

## Technical Procedure for Writing Results Statements

**1.0 Purpose** - This procedure presents the approved statements that shall be used for reporting results in the latent discipline.

**2.0 Scope** - This procedure applies to all written result statements for the latent discipline of the State Crime Laboratory.

**3.0 Definitions** – N/A

### 4.0 Equipment, Materials and Reagents

#### 4.1 Equipment and Materials

- Computer with Forensic Advantage (FA) application.

#### 4.2 Reagents – N/A

**5.0 Procedure** – Analyses shall include an accurate interpretation of the actual results of the examination; this interpretation may include one (1) or more of the following responses or a variation approved by the Forensic Scientist Manager or his/her designee and the Crime Laboratory Director.

#### 5.1 Latent Print Analyses

**5.1.1** There were no latent prints noted or developed on Item (Item number).

**5.1.2** There were no latent prints noted on Item (Item number).

**5.1.3** There were no identifiable latent prints noted or developed on Item (Item number).

**5.1.4** There were no identifiable latent prints noted on Item (Item number).

**5.1.5** (Number of identifiable latent prints) identifiable latent (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) was/were noted/developed on Item (Item number).

**5.1.6** The identifiable latent (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) was/were compared to Item (Item number) with no identification(s) being effected.

**5.1.7** The identifiable latent (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) was/were compared to Item (Item number) and was/were identified as having been made by the (finger of subject).

**5.1.8** No known inked palmprint impressions were submitted; therefore, no comparison with Item (Item number) could be conducted.

**5.1.9** A search of the SBI Identification Files (or AFIT), based on the information provided, failed to disclose known inked impressions of (subject's name); therefore, no comparison could be conducted between this individual and the (number) identifiable latent (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) noted on Item (Item number).

**5.1.10** The identifiable latent (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) was/were compared to (Item number) and was/were identified as having been made by (subject): Identification is defined as

“the decision by an examiner that there are sufficient features in agreement to conclude that two areas of friction ridge impressions originated from the same source. Identification of an impression to one source is the decision that the likelihood the impression was made by another (different) source is so remote that it is considered a practical impossibility.”

**5.1.10.1** (Number) by the (finger identified).

**5.1.10.2** For identifications to multiple fingers and/or multiple subjects, a list format shall be used.

**5.1.11** The identifiable latent/inked (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) was/were of sufficient value for entry into the State Automated Fingerprint Identification System (SAFIS) [or the Advanced Fingerprint Identification Technology (AFIT)].

**5.1.12** The identifiable latent/inked (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) was/were of insufficient value for entry into the State Automated Fingerprint Identification System (SAFIS) [or the Advanced Fingerprint Identification Technology (AFIT)].

**5.1.13** The identifiable latent (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) was/were searched on the SAFIS (AFIT) with (results of search).

**5.1.14** The (number) identifiable latent/inked (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) was/were entered into and searched by the SAFIS with no identification being effected. Due to no elimination prints being submitted for comparison purposes, the (number) identifiable latent/inked (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) was/were not retained in the SAFIS database. Elimination prints must be submitted before a subsequent search will be conducted.

**5.1.15** The known inked impressions submitted on or on file for (subject) are of insufficient detail to conduct a conclusive comparison; therefore, this cannot be considered a conclusive comparison with the unidentified latent (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)). Major case inked impressions, with emphasis on (area needed), will be required to conduct a conclusive comparison.

**5.1.16** The identifiable latent (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) remain(s) unidentified.

**5.1.17** A records check through the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) database and a check with the submitting agency on (date) indicate that this case has been dispositioned. The evidence in this case is being returned unworked. If you have any questions concerning this action, please contact the Forensic Scientist listed below.

**5.1.18** Pursuant to a request from (officer and date), no further analysis was conducted on the above listed evidence.

**5.1.19** Other statements of results as approved by the Forensic Scientist Manager or designee and the Lab Director.

## **5.2 Footwear/Tire Track Analyses**

**NOTE** - There are several variations of the results possible in reports concerning impression evidence. The results are based upon the condition of the submitted questioned and known evidence which concerns the outsole design, outsole design elements, tire tread design, tire tread design elements,

questioned design elements, physical size of the outsole/tire tread/questioned design elements, and the general wear (or lack of general wear) of the outsole design, outsole design elements, tire tread design, tire tread design elements, and/or questioned design elements.

