	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Latent Procedure</i></b></p> <p><b>Pitt County Sheriff's Office Forensics Services Unit</b>  <i>Issued by Technical Leader</i></p>	<p><b>Effective Date:</b> 2018/10/23</p>	<p><b>Ver:</b> <b>4</b></p>
<p>Procedure for Writing Results Statements</p>			<p><b>Page #:</b> <b>1 of 6</b></p>

### **Technical Procedure for Writing Results Statements**

**1.0 Purpose** - This procedure shows the approved and authority to modify 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 PCSO Forensic Services Laboratory.

**3.0 Definitions** – FAR – Forensic Analysis Report application to record all latent analysis results to be attached to RMS.

### **4.0 Equipment, Materials and Reagents**

#### **4.1 Equipment and Materials**

- Computer with RMS.
- Latent Evidence Forensic Analysis Report(FAR)

#### **4.2 Reagents** – N/A

**5.0 Procedure** – Report statements shall include an accurate interpretation of the actual results of the examination. The below statements are meant to be guidelines for examiners to report on actual results. These statements shall be used as described below. Exceptions or modifications of these statements shall only be done to clarify conclusions. The examiner shall be able to demonstrate the need for this modification, to the satisfaction of the Technical Leader or designee and the Quality Manager upon technical review. Any portion of these statements that are in (parenthesis) indicates a choice or a mandatory fill of the correct nomenclature.

#### **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 comparison quality latent prints noted or developed on Item (Item number).


**5.1.3** There were no comparison quality latent prints noted on Item (Item number).

**5.1.4** (Number of comparison quality latent prints) comparison quality latent (fingerprint(s)/palm print(s)/impression(s)) was/were noted / developed on Item (Item number).

**5.1.5** The comparison quality latent (fingerprint(s)/palm print(s)/impression(s)), was/were compared to Item (known impressions of) (Subject) and was/were excluded as having been made by the same source.

**5.1.6** Latent (photo, lift number, latent) was compared to known inked impression of ( Subject) and was excluded as having been made by the same source.

***All copies of this document are uncontrolled when printed.***

	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Latent Procedure</i></b></p> <p><b>Pitt County Sheriff's Office Forensics Services Unit</b>  <i>Issued by Technical Leader</i></p>	<p>Effective Date:  <b>2018/10/23</b></p>	<p>Ver:  <b>4</b></p>
<p>Procedure for Writing Results Statements</p>			<p>Page #:  <b>2 of 6</b></p>

**5.1.7** Exclusion/Elimination is the decision by an examiner that there are sufficient features in disagreement to conclude that two friction ridge impressions originated from different sources. Exclusion/Elimination implies that the likelihood of making these observations if the impressions are coming from the same source is so remote that it is considered as a practical impossibility.

**5.1.8** The results of the comparison of latent (fingerprint(s)/palm print(s)/impression(s)) to Item (known impressions of)(Subject) was/were inconclusive as having been made by the same source.

**5.1.9** Inconclusive is the decision by an Examiner that an identification or exclusion cannot be determined based upon a lack of sufficient data/detail present that is in agreement or disagreement.

**5.1.10** The comparison quality latent (fingerprint(s)/palm print(s)/impression(s)) was/were compared to Item (-known inked impression of Subject) and was/were identified as having been made by the (finger, palm of subject).

**5.1.11** Latent (photo #, lift#, latent#) was compared to known inked impression of (subject) and was identified as having been made by the (finger, palm of subject).


Identification is defined as the decision by an examiner that there are sufficient features in agreement to conclude that two (2) 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.

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


**5.1.13** The comparison quality latent (fingerprint(s)/palm print(s)/impression(s)) was/were compared to Item(known inked impressions of)(Subject) and was/were identified as having been made by (subject):(Photo #, lift#, latent#) by the (finger, palm of subject).

**5.1.13.1**For identifications to multiple fingers/palms and/or multiple subjects, a list format may be used.

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.”

