

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF OKTIBBEHA COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI

WILLIE JEROME MANNING

PETITIONER

versus

Cause No. 2001-0144-CV

(Supreme Court No. 2013-DR-00491-SCT)

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

RESPONDENT



MOTION FOR FINGERPRINT ANALYSIS

Petitioner, Willie Manning, asks this Court to authorize the shipment of fingerprint evidence to one of two experts identified by Petitioner as suitably qualified to undertake the analysis required for this case. Petitioner has provided the State with two proposed orders, one contemplating the use of Kenneth Moses and one contemplating the use of David Stoney, both exceptionally qualified, and the State has objected, citing no grounds for its objections. Petitioner is not asking the State to fund the fingerprint analysis, and the type of examination requested here will not destroy or compromise the lifted prints. Because the Mississippi Supreme Court has authorized fingerprint analysis, Petitioner asks this Court to approve one of the orders proposed by Petitioner and to direct that the analysis be undertaken either by Kenneth Moses or by David Stoney. In support of this motion, Petitioner would show the following:

1. Petitioner incorporates by reference his discussion of the need for fingerprint analysis set forth in his motion submitted to this Court on October 11, 2013. In brief, fingerprints were found in the car belonging to Tiffany Miller and on the car owned by John Wise. In Miller's car, there were several prints suitable for comparison that did not match either Jon Steckler or Miller and that did not match any of the suspects identified by law enforcement, including Manning. It does not appear that any fingerprint analysis was done on the prints lifted

from John Wise's car, even though Manning was allegedly breaking into that car when he was discovered by Steckler and Miller.

2. Petitioner asked the Mississippi Supreme Court to grant leave to seek DNA testing and fingerprint analysis. After the Mississippi Supreme Court granted his motion, Petitioner filed his request with this Court. At a status conference, the parties agreed that Cellmark Labs would conduct the DNA analysis. Petitioner indicated that he intended to contact Ron Smith regarding fingerprint analysis.

3. This Court ordered the parties to inspect the evidence at various agencies and reach an agreement about what should be tested. The parties submitted inventories to the Court and submitted a proposed agreed order to have certain items of evidenced shipped for DNA testing. The lab has not yet reported any conclusions.

4. Petitioner learned that neither Ron Smith nor any other scientist in his lab would be able to conduct the fingerprint analysis due to a conflict of interest arising from the fact that Mr. Smith worked for the Mississippi Crime Lab and participated in the analysis of latent prints from this case before Petitioner's case was tried.

5. Petitioner then contacted Kenneth Moses, an expert fingerprint analyst, who was willing to examine the prints. On September 3, 2014, Petitioner forwarded a proposed order to the State directing Mr. Moses to perform the needed fingerprint analysis. (Ex. 1, Mink email with draft agreed proposed order) The State did not respond. Petitioner followed up to request a response from the State on October 30, 2014. State's counsel indicated that he wished to conduct some research on Mr. Moses and that he would follow up to provide his response within a few days. (Ex. 2, Mink email dated October 30, 2014; Ex. 3, Davis email dated November 4, 2014). On February 10, 2015, Petitioner again requested a response from the State, and this time

attached additional information about Mr. Moses, including a chapter on AFIS that Mr. Moses authored for the Fingerprint Sourcebook, a publication of the National Institute of Justice, a newspaper article regarding a case in which Mr. Moses was engaged by the FBI, and a copy of Moses' CV from the website of his company, Forensic Identification Services. (Ex. 4, Mink email with chapter on AFIS; Ex. 5, Seattle Times article; Ex. 6, Moses CV). On February 16, 2015, the State responded by email stating only, "We object to Mr. Moses." (Ex. 7).

6. Petitioner then resumed his investigation of available fingerprint experts and identified David A. Stoney, a Ph.D. in forensic science who has worked as an analyst and published extensively in the field of forensic sciences, especially regarding fingerprint examination. Petitioner communicated with Dr. Stoney about his availability and willingness to perform the analysis needed for this case, and on March 20, 2015, forwarded Dr. Stoney's curriculum vitae to the State along with a draft proposed agreed order contemplating the use of Dr. Stoney for the needed analysis. (Ex. 8, Mink email and proposed order; Ex. 9, Stoney CV).

On April 9, 2015, having heard no response about the State's position regarding the order proposed on March 20, Petitioner sent another email asking the State for a response. On April 14, without stating why, the State indicated that it opposed the use of Dr. Stoney. (Ex. 10).

7. Petitioner has been diligent in his efforts to engage a suitably qualified expert to conduct the fingerprint analysis needed for this case, and to propose the appropriate method for the analysis, as recommended by the experts. The State has rejected two exceptionally qualified experts without any explanation whatsoever. Significantly, the State objects only to the examiners proposed by Petitioner; it has voiced no objections to the procedures set forth in the proposed agreed orders. That procedure would require the Mississippi Crime Lab to make high resolution scans of the prints and forward them to the examiner. The prints would not be

destroyed or compromised in any way, but would be preserved for DNA analysis, should that become necessary. Furthermore, Petitioner is not asking the State to fund the fingerprint evaluation.

8. At this point, it would be futile for Petitioner to continue to expend time to track down yet another expert only to have the State delay and ultimately reject the proposed expert for no discernible reason.

9. If the Court directs one of the two experts proposed by Petitioner to undertake the analysis needed for this case, and if the State thereafter perceives some basis to object to the method employed by the expert or the conclusions reached by him, then the State can make its objection known at that time and can request of this Court whatever relief it deems appropriate.

10. As the Mississippi Supreme Court has pointedly stated, “the State has no role to play in the determination of the defendant’s use of experts.” *Manning v. State*, 726 So.2d 1152, 1191 (Miss. 1998). Because Petitioner has identified two highly qualified experts, and because the State has not objected to the procedure proposed by Petitioner in the analysis of the available prints, this Court should enter an order directing that the analysis be undertaken by one of the two experts proposed by Petitioner.

11. As Petitioner has noted previously, law enforcement has successfully used automated fingerprint identification systems to solve crimes, even crimes that were committed before law enforcement obtained the technology. *See, e.g., People v. Tenny*, 586 N.E.2d 403 (Ill. App. 1991) (in 1987 prints of codefendant found on item taken from scene of crime that occurred in 1978); *People v. Ferrari*, 155 Misc.2d 749, 589 N.Y.S.2d 983 (N.Y. County Ct. 1992) (defendant arrested in 1991 after prints were linked to 1986 burglary); *State v. Gilmer*, 604 So.2d 117 (La. 1992) (latent prints taken from crime scene in 1987 matched to defendant in 1990);

State v. Johnson, 943 S.W.2d 285 (Mo. App. 1997) (defendant's prints found to match latent prints lifted from items from a crime that occurred twelve years earlier).

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, Petitioner asks this Court to approve one of the orders proposed by Petitioner, included in Exhibits 1 and 8 attached hereto, and to direct that the fingerprint analysis required for this case be undertaken either by Kenneth Moses or by David Stoney, both of whom are amply qualified.

Respectfully submitted, this the 24th day of April, 2015.

WILLIE JEROME MANNING

By: 
COUNSEL FOR MANNING

David P. Voisin (MSB #100210)
David P. Voisin, PLLC
P. O. Box 13984
Jackson, MS 39236-3984
(601) 949-9486

Robert S. Mink (MSB #9002)
Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, LLP
4450 Old Canton Road, Suite 210
Jackson, MS 39211
(601) 987-5324

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Robert S. Mink, hereby certify that I have served this day a copy of the foregoing to the following counsel for Respondents:

Marvin L. White, Jr.
Jason L. Davis
Office of the Attorney General
P. O. Box 220
Jackson, MS 39205-0220

This the 24th day of April, 2015.



ROBERT S. MINK (MSB #9002)

Mink, Rob

From: Mink, Rob
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 8:12 AM
To: jdavi@ago.state.ms.us
Cc: SONNY WHITE (SWHITE@ago.state.ms.us); Marvin White (mwhitejr@comcast.net); david@dvoisinlaw.com
Subject: Manning fingerprint order
Attachments: 61224842-v1-Ex. B to Fingerprint Order.DOCX; 61224843-v1-Proposed order for fingerprint analysis.DOCX


Jason, attached is a proposed order regarding fingerprint analysis that contemplates using Kenneth Moses of Forensic Identification Services in California. We had planned on recommending Ron Smith, but Ron cited a conflict of interest arising from the fact that he worked at the Miss. Crime Lab when Manning's case was first being reviewed.

Ex. A to the order is the inventory of the sheriff's evidence signed by Joe Berry. Ex. B is attached. Please review and let us know if you recommend any changes.

Thanks.

Robert S. Mink

Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, LLP



IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF OKTIBBEHA COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI

WILLIE JEROME MANNING

PETITIONER

versus

Cause No. 2001-0144-CV
(Supreme Court No. 2013-DR-00491-SCT)

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

RESPONDENT

AGREED ORDER FOR DELIVERY OF FINGERPRINT EVIDENCE
AND PROTOCOL FOR FINGERPRINT ANALYSIS

Evidence in this matter suitable for fingerprint analysis has been located in the custody of the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department. The inventory of all evidence located at the Sheriff's Department has been filed with the Clerk of the Court and is attached to this Order as Exhibit "A." Attached as Exhibit "B" to this Order is a list of the original latent lifts that shall undergo appropriate fingerprint analysis in accordance with the protocol set forth below.

1. Within thirty days of the date of this order, the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department shall transmit by Federal Express all items in its possession and identified in Exhibit B" to Kenneth Moses, Director of Forensic Identification Services, 130 Hernandez Ave., San Francisco, CA 94127, Phone Number 415-664-2600, e-mail: forensigid@sbcglobal.net.

2. The Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department is directed to bill the Federal Express charges to counsel for Petitioner, Robert S. Mink, whose office shall provide the number of its Federal Express account upon request.

3. The Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department shall observe all necessary precautions to preserve the integrity of the evidence and the chain of custody. Counsel for both parties shall be given reasonable notice of the date and time of packaging, and counsel shall have the right to be present to observe the packaging unless the right is waived after receipt of reasonable notice.

4. Forensic Identification Services shall attempt to identify latent lifts of value that are searchable in various databases, such as Automated Fingerprint Identification System (“AFIS”) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (“IAFIS”). If Forensic Identification Services identifies latent lifts of value, then it shall transmit those lifts to the Mississippi Crime Lab in a manner consistent with professional standards so that the Mississippi Crime Lab can upload the latent lifts of value identified by Forensic Identification Services to AFIS, IAFIS, or other searchable databases.

5. If there are potential matches from the search of the databases, the top ten respondents of each search shall be sent by the Mississippi Crime Lab via Federal Express to Kenneth Moses of Forensic Identification Systems for his determination of actual matching.

6. All parties and agents acting on behalf of parties concerned in this Order shall exercise their responsibilities under this Order in a reasonable timeframe and without undue delay. All parties and agents acting on behalf of parties in this Order shall exercise maximum caution to prevent contamination of the evidence and shall ensure that a proper chain of custody is maintained at all times. All parties concerned in this Order shall provide documentation of chain of custody to this Court.

7. Forensic Identification Services shall take all maximum precautions to ensure that any latent lifts may subsequently undergo an analysis to determine the presence of DNA.

8. The Mississippi Crime Lab and Forensic Identification Services shall provide in a timely manner reports of their findings, including any lab reports and analyst’s notes, to this Court and the attorneys of record in this case.

9. Upon completion of all forensic testing, Forensic Identification Services shall return all fingerprint evidence in this case to the Oktibbeha County Sheriff’s Department, which

shall exercise maximum precautions to avoid contamination in the event that DNA testing is necessary.

SO ORDERED, this the ___ day of _____, 2014.

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

APPROVED AND AGREED:

David Voisin, Attorney for Willie Jerome Manning

Robert S. Mink, Attorney for Willie Jerome Manning

Jason L. Davis, Attorney for State of Mississippi

61224843.1


Manning v. State of Mississippi
Oktibbeha County Circuit Court Cause No. 2001-0144-CV
(Supreme Court No. 2013-DR-00491-SCT)

Report of Evidence Search on April 16, 2014
Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department and Circuit Clerk Vault

Pursuant to the Court's order of March 6, 2014, representatives of the State of Mississippi and Petitioner, Willie Manning, inspected the physical evidence related to the investigation into the murders of Tiffany Miller and Jon Steckler in the custody of the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department on April 16, 2014. This report details the evidence that was located at the Sheriff's Department, including several items not listed on Exhibit A to the Court's March 6 order, and notes several items of evidence that the representatives of the respective parties were not able to locate.

ITEMS FROM EXHIBIT "A" LOCATED AT THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

<u>Item</u>	<u>Exhibit, document references</u>	<u>photo ref. #</u>
a. extracts from rape kit		
- pubic combings	MCL Ex. 8.3, Q 27 (Crime Lab file at 125)	5833-34
- pubic hair sample	MCL Ex. 8.4, K 8 (Crime Lab file at 126)	5663 5833-34
- head hair sample	MCL Ex. 8.5, K 9 (Crime Lab file at 126)	5663 5833-34
b. Tiffany Miller's clothing		
- two white socks and one bra	MCL Ex. 13 (Howell Aff. at 2)	5800-01
- shoes	MCL Ex. 81, Q 12-13 (Howell Aff. at 6)	5773
- underwear	MCL Ex. 82, Q 14 (Howell Aff. at 6)	5774-76
- belt	MCL Ex. 83, Q 15 (Howell Aff. at 6)	5774-76
- jeans	MCL Ex. 84, Q 16 (Howell Aff. at 6)	5774-76



- shirt	MCL Ex. 85, Q 17 (Howell Aff. at 6)	5734
- t-shirt	MCL Ex. 86, Q 18 (Howell Aff. at 6)	580
- debris from undergarment	Q28 (Crime Lab file at 125)	5833-34
- debris and fibers removed from clothing (Q12 thru Q25) and placed in pillboxes (Crime Lab file at 121)		5665, 5725-26
c. hairs in victims' hands		
- hair in Miller's right hand	MCL Ex. 5, Q 26 (Howell Aff. at 2 / Crime Lab file at 28, 125)	5667, 5670 5833 et seq.
- hair in Steckler's left hand	MCL 24, Q 29 (Howell Aff. at 3 / Crime Lab file at 29, 125)	5667, 5669 5833 et seq.
d. hair and fiber from Miller's car		
- vacuum sweepings & debris from car	Q43-Q59 (Crime Lab file at 125-26)	5663-64, 5679-81, 5683-85, 5690
e. fingernail scrapings		
- Miller right hand	MCL Ex. 9 (Howell Aff. at 2 / Crime Lab file at 28)	5667, 5671
- Miller left hand	MCL Ex. 10 (Howell Aff. at 2 / Crime Lab file at 28)	5667, 5668
- Steckler rt hand	MCL Ex. 19 (Howell Aff. at 3 / Crime Lab file at 29)	5667
- Steckler left hand	MCL Ex. 20 (Howell Aff. at 3 / Crime Lab file at 29)	5667

g. Jon Steckler's clothing

- socks, boxers	MCL Ex. 25 (Howell Aff. at 3)	5770-71
- shoes	MCL Ex. 87, Q 19-20 (Crime Lab file at 124)	5731-32
- pants	MCL Ex. 88, Q 21 (Crime Lab file at 124)	5733
- shirt	MCL Ex. 89, Q 22 (Crime Lab file at 124)	5781
- t-shirt	MCL Ex. 90, Q 23 (Crime Lab file at 124)	5727-28

h. items found in or around Miller's car

- plastic MSU drinking cup	MCL Ex. 38 (Crime Lab file at 31)	5782
- student receipt	MCL Ex. 39 (Crime Lab file at 31)	5794
- Dr. Pepper bottle	MCL Ex. 40 (Crime Lab file at 31)	5720-21
- bottle cap	MCL Ex. 41 (Crime Lab file at 31)	5784
- 3 rolls of film	MCL Ex. 52 (Crime Lab file at 32)	
- bags and paper	Q24 (Crime lab file at 124) Q25 (Crime lab file at 124)	5813-14
- Jack Daniels Bottle	Photograph, Petition Ex. 12 at 2460 (filed under seal)	5729-30

i. fingerprint lifts (for comparison to known prints
in database as well as for DNA testing)

- prints EA thru EU	MCL Ex. 32	5743
---------------------	------------	------

- thirty-one latent lifts from Miller's car	MCL Ex. 55	5783
- latent lifts from Jon Wise's car	MCL Ex. 53	5744

**ADDITIONAL ITEMS OF PHYSICAL EVIDENCE NOT LISTED
ON EXHIBIT "A" BUT FOUND AT SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
ON APRIL 16, 2014**

1.	Floor mat fiber sample from Miller's car (K12, MR2 Inventory Log #6, MCL file at 126)	5685, 5687
2.	Seat fabric sample from Miller's car (K14, MR2 Inventory Log #8, MCL file at 126)	5685, 5689
3.	Debris from car spoiler (Q42a)	5663
4.	Hairs on slides pertaining to Lowery (Q32-43)	5663
5.	bottle (Jack Daniels Country Cocktail) found on side of Pat Station Rd. near bodies	5718
6.	FBI fingerprint lifts, inside Miller passenger window FBI fingerprint lifts, outside Miller passenger window	5751 5750
7.	RFLP extracts from Miller and Steckler (K3 and K4)	5754-55
8.	Contents from passenger side of car door	
9.	Contents from driver's side (brown bag)	5777-79
10.	Contents passenger side and console (brown bag)	5772
11.	Contents from glove compartment (brown bag)	5804-05
12.	1 button with blood from male	5797
13.	1st beer bottle closest to crime scene	5798-99
14.	button from male (found in hospital)	5808-03
15.	Hair from ceiling of car	5811-12

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------|
| 16. | Paper from driver side door pocket
(Q64, MR2 Inventory Log #10) | 5841 |
| 17. | Paper from passenger side door pocket
(Q65, MR2 Inventory Log #11) | 5841 |
| 18. | bony substance found with Miller
at Oktibbeha County Hosp. | 5752-53 |
| 19. | belt buckle, ambulance, male | 5787-88 |
| 20. | "Hair - 25 Steps" | 5793 |
| 21. | Hair from road - scene of crime | 5824-25 |
| 22. | Q 60, 61 / Ex. 66 (unknown reference nos. -
not in MS Crime Lab file) | 5830 |

**ITEMS LISTED ON EXHIBIT "A" BUT NOT FOUND
AT SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT ON APRIL 16, 2014**

a. extracts from rape kit

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| - three swabs | MCL Ex. 8-6, 8-7a and 8-9
(Howell Aff. at 2) | Possibly at Miss. Crime Lab |
| - remainder of
rape kit | MCL Ex. 8 (Howell Aff. at 2) | location unknown |

d. hair and fiber from Miller's car

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---|------------------|
| - hairs found in
car | MCL Ex. 42-51 (Howell Aff. at 4 /
Crime Lab file at 31-32) | location unknown |
|-------------------------|---|------------------|

f. areas of car believed to have been touched by perpetrator

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| - steering wheel | MCL Ex. 56 (Howell Aff. at 5 /
Crime Lab file at 34) | location unknown |
| - rearview mirror | Crime Lab file at 126 | location unknown;
Referred to in FBI report as
part of 930119047 |


- seatbelt buckle Crime Lab file at 126

location unknown;
Referred to in FBI report as
part of 930119047

The representatives of the State of Mississippi and the Petitioner, Willie Manning, certify that the list above reflects the inspection of evidence at the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department on April 16, 2014.


Jason L. Davis, Attorney
For State of Mississippi

David Voisin, Attorney
For Willie Manning



Robert S. Mink, Attorney
For Willie Manning

Joe Berry of the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department certifies that he searched for evidence as ordered by the Circuit Court, that he was present when representatives of the State of Mississippi and Willie Manning reviewed the evidence, that the foregoing list reflects all of the items of physical evidence in the possession of the Sheriff's Department pertaining to the investigation of the murders of Tiffany Miller and Jon Steckler, and that the Sheriff's Department will alert these representatives if additional evidence is discovered.




Joe Berry
For the Sheriff's Department

61178148.1

- seatbelt buckle Crime Lab file at 126

location unknown;
Referred to in FBI report as
part of 930119047

The representatives of the State of Mississippi and the Petitioner, Willie Manning, certify that the list above reflects the inspection of evidence at the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department on April 16, 2014.



Jason L. Davis, Attorney
For State of Mississippi




David Voisin, Attorney
For Willie Manning



Robert S. Mink, Attorney
For Willie Manning

Joe Berry of the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department certifies that he searched for evidence as ordered by the Circuit Court, that he was present when representatives of the State of Mississippi and Willie Manning reviewed the evidence, that the foregoing list reflects all of the items of physical evidence in the possession of the Sheriff's Department pertaining to the investigation of the murders of Tiffany Miller and Jon Steckler, and that the Sheriff's Department will alert these representatives if additional evidence is discovered.



Joe Berry
For the Sheriff's Department

61178148.1

*Items to be shipped to
Forensic Identification Services
for fingerprint analysis*

**Evidence in possession of
Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department**

i. fingerprint lifts		<u>Photo reference</u>
- prints EA thru EU	MCL Ex. 32	5743
- thirty-one latent lifts from Miller's car	MCL Ex. 55	5783
- latent lifts from Jon Wise's car	MCL Ex. 53	5744
- FBI fingerprint lifts, inside Miller passenger window		5751
- FBI fingerprint lifts, outside Miller passenger window		5750
- inked prints of possible suspects	MCL Ex. 54(A-U)	n/a

61224842.1

EX. B

Mink, Rob

From: Mink, Rob
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 3:12 PM
To: jdavi@ago.state.ms.us; SONNY WHITE (SWHIT@ago.state.ms.us); Marvin White (mwhitejr@comcast.net)
Cc: david@dvoisinlaw.com
Subject: Manning I -- crime lab and fingerprint order
Attachments: Manning fingerprint order

Jason, we still need to schedule a trip to the crime lab to witness the packaging of the evidence for shipment to Cellmark.

We also need to know if you agree to the terms of the order concerning fingerprint analysis – I'm resending the email that attaches that order for your review.

Please let me know. Thanks.

Robert S. Mink

Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, LLP
4450 Old Canton Road, Suite 210
Jackson MS 39211
Direct: (601) 987-5324
Fax: (601) 987-5353
Email: rmink@wyattfirm.com

Mailing Address:
Post Office Box 16089
Jackson, Mississippi 39236-6089



Jackson | Memphis | Nashville | Louisville | Lexington | New Albany | www.wyattfirm.com



Mink, Rob

From: JASON DAVIS <JDAVI@ago.state.ms.us>
Sent: Tuesday, November 04, 2014 4:04 PM
To: Mink, Rob
Subject: RE: Manning fingerprint order

Rob,

Sorry I missed you. Glad you were able to come to the show. I can meet at the Crime Lab on either this Thursday or Friday. After that, you'll have to contact Sonny as I will be undergoing shoulder surgery on Monday the 10th and will be out for some time after that.

As for your proposed fingerprint expert, give me some time to research Moses. Don't know anything about him. Will get you an answer by Thursday or Friday.

From: Mink, Rob [<mailto:rmink@wyattfirm.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 8:12 AM
To: JASON DAVIS
Cc: SONNY WHITE; Marvin White (mwhitejr@comcast.net); david@dvoisinlaw.com
Subject: Manning fingerprint order

Jason, attached is a proposed order regarding fingerprint analysis that contemplates using Kenneth Moses of Forensic Identification Services in California. We had planned on recommending Ron Smith, but Ron cited a conflict of interest arising from the fact that he worked at the Miss. Crime Lab when Manning's case was first being reviewed.

Ex. A to the order is the inventory of the sheriff's evidence signed by Joe Berry. Ex. B is attached. Please review and let us know if you recommend any changes.

Thanks.

Robert S. Mink

Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, LLP



Mink, Rob

From: Mink, Rob
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2015 1:49 PM
To: 'JASON DAVIS'
Cc: david@dvoisinlaw.com
Subject: RE: Manning fingerprint order
Attachments: fingerprintsourcbookchp6.pdf; Seattle Times article - Kenneth Moses retained by FBI.pdf; Kenneth Moses CV - Forensic Identification Services.pdf

Jason, I have attached some material on Kenneth Moses, whom we have proposed to do the fingerprint analysis for this case. The first is the chapter on AFIS from the Fingerprint Sourcebook, which is a publication of the National Institute of Justice. The second is an article about a particular fingerprint case in which Moses was retained by the FBI (see page 3), and the third is a printout from Forensic Identification Services, Moses' company, including Moses' CV.

Please let us know if the State agrees to using Moses for the fingerprint analysis. Out of concern for the passage of time, we will submit these materials to Judge Howard with the proposed order we sent you in September if we don't hear back from you shortly. Thanks for your help with this.

Robert S. Mink

Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, LLP
Direct: (601) 987-5324

From: Mink, Rob
Sent: Tuesday, January 20, 2015 1:19 PM
To: 'JASON DAVIS'
Cc: david@dvoisinlaw.com
Subject: RE: Manning fingerprint order

Jason, I hope 2015 is starting out well for you. Please see our last correspondence below about fingerprint testing in Manning, and let us know your position about Kenneth Moses.

Thanks.


Robert S. Mink

Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, LLP
Direct: (601) 987-5324

From: JASON DAVIS [mailto:JDAVI@ago.state.ms.us]
Sent: Tuesday, November 04, 2014 4:04 PM
To: Mink, Rob
Subject: RE: Manning fingerprint order

Rob,

Sorry I missed you. Glad you were able to come to the show. I can meet at the Crime Lab on either this Thursday or Friday. After that, you'll have to contact Sonny as I will be undergoing shoulder surgery on Monday the 10th and will be out for some time after that.





CHAPTER

6


**AUTOMATED FINGERPRINT
IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AFIS)**

KENNETH R. MOSES

CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS
PETER HIGGINS, MICHAEL MCCABE,
SALIL PROBHAKAR, SCOTT SWANN

CONTENTS

3	6.1 Introduction	31	6.5 Summary
9	6.2 AFIS Operations	32	6.6 Reviewers
15	6.3 Standards	32	6.7 References
20	6.4 Digitization and Processing of Fingerprints	33	6.8 Additional Information





CHAPTER 6

AUTOMATED FINGERPRINT IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AFIS)

KENNETH R. MOSES

CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS
PETER HIGGINS, MICHAEL
MCCABE, SALIL PROBHAKAR,
SCOTT SWANN

6.1 Introduction

Prior to the industrial revolution and the mass migrations to the cities, populations lived mostly in rural communities where everyone knew everyone else and there was little need for identification. Indeed, there were no police forces, no penitentiaries, and very few courts. As cities became crowded, crime rates soared and criminals flourished within a sea of anonymity. Newspapers feasted on stories of lawlessness, legislatures quickly responded with more laws and harsher penalties (especially for repeat offenders), and police departments were charged with identifying and arresting the miscreants. Identification systems—rogues' galleries, anthropometry, Bertillon's "portrait parlé," and the Henry system—emerged and quickly spread worldwide at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century.

