

1st Lt. H. A. M. J. M. J.
 President, DCM

CLOSING ADDRESS BY DEFENDING OFFICER

We have heard by the evidence that Private Laplante as the accused has signed for two packs. Now the normal military routine on any soldier having an item on his charge and missing it anywhere or being deficient before he is issued with another, he is usually charged and then the item is replaced. This MFC 800 shows two packs having been issued but this man was not charged. It is agreed that the accused had signed for them but it is not thought that he had noticed the error at that time. In addition to that it is found that on the 20th of October, 1949, that the accused is short one pack because there are two on his 800. Two shown and yet on the same 800 on the 17th of ~~October~~ 1949. *ABH* there is no shortage shown and no deficiencies shown so that we can only draw one conclusion -- that the accused received only one pack....Thank you.

Judge Advocate: Did the accused have a pack with him on his absence?

Defending Officer: Yes, Sir, he did.

Judge Advocate: Then the Court of Inquiry should have found he was deficient one at that time?

Defending Officer: Yes, there is no deficiency of a pack shown on the Court of Inquiry. So that I can only, from the evidence given, I would recommend and point out to the Court that the Defendant is not guilty as charged.

ABH