



## **Handwriting Examination Test No. 19-523/524 Summary Report**

---

Each sample set contained either photographs or digital images of two medical prescriptions (Q1, Q2) and known writings and signatures from two individuals (K1, K2). Participants were requested to examine these items and report their findings. Data were returned from 172 participants, 50 for the 19-523 DVD test and 122 for the 19-524 photo test and are compiled into the following tables:

	<u>Page</u>
<a href="#"><u>Manufacturer's Information</u></a>	<u>2</u>
<a href="#"><u>Summary Comments</u></a>	<u>3</u>
<a href="#"><u>Table 1: Examination Results</u></a>	<u>4</u>
<a href="#"><u>Table 2: Conclusions</u></a>	<u>20</u>
<a href="#"><u>Table 3: Additional Comments</u></a>	<u>57</u>
<a href="#"><u>Appendix: Data Sheet</u></a>	

This report contains the data received from the participants in this test. Since these participants are located in many countries around the world, and it is their option how the samples are to be used (e.g., training exercise, known or blind proficiency testing, research and development of new techniques, etc.), the results compiled in the Summary Report are not intended to be an overview of the quality of work performed in the profession and cannot be interpreted as such. The Summary Comments are included for the benefit of participants to assist with maintaining or enhancing the quality of their results. These comments are not intended to reflect the general state of the art within the profession.

Participant results are reported using a randomly assigned "WebCode". This code maintains participant's anonymity, provides linking of the various report sections, and will change with every report.

## **Manufacturer's Information**

Each sample set contained one photograph of two prescriptions (Q1, Q2) and eight photographs of known writings provided by two individuals (K1a-d, K2a-d). These included course of business writings, dictated writing exemplars, and dictated signature exemplars provided by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1) and Jake Pug (K2). Participants were asked to determine if either of the two individuals contributed to the handprinted text and signatures contained in the two questioned items.

### **SAMPLE PREPARATION-**

During production of dictated known writing, both writers were instructed broadly on formatting in order to maintain general uniformity of appearance. During production of dictated signatures, the writers were requested to sign in the name of "Dr. Zachary Eg." Each questioned document was selected from several versions that were dictated to each individual by a moderator. A third unknown writer produced the signature on Q2.

The handprinted text and signature on the Q1 prescription were both produced by the K1 writer, Dr. Zachary Eg. The handprinted text on Q2 was produced by the K2 writer, Jake Pug. The signature on Q2 was produced by an unidentified third writer for whom no exemplar writing was provided.

Both K1 and K2 writers are male and right-handed. The unidentified third writer is female and right-handed.

**SAMPLE ASSEMBLY:** Once predistribution results were obtained, all sample packs were prepared. For each sample pack, the nine photographs were packaged into a pre-labeled manila envelope, sealed with evidence tape, and initialed with "CTS". All DVDs were produced and placed into cases. QC checks were performed on both media.

### **VERIFICATION-**

All four predistribution laboratories stated that the Q1 handprinted text was produced by the K1 writer and not by the K2 writer. All four predistribution laboratories also stated that the Q2 handprinted text was produced by the K2 writer and not by the K1 writer.

All four predistribution laboratories stated that the Q1 signature was produced by the K1 writer. All predistribution labs either eliminated both the K1 and K2 writers as the source of the Q2 signature or were inconclusive, but no lab identified either of these individuals as a possible contributor.

## **Summary Comments**

---

This test was designed to provide participants with a handprinted text and signature identification challenge involving two medical prescriptions. Each sample set contained either photographs or digital images of each questioned form (Q1, Q2), as well as known writings provided by two individuals, Dr. Zachary Eg (K1) and Jake Pug (K2). Participants were provided with dictated exemplars of each prescription, requested signatures in the name of "Zachary Eg," and course of business writing for both known writers. Participants were requested to determine if either of the known writers contributed to the handprinted text or signature contained within each questioned prescription. The K1 writer produced the handprinted text and signature on Q1, and the K2 writer produced the handprinted text on Q2. The Q2 signature was produced by an unknown third party (Refer to Manufacturer's Information for preparation details).

In regards to Question 1 (Table 1a), "To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on each of the prescriptions?" a breakdown of responses is described below. 172 participants identified the K1 writer (reported "A" or "B") as the writer of the handprinted text in Q1. All 172 participants also eliminated the K2 writer (reported "D" or "E") as the writer of the handprinted text in Q1. All 172 participants identified the K2 writer as the writer of the handprinted text in Q2 and also eliminated the K1 writer as the writer of the handprinted text in Q2.

For Question 2 (Table 1b), "To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed the questioned signature on each of the prescriptions?", 171 out of 172 participants (99.4%) identified the K1 writer as the source of the signature on the Q1 prescription (reported "A" or "B"). Also, 166 of those 171 participants (97.1%) eliminated the K2 writer as the source of the signature on the Q1 prescription (reported "D" or "E"), with the other five participants inconclusive regarding the K2 writer (reported "C"). The remaining one participant was inconclusive for both contributors in regard to the Q1 signature.

All 172 participants either eliminated (74.4%, reported "D" or "E") or were inconclusive (25.6%, reported "C") as to if the K1 writer was the source of the Q2 signature. In the determination of whether the K2 writer produced the Q2 signature, 145 participants (84.3%) were inconclusive as to if the K2 writer produced the Q2 signature. Twenty-one participants eliminated the K2 writer of producing the Q2 signature. Six participants identified the K2 writer as the source of the Q2 signature (reported "A" or "B"). All of these six participants eliminated the K1 writer as the source of the Q2 signature.