The late 1960s and early 1970s witnessed another era of civil turmoil and an unprecedented rise in crime rates, but this era happened to coincide with the development of the silicon chip. The challenges inherent in identification systems seemed ready-made for the solutions of automatic data processing, and AFIS—Automated Fingerprint Identification System—was born.

During this same period, The RAND Corporation, working under a national grant, published *The Criminal Investigative Process* (Greenwood et al., 1975), a comprehensive study and critique of the process by which crimes get solved—or do not. Generally critical of traditional methods used by detectives, the study placed any hopes for improvement on physical evidence in general and latent prints in particular. In a companion study, Joan Petersilia concluded that:

No matter how competent the evidence technician is at performing his job, the gathering of physical evidence at a crime scene will be futile unless such evidence can be properly processed and analyzed. Since fingerprints are by far the most frequently retrieved physical evidence, making the system of analyzing such prints effective will contribute the most toward greater success in identifying criminal offenders through the use of physical evidence. (Petersilia, 1975, p 12)



Though new technology was already in development at the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), it would be a popular movement at the local and state levels that would truly test Petersilia's theory.

6.1.1 Need For Automation

In 1924, the FBI's Identification Division was established by authority of the United States congressional budget appropriation bill for the Department of Justice. The identification division was created to provide a central repository of criminal identification data for law enforcement agencies throughout the United States. The original collection of fingerprint records contained 810,188 records. After its creation, hundreds of thousands of new records were added to this collection yearly, and by the early 1960s the FBI's criminal file had grown to about 15 million individuals. This was in addition to the 63 million records in the civilian file, much of which was the result of military additions from World War II and the Korean conflict.

Almost all of the criminal file's 15 million individuals contained 10 rolled fingerprints per card for a total of 150 million single fingerprints. Incoming records were manually classified and searched against this file using the FBI's modified Henry system of classification. Approximately 30,000 cards were searched daily. The time and human resources to accomplish this daily workload continued to grow. As a card entered the system, a preliminary gross pattern classification was assigned to each fingerprint by technicians. The technicians could complete approximately 100 fingerprint cards per hour. Complete classification and searching against the massive files could only be accomplished at an average rate of 3.3 cards per employee per hour. Obviously, as the size of the criminal file and the daily workload increased, the amount of resources required continued to grow. Eventually, classification extensions were added to reduce the portion of the criminal file that needed to be searched against each card. Nonetheless, the manual system used for searching and matching fingerprints was approaching the point of being unable to handle the daily workload.

Although punch card sorters could reduce the number of fingerprint cards required to be examined based on pattern classification and other parameters, it was still necessary for human examiners to scrutinize each fingerprint card on the candidate list. A new paradigm was necessary to stop the increasing amount of human resources required

to process search requests. A new automated approach was needed to (1) extract each fingerprint image from a tenprint card, (2) process each of these images to produce a reduced-size template of characteristic information, and (3) search a database to automatically produce a highly reduced list of probable candidate matches (Cole, 2001, pp 251–252).

6.1.2 Early AFIS Development

In the early 1960s, the FBI in the United States, the Home Office in the United Kingdom, Paris Police in France, and the Japanese National Police initiated projects to develop automated fingerprint identification systems. The thrust of this research was to use emerging electronic digital computers to assist or replace the labor-intensive processes of classifying, searching, and matching tenprint cards used for personal identification.

6.1.3 FBI AFIS Initiative

By 1963, Special Agent Carl Voelker of the FBI's Identification Division realized that the manual searching of the criminal file would not remain feasible for much longer. In an attempt to resolve this problem, he sought the help of engineers Raymond Moore and Joe Wegstein of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)¹. After describing his problem, he asked for assistance in automating the FBI's fingerprint identification process.

The NIST engineers first studied the manual methods used by human fingerprint technicians to make identifications. These methods were based on comparing the minutiae (i.e., ridge endings and ridge bifurcations) on fingerprint ridges. If the minutiae from two fingerprints were determined to be topologically equivalent, the two fingerprints were declared to be identical—that is, having been recorded from the same finger of the same person. After this review, and after studying additional problems inherent with the inking process, they believed that a computerized solution to automatically match and pair minutiae could be developed that would operate in a manner similar to the techniques used by human examiners to make fingerprint identifications. But to achieve this goal, three major tasks would have to be accomplished. First, a scanner had to be developed that could automatically read and electronically capture the inked fingerprint image. Second, it was necessary to accurately

¹ NIST was known as the National Bureau of Standards when the FBI visited Moore and Wegstein.



and consistently detect and identify minutiae existing in the captured image. Finally, a method had to be developed to compare two lists of minutiae descriptors to determine whether they both most likely came from the same finger of the same individual.

The Identification Division of the FBI decided that the approach suggested by Moore and Wegstein should be followed. To address the first two of the three tasks, on December 16, 1966, the FBI issued a Request for Quotation (RFQ) "for developing, demonstrating, and testing a device for reading certain fingerprint minutiae" (FBI, 1966). This contract was for a device to automatically locate and determine the relative position and orientation of the specified minutiae in individual fingerprints on standard fingerprint cards to be used for testing by the FBI. The requirements stated that the reader must be able to measure and locate minutiae in units of not more than 0.1 mm and that the direction of each minutiae must be measured and presented as output in units of not more than 11.25 degrees (1/32 of a full circle). The initial requirements called for a prototype model to process 10,000 single fingerprints (1,000 cards). Contractors were also instructed to develop a proposal for a subsequent contract to process 10 times that number of fingerprints.

The 14 proposals received in response to this RFQ were divided into 5 broad technical approaches. At the conclusion of the proposal evaluation, two separate proposals were funded to provide a basic model for reading fingerprint images and extracting minutiae. Both proposed to use a "flying spot scanner" for capturing the image. But each offered a different approach for processing the captured image data, and both seemed promising. One contract was awarded to Cornell Aeronautical Labs, Inc., which proposed using a general-purpose digital computer to process binary pixels and develop programs for detecting and providing measurement parameters for each identified minutiae. The second contract was awarded to North American Aviation, Inc., Autonetics Division, which proposed using a special-purpose digital process to compare fixed logical marks to the image for identifying, detecting, and encoding each minutia.

While the devices for fingerprint scanning and minutiae detection were being developed, the third task of comparing two minutiae lists to determine a candidate match was addressed by Joe Wegstein (Wegstein, 1969a, 1970, 1972 a/b, 1982; Wegstein and Rafferty, 1978, 1979; Wegstein et al., 1968). He developed the initial algorithms for determining fingerprint matches based on the processing and compari-

son of two lists describing minutiae location and orientation. For the next 15 years, he continued to develop more reliable fingerprint matching software that became increasingly more complex in order to account for such things as plastic distortion and skin elasticity. Algorithms he developed were embedded in AFISs that were eventually placed in operation at the FBI and other law enforcement agencies.

By 1969, both Autonetics and Cornell had made significant progress on their feasibility demonstration models. In 1970, a Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued for the construction of a prototype fingerprint reader to reflect the experience gained from the original demonstration models with an additional requirement for speed and accuracy. Cornell was awarded the contract to deliver the prototype reader to the FBI in 1972. After a year's experience with the prototype system, the FBI issued a new RFP containing additional requirements such as a high-speed card-handling subsystem. In 1974, Rockwell International, Inc., was awarded a contract to build five production model automatic fingerprint reader systems. This revolutionary system was called Finder. These readers were delivered to the FBI in 1975 and 1976. The next 3 years were devoted to using these readers in the conversion of 15 million criminal fingerprint cards (Moore, 1991, pp 164–175).

As it became apparent that the FBI's efforts to automate the fingerprint matching process would be successful, state and local law enforcement agencies began to evaluate this new technology for their own applications. The Minneapolis–St. Paul system in Minnesota was one of the first automated fingerprint matching systems (after the FBI's) to be installed in the United States. Further, while the United States was developing its AFIS technology in the 1960s, France, the United Kingdom, and Japan were also doing research into automatic fingerprint image processing and matching.

6.1.4 French AFIS Initiative

In 1969, M. R. Thiebault, Prefecture of Police in Paris, reported on the French efforts. (Descriptions of work done by Thiebault can be found in the entries listed in the Additional Information section of this chapter.) France's focus was on the solution to the latent fingerprint problem rather than the general identification problem that was the concern in the United States. The French approach incorporated a *vidicon* (a video camera tube) to scan photographic film transparencies of fingerprints. Scanning was done at 400 pixels per inch (ppi), which was less than an optimal scan



rate for latent work. This minutiae matching approach was based on special-purpose, high-speed hardware that used an array of logical circuits. The French also were interested in resolving the problem of poor fingerprint image quality. In order to acquire a high-contrast image that would be easy to photograph and process, a technique was developed to record live fingerprint images photographically using a principle of "frustrated total internal reflection" (FTIR). Although not put into large-scale production at that time, 20 years later FTIR became the cornerstone for the development of the modern-day livescan fingerprint scanners. These are making the use of ink and cards obsolete for nonforensic identification purposes today.

By the early 1970s, the personnel responsible for development of France's fingerprint automation technology had changed. As a result, there was little interest in pursuing automated fingerprint identification research for the next several years. In the late 1970s, a computer engineering subsidiary of France's largest financial institution responded to a request by the French Ministry of Interior to work on automated fingerprint processing for the French National Police. Later, this company joined with the Morphologic Mathematics Laboratory at the Paris School of Mines to form a subsidiary called Morpho Systems that went on to develop a functioning. Currently, Morpho Systems is part of Sagem (also known as Group SAFRAN).

6.1.5 United Kingdom AFIS Initiative

During the same period of time, the United Kingdom's Home Office was doing research into automatic fingerprint identification. Two of the main individuals responsible for the United Kingdom's AFIS were Dr. Barry Blain and Ken Millard. (Papers produced by Millard are listed in the Additional Information section of this chapter). Like the French, their main focus was latent print work. By 1974, research was being done in-house with contractor assistance from Ferranti, Ltd. The Home Office developed a reader to detect minutiae, record position and orientation, and determine ridge counts to the five nearest neighbors to the right of each minutia. This was the first use of ridge count information by an AFIS vendor (Moore, 1991).

6.1.6 Japanese AFIS Initiative

Like France and the United Kingdom, Japan's motivation for a fingerprint identification system was directed toward the matching of latent images against a master file of rolled

fingerprints. Japan's researchers believed that an accurate latent system would naturally lead to the development of an accurate tenprint system.

By 1966, the Osaka Prefecture Police department housed almost 4 million single fingerprints. An early automation effort by this agency was the development of a pattern classification matching system based on a 17- to 20-digit number encoded manually (Kiji, 2002, p 9). Although this approach improved the efficiency of the totally manual method enormously, it had inherent problems. It required a great deal of human precision and time to classify the latents and single fingerprints; was not fully suitable for latent matching; and produced a long list of candidates, resulting in expensive verifications.

Within a few years, the fingerprint automation focus of Japanese researchers had changed. By 1969, the Identification Section of the Criminal Investigation Bureau, National Police Agency of Japan (NPA), approached NEC to develop a system for the computerization of fingerprint identification. NEC determined that it could build an automated fingerprint identification system employing a similar minutiae-based approach to that being used in the FBI system under development. At that time, it was thought that a fully automated system for searching fingerprints would not be realized for 5 to 10 years. In 1969, NEC and NPA representatives visited the FBI and began to learn about the current state of the art for the FBI's AFIS plans. During the same period, NPA representatives also collaborated with Moore and Wegstein from NIST. Additional AFIS sites were visited where information was acquired regarding useful and worthless approaches that had been attempted. All of this information was evaluated and used in the development of the NEC system.

For the next 10 years, NEC worked to develop its AFIS. In addition to minutiae location and orientation, this system also incorporated ridge-count information present in the local four surrounding quadrants of each minutiae under consideration for pairing. By 1982, NEC had successfully installed its system in the NPA and started the card conversion process. Within a year, latent inquiry searches began.

In 1980, NEC received a U.S. patent for automatic minutiae detection. It began marketing its automated fingerprint identification systems to the United States a few years later.



6.1.7 The Politicization of Fingerprints and the San Francisco Experiment

Early development and implementation of automated fingerprint systems was limited to national police agencies in Europe, North America, and Japan. But the problems associated with huge national databases and the newborn status of computer technology in the 1970s limited the utility of these systems. Government investment in AFIS was justified largely on the promise of efficiency in the processing of incoming tenprint records. But funding these expensive systems on the local level would demand some creativity (Wayman, 2004, pp 50–52).

Following the success of the FBI's Finder, Rockwell took its system to market in the mid-1970s. Rockwell organized a users group for its Printrak system and sponsored an annual conference for customers and would-be customers. Starting with a beta-site in San Jose, California, more than a dozen installations were completed in quick succession. Peggy James of the Houston Police Department, Joe Corcoran from Saint Paul, Donna Jewett from San Jose, and others devoted their energies toward educating the international fingerprint community on the miracle of the minutiae-based Printrak system. Each system that came online trumpeted the solution of otherwise unsolvable crimes and the identity of arrested criminals. A users group newsletter was published and distributed that highlighted some of the best cases and listed the search statistics of member agencies.

Ken Moses of the San Francisco Police Department had attended several of those Printrak conferences and became a staunch crusader for fingerprint automation. In three successive years, he persuaded the Chief of Police to include a Printrak system in the city budget, but each time it was vetoed by the mayor. After the third mayoral veto, a ballot proposition was organized by other politicians. The proposition asked citizens to vote on whether they wanted an automated fingerprint system. In 1982, Proposition E passed with an 80% plurality.

The mayor refused to approve a sole-source purchase from Rockwell, even though it was the only system in the world being marketed. She insisted on a competitive bid with strict evaluation criteria and testing. While on a trade mission to Japan, the mayor learned that the Japanese National Police were working with NEC to install a fingerprint system, but NEC stated that the system was being developed as a public service and the company had no

plans to market it. After meeting with key Japanese officials, NEC changed its mind and agreed to bid on the San Francisco AFIS.

When the bids were opened, not only had Printrak and NEC submitted proposals, but a dark horse named Logica had also entered the fray. Logica had been working with the British Home Office to develop a system for New Scotland Yard.

San Francisco retained systems consultant Tim Ruggles to assist in constructing the first head-to-head benchmark tests of competing in-use fingerprint systems. The test was most heavily weighted toward latent print accuracy, and a set of 50 latent prints graded from poor to good from actual past cases was searched against a prescribed tenprint database. All tests were conducted at the respective vendor's home site.² NEC was awarded the contract and installation was completed in December 1983.

Besides being the first competitive bid on 1980s technology, what differentiated the San Francisco system from those that had gone before was organizational design. AFIS was viewed as a true system encompassing all aspects of friction ridge identification—from the crime scene to the courtroom. The AFIS budget included laboratory and crime scene equipment, training in all phases of forensic evidence, and even the purchase of vehicles. In 1983, a new crime scene unit was organized specifically with the new system as its centerpiece. Significant organizational changes were put into effect:

1. All latents that met minimum criteria would be searched in AFIS.
2. A new unit called Crime Scene Investigations was created and staffed on a 24/7 schedule.
3. Department policies were changed to mandate that patrol officers notify crime scene investigators of all felonies with a potential for latent prints.

² The results of the earliest competitive benchmark tests were published by the International Association for Identification in 1986 (Moses, 1986). Thereafter, some vendors often demanded that the results of benchmark tests be kept secret, and law enforcement agencies generally acquiesced to those demands. This has made it extremely difficult for researchers and prospective purchasers to evaluate competing systems. The veil of secrecy has generally carried over to the sharing of AFIS operational performance data by agency personnel who often develop a strong sense of loyalty to their AFIS vendor.



- All crime scene investigators who processed the crime scenes were trained in the use of the system and encouraged to search their own cases.
- Performance statistics were kept from the beginning, and AFIS cases were tracked through the criminal justice system to the courts.

The result of the San Francisco experiment was a dramatic 10-fold increase in latent print identifications in 1984. The district attorney demanded and got five new positions to prosecute the AFIS cases. The conviction rate in AFIS-generated burglary cases was three times higher than in burglary cases without this type of evidence (Figure 6-1; Bruton, 1989).

At a time when burglary rates were steeply rising in cities across the nation, the burglary rate plummeted in San Francisco (Figure 6-2; Bruton, 1989). Reporters, academics, and police administrators from around the world inundated the San Francisco Police Department for demonstrations and information.

The importance of politics and publicity was not lost on other agencies. Los Angeles even enlisted the backing of film stars to stir up public support. The identification of serial killer Richard Ramirez, the infamous Night Stalker, through a search of the brand-new California State AFIS made worldwide headlines and guaranteed the future funding of systems in California.

6.1.8 AFIS Proliferation

The widely publicized success in San Francisco provided the spark for the rapid proliferation of new AFIS installations along with a methodology of benchmark testing to evaluate the claims of the growing number of competing vendors. Governments quickly provided funding so that, by 1999, the International Association for Identification's (IAI's) *AFIS Directory of Users* identified 500 AFIS sites worldwide (IAI, 1999).


The burgeoning market in these multimillion-dollar systems put forensic identification on the economic map. Commercial exhibits at IAI's conferences that had formerly featured companies hawking tape and powder now expanded to digital image enhancement, lasers and forensic light sources, and the latest in new developments from Silicon Valley. The San Francisco Crime Lab received its first digital imaging system in 1986. This 3M/Comtal system was dedicated to friction ridge enhancement. Fingermatrix installed the first livescan device in the San Francisco Police Identification Bureau in 1988. AFIS brought crime scene and forensic identification out of the basement; no local or state law enforcement administrator wanted to be accused of being left behind.

However, the frenzied expansion of AFIS was not always logical and rational. By the early 1990s, the four biggest vendors—Printrak, NEC, Morpho, and Cogent—were in

FIGURE 6-1

Tracking latent hits through the courts. (Bruton, 1989.)

DISPOSITIONS OF ADULT FELONY ARRESTS






FIGURE 6-2

Statistical study of AFIS hits vs. burglaries in San Francisco, 1984-1988. (Bruton, 1989.)

competition, each offering proprietary software that was incompatible with the others, especially in latent print searching.

Expansion was often based on political considerations and competing mission priorities. Local and state agencies expressed differences in priorities in terms of system design, with states generally emphasizing criminal identification or tenprint functions, while cities and counties focused on crime solving or latent print functions. Generally, the demands of latent print processing on computer resources far exceeded the requirements of tenprint processing, and states balked at the additional expense and technical complexity. As a result, cities, counties, and states often went their separate ways, installing dissimilar systems that could not communicate with neighboring jurisdictions or with the central state repository. Vendors eagerly encouraged this fragmentation in an attempt to gain market share and displace competitors whenever possible. The evolution of electronic transmission standards (see section 6.3) ameliorated this problem for tenprint search but not for latent search.

6.2 AFIS Operations

6.2.1 AFIS Functions and Capabilities

Identification bureaus are legislatively mandated to maintain criminal history records. Historically, this meant huge file storage requirements and cadres of clerks to maintain and search them. Demographic-based criminal history computers were established well ahead of AFIS, first as IBM card sort systems and then as all-digital information systems with terminals throughout the state and, via the

National Crime Information Center (NCIC) network and the National Law Enforcement Teletype System (Nlets), throughout the nation. These automated criminal history systems became even more labor-intensive than the paper record systems they supposedly replaced. In many systems, more paper was generated and placed into the history jackets along with the fingerprint cards, mug shots, warrants, and other required documents.

AFIS revolutionized state identification bureaus because it removed from the paper files the last document type that could not previously be digitized—the fingerprint card. State identification bureaus could now bring to their legislatures cost-benefit analyses that easily justified the purchase of an automated fingerprint system through the reduction of clerical personnel.

Local and county jurisdictions did not usually enjoy the economic benefits of state systems. Pre-AFIS personnel levels were often lower and controlled more by the demands of the booking process than by file maintenance. AFIS generally increased staffing demands on the latent and crime-scene-processing side because it made crime scene processing dramatically more productive. Local and county AFIS purchases were usually justified on the basis of their crime-solving potential.

6.2.1.1 Technical Functions. Law enforcement AFISs are composed of two interdependent subsystems: the tenprint (i.e., criminal identification) subsystem and the latent (i.e., criminal investigation) subsystem. Each subsystem operates with a considerable amount of autonomy, and both are vital to public safety.

The tenprint subsystem is tasked with identifying sets of inked or livescan fingerprints incident to an arrest or

citation or as part of an application process to determine whether a person has an existing record.

In many systems, identification personnel are also charged with maintaining the integrity of the fingerprint and criminal history databases. Identification bureau staffs are generally composed of fingerprint technicians and supporting clerical personnel.

An automated tenprint inquiry normally requires a minutiae search of only the thumbs or index fingers. Submitted fingerprints commonly have sufficient clarity and detail to make searching of more than two fingers unnecessary. Today's AFIS can often return a search of a million records in under a minute. As databases have expanded across the world, some AFIS engineers have expanded to searching four fingers or more in an effort to increase accuracy.

The latent print or criminal identification subsystem is tasked with solving crimes through the identification of latent prints developed from crime scenes and physical evidence. Terminals used within the latent subsystem are often specialized to accommodate the capture and digital enhancement of individual latent prints. The latent subsystem may be staffed by latent print examiners, crime scene investigators, or laboratory or clerical personnel. The staff of the latent subsystem is frequently under a different command structure than the tenprint subsystem and is often associated with the crime laboratory.

The search of a latent print is more tedious and time-consuming than a tenprint search. Latent prints are often fragmentary and of poor image quality. Minutiae features are normally reviewed one-by-one before the search begins. Depending on the portion of the database selected to be searched and the system's search load, the response may take from a few minutes to several hours to return.

Most law enforcement AFIS installations have the ability to perform the following functions:

- Search a set of known fingerprints (tenprints) against an existing tenprint database (TP-TP) and return with results that are better than 99% accurate.³
- Search a latent print from a crime scene or evidence against a tenprint database (LP-TP).

³ This figure is based on requirements found in award documents and benchmark testing rather than operational observation.

- Search a latent from a crime scene against latents on file from other crime scenes (LP-LP).
- Search a new tenprint addition to the database against all unsolved latent prints in file (TP-LP).

Enhancements have been developed to allow other functions that expand AFIS capabilities, including:

- Addition of palmprint records to the database to allow the search of latent palmprints from crime scenes.
- Interfacing of AFIS with other criminal justice information systems for added efficiency and "lights out"⁴ operation.
- Interfacing of AFIS with digital mug shot systems and livescan fingerprint capture devices.
- Addition of hand-held portable devices for use in identity queries from the field. The query is initiated by scanning one or more of the subject's fingers, extracting the minutiae within the device, and transmitting to AFIS, which then returns a hit or no-hit (red light, green light) result. Hit notification may be accompanied by the thumbnail image of the subject's mug shot.
- Multimodal identification systems, including fingerprint, palmprint, iris, and facial recognition, are now available.

6.2.2 System Accuracy

Most dedicated government computer systems are based on demographic data such as name, address, date of birth, and other information derived from letters and numbers. For example, to search for a record within the motor vehicle database, one would enter a license number or operator data. The success of the search will be dependent on the accuracy with which the letters and numbers were originally perceived and entered. The inquiry is straightforward and highly accurate at finding the desired record.

Automated fingerprint systems are based on data extracted from images. Although there is only one correct spelling for a name in a motor vehicle database, a fingerprint image can be scanned in an almost infinite number of ways. Success in searching fingerprints depends on the clarity of the images and the degree of correspondence between

⁴ "Lights out" generally refers to the ability of the system to operate without human intervention.



the search print and the database print (compression and algorithms are two other factors that can affect accuracy). In the case of searching a new tenprint card against the tenprint database, there is usually more than enough image information present to find its mate 99.9% of the time in systems with operators on hand to check respondent lists (rather than true "lights out" operations).

A latent print usually consists of a fragmentary portion of a single finger or piece of palm, though the quality of some latent impressions can exceed their corresponding images of record. The amount of information present in the image is usually of lesser quality and often is contaminated with background interference. Entering latents into the computer has a subjective element that is based on the experience of the operator. Based on latent print acceptance test requirements commonly found in AFIS proposals and contracts, the chances of a latent print finding its mate in the database is about 70 to 80%. Naturally, the better the latent image, the higher the chances of success. Inversely, the chance of missing an identification, even when the mate is in the database, is 25%. Especially in latent print searches, failure to produce an identification or a hit does not mean the subject is not in the database. Other factors beyond the knowledge and control of the operator, such as poor-quality database prints, will adversely affect the chances of a match.

Because of the variability of the images and the subjectivity of the terminal's operator, success is often improved by conducting multiple searches while varying the image, changing operators, or searching other systems that may contain different copies of the subject's prints. It is common that success comes only on multiple attempts.

6.2.3 Peripheral Benefits

6.2.3.1 Community Safety. There is no national reporting mechanism for the gathering of AFIS (or latent print) statistics, so the measurable benefits are illusive. However, to provide some recognition of those benefits, the author of this chapter conducted a survey of latent hits in the 10 largest states by population for the year 2005 (Table 6-1). Prior attempts to provide this type of information have revealed inconsistencies in how identifications are counted and how the hit rate is determined (Komarinski, 2005, pp 184-189).

Based on the author's survey, an estimated 50,000 suspects a year in the United States are identified through AFIS latent searches. In conducting the survey, if the

contacted state bureaus did not have statewide figures, attempts were made to also contact the five largest cities in that state. (In no instance was it possible to contact every AFIS-equipped jurisdiction in a state, so the total hits are the minimum number of hits.) Also, only case hits or suspect hits were counted, depending on what data each agency kept. (When agencies reported multiple hits to a single person, this was not included in data presented.)

Extrapolating from the table, if the remaining 40 states and all agencies of the federal government each had just one latent hit per day, the total estimate of latent hits for the entire United States would surpass 50,000.

Table 6-1

Minimum hits (cases or persons identified) from 10 largest states by population for 2005.

