

of business. I don't know if my friend was absent or otherwise but at times thought so. I never saw any documents concerning this vehicle. I did not tell the provost the other man was the driver because he didn't ask me. I knew the vehicle the provost referred to because the Coy Comd mentioned it when he called the provost in my presence say that I was in possession of a vehicle. I did not deny it either to the coy Comd or provosts because I thought we had been seen driving around in it and also that the driver had been arrested. I thought the driver had been arrested because they found out where I was so thought he must have squealed. The other soldier knew I was AWL. At the time I was arrested I had funny ideas about him and would not have been surprised to find that he had been arrested. I knew where the jeep was because it was always parked there. At no time in conversation with the Coy Comd or provosts did I deny that I was in possession of the jeep. I realized I was being accused of the offence but did not deny it as I was not asked if I was in possession and wasn't concerned in what they thought as I was not involved. I heard the provost say "that he asked me if I had a vehicle" and definitely deny that he did so and would say he wasn't telling the truth. Any rides I had in the jeep were just for the ride (so far as I was concerned).
RP 83 (b) complied with. "GBC"

Prosecution sums up

Defence replies

Court closes to consider the finding.

SUMMING UP PROSECUTION D175515 Rfn Frank Craig

President of the court, gentlemen

Pte Craig was in a transit camp. He was AWL, we learned from the CMP corporal that Pte Craig told him the jeep was his. And he had taken from his unit. He never denied possession when faced with improper possession at the transit camp

He says that he has been staying with another soldier, supposed to be the driver of this vehicle, for three weeks. He saw him pretty often, during that time. Still he doesn't know his name, nor what he was doing in Calais.

Gentlemen, it is my personal opinion that Pte Craig was in improper possession of that and should be tried as such.

"F Matte" Capt
Prosecutor

Belgium
27 Apr 45

SUMMING UP OF THE DEFENCE CASE OF Rn CRAIG RWR D175515

1. Not at any time has it been proven that the accused was actually in possession of the said vehicle or at any time seen driving this vehicle.
2. The MP (witness for the prosecution) stated at no time did he see the accused driving or being at anytime a passenger of the vehicle.
3. The accused stated he had been a passenger in the vehicle but at no time drove it.
4. The vehicle in my opinion has never been proven to be the property of the unit of the accused, as it was stated by the provost that the vehicle belonged to the RWR.

"V Pope" Lieut
Defending Officer