

FAILURE TO INTERVIEW CRUCIAL WITNESS¹

In 2015, a number of fellow experts on the Banking Inquiry **recommended** that the Joint Committee of Inquiry should hear Jonathan's testimony. Jonathan was not permitted to testify before the Joint Committee, nor provide any written testimony, despite the relevance of an Irish regulated bank suffering catastrophic liquidity breaches in 2007 - information that the [@centralbank_ie](https://www.centralbank.ie) was very keen to suppress.

Mr Sugarman received threatening legal letters for reporting a breach of the law on liquidity ratios. "SNAP" in the Netherlands - about which [@Wftproof](#) & [@WinkSabee](#) have written. [#WorstBankScenario](#) & about which Jules Muis testified in the de Wit Commission, but his testimony was excluded from official report.

When Jonathan publicly supported my Protected Disclosures, it caused mayhem with my legal team. I was admonished for Jonathan's public support. As you can imagine, it is atypical for a person's supportive witness to be considered negatively by that person's counsel. How can an Inquiry be legitimate if it is arranged that unpleasant/ unpalatable / unfavourable evidence is excluded?

Much like the Mason Hayes & Curran review of Ulster Bank's activities- MHC deliberately omitted interviewing multiple customers who had been unlawfully engineered into default through use of derivatives. In fact, MHC tried to coerce a customer into the review, but that customer was fraudulently sold swaps PRIOR TO the period referred to in the Terms of Reference & therefore was forced to decline (but also knew MHC represented Ulster Bank - an irresolvable conflict of interest). This was a very convenient way of **achieving a predetermined & deeply misleading outcome**.

What Jonathan had happened upon in 2007 was likely replicated across all Irish banks and this is the reason why evidence was withheld and/or heavily redacted in the Banking Inquiry, across all participants. It was clearly set up to be a "vested interests" Inquiry, but the "masterminds" did not account for several experts raising multiple concerns & departing.

Neither did they account for Allen giving me transcripts proving that he **failed to investigate my disclosures** & rather that he had in fact spent a good deal of time being rude, disagreeable & unprofessional & alluding to his connections.

Astonishingly, Allen tried to mislead me on my own evidence, by withholding evidence to which he had access & then (unprofessionally) gloating about it. When I accessed the evidence that supported my disclosures, rather than accept proof, his sole focus was to demand who had given it to me. He then attempted interference with official transcripts which is documented. Irish citizens deserved better. Irish litigants especially deserve an impartial & independent adjudicator.

¹ Copy from post on X on 9 September 2025 responding to a post by Mr Jonathan Sugarman .

Note: the addition of bold and some formatting changes were added by www.irldefrauded.com to make it easier to read