Some participants observed that the Q2 signature could not be compared to the known signatures of K1 and K2 due to limiting comparison factors with the Q2 signature. Many participants noted the Q2 signature had characteristics associated with a simulated signature. They noted an overall pictorial similarity with the signatures of Dr. Zachary Eg, but also characteristics which differed from authentic signatures. These characteristics included blunt stroke endings, a tremor, and the appearance the signature was slowly drawn. In production of the Q2 item, an authentic signature was visually referenced before being executed by the unidentified third writer. Due to these limiting comparison factors, and having firsthand knowledge of the creation of the questioned signature, those reporting inconclusive ("C") were grouped with eliminations ("D", "E") for purposes of calculating a consensus percentage.

# Examination Results

*To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on each of the prescriptions?*

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
24FQ8A-524	A	E	6M672G-524	A	D
24M7T6-524	A	E	6NXVNJ-524	A	E
279HL2-523	A	E	762XFM-524	B	D
28F33A-524	A	E	78A42N-524	A	E
2FWDHV-523	A	E	7923AV-523	A	E
2LJ9FT-524	A	E	7CZBMH-524	A	E
2TM3H2-524	A	E	7E4AVP-524	A	E
2XBRVK-524	A	E	7F3LPR-524	A	E
2Z7DPB-524	A	E	7HL2TT-524	A	E
342JLT-523	A	E	7P8ANX-524	A	E
37N4MQ-523	A	E	7Z3KVJ-523	A	E
3DKYNU-523	A	E	7ZQ99U-524	A	E
3DPD2V-524	B	D	8B4HZX-524	A	E
3LGVDH-524	A	D	8KCW77-524	A	E
3XUXTP-523	A	E	8N9GBP-523	A	E
42TPKL-523	A	E	8UZNTX-524	A	E
48EJHJ-524	A	E	8Y7J9R-524	A	E
4J7BZ3-524	A	E	98G8K6-524	A	E
4LA7K6-524	A	E	9LX3Z2-524	B	D
4Q8PNP-523	A	D	9R4RGA-523	A	E
4TZEBQ-524	A	E	9RN9WC-524	A	E
4U72JP-523	A	E	A7YDJV-524	A	E
62HJE9-524	A	E	A97NHK-524	A	E
64C68Y-524	A	E	A9ABUR-524	A	E
68TN9G-524	A	E			

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
ABZCZF-524	A	E	FR2BNJ-524	A	E
ADYXJ6-524	A	E	FU9U6R-524	A	E
B8PYPR-523	A	E	FVZN83-524	A	E
BBR2BL-523	A	E	G2M348-524	A	E
BJJFET-524	A	E	G3D2KR-524	A	E
BRKZUP-524	A	E	G62ZRG-524	A	E
BU3RNK-523	A	E	G7VGUJ-524	A	E
BU6ECP-524	A	E	GF7JFJ-523	A	E
BVWDJW-524	A	E	GJMQV7-524	A	E
BYXHWG-524	A	E	GNYR2B-524	A	E
C7QD8K-523	A	E	GRGYGX-523	A	E
CEKKRB-523	A	D	GYH74D-523	A	E
CLLTFQ-524	A	E	H64HFK-524	A	E
CT6YAC-524	A	E	H79CRB-523	A	E
D7BC6H-523	A	E	HC38V4-523	A	E
DD7BE4-524	A	E	HMG7L7-523	A	E
DFXAVN-524	A	E	J9UCN7-524	A	E
DGQ269-523	A	E	JJW69D-524	A	E
E33FXK-523	A	E	JKMZFY-524	A	E
E6DQ4J-524	A	E	JMEW6T-524	A	E
EBVVK4-524	A	E	JMEYUX-523	A	E
EDMKCB-524	B	D	JNM2N9-524	A	E
EHX78H-524	A	E	JP6XBG-524	A	E
EZCGH2-523	A	E	JZZ7V6-524	A	E
F7KZHE-523	A	E	K7H268-524	A	E
FJ8A3Y-523	A	E	KFVTXQ-524	A	E
FLEPCQ-524	A	E	KRNCEG-524	A	E

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
KRP6A4-523	A	E	QG7BCB-523	A	E
KTYAPD-524	A	E	QQT3A3F-524	A	E
KZYT3-524	A	E	QRH92R-523	A	E
L49BF4-524	A	E	QZDDUT-524	A	E
L7ZAWM-524	A	E	R2RUUR-524	A	E
L99KQ7-524	A	E	R8EM6R-523	B	D
LFTFVF-523	A	D	RJ97FQ-523	A	E
LGKGV-524	A	E	RTBGT9-524	A	E
LWVDU6-524	A	E	RTYHXY-524	A	E
MAJLC4-524	A	E	T4RMYB-524	A	E
MBQ2LV-524	A	E	TXJ2CY-524	A	E
MEQ6F4-524	A	E	TZQLWR-524	A	E
MLBB7H-524	A	E	U22NHQ-524	A	E
N2F2J8-524	A	E	U62PQ2-524	A	E
N7VMDZ-523	A	E	UB448V-523	A	E
NMJZP8-524	A	E	UCV2F3-524	A	E
NRR7LD-524	A	E	VGU733-524	A	E
NU27NY-523	A	E	VMGHRA-524	A	E
NVU4W7-524	A	E	VNNX22-523	A	E
NZN4B2-524	A	E	VPKJNZ-523	A	E
P4K92Q-524	A	E	VUX27G-524	A	E
P6C8GA-523	A	E	VY6MVZ-524	A	E
P77XK4-524	A	E	W9AYNM-523	A	E
PA6AG4-524	A	E	WA4KGE-524	A	E
PGRXHZ-524	A	E	WQVKAY-524	B	D
PGUKYE-524	A	E	WQWBJ3-524	A	E
PXDHXK-524	B	D	WTZ737-524	A	E

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
WZZXHA-523	A	E			
XAZH9L-524	A	E			
XULEK6-523	A	E			
Y2NKZ9-523	A	E			
YDHRLY-523	A	E			
YJL93Q-524	A	E			
YU4HYX-524	A	E			
YYWPBE-524	A	E			
Z2KBPM-523	A	E			
Z3DAXU-524	A	E			
Z7VYBY-524	A	E			
ZLKW3Y-524	A	E			
ZP34HL-524	A	E			
ZUZFKD-523	A	E			
ZVBG7C-524	A	E			

**Response Summary - Handwriting on Q1**Total Participants: **172**

To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on each of the prescriptions?

