the end of it, and while I said I wasn't taking other issues into account, I am conscious of the fact that it's not a particularly -- it's not an extended cross-examination, we're not embarking on a whole new direction, a whole new seam of enquiry. So, Mr. Harty, proceed.
507 Q. MR. HARTY: Thank you, Chairman. There is then just one final issue that I should highlight. That in
relation to complaint regarding my client, there is set out in that form all of the actions of which you have complain predate any potential protected disclosure, isn't that correct?
MR. COSTELLOE: I wonder, Chairman, if that is a question that can fairly be answered by the witness. Surely that's a matter for legal submission and ultimately you have already ruled that you're going to hear submission on that point.
CHAI RMAN I certainly will hear.
MR. HARTY: I will ask the question differently.
CHA RMAN okay.
508 Q. MR. HARTY: Before you made any complaint.
A. Before I made an official complaint?

509 Q. Yes.
CHA RNAN Before you made your point 9 complaint or the other ones.

MR. HARTY: or whichever.
510 Q. CHAN RMN Before you made your number 9, Mr. Barry, that's really the thing, there's nothing about number 9 in this.
A. No.

MR. HARTY: Thank you, Mr. Barry.
CHA RMAN what do you say, Mr. Barry.
A. Sorry, in relation to the PIAB?

511 Q. CHAD RMAN Yes.
A. But there is -- that is -- the repetitive conduct and the extent that my position was undermined, that I had lost sense of dignity at work.

512 Q. CHA RMAN Say that solely, say that again.
A. I am saying that number 9 is involved in that.

513 Q. CHA RMAN I don't want to give awe hard time, but can you tell me how I would know that there was something else in it?
A. Because of the inappropriate conduct towards me and the directions that I was given.
514 Q. CHA RMAN Okay, you say that this contains it, I thought you were going to explain why it wasn't in it, but you say it is in it?
A. Yes, because $I$ believe that the discipline that $I$ refer to was because of the criminal allegation, number 9.
CHA RMAN okay.
MR. HARTY: Thank you, Chairman, I have no further
questions.

## END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Now, Mr. Costelloe, do you want to -- I'm sorry, anybody else? I'm sorry, Mr. Carroll, it's not
as if I ignore you or Mr. McGarry, but I am not anticipating that would you have any relevant questions.
MR. CARROLL: No questions.
MR. MEGARRY: That's correct, Chairman, I don't have

CHA RMAN Thank you very much. So, Mr. Costelloe, over to you.
MR. COSTELLOE: Thank you, Chairman, and everyone in
the room, no less yourself, Chairman, will be happy to know that I am going to be very, very brief.
CHAN RMAN Mr. Costelloe, take as long as you like.
MR. COSTELLOE: I only have one thing.
CHA RMAN Mr. Costelloe, I wouldn't want anybody, especially Mr. Barry, but sorry, not just Mr. Barry, anybody to know, we take as long as we take and so be at ease on that one.
MR. COSTELLOE: Thank you.

MR PAUL BARRY MAS QUESTI ONED BY MR COSTELLOE, AS

## FOLLOWE:

515 Q. MR. COSTELLOE: Al1 I really want to do, Mr. Barry, is bring you back to the transcript of the evidence, portions of which were put to you by Mr. Murphy. So the other Mr. Murphy, if you wouldn't mind, please, day 4 , that's Day 178, the fourth day of the hearing. Portions of the transcript have already been put to you a moment ago by Mr. Murphy on behalf of An Garda síochána, isn't that right?
A. That's correct.

516 Q. Okay. I really just want to bring you to one question in particular, it's at the bottom of page 75, it's question number 278. Now, you have been giving your evidence at this point about what you're saying about transfers and that will be apparent for the Chairman when the submissions are made in respect of the evidence. But here, question 278:

# "You told us a few moments ago that actually this was a situation where you were willing to transfer to Mall ow. " 

And then if you go on to the next page.
" -- if public funds could be di verted to support those expenses. Wbuld you agree with me that what you said a few minutes ago is compl et el $y$ different to this?

And then your answer back on the fourth day was:
"No, that is totally incorrect. I said Mallow was my second option. If I was not to be accommodated in M tchel stown, then Mall ow woul d have been the most acceptable station for me to do to."

Do you see that answer there?
A. Yes.

517 Q. Do you in any way wish to amend or correct or change in any shape or form that particular answer that you gave there?
A. No, I do not.