- 5.2.1** There was/were (number/several/overlapping) (questioned impression(s) and/or questioned footwear impression(s) and/or tire tread impression(s)) noted/developed on/in Item (Item number).
- 5.2.2** The questioned footwear impression(s) noted/developed on/in Item (Item number) was/were compared to the known (right shoe(s)/left shoe(s)/ pair of shoes) submitted in Item (Item number). The questioned footwear impression(s) noted/developed on/in Item (Item number) was/were made by the known (right shoe(s)/left shoe(s)/pair of shoes submitted in Item (Item number).
- 5.2.3** The questioned tire tread impression(s) noted/developed on/in Item (Item number) was/were compared to the known tire(s) submitted in Item (Item number). The questioned tire tread impression(s) noted/developed on /in Item (Item number) was/were made by the known (correct tire) submitted as Item (Item number).
- 5.2.4** The questioned glove impression(s) was/were noted/developed on Item (Item number) and was compared to the known glove submitted as Item (Item number). The questioned glove impression(s) noted on Item (Item number) was made by the known (right glove/left glove/pair of gloves) submitted as Item (Item number).
- 5.2.5** The questioned footwear impression(s) noted/developed on/in Item (Item number) correspond(s) in (outsole design or outsole design elements/outsole design or outsole design elements and physical size/outsole design or outsole design elements, physical size, and general wear) with the known (right shoe/left shoe/pair of shoes) submitted in Item (Item number) and could have been made by that/those shoe(s) or any other (right shoe/left shoe/pair of shoes) having the same (outsole design or outsole design elements/outsole design or outsole design elements and physical size/outsole design or outsole design elements, physical size, and general wear). Due to the limited detail in the questioned footwear impression, a more positive association could not be made.
- 5.2.6** The questioned tire tread impression(s) noted/developed on/in Item (Item number) was compared to the known tire(s) submitted in Item (Item number). The questioned tire tread impression(s) correspond(s) with the (tire tread design or tire tread design elements/tire tread design or tire tread design elements and physical size of the elements/tire tread design or tire tread design elements, physical size of the elements, and general wear with the known tire(s) (note the correct tire(s)) submitted in Item (Item number) and could have been made by that/those tire(s) or any other tire(s) having the same (tire tread design or tire tread design elements/tire tread design or tire tread design elements and physical size of the elements/tire tread design or tire tread design elements, physical size of the elements, and general wear of that tire tread design. Due to the limited detail in the questioned tire tread impression(s), a more positive association could not be made.
- 5.2.7** The (questioned impression(s) and/or glove impression(s)) noted/developed on/in Item (Item number) was compared to the (known object's impression(s) and/or glove(s) impression(s)) submitted as Item (Item number). The (questioned impression(s) and/or glove impression(s)) correspond(s) in or with the design of the elements on the inner palm area of the glove(s) and/or the "grip side" of the glove(s) and/or the known object submitted as Item (Item number) and

could have been made by either the (left glove and/or the right glove and/or an object) with the same design characteristics. Due to the limited detail in the (questioned glove impression(s) and/or the questioned impression(s)), a more positive association could not be made.

- 5.2.8** The (questioned impression(s) and/or questioned footwear impression (s) and/or questioned tire tread impression(s)) noted in the photograph(s) submitted as Item (Item number) correspond(s) in (outsole/tread design or outsole/tread design elements/outsole/tread design or outsole/tread design elements and physical size/outsole/tread design or outsole/tread design elements, physical size, and general wear) with the known (right shoe(s)/(left shoe(s)/pair of shoes/left tire(s)/right tire(s)/front tires/rear tires/ all four tire(s)) submitted in Item (Item number). Due to the fact that (there was no scale included in the image(s), the scale was not at the same level as the questioned impression(s), the (questioned impression(s) and/or questioned footwear impression (s) and/or questioned tire tread impression(s)) was/were not photographed at a 90 ° angle), a 1:1 enlargement could not be produced and a more positive association could not be made.
- 5.2.9** The (questioned impression(s) and/or questioned footwear impression (s) and/or questioned tire tread impression(s)) noted/developed on/in Item (Item number) was/were compared to the known shoe(s)/tire(s)/glove(s) submitted in Item (Item number). The (questioned impression(s) and/or questioned footwear impression (s) and/or questioned tire tread impression(s)) noted/developed on/in Item (Item number) was/were of a different (outsole design/tread design/design element); therefore, the impression(s) was/were not made by the known shoe(s)/tire(s)/glove(s) submitted in Item (Item number).
- 5.2.10** The (questioned impression(s) and/or glove impression(s)) noted on/in Item (Item number) was compared to the (known object's impression(s) and/or glove impression(s)) submitted as Item (Item number). The (questioned impression(s) and/or glove impression(s)) contain(s) a (different design element on the inner palm area and/or the "grip side" of the glove and/or the design elements of the known object); therefore, the (questioned impression(s) and/or glove impression(s)) were/was not made by the known object/glove submitted as Item (Item number).
- 5.2.11** The questioned impression(s)/footwear impression(s)/tire tread impression(s) developed/ noted on/in Item (Item number) was/were insufficient for comparison purposes.
- 5.2.12** The questioned footwear impression(s)/tire tread impression(s) was/were searched on the Shoeprint Image Capture and Retrieval (SICAR) system. The pattern of the questioned footwear impression(s)/tire tread impression(s) was similar, but may not be limited, to the outsole design/tire tread design of the (name brand) and could have been made by that (name brand) or any other shoe/tire of the same outsole design/tire tread design.
- 5.2.13** The questioned footwear impression(s)/tire tread impression(s) were/was searched on the Shoeprint Image Capture and Retrieval (SICAR) system. A possible source of the questioned footwear impression(s)/tire tread impression(s) was not located.
- 5.2.14** The questioned tire tread impression(s) were/was searched on the Shoeprint Image Capture and Retrieval (SICAR) and/or the Tread Assistance system(s). A possible source of the questioned tire tread impression(s) was not located.
- 5.2.15** The questioned tire tread impression(s) were/was searched on the Shoeprint Image Capture and Retrieval (SICAR) and/or the Tread Assistance system(s). The pattern of the questioned tire tread impression(s) was similar, but may not be limited, to the tire tread design of the (brand name) tire and could have been made by that brand of tire.

**5.2.16** Other statements of results as approved by the Forensic Scientist Manager and/or his/her designee and the Lab Director.

**5.3 Standards and Controls** – N/A

**5.4 Calibration** – N/A

**5.5 Sampling** – N/A

**5.6 Calculations** – N/A

**5.7 Uncertainty of Measurement** – N/A

**6.0 Limitations** - N/A

**7.0 Safety** - N/A

**8.0 References** – This Technical Procedure was extracted from the 2009 Latent Evidence Section Policy and Procedures Manual.

**9.0 Records** – N/A

**10.0 Attachments** – N/A

<b>Revision History</b>		
Effective Date	Version Number	Reason
09/17/2012	1	Original Document
05/03/2013	2	5.1.10 - added definition of Identification to result statement