Rank by Population	State	AFIS Latent Hits
1	California	8,814
2	Texas	3,590
3	New York	2,592
4	Florida	6,275
5	Illinois	1,224
6	Pennsylvania	1,463
7	Ohio*	1,495
8	Michigan**	1,239
9	Georgia	980
10	New Jersey	1,506
	Total	29,178

* Cleveland not available.

** Detroit not available.

Few studies have been done to measure what effect, if any, a dramatic increase in the rate of suspect latent print identifications from AFIS has had on public safety overall. The burglary data from San Francisco in the late 1980s (Figure 6-2) is probative but must be narrowly construed. FBI Uniform Crime Reports show a steady decline in most serious offenses that coincide with the proliferation of AFIS, but no cause-and-effect relationship has been explored by academia or government. During the 1990s, many states passed "three strikes" laws increasing the punishment for



felony offenses that some theorists have held are responsible for the decline in crime. But before harsher penalties can be applied, perpetrators must be identified and apprehended.

Burglary is the offense most impacted by AFIS. Assume that an active burglar is committing two offenses per week when he is apprehended on the basis of an AFIS hit. He is convicted and, based on harsh sentencing laws, sent to prison for 5 years. In this case, that one AFIS hit will have prevented 100 crimes per year over the course of the 5 year sentence. If this one arrest is then multiplied by some fraction of the totals from the table above, a truer appreciation of the impact that AFIS is having on society can be gained.

6.2.3.2 Validation of Friction Ridge Science. There are many ways to test the efficacy of a theoretical proposition. Corporate and academic laboratories pour tremendous resources into building models that they hope will closely duplicate performance in the real world. Even after successfully passing such testing, theories fail and products get recalled after weathering the rigors of the real world. In-use models invariably trump laboratory models.

During the past 100 years, many models have been constructed to test the theory that no two friction ridge images from different areas of palmar surfaces are alike and to determine what minimum number of minutiae is sufficient to support an individualization decision.

Automated fingerprint systems have been effectively testing identification theory millions of times a day every day for more than 20 years. These systems tend to validate what friction ridge examiners have propounded since Galton first set forth his standards. AFIS has also served as a catalyst to help examiners expand their image-processing knowledge and skills.

Some errors occur every year in both manual and automated systems, and it is through the study of errors that both systems can be improved in the future. According to Dr. James Wayman, Director of the National Biometrics Test Center, "Error rates (in friction ridge identification) are difficult to measure, precisely because they are so low" (Wayman, 2000)

6.2.4 IAFIS

The Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System, more commonly known as IAFIS, is the world's

largest collection of criminal history information. Fully operational since July 28, 1999, IAFIS is maintained by the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division in Clarksburg, WV, and contains fingerprint images for more than 64 million individuals. The FBI's CJIS Division system's architecture and the identification and investigative services provided by the division form an integrated system-of-services (SoS) concept. These identification and information services enable local, state, federal, tribal, and international law enforcement communities, as well as civil organizations, to efficiently access or exchange critical information 24 hours a day, 365 days per year. The SoS provides advanced identification and ancillary criminal justice technologies used in the identification of subjects.

The systems within the CJIS SoS, including IAFIS, have evolved over time, both individually and collectively, to add new technological capabilities, embrace legislative directives, and improve the performance and accuracy of their information services. During its first year of inception, IAFIS processed nearly 14.5 million fingerprint submissions. Today, IAFIS processes similar tenprint volumes in as little as 3 to 4 months. Although designed to respond to electronic criminal transactions within 2 hours and civil transactions within 24 hours, IAFIS has exceeded these demands, often providing criminal search requests in less than 20 minutes and civil background checks in less than 3 hours. Likewise, IAFIS provides the latent print examiners with a superlative investigative tool, allowing fingerprint evidence from crime scenes to be searched in approximately 2 hours rather than the 24-hour targeted response time. Although declared a successful system early within its deployment, IAFIS continues to improve as a vital asset to law enforcement agencies more than 10 years later. Today's transient society magnifies the need for an economic, rapid, positive identification process for both criminal and noncriminal justice background checks. IAFIS processes are regularly improved to allow for a quick and accurate fingerprint-based records check, whether related to terrorists trying to enter the United States or applicants seeking positions of trust. Figure 6-3 illustrates the states that currently interface with IAFIS electronically.

The increasingly complex requirements of the SoS architecture demand a well-structured process for its operations and maintenance. Each of these systems has multiple segments consisting of computer hardware and software that provide the operating systems and utilities, database management, workflow management, transaction or




FIGURE 6-3

Electronic submissions to IAFIS. (Illustration from the Federal Bureau of Investigation.)




FIGURE 6-4

IAFIS segments. (Illustration from the Federal Bureau of Investigation.)


messaging management, internal and external networking, communications load balancing, and system security. IAFIS consists of three integrated segments: the Identification Tasking and Networking (ITN) segment, the Interstate Identification Index (III), and AFIS (Figure 6-4).

Within IAFIS, the ITN segment acts as a “traffic cop” for the fingerprint system, providing workflow/workload management for tenprint, latent print, and document processing. The ITN provides the human-machine interfaces, the internal interfaces for communications within the IAFIS backbone

communications element, the storage and retrieval of fingerprint images, the external communications interfaces, the IAFIS back-end communications element, and user fee billing. The III provides subject search, computerized criminal history, and criminal photo storage and retrieval. The AFIS searches the FBI fingerprint repository for matches to tenprint and latent fingerprints. Supporting IAFIS is the CJIS-wide area network (WAN), providing the communications infrastructure for the secure exchange of fingerprint information to and from external systems. The external systems are the state control

FIGURE 6-5

IAFIS networked architecture. (Illustration from the Federal Bureau of Investigation.)



terminal agencies, state identification bureaus, and federal service coordinators.

Also submitting fingerprint information to IAFIS is the Card Scanning Service (CSS). The CSS acts as a conduit for agencies that are not yet submitting fingerprints electronically. The CSS makes the conversion of fingerprint information from paper format to electronic format and submits that information to IAFIS. Another system providing external communications for IAFIS is Nlets. The purpose of Nlets is to provide interstate communications to law enforcement, criminal justice, and other agencies involved in the enforcement of laws. Figure 6-5 depicts the high-level IAFIS architecture. Users wishing to interface with IAFIS electronically must comply with the FBI's Electronic Fingerprint Transmission Specification (EFTS).

Electronic access to and exchange of fingerprint information with the world's largest national repository of automated criminal and civil records is fulfilling the CJIS mission:

The CJIS Division mission is to reduce terrorist activities by maximizing the ability to provide timely and relevant criminal justice information to the FBI and to qualified law enforcement, criminal justice, civilian, academic, employment, and licensing agencies concerning individuals, stolen property, criminal organizations and activities, and other law enforcement-related data.

6.2.4.1 IAFIS Status as of Early 2006. Because of the evolutionary changes to the American National Standards Institute (ANSI)/NIST standard in 1997, 2000, and 2006, the

FBI has not always had the financial resources or corporate commitment to update IAFIS and keep it current. One area where it has moved forward is the acceptance and processing of "segmented slaps" for civil transactions. These transactions use a modified livescan platen that is 3 inches high so the four fingers of each hand can be placed as a "slap" in a straight up-and-down position. Similarly, both thumbs can be captured simultaneously for a total of three images (type 4 or type 14 as defined in sections 6.3.2.1 and 6.3.3). The resultant transaction's three-image files are easy to segment with the capture device software. The three images and relative location of the segmented fingers within the images are all transmitted. This dramatically reduces collection time and improves the captured-image quality from a content perspective due to the flat, straight, 3-inch placement.

One drawback to IAFIS is that it cannot store and search palmprints, though several production AFISs can do so. Also, at least one foreign production and several domestic AFIS sites accept and store 1,000-pixels-per-inch tenprint images—IAFIS cannot yet do this.

The FBI recognizes its need to expand its services and has (1) tested small palm systems and (2) started a project known as the Next Generation Identification Program (NGI). Driven by advances in technology, customer requirements, and growing demand for IAFIS services, this program will further advance the FBI's biometric identification services, providing an incremental replacement of current IAFIS technical capabilities while introducing new functionality. NGI improvements and new capabilities



will be introduced across a multiyear time frame within a phased approach. The NGI system will offer state-of-the-art biometric identification services and provide a flexible framework of core capabilities that will serve as a platform for multimodal functionality.

6.2.4.2 Universal Latent Work Station. AFISs that are fully ANSI/NIST compliant can send image-based transactions from site to site. But in the latent community, most practitioners want to edit the images and extract the minutiae themselves, that is, perform remote searches rather than submittals. This model also plays well with the ability of most agencies to provide the skilled labor required for imaged-based submittals from other agencies.

The FBI CJIS Division addressed this issue by working closely with Mitretek and the four major AFIS vendors to develop a set of tools that would permit the creation of remote searches for any of their automated fingerprint identification systems and for IAFIS. The result is a free software product called the Universal Latent Workstation (ULW). This software can run on a stand-alone PC with either a flatbed scanner or a digital camera interface. It can also run on vendor-provided latent workstations. At a minimum, when specifying an AFIS in a procurement, one should mandate that the AFIS be able to generate remote searches to IAFIS. It is further recommended that the procurer ask for the ability to perform the ULW function so the vendors can integrate ULW into their systems.

The ULW also provides the ability to launch latent print image searches into IAFIS without the need to manually encode minutiae when working with high-quality latent prints.

6.3 Standards

6.3.1 Background

Standards are mutually agreed upon attributes of products, systems, communication protocols, and so forth. Standards are what permit people to purchase light bulbs made in Hungary, the United States, or Japan and know they will fit in a standard lamp socket. Industries and governments establish standards not just for the convenience of the consumer but to permit competition for the same product.

Each nation has its own standards bureau or management body. In the United States, it is ANSI. At the international

level, there are several such bodies. They include the United Nation's International Labor Organization (ILO) and International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol), the International Standards Organization (ISO), and the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC).

Other than the United Nations and Interpol, these standards bodies do not "invent" or "create" standards but rather provide processes that authorized bodies can use to propose standards for approval at the national level and then at the international level. The United Nations and Interpol tend to build on these national and international standards bodies' standards rather than starting from scratch.

ANSI has offices in both New York and Washington, DC. ANSI has authorized more than 200 bodies to propose standards. If all the procedures are followed correctly and there are no unaddressed objections, then the results of the efforts of these bodies become ANSI standards. The 200 organizations include the following:

- The Department of Commerce's NIST
- IAI
- The American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators
- The International Committee for Information Technology Standards (INCITS)

6.3.2 Fingerprint Standards

Law enforcement agencies around the world have had standards for the local exchange of inked fingerprints for decades. In 1995, Interpol held a meeting to address the transfer of ink-and-paper fingerprint cards (also known as forms) between countries. The local standards naturally had different text fields, had different layouts of text fields, were in different languages, and were on many different sizes of paper. Before that effort could lead to an internationally accepted fingerprint form, Interpol moved to the electronic exchange of fingerprints.

In the ink-and-paper era, the standards included fiber content and thickness of the paper, durability of the ink, size of the "finger boxes," and so forth. With the move in the early 1990s toward near real-time responses to criminal fingerprint submittals, there came a new set of standards.

The only way to submit, search, and determine the status of fingerprints in a few hours from a remote site is through electronic submittal and electronic responses. The source can still be ink-and-paper, but the images need to be digitized and submitted electronically to address the growing demand for rapid turnaround of fingerprint transactions.

The FBI was the first agency to move to large-scale electronic submission of fingerprints from remote sites. As part of the development of IAFIS, the FBI worked very closely with NIST to develop appropriate standards for the electronic transmission of fingerprint images.

Starting in 1991, NIST held a series of workshops with forensic experts, fingerprint repository managers, industry representatives, and consultants to develop a standard, under the ANSI guidelines, for the exchange of fingerprint images. It was approved in November 1993, and the formal title was "Data Format for the Interchange of Fingerprint Information (ANSI NIST-CSL 1-1993)". This standard was based on the 1986 ANSI/National Bureau of Standards minutiae-based standard and ANSI/NBS-ICST 1-1986, a standard that did not address image files.

This 1993 NIST standard (and the later revisions) became known in the fingerprint technology world simply as the "ANSI/NIST standard." If implemented correctly (i.e., in full compliance with the standard and the FBI's implementation), it would permit fingerprints collected on a compliant livescan from any vendor to be read by any other compliant AFIS and the FBI's yet-to-be-built (at that time) IAFIS.

The standard was deliberately open to permit communities of users (also known as domains of interest) to customize it to meet their needs. Some of the customizable areas were image density (8-bit gray scale or binary) and text fields associated with a transaction (e.g., name, crime). The idea was that different communities of users would write their own implementation plans. The mandatory parts of the ANSI/NIST standard were the definitions of the record types, the binary formats for fingerprint and signature images and, within certain record types, the definition of "header" fields such as image compression type.

6.3.2.1 Record Types. For a transaction to be considered ANSI/NIST compliant, the data must be sent in a structured fashion with a series of records that align with ANSI/NIST record types as implemented in a specific user domain (e.g., Interpol).

- All transmissions (also known as transactions) have

to start with a type 1 record that is basically a table of contents for the transmission, the transaction type field (e.g., CAR for "criminal tenprint submission—answer required"), and the identity of both the sending and receiving agencies.

- Type 2 records can contain user-defined information associated with the subject of the fingerprint transmission (such as name, date of birth, etc.) and the purpose of the transaction (arrest cycle, applicant background check, etc.). These fields are defined in the domain-of-interest implementation standard (e.g., the FBI's EFTS). Note that type 2 records are also used for responses from AFISs. They fall into two sets: error messages and search results. The actual use is defined in the domain specification.
- Types 3 (low-resolution gray scale), 4 (high-resolution gray scale), 5 (low-resolution binary), and 6 (high-resolution binary) were set up for the transmission of fingerprint images at different standards (500 ppi for high resolution and 256 ppi for low resolution) and image density (8 bits per pixel for grayscale) or binary (1 bit per pixel for black and white). Note that all images for records type 3 through 6 are to be acquired at a minimum of 500 ppi; however, low-resolution images are down-sampled to 256 ppi for transmission. There are few, if any, ANSI/NIST implementations that support type 3, 5, or 6 images (see explanation below). None of these three record types are recommended for use by latent examiners and fingerprint technicians.
- Type 7 was established for user-defined images (e.g., latent images, faces) and, until the update of the ANSI/NIST standard in 2000, it was the record type for exchanging latent images. This record type can be used to send scanned copies of identity documents, and so forth. Again, the domain specification determines the legitimate uses of the type 7 record.
- Type 8 was defined for signatures (of the subject or person taking the fingerprints), and it is not used in many domains.
- Type 9 was defined for a minimal set of minutiae that could be sent to any AFIS that was ANSI/NIST-compliant.

The first such implementation plan was the FBI's EFTS issued in 1994. The EFTS limited what record types, of the nine defined in the ANSI/NIST standard, the FBI would use, and defined the type 2 data fields. The key decision the FBI



made was that it would only accept 500-ppi gray-scale images or, in ANSI/NIST parlance, type 4 images. As a result of that decision, all law enforcement systems since then have specified type 4 images and do not accept types 3, 5, or 6, which as a result have fallen into disuse for these applications in the United States.

The type 4 records start out with header information in front of the image. The headers tell the computer which finger the image is from, whether it is from a livescan or an inked card, the image size in the number of pixels of width and height, and whether the image is from a rolled impression or a flat or plain impression.

6.3.2.2 Image Quality. Both the ANSI/NIST standard and the EFTS lacked any metrics or standards for image quality. The FBI then appended the EFTS with an image quality standard (IQS) known as Appendix F. (Later, a reduced set of image quality specifications were added as Appendix G because the industry was not uniformly ready to meet Appendix F standards.) The IQS defines minimal acceptable standards for the equipment used to capture the fingerprints. There are six engineering terms specified in the IQS. They are:

1. Geometric image accuracy—the ability of the scanner to keep relative distances between points on an object (e.g., two minutiae) the same relative distances apart in the output image.
2. Modulation transfer function (MTF)—the ability of the scanning device to capture both low-frequency (ridges themselves) and high-frequency (ridge edge details) information in a fingerprint at minimum standards.
3. Signal-to-noise ratio—the ability of the scanning device to digitize the information without introducing too much electronic noise (that is, with the pure white image parts appearing pure white and the totally black image parts appearing totally black).
4. Gray-scale range of image data—avoiding excessively low-contrast images by ensuring that the image data are spread across a minimal number of shades of gray.
5. Gray-scale linearity—as the level of gray changes in a fingerprint capture, the digital image reflects a corresponding ratio of gray level across all shades of gray.
6. Output gray-level uniformity—the ability of the scan-

ning device to create an image with a continuous gray scale across an area on the input image (tested using a special test image) that has a single gray level.

Interestingly, only two of these six image quality standards apply to latent scanning devices: geometric image accuracy and MTF. In fact, the FBI does not certify (see below for a discussion of certified products) scanners for latent use but recommends that latent examiners purchase equipment they are comfortable with using from an image-quality perspective. But EFTS Appendix F does mandate that latent images be captured at 1,000 ppi.

There are no standards for the quality of the actual fingerprint, but livescan and AFIS vendors have rated fingerprint quality for years. They know that fingerprint quality is possibly the strongest factor in the reliability of an AFIS's successfully matching a fingerprint to one in the repository. These ratings are often factored into the AFIS algorithms.

In a paper titled "The Role of Data Quality in Biometric Systems" (Hicklin and Khanna, 2006), the authors wrote the following:

Note that this definition of data quality goes beyond most discussions of biometric quality, which focus on the concept of sample quality. Sample quality deals with the capture fidelity of the subject's physical characteristics and the intrinsic data content of those characteristics. However, an equally important issue for any operational system is metadata quality: databases need to be concerned with erroneous relationships between data elements, which generally come from administrative rather than biometric-specific causes.

Although no standard exists for fingerprint image quality, NIST has researched the relationship between calculated image quality (using algorithms similar to those employed by AFIS vendors) and successful match rates in automated fingerprint identification systems. This led NIST to develop and publish a software utility to measure fingerprint image quality.

The software is entitled NIST Fingerprint Image Software 2. It was developed by NIST's image group for the FBI and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and is available free to U.S. law enforcement agencies as well as to biometrics manufacturers and researchers. The CD contains source code for 56 utilities and a user's guide.

The following summary is from the NIST Web site in 2007:

New to this release is a tool that evaluates the quality of a fingerprint scan at the time it is made. Problems such as dry skin, the size of the fingers and the quality and condition of the equipment used can affect the quality of a print and its ability to be matched with other prints. The tool rates each scan on a scale from 1 for a high-quality print to 5 for an unusable one. "Although most commercial fingerprint systems already include proprietary image quality software, the NIST software will for the first time allow users to directly compare fingerprint image quality from scanners made by different manufacturers," the agency said.

6.3.2.3 Certified Products List. To assist the forensic community to purchase IQS-compliant equipment, the FBI established a certification program. The vendors can self-test their equipment and submit the results to the FBI where, with the technical assistance of Mitretek, the results are evaluated. If the results are acceptable, a letter of certification is sent to the vendor. It is important to know that, for capture devices, it is a combination of the optics (scanner), image processing software, and the operating system that is tested. Therefore, letters of certification are not issued for a scanner but for a scanner and PC configuration that includes a specific scanner model, connected to a PC running a specific operating system, and any image-enhancement scanner drivers used.

At the rate at which manufacturers upgrade scanners, it can be hard to purchase previously certified pieces of equipment. A complete list of all certified equipment is maintained on the FBI's Web site under the CJIS section.

6.3.2.4 Compression. About the same time as the writing of the EFTS, the FBI decided on the compression standard for ANSI/NIST transmissions. Given that the data rate (bandwidth) of telecommunications systems was very low in 1993 compared to today's rates and that the cost of disk storage was quite high, the FBI elected to compress fingerprint images using a technique called wavelet scalar quantization (WSQ).

The initial plan was for tenprint transmissions to be compressed with WSQ at 20:1 and for latent images to remain uncompressed. An FBI fingerprint card in the early 1990s had a surface area for fingerprints that was 8 inches wide and 5 inches high for a total of 40 square inches. Scanning

at 500 ppi in both the 8-inch direction (X) and the 5-inch direction (Y) yielded a total of 10 million bytes of information (10 MB). Compression at 20:1 would produce a half (0.5) MB file that was much easier to transmit and store.

At the 1993 IAI Annual Training Conference in Orlando, FL, the IAI Board of Directors expressed its concerns to the IAFIS program director about the proposed compression rate of 20:1. The FBI agreed to support an independent assessment of the impact of compression on the science of fingerprint identification by the IAI AFIS committee, under the Chairmanship of Mike Fitzpatrick of Illinois, (IAI AFIS Committee, 1994). As a result of the study, the FBI agreed to reduce the average compression to 15:1 (Higgins, 1995, pp 409-418).⁵

As other domains of interest adopted the ANSI/NIST standard around the world (early adopters included the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the United Kingdom Home Office), they all used the EFTS as a model and all incorporated the IQS standard by reference. With one or two exceptions, they also adopted WSQ compression at 15:1.

With the move to higher scan rates for tenprint transactions, the compression technology of choice is JPEG 2000, which is a wavelet-based compression technique. Currently (as of 2007), there are at least five 1000-ppi tenprint, image-based automated fingerprint identification systems using JPEG 2000. Both Cogent and Motorola have delivered 1000-ppi systems. It is anticipated that the other vendors will deliver such systems as the demand increases. Given that older livescan systems operating at 500 ppi can submit transactions to these new automated fingerprint identification systems, it is important that they be capable of working in a mixed-density (500-ppi and 1000-ppi) environment.

All four major AFIS vendors demonstrated the capability to acquire, store, and process 1000-ppi tenprints and palmprints during the 2005 Royal Canadian Mounted Police AFIS Benchmark. It is important to note that these systems acquire the known tenprint and palm images at 1000 ppi for archiving but down-sample them to 500 ppi

⁵The study showed that expert latent print examiners were unable to differentiate original images from those compressed at either 5:1 or 10:1 when presented with enlargements on high-quality film printers. One possible implication of that study was that latent images might safely be compressed at 2:1 (or possibly even more) for transmission, with no loss of information content. Currently, there are no agencies reporting the use of compression with latent images.



for searching and creating an image to be used in AFIS. Currently, 1000-ppi images are used primarily for display at latent examiner workstations. As automated fingerprint identification systems move to using third-level features, it is assumed that the higher resolution images will play a role in the algorithms.

6.3.3 Updates to the ANSI/NIST Standard

Since 1993, the ANSI/NIST standard has been updated three times, most recently in 2007 and 2008. The key changes are as follows:

- In 1997, type 10 transactions were added to permit facial, scar marks, and tattoo images to be transmitted with fingerprint transactions. The title of the document was changed to reflect that: "Data Format for the Interchange of Fingerprint, Facial & SMT (Scar, Mark, and Tattoo) Information (ANSI/NIST-ITL 1a-1997)"
- In 2000, types 13 through 16⁶ were added to support higher density images, latent images in a new format, palm images, and test images, respectively (ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2000).
- NIST held two workshops in 2005 to determine whether there were any new areas that should be added. The major changes desired were the addition of standard record types for biometric data types beyond fingers and faces (e.g., iris images) and the introduction of XML data in the type 2 records. Several other changes and additions were also proposed. (See the 2007 and 2008 revisions, ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2007 and 2-2008.)

6.3.4 Early Demonstrations of Interoperability

By 1996, the IAI AFIS Committee was organizing and managing (under the chairmanships of Mike Fitzpatrick, Peter Higgins, and Ken Moses) a series of demonstrations of interoperability of tenprint-image transactions originating from Aware software, Comnetix Live Scan, and Identix Live Scan and going to Cogent Systems, Printrak (now Motorola), and Sagem Morpho automated fingerprint identification systems. The second year of these demonstrations (1998) saw the same input being submitted between operational AFIS sites from the same three AFIS vendors all over the Nlets network (AFIS Committee Report, 1998, p 490).

⁶Types 11 and 12 were set aside for a project that never came to fruition and are not used in the standard AFIS Committee Report, 1998.

6.3.5 Latent Interoperability

When IAFIS was being developed, the FBI established (in the EFTS) two ways for latent impressions to be run through IAFIS from outside agencies.

6.3.5.1 Remote Submittals. The agency with the latent impression can send (electronically or via the mail) the impression (as an image in the case of electronic submittal) to the FBI, and FBI staff will perform the editing, encoding, searching, and candidate evaluation. The FBI will make any identification decision and return the results to the submitting agency. This process mimics the pre-IAFIS workflow but adds the option of electronic submittal.

6.3.5.2 Remote Searches. The agency with the latent impression performs the editing and encoding and then sends (electronically) a latent fingerprint features search (LFFS) to IAFIS for lights-out searching. IAFIS then returns a candidate list, including finger images, to the originating agency to perform candidate evaluation. The submitting agency makes any identification decision. To support LFFS remote search capability, the FBI published the "native" IAFIS feature set definition.

Many civil agencies and departments have wanted to be able to offer remote tenprint searches, but the feature sets for the major AFIS vendors are proprietary. In 2006, NIST performed a study on interoperability of the native feature set level of many AFIS and livescan companies and compared those with the performance of INCITS 378 fingerprint template standard minutiae (the basic set A and the richer set B).

The MINEX report (Grother et al., 2006) shows that minutiae-based interoperability is possible (with some loss of reliability and accuracy) for single-finger verification systems. The report is careful to point out that the use of INCITS 378 templates for remote criminal tenprint and latent searches is unknown and cannot safely be extrapolated from the report.

Because most AFISs (other than IAFIS) do not have remote LFFS functionality (as of 2007), latent interoperability at the image level usually requires labor on the part of the searching agency. The desire to move that labor burden to the submitting agency is natural because many have some level of excess capacity that could possibly support remote latent searches during off-hours.

6.4 Digitization and Processing of Fingerprints

6.4.1 Algorithms

Demands imposed by the painstaking attention needed to visually match the fingerprints of varied qualities, the tedium of the monotonous nature of the manual work, and increasing workloads due to a higher demand on fingerprint recognition services prompted law enforcement agencies to initiate research into acquiring fingerprints through electronic media and to automate fingerprint individualization based on digital representation of fingerprints. As a result of this research, a large number of computer algorithms have been developed during the past three decades to automatically process digital fingerprint images. An algorithm is a finite set of well-defined instructions for accomplishing some task which, given an initial state and input, will terminate in a corresponding recognizable end-state and output. A computer algorithm is an algorithm coded in a programming language to run on a computer. Depending upon the application, these computer algorithms could either assist human experts or perform in lights-out mode. These algorithms have greatly improved the operational productivity of law enforcement agencies and reduced the number of fingerprint technicians needed. Still, algorithm designers identified and investigated the following five major problems in designing automated fingerprint processing systems: digital fingerprint acquisition, image enhancement, feature (e.g., minutiae) extraction, matching, and indexing/retrieval.