518 Q. In your opinion is that answer in any way inconsistent or in any way incongruent with the answer you have given in response to what you say was Dr. Dennehy's error and your effort to correct that on the face of the PIAB report?
A. No.

MR. MRPH: Sorry, Chairman, could I just object to a question that invites the witness to give an opinion about his own answer.
CHA RMAN Mr. Murphy, don't go there.
MR. MRPHY: Chairman.
CHA RMAN I do understand, I was at this for a long time. I do understand examination, cross-examination. Mr . Costelloe, I can assume him that the evidence won't be overlooked, I can assure him of that. But I can understand his position and I will refrain from saying that his question might be a little difficult to -entirely. But I understand his point, he is endeavouring to re-establish, so to speak, and clarify and confirm Mr. Barry's position, which I am considering he has done.

MR. COSTELLOE: Thank you very much, Chairman, I have nothing further.

END OF EXAM NATI ON

CHA RMAN Thanks very much. Thanks, Mr. Barry. Thanks for coming back to us. Thanks for sitting through the whole thing. I know you were here for the whole thing. It's quite an ordeal. We appreciate that 15:49 and thanks very much for your cooperation.
THE WTNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
CHA RMAN So you're now finished with that. We will be dealing with a few issues about submissions and
legal argument and things of that kind, but it won't involve -- you're welcome to be there, but you don't have to be there, if you know what I mean.
THE WTNESS: okay.
CHA RMAN And then it's over to us in the tribunal to make the best of the whole thing and see what we can do to try to get to the bottom of the whole thing, you know. Do you understand.
THE WTNESS: Thank you.
CHA RMAN Thanks very much. So you can step down and go back to your seat, Mr. Barry, and you're finished with the evidence.

## THE WTNESS THEN WTHDREW

CHA RMAK Now, Mr. McGuinness, is that the evidence? MR. MEGU NNESS: Yes, Chairman, that completes the list of witnesses that the tribunal has scheduled to hear in the matter.
CHA RMAN well, thank you very much. Just before we go, don't we have a few little administrative details, Mr. McGuinness? Are we suggesting that --
MR. COSTELLOE: Chairman, I beg your pardon, before you proceed to deal with those, which obviously we all need to hear of, there was a witness who had been listed in the schedule of witnesses and a number of weeks ago now, the tribunal legal team wrote to us informing us that they didn't propose to call her. Our response then, which was reiterated in a further piece of
correspondence yesterday was that we didn't really mind if she wasn't called, we weren't objecting to that, but we were desirous of her statement being considered as part of the record however that should come about.
CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. COSTELLOE: Now, I really don't mind how it comes about except to say that I plan --
CHAl RMAN what is the witness's name.
MR. COSTELLOE: Patricia Gould, she is to be found at page 1390, it's a short statement.
CHA RMAN what does she say, Mr. Costelloe.
MR. COSTELLOE: Essentially she deals with her
interactions with the witness Inspector o'Sullivan and what may or may not have happened on an occasion when he received correspondence in his pigeonhole at work and what she then noted as being his reaction to that. You will remember, Chairman, that I put certain parts of her statement to that witness and it certainly would be my intention to rely on --
CHAN RMAN Let me see what -- Mr. McGuinness, do we have any --
MR. MEGI NESS: Chairman, just in terms of generality, our procedures adopted when P was commenced envisaged the possibility of the adoption into evidence of witness statements who have not been called in circumstances.
CHAI RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGU NESS: we did propose to all of the parties a list of witnesses whom we proposed to dispense with and
made it clear that those statements would be taken into account as evidence.

CHA RMAN To the extent that they were relevant.
MR. MEGU NESS: To the extent that they're relevant, indeed. And no objection has been taken as I understand it to any of those.

CHA RMAN Yes.
MR. MEGI NESS: Including Ms. Gould's. So it's not the intention of the tribunal to read them, it or them in any laborious manner, but to signify that they will be considered as having been received as evidence. CHAN RMAN okay, we11 that seems reasonable to me. MR. COSTELLOE: Yes.