Response	Handwriting on Q1		
	K1	K2	
A	165	0	<b>Response Key:</b> A: Was WRITTEN by; B: Was PROBABLY WRITTEN by (some degree of identification); C: CANNOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED; D: Was PROBABLY NOT WRITTEN by (some degree of elimination); E: Was NOT WRITTEN by.
B	7	0	
C	0	0	
D	0	12	
E	0	160	

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
24FQ8A-524	E	A	762XFM-524	D	B
24M7T6-524	E	A	78A42N-524	E	A
279HL2-523	E	A	7923AV-523	E	A
28F33A-524	E	A	7CZBMH-524	E	A
2FWDHV-523	E	A	7E4AVP-524	E	A
2LJ9FT-524	E	A	7F3LPR-524	E	A
2TM3H2-524	E	A	7HL2TT-524	E	A
2XBRVK-524	E	A	7P8ANX-524	E	A
2Z7DPB-524	E	A	7Z3KVJ-523	E	A
342JLT-523	E	A	7ZQ99U-524	E	A
37N4MQ-523	E	A	8B4HZX-524	E	A
3DKYNU-523	E	A	8KCW77-524	E	A
3DPD2V-524	D	B	8N9GBP-523	E	A
3LGVDH-524	D	A	8UZNTX-524	E	A
3XUXTP-523	E	A	8Y7J9R-524	E	A
42TPKL-523	E	A	98G8K6-524	E	A
48EJHJ-524	E	A	9LX3Z2-524	D	A
4J7BZ3-524	E	A	9R4RGA-523	E	A
4LA7K6-524	E	A	9RN9WC-524	E	A
4Q8PNP-523	D	A	A7YDJV-524	E	A
4TZEBO-524	E	A	A97NHK-524	E	A
4U72JP-523	E	A	A9ABUR-524	E	A
62HJE9-524	E	A	ABZCZF-524	E	A
64C68Y-524	E	A	ADYXJ6-524	E	A
68TN9G-524	E	A	B8PYPR-523	E	A
6M672G-524	D	A	BBR2BL-523	D	B
6NXVNJ-524	E	A	BJJFET-524	E	A



TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
BRKZUP-524	E	A	G62ZRG-524	E	A
BU3RNK-523	E	A	G7VGUJ-524	E	A
BU6ECP-524	E	A	GF7JFJ-523	E	A
BVWDJW-524	E	A	GJMQV7-524	E	A
BYXHWG-524	E	A	GNYR2B-524	E	A
C7QD8K-523	E	A	GRGYGX-523	E	A
CEKKRB-523	D	A	GYH74D-523	E	A
CLLTFQ-524	E	A	H64HFK-524	E	A
CT6YAC-524	E	A	H79CRB-523	E	A
D7BC6H-523	E	A	HC38V4-523	E	A
DD7BE4-524	E	A	HMG7L7-523	E	A
DFXAVN-524	E	A	J9UCN7-524	E	A
DGQ269-523	E	A	JJW69D-524	E	A
E33FXK-523	E	A	JKMZFY-524	E	A
E6DQ4J-524	E	A	JMEW6T-524	E	A
EBVVK4-524	E	A	JMEYUX-523	E	A
EDMKCB-524	D	B	JNM2N9-524	E	A
EHX78H-524	E	A	JP6XBG-524	E	A
EZCGH2-523	E	A	JZZ7V6-524	E	A
F7KZHE-523	E	A	K7H268-524	E	A
FJ8A3Y-523	E	A	KFVTXQ-524	E	A
FLEPCQ-524	E	A	KRNCEG-524	E	A
FR2BNJ-524	E	A	KRP6A4-523	E	A
FU9U6R-524	E	A	KTYAPD-524	E	A
FVZN83-524	E	A	KZYT3-524	E	A
G2M348-524	E	A	L49BF4-524	E	A
G3D2KR-524	E	A	L7ZAWM-524	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
L99KQ7-524	E	A	R8EM6R-523	D	B
LFTVFV-523	D	A	RJ97FQ-523	E	A
LGKGV-524	E	A	RTBGT9-524	E	A
LWVDU6-524	E	A	RTYHXY-524	E	A
MAJLC4-524	E	A	T4RMYB-524	E	A
MBQ2LV-524	E	A	TXJ2CY-524	E	A
MEQ6F4-524	E	A	TZQLWR-524	E	A
MLBB7H-524	E	A	U22NHQ-524	E	A
N2F2J8-524	E	A	U62PQ2-524	E	A
N7VMDZ-523	E	A	UB448V-523	E	A
NMJZP8-524	E	A	UCV2F3-524	E	A
NRR7LD-524	E	A	VGU733-524	E	A
NU27NY-523	E	A	VMGHRA-524	E	A
NVU4W7-524	E	A	VNNX22-523	E	A
NZN4B2-524	E	A	VPKJNZ-523	E	A
P4K92Q-524	E	A	VUX27G-524	E	A
P6C8GA-523	E	A	VY6MVZ-524	E	A
P77XK4-524	E	A	W9AYNM-523	E	A
PA6AG4-524	E	A	WA4KGE-524	E	A
PGRXHZ-524	E	A	WQVKAY-524	D	B
PGUKYE-524	E	A	WQWBJ3-524	E	A
PXDHXK-524	D	B	WTZ737-524	E	A
QG7BCB-523	E	A	WZZXHA-523	E	A
QQT3F-524	E	A	XAZH9L-524	E	A
QRH92R-523	E	A	XULEK6-523	E	A
QZDDUT-524	E	A	Y2NKZ9-523	E	A
R2RUUR-524	E	A	YDHRLY-523	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
YJL93Q-524	E	A			
YU4HYX-524	E	A			
YYWPBE-524	E	A			
Z2KBPM-523	E	A			
Z3DAXU-524	E	A			
Z7VYBY-524	E	A			
ZLKW3Y-524	E	A			
ZP34HL-524	E	A			
ZUZFKD-523	E	A			
ZVBG7C-524	E	A			

