

CASE OF

B.83934

Cpl

(A/Sjt)

ELDRIDGE

T.W.M.

CCOD

D-3 - PROSECUTION -

FIRST WITNESS

Capt J.A. EVEREST, MT Tech Stores Coy, 1 CCOD, having been duly sworn, states:

I am the Tpt Offr of MT Tech Stores 1 CCOD and have been since June 44. Vehicle CZ 4209900 is a 15 cwt vehicle and assigned for AD and fire duties. It is also on charge to MT Tech Stores. The duties it is assigned for are AD duties within the Bordon area, and it is also used as a tow veh by the Fire Supt of the area, and may be called upon by him. The normal limits are within the Bordon military subdistrict. On 9 Sep 44 there was no call made for this vehicle by the Fire Supt's office. The Woolmer Hotel and the village of Woolmer are not within the Camp area. Longmoor Camp is situated between Bordon and Woolmer and from the record I have from the Fire Supt I understand there is fire fighting eqpt in the Longmoor Camp. There is an order prohibiting WD vehs taking personnel to pubs, MT Dvrs Regs para 44 sub para D-4 sets this out. To my knowledge this veh was never used for recreational purposes. I have here a work ticket for this veh for the period 1-10 Sep, it shows a mileage of 70 miles on 9 Sep compared to a daily average of 12 miles on other days. The OC, the Tpt Offr or the Acting Tpt Offr in the unit would be authorized to sign a work ticket, and in the case of an emergency the Fires Supt could order this veh out to the scene but would not sign the ticket. In the absence of the OC, the A/OC, or the TIC or the Duty Offr could also sign this work ticket. On the 9 Sep I was on leave and Mr Slater was the Tpt Offr in my absence. He is now o/s.

WORK TICKET OFFERED AND RECD IN EVIDENCE AND MARKED EXHIBIT 1.

THE PROSECUTOR STATED THAT THE ORIGINAL WORK TICKET WAS URGENTLY REQUIRED BY THE UNIT AND HE TENDERED A COPY OF THE WORK TICKET CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE COPY.

THE PRESIDENT COMPARED THE COPY WITH THE ORIGINAL AND CERTIFIED THE COPY TO BE A CORRECT COPY.

COPY OF WORK TICKET MARKED EXHIBIT 1 BY THE COURT.

NO CROSS-EXAMINATION

IN THE OPINION OF THE COURT IT IS UNNECESSARY TO COMPLY WITH RF 63(B).

SECOND WITNESS

Capt R.U. NIVEN, MT Tech Stores Coy 1 CCOD, having been duly sworn, states:

On Sat night 9 Sep 44 I was Duty Offr 1 CCOD. About 2120 hrs a pro reported to me that veh CZ 4209900 on charge to MT Stores and driven by Pte Petrie had been involved in an accident with a bus near Whitehill at 2040 hrs. On making my rounds at approx 2300 hrs I saw the driver of the veh Pte Petrie in the gd room and he was sober. I inspected the veh at approx 2305 hrs and damage was slight, some red paint had been scraped into the left front fender and the well above the tire/ on the left side of the vehicle.

Q. Recognize Exhibit 1?

A. Yes, it is the work ticket for veh CZ 4209900.

NO CROSS-EXAMINATION

IN THE OPINION OF THE COURT IT IS UNNECESSARY TO COMPLY WITH RF 63(B).

THIRD WITNESS

*MW*