CHA RMAN I should say, with quite qualification, that if it were a question of, let's say, undermining the whole of a witness's evidence by a statement in a written document, $I$ would hesitate to write in a report that because X had said something in a statement, that it therefore undermined somebody else, in a serious -if there was a major issue of contention. I don't think it would be fair. I don't think that arises. It hasn't arisen previously, and I think we have made clear what the position is and parties understand. So I don't see that as a difficulty, Mr. Costelloe. MR. COSTELLOE: In fact, Chairman, if it's of any
assistance to you, I believe, I hope I did a good enough job of doing it, that $I$ put those parts of the statement which I thought might have been of relevance to the witness and he was given an opportunity to
comment upon them in any event.
CHA RMAK Thank you very much.
MR. COSTELLOE: So I have no problem with that approach. Thank you, Chairman.

CHA RMAN so, I am not anticipating that anybody has
15:53 any problem with that. If they had a problem with that, they could include it or wanted to make any relevant comment on that, they could include it in submissions, otherwise they can take it that the position is as generally as Mr. McGuinness has said and, as I said, subject perhaps to a gloss that I have just put on it.

Now, parties are entitled to make written submissions and the tribunal will welcome the assistance of the parties in making submissions. We were thinking, the position is this: The tribunal proposes that written submissions should be with the tribunal on or before close of business on Friday, 15th July. That gives a tiny bit more than three weeks, but that request we regard as quite reasonable and we give a little more to make that. And we will propose then to have an oral hearing, where parties have an opportunity to comment on the submissions of the other parties, which they won't have seen up to that, and that will be done on the following Friday, which is Friday, 22nd July. I hope that's convenient. If parties have a huge difficulty with that, come back to us. But I would be very slow to change it because we have to make
arrangements here for the availability of the premises and it may be -- Ian, is it here or upstairs?
MR. I AN MRPHY: Probably here
CHA RMAN Probably here. But we have difficulties, obviously we have to depend on the Office of Public Works to facilitate us, which they have been extremely helpful with.

So, okay those are the arrangements. We will then go to work and seek to produce the report as quickly as possible but obviously it's going to take us a bit of time to do that.

Now, I would like on behalf of the tribunal to thank a11 the participants and all the legal representatives who have conducted this inquiry with remarkable efficiency and pleasantly and with great respect for each other and for the witnesses, which I should say, and I will also mention my own team, for whom this simply could not have happened, could not have happened as efficiently or as quickly as it did without them, I am eternally in their debt. Well, $I$ don't know about eternally, but I am very much, deeply, deeply in their debt, I rely on them hugely and I am so thankful for them. We also have all the support staff and the stenographer and we also have Mr. Murphy, who will have been seen coming in and out with me and Mr. Murphy should be entitled to take a bow, and we have the missing Mr. Kavanagh, who unfortunately has succumbed
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to a dose of COVID. Anybody I have forgotten, I'm sorry I have forgotten you and please also accept our gratitude.

So, thanks very much, everybody, and happy vacations 15:57 eventually when they come around, but we will see you again at submissions time. Thank you very much indeed.
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| 132:14, 132:15, | 64:11, 87:21, 129:11, | 60:26 | 10:1, 32:24, 37:19, | 107:14, 114:28, |
| 132:19, 132:22, | 132:10, 140:9, | uncomfortable [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 3,42: 22,45: 3, \\ & 45: 8,49: 9,49: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 115:24, 116:11, |
| 132:24, 132:25, | 141:24, 146:26, | 122:9 | 49:14, 49:16, 49:25, | 116:16, 121:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 133:17, 134:2, } \\ & \text { 136:22, 136:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 151:28, 152:28, } \\ & \text { 159:5, 159:18, } \end{aligned}$ | UNDER [2] - 1:1, 1:7 <br> under [18]-11:26, | $49: 29,52: 3,52: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:18, 135:7, } \\ & \text { 136:29, 137:25, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $136: 24,137: 2,137: 3$ | 159:27, 161:9, | $55: 24,64: 2,71: 4$ | 71:4, 73:23, 74:29, <br> 82:12, 88:4, 96:10, | 145:13, 146:19, |
| 137:6, 137:11, | 162:15, 162:17, | $72: 20,77: 26,85: 4,$ <br> 99.14, 110:6, 110:11 | $97: 13,114: 5,118: 4$ | $147: 15,152: 6,152: 9$ |
| 138:4, 138:5, 138:8, | TRIBUNAL [3] - 1:1, | 131:8, 131:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 121:7, 121:10, } \\ & \text { 128:29, 129:4, 130:3, } \end{aligned}$ | views [4] - 61:22, |




[^0]:    "I subsequently recei ved a medi cal certificate of Sergeant Barry's medical practitioner dated 28th March

