SUBJECT	REPORTING RESULTS AND COMPILATION OF CASE NOTES

16.0 Reporting Results and Compilation of Case Notes:

16.1 Reporting Results.

16.1.1 Check the information in the header of the report generated by the Laboratory Management Information System (LIMS). Follow the guidelines as prescribed in the Crime Lab Policy and Procedures Manual.

16.1.2 Using the system generated report format list the evidence received in the case in the following format :

- Item number assigned to the submitted item(s) by the examiner. E.g., Q-1, K-5, R-23, etc.
- When applicable, the item number assigned to the submitted item(2) by the LIMS. E.g. LAB Item # 1
- Item number assigned to the submitted item(s) by the submitting agency. E.g., (your item 12), (your item HP-27), etc.
- Number of items associated with listed Q, K, or R number. E.g., Three (3), One (1), Thirty-five (35), Numerous, etc.
- If known, the make or manufacturer of the submitted items. E.g., Smith & Wesson, CCI, Fruit of the Loom, etc.
- The type of item(s) is entered next. E.g., pistol, safe door, T-shirt, fired jacketed hollow point bullet, etc.
- The serial number of item, if known, should be listed next. E.g., 1234567, HP654321, etc.
- The model number of item, if known, is listed last. E.g., model-6906, model-92F,etc.

SUBJECT	REPORTING RESULTS AND COMPILATION OF CASE NOTES

16.1.3 Listing of evidence received in the same case on different dates, from different submitting officers, and/or from another section of the Crime Laboratory.

- Evidence received in the same case on different dates by the same officer should be separated by descriptive sentences. E.g., " The following evidence was submitted on June 15, 1996:" (for the first submission) and; " The following evidence was submitted on June 18, 1996:" (for a subsequent submission).

- Evidence received in the same case on the same or different dates but by different submitting officers should be separated by descriptive sentences. E.g.," The following evidence was submitted by Officer Jones, Wake County Sheriff's Office on May 22, 1996:" (for the first submission) and; "The following evidence was submitted by Officer Smith, CCBI on May 22, 1996:" (for a subsequent submission).

- Evidence received in a case from an agent in another section of the Crime Laboratory should be separated from other evidence received in the case by a descriptive sentence. E.g., " The following evidence was received from Special Agent Johnson of the Latent Evidence Section of the SBI Crime Laboratory on April 1, 1996:"

16.1.4 Type of Examination Requested.

· The examiner must type in a general description of requested examination. E.g. Firearms Examination and Identification; Tool Mark Examination and Identification.

16.1.5 The last section of the report is the main body of the report and it contains the conclusions reached by the examiner from the analysis of the evidence received. These conclusions should be brief and to the point and should not contain any lengthy explanation as to why the conclusions were reached

SUBJECT	REPORTING RESULTS AND COMPILATION OF CASE NOTES

All conclusions should be substantiated in the case file by notes of the analyses performed.

Any Q numbered item must have a conclusion of analysis expressed in the main body of the report.

It must also be remembered that every case, every item of evidence and every examination may be different and that no single set of words or expressions will apply in all cases. The following are generalized suggested formats that the examiner may follow and/or adapt to specific situations and are not meant to be all inclusive:

Bullet(s)/Projectile Examinations:

The Q-1 bullet was fired from the K-1 revolver.
(Positive bullet to firearm comparison)

The Q-2 bullet jacket was not fired from the K-4 pistol.
(Negative bullet to firearm comparison)

The Q-1 bullet has the same class characteristics as test bullets fired from the K-1 pistol but Q-1 is too deformed to determine if it was or was not fired from K-1.
(Inconclusive bullet to firearm comparison)

The Q-1 bullet was not fired from the same firearm that fired the Q-2 bullet.
(Negative bullet to bullet comparison)

The Q-1, Q-2 and Q-3 bullets and/or bullet jackets were fired from the same firearm.
(Positive bullet to bullet comparison)

The Q-1 bullet has the same class characteristics (rifling specifications) and some strong similarity of individual characteristics to the Q-3 bullet but there is insufficient agreement of individual characteristics to conclusively determine Q-1 and Q-3 were fired from the same firearm.

SUBJECT	**REPORTING RESULTS AND COMPILATION OF CASE NOTES**

(Inconclusive bullet to bullet comparison)

The Q-12 pellets are consistent in size and weight with # 7½ lead shot.
(Identification of pellets)

The Q-3 lead fragment is of no value for firearms identification.
(Unsuitable for comparison)

The Q-1 bullet has class characteristics (rifling specifications) of five (5) lands and grooves with a right hand twist. Some firearms that fire bullets with class characteristics similar to the Q-1 bullet are manufactured by or known as:

Smith & Wesson
Taurus
I. N.A.
Ruger

Do not use this list to eliminate any suspect firearm of similar caliber and class characteristics (List of firearms that could have fired a bullet)

Cartridge/ Cartridge Cases/ Shotgun Shell Examinations:

The Q-1 cartridge case was fired in the K-4 pistol.
(Positive cartridge case to firearm comparison.)

