Wednesday, 31 January 2024
(10.00 am)

MS PRICE: Good morning, sir. Can you see and hear us?
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you.
MS PRICE: May we please call Mr Shiels.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes.
KEVIN PHILIP SHIELS (sworn) Questioned by MS PRICE
MS PRICE: Could you confirm your full name, please, Mr Shiels?
A. Kevin Philip Shiels.
Q. Thank you for appearing today to assist the Inquiry in its work. As you know, I will be asking you questions on behalf of the Inquiry. You should have in front of you a hard copy of a witness statement in your name dated 18 January 2024; do you have that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Could you turn to page 9 of that, please?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have a copy with a visible signature?
A. I do.
Q. Is that your signature?
A. It is, yes.
Q. Are the contents of your statement true to the best of your knowledge and belief?
"I do not recall being involved in any prosecutions which relied on Horizon IT data prior to Mrs McKelvey's case discussed below or indeed in any subsequent prosecutions. This is the only prosecution case involving these issues that I was involved in."

Was Maureen McKelvey's case also the only case in which you have been involved where the individual being prosecuted was an agent or employee of the Post Office?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Was this the only case in which you were involved where the Post Office conducted the initial criminal investigation, as opposed to the Police Service Northern Ireland?
A. Yes.
Q. Were there other bodies like the Post Office who did initial investigations before referring cases to the Department of the Director of Public Prosecutions?
A. Yes, there were.
Q. Can you give an example of one of those other bodies?
A. Social Security Agency.
Q. Was the process for dealing with cases referred by the Post Office different at all from the process for dealing with cases referred by other bodies?
A. Not to my knowledge. They came through the police.
Q. At the point you became involved in Maureen McKelvey's
A. Yes, they are
Q. For the purposes of the transcript, the reference for Mr Shiels' statement is WITN10580100.

Starting, please, Mr Shiels, with your professional background. You completed your professional training and were called to the roll as solicitor by the Law Society of Northern Ireland in 1991; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. You were in private practice in criminal law until 2003?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. At that point, you joined the Department of the Director of Public Prosecutions as a Senior Public Prosecutor?
A. I did, yes.
Q. You continued as a Senior Public Prosecutor when the office was reconstituted as the Public Prosecution Service for Northern Ireland in 2005; is that right?
A. That's right, that's correct.
Q. Is it right that you remain a senior Public Prosecutor in the Western and Southern Region of the Public Prosecution Service for Northern Ireland?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. You have addressed in your statement your involvement in the prosecution of Maureen McKelvey. Could we have on screen, please, paragraph 5 of Mr Shiels' statement, that is page 2. At paragraph 5 , you say: 2
case, that was February 2004, did you work in a team in the Department of the Director of Public Prosecutions?
A. I worked in a region, which consisted, I think, of five Senior Public Prosecutors. It was called the Northern Region.
Q. Were you aware at the time of others in that region working on cases referred after initial investigation by the Post Office?
A. No.
Q. As far as you were aware, was the Department of the Director of Public Prosecutions, later the Public Prosecution Service, ever given any presentations or briefings by the Post Office in respect of the investigations they carried out and the evidence they produced in support of prospective prosecutions?
A. Not to my knowledge, no.
Q. Were Post Office cases ever discussed within your team or region of prosecutors?
A. Not to my knowledge, no.
Q. As far as you are aware, was there one point of contact at the Post Office for information relating to Post Office cases?
A. No, not to my knowledge.
Q. To the extent that you can help, once a report was produced by the Post Office and sent on to the 4

Department for the Director of Public Prosecutions, later the Public Prosecution Service, was there any scrutiny of the adequacy of the investigation done by the Post Office?
A. Not -- no, in the sense that, prior to reaching the Department of Public Prosecutions, it went through the police, so -- to ensure that everything that was requiring for a prosecution was present, so that would be scrutinised. And, likewise, once it arrived in the Department of Public Prosecutions, if there was evidence missing or a break in the evidence, we would ask for it. But, no, there was no scrutiny of the investigation of the Post Office, as such.
Q. Turning then to your consideration of the file in the Maureen McKelvey case, could we have on screen, please, paragraph 9 of Mr Shiels' statement, it's page 3. At paragraph 9 , you say this:

My role was that of 'Directing Officer', which is the PPS (then DPP) lawyer, with responsibility for considering the file and applying the PPS Test for Prosecution. The Test for Prosecution is set out at Section 4 of the PPS Code for Prosecutors. It is met if:
report on screen, please. It is PNI00000001_082. This is the letter from the Detective Superintendent P McAuley. The Detective Superintendent says this:
"This file refers to a theft from the post office over a considerable period of time and although the defendant makes no admission regarding these thefts I feel that there is sufficient evidence to proceed with the prosecution for theft against the accused." in this case before the submission of the file for a prosecution decision?
A. The involvement would be the report, the file being submitted to the Criminal Justice Branch, who would have reviewed it, then probably run to the -- the DPP, as it then was. There was no -- they appointed -- my understanding is that they appointed a Detective Constable to oversee the files, to ensure that the evidence was present.
Q. At the time, what was your understanding of the police's knowledge of Post Office cases in general?
A. I don't know. I don't know that the police had any knowledge of Post Office cases.
Q. Who had ownership of the investigation once a report had been sent by the Post Office to the police, the Post Office or the police?
"The file was allocated to me on 19 February 2004.
"(i) the evidence which can be presented in court is

What involvement did you understand PSNI to have had
sufficient to provide a reasonable prospect of conviction -- the Evidential Test; and.
"(ii) prosecution is required in the public interest -- the Public Interest Test."

What process did you follow when you received a file in respect of which you were being asked to take a prosecution decision?
A. As I do with all files: I assess the evidence and, if the evidence was sufficient, prosecute.
Q. In terms of what the file you received in this case contained, you address this at paragraph 8 of your statement, if we could go back a page, please. Towards the bottom, please, you say:
"A file in relation to this matter was received from Police Service of Northern Ireland on 28 January 2004. The file contained a covering letter from Detective Superintendent P McAuley stating that there was sufficient evidence for a prosecution. The file contained a further report prepared by Suzanne Winter, Investigations Manager with Post Office Limited detailing that 'the discrepancies summarised on the pension schedule indicate it is due to deliberate action and not error and McKelvey is the only person with the appropriate access and opportunity'."

Could we have that covering letter and underlying 6
A. I would say the Post Office.
Q. How much weight would you have given the police assessment of sufficiency of evidence when you received the file with a covering letter in these terms?
A. I rely on my own view of the -- of each and every file. The police recommendations and views are solely recommendations and views. That's all I can say, there's -- I wouldn't attach great weight to the police recommendations.
Q. You have said that this was the first and only case you dealt with which relied upon Horizon data. Prior to being allocated this case, did you receive any training at all from the Post Office on the Horizon IT System?
A. No.
Q. When you were allocated the case, were you given any information about the Horizon IT System by colleagues who had been involved in Post Office cases?
A. No.
Q. Did you take any steps, upon being allocated this file, to understand how the data relied upon was generated before you took the decision to prosecute?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Well, I was relying on the information supplied in the statements of those people who were using the system, 8
ie the Post Office employees.
Q. Going over the page, please, we can see the summary sheet prepared by the PSNI and this lists the nature of the offence, and we see there "Theft", and scrolling down a little, please, the officer in the case, Suzanne Winter, Investigation Manager. Going over two more pages, please, we have Ms Winter's report.

About halfway down the page, the subject is:
"Theft of Post Office Limited monies at Clanabogan
Post Office ... by Mrs Maureen McKelvey subpostmaster of Clanabogan Post Office."

Two-thirds of the way down, we have the date that
the report was submitted, which is December 2002. Then
going to page 6 of this document, please. There is
a précis of facts, which is authored by Ms Winter. The first page here sets out some background to the paying out of pensions and allowances by members of the public to the Post Office and, towards the bottom, the penultimate paragraph here on this page, there is an explanation of foils, in this way:
"Customers who collect a pension or allowance normally receive payment by order book. The order book contains a number of detachable foils, on which is printed the: date of payment, amount of payment, pension or National Insurance number, group number. The 9
pension and allowances is then entered in the Payments Table of the weekly Cash Account of the post office.
"On completion of the weekly cash account all paid
pension and allowances foils and form P2311(b)MA are dispatched to the Paid Order Unit Lisahally, Londonderry."

Did you understand this summary to be saying that the amounts on the various physical foils were entered into the system, which resulted in an adlist being created which gave both a total of each group of foils and then a summary of the total for all groups?
A. Yes.
Q. The next step was then to enter all the group totals for the accounting week onto the form P2311(b)MA and the physical foils for the week were sent with that form to the Paid Order Unit. That's what the summary here is saying, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. The next paragraph then explains the checks that were conducted by the Paid Order Unit, which were conducted on a rota basis. About halfway down that paragraph, it says:
"Whilst conducting a routine 'rota check' of the
paid pension and allowances foils dispatched by
Clanabogan Post Office, overclaims were identified, on
detachable foils are attached to a counterfoil which is fastened to the covering of the order book.
"Payment can only be made on or after the due day of the payment unless payment in advance has been authorised. When the order book is presented at the post office both the counterfoil and the detachable foil are date stamped, the detachable foil is torn from the order book and the customer paid the sum stated on the foil. The detached foil is retained in the post office for accounting purposes."

Then follows an explanation of the way pensions and allowances are accounted for weekly. It says here:
"Pensions and allowances paid at the counter are summarised and accounted for weekly. Many post offices prepare a daily summary of paid pension and allowance foils. Daily and/or weekly summaries are prepared by sorting all paid foils into their respective group, in ascending order of value, each group of foils is then machine adlisted with the total for each group, carried to the bottom of the machine listing to [produce] a summary of all group totals. Group totals, from all machine lists for that accounting week, are entered onto the form P2311(b)MA. Grand totals, for the individual group numbers, are summarised on the Pensions and Allowances Summary P2311MA. The grand total for all 10
each of the weeks examined, varying in value, from 40p to $£ 148$. The overclaims were generated by claiming non-existent pension and allowances foils."

Pausing there, when you read that last sentence "The overclaims were generated by claiming non-existent pension and allowance foils", did you stop to ask whether this was the correct conclusion to draw as to the discrepancies which had been identified by the Paid Order Unit?
A. Sorry, repeat the question?
Q. So the last line here draws a conclusion as to how the overclaims were generated, and it says, "The overclaims were generated by claiming non-existent pension and allowance foils".

So what the Paid Order Unit had highlighted to the Post Office, according to this summary, was that there was a mismatch between the physical foils for the week and the figures on the P2311(b)MA, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you understand from the summary given to you at the time that the figures appearing on the P2311(b)MA were generated, in part, by someone in branch putting in figures from the hard copy foils and, in part, by the computer, which generated an adlist; was that your understanding from this summary?

12
A. Yes, that -- the information was inputted via the computing system, which gave a balance at the end of the week and which was to match -- that figure should have matched the number of foils that had been paid -- or stubs, counterfoils.
Q. So with that in mind, the conclusion that is stated here, "The overclaims were generated by claiming non-existent pension and allowance foils", I'm asking whether you stopped to question whether that conclusion was justified on the basis of the summary, because there were two alternative explanations for the mismatch, weren't there, apart from a purposeful overclaim: either an error on the part of the person entering the figures from the physical foils or an error on the part of the computer system generating the adlist. Would you agree with those two possible alternatives?
A. Well, yes, I would agree.
Q. Was this something you considered when you read the conclusion in the terms put here, which had been reached by the Post Office Investigator, that the claims --
A. No.
Q. -- were generated by claiming non-existent pension and allowance foils?
A. No, I didn't reach that conclusion, simply for the fact that the allegation was that Ms McKelvey was stealing 13
out was a shortage of $£ 152.80$.
"At the conclusion of the audit, McKelvey was
formally interviewed under Police and Criminal Evidence
(Northern Ireland) Order 1989 Codes of Practice, tape seal numbers [those are given] in the presence of her solicitor Stephen Atherton.
"McKelvey could or would not offer a reason for the discrepancies and stated she had done everything to the best of her ability."

So the summary of Ms McKelvey's position in this report was that she could not explain the discrepancies she was being asked about and had made no admissions; is that fair?
A. That's a fair assessment, yes.
Q. There are then, starting at the top of this page, some observations made by the Investigator.

Forgive me, going on to the next stages of investigation. We've reached at this point the first interview, so starting at the top of this page:
"At the conclusion of the interview McKelvey was informed further checks needed to be completed of the pension and allowance to establish the final figure of the overclaims. McKelvey and Atherton were invited to observe the checking of the outstanding pensions as allowance pouches.
the money. So it wasn't errors, there were no errors highlighted in terms of the computing system or personal errors.
Q. Just at this point, did you consider these two alternative explanations for a mismatch between the figures on the physical foils and those on the form it was being compared to?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. The report goes on to explain what investigations had been done by Post Office Investigators, having been alerted to discrepancies identified by the Paid Order Unit:
"The Post Office Limited Investigation Team when appraised of the situation, made arrangements to receive the paid pension and allowance pouches, forwarded from Clanabogan Post Office to POU, Lisahally, on behalf of the Benefits Agency.
"Local checks by the Post Office Limited Investigation Team revealed overclaims of a similar pattern to those identified by the POU, Lisahally.
"Les Thorpe and Suzanne Winter, Consignia Investigation Team attended Clanabogan Post Office, on Thursday, 4 April 2002, accompanied by John McKenny, a member of the Security and Audit Team. A special audit was conducting by McKenny and the result of the 14
"On 2 May 2002 McKelvey and Atherton observe the examination of the pension pouches and additional overclaims were identified.
"On completion of the examination of the pension pouches arrangements were made with Atherton to formally interview McKelvey regarding the additional pension and allowance overclaims identified.
"On 27 May 2002 McKelvey was formally interviewed under Police and Criminal Evidence (Northern Ireland) Order 1989 Codes of Practice, tape seal numbers [and that's given], in the presence of her solicitor, Stephen Atherton.
"McKelvey offered no explanation regarding the additional overclaims identified.
"McKelvey has made no admissions of guilt in this matter and states she has done everything to the best of her ability."

We then come on to some observations made by the Investigator which are as follows:
"The discrepancies summarised on the pension schedule indicate it is due to deliberate action and not error and McKelvey is the only person with the appropriate access and opportunity.
"Maureen McKelvey has rendered herself liable to prosecution and in view of the availability of evidence 16
to support such actions these papers are forwarded for authorisation to prosecute.
"The accounting aspect in this case is currently $£ 4,623.48$ and remains outstanding."

