shock of it. I was jerked up the steering.

n't make contact with the wheel. If I hadn't got my I would have gone through Iscreen. The left-hand side her car hit me, in the front, ront bumper. The paint-

is damaged.

ving a brief adjournment, which Judge Faughnan oth parties to reflect on the incident was a low impact i, the case resumed. Asked g he had been affected by ries he sustained, Mr Ward ed "eight or nine months. was worse than my neck." r, Ms Hannify challenged ised as to the extent of his and said the witness had vious claims for personal following accidents in Oc-014 and November 2016, g the injuries alleged by the it were sustained in those ccidents

ard said "he didn't go to " in respect of the 2014 colut conceded he did visit a n respect of the 2016 colli-I said he had suffered from n, following the latter acci-

did you not tell the doctor our neck and back pain ose previous accidents," Ms

which Ms Hannify accused the witness of giving untrue evidence. Mr Ward remarked: "I can't remember the 2014 accident." Mr Ward said he did not bring a claim in respect of his November 2016 accident, but later remarked "I probably did bring a claim in 2016".

Ms Hannify said Mr Ward, in a "only attended a doctor a few times". Ms Hannify said, "there was a significant overlap" between the injuries sustained by Mr Ward in the accidents of 2016 and 2017. She also accused the plaintiff of not fully declaring his injuries when being assessed by the doctor for the defendant's insurers.

Ms Hannify claimed Mr Ward was bringing two separate claims arising from "overlapping in-juries". She said Mr Ward did not disclose the injuries he sustained to the doctor arising from the 2016 accident "knowing full well the consequences of doing so'

In striking out the case, Judge Faughnan accepted there had been a collision: "The bottom line here is that there's an acceptance of a collision and there was a shunt." He went on to describe Mr Ward's testimony as "incredulous type of evidence - he can forget when it suits and then he can remember". He

nies cannot pocket er payouts - Naughten

reduce

ne news youts % in the ut s clear

resolve es and ance, it when as a di-Dáil Éire pass-s," he

(Perhich ard by



Deputy Denis Naughten.

my colleagues and I in the Regional Group, Insurance scammers now face up to 10 years in jail and a €100,000 fine after a new law was enacted in July 2021 to crack down on 'compo culture'

"In March of this year, we also introduced a Private Members Bill - the Civil Liability and Courts (Amendment) Bill 2021 – to the Dáil. The Minister for Justice, Helen McEntee gave an undertaking to address the issues and introduce a bill of her own, which we agreed to. However, we will re-introduce this legislation if the Minister does not fulfil her commitment.

"We are now in a position where we can see significant progress in the area, but the progress on reductions in claims will only have the desired effect if we see a significant reduction in insurance premiums," concluded Deputy Naughten.

the rest of the book is a work of fiction based on stories handed down the generations and on Anne's own thoughts after 20 years of research. Pic. Gerry Faughnan



LEITRIM COUNTY COUNCIL **NOTICE PURSUANT TO SECTION 177AE(3) OF THE PLANNING** AND DEVELOPENT ACT 2000 (AS AMENDED) APPLICATION TO AN BORD PLEANALA

Notice is hereby given that Leitrim County Council and on behalf of Roscommon County Council intends to apply to An Bord Pleanála under Section 177AE of the Planning and Development Act, 2000 (as amended) for approval to carry out the following proposed development located in the townland of Hartley, Carrick on Shannon, Co. Leitrim and Cleaheen, Co. Roscommon.

The proposed development comprises:

1.) The demolition of the existing Hartley bridge over the River Shannon

- 2.) Construction of new 3-span replacement bridge structure approximately 25m downstream of the existing bridge crossing
- 3.) Construction of the realigned (vertical and horizontal) L3400 local road on approaches to the new bridge structure.
- 4.) Decommissioning of defunct sections of the L3400 which tied into the bridge it is proposed to demolish.
- 5.) All ancillary works associated with the above works, including:
- a. Temporary Site Compound
- b. Drainage and other Utility Works
- c. Road Safety Barriers
- d. Fencing

A Natura Impact Statement (NIS) has been prepared in respect of the proposed development and forms part of the application for approval submitted to An Bord Pleanála.

The plans and particulars of the proposed development, including the Natura Impact Statement, may be inspected free of charge, or purchased at a fee not exceeding the reasonable cost of making a copy during public opening hours between 29th October 2021 to 10th December 2021 (inclusive of both dates but excluding weekends and bank holidays) at the following locations:

Leitrim County Council, Aras an Chontae, Carrick on Shannon, Co. Leitrim

· Roscommon County Council, Áras an Chontae, Roscommon, County Roscommon

· The Offices of An Bord Pleanála, 64 Marlborough Street, Dublin 1

The plans and particulars, including the Natura Impact Statement, will also be available to view or can be downloaded at http://www.leitrimcoco.ie/eng/Services_A-Z/Planning-and-Development Note: Due to COVID-19, it is recommended that persons contact the relevant office in advance to arrange viewing of the application and to enquire with regard to the current normal opening

Any person may, during the above specified period, make a submission or observation with respect to the proposed development in writing to An Bord Pleanála, 64 Marlborough Street, Dublin 1 not later than 5.30 p.m. on 10th December 2021 relating to:

i. The implications of the proposed development for proper planning and sustainable development in the areas concerned.

ii. The likely effects on the environment of the proposed development, and

iii. The likely significant effects of the proposed development on a European site, if carried out. An Bord Pleanála may give approval to the application with or without conditions or may refuse the application for development.

A person may question the validity of any such decision by the Board by way of an application for judicial review under Order 84 of the Rules of the Superior Courts (S.I. No. 15 of 1986) in accordance with Section 50 of the Planning and Development Act 2000, as amended.