6.4.2 Image Acquisition

Known fingerprint data can be collected by applying a thin coating of ink over a finger and rolling the finger from one end of the nail to the other end of the nail while pressing the finger against a paper card. This would result in an inked "rolled" fingerprint impression on the fingerprint card. If the finger was simply pressed straight down against the paper card instead of rolling, the resulting fingerprint impression would only contain a smaller central area of the finger rather than the full fingerprint, resulting in an inked "flat" or "plain" fingerprint impression.


The perspiration and contaminants on the skin result in the impression of a finger being deposited on a surface that is touched by that finger. These "latent" prints can be chemically or physically developed and electronically captured or

manually "lifted" from the surface by employing certain chemical, physical, and lighting techniques. The developed fingerprint may be lifted with tape or photographed. Often these latent fingerprints contain only a portion of the friction ridge detail that is present on the finger, that is, a "partial" fingerprint.

Fingerprint impressions developed and preserved using any of the above methods can be digitized by scanning the inked card, lift, item, or photograph. Digital images acquired by this method are known as "off-line" images. (Typically, the scanners are not designed specifically for fingerprint applications.)

Since the early 1970s, fingerprint sensors have been built that can acquire a "livescan" digital fingerprint image directly from a finger without the intermediate use of ink and a paper card. Although off-line images are still in use in certain forensic and government applications, on-line fingerprint images are increasingly being used. The main parameters characterizing a digital fingerprint image are resolution area, number of pixels, geometric accuracy, contrast, and geometric distortion. CJIS released specifications known as Appendix F and Appendix G that regulate the quality and the format of fingerprint images and FBI-compliant scanners. All livescan devices manufactured for use in forensic and government law enforcement applications are FBI compliant. Most of the livescan devices manufactured to be used in commercial applications, such as computer log-on, do not meet FBI specifications but, on the other hand, are usually more user-friendly, compact, and significantly less expensive. There are a number of livescan sensing mechanisms (e.g., optical, capacitive, thermal, pressure-based, ultrasound, and so forth) that can be used to detect the ridges and valleys present in the fingertip. However, many of these methods do not provide images that contain the same representation of detail necessary for some latent fingerprint comparisons. For example, a capacitive or thermal image may represent the edges and pores in a much different way than a rolled ink impression. Figure 6-6 shows an off-line fingerprint image acquired with the ink technique, a latent fingerprint image, and some livescan images acquired with different types of commercial livescan devices.

The livescan devices often capture a stream of fingerprint images from a single scan instead of just one image. Depending on the application for which the livescan device was designed, it may run one or more algorithms using

**FIGURE 6-6**

*Fingerprint images from
 (a) a livescan FTIR-based optical scanner;
 (b) a livescan capacitive scanner;
 (c) a livescan piezoelectric scanner;
 (d) a livescan thermal scanner;
 (e) an off-line inked impression;
 (f) a latent fingerprint.*

either a resource-limited (memory and processing power) microprocessor on-board or by using an attached computer. For example, the livescan booking stations usually run an algorithm that can mosaic (stitch) multiple images acquired as a video during a single rolling of a finger on the scanner into a large rolled image. Algorithms also typically run on an integrated booking management system to provide real-time previews (graphical user interface and zoom) to assist the operator in placing or aligning fingers or palms correctly. Typically, a fingerprint image quality-checking algorithm is also run to alert the operator about the acquisition of a poor-quality fingerprint image so that a better quality image can be reacquired from the finger or palm. Typical output from such an automatic quality-checker algorithm is depicted in Figure 6-7.

Although optical scanners have the longest history and highest quality, the new solid-state sensors are gaining great popularity because of their compact size and the ease with which they can be embedded into laptop computers, cellular phones, smart pens, personal digital assistants (PDAs), and the like. Swipe sensors, where a user is required to swipe his or her finger across a livescan sensor that is wide but very short, can offer the lowest cost and size. Such sensors image a single line or just a few lines (slice) of a fingerprint, and an image-stitching algorithm is used to stitch the lines or slices to form a two-dimensional fingerprint image (Figure 6-8).

Depending on the application, it may be desirable to implement one or more of the following algorithms in the livescan device:

FIGURE 6-7

- (a) A good-quality fingerprint;
 (b) A medium-quality fingerprint with creases;
 (c) A poor-quality fingerprint;
 (d) A very poor-quality fingerprint containing a lot of noise.



(a) Quality index = 0.9


(b) Quality index = 0.7





(c) Quality index = 0.4

(d) Quality index = 0.2

- Automatic finger-detection algorithm—The scanner automatically keeps looking for the presence of a finger on its surface and, as soon as it determines that there is a finger present on its surface, it alerts the system.
- Automatic fingerprint-capture algorithm—Immediately after the system has been alerted that a finger is present on the surface of the scanner, it starts receiving a series of images, and the fingerprint-capture algorithm automatically determines which frame in the image sequence has the best image quality and grabs that frame from the video for further image processing and matching.
- Vitality detection algorithm—The scanner can determine whether the finger is consistent with deposition by a living human being.
- Image data-compression algorithm—Compressed image will require less storage and bandwidth when transferred to the system.
- Image-processing algorithms—Certain applications will benefit from feature extraction carried out on the sensor itself; the transfer of the fingerprint features will also require less bandwidth than the image.
- Fingerprint-matching algorithm—Certain applications would like the fingerprint matching to be performed on the sensor for security reasons, especially for on-board sequence checking.
- Cryptographic algorithms and protocol(s)—Implemented in the scanner to carry out secure communication.

**FIGURE 6-8**

As the user sweeps his or her finger on the sensor, the sensor delivers new image slices, which are combined into a two-dimensional image.



6.4.3 Image Enhancement


Fingerprint images originating from different sources may have different noise characteristics and thus may require some enhancement algorithms based on the type of noise. For example, latent fingerprint images can contain a variety of artifacts and noise. Inked fingerprints can contain blobs or broken ridges that are due to an excessive or inadequate amount of ink. Filled paper cards may contain inscriptions overlapping the fingerprints and so forth. The goal of fingerprint enhancement algorithms is to produce an image that does not contain artificially generated ridge structure that might later result in the detection of false minutiae features while capturing the maximum available ridge structure to allow detection of true minutiae. Adapting the enhancement process to the fingerprint capture method can yield the optimal matching performance over a large collection of fingerprints.

A fingerprint may contain such poor-quality areas that the local ridge orientation and frequency estimation algorithms are completely wrong. An enhancement algorithm that can reliably locate (and mask) these extremely poor-quality areas is very useful for the later feature detection and individualization stages by preventing false or unreliable features from being created.

Fingerprint images can sometimes be of poor quality because of noise introduced during the acquisition process. For example: a finger may be dirty, a latent print may be lifted from a difficult surface, the acquisition medium (paper card or livescan) may be dirty, or noise may be introduced during the interaction of the finger with the sensing surface (such as slippage or other inconsistent contact). When presented with a poor-quality image, a forensic expert would use a magnifying glass and try to decipher the fingerprint features in the presence of the noise. Automatic fingerprint image-enhancement algorithms can significantly improve the quality of fingerprint ridges in the fingerprint image and make the image more suitable for further manual or automatic processing. The image enhancement

FIGURE 6-9

An example of local area contrast enhancement. The algorithm enhances the entire image by enhancing a large number of small square local areas.



algorithms do not add any external information to the fingerprint image. The enhancement algorithms use only the information that is already present in the fingerprint image. The enhancement algorithms can suppress various types of noise (e.g., another latent print, background color) in the fingerprint image and highlight the existing useful features. These image enhancement algorithms can be of two types.

6.4.3.1 Enhancement of Latent Prints for AFIS Searching.

In the case of latent searches into the forensic AFISs, the enhancement algorithm is interactive, that is, live feedback about the enhancement is provided to the forensic expert through a graphical user interface. Through this interface, the forensic expert is able to use various algorithms to choose the region of interest in the fingerprint image, crop the image, invert color, adjust intensity, flip the image, magnify the image, resize the image window, and apply compression and decompression algorithms. The forensic expert can selectively apply many of the available enhancement algorithms (or select the parameters of the algorithm) based on the visual feedback. Such algorithms may include histogram equalization, image intensity rescaling, image intensity adjustments with high and low thresholds, local or global contrast enhancement, local or global background subtraction, sharpness adjustments (applying high-pass filter), background suppression (low-pass filter), gamma adjustments, brightness and contrast adjustments, and so forth. An example of local area contrast enhancement is shown in Figure 6-9. In this example, the fingerprint image enhancement algorithm enhances only a small, square, local area of the image at a time but traverses over the entire image in a raster scan fashion such that the entire image is enhanced. Subsequent fingerprint feature extraction can then be either performed manually or through automatic fingerprint feature extraction algorithms.


6.4.3.2 Automated Enhancement of Fingerprint Images.

In the case of lights-out applications (frequently used in automated background checks and commercial applications for control of physical access), human assistance does not occur in the fingerprint individualization process. Enhancement algorithms are used in the fully automated mode to improve the fingerprint ridge structures in poor-quality fingerprint images.

An example of a fully automated fingerprint image-enhancement algorithm is shown in Figure 6-10. In this example, contextual filtering is used that has a low-pass (smoothing) effect along the fingerprint ridges and a band-pass (differentiating) effect in the direction orthogonal to the ridges to increase the contrast between ridges and valleys. Often, oriented band-pass filters are used for such filtering. One such type of commonly used filters is known as Gabor filters. The local context is provided to such contextual filters in terms of local orientation and local ridge frequency.

6.4.4 Feature Extraction

Local fingerprint ridge singularities, commonly known as *minutiae points*, have been traditionally used by forensic experts as discriminating features in fingerprint images. The most common local singularities are ridge endings and ridge bifurcations. Other types of minutiae mentioned in the literature, such as the lake, island, spur, crossover, and so forth (with the exception of dots), are simply composites of ridge endings and bifurcations. Composite minutiae, made up of two to four minutiae occurring very close to each other, have also been used. In manual latent print processing, a forensic expert would visually locate the minutiae in a fingerprint image and note its location, the orientation of the ridge on which it resides, and the minutiae

**FIGURE 6-10**

Stages in a typical contextual filtering-based fingerprint image enhancement algorithm.

One common approach followed by the fingerprint feature extraction algorithms is to first use a binarization algorithm to convert the gray-scale-enhanced fingerprint image into binary (black and white) form, where all black pixels correspond to ridges and all white pixels correspond to valleys. The binarization algorithm ranges from simple thresholding of the enhanced image to very sophisticated ridge location algorithms. Thereafter, a thinning algorithm is used to convert the binary fingerprint image into a single pixel width about the ridge centerline. The central idea of the thinning process is to perform successive (iterative) erosions of the outermost layers of a shape until a connected unit-width set of lines (or skeletons) is obtained. Several algorithms exist for thinning. Additional steps in the thinning algorithm are used to fill pores and eliminate noise that may result in the detection of false minutiae points.

The resulting image from the thinning algorithm is called a *thinned image* or *skeletal image*. A minutiae detection algorithm is applied to this skeletal image to locate the x and y coordinates as well as the orientation (θ) of the minutiae points. In the skeletal image, by definition, all pixels on a ridge have two neighboring pixels in the immediate neighborhood. If a pixel has only one neighboring pixel, it is determined to be a ridge ending and if a pixel has three neighboring pixels, it is determined to be a ridge bifurcation.

Each of the algorithms used in fingerprint image enhancement and minutiae extraction has its own limitation and results in imperfect processing, especially when the input fingerprint image includes non-friction-ridge noise. As a result, many false minutiae may be detected by the minutiae detection algorithm. To alleviate this problem, often a minutiae postprocessing algorithm is used to confirm or validate the detected minutiae. Only those minutiae that pass this postprocessing algorithm are kept and the rest are removed. For example, if a ridge length running away from the minutia point is sufficient or if the ridge direction at the point is within acceptable limits, the minutia is kept.

type. Automatic fingerprint feature-extraction algorithms were developed to imitate minutiae location performed by forensic experts. However, most automatic fingerprint minutiae-extraction algorithms only consider ridge endings and bifurcations because other types of ridge detail are very difficult to automatically extract. Further, most algorithms do not differentiate between ridge endings and bifurcations because they can be indistinguishable as a result of finger pressure differences during acquisition or artifacts introduced during the application of the enhancement algorithm.



**FIGURE 6-11**

Stages in a typical fingerprint minutiae extraction algorithm.

The postprocessing might also include an examination of the local image quality, neighboring detections, or other indicators of nonfingerprint structure in the area. Further, the image can be inverted in gray scale, converting white to black and black to white. Reprocessing of this inverted image should yield minutiae endings in place of bifurcations, and vice versa, allowing a validity check on the previously detected minutiae. The final detected minutiae are those that meet all of the validity checks. Figure 6-11 shows the steps in a typical fingerprint feature-extraction algorithm; the extracted minutiae are displayed overlapping on the input image for visualization.

Note that the stages and algorithms described in this section represent only a typical fingerprint minutiae-extraction algorithm. A wide variety of fingerprint minutiae-extraction algorithms exist and they all differ from one another, sometimes in how they implement a certain stage and sometimes in the stages they use and the order in which they use them. For example, some minutiae extraction algorithms do not use a postprocessing stage. Some others do not use a ridge-thinning stage, and the minutiae detection algorithm works directly on the result of the ridge location algorithm. Some work directly on the enhanced image, and some even work directly on the raw input image. Additional stages and algorithms may also be used.

Many other features are often also extracted in addition to minutiae. These additional features often provide useful information that can be used in the later matching stages to improve the fingerprint-matching accuracy. For example, minutiae confidence, ridge counts between minutiae, ridge count confidence, core and delta locations, local quality measures, and so forth, can be extracted. These additional features may be useful to achieve added selectivity from a minutiae-matching process. Their usefulness for this purpose may be mediated by the confidence associated with each such feature. Therefore, it is important to collect confidence data as a part of the image-enhancement and feature-extraction process to be able to properly qualify detected minutiae and associated features.

Enhanced Image**Ridge Location****Ridge Thinning****Minutiae Detection****Postprocessing****Minutiae points**

The early fingerprint feature-extraction algorithms were developed to imitate feature extraction by forensic experts. Recently, a number of automatic fingerprint feature-extraction (and matching) algorithms have emerged that use non-minutiae-based information in the fingerprint images. For example, sweat pores, which are very minute details in fingerprints, smaller than minutiae points, have been successfully extracted by algorithms from high-resolution fingerprint images. Other non-minutiae-based features are often low-level features (for example, texture



features) that do not have a high-level meaning, such as a ridge ending or bifurcation. These features are well suited for machine representation and matching and can be used in place of minutiae features. Often, a combination of minutiae and non-minutiae-based features can provide the best accuracy in an automatic fingerprint individualization system. Forensic experts use such fine features implicitly, along with normal ridge endings and bifurcations features, during examination.

6.4.5 Matching

Fingerprint matching can be defined as the exercise of finding the similarity or dissimilarity in any two given fingerprint images. Fingerprint matching can be best visualized by taking a paper copy of a file fingerprint image with its minutiae marked or overlaid and a transparency of a search fingerprint with its minutiae marked or overlaid. By placing the transparency of the search print over the paper copy of the file fingerprint and translating and rotating the transparency, one can locate the minutiae points that are common in both prints. From the number of common minutiae found, their closeness of fit, the quality of the fingerprint images, and any contradictory minutiae matching information, it is possible to assess the similarity of the two prints. Manual fingerprint matching is a very tedious task. Automatic fingerprint-matching algorithms work on the result of fingerprint feature-extraction algorithms and find the similarity or dissimilarity in any two given sets of minutiae. Automatic fingerprint matching can perform fingerprint comparisons at the rate of tens of thousands of times each second, and the results can be sorted according to the degree of similarity and combined with any other criteria that may be available to further filter the candidates, all without human intervention.

It is important to note, however, that automatic fingerprint-matching algorithms are significantly less accurate than a well-trained forensic expert. Even so, depending on the application and the fingerprint image quality, the automatic fingerprint-matching algorithms can significantly reduce the work for forensic experts. For example, in the case of latent print matching where only a single, very poor quality partial fingerprint image is available for matching, the matching algorithm may not be very accurate. Still, the matching algorithm can return a list of candidate matches that is much smaller than the size of the database; the forensic expert then needs only to manually match a much smaller number of fingerprints. In the case of latent print

matching when the latent print is of good quality, or in the case of tenprint-to-tenprint matching in a background check application, the matching is highly accurate and requires minimal human expert involvement.


Automatic fingerprint-matching algorithms yield imperfect results because of the difficult problem posed by large intraclass variations (variability in different impressions of the same finger) present in the fingerprints. These intraclass variations arise from the following factors that vary during different acquisition of the same finger: (1) displacement, (2) rotation, (3) partial overlap, (4) nonlinear distortion because of pressing of the elastic three-dimensional finger onto a rigid two-dimensional imaging surface, (5) pressure, (6) skin conditions, (7) noise introduced by the imaging environment, and (8) errors introduced by the automatic feature-extraction algorithms.

A robust fingerprint-matching algorithm must be able to deal with all these intraclass variations in the various impressions of the same finger. The variations in displacement, rotation, and partial overlap are typically dealt with by using an alignment algorithm. The alignment algorithm should be able to correctly align the two fingerprint minutiae sets such that the corresponding or matching minutiae correspond well with each other after the alignment. Certain alignment algorithms also take into account the variability caused by nonlinear distortion. The alignment algorithm must also be able to take into consideration the fact that the feature extraction algorithm is imperfect and may have introduced false minutiae points and, at the same time, may have missed detecting some of the genuine minutiae points. Many fingerprint alignment algorithms exist. Some may use the core and delta points, if extracted, to align the fingerprints. Others use point pattern-matching algorithms such as Hough transform (a standard tool in pattern recognition that allows recognition of global patterns in the feature space by recognition of local patterns in a transformed parameter space), relaxation, algebraic and operational research solutions, "tree pruning," energy minimization, and so forth, to align minutiae points directly. Others use thinned ridge matching or orientation field matching to arrive at an alignment.

Once an alignment has been established, the minutiae from the two fingerprints often do not exactly overlay each other because of the small residual errors in the alignment algorithm and the nonlinear distortions. The next stage in a fingerprint minutiae-matching algorithm, which establishes the minutiae in the two sets that are corresponding

FIGURE 6-12

Stages in a typical fingerprint minutiae matching algorithm.



and those that are noncorresponding, is based on using some tolerances in the minutiae locations and orientation to declare a correspondence. Because of noise that is introduced by skin condition, recording environment, imaging environment, and the imperfection of automatic fingerprint feature-extraction algorithms, the number of corresponding minutiae is usually found to be less than the total number of minutiae in either of the minutiae sets in the overlapping area. So, finally, a score computation algorithm is used to compute a matching score. The matching score essentially conveys the confidence of the fingerprint matching algorithm and can be viewed as an indication of the probability that the two fingerprints come from the same finger. The higher the matching score, the more likely it is that the fingerprints are mated (and, conversely, the lower the score, the less likely there is a match). There are many score computation algorithms that are used. They range from simple ones that count the number of matching minutiae normalized by the total number of minutiae in the two fingerprints in the overlapping area to very complex probability-theory-based, or statistical-pattern-recognition-classifier-based algorithms that take into account a number of features such as the area of overlap, the quality of the fingerprints, residual distances between the matching minutiae, the quality of individual minutiae, and so forth. Figure 6-12 depicts the steps in a typical fingerprint matching algorithm.

Note that the stages and algorithms described in this section represent only a typical fingerprint minutiae-matching algorithm. Many fingerprint minutiae-matching algorithms exist and they all differ from one another. As with the various extraction algorithms, matching algorithms use different implementations, different stages, and different orders of stages. For example, some minutiae-matching algorithms do not use an alignment stage. These algorithms instead attempt to prealign the fingerprint minutiae so that alignment is not required during the matching stage. Other algorithms attempt to avoid both the prealignment and alignment during matching by defining an intrinsic coordinate system for fingerprint minutiae. Some minutiae-matching algorithms use local alignment, some use global

alignment, and some use both local and global alignment. Finally, many new matching algorithms are totally different and are based on the non-minutiae-based features automatically extracted by the fingerprint feature-extraction algorithm, such as pores and texture features.

6.4.6 Indexing and Retrieval

In the previous section, the fingerprint matching problem was defined as finding the similarity in any two given fingerprints. There are many situations, such as controlling physical access within a location or affirming ownership of a legal document (such as a driver's license), where a single match between two fingerprints may suffice. However, in a large majority of forensic and government applications, such as latent fingerprint individualization and background



checks, it is required that multiple fingerprints (in fact, up to 10 fingerprints from the 10 fingers of the same person) be matched against a large number of fingerprints present in a database. In these applications, a very large amount of fingerprint searching and matching is needed to be performed for a single individualization. This is very time-consuming, even for automatic fingerprint-matching algorithms. So it becomes desirable (although not necessary) to use automatic fingerprint indexing and retrieval algorithms to make the search faster.

Traditionally, such indexing and retrieval has been performed manually by forensic experts through indexing of fingerprint paper cards into file cabinets based on fingerprint pattern classification information as defined by a particular fingerprint classification system.

Similar to the development of the first automatic fingerprint feature extraction and matching algorithms, the initial automatic fingerprint indexing algorithms were developed to imitate forensic experts. These algorithms were built to classify fingerprint images into typically five classes (e.g., left loop, right loop, whorl, arch, and tented arch) based on the many fingerprint features automatically extracted from fingerprint images. (Many algorithms used only four classes because arch and tented arch types are often difficult to distinguish.)

Fingerprint pattern classification can be determined by explicitly characterizing regions of a fingerprint as belonging to a particular shape or through implementation of one of many possible generalized classifiers (e.g., neural networks) trained to recognize the specified patterns. The singular shapes (e.g., cores and deltas) in a fingerprint image are typically detected using algorithms based on the fingerprint orientation image. The explicit (rule-based) fingerprint classification systems first detect the fingerprint singularities (cores and deltas) and then apply a set of rules (e.g., arches and tented arches often have no cores; loops have one core and one delta; whorls have two cores and two deltas) to determine the pattern type of the fingerprint image (Figure 6-13). The most successful generalized (e.g., neural network-based) fingerprint classification systems use a combination of several different classifiers.

Such automatic fingerprint classification algorithms may be used to index all the fingerprints in the database into distinct bins (most implementations include overlapping or pattern referencing), and the submitted samples are then

compared to only the database records with the same classification (i.e., in the same bin). The use of fingerprint pattern information can be an effective means to limit the volume of data sent to the matching engine, resulting in benefits in the system response time. However, the automatic fingerprint classification algorithms are not perfect and result in errors in classification. These classification errors increase the errors in fingerprint individualization because the matching effort will be conducted only in a wrong bin. Depending on the application, it may be feasible to manually confirm the automatically determined fingerprint class for some of the fingerprints where the automatic algorithm has low confidence. Even so, the explicit classification of fingerprints into just a few classes has its limitations because only a few classes are used (e.g., five), and the fingerprints occurring in nature are not equally distributed in these classes (e.g., arch and tented arch are much more rare than loops and whorls).


Many of the newer automatic fingerprint classification algorithms do not use explicit classes of fingerprints into distinct classifications but rather use a continuous classification of fingerprints that is not intuitive for manual processing but is amenable to automatic search algorithms. In continuous classification, fingerprints are associated with numerical vectors summarizing their main features. These feature vectors are created through a similarity-preserving transformation, so that similar fingerprints are mapped into close points (vectors) in the multidimensional space. The retrieval is performed by matching the input fingerprint with those in the database whose corresponding vectors are close to the searched one. Spatial data structures can be used for indexing very large databases. A continuous classification approach allows the problem of exclusive membership of ambiguous fingerprints to be avoided and the system's efficiency and accuracy to be balanced by adjusting the size of the neighborhood considered. Most of the continuous classification techniques proposed in the literature use the orientation image as an initial feature but differ in the transformation adopted to create the final vectors and in the distance measure.

Some other continuous indexing methods are based on fingerprint minutiae features using techniques such as geometric hashing. Continuous indexing algorithms can also be built using other non-minutiae-based fingerprint features such as texture features.



FIGURE 6-13

The six commonly used fingerprint classes: (a) whorl, (b) right loop, (c) arch, (d) tented arch, (e) left loop, and (f) double loop whorl.



Choosing an indexing technique alone is usually not sufficient; a retrieval strategy is also usually defined according to the application requirements, such as the desired accuracy and efficiency, the matching algorithm used to compare fingerprints, the involvement of a human reviewer, and so on. In general, different strategies may be defined for the same indexing mechanism. For instance, the search may be stopped when a fixed portion of the database has been explored or as soon as a matching fingerprint is found. (In latent fingerprint individualization, a forensic expert visually examines the fingerprints that are considered sufficiently similar by the minutiae matcher and terminates the search when a true correspondence is found.) If an exclusive classification technique is used for indexing, the following retrieval strategies can be used:

- Hypothesized class only—Only fingerprints belonging to the class to which the input fingerprint has been assigned are retrieved.
- Fixed search order—The search continues until a match is found or the whole database has been explored. If a correspondence is not found within the hypothesized class, the search continues in another class, and so on.
- Variable search order—The different classes are visited according to the class likelihoods produced by the classifier for the input fingerprint. The search may be stopped as soon as a match is found or when the likelihood ratio between the current class and the next to be visited is less than a fixed threshold.



Finally, many system-level design choices may also be used to make the retrieval fast. For example, the search can be spread across many computers, and special-purpose hardware accelerators may be used to conduct fast fingerprint matching against a large database.