There is no reason given here by the Investigator for why she says the discrepancies summarised on the pension schedule indicate it is due to deliberate action and not error. There is also no reason given for why Ms Winter considered that Mrs McKelvey had rendered herself liable to prosecution. Did you probe why these conclusions were reach by Ms Winter at this time?
A. No, I did not.
Q. You say at paragraph 10 of your statement that, having considered the evidence on the file, you decided that the test for prosecution was met. There's no reference in Ms Winter's report to what material was included with the report. Can you recall now whether you were provided with the records of tape recorded interview with the report from Ms Winter or were you reliant on the summary given in the report at the point of taking the decision to prosecute.
A. No, I had a full transcript of the three taped interviews conducted with Mrs McKelvey.
Q. Did you read through them before you took your decision?
A. I did.
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your decision to prosecute?
A. No.
Q. Did you --
A. Mrs McKelvey -- reading that, Mrs McKelvey said it was an error on her part.
Q. So you understood that to mean she was saying it was error on her part --
A. Yes.
Q. -- rather than deliberate overclaiming?
A. Yes.
Q. Having read the interview transcript and having interpreted that in that way, did you consider any further the possible explanation, other than theft, that there might be errors, human errors or computer errors, that may have caused the discrepancies at the heart of the case?
A. I considered human error not computer error.
Q. Why did you dismiss human error?
A. Because there is that -- there were that many, they were so pronounced.
Q. Thank you. That transcript can come down.

There is no reference in Ms Winter's report to the fact that there were underclaims as well as overclaims, to use the terminology of the report. Overclaims. Were you aware that there were underclaims as well as
Q. There was a point towards the end of Mrs McKelvey's first interview in April where she raised a question over whether there might have been an error on the computer. That isn't mentioned in the précis of facts in Ms Winter's report but, having read through the transcripts, were you aware of that when you took the decision to prosecute?
A. Yes.
Q. We can go to it if it would help. It's PNI00000001_062 and it's page 76, please. So going down, please, towards the bottom of the page of this interview, this is, as I said, towards the end of that first interview. There's some discussion there of the physical foils on that page. Towards the bottom, the last question on this page, Suzanne Winter says:
"Have you anything else you'd like to say Mrs McKelvey before we conclude the interview?"

At the top of the next page, please:
"Yes I do believe I did everything to the best of my ability, I've been doing it for 11 years and I done it right, if there's been an error on the computer?? I've just done that, I didn't mean to do it, that's all I can say."

So that gives the context for the reference to error on the computer. Did this have any influence at all on 18
overclaims identified at the point of deciding that the prosecution test was met?
A. From memory, yes.
Q. What relevance did you think that that had?
A. The overclaims -- in terms of the overclaims, because of the amount of money claimed, when it balanced it should reflect how much of the overclaim was. So, for instance, if there was an overclaim of $£ 150$, one would expect to find the balance on the Post Office of $£ 150$ over. But there was -- the overclaims never matched the balance on the books. So that was -- indicate that money was being removed or hidden. The same way with the underclaims.
Q. Did you consider that the existence of underclaims might reflect errors, whether they are human or computer, causing a discrepancy the other way?
A. On reflection now, yes. But at the time, no.
Q. At the time, how did you satisfy yourself that Ms Winter's assessment that the discrepancies on the pension schedule indicated deliberate action were correct?
A. Well, it wasn't only Mrs Winter, it was the staff at Lisahally who were doing the checks, and their evidence supported the account of Ms Winter.
Q. In terms of the figure given for the accountancy aspect 20
of the case, could we have Ms Winter's report back on screen, please. That is PNI00000001_082. It's page 8 of that document, please. Towards the bottom of the précis of facts. This page, the last sentence:
"The accounting aspect of this case is currently $£ 4,623.48$ and remains outstanding."

This was the figure the Post Office was alleging that Ms Winter had stolen and we can see that if we go to page 11 of the document. Under "Recommendations as to Charges and Proceedings":
"... that you Maureen McKelvey between a date unknown and 4 April 2002 at Clanabogan Post Office stole $£ 4,623.48$ the property of Post Office Limited.
"Contrary to ... the Theft Act ..."
The précis of facts from Ms Winter explained that there had been an audit conducted on 4 April 2002 and the result of that, we saw in the summary, was a shortage of $£ 152.80$. It seems, then, that there was analysis of further pensions and allowances pouches, although there's no mention in the summary of any further audit conducted. How did you satisfy yourself that there was an actual loss to the Post Office and the extent of that loss, having read Ms Winter's report.
A. It wasn't Ms Winter's report; it was the totality of the file, it was the evidence given by the -- excuse me -21
Q. Does the law, as it applies in Northern Ireland, include the same requirement as the law in England and Wales, that the prosecution must pursue all reasonable lines of inquiry, whether pointing towards or away from the guilt of a suspect?
A. Yes.
Q. As a prosecutor, and you made some reference to this earlier, if you consider that a reasonable line of inquiry has not been pursued in a case or that there is an evidential gap in the case, could you direct an Investigating Officer to pursue that line or investigate that gap?
A. I would ask them to consider pursuing it or find an explanation as to the gap or why there's a gap. I could direct them but, whether they conducted the -acted on my directions, it's a matter for them.
Q. When you read Ms Winter's report, did you consider there were any reasonable lines of inquiry which had not been pursued or any evidential gaps in the case?
A. No, from memory, no.
Q. I asked earlier about alternative explanations in this case, other than deliberate overclaiming, namely human error and computer error. Having read Ms Winter's summary of steps taken in the investigation, to the point of this report, did you ask yourself whether

22
either of those possibilities should be investigated further?
A. No.
Q. More widely, did you have any reason, when you considered this report, to question whether the data being relied upon by the Post Office was reliable?
A. I had no reason to believe otherwise.
Q. On what basis did you decide that the evidential test was met in this case for a charge of theft and, in particular, the dishonesty aspect to that offence?
A. Well, there was no attempt by Mrs McKelvey to repay the alleged money stolen and she -- because of the amount of alleged human errors, there were too many to discount as solely errors and not a deliberate act -- or deliberate acts of theft.
Q. You say at paragraph 10 of your statement that, having decided the prosecution test was met, you issued a direction to case preparation in late February 2004, to prepare papers in anticipation of trial; is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. You then signed committal papers on the 22 March 2004; is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Could we have on screen, please, PNI00000001_082. Going 24
to page 4 of the document, please -- apologies, l've given the wrong reference. Could we please have PNI00000001_081. That's page 4. So we can see that this is to the Chief Constable and, scrolling down to the bottom, please, we can see that it is dated 22 March 2004 and it's a communication from you.

Going back up, please, under "Charge", there is this:
"Prosecute Maureen McKelvey on indictment for the following non-scheduled offence:
"That you, on a date unknown between the 1st day of September 2001 and the 21st day of August 2002, in the County Court Division of Fermanagh and Tyrone, stole cash in the sum of $£ 4,623.48$ or thereabouts belonging to Post Office Limited, contrary to Section 1 of the Theft Act (Northern Ireland) 1969."

Did you draft the charge that we see here?
A. I did, yes.
Q. Then under "General", there is this:
"Prosecution on indictment is warranted.
"The amount of 'errors' in a relatively short time
frame would indicate that this is more than simple incompetence."

This appears to be the extent of the reasoning provided to the Chief Constable for why the prosecution
Q. Given your lack of knowledge of the Post Office accounting practices and computing software when you were allocated this case, do you think you were in the position to make an assessment of what any given number of errors might be indicative of?
A. Well, say -- I was relying on people who were providing the information from Lisahally but, given that Mrs McKelvey had been doing this for a certain length of time, with no errors, it was surprising. The errors arising were too many to ignore.
Q. Were you, in fact, led by the Post Office assessment of the case, as set out in the investigation report of Ms Winter?
A. I wouldn't say I was led, no, I had cognisance of the report but I wasn't relying on the report because the report isn't evidence -- evidential. The evidence was contained in the statements of the witnesses from Lisahally.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I was going to ask you expressly,
I take it that the file which you received from the police, upon which you based your decision, actually contained the witness statements which, some weeks later, formed the basis of the committal bundle; is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.
test was met; is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Can you help with why you considered that a large number of errors in a relatively short time frame was indicative of theft, rather than "simple incompetence", as you put it?
A. From memory, no. The only thing I would say is that, because of the amount of errors, Mrs McKelvey was alleging in interview that when she was inputting the data into the computer, the computer itself was -wasn't user-friendly but there were that many, as I say, errors that it just couldn't be simply incompetence on behalf of the -- Mrs McKelvey. There must have been something more to it.
Q. In this case there were discrepancies identified which post-dated the audit and the first interview conducted on 4 April 2002 and these were put to Mrs McKelvey in the second interview which took place on 27 May 2002.

Did you take this into account when making your prosecution decision, in that these discrepancies arose after Mrs McKelvey had come under scrutiny, so would that not be something which weighed against deliberate overclaiming rather than for?
A. I can't recall. I understand the questioning yes, but now, sitting here today, no, I can't recall that. 26

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. Without identifying them, are you telling me, because you mentioned it on a number of occasions, that there were, in that file, witness statements from members of staff at Lisahally, which you relied upon?
A. Yes, that's correct, yes.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right. Thank you. Yeah.
MS PRICE: Having been through Ms Winter's report in some detail this morning, would you agree that the report did not sufficiently address the possibilities of human or computer error as alternative explanations in the case?
A. Yes, I would agree with that.
Q. Going back to your direction to the Chief Constable -and this is page 4 , we're on page 4 -- below your reasoning for why the prosecution test was met, you set out the steps to be followed to progress the case. You say:
"Primary prosecution disclosure will be made to the dense following committal.
"Committal papers, directions for committal proceedings, the police investigation file and a Copy Direction Part I have been handed to the police officer in charge of the case and he should deal with them in compliance with PSNI Force instructions.
"The Senior Law Clerk, Southern Circuit, will be 28
sent, inter alia, copy Part I of this direction, Direction Part II, copy Directions for committal proceedings and letters and enclosures to be given to the Disclosure Officer at the time the committal papers are checked and copy police report.
"The District Commander, Omagh, Police Service of Northern Ireland, has now been sent a copy Direction Part I and copy Directions for committal proceedings."

So you gave directions to others to progress the case in these ways, including direction to provide the Disclosure Officer with directions for committal proceedings, letters and enclosures. Could we have on screen, please, paragraph 13 of Mr Shiels' statement, that's page 4 of the statement. Do you say here:
"The primary disclosure would have included the Non-Sensitive Disclosure Schedule which to my recollection was provided by police. I would also have been in receipt of the Sensitive Schedule which was a nil return. My understanding at the time was Detective Constable Coyle was the Disclosure Officer." So your understanding is that the non-sensitive disclosure schedule was provided by the police; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. You say your understanding at the time was that 29

Winter.
Q. Did you have any concerns at all about the Disclosure Officer in the case being an Investigator for the Post Office?
A. No.
Q. Were you satisfied that Ms Winter was suitably qualified for the role?
A. I never thought about it. (Unclear) but, considering she was the Investigator for the Post Office, I thought she was sufficiently qualified to investigate.
Q. Under point 1 of the disclosure instructions, you say:
"At the time when you return the signed committal papers to the Senior Law Clerk for checking you will be handed an envelope containing primary prosecution disclosure. On the day of committal, following the committal for trial, you should hand the envelope to the legal representative for the accused, or, if that is not possible to the accused personally."

Would you have considered the primary disclosure material yourself at the stage you were sending out your directions in the case or would you simply have checked over the disclosure schedules provided to you?
A. No, I would have provided primary disclosure at committal, if anything fell to be disclosed.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Sorry, I didn't quite catch that. Could
A. On reflection, I think they were prepared by Suzanne
you repeat that answer?
A. I would have considered primary disclosure at the time of committal and disclosed material at that point.
MS PRICE: Could we have on screen, please, paragraph 14 of Mr Shiels' statement, it is page 4. At paragraph 14 you say this:
"There was nothing in the Non-Sensitive Disclosure Schedule or the Sensitive Disclosure Schedule which alerted me to any issue with the Horizon IT System. If any such material existed and was brought to my attention I would have disclosed it as primary disclosure. I would also have reviewed whether the test for prosecution remained met."

Are you saying here, essentially, that you were reliant upon the Post Office to draw your attention to any material which might have put in question the reliability of the Horizon data?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. In terms of the issues being raised in the defence statement in this case -- and we'll come on to look at that in a moment -- given that human error was being raised, did you make any enquiries of the Post Office through the police as to the level of training Mrs McKelvey had received on the Horizon system or any difficulties she had reported with using the system?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Do you think that you should have done?
A. No.
Q. Mrs McKelvey pleaded not guilty on 17 May 2004 and the case was listed for mention on 24 June 2004; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. You deal at paragraph 17 of your statement with the Directing Officer's role in relation to disclosure and you say:
"An important part of the Directing Officer's role is to discharge the disclosure duties placed on the DPP/PPS. Those obligations are set out at paragraphs 4.54-4.59 of the PPS Code for Prosecutors. By virtue of Section 7A of the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (as amended) disclosure duties are continuing and are kept under review by the Directing Officer throughout a prosecution."

Secondary disclosure was triggered by receipt of the defence statement in this case; is that right?
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Before we go on to that, Ms Price, I know that we've got them, can I just be told publicly, so to speak whether the primary disclosure Non-Sensitive Schedule was signed by anyone?
MS PRICE: Sir, I'll find an answer to that and come back to 33
A. Unsigned. I think that the Counsel for the Inquiry refers to a signature at page 14 of the Non-Sensitive Material which is redacted. I think that signature is mine.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. But you are not the person, in effect, authenticating the disclosure statement; is that what you're telling me?
A. Yes, that's right, yes.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right.
MS PRICE: Sir --
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So where the Disclosure Officer, if I can use that phrase, should have signed the statement, it is not signed; is that correct?
A. That's correct.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Fine. Well, it's not fine. But you know what I mean.
MS PRICE: Sir, the signature to which I'm referring is on a covering document to the schedule itself.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes.
MS PRICE: We will do some further investigation, sir, to see if we can provide you with more information.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. Thank you. Sorry to interrupt.
MS PRICE: Not at all, sir.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: You were, I think, about to go on to secondary disclosure following a Defence Case Statement.
you, if I may.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I mean, Mr Shiels refers at paragraph 13 to the Non-Sensitive Disclosure Schedule and gives a reference to a document. I just wonder, if we looked at that document, it would give us the answer, that's all.
MS PRICE: Yes, I have the Schedule of Non-Sensitive Material. Unfortunately, the copy I have has a redacted signature and I recall now, sir, looking at this earlier, I'm sure we can look behind that redacted signature to see if we can find the answer, sir.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I mean, I shouldn't hide the point, whoever was actually providing information for the -this is a question to you, Mr Shiels -- whoever was providing the information upon which the list was drawn up, the person who signs it has a legal obligation in relation to it, does he or she not?
A. That's correct.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, yes, so I would like to know who did sign this. Thanks.
A. I may be of assistance in that, from memory. In preparing my statement and having looked at the disclosure schedule, both the Sensitive and Non-Sensitive Disclosure Schedules were unsigned.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: They were unsigned? 34

MS PRICE: I'm grateful.
You address secondary disclosure at paragraphs 18 and 19 of your statement, so going over the page, please. Here, you say this:
"A Defence Statement was received by PPSSNI on 10 May 2004. At paragraph 4 it cited four possible causes of the branch shortfalls identified:
"(i) Human error;
"(ii) Pressure of running the shop;
(iii) Operating a credit account through the Post Office;
"(iv) Failure of the Post Office to provide a sufficient cash float."

