



ARCHIVED

STANDARD FOR REPORTING FRICTION RIDGE EXAMINATIONS (LATENT/TENPRINT)

Preamble

SWGFAST recognizes the importance of providing the recipient with an accurate, comprehensive, and understandable friction ridge examination report. A report is a summary of the friction ridge impression examinations performed in a case (case as defined by organization policy). Additional materials and case documentation may be available.

1 Scope

This document provides the minimum information that shall be included in a report. Additional information may be included.

For purposes of this document, automated responses generated by an automated fingerprint identification system (AFIS) are not considered reports.

2 Required Elements

- 2.1** Title of report (e.g., type of report)
- 2.2** Reporting organization and location
- 2.3** Pagination, including total number of pages
- 2.4** Submitting agency or individual
- 2.5** Case identifier on each page
- 2.6** Date of report
- 2.7** Evidence or request information, if applicable

- 2.7.1** Description

- 2.7.2** Unique identifier (e.g., item number, evidence number, serial number)

- 2.8** Exemplar information

Exemplar information for comparisons, except exclusions as a result of an AFIS search, shall be listed in the report.

- 2.8.1** Name, to include alias if necessary (per organization policy)

- 2.8.2** Anatomical source (e.g., fingers, palms, foot)

- 2.8.3** Origin of exemplar (e.g., provided, obtained from archive, obtained from database)

- 2.8.4** Personal identification number (e.g., FBI number, state identification number, local identification number), date of birth, or unique identifier
- 2.9** Examination results
 - 2.9.1** Statement that processing was conducted, if applicable
 - 2.9.2** Statement that analysis was performed
 - 2.9.3** The value determination of friction ridge impressions
 - 2.9.3.1** Description of item or unique identifier, from which suitable, non-suitable or no friction ridge impressions were detected by the reporting examiner. For non-original evidence (e.g., lift, photographs, and digital), description of original item shall also be indicated, if available
 - 2.9.4** Statement that comparisons were conducted, if applicable
 - 2.9.5** Statement that AFIS searches were conducted, if applicable
 - 2.9.5.1** Databases searched (local, state, federal)
 - 2.9.5.2** Search results (not intended to require or recommend the inclusion of individual candidate information)
 - 2.9.5.3** Statement indicating unidentified friction ridge impression(s) registered to unsolved latent or tenprint database, if applicable
 - 2.9.6** For all conclusions, the following shall be documented in the report:
 - 2.9.6.1** Name on exemplar
 - 2.9.6.2** Unique identifier of exemplar, if available
 - 2.9.6.3** If no personal identification number available, the date of birth, if available
 - 2.9.6.4** Description of item or unique identifier, from which suitable friction ridge impressions were detected. For non-original evidence, description of original item shall also be indicated
 - 2.9.6.5** For identification conclusions, simultaneous impressions shall be reported if an identification conclusion is reached and none of the impressions stand alone.
 - 2.9.6.6** The reason for each inconclusive determination.
 - 2.9.6.7** Statement that items submitted were not examined, if applicable.
- 2.10** Name, signature, or equivalent, of examiner
- 2.11** Glossary or explanation of technical terms and abbreviations, if applicable.
- 2.12** If applicable, a statement indicating that limited comparisons were conducted or suitable latent prints were not compared.

3 Suggested Elements

- 3.1** Date of request
- 3.2** Date evidence received
- 3.3** Friction ridge impression detection techniques (e.g., black powder, chemicals, or digital imaging software)
- 3.4** Statement indicating the friction ridge impression comparison process(es) used
- 3.5** Total number of suitable friction ridge impressions per item

- 3.6** For identifications
 - 3.6.1** Anatomical source to include specific finger, palm, or toe
 - 3.6.2** Unique identifier of friction ridge impression
- 3.7** Statement of verification(s) performed, if applicable
- 3.8** Identity of verifier(s)
- 3.9** Statement indicating conflicting conclusions resolved by organization policy and not due to an examiner changing their decision (e.g., organization policy dictates the most conservative conclusion is reported out).
- 3.10** Disposition of evidence
- 3.11** Statement indicating exemplar(s) disposition, not to be confused with arrest disposition (e.g., tenprint card, palm prints added to file)
- 3.12** Statement that materials (e.g., case notes or standard operating procedures) are on file.
- 3.13** Qualifying statements indicating the significance of conclusions (e.g., the presence of a friction ridge print on an item of evidence does not necessarily indicate the significance or time frame in which the print was deposited).
- 3.14** Opinion or interpretation statement (e.g., the examination results and conclusions are the opinion of the examiner issuing the report).