**Response Summary - Handwriting on Q2**

Total Participants: 172

To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on each of the prescriptions?

Response	Handwriting on Q2		
	K1	K2	
A	0	165	<b>Response Key:</b> A: Was WRITTEN by; B: Was PROBABLY WRITTEN by (some degree of identification); C: CANNOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED; D: Was PROBABLY NOT WRITTEN by (some degree of elimination); E: Was NOT WRITTEN by.
B	0	7	
C	0	0	
D	13	0	
E	159	0	

# Examination Results

*To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed the questioned signature on each of the prescriptions?*

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
24FQ8A-524	A	E	6M672G-524	B	C
24M7T6-524	A	E	6NXVNJ-524	A	D
279HL2-523	A	E	762XFM-524	B	D
28F33A-524	B	D	78A42N-524	A	E
2FWDHV-523	A	E	7923AV-523	A	E
2LJ9FT-524	A	E	7CZBMH-524	A	E
2TM3H2-524	B	D	7E4AVP-524	A	E
2XBRVK-524	B	D	7F3LPR-524	A	E
2Z7DPB-524	A	E	7HL2TT-524	A	E
342JLT-523	A	E	7P8ANX-524	A	E
37N4MQ-523	A	E	7Z3KVJ-523	A	E
3DKYNU-523	A	E	7ZQ99U-524	A	E
3DPD2V-524	B	D	8B4HZX-524	B	D
3LGVDH-524	A	D	8KCW77-524	A	D
3XUXTP-523	A	E	8N9GBP-523	A	E
42TPKL-523	A	E	8UZNTX-524	A	E
48EJHJ-524	A	E	8Y7J9R-524	A	E
4J7BZ3-524	A	E	98G8K6-524	A	E
4LA7K6-524	A	E	9LX3Z2-524	B	D
4Q8PNP-523	A	D	9R4RGA-523	A	E
4TZEBQ-524	A	E	9RN9WC-524	A	E
4U72JP-523	A	E	A7YDJV-524	A	E
62HJE9-524	A	E	A97NHK-524	A	E
64C68Y-524	A	E	A9ABUR-524	A	E
68TN9G-524	A	E	ABZCZF-524	A	E

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
ADYXJ6-524	A	E	FU9U6R-524	A	E
B8PYPR-523	A	C	FVZN83-524	A	E
BBR2BL-523	A	E	G2M348-524	A	E
BJJFET-524	A	E	G3D2KR-524	A	E
BRKZUP-524	A	E	G62ZRG-524	A	E
BU3RNK-523	A	E	G7VGUJ-524	A	E
BU6ECP-524	A	E	GF7JFJ-523	A	E
BVWDJW-524	C	C	GJMQV7-524	A	E
BYXHWG-524	A	E	GNYR2B-524	B	C
C7QD8K-523	A	E	GRGYGX-523	B	D
CEKKRB-523	A	D	GYH74D-523	A	E
CLLTFQ-524	A	E	H64HFK-524	B	D
CT6YAC-524	A	E	H79CRB-523	A	E
D7BC6H-523	A	E	HC38V4-523	A	E
DD7BE4-524	A	E	HMG7L7-523	A	E
DFXAVN-524	A	E	J9UCN7-524	A	E
DGQ269-523	A	E	JJW69D-524	A	E
E33FXK-523	A	E	JKMZFY-524	A	E
E6DQ4J-524	A	E	JMEW6T-524	A	E
EBVVK4-524	A	E	JMEYUX-523	A	E
EDMKCB-524	B	D	JNM2N9-524	A	E
EHX78H-524	A	E	JP6XBG-524	A	E
EZCGH2-523	A	E	JZZ7V6-524	A	E
F7KZHE-523	A	E	K7H268-524	A	E
FJ8A3Y-523	A	E	KFVTXQ-524	A	E
FLEPCQ-524	A	E	KRNCEG-524	A	E
FR2BNJ-524	A	E	KRP6A4-523	A	E

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
KTYAPD-524	A	E	QQT3F-524	A	E
KZYT3-524	A	E	QRH92R-523	B	D
L49BF4-524	A	E	QZDDUT-524	A	E
L7ZAWM-524	A	E	R2RUUR-524	B	D
L99KQ7-524	A	E	R8EM6R-523	B	C
LFTVF-523	A	D	RJ97FQ-523	A	E
LGKGV-524	A	E	RTBGT9-524	A	E
LWVDU6-524	A	E	RTYHXY-524	A	E
MAJLC4-524	A	E	T4RMYB-524	A	E
MBQ2LV-524	A	E	TXJ2CY-524	A	E
MEQ6F4-524	A	E	TZQLWR-524	A	E
MLBB7H-524	A	E	U22NHQ-524	A	E
N2F2J8-524	A	E	U62PQ2-524	A	E
N7VMDZ-523	A	C	UB448V-523	A	E
NMJZP8-524	A	E	UCV2F3-524	A	E
NRR7LD-524	A	E	VGU733-524	A	E
NU27NY-523	A	E	VMGHRA-524	A	E
NVU4W7-524	A	E	VNNX22-523	A	E
NZN4B2-524	A	E	VPKJNZ-523	A	E
P4K92Q-524	A	E	VUX27G-524	A	E
P6C8GA-523	A	E	VY6MVZ-524	A	E
P77XK4-524	A	E	W9AYNM-523	A	E
PA6AG4-524	A	E	WA4KGE-524	A	E
PGRXHZ-524	A	E	WQVKAY-524	B	D
PGUKYE-524	A	E	WQWBJ3-524	A	E
PXDHXK-524	B	D	WTZ737-524	A	E
QG7BCB-523	A	E	WZZXHA-523	A	E