Then at 19:
"Regardless of the contents of the Defence Statement, had any matter been drawn to my attention suggesting that there was a question mark over the reliability of the Horizon IT System this would have been disclosed as primary disclosure as it would clearly have undermined the prosecution case."

So the reliability of the Horizon IT System was not raised explicitly in the Defence Statement but, again, you say that had you been made aware that there was any question of the reliability of the IT system, you would have considered this to be disclosable information; is 36
that right?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Following receipt of the Defence Statement, you sent this to Detective Constable Coyle asking him to review the unused material listed on the schedules and in his possession; is that right?
A. Yes, it was sent on my behalf.
Q. Could we have on screen, please, PNI00000001_078.

This is a letter from you to Maureen McKelvey's solicitors at the time dated 13 June 2004. You enclosed -- scrolling down, please -- you refer to having considered your Defence Statement received on 10 May. You refer to being required to disclose any prosecution material which has not previously been disclosed, which might reasonably be expected to assist the defence, and then you enclose further documentation in response to the Defence Statement.

Included in that list that you set out there, are the last two items, 6 and 7: office copies of the Clanabogan Post Office computer transaction log, for two time periods. Having seen those actual documents which appear further on in this larger document we're looking at now, those are the documents titled "Cash account final", aren't they?
A. Yes.
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A. Yes.
Q. We will come on to the review you did of the prosecution after Mrs McKelvey's ill health was raised in September 2004 but I would like first, please, to take you to some of the documents relating to the July 2004 specific disclosure requests, recognising, of course, that you did not personally deal with these.

Could we have on screen, please, PNI00000001_071, and page 3 of this document, please. This is a letter dated 22 July 2004 from Mrs McKelvey's solicitors to Detective Constable Coyle. It is the letter to which you refer at paragraph 25 of your statement, if that helps you to put it in context.

Scrolling down, please, we can see:
"We refer to the above matter and, following directions of Forensic Accountants retained, hereby seek the following Secondary Disclosure as a matter of urgency ..."

There were four secondary disclosure requests made in this letter. The first one was disclosure of all correspondence between the Post Office Paid Order Unit and the investigations unit, headed by Suzanne Winter, as indicated in the statement of Ms Winter as giving rise to her investigation.

The second was disclosure of all records held by 39
Q. Were you made aware by the Post Office at this stage or any other stage that there was further and better audit data available from Fujitsu on request?
A. No.
Q. Could we have on screen, please, page 6 of Mr Shiels' statement to the Inquiry. That's page 6, paragraphs 23 and 24. At paragraphs 23 and 24 , you say this:
"Having completed secondary disclosure I had no further involvement in this case until I was requested to review the prosecution on public interest grounds due to the ill health of Mrs McKelvey on 10 September 2004.
"In this particular region the DPP office was situated in Omagh Courthouse and was staffed at that time by two Senior Public Prosecutors who would have dealt with disclosure and other issues that would have arisen during the lifetime of any case in the Crown Court."

So is it right that you had no involvement in the specific disclosure requests made by the defence in July 2004, although you have helpfully set out a summary of events relating to these in the paragraphs which follow in your statement.
A. That's correct.
Q. So is that summary based solely on your review of the documents provided by you to the Inquiry? 38

Post Office Limited Investigations Unit, Social Security Agency Paid Order Unit and Post Office Omagh Headquarters of a report in the second half of 2001 by Mrs McKelvey to Garry Groogan, Area Manager for Sub Post Offices Omagh District, in relation to problems with the Horizon computer:
"This request for assistance gave rise to a site visit by Eugene McMahon and subsequent investigation by Lisahally. We, therefore, seek immediate disclosure of all documentation report to the conclusions drawn by Lisahally."

Then third:
"Disclosure of all records relating to the reporting of problems encountered at Clanabogan Post Office following the suspension of Mrs McKelvey in relation to Horizon computer system."

Finally, fourth:
"Please let us have copy of the Interview Tape[s]. PACE24 enclose herewith."

That last request is crossed out and someone has written "Dealt with previously", presumably because these had already been disclosed; we've seen them on the schedule, haven't we, Mr Shiels?
A. Yes.
Q. Then there is a letter from your late colleague, Brian 40

Curran, to Mrs McKelvey, dated 27 July 2004. Could we 1 have that on screen, please. The reference is PNI00000001_079. That's the letter dated 27 July 2004. It confirms that Mr Curran had asked the officer in charge to liaise with Suzanne Winter in that third paragraph there:
"... in order to deal with the request for further disclosure."

Then we have a letter from Suzanne Winter to Detective Constable Coyle, dated 30 July 2004. Could we have that on screen, please. It is PNI00000001_069. We see there from Suzanne Winter to Colin Coyle, 30 July 2004, and Ms Winter says this:
"Colin ... unable to contact you this morning and I am on leave for 3 weeks. Update is as follows:
"Disclosure Statement.
"Ref 2 [so referring to the second disclosure request]: I have spoken with Garry Groogan and Eugene McMahon ... Garry has no reports available and Eugene has a diary entry of visiting McKelvey February 2002 to discuss Lottery I have search through the office file and copied anything I believe may be relevant (see enclosed).
"Ref 3: I have requested the call logs from August 2002 to present date. Temp postmaster started 41

1 ; is that right?
A. That's my understanding yes.
Q. Then 2 and 3 , so referring to disclosure requests 2 and 3:
"Please see the attached report dated 30 July 2004 from the Investigating Officer.
"I would like to draw attention to no 3 where the Investigating Officer states the logs are for information only and cannot be used formally unless the owners of the computer system are involved.
"I have retained a copy of the disclosure."
"Submitted for information and onward transmission to the PPS."

So it appears that Suzanne Winter's letter of 30 July 2004 and Detective Constable Coyle's memo were being sent on to the DPP; is that right?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Going back a page, we can see this happening by way of a letter dated 16 August 2004. Going to PPS, Belfast Chambers from --
A. Yes --
Q. Forgive me, I cut across you?
A. Yes, that's correct, it was sent by C 2 .
Q. Is that where you were based or is that a different location?

19 September 2002 and new postmaster started on 7 March 2003. These logs are for information only and cannot be used formally if a statement and full explanation is required the Fujitsu the owners of the Horizon computer system have to be involved."

She then says she returns to work on 23 August.
You say in your statement that you had not seen this letter before compiling your statement for the Inquiry; is that right?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Could we have back on screen, please, PNI00000001_071. Going, please, to page 2 of this document, this is a memo from Detective Constable Coyle to the Criminal Justice Unit, Omagh, and it reads as follows:
"Please see the attached letter from John J McNally \& Co solicitors re Maureen McKelvey. Although the letter is addressed to myself I have supplied the PPS with the original.
"I have discussed the matter with the PPS and the Investigating Officer Suzanne Winter and report as follows:

1. I have been informed by the Investigating Officer this matter is covered by the statements and exhibits from staff at the Lisahally office."

So that appears to be relating to disclosure request 42
A. That was a different location.
Q. So this is from Criminal Justice Manager J McCleery. Attention was drawn here to the "further documentation for your information". That appears to enclose the memo and Ms Winter's note that we've looked at, at the previous page.

So attention was drawn by Detective Constable Coyle to Ms Winter's comment that the helpline call logs were for information only and could not be formally produced unless the owners of the computer system were involved.

Did anyone from the DPP review the further disclosure provided by Ms Winter to assess whether the prosecution test was still met? I know you're working on the basis of the documents you've seen but is there any evidence of that on the documents you have seen?
A. No, there's nothing.
Q. Were you aware of the helpline call logs and other documents contained in this new disclosure which showed problems encountered by Mrs McKelvey using the system, as well as some reports of discrepancies in the accounts? Was that drawn to your attention at all by anyone at the time?
A. No, it wasn't.
Q. Documents which showed problems encountered by Mrs McKelvey using the system, as well as reported 44
discrepancies, were relevant, were they not, to your earlier assessment that the amount of errors in a relatively short time frame indicated more than simple incompetence, as you put it?
A. Yes, they were very relevant.
Q. They were also relevant to the third possible explanation for discrepancies, which I raised with you earlier -- computer error -- weren't they?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. Do you think these documents should have been drawn to your attention specifically at the time?
A. Yes.
Q. Had they been, would it have caused you to reassess whether the prosecution test was still met?
A. It would have, yes.
Q. Would it have changed your view as to whether the prosecution test was met?
A. It may well have done.
Q. The call logs which were produced by the Post Office were for the date range 26 September 2001 to 15 May 2002. It appears that these were provided to Mrs McKelvey's solicitors. Could we have on screen, please, PNI00000001_070. Scrolling down, please, to the bottom, we can see this is the letter from Paul Dale from the DPP to Mrs McKelvey's solicitors, which you 45
purposes of preparing your statement, are you able to assist at all with whether any further material was received or reviewed?
A. From the material, no, there's no further material received.
Q. Ms Winter had referred in her letter of 30 July 2004 to the need for a statement from Fujitsu if the call logs were to be used formally. The Inquiry has been unable to find any evidence on the papers disclosed of any such statement being obtained in this case. As far as you're aware, was a statement obtained from Fujitsu in this case?
A. No, as far as I'm aware, there's no statement obtained.

MS PRICE: I wonder if that might be a convenient moment for the morning break.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, certainly. Yes.
MS PRICE: It is 11.25 . Perhaps if we can come back at 11.40, please, sir.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, certainly.
MS PRICE: Thank you.
(11.26 am)

## (A short break)

(11.41 am)

MS PRICE: Hello, sir, can you see and hear us still?
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you, yes.
refer to in your statement. He says this:
"I refer to your letter dated 22 July 2004.
"I will deal the matters you raise in the same order as set out in your above correspondence:

1. I am informed that this is covered by the statements and exhibits from staff at Lisahally office.
2. The enclosed is the only relevant documents held by Post Office Investigations.
3. Call logs from August 2002 to present date are not in possession of Post Office Investigations. I am informed that they have been requested and any documents received will be reviewed for disclosure in due course. I have, however, been supplied with a printout for 26/09/01 to 15/05/02 which is enclosed for your information."

What had been requested at item 3 of Mrs McKelvey's solicitors' letter were records of problems encountered at Clanabogan Post Office following Mrs McKelvey's suspension. The call logs referenced here related to the period before her suspension. Mr Dale's letter suggested that these had been requested. You say in your statement that you have no independent recollection of whether any further material was received or reviewed.

Having reviewed the documentation you have, for the 46

MS PRICE: Thank you. Sir, before I resume my questions relating to specific disclosure requests in July 2004, you asked earlier about the schedules of sensitive and non-sensitive material --
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes.
MS PRICE: -- and whether they provided any assistance as to who had signed them off, if anyone. Mr Shiels said, from memory, that they were unsigned and certainly the ones that I'm looking at, at the moment, if we can have them on screen, that appears to be correct. So we have PNI00000001_080. So that coversheet, if we can just scroll down a little, confirms handing of the envelope containing primary disclosure and we've checked beneath that and the signature doesn't take us any further on who was handing over the envelope. It's an unknown person.

Going over two pages, please, we have the police schedule of non-sensitive material. If we scroll down to the bottom, please, the Disclosure Officer box signature and date is blank but there is a signature for signed DPP Prosecutor, and that, having looked behind the redaction, appears to be Mr Shiels' signature.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes.
MS PRICE: Perhaps, sir, if I may just ask a question relating to that in a moment.
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| SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Of course. | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| MS PRICE: There is one more page of this document on | 2 |
| page 16, again schedule of non-sensitive material, this | 3 |
| is page 14, internal 14, which I think Mr Shiels was | 4 |
| referring to. Scrolling down to the bottom, please, we | 5 |
| can see, again, there's a redacted signature and that | 6 |
| signature also appears to be Mr Shiels' signature but | 7 |
| there is no additional signature there. | 8 |
| SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Mm-hm. | 9 |
| MS PRICE: So Mr Shiels, was this the document you had in | 10 |
| mind when you were, from memory, saying that the | 11 |
| schedule was unsigned? | 12 |
| A. Yes. | 13 |
| Q. In circumstances where it was unsigned by the Disclosure | 14 |
| Officer, can you assist with why you signed the document | 15 |
| or the circumstances in which you did, absent | 16 |
| a signature of the Disclosure Officer? | 17 |
| A. On the basis that all the documents purporting to be in | 18 |
| the disclosure schedule were present and correct and on | 19 |
| the file that I read. | 20 |
| MS PRICE: Sir, do you have any further questions on this | 21 |
| before I turn to my -- | 22 |
| SIR WYN WILLIAMS: No, thank you. Thanks for your research | 23 |
| over the break, Ms Price. | 24 |
| MS PRICE: Thank you, sir. |  | 49

on the Post Office for guidance on technical matters relating to Post Office procedures?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you aware at the time that further disclosure requests had been made in the case as set out in this letter? So if we can scroll down, please. There is a reference to the meeting with Ms Winter and "We would be obliged if you would provide us with the following information", and then just scrolling down slowly, that page and over to the next.

So were you aware of this second set of requests in July 2013 for further documents from the accountants to Ms Winter?
A. No, I was not aware.
Q. At point 3 here, we have this:
"We have been informed that on one of the occasions Mrs McKelvey requested assistance Garry Groogan came to the Post Office to assist in the reconciliation of a P\&A report [Pensions and Allowances]. The report could not be reconciled and Mr Groogan asked Lisahally to check number of weeks for any inconsistencies in P\&A reports. Can you provide details of:
"(a) When Mr Groogan contacted Lisahally in relation to this matter?
Q. To the extent that you can say, do you think this was 50
"(b) What week originally prompted the checking of P\&A reports?
"(c) What other weeks were checked and what, if any, inconsistencies were found?
"(d) Provide details of reports produced by Lisahally, either written or verbal, in relation to Mr Groogan's request."

