

CIVIL SERVICE RETALIATION
DUE TO PROTECTED DISCLOSURES

by

The Investigator

By the Service unfairly, unnecessarily and disproportionately, retaliate against me in breach of the means of processing set out in sections 12(1) and 21 of the Protected Disclosures Act 2014:

1. By stationing a superior on the street outside the Investigator's office entrance to monitor their arrival at work so as to alert others of my arrival
2. By stationing yet another superior "to greet the Investigator" on the floor to ensure they could not talk to colleagues or to other people supportive of the Investigator making my Protected Disclosures.
3. By attempting to reassign the Investigator to another role.
4. By threatening to withhold the Investigator's salary and failing to prevent publication of that threat.
5. In these circumstances a newspaper headline publishing this threat in a mainstream Sunday newspaper caused significant distress to the Investigator and to their family members.
6. A request **not** to discuss evidence that the Investigator had seen during their time as Investigator of the Central Bank with their colleagues who would remain on the Regulatory Stream.
7. The production of a Report on 6 May 2015 which contained false statements with the intention of discrediting the Investigator.
8. This false 6 May 2015 report was drafted by **Ms Elaine Gunn** who reports directly to **Mr Peter Finnegan**, Dail Clerk.
9. **Ms Gunn** was aware and remains aware that no investigator on the wider team has yet contradicted the statements made by the Investigator in the Protected Disclosures on 25 April 2015

10. Not conducting a sufficiently thorough investigation into the Investigator's allegations

- a. given that **Ms Gunn** also refused to speak with a number of investigators who spoke out in of the Investigator's defense and who had witnessed the conduct referred to in my original e-mail.
- b. To do so would disrupt the preordained outcome for the report (produced by the Service);

11. A false announcement of the Investigator's resignation during the week of 1 June 2015

12. Clearing of the Investigator's desk and personal items without their knowledge.

13. The false announcement of the Investigator's resignation was made by an employee of the Service and the Investigator's desk was cleared by an employee of the Service.

[Note: when challenged, there was an immediate back pedaling in relation to the Investigator' "fake resignation" by Mr Michael Errity (another employee of the Service) in which he states that desks were simply being reconfigured with the Investigator's desk subsequently being restored to its previous state]

14. The notification of the suspension of the Investigator's salary on 15 July 2015 by the Service in breach of the Protected Disclosures Act 2014.

15. When two elected representatives argued against the suspension of the Investigator's salary, it was the Service who ignored this argument or alternatively advised that it was not a matter of concern to the elected representative, despite it being a matter of the breach of Irish legislation.

16. The issuance of a false statement to the media in respect of the Investigator's former colleague's reasons for resigning, i.e. an outright denial when in fact the Investigator and numerous other investigators are aware of the Services' knowledge of the reasons for resignation and that they are linked to the Investigator's concerns.

17. The continued facilitation of repeated and obvious delays associated with the commencement of an investigation into the allegations raised.