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
XAZH9L-524	A	E			
XULEK6-523	A	E			
Y2NKZ9-523	A	E			
YDHRLY-523	A	E			
YJL93Q-524	A	E			
YU4HYX-524	A	E			
YYWPBE-524	A	E			
Z2KBPM-523	A	D			
Z3DAXU-524	A	E			
Z7VYBY-524	A	E			
ZLKW3Y-524	A	E			
ZP34HL-524	A	E			
ZUZFKD-523	A	E			
ZVBG7C-524	A	E			

<b>Response Summary - Signature on Q1</b>			Total Participants: 172
<i>To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed the questioned signature on each of the prescriptions?</i>			
Response	Signature on Q1		
	K1	K2	
A	154	0	<b>Response Key:</b> A: Was WRITTEN by; B: Was PROBABLY WRITTEN by (some degree of identification); C: CANNOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED; D: Was PROBABLY NOT WRITTEN by (some degree of elimination); E: Was NOT WRITTEN by.
B	17	0	
C	1	6	
D	0	21	
E	0	145	

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
24FQ8A-524	D	C	762XFM-524	D	C
24M7T6-524	E	C	78A42N-524	E	E
279HL2-523	C	C	7923AV-523	E	C
28F33A-524	D	C	7CZBMH-524	D	D
2FWDHV-523	E	E	7E4AVP-524	E	E
2LJ9FT-524	C	C	7F3LPR-524	E	D
2TM3H2-524	C	C	7HL2TT-524	E	A
2XBRVK-524	D	C	7P8ANX-524	E	C
2Z7DPB-524	D	C	7Z3KVJ-523	E	C
342JLT-523	E	E	7ZQ99U-524	D	C
37N4MQ-523	E	C	8B4HZX-524	D	C
3DKYNU-523	E	E	8KCW77-524	C	C
3DPD2V-524	C	C	8N9GBP-523	D	C
3LGVDH-524	D	C	8UZNTX-524	D	C
3XUXTP-523	C	C	8Y7J9R-524	E	C
42TPKL-523	E	C	98G8K6-524	C	C
48EJHJ-524	D	C	9LX3Z2-524	C	C
4J7BZ3-524	E	C	9R4RGA-523	E	C
4LA7K6-524	C	C	9RN9WC-524	E	C
4Q8PNP-523	D	C	A7YDJV-524	E	C
4TZEBO-524	E	E	A97NHK-524	D	C
4U72JP-523	E	C	A9ABUR-524	E	C
62HJE9-524	C	C	ABZCZF-524	C	C
64C68Y-524	E	C	ADYXJ6-524	C	C
68TN9G-524	E	C	B8PYPR-523	E	C
6M672G-524	D	C	BBR2BL-523	D	C
6NXVNJ-524	D	C	BJJFET-524	C	C



TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
BRKZUP-524	C	C	G62ZRG-524	E	B
BU3RNK-523	E	C	G7VGUJ-524	E	C
BU6ECP-524	E	D	GF7JFJ-523	E	C
BVWDJW-524	C	C	GJMQV7-524	E	C
BYXHWG-524	E	C	GNYR2B-524	C	C
C7QD8K-523	E	C	GRGYGX-523	D	C
CEKKRB-523	D	D	GYH74D-523	D	C
CLLTFQ-524	C	C	H64HFK-524	D	C
CT6YAC-524	C	C	H79CRB-523	D	C
D7BC6H-523	E	E	HC38V4-523	C	C
DD7BE4-524	E	C	HMG7L7-523	E	C
DFXAVN-524	E	A	J9UCN7-524	C	C
DGQ269-523	C	C	JJW69D-524	E	C
E33FXK-523	E	C	JKMZFY-524	C	C
E6DQ4J-524	E	B	JMEW6T-524	C	C
EBVVK4-524	E	C	JMEYUX-523	D	C
EDMKCB-524	D	C	JNM2N9-524	E	C
EHX78H-524	E	C	JP6XBG-524	E	C
EZCGH2-523	E	C	JZZ7V6-524	C	C
F7KZHE-523	C	C	K7H268-524	C	C
FJ8A3Y-523	E	C	KFVTXQ-524	C	C
FLEPCQ-524	E	C	KRNCEG-524	E	C
FR2BNJ-524	E	C	KRP6A4-523	D	C
FU9U6R-524	D	C	KTYAPD-524	E	C
FVZN83-524	D	C	KZYTEM3-524	D	C
G2M348-524	E	C	L49BF4-524	E	C
G3D2KR-524	D	C	L7ZAWM-524	D	C