Was this point the suggestion that Mrs McKelvey experienced problems reconciling the pensions and allowances report, problems which were reported to Garry Groogan, raised with you at the time?
A. No, they were not.
Q. Have you been able to establish on your review of the papers what happened in respect of this request?
A. No. There was no further material sent to the PPS or the DPP on the foot of that request. But that request was sent to Mrs Winters and it looked like the forensic accountants are liaising directly with her and keeping the DPP and, in fact, the police out of the loop entirely. And that was only sent by Mrs Winters -- or, sorry, Mrs McKelvey's solicitor to the DPP in Omagh. I think you read out "for reference only". I think they intended it as -- just they sent them to the DPP for information. They weren't asking the DPP to act on it.
Q. Could we have on screen, please, page 8 of Mr Shiels'
statement. At paragraphs 34 and 35 you say this:
"On 7 September 2004 the defence solicitors wrote to DPP staff based at Omagh Courthouse asking the DPP to consider whether the public interest limb of the test for prosecution was still met in light of an enclosed medical report on Mrs McKelvey. Within the Inquiry materials is a handwritten note from a DPP clerk passing the correspondence to me for urgent reply.
"There is a handwritten file note created by me dated 10 September 2004 in respect of a telephone call to Mrs McKelvey's solicitor Stephen Atherton in which I expressed sympathy for his client's health problems but concluded that there was nothing in the report that would influence me to alter my original decision to prosecute."

I'm not going to ask you about the detail of your decision in relation to the public interest grounds but, when you did that review, did you review whether the evidential test continued to be met?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Why not?
A. There was no further material for me to review.
Q. You deal at paragraph 36 of your statement with the trial and you say:
"The trial in this matter was listed to commence on 53

MS PRICE: He's not aware, I think, was the answer. So you can't assist us one way or the other on that?
A. No.
Q. Finally, from me, Mr Shiels, the Inquiry has heard from Ms Winter that there came a point in time when the Police Service Northern Ireland required there to be a statement from Fujitsu attesting that the computer was working correctly and reliable in relevant Post Office cases referred for prosecution. Do you recall being aware of the introduction of this requirement?
A. No.

MS PRICE: Sir, those are all the questions I have. Do you have any questions before I turn to Core Participants?

## Questioned by SIR WYN WILLIAMS

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, just one aspect I'd like to explore a little with you, Mr Shiels. The impression, let's use that word, that I have at the moment, is that, following your decision to prosecute, no one within the DPP team, to use a loose expression, thought it necessary to refer requests, for example, relating to secondary disclosure, to the person who'd actually taken the decision to prosecute, all right? That seems clear from this correspondence trail. Was that usual at the time or was it just one of those things, that people might say?
A. No, it was usual for two locations, one being Omagh and

13 September 2004 when a jury was empanelled. The trial ran for 3 days until 16 September 2004 when the jury returned a not guilty verdict. During the currency of the trial I am not aware if any issues whether disclosure or otherwise were brought to my attention. Such issues, if any, would normally have been dealt with by those prosecutors situated in the DPP office in Omagh Courthouse."

Were you at the trial?
A. No, I was not.
Q. Was the outcome of the trial reported to you at the time?
A. No, it was not, which is not unusual.
Q. Does it follow that you are unable to assist us with whether there was any review of the case done either by the PSNI or the PPS?
A. From memory there was no review done by the PPS. I was not asked to offer my views on the file in the prosecution. So no, in relation to the PPS, I don't think there was any review conducted.
Q. It may follow from your answers but, as far as you were aware, was there any review of the case done by the Post Office after Mrs McKelvey's acquittal?
A. I'm not aware.

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry -54
the other one being Belfast Crown Court, because each of those two courthouses had their own team of prosecutors who would have dealt with post-decision disclosure issues and any other matters that arose during the currency of trials in those locations. Other Crown Courts didn't have those in-house prosecutors or prosecutors on site, so to speak.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Is that still the position?
A. No, it's not. It's not --

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: In the current -- in 2024, the same prosecutor would be consulted on all important steps once a prosecution was instigated; is that right?
A. That is correct, yes.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, fine. I ask the question, in part because when it came to deciding whether Mrs McKelvey's health should be a bar to her prosecution, they did consult you?
A. They did, yes.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I take it that was because the instigator of the prosecution was then thought to be the appropriate person to decide whether to put an end to it?
A. Yes.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, all right. Fine. Yes, thank you very much.
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| Questioned by MR JACOBS | 2 |
| :---: | :---: |
| MR JACOBS: Mr Shiels, I represent Maureen McKelvey. | 3 |
| You made some admissions in your evidence this | 4 |
| morning. At 10.55 you accepted that the investigation | 5 |
| report didn't sufficiently address the possibility of | 6 |
| human or computer error as an alternative explanation in | 7 |
| this case. You've also confirmed that the helpline call | 8 |
| log documents were not bought to your attention, and you | 9 |
| said that that might have changed your view on whether | 10 |
| the prosecution test was met. You also accept that that | 11 |
| you have, perhaps unsurprisingly, a lack of knowledge in | 12 |
| Post Office accounting processes and that you were | 3 |
| reliant on Post Office for technical matters. So that's | 14 |
| what you've told the Inquiry this morning. | 15 |
| You weren't made aware of the fact that Mrs McKelvey | 16 |
| was acquitted in September 2004. Why was that; why | 17 |
| weren't you told about that? | 18 |
| A. It wouldn't be usual to be told whether somebody was | 19 |
| acquitted or convicted. | 20 |
| Q. Mrs McKelvey has said, and it's been put to witnesses, | 21 |
| that the trial judge after the acquittal made a number | 22 |
| of comments and one of the things he said was that the | 23 |
| Post Office case has been a sham. You were asked by | 24 |
| Ms Price whether there was any review of the outcome of | 25 | 57

A. I would agree with that statement, yes.
Q. Do you think that, perhaps, if there had been a review and, of course, you can only speculate but that it might have thrown up the fact that certain information that should have been provided to you by the Post Office wasn't?
A. Yes. I agree with that.
Q. I'm just asked to raise one other point with you. We understand that 29 subpostmasters were prosecuted in Northern Ireland. Had there been a review in 2004, as a prosecutor yourself, do you think that might have changed how matters were dealt with in investigations going forward?
A. Possibly, yes. Possibly.

MR JACOBS: Thank you. I haven't any more questions for you.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I think all things are possible,
Mr Shiels, as they say. So possibly is a good answer to that last question.

Thank you, Mr Shiels, for making yourself available.
As a matter of interest, actually, the documents
which you produced as part of your paragraphs -- or let's say from paragraphs 25 onwards, which weren't drawn to your attention but you discovered, was that because we sent them to you or did you send them to us?
the occasion.
Now, you said that you didn't know about the outcome of the case. Are you able to explain why, when a case is rejected, in the way that it was and in light of the comments that a judge may have made, why PPS wouldn't conduct a review?
A. Well, if the judge made those comments, I would expect a review to be carried out.
Q. I'm sorry, I didn't hear that. Speak up, please.
A. If the judge did make those comments, I would expect a review or -- certainly to be carried out or questions to be asked.
Q. But you weren't even told about the outcome, were you, Mr Shiels?
A. No, no.
Q. You also have said that you weren't aware of any Post Office review and, certainly, one can infer from that that the PPS weren't involved in any review with the Post Office concerning the acquittal.
A. No, as far as I'm aware, there was no review.
Q. Do you think that, in circumstances where a company or a commercial organisation is an alleged victim and the sole investigator, that there's a risk that information provided to a Prosecution Authority may not always be balanced or objective?
A. I believe we sent them to you.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, then, thank you very much for being thorough enough to find them.

Right. Good. We will resume tomorrow, I take it, Ms Price?
MS PRICE: Yes, sir, 10.00 for Mr Ward.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you.
MS PRICE: Thank you.
(12.02 pm)
(The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am the following day)
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|  | $\begin{aligned} & 12.02[1] 60 / 9 \\ & 13[2] 29 / 1334 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26 September [1] } \\ & 45 / 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 51/13 52/18 } \\ & \text { accounted [2] 10/12 } \end{aligned}$ | alleged [3] 24/12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MR JACOBS: [2] 57/3 59/15 | 13 June [1] 37/10 | 26/09/01 [1] 46/14 | 10/14 | 24/13 58/22 |
| 8] 1/3 | 13 September [1] | 27 July [2] 41/1 41/3 | accounting [7] 10/10 | alleging [2] 21/7 26/ |
| 1/5 1/9 28/8 32/4 | 54/ | 27 May [2] 16/8 | 10/22 11/14 17/3 21/5 | allocated [5] 5/18 |
| 33/25 34/7 35/10 | 14 [5] 32/4 32/5 35/2 | 26/ | 27/2 57/13 | 8/12 8/15 8/19 27/3 |
| 35/17 35/20 35/23 | 49/4 49 | 28 January [1] | accounts [1] 44/ | allowance [10] |
| 36/1 47/14 47/17 |  | 28 July [2] 50/2 5 | accused [3] | 10/15 12/6 12/14 13/8 |
| 47/20 47/24 48/1 48/6 | 15 May [1] 4 | 29 [1] 59/9 | 7 31/1 | /23 14/15 15/22 |
| 48/24 49/2 49/10 | $15$ | 3 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { acquittal [3] } \\ 57 / 2258 / 19 \end{array}$ |  |
| 49/21 49/25 55/1 | 152.80 [3] 15/1 21/18 | 3 days [1] | acquitted [2] 57/17 | 10/12 10/13 10/2 |
|  | 22/7 | 30 July [5] 41/10 | 57/20 | 1/1 11/4 11/24 |
| [35] 1/4 1/6 27/19 | 16 [1] | 41/12 43/5 43/15 47/6 | across | 21/19 51/20 52/1 |
| 28/1 28/7 31/25 33/21 | 16 August [1] 43/19 | 31 [1] 50 | act [5] 21/14 | already [1] 40/2 |
| 34/2 34/12 34/19 | 16 September 2004 | 31 January | 25/16 33/16 52/24 | also [9] 3/6 17/8 |
| 34/25 35/5 35/9 35/11 |  |  | acted [1] | 29/17 32/12 45/6 |
| 35/15 35/19 35/22 | 17 [1] 33/8 | 34 [1] | action [4] 6/22 16/2 | 57/8 57/11 58/16 |
| 35/24 47/16 47/19 | 17 May [1] 3 | 35 [1] | 7/7 20/20 | alter [1] 53/14 |
| 47/25 48/5 48/23 49/1 | 18 [1] 36/2 |  | actions [1] | ernative [5] |
| 49/9 49/23 55/15 56/8 | 18 January [1] 1/ | 4 | acts [1] 24/15 | 28/11 |
| 56/10 56/14 56/19 | 19 Febr | 4 April [3] 21/16 22/5 |  | natives [ |
| 56/24 59/17 60/2 60/7 | 19 September [1] |  |  | although [4] 7/5 |
| T | 19 September [1] $42 / 1$ | 4 April 200 | $34 / 1355 / 2159 /$ | $21 / 2038 / 2042 / 1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { REPOI } \\ & 54 / 25 \end{aligned}$ | 1969 [1] | 21/12 | additional [4] 1 | always [1] |
|  | 1989 [2] 15/4 | 4,623.4 | /6 16/14 49/8 | am [9] 1/2 32/18 |
|  | 1991 [1] |  | address [5] 6/11 | 41/15 46/5 46/10 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 1996 \text { [1] } 33 / 16 \\ & \text { 1st [1] } 25 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | $4.59 \text { [1] }$ | 36/2 50/8 | 47/21 47/23 54/4 $60 / 10$ |
|  |  | 40p [1] | 42/17 | amended [1] |
| 'the [1] 6/21 |  | 7 | adequacy | amount [6] 9/24 20 |
| 0 | $2001 \text { [3] 25/12 40/3 }$ | 7 | adlist [3] 11/9 | amounts [1] 11/8 |
| 01 [1] | 4/20 | 7 | 13/15 | analysis [1] 21/1 |
| 02 [1] 46/14 | 2002 [15] 9/13 14/23 |  | adlisted [1] | answer [6] 32/1 |
| 062 [1] 18/9 | 6/8 21/12 21/16 |  | admission [1] 7/6 | 33/25 34/5 34/11 |
| 069 [1] 41/11 |  | A | admissions [3] 15/12 | 59/18 |
| 070 [1] 45/23 |  | ability [3] 15/9 16/17 |  | answers [1] 54/ |
| 071 [2] 39/8 42/11 | 2003 [2] 2/9 42/2 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { ability } \\ 18 / 20 \end{array}$ | advance [1] 10/4 <br> after [6] 4/7 10/3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { anticipation [1] } \\ & 24 / 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 072 [1] 50/4 078 [1] 37/8 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{2 0 0 3}[2] 2 / 942 / 2 \\ & \mathbf{2 0 0 4}[33] 4 / 15 / 18 \end{aligned}$ | able [3] 47/1 52/13 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { after [6] } 4 / 7 \text { 10/3 } \\ 26 / 2139 / 354 / 23 \end{array}$ | $\text { any [50] } 3 / 13 / 3$ |
| 079 [1] 41/3 | 6/15 24/18 24/22 25/6 |  | 57/22 | 5/2 7/21 8/12 8/15 |
| 080 [1] 48/11 | 38/11 38/20 39/4 39/5 | $11 / 2115 / 12 \text { 23/21 }$ | again [3] 36/22 49 | 8/19 18/25 19/12 |
| 081 [2] 25/3 30/5 | 38/11 38/20 39/4 39/5 | $31 / 231 / 835 / 2448 / 3$ | 49/6 | 21/20 22/4 22/8 |
| 082 [3] 7/1 21/2 | 41/1 41/3 41/10 | $53 / 1657 / 1858 / 2$ | against [2] 7/8 26/22 | 23/19 24/4 27/4 31/2 |
| 24/25 | 41/13 43/5 43 | 58/13 | Agency [3] 3/20 | 3/9 32/10 32/16 |
| 1 | 50/2 50/6 53/2 53/10 | ab |  | 36/23 37/13 38/2 |
| 10 [2] 17/13 | 54/1 54/2 57/17 59/10 |  | agree [6] 13/15 13/1 | 38/16 44/15 46/11 |
| 10 May [2] 36/6 | 2005 [1] 2/16 |  | 28/9 28/12 59/1 59/7 | 46/23 47/2 47/9 47/9 |
| 37/13 | 2013 [1] 51/13 |  | alerted [2] 14/11 32/9 | 48/6 48/14 49/21 |
| 10 Septem | 2024 [3] 1/1 1/16 |  | alia [1] 29/1 | 51/22 52/3 54/4 54/6 |
| 38/11 53/10 | 10 |  | all [33] 3/22 6/8 8/7 | 54/15 54/20 54/22 |
| 10.00 [3] 1/2 60/6 | 21st [1] 25/12 | accompanied | 8/13 10/17 10/21 | 55/13 56/4 57/25 |
| 60/10 | 22 July [2] 39/1 |  | 10/21 10/25 11/3 | 58/16 58/18 59/15 |
| 10.55 [1] 57 | 46/2 |  | 11/11 11/13 18/2 | anyone [4] 33/24 |
| 11 [1] 21/9 | 22 March [2] 24/22 | $\text { /24 26/19 } 36$ | 18/25 22/15 22/16 | 44/11 44/22 48/7 |
| 11 years [1] 18/20 | 2 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} 20 / 24 \\ 37 / 23 \end{array}$ | 23/3 28/7 31/2 34/6 | anything [3] 18/16 |
| 11.25 [1] 47/17 | 23 [2] 38/6 38/ | $31$ | 35/9 35/23 39/20 | 31/24 41/22 |
| 11.26 [1] 47/21 | 23 August [1] 42/6 |  | 39/25 40/10 40/13 | apart [1] 13/1 |
| 11.40 [1] 47/18 | $24 \text { [2] 38/7 38/7 }$ | accountants [5] | 44/21 47/2 49/18 | apologies [1] 25/1 |
| 11.41 [1] 47/23 | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \text { June [1] 33/5 } \\ & 25 \text { [2] } 39 / 1259 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | $39 / 1650 / 1250 / 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55 / 1255 / 2256 / 11 \\ & 56 / 2459 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | appear [1] 37/22 appearing [2] 1/12 |