Appendix A

Example Report 1 (short version – emphasizing content, not format) Requirements highlighted in blue

ABC Police Department (ABC, USA)

Latent Print Unit – Latent Print Analysis Report

Case Number: 2010-12345

Requestor: Detective Toni Roberts, ABC PD

Exemplars:

Submitted fingerprint records:

MICHELE TRIPLETT, DOB 08/15/1995

MITCH HOLLARS, DOB 08/31/1994

Fingerprint record printed from AFIS¹ archive:

HERMAN BERGMAN, PIN 123

Evidence:

5 Latent lifts collected at scene submitted by Crime Scene Unit Supervisor Melissa Gische as follows:

Latent lift #1(A) – fingerprint – “rear passenger panel”

Latent lift #2(A-B) – fingerprints – “outside rear roof passenger side”

Latent lift #3 – outside rear passenger window passenger side”

Latent lift #4(A) – fingerprint (tip) – “outside driver door”

Latent lift #5(A) – fingerprint – “outside driver door”

RESULTS OF ACE-V² COMPARISON PROCESS:

TRIPLETT, HOLLARS, and BERGMAN were excluded as the source of latents #1A, 2A, 2B, and 5A.

TRIPLETT, HOLLARS, and BERGMAN were inconclusively³ compared to latent #4A. Exemplars from the tip area of the fingers are needed.

Latent lift #3 contains insufficient friction ridge detail for comparison.

Page 1 of 2

¹ AFIS – The acronym for Automated Fingerprint Identification System, a generic term for a fingerprint matching, storage, and retrieval system.

² ACE-V – The acronym for a scientific method: Analysis, Comparison, Evaluation, and Verification (see individual terms).

³ Inconclusive – The determination by an examiner that there is neither sufficient agreement to individualize, nor sufficient disagreement to exclude.

VERIFICATION⁴:

Forensic Latent Print Examiner Kasey Wertheim verified the conclusions.

Leonard Butt

September 16, 2011

Leonard Butt

Date

Case Number: 2010-12345

Page 2 of 2

⁴ Verification – The independent application of the ACE process as utilized by a subsequent examiner to either support or refute the conclusions of the original examiner; this may be conducted as blind verification. Verification may be followed by some level of review as specified by agency policy.

Standard for Reporting Friction Ridge Examinations
3/09/2012 ver. 1.0.1
Posted: 6/23/2012

Example Report 2 (long version – emphasizing content, not format)

Requirements highlighted in blue

ABC Police Department (ABC, USA)

Latent Print Unit

123 Main Street

Washington D.C. 20035

Latent Print Analysis Report

To: Detective Toni Roberts

Date: September 16, 2011

ABC PD

Case Number: 2010-12345

Case Title: Bank of ABC

123 ABC Blvd.

ABC, USA

Feb. 28, 2010

Bank Robbery

Date specimens received: March 3, 2010

Fingerprint Analyst: Leonard Butt

The items listed below were examined in the Latent Print Unit:

Item #	Description	
1	Demand note beginning, "I have a gun..."	Submitted
2	Bank of ABC withdrawal form	Submitted
3	Pen with chain	Submitted
4	Lift indicated as coming from customer counter	Submitted
5	Ski mask	Submitted
6	Fingerprints of MICHELE TRIPLETT, ABCPD #123456	Printed from ABCAFIS archive
7	Fingerprints of MITCH HOLLARS, ABCPD #987654	• Printed from ABCAFIS as a result of an automated search

Table 1: Items examined in Latent Print Section

Results of Examinations:

