

5

Closing address by defending officer.

It is our contention that the charge of desertion has not been proven, because he was not warned for any operation, therefore he went away only with the idea of coming back for the move.

Closing address by Prosecutor:

The evidence of Sgt. Hopkins proved that the pl. had been warned, the accused was therefore at fault in not staying around. After training with "Buffaloes" for some time, it was common knowledge that they would be used in the next operation. The accused did not make any special effort to trace the Co or its men. Pte. Murray speaks for himself his evidence is not to be relied upon. Pte. McKellar is also unable to ascertain the date. It is our contention that missing his Pl. under such circumstances after being warned for a move, should class the accused as a deserter not as an absentee.

---

Witness as to character: A 76002 Sgt. H. Kruppel sworn states

I am A 76002 Sgt. H. Kruppel, I have known the accused for one and half year, the months of training we have done together in England, I found the accused a very good soldier. After landing in France on D-day, he continued his good work, specially at the Battle of Caen. Later he was transferred to the Scout Pl., reason because he was the best soldier in "A" Coy. If possible I would like to have him back in my pl.