(17) MR JACOBS: - appearing

A
appearing... [1] 12/21
appears [8] 25/24 42/25 43/14 44/4 45/21 48/10 48/22 49/7
applies [1] 23/1
applying [1] 5/21
appointed [2] 7/15 7/16
appraised [1] 14/14 appropriate [3] 6/24 16/23 56/21
April [6] 14/23 18/2 21/12 21/16 22/5 26/17
April 2002 [1] 14/23 are [38] $1 / 24$ 2/1 4/20 8/6 10/1 10/7 10/12 10/13 10/16 10/22 10/24 11/4 15/5 15/15 16/19 17/1 20/15 22/2 28/1 29/5 30/10 32/14 33/13 33/16 33/17 35/5 37/18 37/23 42/2 43/8 43/10 46/9 47/1
52/18 54/14 55/12
58/3 59/17
Area [1] 40/4
aren't [1] 37/24
arisen [1] 38/16
arising [1] 27/10
arose [2] 26/20 56/4
arrangements [2] 14/14 16/5
arrived [1] 5/9
as [67]
ascending [1] 10/18
ask [8] 5/11 12/6
23/13 23/25 27/19
48/24 53/16 56/14
asked [11] 6/6 15/12
23/21 30/7 41/4 48/3
51/21 54/18 57/24
58/12 59/8
asking [5] 1/13 13/8 37/4 52/24 53/3
aspect [5] 17/3 20/25
21/5 24/10 55/15
assess [2] $6 / 844 / 12$ assessment [6] $8 / 3$
15/14 20/19 27/4 27/11 45/2
assist [7] 1/12 37/15 47/2 49/15 51/19 54/14 55/2
assistance [4] 34/21
40/7 48/6 51/18
at [96]
Atherton [6] 15/6 15/23 16/1 16/5 16/12 53/11
attach [1] $8 / 8$
attached [3] 10/1 42/15 43/5
attempt [1] 24/11 attended [1] 14/22 attention [11] 32/11 32/15 36/16 43/7 44/3 44/7 44/21 45/11 54/5 57/9 59/24
attesting [1] 55/7 audit [11] 14/24
14/25 15/2 21/16 21/21 22/4 22/5 22/6 22/18 26/16 38/2
August [5] 25/12 41/24 42/6 43/19 46/9 authenticating [1] 35/6
authored [1] 9/15 authorisation [1] 17/2
authorised [1] 10/5
Authority [1] 58/24
availability [1] 16/25 available [3] 38/3 41/19 59/20
aware [23] 4/6 4/10 4/20 18/6 19/25 36/23 38/1 44/17 47/11 47/13 50/17 50/21 51/5 51/12 51/15 54/4 54/22 54/24 55/1 55/10 57/16 58/16 58/20
away [1] 23/4

## B

back [8] 6/12 21/1 25/7 28/13 33/25 42/11 43/18 47/17 background [2] 2/5 9/16
balance [3] 13/2 20/9 20/11
balanced [2] 20/6 58/25
bar [1] 56/16
based [4] 27/21
38/24 43/24 53/3
basis [6] 11/21 13/10 24/8 27/23 44/14 49/18
be [49] 1/13 5/9 5/25 7/12 10/3 11/7 15/21 19/14 24/1 25/24
26/12 26/22 27/5
28/16 28/18 28/25
29/3 31/13 31/24
33/22 34/21 36/25 37/15 41/22 42/2 42/5 42/25 43/9 44/9 46/12 47/8 47/14 48/10 48/22 49/7 49/18 51/9 51/21 53/19 55/6

56/11 56/16 56/20 57/19 57/19 58/8 58/11 58/12 58/24 became [1] $3 / 25$ because [13] 13/10 19/19 20/5 24/12 26/8 27/15 28/2 30/17 40/21 56/1 56/15 56/19 59/25
been [46] 3/7 7/24 8/17 10/4 12/8 13/4 13/19 14/10 14/10 18/3 18/20 18/21 21/16 23/9 23/18 26/13 27/8 28/8 28/22 29/7 29/18 30/20 30/23 36/16 36/19 36/23 37/14 40/22 42/22 45/10 45/13 46/11 46/13 46/16 46/21 47/8 50/9 51/6 51/17 52/13 54/6
57/21 57/24 59/2 59/5 59/10
before [11] 3/16 7/10
8/21 17/24 18/17
33/21 42/8 46/20 48/1 49/22 55/13
behalf [5] 1/14 14/16 26/13 37/7 50/13
behind [2] 34/10 48/21
being [26] 3/1 3/7 6/6 7/12 8/12 8/19 11/9 14/7 15/12 20/12 22/7 22/12 22/16 22/20 24/6 31/3 32/19 32/21 37/13 43/16 47/10 51/1 55/9 55/25 56/1 60/2
Belfast [2] 43/19 56/1
belief [1] $1 / 25$
believe [4] 18/19 24/7 41/22 60/1
belonging [1] 25/14
below [2] $3 / 328 / 14$
beneath [1] 48/13
Benefits [1] 14/17
best [4] 1/24 15/9
16/16 18/19
better [1] 38/2
between [6] 12/17
14/5 21/11 22/19
25/11 39/21
blank [1] $48 / 20$
bodies [3] 3/15 3/19 3/23
book [5] 9/22 9/22
10/2 10/5 10/8
books [1] 20/11
both [3] 10/6 11/10 34/23
bottom [10] 6/13

| $9 / 18$ 10/20 18/11 | $57 / 24$ 58/3 58/3 |
| :--- | :--- | 18/14 21/3 25/5 45/24 cases [10] 3/16 3/21 48/19 49/5

bought [1] 57/9
box [1] 48/19
branch [3] 7/13
12/22 36/7
break [4] 5/11 47/15 47/22 49/24
Brian [1] 40/25
briefings [1] $4 / 13$
brought [2] 32/10 54/5
bundle [1] 27/23
but [26] 5/12 18/5
20/10 20/17 23/15
26/11 26/24 27/7
27/15 30/19 31/8 35/5
35/15 36/22 39/4 44/14 48/20 49/7
50/17 52/16 53/13 53/17 54/21 58/13 59/3 59/24

## C

C2 [1] 43/23
call [10] 1/5 41/24
44/8 44/17 45/19 46/9
46/19 47/7 53/10 57/8
called [2] 2/6 4/4
came [6] 3/24 50/9
50/11 51/18 55/5
56/15
can [37] 1/3 1/4 3/19 4/24 5/25 8/7 9/2 10/3 17/17 18/9 18/22
19/21 21/8 25/3 25/5
26/3 30/10 33/22
34/10 34/11 35/11
35/21 39/14 43/18
45/24 47/17 47/24
48/9 48/11 49/6 49/15
50/14 50/25 51/7
51/23 58/17 59/3
can't [3] 26/24 26/25
55/2
cannot [2] 42/2 43/9 carried [4] 4/14
10/19 58/8 58/11
case [54] 3/3 3/4 3/6
3/6 3/10 4/1 5/15 6/10 7/10 8/10 8/12 8/15 9/5 17/3 19/16 21/1 21/5 22/23 23/9 23/10 23/19 23/22 24/9 24/18 26/15 27/3 27/12 28/11 28/16 28/23 29/10 30/2 30/8 30/13 31/3 31/21 32/20 33/5 33/20
35/25 36/20 38/9 38/16 47/10 47/12
50/20 50/23 51/6
54/15 54/22 57/8

3/23 4/7 4/17 4/22
7/20 7/22 8/17 55/9
cash [5] 11/2 11/3
25/14 36/13 37/23
catch [1] 31/25
caused [2] 19/15 45/13
causes [1] 36/7
causing [1] 20/16
certain [2] 27/8 59/4
certainly [5] 47/16
47/19 48/8 58/11
58/17
Chambers [1] 43/20
changed [3] 45/16
57/10 59/12
charge [8] 22/12
22/17 24/9 25/7 25/17
28/23 30/9 41/5
Charges [1] 21/10
check [1] 51/21
check' [1] 11/23
checked [4] 29/5
31/21 48/13 52/3
checking [4] 15/24
22/1 31/13 52/1
checks [4] 11/19
14/18 15/21 20/23
Chief [3] 25/4 25/25 28/13
Circuit [1] 28/25
circumstances [3]
49/14 49/16 58/21
cited [2] 22/12 36/6
claimed [1] 20/6
claiming [5] 12/2
12/5 12/13 13/7 13/22
claims [1] 13/20
Clanabogan [9] 9/9
9/11 11/25 14/16
14/22 21/12 37/20
40/14 46/18
clear [1] 55/22
clearly [1] 36/19
clerk [3] 28/25 31/13
53/7
client's [1] 53/12
Co [1] 42/16
Code [2] 5/23 33/14
Codes [2] 15/4 16/10
cognisance [1] 27/14
Colin [2] 41/12 41/14
colleague [1] 40/25
colleagues [1] 8/16
collect [1] 9/21
come [7] 16/18 19/21
26/21 32/20 33/25 39/2 47/17
Commander [1] 29/6
commence [1] 53/25
comment [1] 44/8
comments [4] 57/23
comments... [3] 58/5 58/7 58/10

## commercial [1]

58/22
committal [16] 24/22 27/23 28/19 28/20 28/20 29/2 29/4 29/8 29/11 30/4 30/6 31/12 31/15 31/16 31/24 32/3
communication [1] 25/6
company [1] 58/21 compared [1] 14/7 compiling [1] $42 / 8$ completed [3] 2/5 15/21 38/8
completion [2] 11/3 16/4
compliance [1] 28/24
computer [21] 12/24
13/15 18/4 18/21
18/25 19/14 19/17 20/15 23/23 26/10 26/10 28/11 37/20 40/6 40/16 42/4 43/10 44/10 45/8 55/7 57/7 computing [3] 13/2 14/2 27/2
concerning [1] 58/19 concerns [1] 31/2 conclude [1] 18/17 concluded [1] 53/13 conclusion [8] $12 / 7$
12/11 13/6 13/9 13/19 13/24 15/2 15/20 conclusions [2] 17/11 40/10
conduct [1] 58/6
conducted [10] 3/11
11/20 11/20 17/23
21/16 21/21 22/5 23/15 26/16 54/20 conducting [2] 11/23 14/25
confirm [1] 1/9
confirmed [1] 57/8
confirms [2] 41/4 48/12
consider [8] 14/4
19/12 20/14 23/8
23/13 23/17 50/24 53/4
considerable [1] 7/5 consideration [1] 5/14
considered [11]
13/18 17/9 17/14 19/17 24/5 26/3 31/19 32/2 36/25 37/12 50/22
considering [2] 5/21

31/8

Consignia [1] 14/21 consisted [1] 4/3 Constable [14] 7/17 25/4 25/25 28/13 29/20 30/1 30/14 30/19 37/4 39/11 41/10 42/13 43/15 44/7
consult [1] 56/17 consulted [1] 56/11 contact [2] 4/20 41/14
contacted [1] 51/24 contained [6] 6/11 6/16 6/19 27/17 27/22 44/18
containing [2] 31/14 48/13
contains [1] 9/23 contents [2] 1/24 36/15
context [2] 18/24 39/13
continued [2] 2/14 53/19
continuing [1] 33/16 contrary [2] 21/14 25/15
convenient [1] 47/14
convicted [1] 57/20
conviction [1] $6 / 2$
copied [1] 41/22
copies [1] 37/19 copy [13] $1 / 151 / 20$ 12/23 28/21 29/1 29/2 29/5 29/7 29/8 30/7 34/8 40/18 43/11 Core [1] 55/13 correct [23] 2/8 2/10 2/17 2/21 3/9 12/7 20/21 22/21 24/21 24/24 26/2 27/25 28/6 34/18 35/13 35/14 37/2 38/23 42/10 43/23 48/10 49/19 56/13
correctly [1] 55/8 corresponded [1] 50/19
correspondence [6]
39/21 46/4 50/12
50/16 53/8 55/23
could [28] 1/9 1/18 2/23 5/15 6/12 6/25 15/7 15/11 21/1 23/10 23/15 24/25 25/2 29/12 30/4 31/25 32/4 37/8 38/5 39/8 41/1 41/10 42/11 44/9 45/22 50/3 51/20 52/25
couldn't [1] 26/12
Counsel [1] 35/1
counter [1] 10/13 counterfoil [2] 10/1 10/6
counterfoils [1] 13/5 County [1] 25/13 course [4] 39/6 46/12 49/1 59/3
court [4] 5/25 25/13
38/17 56/1
Courthouse [4]
38/13 50/8 53/3 54/8
courthouses [1] 56/2
Courts [1] 56/6
covered [2] 42/23 46/5
covering [5] 6/16 6/25 8/4 10/2 35/18 coversheet [1] 48/11 Coyle [10] 29/20 30/1 30/15 30/19 37/4 39/11 41/10 41/12 42/13 44/7
Coyle's [1] 43/15 created [2] 11/10 53/9
credit [1] 36/10
criminal [8] 2/9 3/11 7/13 15/3 16/9 33/15 42/13 44/2
crossed [1] 40/20
Crown [3] 38/16 56/1 56/5
Curran [2] 41/1 41/4
currency [2] 54/3 56/5
current [1] 56/10 currently [2] 17/3 21/5
customer [1] 10/8
Customers [1] 9/21 cut [1] 43/22