6.4.7 Accuracy Characterization

Although manual fingerprint matching is a very tedious task, a well-trained forensic expert is not likely to make individualization mistakes, especially when the fingerprint image quality is reasonable. Automatic fingerprint algorithms, on the other hand, are not nearly as accurate as forensic experts and have difficulty in dealing with the many noise sources in fingerprint images. Accuracy of fingerprint algorithms is crucial in designing fingerprint systems for real-world usage. The matching result must be reliable because many real-world decisions will be based on it. Algorithm designers usually acquire or collect their own fingerprint database and test the accuracy of their fingerprint algorithms on this database. By testing new algorithms or changes in the old algorithm or changes in algorithm parameters on the same database, they can know whether the new algorithm or changes improve the accuracy of the algorithm. Further, the algorithms' developers look closely at the false-positive and false-nonmatch errors made by their algorithms and get a better understanding of the strengths and limitations of their algorithms. By comparing the errors made by different algorithms or changes, the algorithm designers try to understand whether a change improves false positives, false nonmatches, both, or neither, and why. The algorithms' designers can then come up with algorithmic techniques to address the remaining errors and improve their algorithms' accuracy. It is desirable to have as large a database of fingerprints as possible from as large a demography as possible so that the algorithms are not overly adjusted to any certain variety of fingerprints and the accuracy obtained in the laboratory generalizes well in the field. Public organizations (e.g., NIST) perform periodic testing of fingerprint algorithms from different vendors on a common database to judge their relative accuracy.

There is a trade-off between the false positives and false-nonmatch error rates in fingerprint matching. Either of these two errors can be lowered at the expense of increasing the other error. Different applications have different requirements for these two types of errors. Interestingly, different fingerprint algorithms may perform differently, depending on the error rates. For example, algorithm A

may be better than algorithm B at a low false-positive rate, but algorithm B may be better than algorithm A at a low false-nonmatch rate. In such cases, the algorithm designers may choose a certain algorithm or specific parameters to be used, depending on the application.

6.5 Summary

Fingerprint technology has come a long way since its inception more than 100 years ago. The first primitive live-scan fingerprint readers introduced in 1988 were unwieldy beasts with many problems as compared to the sleek, inexpensive, and relatively miniscule sensors available today. During the past few decades, research and active use of fingerprint matching and indexing have also advanced our understanding of individuality, information in fingerprints, and efficient ways of processing this information. Increasingly inexpensive computing power, less expensive fingerprint sensors, and the demand for security, efficiency, and convenience have led to the viability of automatic fingerprint algorithms for everyday use in a large number of applications.

There are a number of challenges that remain to be overcome in designing a completely automatic and reliable fingerprint individualization system, especially when fingerprint images are of poor quality. Although automatic systems have improved significantly, the design of automated systems do not yet match the complex decision-making of a well-trained fingerprint expert as decisions are made to match individual fingerprints (especially latent prints). Still, automatic fingerprint matching systems hold real promise for the development of reliable, rapid, consistent, and cost-effective solutions in a number of traditional and newly emerging applications.

Research in automatic fingerprint recognition has been mostly an exercise in imitating the performance of a human fingerprint expert without access to the many underlying, information-rich features an expert is able to glean by visual examination. The lack of such a rich set of informative features in automatic systems is mostly because of the unavailability of complex modeling and image-processing techniques that can reliably and consistently extract detailed features in the presence of noise. Perhaps using the human, intuition-based manual fingerprint recognition approach may not be the most appropriate basis for the design of automatic fingerprint recognition systems. There

may be a need for exploring radically different features rich in discriminatory information, robust methods of fingerprint matching, and more ingenious methods for combining fingerprint matching and classification that are amenable to automation.

6.6 Reviewers

The reviewers critiquing this chapter were Patti Blume, Christophe Champod, Wayne Eaton, Robert J. Garrett, Laura A. Hutchins, Peter D. Komarinski, and Kasey Wertheim.

6.7 References

AFIS Committee Report. International Association for Identification: Mendota Heights, MN, 1994.

AFIS Committee Report. *J. Forensic Ident.* 1998, 48 (4), 489–500.

American National Standards for Information Systems—Data Format for the Interchange of Fingerprint Information; ANSI/NIST-CSL 1-1993; National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, DC, 1993.

American National Standard for Information Systems—Data Format for the Interchange of Fingerprint, Facial & SMT (Scar, Mark, and Tattoo) Information; ANSI/NIST-ITL 1a-1997; National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, DC, 1997.

American National Standard for Information Systems—Data Format for the Interchange of Fingerprint, Facial, & Scar Mark & Tattoo (SMT); ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2000, NIST Special Publication #500-245; National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, DC, 2000.

American National Standards for Information Systems—Data Format for the Interchange of Fingerprint, Facial, & Other Biometric Information—Part 1 (Traditional Format); ANSI/NIST-ITL 1-2007, NIST Special Publication #500-271; National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, DC, 2007. Available online at http://www.nist.gov/customcf/get_pdf.cfm?pub_id=51174.

American National Standards for Information Systems—Data Format for the Interchange of Fingerprint, Facial, & Other Biometric Information—Part 2 (XML Version); ANSI/NIST-ITL 2-2008, NIST Special Publication #500-275; National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, DC, 2008. Available online at http://www.nist.gov/customcf/get_pdf.cfm?pub_id=890062.

Bruton, T. *Annual Report of the Crime Scene Investigations Unit*; San Francisco Police Department: San Francisco, CA, 1989.

Cole, S. *Suspect Identities*; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, 2001.

FBI Request for Quotation No. 66-1, December 16, 1966.

Greenwood, P. W.; Chaiken, J. M.; Petersilia, J. *The Criminal Investigative Process* (Vols. 1–3); Technical Report R-1777-DOJ; RAND Corporation: Santa Monica, CA, 1975.

Grother, P.; McCabe, M.; et al. *MINEX: Performance and Interoperability of INCITS 378 Fingerprint Template*; NISTIR 7296; National Institute of Standards and Technology, March 21, 2006.

Hicklin, A.; Khanna, R. *The Role of Data Quality in Biometric Systems*; Mitretek Systems: Falls Church, VA, 2006.

Higgins, P. Standards for the Electronic Submission of Fingerprint Cards to the FBI. *J. Forensic Ident.* 1995, 45 (4), 409–418.

International Association for Identification. *AFIS Directory of Users*; IAI: Mendota Heights, MN, 1999.

Kiji, K. *AFIS 30-Year History*. NEC Internal Corporate Report; NEC Solutions: Tokyo, Japan, 2002.

Komarinski, P. *Automated Fingerprint Identification Systems*. Elsevier: New York, 2005.

Moore, R. T. Automatic Fingerprint Identification Systems. In *Advances in Fingerprint Technology*, 1st ed.; Lee, H. C.; Gaensslen, R. E., Eds.; Elsevier, NY, 1991; pp 163–191.

Moses, K. R. Consumer's Guide to Fingerprint Systems. *Ident. News* 1986, 36 (6), 5–7, 10.

National Institute for Standards and Technology. *MINEX: Performance and Interoperability of INCITS 378 Fingerprint Template (NISTIR 7296)*; March 6, 2005.



Petersilia, J. *The Collection and Processing of Physical Evidence*; WN-9062-DOJ; RAND Corporation: Santa Monica, CA, 1975.

Wayman, J. *Biometric Systems*. Springer: New York, 2004.

Wegstein, J. H. *A Computer Oriented Single-Fingerprint Identification System*; Technical Note 443; National Bureau of Standards, U.S. Department of Commerce: Washington, DC, 1969a.

Wegstein, J. H. *A Semi-Automated Single Fingerprint Identification System*; Technical Note 481; National Bureau of Standards, U.S. Department of Commerce: Washington, DC, 1969b.

Wegstein, J. H. *Automated Fingerprint Identification*; Technical Note 538; National Bureau of Standards, U.S. Department of Commerce: Washington, DC, 1970.

Wegstein, J. H. *The M40 Fingerprint Matcher*; Technical Note 878; National Bureau of Standards, U.S. Department of Commerce: Washington, DC, 1972a.

Wegstein, J. H. *Manual and Automated Fingerprint Registration*; NBS Technical Note 730; National Bureau of Standards, U.S. Department of Commerce: Washington, DC, 1972b.

Wegstein, J. H. *An Automated Fingerprint Identification System*; NBS Special Publication 500-89; National Bureau of Standards, U.S. Department of Commerce: Washington, DC, 1982.

Wegstein, J. H.; Rafferty, J. F. *The LX39 Latent Fingerprint Matcher*; Special Publication 500-36; National Bureau of Standards, U.S. Department of Commerce: Washington, DC, 1978.

Wegstein, J. H.; Rafferty, J. F. The Automated Identification of Fingerprints. In *Dermatoglyphics—Fifty Years Later*; March of Dimes: Washington, DC, 1979.

Wegstein, J. H.; Rafferty, J. F.; Pencak, W. J. *Matching Fingerprints by Computer*; Technical Note 466; National Bureau of Standards, U.S. Department of Commerce: Washington, DC, 1968.

6.8 Additional Information

Asai, K.; Kato, Y.; Hoshino, Y.; Kiji, K. In *Automatic Fingerprint Identification*. Proceedings of the SPIE-Imaging Applications for Automated Industrial Inspection and Assembly, 1979; pp 49–56.

Lee, H. C.; Gaensslen, R.E., Eds. *Advances in Fingerprint Technology*; 2nd ed.; CRC Press: Washington, D.C., 2001.

Millard, K. In An Approach to the Automatic Retrieval of Latent Fingerprints, Proceedings of Carnahan Conference on Electronic Crime Countermeasures, Lexington, KY, 1975; pp 45–51.

Millard, K. In Development on Automatic Fingerprint Recognition, Proceedings of the Carnahan Conference on Security Technology, Zurich, Switzerland, 1983; pp 173–178.

Prabhakar, S.; Jain, A.; Maltoni, D.; Maio, D. *Handbook of Fingerprint Recognition*; Springer-Verlag: New York, 2003.

Ratha, N.; Bolle, R., Eds. *Automated Fingerprint Recognition Systems*; Springer-Verlag: New York, 2004.

Roberts, D. F. Dermatoglyphics and Human Genetics. In *Dermatoglyphics—Fifty Years Later*; Birth Defects Original Article Series; Wertelecki, W., Plato, C., Paul, N. W., Eds.; Alan R. Liss Inc.: New York, 1979; pp 475–494.

Thiebault, R. In Automatic Process for Automated Fingerprint Identification, Proceedings of the International Symposium on Automation of Population Register Systems, 1967; pp 207–226.

Thiebault, R. An Automatic Procedure for Identifying Fingerprints. *International Criminal Police Rev.* 1970, 25, 2–10.

Uchida, K. Fingerprint Identification. *NEC J. Advanced Technology* 2005, 2 (1), 19–27.

Wayman, J.; Jain, A.; Maltoni, D.; Maio, D., Eds. *Biometric Systems*, Springer-Verlag: New York, 2005.



The Seattle Times Company NWclassifieds | NWsource | seattletimes.com

The Seattle Times LOCAL NEWS

Home delivery Contact us Search archive

Your account Today's news index Weather Traffic Movies Restaurants Today's events

- NEWS / HOME LOCAL Eastside Snohomish County COLUMNISTS Nicole Brodeur Danny Westneat Sherry Grindeland On Politics Inside The Times Here and Now The Rev. Dale Turner BUSINESS/TECH NATION/WORLD POLITICS CONSUMER EDUCATION OBITUARIES SPECIAL PROJECTS OPINION SPORTS ENTERTAINMENT HEALTH TRAVEL / OUTDOORS LIVING PACIFIC NW MAGAZINE COMICS / GAMES PHOTOGRAPHY NWCLASSIFIEDS NWSOURCE SHOPPING SERVICES



Tuesday, May 25, 2004 - Page updated at 12:00 A.M.

FBI admits fingerprint error, clearing Portland attorney

By David Heath and Hal Bernton Seattle Times staff reporters

A federal judge yesterday cleared Portland attorney Brandon Mayfield of ties to the Madrid train bombings after the FBI made the stunning admission that it erred when analyzing a copy of fingerprints.



enlarge Brandon Mayfield listens to his wife, Mona Mayfield, during a news conference yesterday in Portland. A federal judge cleared the attorney of any involvement in the March 11 train bombings in Madrid.

Portland's FBI Special Agent in Charge, Robert Jordan, said the error, based on a "substandard" copy of the prints, will prompt the agency to review its guidelines for making identifications and ask an international panel of experts to analyze what went wrong.

He also apologized to Mayfield, a former Army officer and Muslim convert who was mistakenly arrested earlier this month as a material witness in the March 11 terrorist attack that killed 191 and wounded some 2,000.

"The FBI regrets the hardships that this has placed on Mr. Mayfield and his family," Jordan said.

Mayfield, 37, who appeared at a news conference with his family and his federal public defenders, said he was angry but was trying to "decompress."

"I am just two or three days out of the detention facility, and I'm just starting not to shake," said Mayfield, who was released Thursday. He was speaking about the case for the first time because U.S. District Judge Robert Jones lifted a gag order.

"I've been singled out and discriminated against, I feel, as a Muslim," Mayfield said.

U.S. Attorney Karin Immergut of Portland denied that Mayfield was targeted because of his religion. "I can assure you that is not true," she said.

The flawed case against Mayfield raises new concerns about the reliability of FBI procedures used in fingerprint forensic science. In making the link between Mayfield and a blue plastic bag containing detonators found near a Madrid train station, FBI officials relied on a digital copy of prints that Jordan said was of "substandard quality."

Today Archive Go Advanced search



PACIFIC SCIENCE CENTER & JPMORGAN CHASE & CO. Behind every collaboration is a story >>



Only last weekend did two agents fly to Madrid to take a look at the original print that Spanish officials eventually linked to an Algerian with a criminal record.

"Why was a substandard image used to make a positive identification?" asked fingerprint expert Pat Wertheim, based in Arizona. "I'm sure the FBI will be doing a lot of soul-searching. A lot of us in the fingerprint profession will be waiting for the answer so that we can adopt measures to prevent a repeat of this tragic arrest."



The collapse of the Mayfield case also is providing ammunition to critics of the Bush administration's homefront handling of the war on terror. Mayfield was never charged with a crime but was arrested as a material witness with possible information about the Madrid bombing. The use of the material-witness statute has emerged as a controversial legal tactic in the war on terrorism, and Mayfield added his voice to the critics.

"There are other material witnesses languishing away," he said. "In my estimation, it's an abuse of the judicial process."

Court records released yesterday sketch the outlines of the investigative effort that led to Mayfield's May 6 arrest and two-week detention in the Multnomah County Jail. According to documents, Mayfield's prints were among the best 15 matches found by the FBI fingerprint computer, which holds the prints of some 45 million persons.

Those matches were then compared by FBI examiners to the digital image of a partial print sent by Spanish authorities, who concluded the print was a "100 percent identification" with Mayfield.

Once the FBI made its erroneous match, it then built up a case against Mayfield based, in part, on his legal work and associations in the Muslim community, records show.

Mayfield handled a child-custody case for Jeffrey Battle, a Portland-area Muslim who was arrested in October 2002 and eventually pleaded guilty to conspiracy to wage war against the United States on the behalf of the Taliban. In asking for a search warrant of Mayfield, an FBI agent noted that Battle had described himself as "undercover" and "behind enemy lines" while living in America and once wanted to case synagogues in preparation for mass murder.

The agent included no evidence that Mayfield shared the views of his client, or ever contemplated any such action.

The case also was built, in part, on September 2002 telephone communications that Mayfield, or his wife, had with another Oregon Muslim, Peter Seda, the U.S. director of the Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation. Six offices of that global group have been designated as terrorist organizations by the U.S. Department of the Treasury, the FBI said in the search warrant.

The government's willingness to pile such information into FBI affidavits angered Mayfield and his Portland attorney, Steve Wax.

"We think it is very troubling that that kind of innuendo and guilt by association was used," said Wax. "It is a terrible thing to do."

Mayfield said his case also raises questions about the Patriot Act, which the Bush administration has hailed as a key tool in terrorism investigations.

Mayfield said he suspected authorities had him under surveillance and entered his home in the days before his arrest under the "sneak and peek" search warrants allowed by the Patriot Act. Mayfield said he and his wife

noticed that a deadbolt lock they don't use had been locked and found other signs that someone had been in their home.

Even as the FBI homed in on Mayfield, Spanish authorities were disputing the FBI's fingerprint analysis on the Madrid bag. The blue plastic bag containing detonators was found in a van parked near a train station.

An independent fingerprint expert cited by the FBI in court records appeared to bolster the agency's analysis.

But Mayfield's lawyer said the expert's report had cautions that were not included in the FBI's affidavit to get the Mayfield search warrants. The expert's report included such caveats as the quality of the print copy was poor and that the image possibly included an overlay of another print. The expert, Kenneth Moses, said it was important to see the original image to make a definitive identification, Wax said.



Immergut, the U.S. attorney, said the error was regrettable but that as soon as the misidentification came to light, federal authorities "moved immediately" to have Mayfield released.

The chronology of the FBI's mistaken identification of Mayfield can be seen in the dozens of pages of court documents released yesterday.

Within a week of the bombing, the FBI was provided with the fingerprint images by Spanish authorities.

FBI senior fingerprint examiner Terry Green entered one of the prints into the agency's fingerprint computer. Mayfield was among 15 persons returned as potential matches to the unknown suspect.

Green compared Mayfield's fingerprint card from his military service with the Spanish evidence and found 15 points in common. Green considered the match a "100 percent identification," documents show.

Green's supervisor, Michael Wieners, and retired FBI fingerprint examiner John Massey also verified the match.

"We don't know whether the second or third level of examination was done blind or done with knowledge of who he was," Wax said yesterday.

The Portland lawyer was not under federal investigation before March 18, records show. But after the identification, Portland FBI agents investigated him, searching news articles, travel records and telephone records.

In the search warrant seeking probable cause, federal agents noted the nationality of his wife, the former Mona Mohamed, and his representation of Jeffrey Battle, as well as his honorable discharge from active duty at Fort Lewis and his work as a second lieutenant in the ROTC.

The documents also show federal authorities learned that Mayfield had not left the country traveling under his own name and that his passport had expired in October 2003. The FBI did not find any aliases used by Mayfield, records show.

"People should wake up," Mayfield said yesterday. "You can't trade freedom for security, because if you do, you're going to lose both."

Seattle Times staff reporter Ken Armstrong contributed to this report. David Heath: 206-464-2136 or dheath@seattletimes.com; Hal Bernton: 206-464-2581 or hbernton@seattletimes.com

Copyright © 2004 The Seattle Times Company

[E-mail this article](#)

[Print this article](#)

[Search archive](#)

[More local news headlines...](#)

[seattletimes.com home](#)

[Home delivery](#) | [Contact us](#) | [Search archive](#) | [Site map](#) | [Low-graphic](#)
[NWclassifieds](#) | [NWsource](#) | [Advertising info](#) | [The Seattle Times Company](#)

Copyright © The Seattle Times Company

[↑ Back to top](#)

FIS Forensic Identification Services



Home



Kenneth R. Moses




Additional Credentials



Links for Students

Summary of Qualifications:

- Kenneth Moses has over thirty years of experience in forensic evidence. He established the Crime Scene Investigations Unit of the San Francisco Crime Laboratory in 1983 and was instrumental in the installation of automated fingerprint systems in San Francisco and at the California Department of Justice. His experience includes examination of a wide variety of physical evidence and expert testimony. Over the years, he has worked with attorneys, with local, state, and federal agencies, and with private companies in a number of complex investigations. He has been active in national efforts to establish professional standards in friction ridge analysis. Mr. Moses currently serves in private practice as Director of Forensic Identification Services in San Francisco.



Education:

- Bachelors Degree in Criminology; University of California, Berkeley, 1969
- Chemistry major, University of San Francisco, 1963-65
- Administrative Advanced Latent Fingerprint School; F.B.I., 1972
- Field Evidence Certification Program; Long Beach State University 1971
- Bloodstain Evidence Institute, Elmira College, N.Y., 1981
- Continuing Education, Bloodstain Evidence, IAI, Milwaukee, 1999

Professional Experience:

- Founder, Forensic Identification Services, 1998
- Supervisor, Crime Scene Investigations, Crime Laboratory, 1980-1997
- Latent print examiner and crime scene investigator, Crime Laboratory, San Francisco Police Department, 1971-1998
- Investigation of 17,000 crime scenes including approximately 500 homicide scenes
- Latent print examiner and crime scene investigator, Crime Laboratory, San Francisco Police Department, 1971-1998
- Court testimony as an expert witness in **crime scene investigations, physical evidence, scene reconstruction, blood spatter analysis, shoe and tire impressions, firearms, gunshot residue and fingerprint identification** in 750 cases in State and Federal courts
- Systems Manager, Automated Fingerprint Identification System, 1983-1997
- Police Officer, San Francisco Police Department, 1970
- High school chemistry and biology teacher, 1967-1969
- Investigator, Alameda County Coroner's Office, 1966-67

Kenneth R. Moses, Director
Service Nationwide

San Francisco, CA
Los Angeles, CA
415-664-2600

Email: forensicID@aol.com



Forensic
Identification
Services

Kenneth R. Moses

Summary of Qualifications:

Kenneth Moses has over thirty years of experience in forensic evidence. He established the Crime Scene Investigations Unit of the San Francisco Crime Laboratory in 1983 and was instrumental in the installation of automated fingerprint systems in San Francisco and at the California Department of Justice. His experience includes examination of a wide variety of physical evidence and expert testimony. Over the years, he has worked with attorneys, with local, state, and federal agencies, and with private companies in a number of complex investigations. He has been active in national efforts to establish professional standards in friction ridge analysis. Mr. Moses currently serves in private practice as Director of Forensic Identification Services in San Francisco.

Education:

Bachelors Degree in Criminology; University of California, Berkeley, 1969
Chemistry major, University of San Francisco, 1963-65
Administrative Advanced Latent Fingerprint School; F.B.I., 1972
Field Evidence Certification Program; Long Beach State University 1971
Bloodstain Evidence Institute, Elmira College, N.Y., 1981
Continuing Education, Bloodstain Evidence, IAI, Milwaukee, 1999

Professional Experience:

Founder, Forensic Identification Services, 1998
Supervisor, Crime Scene Investigations, Crime Laboratory, 1980-1997
Latent print examiner and crime scene investigator, Crime Laboratory, San Francisco Police Department, 1971-1998
Investigation of 17,000 crime scenes including approximately 500 homicide scenes
Court testimony as an expert witness in **crime scene investigations, physical evidence, scene reconstruction, blood spatter analysis, shoe and tire impressions, firearms, gunshot residue and fingerprint identification** in 750 cases in State and Federal courts
Systems Manager, Automated Fingerprint Identification System, 1983-1997
Police Officer, San Francisco Police Department, 1970
High school chemistry and biology teacher, 1967-1969
Investigator, Alameda County Coroner's Office, 1966-67

Additional Professional Activities

Instructor in Biometrics, U.C.L.A., 2002
Technical Working Group, Mass Fatalities Incidents, Human Identification, National Institute of Justice, 2001

Page 1 of 5

130 Hernandez Avenue ♦ San Francisco, CA 94127
Phone: 415.664.2600 ♦ Fax: 415.664.2615 ♦ Email: beaurup@earthlink.net
www.forensicidservices.com



Forensic
Identification
Services

Kenneth R. Moses

Project Director, Infant Identification Program, 2001
Design and implementation of Digital Image Enhancement System for latent prints,
1989
National Scientific Working Group for Friction Ridge Analysis, Standards, and
Training (SWGFAST), 1998
Design and construction of Fingerprint Processing Laboratory, SFPD Crime Lab,
1983
Instructor, Bloodstain Evidence Courses (3), 1986-87, San Francisco Police Academy
Associate Editor, California Identification Digest, 1997-present
Lecturer in forensic evidence before the following organizations:

California Appellate Project
California State Bar Continuing Education
California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
California Public Defenders Association
Defense Investigators Training Academy
San Francisco Public Defenders Office
Alameda Public Defenders Office
California Attorneys for Criminal Justice
International Association for Identification
California State Division IAI
National Law Enforcement Seminar
American Association of Medical Examiners
University of San Francisco Law School
Northern California Law Enforcement Training Center, Santa Rosa
U.S. Postal Inspection Service, San Bruno
National Association of Bunco Investigators
Attorney General's Advisory Committee on Criminal Identification

Assistance and advisory to government agencies in implementation of automated
fingerprint and image enhancement systems. Some of those agencies include:

Federal Bureau of Investigation, C.J.I.S. advisory committee on latent fingerprints
California Department of Justice, CAL-ID
Los Angeles Police Department
Los Angeles Sheriff's Department
Michigan State Police
Massachusetts State Police
Tulare County Sheriff's Office
Ontario Police Department
Alameda Sheriff's Office
Contra Costa County Sheriff's Department
Connecticut State Police
Idaho Department of Public Safety

Page 2 of 5



Forensic
Identification
Services

Kenneth R. Moses

Selected Papers Delivered at Conferences

- "The Role of the Independent Expert", CSDIAI, Concord, 2001
- "Crime Scene Evidence Collection and Preservation Issues," California Public Defenders Association, 1999
- "AFIS and Community Policing," International Association for Identification, 1999
- "Productivity of Fingerprint Systems," International Forensic Symposium, FBI, Quantico, 1987
- "Automated Fingerprint Systems," National Assoc. of Criminal Justice Planners, San Diego, 1987
- "Blood Spatter Evidence," California Medical Examiners, 1989
- "The Future of the Identification Profession," IAI, Sacramento, 1988
- "Making AFIS Systems Work," California State Division, IAI, 1987
- "Image Processing of Latent Fingerprints," Police Technology Conference, Canberra, Australia, 1992
- "Chemical Processing of Fingerprints from Documents," National Association of Bunco Investigators, Charleston, S.C., 1994
- "DNA at the Crime Scene," DNA Symposium, University of San Francisco, 1994
- "Points Revisited, Individuality in Nature," Cal State Division, IAI, 1997
- "Fingerprints in the Courtroom---Legal Aspects of Digitized Fingerprint Technologies," AFIS Users Groups, 1998
- "AFIS and Community Policing," International Association for Identification, 1999
- "Daubert Issues in Identification," Arizona Identification Council, 1999
- "Forensic Evidence at Crime Scenes," CAJC/CPDA Capital Case Defense Seminar, 2001
- "The Role of the Independent Expert," California State IAI, 2001
- "Friction Ridge Identification," Defense Investigators Academy, 2001

Professional Affiliations

International Association for Identification
Chairman, AFIS Sub-committee, IAI
American Academy of Forensic Sciences
AFIS Internet---A Users Group for Automated Fingerprint Systems
Scientific Working Group for Friction Ridge Analysis, Standards, and Training (SWGFAST)



Forensic
Identification
Services

Kenneth R. Moses

Certifications:

Certified Latent Print Examiner, IAI, 1997
Senior Crime Scene Analyst, IAI
California Community College Teaching Credential

Honors and Awards:

Outstanding Service Award, 1985, San Francisco Board of Supervisors
Dedication and Professionalism Award, 1997, Criminal Trial Lawyer's Association
Police Officer of the Year Award, 1990, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Pursuit of Excellence Award, 1991, U.S. Postal Inspection Service
Meritorious Conduct Medal, 1993, San Francisco Police Department
My Favorite Cop Award, 1995, SF Independent Newspaper
Geo Pletts Award for Distinguished Service, California State Division, International
Association for Identification, 2000.