The Q-2 shotgun shell was not fired in the K-2 shotgun.
(Negative shotgun shell to firearm comparison)

The Q-3 cartridge case has the same class characteristics and some similar individual characteristics to test cartridge cases fired in the K-5 rifle; however, there is insufficient agreement of individual characteristics to determine if Q-3 was fired in K-5.
(Inconclusive cartridge case to firearm comparison).

The Q-5 shotgun shell was chambered and extracted from the K-2 shotgun.
(Positive shotgun shell to firearm comparison)

SUBJECT	REPORTING RESULTS AND COMPILATION OF CASE NOTES

There are no marks on the K-4 cartridge that can be used to determine if it was or was not chambered in and/or extracted/ejected from the K-1 pistol.
(Inconclusive cartridge to firearm comparison)

The Q-3 and Q-7 cartridge cases were fired in the same firearm.
(Positive cartridge case to cartridge case comparison)

The Q-3 and Q-7 shotgun shells were not fired in the same firearm.
(Negative shotgun shell to shotgun shell comparison)

The Q-3 cartridge case has the same class characteristics and some strong similarity of individual characteristics to the Q-7 cartridge case; however, there is insufficient agreement of the individual characteristics to determine if Q-3 and Q-7 were fired in the same firearm. (Inconclusive cartridge case to cartridge case comparison)

Firearm function and trigger pull examinations:

The K-1 revolver functions properly.

K-1 has a single action trigger pull of greater than five (5) pounds but less than or equal to five and one-half (5½) pounds and a double action trigger pull of greater than ten (10) pounds but less than and or equal to eleven (11) pounds.

The K-2 rifle will fire by pulling the trigger when the hammer is cocked and the safety lever is either engaged or disengaged.

K-2 has a trigger pull of greater than six (6) pounds and less than or equal to seven (7) pounds.

As received the K-1 pistol does not function. K-1 is missing a hammer and a recoil spring. Parts from a reference firearm were used to replace the missing parts in the K-1 pistol and the pistol then functioned properly.

SUBJECT	**REPORTING RESULTS AND COMPILATION OF CASE NOTES**

Tool Mark Examinations:

The Q-4 tool mark was made by the K-1 hammer.
(Positive tool mark comparison)

The Q-5, Q-6 and Q-10 tool marks were not made by the K-5 screwdriver.
(Negative tool mark comparison)

The tool mark on the Q-1 piece of cut wire has similar class characteristics and some similar individual characteristics to test cuts made by the K-4 wire cutters; however, there is insufficient agreement of the individual characteristics to determine it the tool mark on Q-1 was or was not made by the K-4 wire cutters.
(Inconclusive tool mark comparison)

The tool marks on the K-4 safe door were made by a prying type tool with a flat bladed tip, approximately one (1) inch in width.
(Type of tool that made the tool mark)

Gunshot Residue/ Shotgun Pellet Pattern Examinations:

The area around the hole in the upper left chest area of the R-1 shirt was microscopically examined and chemically processed for the presence of gunshot residues. Residues and physical characteristics consistent with a contact gunshot were found.
(Contact gunshot)

The area around the hole in the upper right arm area of the R-4 jacket was microscopically examined and chemically processed for the presence of gunshot residues and a pattern of residues was found. Using the K-2 revolver and ammunition like the Q-8 and Q-9 cartridge cases test material was shot at various distances. Patterns similar to the pattern on the upper right arm of the R-4 jacket were produced at distances greater than two (2) feet and less than three (3) feet.
(Hole with pattern of nitrite residues)

The area around the hole in the lower left back of the R-6 sweatshirt was microscopically examined and chemically processed for the presence of gunshot residues, and some scattered gunpowder

residue was found. No residues were found on which to base an accurate muzzle to target distance determination. Using the K-2 rifle and ten (10) of the K-4 cartridges, test material was shot at various distances. No gunshot residue was observed on test material shot at distance of six (6) feet or greater.
(Hole with scattered nitrite residues or vaporous lead deposits)

The area around the hole in the front left lower leg of the R-6 blue jeans was microscopically examined and chemically processed for the presence of gunshot residues. Residues were found which are consistent with the passage of a bullet. No residues were found on which any muzzle to target distance determinations can be made.
(Bullet wipe)

The area around the bullet hole in the left rear shoulder area of the R-5 shirt was microscopically examined and chemically processed for the presence of residues and no residues were found. Therefore, no muzzle to target distance determination is possible.
(Negative residues)

The chest area of the R-7 T-shirt was examined and a shot pattern was found. Using the K-2 shotgun and ammunition like the Q-2 and Q-3 fired shotgun shells, patterns similar to that on the chest of the R-7 T-shirt were produced at distances greater than nine (9) feet and less than eighteen (18) feet.
(Shotgun pellet pattern)

Serial Number Restoration Examinations:

Examination and chemical processing of the K-1 revolver restored the original obliterated serial number which was determined to be "123456". A search of the NCIC Stolen Gun Files by Serial Number "123456" revealed no matching entries. If a gun trace is desired, please contact your local ATF Office.