	<p align="center"><b>Latent Procedure</b></p> <p><b>Pitt County Sheriff's Office Forensics Services Unit</b></p> <p><i>Issued by Technical Leader</i></p>	<b>Effective Date:</b> 2018/10/23	<b>Ver:</b> <b>4</b>
		Procedure for Writing Results Statements	

- 5.1.14 The comparison quality latent/inked (fingerprint(s)/palm print(s)/impression(s)) was/were of sufficient value for entry into the State Automated Fingerprint Identification System (SAFIS)
- 5.1.15 The comparison quality latent (fingerprint(s)/palm print(s)/impression(s)) was/were searched on the SAFIS with (results of search).
- 5.1.16 Due to no elimination prints being submitted for comparison purposes, the comparison quality latent/inked (fingerprint(s)/palm print(s)/impression(s)) was/were not retained in the SAFIS database.
- 5.1.17 Elimination prints from involved potential donors shall be forwarded to this analyst for further analysis prior to any further SAFIS searching. Latent prints shall be forward to unsolved latent file to be searched periodically as deemed appropriate by the Latent Examiner.
- 5.1.18 The comparison quality latent (fingerprint(s)/palm print(s)/impression(s)) was/were compared to Item (known inked impression of) with no identification(s) being effected, however 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)/palm print(s)/impression(s)). Major case inked impressions, with emphasis on (area needed), will be required to conduct a conclusive comparison.
- 5.1.19 The comparison quality latent (fingerprint(s)/palm print(s)/impression(s)) remain(s) unidentified.
- 5.1.20 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 Examiner listed below.
- 5.1.21 Pursuant to a request from (officer and date), no further analysis was conducted on the above listed evidence.
- 5.1.22 There were no identifiable latent prints noted on this Item.
- 5.1.23 The identifiable latent (photo/lift #,fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) was/were compared to Known Inked Impression of (Subject) and was/were identified as having been made by the (finger/Palm of subject).
- 5.1.24 A search of the SBI Identification Files(SAFIS) ,Pitt County Sheriff Office files and FBI Files, utilizing the information provided, failed to disclose known inked impressions of (subject's name); therefore, no comparison was conducted between this individual and the (number) comparison latent (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) photo/lift #, noted on Item (Item number).

	<p align="center"><b><i>Latent Procedure</i></b></p> <p><b>Pitt County Sheriff's Office Forensics Services Unit</b>  <i>Issued by Technical Leader</i></p>	<p><b>Effective Date:</b>  2018/10/23</p>	<p><b>Ver:</b>  <b>4</b></p>
<p>Procedure for Writing Results Statements</p>			<p><b>Page #:</b>  <b>4 of 6</b></p>

**5.1.25** The identifiable latent (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) photo/lift #, was/were compared to (Known inked Impression of (subject) and was/were identified as having been made by (subject's (finger identified):

**5.1.25.1** 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."

**5.1.26** The identifiable latent/inked (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) photo/lift #, was/were of sufficient value for entry into the State Automated Fingerprint Identification System (SAFIS) [or the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS)].

**5.1.27** The comparison quality latent (fingerprint(s)/palmprint(s)/impression(s)) was/were compared to Item (Item number) known inked impression of subject(s) with no identification(s) being effected. The known inked impressions submitted on or on file for (subject) are of insufficient detail to conduct a conclusive comparison. Major case inked impressions, with emphasis on (area needed), will be required to conduct a conclusive comparison.

**5.1.28** Other statements of results as approved during technical review by the Technical Leader or designee and the Quality Manager.

**5.2 Standards and Controls – N/A**

**5.3 Calibration – N/A**

**5.4 Sampling – N/A**

**5.5 Calculations – N/A**

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

**6.0 Limitations - N/A**

**7.0 Safety - N/A**


**8.0 References –**

Laboratory Quality System Procedure for Reporting of Results

SWGFAST Documents on Reporting of results


Latent Section References and Resources Repository

***All copies of this document are uncontrolled when printed.***

	<p align="center"><b><i>Latent Procedure</i></b></p> <p><b>Pitt County Sheriff's Office Forensics Services Unit</b>  <i>Issued by Technical Leader</i></p>	<p>Effective Date: 2018/10/23</p>	<p>Ver: <b>4</b></p>
<p>Procedure for Writing Results Statements</p>			<p>Page #: <b>5 of 6</b></p>

**9.0 Records – N/A**

**10.0 Attachments – N/A**

	<p align="center"><b><i>Latent Procedure</i></b></p> <p><b>Pitt County Sheriff's Office Forensics Services Unit</b>  <i>Issued by Technical Leader</i></p>	<p>Effective Date: 2018/10/23</p>	<p>Ver: <b>4</b></p>
<p>Procedure for Writing Results Statements</p>			<p>Page #: <b>6 of 6</b></p>

REVISION HISTORY		
CURRENT VERSION	EFFECTIVE DATE	SUMMARY OF CHANGES
1	2016/07/01	Original Version
2	2016/08/15	Modified statements from original , Added language to give authority of approval of change in statement to further clarify.
3	2018/04/01	Add text in purpose, Modify revision history and change effective date.
4	2018/10/23	Clarify procedure for allowing modification to result statements. Add and define “inconclusive” result.

***All copies of this document are uncontrolled when printed.***