Mink, Rob

From: JASON DAVIS <JDAVI@ago.state.ms.us>
Sent: Monday, February 16, 2015 12:14 PM
To: Mink, Rob
Cc: SONNY WHITE; Marvin White
Subject: RE: Manning fingerprint order

Rob,

We object to Mr. Moses.

From: Mink, Rob [<mailto:rmink@wyattfirm.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2015 1:50 PM
To: JASON DAVIS
Cc: david@dvoisinlaw.com
Subject: RE: Manning fingerprint order

Jason, I have attached some material on Kenneth Moses, whom we have proposed to do the fingerprint analysis for this case. The first is the chapter on AFIS from the Fingerprint Sourcebook, which is a publication of the National Institute of Justice. The second is an article about a particular fingerprint case in which Moses was retained by the FBI (see page 3), and the third is a printout from Forensic Identification Services, Moses' company, including Moses' CV.

Please let us know if the State agrees to using Moses for the fingerprint analysis. Out of concern for the passage of time, we will submit these materials to Judge Howard with the proposed order we sent you in September if we don't hear back from you shortly. Thanks for your help with this.

Robert S. Mink

Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, LLP
Direct: (601) 987-5324

From: Mink, Rob
Sent: Tuesday, January 20, 2015 1:19 PM
To: 'JASON DAVIS'
Cc: david@dvoisinlaw.com
Subject: RE: Manning fingerprint order

Jason, I hope 2015 is starting out well for you. Please see our last correspondence below about fingerprint testing in Manning, and let us know your position about Kenneth Moses.

Thanks.

Robert S. Mink

Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, LLP
Direct: (601) 987-5324

From: JASON DAVIS [<mailto:JDAVI@ago.state.ms.us>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 04, 2014 4:04 PM



Mink, Rob

From: Mink, Rob
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2015 10:59 AM
To: 'JASON DAVIS'
Cc: SONNY WHITE; Marvin White; david@dvoisinlaw.com
Subject: Manning - fingerprints
Attachments: 61318942-v1-Fingerprint Order 3.20.15 (David Stoney).PDF; 61224842-v1-Ex. B to Fingerprint Order.DOCX; Stoney, David CV 10 2014.doc

Jason, attached is a proposed agreed order on fingerprint testing using David Stoney. Stoney's CV is attached. Let us know if you agree with this.

Thanks.

Robert S. Mink

Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, LLP
Direct: (601) 987-5324



IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF OKTIBBEHA COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI

WILLIE JEROME MANNING

PETITIONER

versus

Cause No. 2001-0144-CV
(Supreme Court No. 2013-DR-00491-SCT)

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

RESPONDENT

AGREED ORDER FOR DELIVERY OF FINGERPRINT EVIDENCE
AND PROTOCOL FOR FINGERPRINT ANALYSIS

Evidence in this matter suitable for fingerprint analysis has been located in the custody of the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department. The inventory of all evidence located at the Sheriff's Department has been filed with the Clerk of the Court and is attached to this Order as Exhibit "A." Attached as Exhibit "B" to this Order is a list of the original latent lifts that shall undergo appropriate fingerprint analysis in accordance with the protocol set forth below.

1. Within thirty days of the date of this order, the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department shall transmit by Federal Express all items in its possession and identified in Exhibit B" to the Mississippi Crime Lab.

2. The Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department is directed to bill the Federal Express charges to counsel for Petitioner, Robert S. Mink, whose office shall provide the number of its Federal Express account upon request.

3. The Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department shall observe all necessary precautions to preserve the integrity of the evidence and the chain of custody. Counsel for both parties shall be given reasonable notice of the date and time of packaging, and counsel shall have the right to be present to observe the packaging unless the right is waived after receipt of reasonable notice.

4. The Mississippi Crime Lab shall make high quality scans of each latent print at 1200 ppi, copy the scans to a DVD, and deliver the DVD by Federal Express to:

David A. Stoney
Stoney Forensic, Inc.
14101 Willard Road, Suite G
Chantilly, Virginia 20151
(phone no. 703-263-7492)

5. David Stoney shall attempt to identify latent lifts of value that are searchable in various databases, such as Automated Fingerprint Identification System (“AFIS”) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (“IAFIS”). If Mr. Stoney identifies latent lifts of value, then he shall identify those lifts for the Mississippi Crime Lab. The Mississippi Crime Lab shall upload the latent lifts of value identified by Mr. Stoney to AFIS, IAFIS, or other searchable databases.

6. If there are potential matches from the search of the databases, the Mississippi Crime Lab shall send a list of all potential matches and the corresponding reference prints to Mr. Stoney for his determination of actual matching.

7. All parties and agents acting on behalf of parties concerned in this Order shall exercise their responsibilities under this Order in a reasonable timeframe and without undue delay. All parties and agents who come into possession of fingerprint evidence as directed by this Order shall exercise maximum caution to prevent contamination of the evidence and shall ensure that a proper chain of custody is maintained at all times. All such parties and agents shall provide documentation of chain of custody to this Court.

8. The Mississippi Crime Lab shall take all maximum precautions to ensure that any latent lifts may subsequently undergo an analysis to determine the presence of DNA.

9. The Mississippi Crime Lab and Mr. Stoney shall provide in a timely manner reports of their findings, including any lab reports and analyst's notes, to this Court and the attorneys of record in this case.

10. Upon completion of all forensic testing, the Mississippi Crime Lab shall return all fingerprint evidence in this case to the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department, which shall exercise maximum precautions to avoid contamination in the event that DNA testing is necessary.

SO ORDERED, this the ___ day of _____, 2015.

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

APPROVED AND AGREED:

David Voisin, Attorney for Willie Jerome Manning

Robert S. Mink, Attorney for Willie Jerome Manning

Jason L. Davis, Attorney for State of Mississippi

61318932.1



Manning v. State of Mississippi
Oktibbeha County Circuit Court Cause No. 2001-0144-CV
(Supreme Court No. 2013-DR-00491-SCT)

Report of Evidence Search on April 16, 2014
Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department and Circuit Clerk Vault

Pursuant to the Court's order of March 6, 2014, representatives of the State of Mississippi and Petitioner, Willie Manning, inspected the physical evidence related to the investigation into the murders of Tiffany Miller and Jon Steckler in the custody of the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department on April 16, 2014. This report details the evidence that was located at the Sheriff's Department, including several items not listed on Exhibit A to the Court's March 6 order, and notes several items of evidence that the representatives of the respective parties were not able to locate.

ITEMS FROM EXHIBIT "A" LOCATED AT THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

<u>Item</u>	<u>Exhibit, document references</u>	<u>photo ref. #</u>
a. extracts from rape kit		
- pubic combings	MCL Ex. 8.3, Q 27 (Crime Lab file at 125)	5833-34
- pubic hair sample	MCL Ex. 8.4, K 8 (Crime Lab file at 126)	5663 5833-34
- head hair sample	MCL Ex. 8.5, K 9 (Crime Lab file at 126)	5663 5833-34
b. Tiffany Miller's clothing		
- two white socks and one bra	MCL Ex. 13 (Howell Aff. at 2)	5800-01
- shoes	MCL Ex. 81, Q 12-13 (Howell Aff. at 6)	5773
- underwear	MCL Ex. 82, Q 14 (Howell Aff. at 6)	5774-76
- belt	MCL Ex. 83, Q 15 (Howell Aff. at 6)	5774-76
- jeans	MCL Ex. 84, Q 16 (Howell Aff. at 6)	5774-76



- shirt	MCL Ex. 85, Q 17 (Howell Aff. at 6)	5734
- t-shirt	MCL Ex. 86, Q 18 (Howell Aff. at 6)	580
- debris from undergarment	Q28 (Crime Lab file at 125)	5833-34
- debris and fibers removed from clothing (Q12 thru Q25) and placed in pillboxes (Crime Lab file at 121)		5665, 5725-26
c. hairs in victims' hands		
- hair in Miller's right hand	MCL Ex. 5, Q 26 (Howell Aff. at 2 / Crime Lab file at 28, 125)	5667, 5670 5833 et seq.
- hair in Steckler's left hand	MCL 24, Q 29 (Howell Aff. at 3 / Crime Lab file at 29, 125)	5667, 5669 5833 et seq.
d. hair and fiber from Miller's car		
- vacuum sweepings & debris from car	Q43-Q59 (Crime Lab file at 125-26)	5663-64, 5679-81, 5683-85, 5690
e. fingernail scrapings		
- Miller right hand	MCL Ex. 9 (Howell Aff. at 2 / Crime Lab file at 28)	5667, 5671
- Miller left hand	MCL Ex. 10 (Howell Aff. at 2 / Crime Lab file at 28)	5667, 5668
- Steckler rt hand	MCL Ex. 19 (Howell Aff. at 3 / Crime Lab file at 29)	5667
- Steckler left hand	MCL Ex. 20 (Howell Aff. at 3 / Crime Lab file at 29)	5667

g. Jon Steckler's clothing

- socks, boxers	MCL Ex. 25 (Howell Aff. at 3)	5770-71
- shoes	MCL Ex. 87, Q 19-20 (Crime Lab file at 124)	5731-32
- pants	MCL Ex. 88, Q 21 (Crime Lab file at 124)	5733
- shirt	MCL Ex. 89, Q 22 (Crime Lab file at 124)	5781
- t-shirt	MCL Ex. 90, Q 23 (Crime Lab file at 124)	5727-28

h. items found in or around Miller's car

- plastic MSU drinking cup	MCL Ex. 38 (Crime Lab file at 31)	5782
- student receipt	MCL Ex. 39 (Crime Lab file at 31)	5794
- Dr. Pepper bottle	MCL Ex. 40 (Crime Lab file at 31)	5720-21
- bottle cap	MCL Ex. 41 (Crime Lab file at 31)	5784
- 3 rolls of film	MCL Ex. 52 (Crime Lab file at 32)	
- bags and paper	Q24 (Crime lab file at 124) Q25 (Crime lab file at 124)	5813-14
- Jack Daniels Bottle	Photograph, Petition Ex. 12 at 2460 (filed under seal)	5729-30

i. fingerprint lifts (for comparison to known prints
in database as well as for DNA testing)

- prints EA thru EU	MCL Ex. 32	5743
---------------------	------------	------

- thirty-one latent lifts from Miller's car	MCL Ex. 55	5783
- latent lifts from Jon Wise's car	MCL Ex. 53	5744

**ADDITIONAL ITEMS OF PHYSICAL EVIDENCE NOT LISTED
ON EXHIBIT "A" BUT FOUND AT SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
ON APRIL 16, 2014**

1.	Floor mat fiber sample from Miller's car (K12, MR2 Inventory Log #6, MCL file at 126)	5685, 5687
2.	Seat fabric sample from Miller's car (K14, MR2 Inventory Log #8, MCL file at 126)	5685, 5689
3.	Debris from car spoiler (Q42a)	5663
4.	Hairs on slides pertaining to Lowery (Q32-43)	5663
5.	bottle (Jack Daniels Country Cocktail) found on side of Pat Station Rd. near bodies	5718
6.	FBI fingerprint lifts, inside Miller passenger window FBI fingerprint lifts, outside Miller passenger window	5751 5750
7.	RFLP extracts from Miller and Steckler (K3 and K4)	5754-55
8.	Contents from passenger side of car door	
9.	Contents from driver's side (brown bag)	5777-79
10.	Contents passenger side and console (brown bag)	5772
11.	Contents from glove compartment (brown bag)	5804-05
12.	1 button with blood from male	5797
13.	1st beer bottle closest to crime scene	5798-99
14.	button from male (found in hospital)	5808-03
15.	Hair from ceiling of car	5811-12

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------|
| 16. | Paper from driver side door pocket
(Q64, MR2 Inventory Log #10) | 5841 |
| 17. | Paper from passenger side door pocket
(Q65, MR2 Inventory Log #11) | 5841 |
| 18. | bony substance found with Miller
at Oktibbeha County Hosp. | 5752-53 |
| 19. | belt buckle, ambulance, male | 5787-88 |
| 20. | "Hair - 25 Steps" | 5793 |
| 21. | Hair from road - scene of crime | 5824-25 |
| 22. | Q 60, 61 / Ex. 66 (unknown reference nos. -
not in MS Crime Lab file) | 5830 |

**ITEMS LISTED ON EXHIBIT "A" BUT NOT FOUND
AT SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT ON APRIL 16, 2014**

a. extracts from rape kit

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| - three swabs | MCL Ex. 8-6, 8-7a and 8-9
(Howell Aff. at 2) | Possibly at Miss. Crime Lab |
| - remainder of
rape kit | MCL Ex. 8 (Howell Aff. at 2) | location unknown |

d. hair and fiber from Miller's car

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---|------------------|
| - hairs found in
car | MCL Ex. 42-51 (Howell Aff. at 4 /
Crime Lab file at 31-32) | location unknown |
|-------------------------|---|------------------|

f. areas of car believed to have been touched by perpetrator

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|
| - steering wheel | MCL Ex. 56 (Howell Aff. at 5 /
Crime Lab file at 34) | location unknown |
| - rearview mirror | Crime Lab file at 126 | location unknown;
Referred to in FBI report as
part of 930119047 |


- seatbelt buckle Crime Lab file at 126

location unknown;
Referred to in FBI report as
part of 930119047

The representatives of the State of Mississippi and the Petitioner, Willie Manning, certify that the list above reflects the inspection of evidence at the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department on April 16, 2014.


Jason L. Davis, Attorney
For State of Mississippi

David Voisin, Attorney
For Willie Manning



Robert S. Mink, Attorney
For Willie Manning

Joe Berry of the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department certifies that he searched for evidence as ordered by the Circuit Court, that he was present when representatives of the State of Mississippi and Willie Manning reviewed the evidence, that the foregoing list reflects all of the items of physical evidence in the possession of the Sheriff's Department pertaining to the investigation of the murders of Tiffany Miller and Jon Steckler, and that the Sheriff's Department will alert these representatives if additional evidence is discovered.




Joe Berry
For the Sheriff's Department


61178148.1


- seatbelt buckle Crime Lab file at 126

location unknown;
Referred to in FBI report as
part of 930119047


The representatives of the State of Mississippi and the Petitioner, Willie Manning, certify that the list above reflects the inspection of evidence at the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department on April 16, 2014.


Jason L. Davis, Attorney
For State of Mississippi


David Voisin, Attorney
For Willie Manning


Robert S. Mink, Attorney
For Willie Manning

Joe Berry of the Oktibbeha County Sheriff's Department certifies that he searched for evidence as ordered by the Circuit Court, that he was present when representatives of the State of Mississippi and Willie Manning reviewed the evidence, that the foregoing list reflects all of the items of physical evidence in the possession of the Sheriff's Department pertaining to the investigation of the murders of Tiffany Miller and Jon Steckler, and that the Sheriff's Department will alert these representatives if additional evidence is discovered.


Joe Berry
For the Sheriff's Department

61178148.1

*Items to be shipped to
Forensic Identification Services
for fingerprint analysis*

**Evidence in possession of
Oktribbeha County Sheriff's Department**

i. fingerprint lifts		<u>Photo reference</u>
- prints EA thru EU	MCL Ex. 32	5743
- thirty-one latent lifts from Miller's car	MCL Ex. 55	5783
- latent lifts from Jon Wise's car	MCL Ex. 53	5744
- FBI fingerprint lifts, inside Miller passenger window		5751
- FBI fingerprint lifts, outside Miller passenger window		5750
- inked prints of possible suspects	MCL Ex. 54(A-U)	n/a

61224842.1

EX. B

DAVID A. STONEY, Ph.D., M.P.H., B.S.

CURRICULUM VITAE (Summary Page)

EDUCATION:

University of California, Berkeley, BS double major in Chemistry and Criminalistics, MPH in Forensic Science, PhD in Forensic Science.

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING:

Two years crime laboratory internship and 15 weeks continuing education.

POSITIONS / FACULTY APPOINTMENTS:

6 years bench practitioner, IFS Criminalistics Laboratory, Oakland, CA
15 years faculty University of Illinois at Chicago, Forensic Science Program
8yrs Director of Forensic Sciences, 5yrs Clinical Professor of Forensic Sciences
10 years Director, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL
14 years Chief Scientist, Stoney Forensic, Inc., Chantilly, VA

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS:

31 years American Academy of Forensic Sciences, Criminalistics Section
35 years California Association of Criminalists
32 years International Association for Identification (Associate)
22 years State Microscopical Society of Illinois
23 years American Chemical Society

JOURNALS:

20 years Journal of Forensic Sciences, Editorial Board
15 years The Microscope, Associate Editor / Editor
5 years Journal of Forensic Identification, Editorial Board


OTHER PROFESSIONAL SERVICE:

NIJ Peer Review Panels (13); NIJ Fingerprint Advisory Board
NIJ/FBI 2011 Trace Evidence Steering Committee
NIJ/NIST Expert Working Group on Human Factors in Latent Print Analysis
Scientific Working Group on Friction Ridge Analysis, Study, and Technology (SWGFAST)
NIST OSAC Physics/Pattern Scientific Area Committee
Forensic Education Task Group, Executive Committee
National Academy of Sciences (testimony, reviewer)
IAFS Chairman, Evaluation and Statistics Section

TESTIMONY:

Qualified as scientific expert witness in Federal Courts and Superior Courts of California, Colorado, Georgia and Illinois. Areas of fingerprint analysis, trace evidence analysis and forensic serology.

50+ Continuing education workshops / courses taught (including for Interpol, RCMP, CCI, MAFS, NEAFS, Ohio BCI, Phoenix PD, USACIL and Washington State Patrol)
10+ Major grants and funded research, six with National Institute of Justice
80+ Publications
125+ Professional presentations and appearances



DAVID A. STONEY, Ph.D., M.P.H., B.S.
CURRICULUM VITAE

EDUCATION:

PhD	University of California, Berkeley, Forensic Science	1985
MPH	University of California, Berkeley, Forensic Science	1979
BS	University of California, Berkeley, Double Major Chemistry and Criminalistics, Highest Honors	1977

DISSERTATION:

A Quantitative Assessment of Fingerprint Individuality	1985
--	------

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING:

Criminalist Intern, Contra Costa County Criminalistics Laboratory, Martinez, CA	1976 - 1978
Serological Research Institute, Emeryville, CA, Bloodstain Analysis (3 weeks)	1979
McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL (10 weeks) Basic Microscopy	1979
Forensic Microscopy of Soils	1979
Forensic Microscopy of Botanical Materials	1979
Microchemical Analysis	1982
Advanced Microchemical Analysis	1988
Microscopy for Art Conservators	1989
Photomicrography	1989
Microscopy for Pharmaceutical Scientists	1990
Crystal Morphology and Optics	1991
Examination of Building Materials	1993
Midwestern Association of Forensic Scientists Mathematics in Serology Workshop (8 hours)	1987
Paint Composition and Analysis Workshop (1 week)	1982
Identification of Unknown Particles (16 hours)	1995
US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs Financial Management Training Seminar (8 hours)	1996
Media Cybernetics, L.P. Image Analysis Tutorial (16 hours)	1998

POSITIONS / FACULTY APPOINTMENTS:

Stoney Forensic, Inc. Chief Scientist	2000 - present
University of Illinois at Chicago Clinical Professor of Forensic Sciences	2000 - 2005
Adjunct Professor of Forensic Sciences	1997 - 2000
Director of Forensic Sciences, full time faculty	1985 - 1992
McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL Director	1994 - 2004
Director, Chamot Microscopy Facility at Cornell	1996 - 2001
Cornell University Professor Adjunct, Design & Environmental Analysis	1999 - 2001

POSITIONS / FACULTY APPOINTMENTS (continued):

Columbia College, Chicago, IL	
Part-time Faculty, Science Institute	1996 - 1997
University of New Haven, New Haven, CT	
Visiting Professor, Forensic Science	1991, 1994
Institute of Forensic Science Criminalistics Laboratory, Oakland, CA, Criminalist	1979 - 1985
University of California, Berkeley	
Research Assistant, Environmental Health Sciences	1977 - 1978
Teaching Assistant, Forensic Sciences	1978 - 1980

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS:

American Academy of Forensic Sciences, Criminalistics Section	
Fellow	1989 - present
Member	1987 - 1989
Provisional Member	1983 - 1987
California Association of Criminalists	
Member	1979 - present
Editorial Secretary and Board of Directors	1983 - 1985
International Association for Identification	
Associate Member	1982 - 2006
Life Associate Member	2006 - present
Midwestern Association of Forensic Scientists	1985 - 2005
Council on Forensic Science Education	
Member	1988 - 2001
Chairman	1988 - 1990
Secretary	1992 - 1994
State Microscopical Society of Illinois, Member	1992 - present
Microscopical Society of America, Member	1996 - 2004
American Chemical Society, Member	1991 - present
Association of Firearms and Toolmarks Examiners	
Subscribing Member	1986 - 1990
American Society for Testing and Materials	
Committee E-30, Forensic Sciences	1989 - 1990
American Dermatoglyphics Association, Fellow	1986 - 1990

JOURNAL EDITORIAL BOARDS:

<u>Journal of Forensic Sciences</u> , Editorial Board	1989 - 2008
<u>The Microscope</u>	
Editor	1995 - 1999, 2001 - 2004
Associate Editor	1989 - 1995, 2000
<u>Analytica Chimica Acta</u> , Guest Editor, Forensic Science	1994
<u>Journal of Forensic Identification</u> , Editorial Board	1988 - 1993

OTHER PROFESSIONAL SERVICE:

<u>NIST OSAC Physics/Pattern Scientific Area Committee</u>	2014
<u>Scientific Working Group on Friction Ridge Analysis, Study, and Technology (SWGFAST)</u>	2011 - 2014
<u>NIJ/FBI Trace Evidence Steering Committee</u>	2011, 2013
<u>Forensic Education Task Group, Executive Committee</u>	2010
<u>NIJ/NIST Expert Working Group on Human Factors in Latent Print Analysis</u>	2008 - 2011
<u>Peer Reviews National Institute of Justice (NIJ)</u>	
Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Grants	2010, 2011
Draft Report Product Review	2010
Impression Evidence	2009
Forensic Analysis of Trace Evidence	2009
Report on Education and Training in Forensic Science	2004
General Forensic Research and Development	2003, 2001
Crime Laboratory Improvement: Latent Prints	2002
Forensic Chemistry	2000
Forensics, Investigator-Initiated Research	1998, 1999
Forensic Science and Criminal Justice Technology	1991
Criminal Justice Technology Program	1990
<u>National Academy of Sciences</u>	
Review of Draft Report: Strengthening Forensic Science in the United States: A Path Forward	2008
Testimony before the NAS Committee	2007
<u>American Chemical Society</u>	
Organizer, Chemical Microscopy Symposium	
ACS Meeting, San Francisco	2000
Lecture Tour, Prairie Circuit	1993
<u>Fingerprint Advisory Board, National Institute of Justice</u>	1999, 2004
<u>International Association of Forensic Scientists</u>	
Chairman, Evaluation and Statistics Section	1990, 1996
<u>External Auditor, Serology Section</u>	
South Australia State Forensic Science Centre	
Adelaide, South Australia	1990
<u>University of Central Florida</u>	
External Reviewer, Forensic Science Program	1988

TESTIMONY:

Qualified as scientific expert witness in Federal Courts and Superior Courts of California, Colorado, Georgia and Illinois. Areas of fingerprint analysis, trace evidence analysis and forensic serology.