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
L99KQ7-524	D	C	R8EM6R-523	D	C
LFTFVF-523	D	C	RJ97FQ-523	E	C
LGKGVF-524	E	C	RTBGT9-524	E	E
LWVDU6-524	C	C	RTYHXY-524	D	D
MAJLC4-524	C	C	T4RMYB-524	E	C
MBQ2LV-524	D	C	TXJ2CY-524	D	C
MEQ6F4-524	E	C	TZQLWR-524	E	C
MLBB7H-524	E	C	U22NHQ-524	E	C
N2F2J8-524	E	C	U62PQ2-524	E	C
N7VMDZ-523	D	C	UB448V-523	E	C
NMJZP8-524	E	C	UCV2F3-524	E	C
NRR7LD-524	E	C	VGU733-524	E	B
NU27NY-523	C	C	VMGHRA-524	C	C
NVU4W7-524	E	E	VNNX22-523	E	C
NZN4B2-524	C	C	VPKJNZ-523	E	E
P4K92Q-524	D	C	VUX27G-524	C	C
P6C8GA-523	D	C	VY6MVZ-524	E	C
P77XK4-524	E	E	W9AYNM-523	E	E
PA6AG4-524	C	C	WA4KGE-524	C	C
PGRXHZ-524	D	C	WQVKAY-524	D	C
PGUKYE-524	E	C	WQWBJ3-524	E	C
PXDHXK-524	C	C	WTZ737-524	D	C
QG7BCB-523	C	C	WZZXHA-523	E	C
QQTA3F-524	E	E	XAZH9L-524	C	C
QRH92R-523	C	C	XULEK6-523	E	E
QZDDUT-524	C	C	Y2NKZ9-523	E	C
R2RUUR-524	C	C	YDHRLY-523	E	D

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
YJL93Q-524	E	C			
YU4HYX-524	E	C			
YYWPBE-524	C	C			
Z2KBPM-523	D	C			
Z3DAXU-524	D	C			
Z7VYBY-524	E	E			
ZLKW3Y-524	E	C			
ZP34HL-524	E	B			
ZUZFKD-523	C	C			
ZVBG7C-524	C	C			

<b>Response Summary - Signature on Q2</b>			Total Participants: <b>172</b>
<i>To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed the questioned signature on each of the prescriptions?</i>			
Response	Signature on Q2		
	K1	K2	
A	0	2	<b>Response Key:</b> A: Was WRITTEN by; B: Was PROBABLY WRITTEN by (some degree of identification); C: CANNOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED; D: Was PROBABLY NOT WRITTEN by (some degree of elimination); E: Was NOT WRITTEN by.
B	0	4	
C	44	145	
D	44	6	
E	84	15	

# Conclusions

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
24FQ8A-524	<p>Identification: It was determined that the questioned hand printing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) were prepared by ZACHARY EG, writer of Item 3 (Items K1a-d). May Not Have (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached due to the limited quantity of undictated known signatures, the presence of characteristics observed in the questioned signature that could not be accounted for based on the submitted known writing, and the possibility of simulation or tracing. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate that ZACHARY EG, writer of Item 3 (Items K1a-d), may not have prepared the Item 2 (Item Q2) signature. HANDWRITING (JAKE PUG): Identification: It was determined that the questioned hand printing on Item 2 (Item Q2) was prepared by JAKE PUG, writer of Item 4 (Items K2a-d). No conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not the questioned Item 2 (Item Q2) signature was prepared by JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d) due to the presence of characteristics observed in the questioned writing that could not be accounted for based on the submitted known writing, and the possibility of simulation or tracing.</p>
24M7T6-524	<p>Question 1. The deed contained in recipe Q1 if it corresponds to the basic deed of comparison of Zachary Eg (K1). The writing contained in recipe Q2 does not correspond to the writing of Zachary Eg (K1). The writing contained in recipe Q1 does not correspond to Jake Pug (K2). The writing contained in recipe Q2 if it corresponds to Jake Pug (K2). Question 2. The signature contained in the recipe Q1 if it corresponds to the base comparison firms of Zachary Eg (K1). The signature contained in recipe Q2 does not correspond to the base comparison firms of Zachary Eg (K1). The signature contained in recipe Q1 does not correspond to the Jake Pug (K2) collation base signatures. With respect to the signature contained in the Q2 recipe, it cannot be determined who is due to the fact that there are not enough elements of collation.</p>
279HL2-523	<p>A comparative handwriting examination of Items Q1 and Q2 and K1 and K2 resulted in the following findings: TEXT: The writer who prepared the known writing on K1a-d (Zachary Eg) prepared the questioned writing on Q1. This finding is based upon the agreement of significant individualizing handwriting characteristics with the absence of any significant differences between the questioned and the known writings. The writer who prepared the known writing on K2a-d (Jake Pug) did not prepare the questioned writing on Q1. This finding is based on the absence of corresponding characteristics and the presence of significant differences in handwriting characteristics between the questioned and the known writings. The writer who prepared the known writing on K1a-d (Zachary Eg) did not prepare the questioned writing on Q2. This finding is based on the absence of corresponding characteristics and the presence of significant differences in handwriting characteristics between the questioned and the known writings. The writer who prepared the known writing on K2a-d (Jake Pug) prepared the questioned writing on Q2. This finding is based upon the agreement of significant individualizing handwriting characteristics with the absence of any significant differences between the questioned and the known writings. SIGNATURES: The writer who prepared the known signatures on K1a-d (Zachary Eg) prepared the questioned signature on Q1. This finding is based upon the agreement of significant individualizing handwriting characteristics with the absence of any significant differences. The writer who prepared the known signatures on K2a-d (Jake Pug) did not prepare the questioned signature on Q1. This finding is based on the absence of corresponding characteristics and the presence of significant differences in handwriting characteristics between the questioned and the known writing. The K1a-d writer (Zachary Eg) and the K2a-d writer (Jake Pug) could not be identified or eliminated as the writer of the Q2 signature due to the combination of similarities as well as unexplained differences between the known and questioned signatures. In addition, the Q2 signature contains characteristics of unnatural writing such as blunt beginning and ending strokes, hesitation, and tremor.</p>
28F33A-524	<p>HANDWRITING (DR. ZACHARY EG): Identification: It was determined that the hand printed entries on Item 1 (Item Q1) were prepared by DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d). May Have Prepared (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached regarding the questioned Item 1 (Item Q1) signature due to the limited complexity and legibility of the signature.</p>