Items of evidence submitted to the Latent Print Unit for examination may be examined visually, examined with various light sources, or processed with chemicals and powders to detect the presence of latent friction ridge prints. The specific sequence of examinations and processes depends upon the nature of the evidence.*

ABC PD conducts friction ridge print examinations using the Analysis, Comparison, Evaluation, and Verification (ACE-V) process. The first step in the process is Analysis, which is conducted independently on first the latent then the known prints. During this step, each print is analyzed for both the quality and quantity of information present. The quality and quantity of information observed during the Analysis phase determines whether the print contains suitable information to conduct a comparison with another print. I detected four latent fingerprints on Items 1, 2, and 4 that were suitable for comparison.

Item #	Description	Processing techniques applied	# of prints	Processing technique
1	Demand note beginning, "I have a gun..."	Visual, LASER, UV, Crimescope, DFO/LASER, Ninhydrin, Physical Developer	2 (L1a, L1b)	1 DFO/LASER, 1 Ninhydrin
2	Bank of ABC withdrawal form	Visual, LASER, UV, Crimescope, DFO/LASER, Ninhydrin, Physical Developer	1 (L2)	Ninhydrin
3	Pen with chain	Visual, LASER, UV, Crimescope, Cyanoacrylate fuming, RUVIS, Cyanoacrylate dye stain/LASER/UV/Crimescope, White Powder	1	No friction ridge impressions detected
4	Lift indicated as coming from customer counter	Visual – see crime scene log for additional information	1 (L4)	Black powder lift
5	Ski mask	No processing or analysis	1	1

Table 2: Processing techniques applied and prints determined to be suitable for comparison

In the Comparison phase of the ACE-V process, I conducted a side-by-side comparison of a latent print with an exemplar. I examined both prints for similarities and differences, assessing ridges sequentially for agreement or disagreement in all levels of detail.

In the Evaluation phase of the ACE-V, I considered all of the information gathered during Analysis and Comparison to reach conclusions about the origin of the latent prints. I compared the four latent fingerprints to the fingerprints of MICHELE TRIPLETT, ABCPD #123456, with the following results:

*See Processing Guide for Developing Latent Prints, ABC PD, Revised 2001.

Item #	Description	# of prints	Results of comparison with MICHELE TRIPLETT, ABCPD #123456
1	Demand note beginning, "I have a gun..."	2	2 Identifications
2	Bank of ABC withdrawal form	1	Exclusion
4	Lift indicated as coming from customer counter	1	Exclusion

Table 3: Results of comparisons with MICHELE TRIPLETT, ABCPD #123456

The remaining two unidentified latent fingerprints were searched in the ABC Automated Fingerprint Identification System (ABCAFIS) with the following results:

Item #	Description	# of prints	Results of ABCAFIS search
2	Bank of ABC withdrawal form	1	No Identification effected
4	Lift indicated as coming from customer counter	1	Identification with MITCH HOLLARS, ABCPD #987654

Table 4: Results of ABCAFIS searches

The remaining unidentified latent fingerprint is not a fingerprint of MITCH HOLLARS, ABCPD #987654. The unidentified latent fingerprint L2 was registered to the Unsolved Latent File.

Summary of Evaluation:

Item #	Description	# of prints	Evaluation Summary
1	Demand note beginning, "I have a gun..."	2	2 Identifications w/ MICHELE TRIPLETT, ABCPD #123456
2	Bank of ABC withdrawal form	1	Not a fingerprint of MICHELE TRIPLETT, ABCPD #123456, or MITCH HOLLARS, ABCPD #987654
4	Lift indicated as coming from customer counter	1	Identification with MITCH HOLLARS, ABCPD #987654

Table 5: Summary of evaluation

The presence of a friction ridge print on an item of evidence indicates contact was made between the source and the item of evidence. The presence of a friction ridge print alone does not necessarily indicate the significance of either the contact or the time frame during which the contact occurred.

Results of Verifications and Blind Verifications:

The Verification step of the ACE-V process consists of an independent application of the ACE process by a subsequent examiner to either support or refute the conclusions of the original examiner. On April 18, 2011, Fingerprint Analyst Kasey Wertheim verified the identifications. There were no conflicts of opinion.

