

IRISH NATIONWIDE BUILDING SOCIETY ASP INQUIRY
DECISION OUTCOMES OF DECISIONS OF THE INQUIRY

Decision on costs, jurisdiction and timing of the response to the Inquiry Management Questionnaire, 9 December 2015

The Inquiry Members decided to:

- (i) take the fact that the Persons Concerned could not have their costs awarded to them by the Inquiry into consideration when considering timelines for responses to the Inquiry Management Questionnaire;
- (ii) await the judgment of the High Court in the case of *Fingleton v Central Bank* 2015 508/JR before proceeding to consider the matter of the jurisdiction of the Inquiry to examine the suspected participation of the Persons Concerned in all or some of the suspected prescribed contraventions by INBS any further; and
- (iii) extend the date for the completion by the Persons Concerned of the Inquiry Management Questionnaire previously provided to them to a date to be determined following the Inquiry's determination in relation to the jurisdiction issue.

Decision following Inquiry Management Meeting called to consider responses to the Inquiry Management Questionnaire submitted by Persons Concerned, 16 March 2016

The Inquiry Members decided to request submissions in relation to whether the Inquiry hearing should be held in public or in private, or a hybrid of both, and in relation to any preliminary issues or applications.

Decision on whether the Inquiry should be held in public or in private, 21 September 2016

The Inquiry Members decided that the Inquiry (including any Inquiry Management Meetings) should be held in public subject to the possibility that this decision might be varied or revoked by the Inquiry Members in accordance with section 33AZ(3) of the Central Bank Act 1942 (as amended). The Inquiry Members further decided that it was appropriate to give public notice of both public and private Inquiry Management Meetings.

Decision on whether hearings in the Inquiry (including Inquiry Management Meetings) should continue in public or private, 24 October 2016

The Inquiry Members decided not to accede to a request from the Director of Public Prosecutions to hold Inquiry hearings in private, as they were not satisfied that the concerns expressed by her in relation to the possible impact of public hearings on criminal proceedings satisfied the criteria set out in section 33AZ(2) of the Central Bank Act 1942 (as amended).

Decision on whether hearings in the Inquiry (including Inquiry Management Meetings) should be adjourned, 24 October 2016

The Inquiry Members decided that an open-ended adjournment of Inquiry hearings was neither necessary nor appropriate but that no further public Inquiry Management Meetings would be held until 30 November 2016.

Decision on oral hearings, 17 November 2016

The Inquiry Members decided that certain preliminary issues and applications would be determined having heard oral submissions, whereas other issues would be determined on the basis of written submissions alone.

Decision on the effect of the settlement agreement between INBS and the Central Bank, 20 January 2017

[*Published in full*](#)

Decision on modular hearings, 20 January 2017

[*Published in full*](#)

Decision in relation to the status of the Investigation Reports, 20 January 2017

[*Published in full*](#)

Decision in relation to the procedure for identifying witnesses and obtaining witness statements, 20 January 2017

[*Published in full*](#)

Decision on stay application by Mr Michael Fingleton, 20 January 2017

[*Published in full*](#)

Decision on proof of documents, 20 February 2017

[*Published in full*](#)

Decision on termination application by Mr Michael Walsh, 1 March 2017

The Inquiry Members decided not to accede to Mr Walsh's application that the Inquiry be terminated as against him.

Decision on particularisation, access to documents and other procedural matters in relation to Mr Michael Walsh, 9 May 2017

The Inquiry Members decided not to accede to Mr Walsh's application for further particularisation of the case against him. The Inquiry Members acceded in part to Mr Walsh's application for further documents and directed Enforcement to provide certain categories of additional documents. The Inquiry Members also confirmed some incidental matters regarding Inquiry procedure.

Decision on particularisation, access to documents and other procedural matters in relation to Mr Michael Fingleton, 10 May 2017

The Inquiry Members did not accede to Mr Fingleton's application for further particularisation of the case against him. The Inquiry Members acceded in part to Mr Fingleton's application for further documents and directed Enforcement to provide certain additional documentation.