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>However, characteristics in common were observed which indicate DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), may have prepared the questioned Item 1 (Item Q1) signature. May Not Have Prepared (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached regarding the questioned Item 2 (Item Q2) signature due to characteristics of simulation, the limited complexity and legibility of the signature, and the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), may not have prepared the questioned Item 2 (Item Q2) signature. It should be noted that simulations usually do not contain a sufficient quantity of identifying characteristics of their preparer(s). Therefore it is doubtful that an individual will ever be identified or eliminated as having prepared the questioned Item 2 (Item Q2) signature.</p> <p>HANDWRITING (JAKE PUG): Identification: It was determined that the hand printed entries on Item 2 (Item Q2) were prepared by JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d). May Not Have Prepared (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached regarding the questioned Item 1 (Item Q1) signature due to the limited complexity and legibility of the signature, as well as the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), may not have prepared the questioned Item 1 (Item Q1) signature. No Conclusion: Although inconsistencies were observed, no conclusion could be reached whether or not the questioned Item 2 (Item Q2) signature was prepared by JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), due to characteristics of simulation, the limited complexity and legibility of the signature, and the presence of unexplained characteristics. It should be noted that simulations usually do not contain a sufficient quantity of identifying characteristics of their preparer(s). Therefore it is doubtful that an individual will ever be identified or eliminated as having prepared the questioned Item 2 (Item Q2) signature.</p>
2FWDHV-523	<p>1. The findings in order to determine the similarities and differences as below: a) Handwriting Q1 was written by K1. b) Handwriting Q1 was not written by K2. c) Handwriting Q2 was not written by K1. d) Handwriting Q2 was written by K2. 2. The findings in order to determine the similarities and differences as below: a) Signature Q1 was written by K1. b) Signature Q1 was not written by K2. c) Signature Q2 was not written by K1. d) Signature Q2 was not written by K2.</p>
2LJ9FT-524	<p>1. The body of questioned writing and signature on Prescription Q1 (Xanax) were written by Zachary Eg (K1), at the same time they were not written by Jake Pug (K2). 2. The The body of questioned writing on Prescription Q2 (Vicodin) was written by Jake Pug (K2), at the same time it was not written by Zachary Eg (K1). 3. The questioned signature on Prescription Q2 (Vicodin) is not an authentic signature of Zachary Eg (K1).</p>
2TM3H2-524	<p>1. Q1(Excluding the signature) was written by K1. 2. Q2(Excluding the signature) was written by K2. 3. Q1(Signature) was probably written by K1. 4. Q2(Signature) cannot be identified.</p>
2XBRVK-524	<p>1. The questioned signature on Q1 showed significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen signatures on K1a, K1b, K1c and K1d. As such and due to limited collected specimen signatures and characteristic features, I am of the opinion that the questioned signature on Q1 was probably written by the writer of the specimens (Dr. Zachary Eg). 2. The questioned signature on Q2 showed significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen signatures on K1a, K1b, K1c and K1d. As such and due to limited collected specimen signatures and characteristic features, I am of the opinion that the questioned signature on Q2 was probably not written by the writer of the specimens (Dr. Zachary Eg). 3. The questioned signature on Q1 showed significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen signatures on K2a, K2b and K2c. However, due to the questioned signature is not the original signature of "Jake Pug" and the questioned signature on Q1 has been identified was probably written by "Dr. Zachary Eg", I am of the opinion that this questioned signature was probably not written by "Jake Pug". 4. The questioned signature on Q2 showed some differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen signatures on K2a, K2b and K2c. However, due to limited specimen and characteristic features as well as the questioned signature is not the original signature of "Jake Pug", I was not able to form an opinion on the authorship of this questioned signature. 5. The questioned handwriting on Q1 showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting on K1a, K1b and K1d. Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting on Q1 was written by the writer of the specimens (Dr. Zachary Eg). 6. The questioned</p>