Examination and magnetic processing of the K-2 pistol restored the original obliterated serial number which was determined to be "654321". A check of the NCIC Stolen Gun Files by Serial Number "654321" revealed a possible hit from Wilmington, NC. Contact the Wilmington Police Department (reference Wilmington OCA 199301264) to confirm or not confirm this possible hit.

SUBJECT	**REPORTING RESULTS AND COMPILATION OF CASE NOTES**

Examination and magnetic/chemical processing of the K-1 pistol restored the original obliterated serial number which was determined to be "124*7321". The asterisk (*) represents a partially restored digit that was concluded to be most likely a "5"; however, a "6" could not be eliminated.

Examination and magnetic/chemical processing of the K-2 revolver failed to restore a serial number (or failed to restore a complete serial number).

Other miscellaneous examinations that may be reported.

1. Chronograph results
2. Interior, Exterior or Terminal Ballistic examinations.
3. Identity of burned/charred firearm/ammunition.
4. Other examinations as necessary.

16.1.6 Disposition

· The examiner should check that the disposition generated by the LIMS is correct and follows guidelines in the Crime Lab Policy Manual. If the disposition is incorrect, the correct disposition must be typed in, replacing the wrong disposition.

16.2 Case Notes.

16.2.1 The case notes in the Master File should include all work sheets, notes, sketches, photographs, and any other documentation used to arrive at the conclusions reported. LIMS generated/stored notes/worksheets at this time will not include sketches, photographs and miscellaneous documentation (E.g. Manufacturers Literature).

16.2.2. Each page should have a consecutive page number at the top right corner, with the cover sheet as Page 1 . Each page should have the case number at the top of the page (preferably under the page number) and each page will have the initials of the examiner.

SUBJECT	REPORTING RESULTS AND COMPILATION OF CASE NOTES

16.2.3 After completion of the notes and report in the LIMS the examiner will assign the case via the LIMS to a Senior Examiner for Technical Review. Refer to Section 17.1.2 for the criteria for Technical Review.

- Any evidence that needs microscopic review should be transferred to the designated Senior Examiner via the LIMS.

- If any errors or omissions are found the Senior Agent will make note of these errors or omissions and reject the case via the LIMS. If there are no errors or when the case has been returned to the Senior Examiner after corrections were made, the Senior Examiner will approve the case via the LIMS.

- After approval of the Technical Review by a Senior Examiner the examiner will assign the case via the LIMS to the SAC or the SAC's designee for Administrative Review.

- If any errors or omissions are found the SAC or designee will make note of these errors or omissions and reject the case via the LIMS. If there are no errors or when the case has been returned to the SAC or designee after corrections were made, the SAC or designee will approve the case via the LIMS.

- After approval of the Administrative Review the examiner should print out a copy of his notes for placement in the Master File. Any sketches, photographs or additional documentation should be added to the Master File ensuring that all page numbers are correct.

- The Examiner will then print out the copies of the report that are necessary via the LIMS.

- The completed reports and the computer generated Case Cover Sheet should be retrieved from the section printer. The Cover Sheet will be

place in the notes as page 1 and the examiner must initial next to his name and fill in the correct number of pages in the appropriate space. The reports are attached to the front of the Master File and the reports and file are given to the section secretary. The section secretary will retrieve the Firearms Section copy of the SBI-5 from the Section Files and attach it to the front of the report. The secretary will update the sections case log database indicating date of completion. The Master File and the reports are then returned to the examiner to be placed with the evidence.

- If the evidence is being retained or held-for-pickup by an agency that does not have a specific day for evidence pickup, the examiner will maintain the Firearms Section copy of the SBI-5 with the evidence and the report will be forwarded to ECU.

- If the evidence is being sent back to the agency or the agency is one with a specific day for pickup of evidence the examiner will normally transfer the evidence via the LIMS to the Evidence Control Unit giving them the Master File and the reports at the same time.

- Evidence can also be returned in person to the submitting agency by examiners. Be sure both the Master File copy of the SBI-5 is signed and dated. Then show a transfer the evidence in the LIMS under External Transfer. The report is turned over to ECU.

- After the evidence is transferred via LIMS to the Evidence Control Unit or to the original agency by an examiner the Firearms Section's copy of the SBI-5 is re-filed in the Firearm Section Files.