AWARDS / RECOGNITION:

Scientific Working Group on Friction Ridge Analysis, Study, and Technology (Election to Membership)	2010
American Academy of Forensic Sciences Award of Merit (Editorial Board 1989-2008)	2009
Midwestern Association of Forensic Scientists Certificate of Recognition (Course Instructor)	1997
Certificate of Recognition (Committee Chair)	1989
California Association of Criminalists Certificate of Appreciation (Dinner Talk)	1996
Distinguished Service Award (Editorial Secretary)	1983 - 1985
University of Illinois at Chicago, Tenure	1994
Northeastern Association of Forensic Scientists Certificate of Appreciation (Course Instructor)	1989
National Institute of Justice Graduate Research Fellowship	1982 - 1984
American Academy of Forensic Scientists Honorable Mention, New Member Contributions	1982
University of California, Berkeley Regents Fellowship	1979 - 1980
Phi Beta Kappa	1977
James Monroe McDonald Scholarship	1976
President's Undergraduate Fellowship	1976
Regents Scholarship	1975, 1976
National Merit Scholarship Letter of Commendation	1971

CONTINUING EDUCATION WORKSHOPS / COURSES TAUGHT:

Amgen, Thousand Oaks, California Pharmaceutical Microscopy, July 10-14, 2000
Bristol-Myers Squibb, New Brunswick, New Jersey Pharmaceutical Microscopy, July 24-28, 1995
California Criminalistics Institute Advanced Microscopy, Course M205, Sacramento, CA, April 15-19, 1996 Forensic Statistics, Course M401, 1997, 1998, 1999
Chamot Microscopy Facility at Cornell Polarized Light Microscopy, Sept. 14-18, 1998
Eastern Analytical Symposium, Somerset, New Jersey Inorganic Microchemical Testing by Polarized Light Microscopy, Nov. 17, 1996
Eli Lilly, Lafayette, Indiana Pharmaceutical Microscopy, Sept. 28-Oct. 3, 1997
Interpol, Lyons, France Particle Sampling Methods and Capabilities for Incident Response, Linking of Cases and Investigative Support. Workshop, June 25-26, 2009

CONTINUING EDUCATION WORKSHOPS / COURSES TAUGHT (continued):

Microscopy Society of America

Polarized Light Microscopy in the Materials Sciences, Cleveland, Ohio,
Aug. 10, 1997

Traditional and Electronically Enhanced Polarized Light Microscopy
(with Rudolf Oldenbourg), Atlanta, GA, July 10, 1998. McCrone

Research Institute, Chicago, IL

Advanced Polarized Light / Forensic Microscopy, May 8-12, 2000

Forensic Microscopy, May 15-19, 1989; May 7-11, 1990; Nov. 30-Dec. 4, 1992;
Nov. 29-Dec. 3, 1993; Mar. 21-25, 1994; Aug. 29-Sept. 2, 1994;
Nov. 28-Dec. 2, 1995, May 3-7, 1999

Hair and Fiber Microscopy, May 13-17, 1991

Man-made Fiber Microscopy, Aug. 13-17, 1990; Aug. 6-10, 1991; July 27-31, 1992

Microscopy for Art Conservators, May 18-22, 1992; May 17-21, 1993;
Sept. 11-15, 2000

Paint Microscopy, July 6-10, 1992; July 12-16, 1993

Pharmaceutical Microscopy, June 24-25, 1992; June 14-18, 1993; Feb. 13-17,
1995, July 31-Aug. 4, 1995; Sept. 25-29, 2000

Polarized Light Microscopy, Sept. 20-24, 1993; Oct. 25-29, 1993, Mar. 16-18, 1998,
June 21-24, 1999; Aug. 21-25, 2000

Polymer Fiber & Film Microscopy, Nov. 6-10, 1995

Merck & Co., Inc., Elkton, Virginia

Polarized Light Microscopy, October 28-31, 1996

Midwestern Association of Forensic Scientists, Des Moines, Iowa

Microscopy of Paint Pigments, Oct. 13-14, 1997

Northeastern Association of Forensic Scientists, Albany, New York

Forensic Microscopy, Oct. 16-20, 1989

Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation, Forensic Laboratory, London, Ohio

Forensic Microscopy, Feb. 8-12, 1993

Phoenix Police Department Crime Laboratory, Phoenix, Arizona

Forensic Microscopy, April 1-5, 1996

Procter & Gamble, Cincinnati, Ohio

PLM/Liquid Crystals, June 5-9, 1995; Oct. 30-Nov. 1, 1995; Feb. 9-11, 1998

Pharmaceutical Microscopy, Jun 19-23, 1995; Apr. 16-18, 1997; Feb. 3-5, 1999

Procter & Gamble, Norwich, New York

Pharmaceutical Microscopy, Nov. 10-12, 1998; Nov. 15-18, 1998

Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Chemistry Section, Ottawa, Canada

Forensic Microscopy, Nov. 6-10, 1989

South Australian Forensic Science Centre, Adelaide, SA

Polarized Light Microscopy, Jan. 24, Feb. 1, 1991

Washington State Patrol Crime Laboratory, Seattle, Washington

Advanced Forensic Microscopy, Sept. 28-Oct. 2, 1992

United States Food and Drug Administration, University of Illinois, Chicago

Statistical Quality Control, August 9, 1990

United States Army Criminal Investigation Laboratory

Microscopy of Explosives, Jan. 24-28, 2011

University of California Extension, Davis

Forensic Statistics, Winter, 2003; Winter, 2005

GRANTS AND FUNDED RESEARCH:

A Biologically Informed Assessment of Fingerprint Individuality. National Institute of Justice, Graduate Research Fellowship, 1982.

The Relationship between Epidermal Ridge Patterns and the Ridge Minutiae. University of Illinois at Chicago, Campus Research Board Grant, Department of Criminal Justice, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, 1985.

The Forensic Sciences in Injury. University of Illinois at Chicago, Center for Educational Development, Interprofessional Education Committee, 1987 (with Dr. Robert J. Stein, Chief Medical Examiner, Cook County).

Modeling of Epidermal Ridge Minutiae. Office of Social Science Research, University of Illinois at Chicago, Department of Criminal Justice, 1988 (for on-site collaboration with Dr. Colin Aitken, University of Edinburgh, Scotland).

The Use of HPLC with Diode Array Detection for the Analysis and Relative Dating of Inks and the Differentiation of Dyes. National Institute of Justice, 1989 (as co-investigator, with Dr. Ian Tebbett, Principal Investigator).

Automated Fingerprint Identification Systems: Their Acquisition, Management, Performance and Organizational Impact. National Institute of Justice, 1990 (as Principal Investigator, with Dr. Joseph Peterson, co-investigator).

The PLM Microprobe: An Electron Microprobe for Use on a Light Microscope Stage. National Institute of Justice, 1993 (as Principal Investigator).

Research on Source Determination of Terrorist Related Evidence – Fiber Collection and Classification. Defense Logistics Agency, 1995 (as Principal Investigator).

MIA Soil Evaluation Testing. U.S. Government, Subcontract through Classified Prime, 1995-1997 (as Principal Investigator).

Inference of Geographical Origin from Dust Samples. US Government, 1995-1997.

Geographical Sourcing of Trace Particles. US Government, Subcontract with Bode Technology Group as Prime, 1998-2001, and MAR, Inc. as Prime 2002-2003 (as Principal Investigator).

Geolocation using Trace Particles and Residues. Intelligence Technology Innovation Center, 2003-2006 (as Lead Scientist).

GRANTS AND FUNDED RESEARCH:

Improvement of Geolocation and Broader Forensic Science Capabilities.
Intelligence Technology Innovation Center, U.S. Government, 2006-2011
(as Lead Scientist).

Use of Scanning Electron Microscopy / Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy
(SEM/EDS) Methods for the Analysis of Small Particles Adhering to
Carpet Fiber Surfaces as a Means to Test Associations of Trace Evidence
in a Way that is Independent of Manufactured Characteristics. National
Institute of Justice, 2010 (as Principal Investigator).

Exploitation of Very Small Particles to Enhance the Probative Value of Carpet
Fibers. National Institute of Justice, 2012 (as Principal Investigator).

Differential Sampling of Footwear to Separate Relevant Evidentiary Particles
from Background Noise. National Institute of Justice, 2014 (as Principal
Investigator).

ARTICLES / MAJOR PUBLICATIONS:

Bowen, A. and Stoney, D., A New Method for the Removal and Analysis of Small Particles Adhering to Carpet Fiber Surfaces, *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 58, No. 3, pp. 789-796, 2013.

Stoney, D.A. and Champod, C., Fingerprint Identification (Scientific Status), In: *Modern Scientific Evidence: The Law and Science of Expert Testimony*, 2012-2013 ed., Chapter 33, J.Sanders, D. Faigman, E. Cheng, J. Mnookin, E.Murphy, Eds., Thomson West, St. Paul, Minnesota, 2013.

Stoney, D.A., Bowen, A.M. and Stoney, P.L. Inferential Source Attribution from Dust: Review and Analysis, *Forensic Sci Rev*, Vol 25, pp.107-142, 2013.

Stoney, D.A. and Stoney, P.L. Use of Scanning Electron Microscopy/Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy (SEM/EDS) Methods for the Analysis of Small Particles Adhering to Carpet Fiber Surfaces as a Means to Test Associations of Trace Evidence in a Way That is Independent of Manufactured Characteristics, US Department of Justice. NCJ 239051, 2012.

Expert Working Group on Human Factors in Latent Print Analysis (D.A. Stoney, member). *Latent Print Examination and Human Factors: Improving the Practice through a Systems Approach*. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology. 2012.

Stoney, D.A., Discussion on "Quantifying the weight of evidence from a forensic fingerprint comparison: a new paradigm" by Cedric Neumann, Ian Evett and James Skerrett, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Series A, Vol. 175, Part 2, 371-415, 2012.

Stoney, D.A., Bowen, A.M., Bryant, V.M., Caven, E.A., Cimino, M.T. and Stoney, P.L., Particle Combination Analysis for Predictive Source Attribution: Tracing a Shipment of Contraband Ivory, *Journal of the Association of Trace Evidence Examiners*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 13-72, December, 2011.

Mnookin, J.L., Cole, S.A., Dror, I.E., Fisher, B.A.J., Houck, M., Inman, K., Kaye, D.H., Koehler, J.K., Langenburg, G., Risinger, D.M., Rudin, N., Siegel, J. and Stoney, D.A., The Need for a Research Culture in Forensic Science, *UCLA Law Review*, Vol. 58, No. 3, February, 2011.

Stoney, D.A., Fingerprint identification, in: D.L. Faigman, M.J. Saks, J. Sanders, E.K. Cheng (Eds.), *Modern Scientific Evidence: The Law and Science of Expert Testimony*, vol. 4, Thomson-West, St. Paul, MN, 2010, pp. 337-449.

Stoney, D.A. and Stoney, P.L., Emergence of a Practical and Effective Geolocation Capability, *Journal of the Intelligence Community Research & Development*, September 14, 2007, pp. 1-30.

ARTICLES / MAJOR PUBLICATIONS:

Stoney, D.A., Bowen, A.M., Stoney, P.L. and Sparenga, S.S., Review and Analysis of Geolocation and Related Forensic Source Determination Efforts: Overview and Method-imposed Limitations, *Journal of the Intelligence Community Research & Development*, November 9, 2006, pp. 1-19.

Andrews, L.B.; Buenger, N.; Bridge, J.; Rosenow, L.; Stoney, D.A.; Gaensslen, R.E.; Karamanski, T.; Lewis, R.; Paradise, J.; Inlander, A.; and Gonen, D. Constructing Ethical Guidelines for Biohistory, *Science*, Vol. 304, pp. 215-216, April 9, 2004.

Stoney, D.A. A Selection of Some of Dr. McCrone's High and Low Profile Cases in the Forensic Analysis of Art, *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 280-282, 2004.

Stoney, D.A., Fingerprint Identification (Scientific Status), In: *Modern Scientific Evidence: The Law and Science of Expert Testimony*, 2d ed., D.L. Faigman, D.H. Kaye, M.J. Saks and J. Sanders, Eds., West, St. Paul, Minnesota, 2002.

Stoney, D.A. Measurement of Fingerprint Individuality, In: *Advances in Fingerprint Technology*, 2nd ed., H.C. Lee and R.E. Gaensslen, Eds., CRC Press LLC, Boca Raton, Florida, 2001, pp. 327-388.

Berry, J. and Stoney, D.A. History and Development of Fingerprinting, In: *Advances in Fingerprint Technology*, 2nd ed., H.C. Lee and R.E. Gaensslen, Eds., CRC Press LLC, Boca Raton, Florida, 2001, pp. 1-40.

Bayard, M.A. and Stoney, D.A. The PLM/Microprobe: An Electron Microprobe for Use on the Light Microscope Stage Designed for Trace Evidence Analysis, *The Microscope*, Vol. 47, No. 4, pp. 209-228, 1999.

Stoney, D.A. PLM/Microprobe: An Electron Microprobe for Use on a Light Microscope Stage Designed for Trace Evidence Analysis: Final Report, US Department of Justice, NCJ 173067, 1998.

Stoney, D.A., Fingerprint Identification (Part B. Scientific Status), In: *The West Companion to Scientific Evidence*, Chapter 17, D.L. Faigman, D.H. Kaye, M.J. Saks and J. Sanders, Eds., West, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1997, pp.55-78.

Stoney, D.A. and Dougherty, P.M., Forensic Microscopy in the 1890s, with Notes on the Development of the Comparison Microscope, In: *Chemistry and Crime*, 2nd ed., S. M. Gerber, Ed., American Chemical Society, Washington D.C., pp. 107-135, 1997.

Stoney, D.A., Relaxation of the Assumption of Relevance and an Application to One-Trace and Two-Trace Problems, *Journal of the Forensic Science Society*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 17-21, 1994.

Stoney, D.A. The Torbanehill Mineral: Professor Quekett as Forensic Scientist, *The Microscope*, Vol. 41, No. 4, pp. 119-141, 1993.

ARTICLES / MAJOR PUBLICATIONS:

Klug, D., Peterson, J.L. and Stoney, D.A. Automated Fingerprint Identification Systems: Their Acquisition, Management, Performance and Organizational Impact Final Report , US Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, NCJ 137349, 1992

Stoney, D.A., Reporting of Highly Individual Genetic Typing Results: A Practical Approach, *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 373-386, March 1992.

Aitken, C.G.G. and Stoney, D.A. (Editors) *The Use of Statistics in Forensic Science*, Prentice Hall, New York, 1991.

Stoney, D.A., Transfer Evidence, In: *The Use of Statistics in Forensic Science*, C.G.G. Aitken and D.A. Stoney, Eds., Prentice Hall, New York, pp. 107-138, 1991.

Stoney, D.A., McConville, S. and Klug, D., Corrections and Criminalistics, *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 36, No. 5, pp. 1416-1429, September 1991.

Stoney, D.A., What Made Us Ever Think We Could Individualize Using Statistics?, *Journal of the Forensic Science Society*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 197-199, April 1991.

Evetts, I.W., Buffery, C., Willott, G. and Stoney, D.A. Guide to Interpreting Single Locus Profiles of DNA Mixtures in Forensic Cases, *Journal of the Forensic Science Society*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 41-47, January 1991.

Stoney, D.A., The Use of the Chelsea Filter and Alternative Dichromatic Effects in the Microscopical Characterization of Paint Pigments, *The Microscope*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 67-81, 1990.

Stoney, D.A., Criminalistics, Chemical Instrumentation and DNA Typing: Opportunities and Challenges for the Forensic Microscopist, *The Microscope*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 287-290, 1989.

Stoney, D.A. and Thornton, J.I., Multivariate Analysis of Typeface Damage Frequencies, *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 673-677, May 1989.

Stoney, D.A., The Technician in the Police Laboratory: Contributions of John E. Davis, *The Microscope*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 125-128, 1989.

Stoney, D.A., Distribution of Epidermal Ridge Minutiae, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, Vol. 77, No. 3, pp. 367-376, November 1988.

Stoney, D.A., A Medical Model for Criminalistics Education, *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 1086-1094, July 1988.

Stoney, D.A. and Thornton, J.I., A Systematic Study of Epidermal Ridge Minutiae, *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 32, No. 5, pp. 1182-1203, September 1987

ARTICLES / MAJOR PUBLICATIONS:

Stoney, D.A. and Thornton, J.I., A Method for the Description of Minutia Pairs in Epidermal Ridge Patterns, *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 1217-1234, October 1986.

Stoney, D.A. and Thornton, J.I., A Critical Analysis of Quantitative Fingerprint Individuality Models, *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 1187-1216, October 1986.

Stoney, D.A. and Thornton, J.I., The Forensic Significance of the Correlation of Density and Refractive Index in Glass Evidence, *Forensic Science International*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 147-157, 1985.

Stoney, D.A., Evaluation of Associative Evidence: Choosing the Relevant Question, *Journal of the Forensic Science Society*, Vol. 24, No. 5, pp. 473-482, September/October 1984.

Stoney, D.A., Statistics Applicable to the Inference of a Victim's Blood Type from Familial Testing, *Journal of the Forensic Science Society*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 9-22, January/February 1984.

Stoney, D.A. and Thornton, J.I., Glass Evidence, In: *Scientific and Expert Evidence*, 2nd ed., E.J. Imwinkelried, Ed., New York: Practising Law Institute, pp. 239-277, 1981.

Stoney, D.A. and Thornton, J.I., Solvent-Dependent Photolysis for Identification of Lysergic Acid Diethylamide and Other Indolamines, *Analytical Chemistry*, Vol. 51, No. 8, pp. 1341-1343, July 1979.

Thornton, J.I. and Stoney, D.A., An Improved Ferrous Metal Detection Reagent, *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 739-741, October 1977.

PROCEEDINGS / ABSTRACTS / EDITORIALS / LETTERS:

Stoney, D.A. and Neumann, C. Computational Methods Supporting Particle Combination Analysis: Application to Very Small Particles on the Surface of Carpet Fibers (abstract), *Proceedings of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 20, pp. 85-86, February, 2014.

Stoney, D.A. Emergence of Scientific Latent Print Practices: Implications for Examinations, Findings, Evidence and Decision Making (abstract), *Proceedings of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 20, pp. 253-254, February, 2014.

Stoney, D.A. and Stoney, P.L. Particle Combination Analysis: A Fundamentally New Investigative Approach (abstract), *Proceedings of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 20, pp. 274-275, February, 2014.

Stoney, D.A., Bowen, A.M. and Stoney, P.L. The Use of Computer-Controlled Scanning Electron Microscopy (CCSEM) Methods for the Analysis of Small Particles Adhering to Carpet Fiber Surfaces (abstract), *Proceedings of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 18, p. 113, February, 2012.

Stoney, D.A., Bowen, A.M. and Stoney, P.L. Analysis of Predictive Source Attribution Methods that are Based on Small Particle Traces (abstract), *Proceedings of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 17, p. 104, February, 2011.

Stoney, D.A. Skip Palenik: Master of Microchemistry and Chemical Microscopy (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 52, No. 1, p ii, 2004.

Stoney, D.A. Institute or Associates? (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 51, No. 4, p ii, 2003.

Stoney, D.A. Where in the World did this Come From? (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 51, No. 3, p. 174, 2003.

Stoney, D.A. Inter/Micro-2003, *The Microscope*, Vol. 51, No. 3, pp. 141-174, 2003.

Stoney, D.A. Counterterrorism, "White Powders" and the Polarized Light Microscope (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 51, No. 3, p ii, 2003.

Stoney, D.A. Nurturing Chemical Microscopy (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 51, No. 2, p ii, 2003.

Stoney, D.A. Provenance and Reconstruction using Trace Evidence (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 50, No. 2/3, pp. 141, 2002.

Stoney, D.A. Inter/Micro-2002, *The Microscope*, Vol. 50, No. 2/3, pp. 123-142, 2002.

PROCEEDINGS / ABSTRACTS / EDITORIALS / LETTERS:

Stoney, D.A. The Legacy and Changing Gears (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 50, No. 4, p ii, 2002.

Stoney, D.A. Weasel-Words and the Importance of Inconsistent Results (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 50, No. 1, p. ii, 2002

Stoney, D.A. Principles of Forensic Lookology: Seeing is Not Enough (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 49, No. 4, p. ii, 2001.

Stoney, D.A. A Short History of the Forensic Use of the Comparison Microscope (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 49, No. 3, p. 188, 2001.

Stoney, D.A. Inter/Micro-2001, *The Microscope*, Vol. 49, No. 3, pp. 171-188, 2001.

Stoney, D.A. Three Equations, Three Unknowns (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 49, No. 3, p. ii, 2001.

Stoney, D.A. Documentation of Forensic Microcrystalline Drug Derivatives (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 49, No. 2, p. ii, 2001.

Stoney, D.A. Computer-Assisted Methods for Objectivity and Efficiency in the Microscopical Interpretation of Evidence (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 48, No. 3, p. 147, 2000.

Stoney, D.A. Dr. Walter C. McCrone Receives the American Chemical Society Award for work on the Turin Shroud (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 48, No. 1, p. ii, 2000.

Stoney, D.A. Criminalistics in the New Millennium, California Association of Criminalists, *CAC News*, pp. 33-35, First Quarter 2000.

Stoney, D.A. Millennium (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 47, No. 4, p. ii, 1999.

Stoney, D.A. A Light Microscope I'd Like to See (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 47, No. 2, p. 113, 1999.

Stoney, D.A. The Bright Side of Polarized Light Microscopy (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 47, No. 2, p. ii, 1999.

Stoney, D.A. How Shall we Identify Apples in the New Millennium (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 46, No. 4, p. ii, 1998.

Stoney, D.A. Experiments with the LC-Pol Scope from CRI (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 46, No. 3, p. 231, 1998.

Stoney, D.A. Determining the Source of Particle Samples (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 46, No. 3, p ii, 1998.

PROCEEDINGS / ABSTRACTS / EDITORIALS / LETTERS:

Stoney, D.A. What Needs Doing in Microscopy? (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 46, No. 2, p ii, 1998.

Stoney, D.A. Forensic Hair Atlas (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 46, No. 1, p. ii, 1998

Stoney, D.A. Certification in Applied Chemical Microscopy (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 45, No. 4, p. ii, 1997.

Stoney, D.A. The First U.S. Degree Program in Forensic Science – Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science: 1932-1938 (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 45, No. 3, p. 115, 1997.

Stoney, D.A. Reflected Light Only, Please... (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 45, No. 3, p. ii, 1997.

Stoney, D.A. Editorial (Chamot Microscopy Facility at Cornell), *The Microscope*, Vol. 45, No. 2, p. ii, 1997.

Stoney, D.A. Judgment Day for the Shroud of Turin (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 45, No. 1, p. ii, 1997.

Stoney, D.A. Yes, But What Are Those Particles? (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 44, No. 4, p. ii, 1996.

Shane, J.D. and Stoney, D.A., Building a Fiber Database – Concept and Design and Implications for Forensic Databases (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 44, No. 3, p. 168, 1996.

Stoney, D.A. An Alternative Spot Test for Crack Cocaine (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 44, No. 3, p. 165, 1996.

Stoney, D.A. Editorial (Knowledge, proficiency and experience in chemical microscopy), *The Microscope*, Vol. 44, No. 3, p. iii, 1996.

Stoney, D.A. Editorial (Inter/Micro 96), *The Microscope*, Vol. 44, No. 2, p. iii, 1996.

Stoney, D.A. Welcome to the Blind Chemist's Society (editorial), *The Microscope*, Vol. 44, No. 1, p. iii, 1996.

Stoney, D.A. Editorial (Future of trace evidence analysis in crime laboratories), *The Microscope*, Vol. 43, No. 4, p. iii, 1995.

Stoney, D.A., The McCrone Research Institute Fiber Database Project (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 43, No. 3, p 143, 1995.

PROCEEDINGS / ABSTRACTS / EDITORIALS / LETTERS:

Stoney, D.A., The Vail Murder Case of 1891 (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 42, No. 3, pp. 141-142, 1994.

Stoney, D.A., (Preface to Special Issue on Analytical Aspects of Forensic Science), *Analytica Chimica Acta*, Vol. 288, Nos. 1/2, March, pp. 1-2, 1994.

Stoney, D.A. The Torbanehill Mineral: Professor Quekett as Forensic Scientist (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 41, No. 2/3, pp. 81-82, 1993.

Stoney, D.A. and Laughlin, G., Characterization of Spectra Fibers (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 40, No. 3, p. 190, 1992.

Stoney, D.A., Palenik, S. J. and Hickey, A.J., Microencapsulation Methods and Their Application to Chemical Microscopy (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 191-192, 1992.

Stoney, D.A., Zona, C. and Cai, X. Identification of Paint Pigment Sublimates by Optical Crystallography, in *Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Forensic Aspects of Trace Evidence*, June 24-28, 1991, Quantico, VA., USGPO, 1991.

Stoney, D.A., Description and Evaluation of Quantitative Methods Used to Assess the Strength of Correspondence Between Many-Banded Patterns Resulting from DNA Typing, in *Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Forensic Aspects of DNA Analysis*, June 19-23, 1989, Quantico, VA., USGPO, 1991.

Stoney, D.A. and Stephan, B., Rhinoceros Horns, Horse Hooves and Whale Baleen (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 39, Nos. 3 & 4, pp. 239-241, 1991.

Stoney, D.A. (Chair, Subcommittee on Statistical Issues) Summary of Discussions and Recommendations, In: *Proceedings of the Canberra Meeting on the Feasibility of a National DNA Profiling Database*, Canberra: SMANZFL (Senior Managers Australian & New Zealand Forensic Laboratories) pp. 45-48, January, 1991.

Stoney, D.A., Cai, X. and Zona, C., Sublimation and Characterization of Organic Pigments (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 38, No. 4, p. 391, 1990.

Stoney, D.A., Video Documentation of Observations Using Dichromatic Illumination (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 381-382, 1990.

Stoney, D.A., The Use of the Chelsea Filter and Alternative Dichromatic Effects in the Microscopical Characterization of Paint Pigments (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 255-256, 1989.

PROCEEDINGS / ABSTRACTS / EDITORIALS / LETTERS:

Stoney, D.A., The Use of the Chelsea Filter and Alternative Dichromatic Effects in the Microscopical Characterization of Paint Pigments (abstract), *The Microscope*, Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 255-256, 1989.

Stoney, D.A., Discussion of "Probability Analysis and the Evidential Value of Bolt Arrangements," (letter to the editor), *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 34, No. 6, pp. 1295-1296, 1989.

Stoney, D.A., Observations on Orientation and Distances between Nearest-Neighbor Minutiae (abstract), *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, Vol. 78, No. 2, p. 309, February, 1989.

Stoney, D.A. and Thornton, J.I., (response to letter to the editor on fingerprints), *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 11-12, 1988.

Stoney, D.A., Description of Minutiae Within their Ridge Environment, (brief communication) *Newsletter of the American Dermatoglyphics Association*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1987.

Stoney, D.A., Multivariate Analysis of Typeface Damage Frequencies, (extended abstract) *Journal of the Canadian Society of Forensic Science*, Vol. 20, No. 3, August 1987, pp. 100-102.

Stoney, D.A., Fundamental Principles in the Evaluation of Associative Evidence (extended abstract), *Journal of the Canadian Society of Forensic Science*, Vol. 20, No. 3, August 1987, pp. 280-282.

Stoney, D.A., Interpretation Issues in Multiple-Fiber Cases (extended abstract), *Journal of the Canadian Society of Forensic Science*, Vol. 20, No. 3, August 1987, pp. 287-288.

Stoney, D.A., Local modeling of ridge minutiae (extended abstract), *Journal of the Canadian Society of Forensic Science*, Vol. 20, No. 3, August 1987, pp. 86-87.

Stoney, D.A., (correspondence on the use of statistics in court), *Forensic Science Society Statistics Sub-group Newsletter*, pp. 1-2, Winter 1986.

Stoney, D.A., ed., "California Association of Criminalists 64th Semi-Annual Meeting," *Journal of the Forensic Science Society*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 145-148, March/April 1985.

Stoney, D.A., ed., "California Association of Criminalists 63rd Semi-Annual Meeting," *Journal of the Forensic Science Society*, Vol. 24, No. 6, pp. 591-598, November/December 1984.

Stoney, D.A., Discussion of "The Role of Fibers in Forensic Science Examinations" (letter to the editor), *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol. 29, No. 4, pp. 959-960, 1984.

PROCEEDINGS / ABSTRACTS / EDITORIALS / LETTERS:

Stoney, D.A., ed., "California Association of Criminalists 62nd Semi-Annual Meeting," *Journal of the Forensic Science Society*, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 229-233, May/June 1984.

Stoney, D.A., Note on Friction-Ridge Skin in Marsupials, *Ident-o-Gram Newsletter*, p. 7, September, 1983.

Stoney, D.A., Comments on the March and June 1982 Ethical Dilemmas, *California Association of Criminalists Newsletter*, pp. 11-15, September, 1982.

Stoney, D.A., Arc vs. Chord Length when Measuring Land Widths, *California Association of Criminalists Newsletter*, p. 18, June, 1982.