Case Number:2010-12345

Page 3 of 4

On April 19, 2011, Fingerprint Examiner Herman Bergman conducted a blind verification of the identification to MITCH HOLLARS on L4. In blind verifications, the verifying examiner is unaware of the original examiner's conclusion. This blind verification resulted in conflicting conclusions. Examiner Bergman deemed the comparison inconclusive. On April 20, 2011, Fingerprint Examiner Andre Moenssens blind verified the identification to MITCH HOLLARS on L4. There were no additional conflicts of opinion.

Additional documentation, including bench notes and annotated images of the latent prints for both the primary analyst and verifiers, is retained as part of the case record and can be provided upon request. The ABCPD Latent Print Unit's *Quality Assurance Manual and Standard Operating Procedures* can be found online at www.ABCPD.gov.

For questions about the content of this report, please contact Fingerprint Analyst Leonard Butt at (202) 123-4567.

The specimens from this report are being returned separately.

Leonard Butt

Leonard Butt

Fingerprint Analyst

Case Number:2010-12345

Page 4 of 4

Standard for Reporting Friction Ridge Examinations
3/09/2012 ver. 1.0.1
Posted: 6/23/2012

Example Report 3 (tenprint version – emphasizing content, not format)
(Requirements highlighted in blue)

ABC Police Department (ABC, USA)

Identification Unit – Tenprint Analysis Report

Case Number: 2010-12345

Requestor: Detective Toni Roberts, ABC PD

Exemplars:

Submitted fingerprint records:

K1 MICHELE TRIPLETT, DOB 08/15/1995

K2 MICHELLE TRIP, DOB 08/15/1995

Fingerprint record printed from AFIS⁵ archive:

MICHELE TRIPLETT, DOB 08/15/1995 (#12345)

RESULTS OF ACE-V⁶ COMPARISON PROCESS:

Items K1 and K2 were compared and identified with the prints from the AFIS database of MICHELE TRIPLETT (#12345)

VERIFICATION⁷:

Tenprint Examiner Kasey Wertheim verified the conclusions.

Leonard Butt

September 16, 2011

Leonard Butt

Date

Page 1 of 1

¹ AFIS – The acronym for Automated Fingerprint Identification System, a generic term for a fingerprint matching, storage, and retrieval system.

² ACE-V – The acronym for a scientific method; Analysis, Comparison, Evaluation, and Verification (see individual terms).

³ Verification – The independent application of the ACE process as utilized by a subsequent examiner to either support or refute the conclusions of the original examiner; this may be conducted as blind verification. Verification may be followed by some level of review as specified by agency policy.

Example Report 4 (short version – emphasizing content, not format)
(Requirements highlighted in blue)

ABC Police Department (ABC, USA)

AFIS Identification Unit – Inked Print Analysis Report

Case Number: 2010-12345

Requestor: Detective Toni Roberts, ABC PD

Exemplars:

Fingerprint record printed from AFISⁱ archive:

HERMAN BERGMAN, PIN 123

Item:

Item 1 – pawn ticket #1234 from John's Pawn Shop

RESULTS OF ACE-Vⁱⁱ COMPARISON PROCESS:

BERGMAN was excluded as the source of the inked impression present on pawn ticket #1234 from John's Pawn Shop (Item 1).

VERIFICATIONⁱⁱⁱ:

Forensic Examiner John Black verified the conclusion.

Leonard Butt

September 16, 2011

Forensic Examiner Leonard Butt

Date

Page 1 of 1

ⁱ AFIS – The acronym for Automated Fingerprint Identification System, a generic term for a fingerprint matching, storage, and retrieval system.

ⁱⁱ ACE-V – The acronym for a scientific method; Analysis, Comparison, Evaluation, and Verification (see individual terms).

ⁱⁱⁱ Verification – The independent application of the ACE process as utilized by a subsequent examiner to either support or refute the conclusions of the original examiner; this may be conducted as blind verification. Verification may be followed by some level of review as specified by agency policy.