

Q losing address DG page 4.
Reference

DG paid.

21 Mar 46 ^W

The Court has heard the evidence of the witnesses so I will not take up time necessary to re-examine each one, but only bring a few points to the Court's attention.

The Court has heard the evidence of the identification parade held on 25 Feb 46. When only Esau v.o. Kuyumt could identify the accused, and the other witnesses failed utterly to do so. In Court Esau v.o. Kuyumt testified that the accused was not driving the jeep, yet the other witnesses whose veracity I will leave to the Court to judge identified the accused in Court and two said he was the driver. One went so far as to deny he has spoken to his family of the Court martial which must of been one of the biggest events in their hum hum Dulik village existence.

their statements differed very widely in many respects from previous statements they gave on the summary of evidence. Evidence was given that the jeep was travelling on the right hand side of the road and that it had a faulty muffler which could easily lead to the view it was travelling a great deal faster than it actually was.

The other vehicles a ~~truck~~^{van} & right hand drive with 3 in the front seat, 9 with the count of the witness. Paton was sitting in the centre of an dining truck.