Stoney, D.A., A Spot Test for Tungsten Oxide, *California Association of Criminalists Newsletter*, p. 12, June, 1982.

Stoney, D.A., The Correlation of Density and Refractive Index, in Glass: Forensic Considerations, *California Association of Criminalists Newsletter*, pp. 3-12, Fall, 1979.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND APPEARANCES:

"Particle Combination Analysis: Very Small Particles on the Surfaces of Carpet Fibers as Multiple-Transfer Evidence," Presentations to:

- NIST Forensic Sciences Group, Gaithersburg, MD, May 9, 2014.
- University of Lausanne Forensic Science Program, Lausanne, Switzerland, June 10, 2014.
- Trace Evidence Section, United States Army Criminal Investigation Laboratory, Defense Forensic Science Center, Fort Gillam, GA, September 11, 2014.

"Unleashing Next Generation Forensic Trace Evidence Analysis: Inferences and Quantitative Associations from Particle Combinations," California Association of Criminalists Spring 2014 Seminar, San Diego, CA, May 8, 2014.

"Particle Combination Analysis: Very Small Particles on the Surfaces of Carpet Fibers as Multiple-Transfer Evidence," (Workshop) California Association of Criminalists Spring 2014 Seminar, San Diego, CA, May 6, 2014.

"Particle Combination Analysis: A Fundamentally New Investigative Approach," American Academy of Forensic Sciences 66th Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA, February 21, 2014.

"Computational Methods Supporting Particle Combination Analysis: Application to Very Small Particles on the Surface of Carpet Fiber," American Academy of Forensic Sciences 66th Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA, February 20, 2014.

"Emergence of Scientific Latent Print Practices: Implications for Examinations, Findings, Evidence and Decision Making," American Academy of Forensic Sciences 66th Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA, February 20, 2014.

"Forensic Trace Evidence Analysis: Established Methods and New Technologies," John Jay College Science Department Graduate Programs in Forensic Science Seminar Series, November 7, 2013.

"Exploitation of Very Small Particles to Enhance the Probative Value of Carpet Fibers," Pills and Particles: Toxicology and Linking Trace Evidence, National Institute of Justice Live Forensic Research Seminar Series, Webinar, June 4, 6 and 11, 2013.

"Exploitation of Very Small Particles to Enhance the Probative Value of Carpet Fibers," National Institute of Justice 2013 Research Grantees Meeting, Washington, DC, February 19, 2013.

"Exploitation of Very Small Particles (VSP) to Enhance the Probative Value of Fiber Evidence," Presentation at the NIJ Conference, Arlington VA, June 19, 2012.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND APPEARANCES:

"The Use of Computer-Controlled Scanning Electron Microscopy (CCSEM) Methods for the Analysis of Small Particles Adhering to Carpet Fiber Surfaces," American Academy of Forensic Sciences 64th Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA, February 24, 2012.

"Microscopical Examination and Comparison of Commonly Seen / Easily Identifiable Components," (part of workshop, "What Did You Just Step In?! Use of Forensic Soil Examinations to Find Out"), American Academy of Forensic Sciences 64th Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA, February 21, 2012.

"Issues Facing the Field of Forensic Soil Examination: Provenance / Map Questions," (part of workshop, "What Did You Just Step In?! Use of Forensic Soil Examinations to Find Out"), American Academy of Forensic Sciences 64th Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA, February 20, 2012.

"Discussion of the Paper 'Quantifying the weight of evidence from a forensic fingerprint comparison: a new paradigm' by Cedric Neumann, Ian Evett and James Skerett," Royal Statistical Society Ordinary Meeting, London, September 28th, 2011.

"Time to Re-Think Dusts," NIJ/FBI 2011 Trace Evidence Symposium, Kansas City, MO, August 11, 2011.

"Taxonomic Identifications of Traces Using Non-Human DNA," NIJ/FBI 2011 Trace Evidence Symposium, Kansas City, MO, August 10, 2011.

"A Procedure for Recovering Fine Particles from Carpet Fibers" (with A. Bowen, presenting) Inter-Micro 2011, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, July 11, 2011.

"Individualization is a Conclusion, Not a Process," 8th International Conference on Inference and Statistics, Seattle, WA, July 19, 2011.

"Analysis of Predictive Source Attribution Methods that are Based on Small Particle Traces," (with Andrew Bowen and Paul Stoney), American Academy of Forensic Sciences 63st Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, February 25, 2011.

"A Proposed Educational Structure for Forensic Laboratory Scientists," Forensic Education Task Group, Executive Committee, Dallas, TX, January 10, 2011.

"The Dust in the Box: Determination of the Geographical Source and Environment from Adhering Dusts," (with Paul L. Stoney), Society for Wildlife Forensic Sciences, Ashland, Oregon, April 21, 2010. (Presented by Dr. Edgard Espinoza.)

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND APPEARANCES:

"Putting Individualization and Errors in Context: What forensic science has been doing while you ignored it, why you should be thankful, and how you can help, now that you're interested," Forensic Science: A Blueprint for the Future, Program on Understanding Law, Science & Evidence, UCLA Law School, February 18, 2010.

Individualization Panel (Presentation and Discussion), American Academy of Forensic Sciences 61st Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado, February 19, 2009.

"CSI in a Box, Part 2," (with Paul Stoney), 6th International Conference on Environmental Crime, Interpol, Lyons, France, October 13-17, 2008. Three presentations at different levels of technical detail: open meeting (10/13), Wildlife Crime Working Group (10/14) and plenary conference session (10/17).

Capabilities Briefing, National Fish & Wildlife Forensics Laboratory, Ashland, Oregon, April 14, 2008.

"Opportunities for Improvement: Critical Areas", National Academy of Sciences Committee on Science, Technology and the Law, Washington, D.C., January 26, 2007.

"Initial Results of the ITIC Funded R&D Project "Chicago", Chantilly, VA, July 27, 2005.

"What Can a Certified Chemical Microscopist Do?," Inter-Micro 04, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, July 14, 2004.

"Case Examples: Microscopists Helping Chemical Laboratories," Inter-Micro 04, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, July 12, 2004.

"Where in the World did this Come From?," Inter-Micro 03, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, July 12, 2003.

"A Selection of Some of Dr. McCrone's High and Low Profile Cases in the Forensic Analysis of Art", American Academy of Forensic Sciences 55th Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, February 11, 2003.

"Dr. McCrone's Microscopical & Microchemical Examination of Tapes from the Shroud of Turin", (Invited) ACS Local Meeting, San Antonio, TX, November 11, 2002.

"Provenance and Reconstruction Using Trace Evidence," Inter-Micro 02, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, June 27, 2002.

"A Short History of the Forensic Use of the Comparison Microscope," Inter-Micro 01, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, June 28, 2001.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND APPEARANCES:

"The Romance and Reality of Forensic Trace Evidence Analysis," (Invited) Symposium X, Materials Research Society, Boston, MA, November 27, 2000.

"Ethics and Forensic Analysis," (Invited) Seminar Series in Forensic Chemistry, Associated Colleges of the Chicago Area, Morton Arboretum, November 14, 2000.

"Advantages of Access to the Hot Stage," (Invited) Eastern Analytical Symposium, Atlantic City, NJ, November 1, 2000.

"Introduction to Forensic Science," (Invited) Seminar Series in Forensic Chemistry, Associated Colleges of the Chicago Area, Morton Arboretum, September 12, 2000.

"Computer Assisted Methods for Objectivity and Efficiency in the Microscopical Analysis and Interpretation of Fiber Evidence," Inter/Micro 2000, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, June 29, 2000.

"Teaching Fundamentals of Light Microscopy," (Invited) Minnesota Microscopy Society, Spring Symposium, Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 19, 2000.

"Options for Computer-Assisted Polarized Light Microscopy," American Academy of Forensic Sciences 52nd Annual Meeting, Reno, Nevada, February 24, 2000.

"The Contribution of Forensic Science to the Obstruction of Justice" (Invited), American Academy of Forensic Sciences 52nd Annual Meeting, Reno, Nevada, February 24, 2000.

Seminar in Forensic Science (Guest Lecturer), University of California, Davis, October 6, 1999.

"A Light Microscope I'd Like to See," Inter-Micro 99, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, June 29, 1999.

"Perspectives on the Practice and Culture of Forensic Science," (Invited) Science in the Courtroom for the 21st Century, Office of the State Appellate Defender, Chicago, IL, May 14, 1999.

Lectures on Polarized Light Microscopy applied to Indoor Dusts, Cornell University, Course DEA 652, Mar. 7, Apr. 20 & 27, 1999. Lectures on Polarized Light Microscopy of Fibers, Cornell University, Course TXA 335, Apr. 19 & 26, 1999.

Lectures on Polarized Light Microscopy applied to Indoor Dusts, Cornell University, Course DEA 652, Mar. 7, Apr. 20 & 27, 1999.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND APPEARANCES:

"Provenance and Reconstruction using Trace Evidence," (Invited) Midwest Association of Forensic Scientists, Ann Arbor, MI, Oct. 9, 1998.

"Experiments with the LC-Pol Scope from CRI," Inter-Micro 98, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, August 11, 1998.

"Traditional and Electronically Enhanced Polarized Light Microscopy," (with Rudolf Oldenbourg) Georgia State Microscopical Society, Atlanta, GA, July 15, 1998.

"Analytical Light Microscopy: Examples of Practical Problem-Solving and Efficiency in Pharmaceutical Quality Control and Formulation," (Invited, with Walter C. McCrone) Microscopy Society of America, Atlanta, GA, July 15, 1998.

Lectures on Polarized Light Microscopy of Fibers, Cornell University, Course TXA 335, Apr. 6 & 13, 1998.

Lectures on Polarized Light Microscopy applied to Indoor Dusts, Cornell University, Course DEA 652, Apr. 4 & 5, 1998.

"Soap Bubbles - Lyotropic Liquid Crystals," (Invited) State Microscopical Society of Illinois Monthly Meeting, January 23, 1998.

"Ethics and Forensic Analysis," (Invited) Seminar Series in Forensic Chemistry, Associated Colleges of the Chicago Area, Argon National Laboratory, November 11, 1997.

"Introduction to Forensic Science," (Invited) Seminar Series in Forensic Chemistry, Associated Colleges of the Chicago Area, Argon National Laboratory, September 16, 1997.

"Microscopy at Cornell," Chemistry Department, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY (organizer / chairman of one-day symposium), August 8, 1997.

"The First U.S. Degree Program in Forensic Science — Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science: 1932-1938," Inter/Micro-97, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, July 24, 1997.

"Statistical Methods Applied to Methodology and Quality Assurance in Forensic Science," (Invited) Israel National Police, Division of Identification and Forensic Science, Jerusalem, Israel, May 6, 1997.

"Issues in the Case-Specific Forensic Application of Statistical Methods," (Invited) Israel National Police, Division of Identification and Forensic Science, Jerusalem, Israel, May 5, 1997.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND APPEARANCES:

"Light Microscopy of Polymorphism and Hydrates," 35th Annual Eastern Analytical Symposium, Somerset, NJ, November 18, 1996.

"The PLM/Microprobe: An Electron Microprobe for Use on a Light Microscope Stage Designed for Trace Evidence Analysis," International Association of Forensic Sciences 14th Triennial Meeting, Tokyo, Japan, August 28, 1996.

"Efficiency in the Destructive Analysis of Physical Evidence: Prosecution and Defense Perspectives," International Association of Forensic Sciences 14th Triennial Meeting, Tokyo, Japan, August 27, 1996.

"Light Microscopy and Characterization of the Solid State," (Invited) Symposium on Microscopic and Spectroscopic Characterization of Pharmaceuticals, Fine Particle Society, 27th Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL, August 8, 1996.

"An Alternative Spot Test for Crack Cocaine," Inter/Micro-96, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, July 25, 1996.

"Statistical Applications in Trace Evidence," (Invited) International Symposium on the Forensic Examination of Trace Evidence in Transition, FBI Laboratory Division, San Antonio, TX, June 28, 1996.

"Interpreting Trace Evidence," (Invited) California Association of Criminalists Dinner Meeting, Sacramento, CA, April 18, 1996.

"Interpretation of Transfer Evidence," (Invited) American Chemical Society 210th National Meeting, Chicago, IL, August 23, 1995.

"Problem Solving with the Light Microscope," Argonne National Laboratory, National Science Technology Council - Summer Teaching Enhancement Program, August 9, 1995.

"The McCrone Research Fiber Database Project," Inter/Micro 95, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, July 12, 1995

"Introduction to Forensic Chemistry," (Invited) Florida Sections, American Chemical Society, Orlando, FL, May 6, 1995.

"The Vail Murder Case of 1891," Inter-Micro 94, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, July 19, 1994.

(Television Appearances, Comments on O.J. Simpson Case)

CNN News, Chicago, IL, July 8, 1994

CLTV News, Chicago, IL, July 8, 1994

CNN News, Chicago, IL, Aug. 26, 1994

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND APPEARANCES:

"Victorian Forensic Microscopy," Hugo's Companions, Chicago, IL, March 31, 1994.

"The PLM/Microprobe: An Electron Microprobe for Use on a Light Microscope Stage Designed for Trace Evidence Analysis," National Institute of Justice, Forensic Sciences and Criminal Justice Technology, Annual Program Meeting, San Antonio, TX, February 15, 1994.

"Introduction to Statistics for Forensic Scientists," John Jay College of Criminal Justice, Forensic Science 790, New York, NY, October 14, 1993.

"Introduction to Forensic Science," (Invited) Seminar Series in Forensic Chemistry, Associated Colleges of the Chicago Area, Argonne National Laboratory, September 28, 1993.

"Forensic Microscopy in the 1890's," State Microscopical Society of Illinois, Chicago, IL, September 17, 1993.

"The Torbanehill Mineral: Professor Quekett as Forensic Scientist," Inter-Micro 93, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, July 22, 1993.

"Crime Scene First Response," Training seminar for the University of Illinois Police, Chicago, IL, May 3-7, 1993.

"Visualization of Chemical Principles Through Chemical Microscopy" American Chemical Society, March 15 (Rock River Section, Rockford, IL), March 17 (Illinois/Iowa Section, Monmouth, IL), March 18 (Iowa Section, Amana, IA), and May 10, 1993 (Peoria Section, Peoria, IL).

"Forensic Science" Lake Bluff Elementary School, Challenge Cafe, Shorewood, WI, February 24, 1993.

"Forensic Applications of Chemical Microscopy" Illinois Institute of Technology, Chemistry Departmental Seminar, Chicago, IL, October 9, 1992.

"Forensic Applications of Chemical Microscopy" Illinois Institute of Technology, Chemistry Departmental Seminar, Chicago, IL, October 9, 1992.

"Rhinceros Horns, Horse Hooves and Whale Baleen" Triton College, Science Enrichment Lecture Series, Chicago, IL, September 22, 1992.

"The Role of the Evidence Technician and Working a Crime Scene," University of Illinois at Chicago, Criminal Justice CrJ 260, Chicago, IL, September 15, 1992.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND APPEARANCES:

"Professional Development in the Forensic Sciences" University of Illinois at Chicago, Pharmacy Administration and Pharmacodynamics Departmental Seminar, Chicago, IL, September 2, 1992.

"Characterization of Spectra Fibers" (with G. Laughlin) Inter-Micro 92, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, July 16, 1992.

"Microencapsulation Methods and their Application to Chemical Microscopy" (with T. Hickey and S. Palenik) Inter-Micro 92, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, July 16, 1992.

"Problems in Fingerprint Science" (Invited) Cook County Public Defender's Office, Chicago, IL, June 4, 1992.

"DNA Statistics: A Criminalist's Perspective" (invited, panel discussion), California Association of Criminalists 79th Semi-Annual Seminar, Bass Lake, CA, May 8, 1992.

"Forensic Paint Examination for Art Conservators" (invited), Minnesota Society of Optical Microscopists Spring Symposium, St. Paul, MN, April 27, 1992.

"Problems in Fingerprint Science" (Invited) Cook County Public Defender's Office, Chicago, IL, February 27, 1992.

"Rhinoceros Horns,, Horse Hooves and Whale Baleen" (with B. Stephan) Inter-Micro 91, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, August 20, 1991.

"Identification of Paint Pigment Sublimates by Optical Crystallography," (with C. Zona and X. Cai) International Symposium on the Forensic Aspects of Trace Evidence, Quantico, Virginia, June 25, 1991.

"Automated Fingerprint Identification Systems: their Acquisition, Management, Performance and Organization" (with D. Klug and J. Peterson) American Academy of Forensic Sciences 43rd Annual Meeting, February 21, 1991.

"The First U.S. Degree Program in Forensic Science: Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science 1932-1938" American Academy of Forensic Sciences 43rd Annual Meeting, February 21, 1991.

"Statistical Aspects of DNA Interpretation," Seminar/Workshop for the New Zealand Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, Chemistry Section, Auckland, New Zealand, February 15, 1991.

"Training in Critical Polarized Light Microscopy," South Australian Microscopical Society, Annual Membership Meeting, Adelaide, South Australia, Dec. 2, 1990.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND APPEARANCES:

"A Practical Approach to the Reporting of Highly Individual Genetic Typing Results," Seminar for the South Australian Forensic Science Centre, Adelaide, South Australia, February 11, 1991.

"Who is Dave Stoney?," (invited) Annual Meeting of the Australian and New Zealand Forensic Science Society, South Australian Branch, Adelaide, South Australia, November 30, 1990.

"Reflection on the 1980's: The Quest for Precision in a Subjective Discipline" International Association of Forensic Sciences 12th Triennial Meeting, Adelaide Australia, October 27, 1990.

"What Made us Ever Think we Could Individualize Evidence Using Statistics?" International Association of Forensic Sciences 12th Triennial Meeting, Adelaide Australia, October 27, 1990.

"Characterization of Paint Pigment Sublimates" (with C. Zona and X. Cai) Inter-Micro 1990, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, August 21, 1990.

Chair, Art Conservation Session, Inter-Micro 1990, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, August 20, 1990.

"Video Documentation of Dichromatic Illumination Effects" Inter-Micro 1990, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago, IL, August 20, 1990.

"Microscopy and Forensics," WGN Radio Extension 720, Chicago, IL, June 13, 1990.

"Trace Evidence," National Conference on Clinical Forensic Medicine, Illinois Chapter of American College of Emergency Room Physicians, Chicago, IL, May 4-5, 1990.

"Interpretation of Multiple-Banded DNA Patterns," PROMEGA Conference on DNA Interpretation, Madison, WI, April, 1990.

"Hypothetical Cases," International Conference on Forensic Statistics, Edinburgh, Scotland, April 2-4, 1990.

"Use of Dichromatic Illumination for the Characterization of Trace Evidence," American Academy of Forensic Scientists 42nd Annual Meeting, Cincinnati, OH, February 19-24, 1990.

"Reduction in Evidential Value in Multiple-Offender DNA Typing Cases," American Academy of Forensic Scientists 42nd Annual Meeting, Cincinnati, OH, February 19- 24, 1990.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND APPEARANCES:

"Assessing the Strength of Correspondence Between Many-banded DNA Patterns," Midwestern Association of Forensic Scientists, Annual Meeting, Fairview Heights, IL, October 4- 6, 1989.

"Update on the Forensic Science Program at the University of Illinois at Chicago," Midwestern Association of Forensic Scientists, Annual Meeting, Fairview Heights, IL, October 4-6, 1989.

"Statistical Implications of Multiple-Offender DNA Typing Results," Midwestern Association of Forensic Scientists, Annual Meeting, Fairview Heights, IL, October 4-6, 1989 and The International Symposium on Human Identification, Madison, WI, November 30-December 1, 1989.

"The Use of the Chelsea Filter and Alternative Dichromatic Effects in the Microscopical Identification of Paint Pigments," Inter-Micro 1989, McCrone Research Institute, Chicago IL, July 24, 1989 and Midwestern Association of Forensic Scientists, Annual Meeting, Fairview Heights, IL, October 4-6, 1989.

"Description and Evaluation of Quantitative Methods Used to Assess the Strength of Correspondence Between Many-Banded Patterns Resulting from DNA Typing," International Symposium on DNA Typing Methods, Quantico, VA, June 18-23, 1989.

"Observations on Orientations and Distances Between Nearest-Neighbor Minutiae," (invited) American Association of Physical Anthropologists 58th Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA, April 7, 1989.

"Fingerprint Identification," (Invited) Illinois Institute for Continuing Legal Education, Program on Forensic Evidence, Chicago, IL, December 9, 1988.

"Relevance and Analytical Precision in the Evaluation of Associative Evidence," (invited) American Society of Criminology, 40th Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL, November 10, 1988.

"Statistical Evaluation of DNA Fingerprints," Midwestern Association of Forensic Scientists 17th Annual Meeting, Minneapolis, MN, October 6, 1988.

"Introduction to Forensic Science," (Invited) Seminar Series in Forensic Chemistry, Associated Colleges of the Chicago Area, Argonne National Laboratory, September 27, 1988.

"Fingerprint Comparisons/Issues Arising in Casework Reexaminations," (Invited) Cook County Public Defender's Office, Chicago, IL, June 22, 1988.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND APPEARANCES:

"Relaxation of the Assumption of Relevance in a Two-Trace Problem," American Academy of Forensic Sciences, 40th Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA, February 18, 1988.

"Demonstrative Evidence Supporting Medical-Legal Cases," workshop with Terri McDermott and Diane Nelson, Biocommunication Chicago Forum, Chicago, IL, October 25, 1987.

"An Early Forensic Scientist in the Midwest," (Invited) Midwestern Association of Forensic Scientists 16th Annual Meeting, Mackinac Island, MI, October 7, 1987.

"Interpretation Issues in Multiple-Fiber Cases," International Association of Forensic Sciences 11th Triennial Meeting, Vancouver, B.C., August 6, 1987.

"Fundamental Principles in the Evaluation of Associative Evidence," (Invited) International Association of Forensic Sciences 11th Triennial Meeting, Vancouver, B.C., August 4, 1987.

"Multivariate Analysis of Typeface Damage Frequencies," International Association of Forensic Sciences 11th Triennial Meeting, Vancouver, B.C., August 4, 1987.

"Local Modeling of Ridge Minutiae," (poster presentation), International Association of Forensic Sciences 11th Triennial Meeting, Vancouver, B.C., August 4, 1987.

"Career Opportunities in Forensic Science," (panel discussion), University of Illinois at Chicago, Medical Technology Program, MT 307 Organization and Management, May 29, 1987.

"A Medical Model for Criminalistics Education," (Invited) American Academy of Forensic Sciences 39th Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA, February 20, 1987.

"Criteria for the Typing of Semen on Vaginal Swabs," Midwestern Association of Forensic Scientists 15th Annual Meeting, Springfield, IL, October 9, 1986.

"Distribution of Fingerprint Minutiae on the Distal Portions of Thumbprints," American Academy of Forensic Sciences 38th Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA, February 15, 1986.

"Statistical Evaluation of Fingerprint Minutiae," Institute of Forensic Sciences 36th Medical Legal Seminar, Oakland, CA, October 11, 1985.

"Quantitative Assessment of Associative Evidence," Criminal Justice Departmental Seminar, University of Illinois at Chicago, February 25, 1985.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS AND APPEARANCES:

"Fiber Evidence - Case Illustrations," Institute of Forensic Sciences 33rd Medical Legal Seminar, Oakland, CA, June 1, 1984.

"Blood Groupings of Missing Persons," Institute of Forensic Sciences 31st Medical Legal Seminar, Oakland, CA, May 20, 1983.

"Courtroom Presentation of Numerical Probabilities," (Invited, followed by Panel Discussion) American Academy of Forensic Sciences 35th Annual Meeting, Cincinnati, OH, February 18, 1983.

"Evaluation of Associative Evidence," First Inter-American Congress of Forensic Sciences, Sacramento, CA, November 5, 1982.

"A Theoretical Framework for the Interpretation of Fiber Evidence," California Association of Criminalists Trace Evidence Study Group, Oakland, CA, July 15, 1982.

"Trace Evidence," (Invited, Panel Discussion), California Association of Criminalists 59th Semi-Annual Seminar, Newport Beach, CA, May 15, 1982.

"Statistics Applicable to the Inference of a Victim's Blood Type from Familial Testing," California Association of Criminalists 58th Semi-Annual Seminar, Stateline, NV, September 4, 1981.

"Instrumental and Microscopic Analysis of Trace Evidence," part of a course accredited by the state bar association: Interpretation of Physical Evidence - A Seminar for Attorneys, San Francisco, CA, November 9, 1979.

"Solvent-Dependent Photolysis for Identification of Lysergic Acid Diethylamide and Other Indolamines," California Association of Criminalists 53rd Semi-Annual Seminar, San Diego, CA, May 11, 1979.

"The Correlation of Density and Refractive Index in Window Glass: Forensic Considerations," California Association of Criminalists 53rd Semi-Annual Seminar, San Diego, CA, May 10, 1979.

"Proposed Research on Land Impression Variation," California Association of Criminalists Firearms Study Group, San Rafael, CA, August 26, 1977.

Mink, Rob

From: JASON DAVIS <JDAVI@ago.state.ms.us>
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2015 1:38 PM
To: Mink, Rob
Subject: RE: Manning - fingerprints

Rob,

Apologies. I have in my notes that I had responded to this on March 24 but I don't have a sent email confirming that. Don't know what happened. We oppose the use of Stoney.

From: Mink, Rob [<mailto:rmink@wyattfirm.com>]
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 5:34 PM
To: JASON DAVIS
Cc: SONNY WHITE; Marvin White (mwhitejr@comcast.net); david@dvoisinlaw.com
Subject: FW: Manning - fingerprints

Jason, please let us know the State's position on the attached agreed order sent to you on March 20. We need to present something to Judge Howard on this.

Robert S. Mink

Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, LLP
Direct: (601) 987-5324

From: Mink, Rob
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2015 10:59 AM
To: 'JASON DAVIS'
Cc: SONNY WHITE; Marvin White; david@dvoisinlaw.com
Subject: Manning - fingerprints

Jason, attached is a proposed agreed order on fingerprint testing using David Stoney. Stoney's CV is attached. Let us know if you agree with this.

Thanks.

Robert S. Mink

Wyatt, Tarrant & Combs, LLP
Direct: (601) 987-5324

The information contained in this transmission is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this information, do not review, retransmit, disclose, disseminate, use, or take any action in reliance upon this information. If you received this transmission in error, please contact the sender immediately, destroy all printed copies, and delete the material from all computers.