## D

daily [2] 10/15 10/16
Dale [1] 45/24
Dale's [1] 46/20
data [7] 3/2 8/11 8/20 24/5 26/10 32/17 38/3 date [9] 9/12 9/24 10/7 21/11 25/11 41/25 45/20 46/9 48/20
dated [14] 1/16 25/5
26/16 37/10 39/10
41/1 41/3 41/10 43/5 43/19 46/2 50/2 50/6 53/10
dates [1] 22/17
day [6] 10/3 22/5
25/11 25/12 31/15
60/10
days [1] 54/2
deal [6] 28/23 33/8
39/7 41/7 46/3 53/23
dealing [2] 3/21 3/23 Directing [3] 33/9 dealt [6] 8/11 38/15 33/11 33/17
40/21 54/6 56/3 59/12 direction [7] 24/18
December [1] 9/13 28/13 28/22 29/1 29/2
decide [2] 24/8 56/21 $29 / 7$ 29/10
decided [2] 17/14 directions [10] 23/16
24/17 28/20 29/2 29/8 29/9
deciding [2] 20/1
56/15
decision [14] 6/7
7/11 8/21 17/21 17/24 18/7 19/1 26/20 27/21 53/14 53/17 55/18 55/21 56/3
defence [12] 32/19
33/20 35/25 36/5
36/15 36/22 37/3
37/12 37/16 37/17 38/19 53/2
defendant [1] 7/6
deliberate [9] 6/22
16/21 17/7 19/9 20/20 23/22 24/14 24/14 26/22
dense [1] 28/19
Department [8] 2/11
3/17 4/2 4/10 5/1 5/6 5/10 50/7
detachable [4] 9/23
10/1 10/6 10/7
detached [1] 10/9
detail [3] 28/9 50/15 53/16
detailing [1] 6/21
details [2] 51/23 52/5
Detective [14] 6/16
7/2 7/3 7/16 29/20
30/1 30/14 30/19 37/4 District [2] 29/6 40/5
39/11 41/10 42/13
43/15 44/7
diary [1] 41/20
did [50] 2/13 3/15 4/1
6/5 7/9 8/12 8/19 11/7 12/6 12/20 14/4 17/10 17/12 17/24 17/25
18/19 18/25 19/3
19/12 19/18 20/4
20/14 20/18 21/21
22/4 22/22 23/17
23/25 24/4 24/8 25/17
25/18 26/19 28/9
30/22 31/2 32/22 33/1
34/19 39/2 39/7 44/11
49/16 53/18 53/18
53/20 56/16 56/18
58/10 59/25
didn't [8] 13/24 14/8
18/22 31/25 56/6 57/6
58/2 58/9
differences [1] 22/19
different [3] 3/22
43/24 44/1
difficulties [1] 32/25 54/14
direct [2] 23/10 23/15 doesn't [1] 48/14
doing [3] 18/20 20/23 27/8
don't [4] 7/21 7/21 22/8 54/19
done [11] 5/3 14/10
15/8 16/16 18/20
18/22 33/2 45/18
54/15 54/17 54/22
down [15] 9/5 9/8
9/12 11/21 18/10
19/21 25/4 37/11
39/14 45/23 48/12 48/18 49/5 51/7 51/10
DPP [18] 5/20 7/14
33/13 38/12 43/16
44/11 45/25 48/21
52/16 52/19 52/21
52/23 52/24 53/3 53/3
53/7 54/7 55/18
DPP/PPS [1] 33/13
draft [1] 25/17
draw [3] 12/7 32/15
43/7
drawn [8] 34/15
36/16 40/10 44/3 44/7 44/21 45/10 59/24
draws [1] 12/11
due [6] 6/22 10/3
16/21 17/7 38/10 46/12
during [3] 38/16 54/3 56/4
duties [2] 33/12 33/16

## E

each [6] 8/5 10/18
10/19 11/10 12/1 56/1
earlier [6] 23/8 23/21
34/10 45/2 45/8 48/3
effect [1] 35/6
either [4] 13/12 24/1 52/6 54/15
else [1] 18/16
empanelled [1] 54/1 employee [2] 3/8 30/18
employees [1] 9/1
enclose [3] 37/16
40/19 44/4
enclosed [6] 37/11
41/23 46/7 46/14
50/12 53/5
enclosures [2] 29/3 29/12
encountered [4]
40/14 44/19 44/24 46/17
end [4] 13/2 18/1 18/12 56/21
ended [1] 22/20
England [1] 23/2
enough [1] 60/3 enquiries [1] 32/22 ensure [2] 5/7 7/17 enter [1] 11/13 entered [3] 10/22 11/1 11/8
entering [1] 13/13 entirely [1] 52/20 entry [1] 41/20 envelope [4] 31/14 31/16 48/12 48/15 error [20] 6/23 13/13
13/14 16/22 17/8 18/3 18/21 18/24 19/5 19/7 19/17 19/17 19/18 23/23 23/23 28/11 32/21 36/8 45/8 57/7 errors [16] 14/1 14/1 14/3 19/14 19/14 19/14 20/15 24/13 24/14 26/4 26/8 26/12
$27 / 5 ~ 27 / 9 ~ 27 / 9 ~ 45 / 2$ 27/5 27/9 27/9 45/2 essentially [1] 32/14 establish [2] 15/22 52/13
Eugene [3] 40/8 41/18 41/19
even [1] 58/13
events [1] 38/21
ever [2] 4/12 4/17 every [1] $8 / 5$ everything [4] 5/7 15/8 16/16 18/19 evidence [22] 4/14 5/10 5/11 5/25 6/8 6/9 6/18 7/7 7/18 8/3 15/3 16/9 16/25 17/14 20/23 21/25 22/23 27/16 27/16 44/15 47/9 57/4
evidential [6] 6/2 23/10 23/19 24/8 27/16 53/19
examination [2] 16/2 16/4
examined [1] 12/1
example [2] 3/19 55/20
excuse [1] 21/25
exhibits [2] $42 / 24$ 46/6
existed [1] 32/10 existence [1] 20/14 existent [5] 12/3 12/5 12/13 13/8 13/22 expect [3] 20/9 58/7 58/10
expected [1] 37/15
experienced [1] 52/9
explain [3] 14/9 15/11 58/3
explained [1] 21/15
explains [1] 11/19
explanation [8] 9/20

10/11 16/13 19/13 23/14 42/3 45/7 57/7
explanations [4] 13/11 14/5 23/21 28/11
explicitly [1] 36/22
explore [1] 55/15
expressed [1] 53/12 expression [1] 55/19 expressly [1] 27/19 extent [4] 4/24 21/23 25/24 50/25
extremely [1] 50/24

## F

fact [9] 13/24 19/23
22/9 27/11 50/16
50/18 52/19 57/16 59/4
facts [4] 9/15 18/4
21/4 21/15
Failure [1] 36/12
fair [2] 15/13 15/14
far [6] 4/10 4/20
47/10 47/13 54/21
58/20
fastened [1] 10/2
February [4] 4/15/18
24/18 41/20
February 2004 [1] 4/1
feel [1] 7/7
fell [1] 31/24
Fermanagh [1] 25/13
figure [8] 13/3 15/22
20/25 21/7 22/6 22/8
22/11 22/14
figures [6] 12/18
12/21 12/23 13/13
14/6 22/20
file [23] 5/14 5/18
5/21 6/5 6/10 6/14
6/16 6/18 7/4 7/10
7/12 8/4 8/5 8/19
17/14 21/25 27/20
28/3 28/21 41/21
49/20 53/9 54/18
files [2] 6/8 7/17
final [2] 15/22 37/24
Finally [2] 40/17 55/4
find [6] 20/9 23/13
33/25 34/11 47/9 60/3
fine [4] 35/15 35/15
56/14 56/24
first [9] $8 / 109 / 16$
15/18 18/2 18/12 22/6
26/16 39/4 39/20
five [1] $4 / 3$
float [1] 36/13
foil [4] 10/6 10/7 10/9 10/9
foils [24] 9/20 9/23
10/1 10/16 10/17
10/18 11/4 11/8 11/10

11/15 11/24 12/3 12/6 generating [1] 13/15 12/14 12/17 12/23 give [2] 3/19 34/5
13/4 13/8 13/14 13/23 given [17] 4/12 8/2
14/6 18/13 22/1 22/19 8/15 12/20 15/5 16/11
follow [4] 6/5 38/21 17/5 17/8 17/20 20/25
54/14 54/21
followed [1] 28/16
following [12] 25/10
28/19 31/15 35/25
37/3 39/15 39/17
40/15 46/18 51/9
55/17 60/10
follows [5] 10/11
16/19 41/15 42/14 42/21
foot [1] 52/16
Force [1] 28/24
forensic [2] 39/16 52/17
Forgive [2] 15/17 43/22
form [6] 10/23 11/4
11/14 11/15 14/6 22/19
formally [7] 15/3 16/5
16/8 42/3 43/9 44/9 47/8
formed [1] 27/23
forward [1] 59/13
forwarded [2] 14/15 17/1
found [1] 52/4
four [2] 36/6 39/19
fourth [1] 40/17
frame [3] 25/22 26/4 45/3
friendly [1] 26/11
front [1] 1/14
Fujitsu [5] 38/3 42/4 47/7 47/11 55/7
full [3] 1/9 17/22 42/3
further [23] 6/19
15/21 19/13 21/19
21/21 24/2 35/20
37/16 37/22 38/2 38/9
41/7 44/3 44/11 46/23
47/2 47/4 48/14 49/21
51/5 51/13 52/15
53/22

## G

gap [4] 23/10 23/12 23/14 23/14
gaps [1] 23/19
Garry [5] 40/4 41/18
41/19 51/18 52/10
gave [4] 11/10 13/2
29/9 40/7
general [2] 7/20
25/19
generated [9] 8/20
12/2 12/5 12/12 12/13
12/22 12/24 13/7
13/22

21/25 25/2 27/1 27/4
27/7 29/3 32/21
gives [2] 18/24 34/3 giving [1] 39/23 go [7] 6/12 18/9 21/8 30/7 33/21 35/24 50/14
goes [1] 14/9 going [17] 9/2 9/6 9/14 15/17 18/10 24/25 25/7 27/19 28/13 30/10 36/3 42/12 43/18 43/19 48/17 53/16 59/13 good [3] 1/3 59/18 60/4
got [1] 33/22
grand [2] 10/23 10/25
grateful [1] 36/1
great [1] 8/8
Groogan [6] 40/4
41/18 51/18 51/21 51/24 52/11
Groogan's [1] 52/7 grounds [2] 38/10 53/17
group [9] 9/25 10/17
10/18 10/19 10/21
10/21 10/24 11/10 11/13
groups [1] 11/11
guidance [1] 51/2
guilt [2] 16/15 23/4 guilty [2] 33/4 54/3

H
had [45] 7/9 7/21
7/23 7/23 8/17 12/8
12/15 13/4 13/19 14/9
15/8 15/12 17/9 17/22 20/4 21/8 21/16 23/18 24/7 26/21 27/8 27/14
30/7 30/17 30/18
32/24 32/25 36/16
36/23 38/8 38/18
40/22 41/4 42/7 45/13
46/16 46/21 47/6 48/7
49/10 50/19 51/6 56/2
59/2 59/10
half [1] 40/3
halfway [2] 9/8 11/21
hand [1] 31/16
handed [2] 28/22
31/14
handing [2] 48/12 48/15
handwritten [2] 53/7
53/9
(20) doing - handwritten

