JUDGE REMOVAL[1]

Apparently, Chief Justice Donal O'Donnell wants greater protection for judges against removal by parliamentary majority.

- Interesting timing.
- But who protects citizens from serious professional misconduct within the legal system?
- Consider my experience as the Irish Banking Inquiry whistleblower.
- In 2015, Senan Allen SC conducted a review of my protected disclosures. I have long challenged the integrity of his published report.
- The contemporaneous interview transcripts, now being subjected to detailed independent comparison, raise fundamental questions about disclosures Allen expressly declined to investigate, multiple serious disclosures that he acknowledged & accepted- before subsequently authoring serious adverse conclusions - published by @OireachtasNews
- Mainstream media faithfully reported the fabricated report - even confirming all in order with the disclosures that Allen expressly declined to investigate in interviews- & Allen was later appointed to the High Court and then the Court of Appeal.
- Meanwhile, a barrister representing me in proceedings arising from my whistleblowing failed to disclose material conflicts of interest over approximately seven years, including professional work for the Central Bank of Ireland, an institution central to my disclosures.
- A formal professional conduct complaint concerning those undisclosed conflicts remains outstanding with @LSRAIreland
- Yet this same barrister has now appeared on a panel discussing the importance of expert witnesses disclosing their conflicts of interest.
- How can a legal professional publicly lecture others - even experts - about disclosure obligations while facing an unresolved complaint concerning their own failure to disclose conflicts?
- What consideration, if any, was given to the apparent contradiction or is there a sense of "ongoing protection"?

[1] Taken from a post on X by @mlorrm

- The legal profession cannot credibly demand exacting standards of independence and transparency from expert witnesses while appearing unwilling to confront serious questions about its own members.

- And where does this leave a whistleblower who alleges that the supposedly independent review of her disclosures was fundamentally misrepresented, only to discover years later that her own legal representation was affected by previously undisclosed conflicts?

- Before demanding stronger constitutional protection for judges, perhaps the Chief Justice should address whether the existing structures provide meaningful accountability for serious misconduct allegations involving barristers and judges?

- Judicial independence without effective accountability risks becoming institutional protection rather than protection of the public.

- Trust in the administration of justice cannot be commanded. It must be earned.

- And when the very professionals entrusted with enforcing duties of candour, independence and disclosure are themselves the subject of unresolved allegations concerning those duties, public confidence is inevitably put at risk.