CASPIR.warplane.com

CASPIR Aircraft Accident Cards

Serial: KB112

Title: de Havilland Mosquito B.Mk. XX serial:KB112 Accident Card

Author: Royal Air Force (RAF)

Subject: This accident involved 1 aircraft on 1944-April-05. Mosquito X s/n KB112. This accident involved 2 people. Shemilt GL, Whitney DC

Keywords: RAFMosquito X,KB112,36 OTU,36 Operational Training Unit,Aerodrome,1944-April-05,Shemilt,WhitneyRCAF L20

Created: 1944-04-05

Link: https://caspir.warplane.com/aircraft/serial-search/aircraft-no/200001095#KB112

ACCIDENT CLASSIFICATION

UNIT	COM.	PLACE	DATE	TIME
36 O.T.U. Greenwood	E	M.A.	5-4-44	1655

H.Q. FILE 1300-KB112

A/C TYPE	NO.	CRASH CAT.	S.E.	M.E.	DAY	NIGHT
MOSQUITO X	KB112	"B"		x	x	

PERSONNEL	RANK	NUMBER	DUTY	INJURIES
SHERLIL, G.L. DFC	F/O	J8405	P	Uninj.
WHITNEY, D.C.	Lieut		PASS	Uninj.

SIGNAL

NO.	DATE
A.581	6-4

D 14 (REVISED)

NO.	CHECKED
44	✓

#1

ENGINE	ENGINE NUMBER (S)
Packard Merlin	A6316/A325670 serious
xxx	A6360/A325699

HOURS FLOWN BY PILOTS

INST.	NIGHT	ON TYPE SOLO	ON TYPE DUAL	TOTAL SOLO	TOTAL DUAL
150	225	290	2	600	100

ACCIDENT CLASSIFICATION

TYPE OF A/C

TYPE OF UNIT

CATEGORY

COMMAND

MONTH

STAGE OF FLIGHT

FORCED LANDING
TAXYING
LANDING
TAKE-OFF
FLIGHT
STAT'RY

INJURY
FATAL
INJ
3RD
S
Z

RAF
M

PURPOSE OF FLIGHT:
Night flying test.

NATURE OF ACCIDENT:
Pilot made unusually wide ciruit after selectin wheels down as a/c were landing ahead. A/C made normal touch down and after 200 yds run stbd u/c collapsed.

CLASSIFICATION:
~~33. Technical defect.~~ (18)
18. Misc. Technical

SECONDARY OR CONTRIBUTORY FACTORS:
(35)
35. M/C Defect

R. C. A. F. L 20 (REVISED)
7M-4-43 (3202) K. P. 5051
H. Q. 885-L 20

TECHNICAL OFFICER'S REPORT:
From tests made it is concluded that technical failu was not involved.
LUC/RCDOW/LCDL

COURT OF INQUIRY OR INVESTIGATING OFFICER'S REPORT:
FINDINGS: SUMMARY No.

Remarks of Unit C.O.
F/O Shemilt has a very good history as pilot. His flying here confirms this, as he has demonstrated that he is most careful and attentive to detail in flying. This accident (in view of technical report) would seem to indicate he did not make absolutely sure both u/c legs were locked down. There are however ample precedents that prove warning devices to be unsound or indicate that u/c is safely locked, when in fact it is not. In my view the fact that an accident occurred in a plane he was piloting has been punishment enough and that endorsement would not have the beneficial result it is intended to provide for other pilots with a different temperament. I recommend that he be admonished by Station Commander in view of element of doubt that can be said to exist (in his view) in this case.

ACTION TAKEN:
NIL

C. C. LTD. 7084-43