| H | $40$ |  | include [2] 22/18 | 26/18 40/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| happened [1] 52/14 |  |  |  | ] $15 / 3$ |
| happening [1] 43/18 <br> hard [2] 1/15 12/23 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 21/21 22/13 59/12 | I think [12] 4/3 30/19 | including [1] 29/10 | into [4] 10/17 11/9 |
| has [17] 10/4 16/15 | however [1] 46/13 | 30/25 35/1 35/3 35/24 | incompetence [4] | 26/10 26/ |
| 34/8 34/16 37/14 | human [10] 19/14 | 49/4 52/22 52/22 55/1 | 25/23 26/5 26/12 45 | introduction [1] |
| 40/20 41/19 41/20 | 19/17 19/18 20 | 57/1 5 | inconsistencies [2] | 55/ |
| 47/8 55/4 57/1 57/21 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 23/22 24/13 28/10 } \\ 32 / 21 & 36 / 857 / 7\end{array}$ | I thought [1] 31/9 I turn [2] 49/22 55/13 | 51/22 52/4 | investigate [2] 23/12 |
| 57/24 | 32/21 36/8 5 | I turn [2] 49/22 55/13 | indeed [1] 3/3 | 31/ |
| have [102] |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { haven't [2] 40/23 } \\ & 59 / 15 \end{aligned}$ |  | 1 was [10] | indicate | 23/11 42/20 42/ |
|  | 1 a | 27/6 27/14 27/19 38/9 | 16/21 17/7 20/11 | 43/6 43/8 |
| having [15] 14/10 | 46/5 46/10 54/4 | /21 51/15 54/10 | 25/22 | vestigation |
| 19/11 21/23 23/23 | 1 |  | indicated | 3/12 4/7 5/3 5/1 |
|  | I asked [1] |  | 39/23 45/3 | 9/6 14/13 14/19 1 |
| 37/12 37/21 38/8 | 1 assess [1] | I will [2] 1/13 | indicative [3] 26/5 | 5/18 23/24 27/1 |
| 46/25 48/21 | [2] | I wonder [1] 4 | 27/5 | 8/21 35/20 39/24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { he [4] } 28 / 2334 / 17 \\ & 46 / 157 / 23 \end{aligned}$ |  | I worked [1] | indictment | 40/8 57/5 |
|  | I | I would [17] | 5 | vestigati |
| He's [1] 55/1 headed [1] 39/22 |  | 13/17 23/13 26/ | individual [2] | 3/16 4/14 6/20 14/9 |
|  |  | 30/16 31/23 |  | 3/15 39/22 40/1 46/8 |
| Headquarters [1]$40 / 3$ |  | 1 | infer [1] | 46/10 59 |
|  |  | 7 | influence [2] | gat |
| health [4] 38/11 39/3 53/12 56/16 |  | 58/7 58/10 59/1 | 53/1 | 3/20 15/16 16/19 |
|  |  | I wouldn't [2] 8/8 | information [19] | $17 / 5$ 31/3 31/9 58/2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { hear [3] } 1 / 347 / 24 \\ & 58 / 9 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | Investigators [1] |
|  | I did [7] | I'd [2] | 4/13 34/15 35/2 | 14/10 |
| heard [1] 55/4 | 18 | I'Il [1] 33/25 | 6/25 42/2 43/9 43/1 | invited [1] 15/23 |
|  | 33/1 53/20 | I'm [13] 13/8 22 | 4/4 44/9 46/15 51/1 | involved [10] 3/1 3 |
| hearing [1] 60/10 | I didn't [5] | 34/10 35/17 36/1 | 52/24 58/23 59/4 | 3/25 8/17 |
| held [2] 39/25 46/7 | 18/22 31/25 | 47/13 48/9 53/16 | informed [5] 15/2 | 2/5 43/10 44/10 |
| Hello [1] 47/24 <br> help [3] 4/24 18/9 |  | 4/25 58/9 | 2/22 46/5 46/11 | 58/1 |
|  | 8/19 50/14 | 58/20 59/8 | 1/17 | Ivement [5] 2/22 |
|  | [4] 7/21 | [3] | al | 712 38/9 38/18 |
| helpfully [1] 38/20 |  |  |  | volving |
| helpline [3] 44/8 | [1] | identified [11] | utt | d [12] 2/7 2/ |
|  | xpressed [1] | $1114 / 20$ 16/3 | inputting [1] 26/9 | 5 15/4 |
| helps [1] 39/13 | I feel [1] 7/7 | 16/7 16/14 20/1 26/15 | inquiry [13] 1/12 1/14 | 16/9 23/1 25/16 29 |
| her [11] 15/5 15/9 16/11 16/17 19/5 19/7 | I had [4] 17/22 | /9 | 23/18 | 55/6 59/1 |
|  | 27/14 38/8 | identifying [1] 28/1 | 8/6 38/25 42/8 47/8 | is [126] |
| 39/24 46/20 47/6 | I have [12] | ie [1] 9/1 | 53/6 55/4 57/15 | isn't [3] 11/17 18/4 |
| 52/18 56/16 | 4 | ie the [1] | stance [1] 20/8 | 27/16 |
| here [16] 9/16 9/19 | 42/17 42/19 42/22 | if [37] 5/10 5/24 6/8 | instigated [1] 56/12 | sue [1] |
|  | 43/11 46/13 5 | 6/12 18/9 18/21 20/8 | instigator [1] 56/19 | issued [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10 / 12 \quad 11 / 1612 / 11 \\ & 13 / 7 \quad 13 / 1917 / 5 \quad 25 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | 55/17 | 21/8 22/4 23/8 31/17 | instructed [1] 50/13 | issues [6] 3/5 32/19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 26 / 25 ~ 29 / 1432 / 14 \\ & 36 / 444 / 346 / 1951 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | I haven | 1/24 32/9 34/1 34/4 | instructions [3] | 38/15 54/4 54/6 56/4 |
|  | I just [1] 34/4 | 35/2 | 28/24 30/11 31 | it [101] |
| hereby [1] 39/16 | I know [2] 33 | 39/12 42/3 47/7 47/ | Insurance [1] 9/2 | it's [12] |
|  | 4 | 47/17 48/7 48/9 48/ | intend [1] 50/15 | 10 21/2 23/16 |
|  | I may [3] 3 | 48/18 48/24 50/14 | intended [1] 52/2 | 15 48/15 50/4 56 |
| herseif [2] 16/24 |  | 51/7 51/9 52/3 54/4 | 29/1 | 6/9 57/21 |
|  | I mean [3] 34/2 34/12 | 54/6 58/7 58/10 59/2 | inter alia [1] | [1 |
|  |  | ignore [1] 27 | erest [6] 6/4 6/4 | ms [1] 3 |
|  | I never [1] | ii [3] 6/3 29/2 36/9 | 38/10 53/4 53/17 | [1] 1/13 |
| $14 / 2$ | I r | iii [1] 36/10 | 59/21 | elf [2] 26/10 35/1 |
| 1] | 1 | ill [2] 38/11 39 | ernal [1] 49/4 | iv [1] 36/1 |
| his [2] 37/5 53/12 | I recall [1] 34/9 | ill health [2] 38/11 | rpreted [1] |  |
| hm [1] 49/9 |  | 39/3 |  |  |
| Horizon [12] 3/2 8/ |  | important [2] 33 |  |  |
| $8 / 138 / 1632 / 932 / 17$ | I resume [1] 48 | imps | $18 / 11 \text { 18/12 18/17 }$ | January [3] 1/1 1/1 |
| 32/24 36/18 36/21 | I said [1] 18/12 | impression [1] 55/16 | 19/11 22/6 26/9 26/16 | 6/15 |

(21) happened - January

J
John [2] 14/23 42/15
joined [1] 2/11
judge [4] 57/22 58/5 58/7 58/10
July [15] 38/19 39/5
39/10 41/1 41/3 41/10 41/12 43/5 43/15 46/2 47/6 48/2 50/2 50/6 51/13
July 2004 [1] 48/2
June [2] 33/5 37/10 jury [2] 54/1 54/2 just [12] 14/4 18/22 26/12 33/22 34/4 48/11 48/24 51/10 52/23 55/15 55/24

## 59/8

Justice [3] 7/13 42/14 44/2
justified [1] 13/10

## K

keeping [1] 52/18
kept [1] 33/17
KEVIN [3] 1/7 $1 / 11$
61/3
know [8] 1/13 $7 / 21$
7/21 33/21 34/19 35/15 44/13 58/2
knowledge [9] $1 / 25$
3/24 4/16 4/19 4/23
7/20 7/22 27/1 57/12

## L

lack [2] 27/1 57/12
large [1] 26/3
larger [1] 37/22
last [7] 12/4 12/11
18/14 21/4 37/19 40/20 59/19
late [2] 24/18 40/25
later [3] 4/11 5/2 27/23
law [6] 2/6 2/9 23/1
23/2 28/25 31/13
lawyer [1] 5/20
leave [1] 41/15
led [2] 27/11 27/14
legal [2] $31 / 17$ 34/16
length [1] $27 / 8$
Les [1] 14/21
Les Thorpe [1] $14 / 21$
let [1] 40/18
let's [2] 55/16 59/23 letter [25] 6/16 6/25 7/2 8/4 37/9 39/9 39/11 39/20 40/25 41/3 41/9 42/8 42/15 42/17 43/14 43/19 45/24 46/2 46/17 46/20 47/6 50/2 50/5 50/12 51/7
letters [2] 29/3 29/12 level [1] 32/23 liable [2] 16/24 17/10 liaise [1] 41/5 liaising [1] 52/18 lifetime [1] 38/16 light [3] 50/16 53/5 58/4
like [7] 3/15 18/16 34/19 39/4 43/7 52/17 55/15
likewise [1] 5/9
limb [1] 53/4
Limited [7] 6/20 9/9 14/13 14/18 21/13 25/15 40/1
line [3] 12/11 23/8 23/11
lines [2] 23/3 23/18
Lisahally [15] 11/5
14/16 14/20 20/23
22/1 27/7 27/18 28/4
40/9 40/11 42/24 46/6
51/21 51/24 52/6
list [2] 34/15 37/18
listed [3] 33/5 37/5 53/25
listing [1] 10/20
lists [2] 9/3 10/22
little [3] 9/5 48/12 55/16
Local [1] 14/18
location [2] 43/25
44/1
locations [2] 55/25 56/5
$\log [2] 37 / 2057 / 9$
logs [9] 41/24 42/2
43/8 44/8 44/17 45/19
46/9 46/19 47/7
Londonderry [1]
11/6
look [3] 30/4 32/20 34/10
looked [5] 34/4 34/22
44/5 48/21 52/17
looking [3] 34/9
37/22 48/9
loop [1] 52/19
loose [1] 55/19
loss [4] 21/22 21/23
22/14 22/23
losses [2] 22/2 22/3
Lottery [1] 41/21
lower [1] 22/11

## M

MA [5] 10/23 11/4 11/14 12/18 12/21 machine [3] 10/19 10/20 10/22
made [19] 10/3 14/14
15/12 15/16 16/5
16/15 16/18 23/7

28/18 36/23 38/1
McKenny [2] 14/23 38/19 39/19 51/6 57/4 14/25
57/16 57/22 58/5 58/7 McMahon [2] 40/8
make [3] 27/4 32/22 58/10
makes [1] 7/6
making [2] 26/19
59/20
Manager [4] 6/20 9/6 40/4 44/2
many [5] 10/14 19/19 24/13 26/11 27/10
March [3] 24/22 25/5 42/1
mark [1] 36/17
match [1] 13/3
matched [2] 13/4 20/10
material [18] 17/16
31/20 32/3 32/10
32/16 34/8 35/3 37/5
37/14 46/23 47/2 47/4
47/4 48/4 48/18 49/3
52/15 53/22
materials [1] 53/7
matter [11] 6/14
16/16 23/16 36/16
39/15 39/17 42/19
42/23 51/25 53/25 59/21
matters [5] 46/3 51/2 56/4 57/14 59/12
Maureen [11] 2/23
3/6 3/25 5/15 9/10
16/24 21/11 25/9 37/9 42/16 57/3
may [18] 1/5 16/1
16/8 19/15 26/18
30/19 33/4 34/1 34/21
36/6 37/13 41/22
45/18 45/20 48/24
54/21 58/5 58/24
McAuley [2] 6/17 7/3
McCleery [1] 44/2
McKelvey [46] 2/23
5/15 6/23 9/10 13/25 15/2 15/7 15/20 15/23 16/1 16/6 16/8 16/13 16/15 16/22 16/24 17/9 17/23 18/17 19/4 19/4 21/11 24/11 25/9 26/8 26/13 26/17 26/21 $27 / 832 / 2433 / 4$ 38/11 40/4 40/15 41/1 41/20 42/16 44/19 44/25 50/13 51/18 52/8 53/6 57/3 57/16 57/21
McKelvey's [19] 3/2
3/6 3/25 15/10 18/1
37/9 39/3 39/10 45/22 45/25 46/16 46/18
50/3 50/6 50/18 52/21
53/11 54/23 56/15

41/19
McNally [1] 42/15
me [13] 5/18 15/17
21/25 28/2 32/9 35/7
43/22 50/11 53/8 53/9
53/14 53/22 55/4
mean [5] 18/22 19/6
34/2 34/12 35/16
medical [1] 53/6
meet [1] 22/23
meeting [1] 51/8
member [1] 14/24
members [2] 9/17
28/4
memo [3] 42/13
43/15 44/4
memory [7] 20/3
23/20 26/7 34/21 48/8
49/11 54/17
mention [2] 21/20
33/5
mentioned [2] 18/4

## 28/2

met [15] 5/23 17/15
20/2 24/9 24/17 26/1
28/15 32/13 44/13
45/14 45/17 50/19
53/5 53/19 57/11
might [11] 18/3 19/14
20/14 27/5 32/16
37/15 47/14 55/24
57/10 59/3 59/11
mind [2] 13/6 49/11
mine [1] 35/4
mismatch [3] 12/17
13/11 14/5
missing [1] 5/11
Mm [1] 49/9
Mm-hm [1] 49/9
moment [5] 32/21
47/14 48/9 48/25
55/17
money [4] 14/1 20/6
20/12 24/12
monies [1] $9 / 9$
more [8] 9/6 24/4
25/22 26/14 35/21
45/3 49/2 59/15
morning [6] 1/3 28/9
41/14 47/15 57/5
57/15
Mr [34] 1/5 1/10 2/3
2/4 2/24 5/16 29/13
32/5 34/2 34/14 38/5
40/23 41/4 46/20 48/7
48/22 49/4 49/7 49/10
50/2 51/21 51/24 52/7 52/25 55/4 55/16 57/1 61/5
57/2 57/3 58/14 59/18 Ms McKelvey [1]
59/20 60/6 61/9 13/25
Ms McKelvey's [1]

Ms McKelvey's... [1] 15/10
MS PRICE [6] 1/8 33/21 49/24 57/25 60/5 61/5
Ms Winter [17] 9/15 17/9 17/11 17/19 20/24 21/8 21/15 27/13 31/6 39/23 41/13 44/12 47/6 50/19 51/8 51/14 55/5
Ms Winter's [13] 9/7 17/16 18/5 19/22 20/19 21/1 21/23 21/24 23/17 23/23 28/8 44/5 44/8
much [4] 8/2 20/7 56/25 60/2
must [2] 23/3 26/13 my [21] 3/24 4/16 4/19 4/23 5/19 7/15 8/5 18/19 23/16 29/16 29/19 32/10 34/22 36/16 37/7 43/2 48/1 49/22 53/14 54/5 54/18
myself [1] 42/17

## N

name [2] 1/9 1/15
namely [1] 23/22
National [1] $9 / 25$
nature [2] 9/3 50/23
necessary [1] 55/19
need [1] 47/7
needed [1] 15/21
never [3] 20/10 31/8 50/11
new [2] 42/1 44/18
next [5] 11/13 11/19
15/17 18/18 51/11
nil [1] 29/19
no [76]
no 3 [1] 43/7
non [17] $12 / 312 / 5$
12/13 13/8 13/22
25/10 29/16 29/21
32/7 33/23 34/3 34/7
34/24 35/2 48/4 48/18 49/3
non-existent [5] 12/3 12/5 12/13 13/8 13/22
non-scheduled [1] 25/10
non-sensitive [11] 29/16 29/21 32/7
33/23 34/3 34/7 34/24 35/2 48/4 48/18 49/3 normally [2] 9/22 54/6
Northern [13] 2/7 2/16 2/20 3/12 4/4

6/15 15/4 16/9 23/1 officers [1] 22/1 25/16 29/7 55/6 59/10 offices [2] 10/14 40/5 out [18] 4/14 5/22 not [57] 3/1 3/24 4/16 Okay [1] 22/22 4/19 4/23 5/5 6/23 Omagh [10] 29/6 8/23 15/7 15/11 16/21 $38 / 13$ 40/2 40/5 42/14 17/8 17/12 19/17 23/9 $50 / 8$ 52/21 53/3 54/7 23/18 24/14 26/22 28/10 30/20 31/17 33/1 33/4 34/17 35/5 35/13 35/15 35/23 36/21 37/14 39/7 42/7 one [15] 3/19 4/20 44/9 45/1 46/10 50/10 $20 / 8$ 39/20 49/2 51/17 50/15 50/17 50/21 51/15 51/20 52/12 53/16 53/20 53/21 54/3 54/4 54/10 54/13 54/13 54/18 54/24 55/1 56/9 56/9 57/9 58/24
note [3] 44/5 53/7 53/9
nothing [3] 32/7 44/16 53/13 now [7] 17/17 20/17 26/25 29/7 34/9 37/23 58/2
number [9] 9/23 9/25
9/25 13/4 26/3 27/4
28/2 51/22 57/22
numbers [3] 10/24
15/5 16/10

## 0

objective [1] 58/25
obligation [1] 34/16
obligations [1] 33/13
obliged [1] 51/9
observations [2]
15/16 16/18
observe [2] 15/24 16/1
obtained [3] 47/10 47/11 47/13
obviously [1] 22/10
occasion [1] 58/1
occasions [2] 28/3 51/17
off [1] 48/7
offence [3] 9/4 24/10 25/10
offer [2] 15/7 54/18
offered [1] 16/13
office [83]
officer [25] 9/5 23/11
28/22 29/4 29/11
29/20 30/1 30/8 30/8
30/13 30/14 30/15
30/17 30/20 31/3
33/17 35/11 41/4 42/20 42/23 43/6 43/8 48/19 49/15 49/17
Officer' [1] 5/19
Officer's [2] 33/9 33/11

55/25
on [135]
once [4] 4/24 5/9 7/23 56/12

55/2 55/15 55/18 55/24 55/25 56/1 57/23 58/17 59/8
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48/14 50/15 56/19 60/4
taken [2] 23/24 55/21
taking [1] 17/20
tape [4] 15/4 16/10
17/18 40/18
taped [1] 17/22
team [8] 4/1 4/17
14/13 14/19 14/22
14/24 55/18 56/2
technical [2] 51/2
57/14
telephone [1] 53/10
telling [2] 28/2 35/7
Temp [1] 41/25
terminology [1] 19/24
terms [9] 6/10 8/4 13/19 14/2 20/5 20/25 30/16 30/20 32/19
test [18] 5/21 5/22
6/2 6/4 17/15 20/2
22/24 24/8 24/17 26/1
28/15 32/12 44/13
45/14 45/17 53/4
53/19 57/11
than [8] 19/9 19/13
22/11 23/22 25/22
26/5 26/23 45/3
thank [16] 1/4 1/12
19/21 28/7 35/22
47/20 47/25 48/1
49/23 49/25 56/24
59/15 59/20 60/2 60/7
60/8
Thanks [2] 34/20 49/23
that [265]
that's [32] 2/8 2/10
2/17 2/17 2/21 3/9 8/7

11/16 15/14 16/11 18/22 22/5 24/21
thirds [1] 9/12
this [114]
24/24 25/3 26/2 27/25 thorough [1] 60/3
28/6 29/14 34/5 34/18 Thorpe [1] 14/21
35/8 35/14 37/2 38/6 those [20] 3/19 8/25 38/23 41/3 42/10 43/2 $13 / 16$ 14/6 14/20 15/5
43/17 43/23 57/14 $\quad 22 / 20$ 24/1 30/23
theft [11] 7/4 7/8 9/4 $33 / 13$ 37/21 37/23
9/9 19/13 21/14 22/12 24/9 24/15 25/15 26/5
Theft Act [1] 21/14
thefts [1] 7/6
their [3] 10/17 20/23 56/2
them [15] 17/24
23/13 23/15 23/16
28/1 28/23 33/22
40/22 48/7 48/10
52/23 59/25 59/25
60/1 60/3
then [28] 5/14 5/20
7/14 7/15 9/13 10/11
10/18 11/1 11/11
11/13 11/19 15/15
16/18 21/18 22/18
24/22 25/19 30/9
36/14 37/16 40/12
40/25 41/9 42/6 43/3
51/10 56/20 60/2
there [76]
there's [11] 8/8 17/15
18/13 18/21 21/20
23/14 44/16 47/4
47/13 49/6 58/23
thereabouts [1] 25/14
therefore [2] 30/12 40/9
these [16] $3 / 57 / 68 / 4 \quad 18 / 18$
14/4 17/1 17/10 26/17 torn [1] 10/7
26/20 29/10 38/21 total [4] 10/19 10/25
39/7 40/22 42/2 45/10 11/10 11/11
45/21 46/21
they [30] 2/1 3/24
4/14 4/14 7/15 7/16
19/19 20/15 22/2 22/2
23/15 30/25 34/25 totals [4] 10/21 10/21
37/24 45/1 45/5 45/6 10/23 11/13
45/8 45/9 45/13 46/11 towards [8] 6/12 9/18

|  | 48/8 | towards [8] | $6 / 12$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $48 / 8$ | $52 / 12$ | $52 / 22$ | $18 / 1$ | $18 / 11$ |
| $18 / 12$ |  |  |  |  |

52/23 52/24 56/16
56/18 59/18
thing [1] 26/7
things [3] 55/24
57/23 59/17
think [23] 4/3 20/4
22/4 22/22 27/3 30/19
30/25 33/2 35/1 35/3
35/24 45/10 49/4
50/25 52/22 52/22
54/20 55/1 57/1 58/21
59/2 59/11 59/17
third [3] 40/12 41/5
45/6
totality [1] 21/24
totalled [1] 22/2
totalling [2] 22/15
22/16

18/14 21/3 23/4
trail [1] 55/23
training [3] 2/5 8/12 32/23
transaction [1] 37/20
transcript [4] 2/2
17/22 19/11 19/21
transcripts [1] 18/6
transmission [1] 43/12
trial [9] 24/19 31/16
53/24 53/25 54/1 54/4
54/9 54/11 57/22
trials [1] 56/5

| T | urgency [1] 39/18 | 22/10 24/11 27/6 | 17/8 17/10 19/18 | wrote [1] 53/2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| triggered [1] 33/19 true [1] 1/24 trying [1] 22/13 turn [3] 1/18 49/22 55/13 <br> Turning [1] 5/14 two [11] 9/6 9/12 13/11 13/16 14/4 37/19 37/20 38/14 48/17 55/25 56/2 <br> Two-thirds [1] 9/12 Tyrone [1] 25/13 | urgent [1] 53/8 | 27/19 35/15 44/20 | 23/14 25/25 26/3 | [2] 55/14 61/7 |
|  | us [9] 1/3 34/5 40/18 $47 / 2448 / 1451 / 9$ | /7 60 | 57/17 57/17 58/3 58/5 | Y |
|  | 54/14 55/2 59/25 | were [96] | widely [1] 24/4 | Yeah [1] 28/7 |
|  | use [4] 19/24 35/12 | weren't [9] 13/12 | will [9] 1/13 28/18 | years [1] 18/20 |
|  | 55/16 55/19 | 45/8 52/24 57/16 | 28/25 31/13 35/20 | yes [82] |
|  | used [3] 42/3 43/9 | 57/18 58/13 58/1 | 39/2 46/3 46/12 60/4 | you [261] |
|  | 47/8 | 58/18 59/23 | WILLIAMS [2] 55/14 | you'd [1] |
|  | user [1] | Western [1] 2 | 61 | you're [3] 35/7 44/13 |
|  | user-friendly [1] | what [22] 6/5 6/1 | Winter [34] 6/19 9/6 | 47/10 |
|  | 26/11 | 7/9 7/19 11/16 12/1 | 9/15 14/21 17/9 17/11 | you've [3] 44/ |
|  | using [4] 8/25 3 | 14/9 17/16 20/4 | 17/19 18/15 20/22 |  |
| U | usual [4] 50/22 | 35/7 35/16 | 27/13 30/9 30/12 | 1/22 1/24 |
| $\overline{\text { unable [3] } 41 / 1447 / 8}$ | 55/25 57/19 | 52/3 52/3 52/14 57/15 | 30/16 30/21 30/24 | 2/22 2/22 4/17 |
|  |  | when [24] 2/14 6/5 | 31/1 31/6 39/22 39/23 | 6/11 7/19 12/24 17/1 |
|  |  | 8/3 8/15 10/5 12/4 | 41/5 41/9 41/12 41/13 | 17/24 19/1 24 |
| Unclear [1] 31/8 under [8] 15/3 16/9 | value [2] 10/18 | 13/18 14/13 18/6 20/6 | 42/20 44/12 47/6 | 26/19 27/1 27/21 |
|  | various [1] 11/8 | 23/17 24/4 26/9 26/19 | 50/13 50/19 51/8 | 28/13 28/14 29/21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 21 / 925 / 7 \text { 25/19 26/21 } \\ & 31 / 1133 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | varying [1] 12/1 | 27/2 31/12 49/11 | 51/14 55/5 | 29/25 30/13 31/20 |
| underclaims [4] 19/23 19/25 20/13 | verbal [1] 52/6 | 51/24 53/18 54/1 54/2 | Winter's [14] 9/7 | 32/15 33/8 36/3 37/1 |
|  | verdict [1] 54/3 | 55/5 56/15 58/3 | 17/16 18/5 19/22 | 38/22 38/24 39/12 |
| 20/14 | very [3] 45/5 56/25 | where [8] 3/7 3/10 | 20/19 21/1 21/23 | 40/25 42/7 42/8 44/4 |
| underlying [1] 6/25 undermined [1] | 60/2 | 18/2 35/11 43/7 43/24 | 21/24 23/17 23/23 | 44/21 45/1 45/11 |
|  | via [1] | 49/14 58/21 | 28/8 43/14 44/5 44/8 | 45/16 46/1 46/2 46/4 |
|  | victim [1] 58/2 | whether [27] 12/7 | Winters [2] 52/17 | 46/14 46/22 47/1 |
|  | view [4] 8/5 16/25 | 13/9 13/9 17/17 18/3 | 52/20 | 49/23 50/1 52/13 |
| understand [8] 7/9 <br> 8/20 11/7 12/20 22/13 | 45/16 57/10 | 20/15 23/4 23/15 | within [4] 4/17 30/18 | 53/16 53/23 54/21 |
| 26/24 30/23 59/9understanding [8] | views [3] 8/6 8/7 | 23/25 24/5 32/12 | 53/6 55/18 | 55/18 57/4 57/9 57/1 |
|  | 54/18 | 33/23 44/12 45/14 | Without [1] 28/ | 59/22 59/24 |
| 7/16 7/19 12/25 29/19 | virtue [1] 33/14 | 45/16 46/23 47/2 48/6 | WITN10580100 [1] | yourself [6] 20/18 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29/21 29/25 30/13 } \\ & 43 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | visible [1] 1/20 | 53/4 53/18 54/4 54/15 | 2/3 | 21/21 23/25 31/20 |
|  | visit [1] 40/8 | 56/15 56/21 57/10 | witness [3] 1/15 | 59/11 59/20 |
|  | visiting [1] 41/20 | 57/19 57/25 | 27/22 28/3 |  |
| understood [2] 19/6 $22 / 13$ | W | 59] 3/2 | sses [ |  |
| Unfortunately [1] 34/8 | Wales [1] 23/2 | 4/3 5/19 5/25 |  |  |
|  | Ward [1] 60/6 | 8/11 9/13 9/15 9/23 | wonder [2] 34/4 |  |
| unit [11] 11/5 11/16 $11 / 2012 / 912 / 15$ | warranted [1] 25/20 | $12 / 8 \quad 12 / 24 \quad 13 / 2 \quad 13 / 3$ |  |  |
| $11 / 20 ~ 12 / 9 ~ 12 / 15$$14 / 1239 / 2139 / 22$ | was [178] | $\begin{aligned} & 12 / 812 / 2413 / 213 / 3 \\ & 13 / 1916 / 1922 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | word [1] 55/17 <br> work [3] 1/13 4/1 |  |
|  | wasn't [7] 14/1 20/22 | $\begin{aligned} & 13 / 1916 / 1922 / 11 \\ & 22 / 2023 / 18 \\ & 26 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { work [3] } 1 / 134 / 1 \\ & 42 / 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 40/1 40/2 42/14 unknown [3] 21/12 | $21 / 24 \text { 26/11 27/15 }$ | 22/20 23/18 26/15 | worked [1] 4/3 |  |
|  | 214/23 59/6 | 26/18 26/22 27/20 <br> 27/21 27/22 28/4 | worked [1] 4/3 working [3] 4/7 44/13 |  |
|  | way [9] 9/12 9/20 | $\begin{aligned} & 27 / 2127 / 22 \text { 28/4 } 29 / 18 \text { 30/7 } \\ & 29 / 16 \end{aligned}$ | working [3] $4 / 744 / 13$ $55 / 8$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { unless [3] } 10 / 443 / 9 \\ & 44 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | 10/11 19/12 20/12 | 30/22 32/8 32/16 | would [51] 5/8 5/11 |  |
|  | 20/16 43/18 55/2 58/4 | 34/15 35/3 35/17 | 7/12 7/13 8/1 8/2 |  |
| unsigned [6] 34/24 | ways [1] 29/10 | 37/14 37/15 37/21 | 13/15 13/17 15/7 18/9 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 34 / 2535 / 148 / 849 / 12 \\ & 49 / 14 \end{aligned}$ | we [67] | 38/21 39/11 44/18 | 20/8 23/13 25/22 26/7 |  |
| unsurprisingly [1]$57 / 12$ | we'll [1] 32/20 | 44/24 45/7 45/19 | 26/21 28/9 28/12 |  |
|  | we're [2] 28/14 37/22 | 45/25 46/14 49/4 | 29/15 29/17 30/16 |  |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{llll} 57 / 12 \\ \text { until [4] } & 2 / 9 & 38 / 9 & 54 / 2 \end{array}\right\|$ | we've [5] 15/18 33/22 | 49/16 50/22 52/10 | 31/19 31/21 31/23 |  |
| $60 / 10$ | 40/22 44/5 48/13 | 53/11 54/13 59/22 | 32/2 32/11 32/12 34/5 |  |
|  | Wednesday [1] 1/ | 59/23 | 34/19 36/18 36/19 |  |
| unused [1] 37/5 unusual [3] 50/23 | week [6] 10/22 11/14 | Whilst [1] 11/23 | 36/24 38/14 38/15 |  |
| 50/24 54/13 | 11/15 12/17 13/3 52/1 | who [17] 3/15 7/13 | 39/4 43/7 45/13 45/15 |  |
|  | weekly [5] 10 | 7/23 8/17 8/25 9/21 | 45/16 50/9 50/17 |  |
| up [5] 22/20 25/7 | 10/14 10/16 11/2 11/3 | 20/23 22/1 27/6 30/9 | 50/22 50/24 51/8 51/9 |  |
| 34/16 58/9 59/4 | weeks [5] 12/1 27/22 | 30/15 34/16 34/19 | 53/14 54/6 56/3 56/11 |  |
| Update [1] 41/15 updated [1] 22/18 upon [8] 8/11 8/19 8/20 24/6 27/21 28/5 32/15 34/15 | 51/22 52/3 | 38/14 48/7 48/15 56/3 | 58/7 58/10 59/1 |  |
|  | weighed [1] | who'd [1] 55/21 | wouldn't [4] 8/8 |  |
|  | ght [2] | whoever [2] 34/13 | 27/14 57/19 58/5 |  |
|  | well [15] $8 / 2413 / 17$ $19 / 2319 / 2520 / 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34 / 14 \\ & \text { why [15] } 8 / 2317 / 6 \end{aligned}$ | written [2] 40/21 52/6 wrong [1] 25/2 |  |

(27) triggered - yourself