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	handwriting on Q2 showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting on K1a, K1b and K1d. Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting on Q2 was not written by the writer of the specimens (Dr. Zachary Eg). 7. The questioned handwriting on Q1 showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting on K2a, K2b and K2d. Therefore, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting on Q1 was not written by the writer of the specimens (Jake Pug). 8. The questioned handwriting on Q2 showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting on K2a, K2b and K2d. Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting on Q2 was written by the writer of the specimens (Jake Pug).
227DPB-524	Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING (DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d)): Identification: It was determined that the questioned writing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) were prepared by DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d). May Not Have (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics, limited undictated known signatures, and the possibility of simulation/tracing. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), may not have prepared the Item 2 (Item Q2) questioned signature. HANDWRITING (JAKE PUG (Item 4 (Items K2a-d)): Identification: It was determined that the questioned writing excluding the signature on Item 2 (Item Q2) was prepared by JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d). No Conclusion: No Conclusion could be reached whether or not JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), prepared the questioned signature on Item 2 (Item Q2) due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the possibility of simulation/tracing.
342JLT-523	1. The findings in order to determine the similarities and differences as below: a) Handwriting Q1 was written by K1. b) Handwriting Q1 was not written by K2. c) Handwriting Q2 was not written by K1. d) Handwriting Q2 was written by K2. 2. The findings in order to determine the similarities and differences as below: a) Signature Q1 was written by K1. b) Signature Q1 was not written by K2. c) Signature Q2 was not written by K1. d) Signature Q2 was not written by K2.
37N4MQ-523	The prescription (Q1), was written by Dr. Zachary Eg. including the signature. The prescription (Q2), was written by Jake Pug. excluding the signature. The prescription (Q2) signature, was not written by Dr. Zachary Eg., and can not be Identified or Eliminated by Jake Pug.
3DKYNU-523	1. The findings in order to determine the similarities and differences as below: a) Handwriting Q1 was written by K1. b) Handwriting Q1 was not written by K2. c) Handwriting Q2 was not written by K1. d) Handwriting Q2 was written by K2. 2. The findings in order to determine the similarities and differences as below: a) Signature Q1 was written by K1. b) Signature Q1 was not written by K2. c) Signature Q2 was not written by K1. d) Signature Q2 was not written by K2.
3DPD2V-524	Based on the examination and comparison of the question writing/printing located on Q1 & Q2 submitted with the known writing/printing of Dr Eg listed as K1 and Jake Pug listed as K2, I offer the following. I find the there is a strong probability Dr Eg authored the writing located on Q1. In addition I find that there is a strong probability Jake Pug authored the question writing on the face side of Q2 with the exception of the signature line. Due to the lack of similarities found within the question writing in of Jake Pug submitted I find that he cannot be identified or eliminated. The same conclusion is offered on from the known writing of Dr. Eg.
3LGVDH-524	K1: questioned writing: Q1 XANAX: Level +3 The results strongly support that.. (main hypothesis). Q2 Vicodin: Level -2 The results support that.. (alt. hypothesis). questioned signature: Q1 Level +3 The results strongly support that.. (main hypothesis). Q2 Level -2 The results support that.. (alt. hypothesis). K2: questioned writing: Q1 XANAX: Level -2 The results support that.. (alt. hypothesis). Q2 Vicodin: Level +3 The results strongly support that.. (main hypothesis). questioned signature: Q1 Level -2 The results support that.. (alt. hypothesis). Q2 Level 0 The results equally support that (main hypothesis) and that (alt. hypothesis).
3XUXT-523	The writing contained in Evidence Q1 was performed by K1. The writing contained in Evidence Q2 was performed by K2. The signature in evidence Q1 shows significant similarities with the writing of K1.

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
42TPKL-523	The body of writing and signature on the Q1 prescription was written by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1a-d). The body of writing and signature on the Q2 prescription was not written by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1a-d). The body of writing and signature on the Q1 prescription was not written by Jake Pug (K2a-d). The body of writing on the Q2 prescription was written by Jake Pug (K2a-d). Jake Pug (K2a-d) cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the signature on the Q2 prescription.
48EJHJ-524	It was determined the prescription for Xanax, (including the signature), "Zachary Eg", Q1, was written by Zachary Eg, K1. It was also determined the prescription for Vicodin, (excluding the signature), "Zachary Eg", Q2, was written by Jake Pug, K2. Due to the unexplained variation in the signature, "Zachary Eg", Q2, which could be due in part to an attempt to disguise, there was not a basis for identifying Jake Pug, K2 as being the writer of the signature. However, there were observed differences between the known signature of Zachary Eg, K1 that indicate he is probably not the writer of the Q2 signature.
4J7BZ3-524	1. The questioned writing body of the Q1 Xanax recipe, presents the same characteristics of form and graphonomic aspects and is identified with the standard samples written by Zachary Eg (K1). 2. The questioned writing body of the Q2 Vicodin recipe does not have the same characteristics of form and graphonomic aspects and therefore does not identify with the standard samples written by Zachary Eg (K1). 3. The questioned writing body of the Q1 Xanax recipe does not have the same characteristics of form and graphonomic aspects and therefore does not identify with the standard samples written by Jake Pug (K2). 4. The questioned writing body of the Q2 Vicodin recipe, presents the same characteristics of form and graphonomic aspects and is identified with the standard samples written by Jake Pug (K2). 5. The questioned signature of the recipe Q1 Xanax, presents the same characteristics of form and graphonomic aspects and is identified with the standard samples written by Zachary Eg (K1). 6. The questioned signature of the Q2 Vicodin recipe does not have the same characteristics of form and graphonomic aspects and therefore does not identify with the standard samples written by Zachary Eg (K1). 7. The questioned signature of the Q1 Xanax recipe, does not have the same characteristics of form and graphonomic aspects and therefore does not identify with the standard samples written by Jake Pug (K2). 8. The questioned signature of the Q2 Vicodin recipe, since it is an imitation of a signature, does not have sufficient characteristics of form and graphonomic aspects to identify or eliminate it in front of the standard samples written by Jake Pug (K2).
4LA7K6-524	HANDWRITING (DR. ZACHARY EG): Identification: It was determined that DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), prepared the body of questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1) and the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature on Item 1 (Item Q1). HANDWRITING (JAKE PUG): Identification: It was determined that JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), prepared the body of questioned writing on Item 2 (Item Q2). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), or JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), prepared the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature on Item 2 (Item Q2) due to possible distortion/disguise and the slowly prepared nature of the questioned signature.
4Q8PNP-523	Significant evidence was found to support the proposition that the writer of Exhibit K1 (Zachary Eg) wrote the questioned entries in the Patient Name, Address, Date, Rx, MD: and signature areas on Exhibit Q1. No evidence was found to support the proposition that the writer of Exhibit K2 (Jake Pug) wrote the questioned entries on Exhibit Q1. Significant evidence was found to support the proposition that the writer of Exhibit K2 (Jake Pug) wrote the questioned entries in the Patient Name, Address, Date, Rx, and MD: areas on Exhibit Q2. The evidence provides strong support to the proposition that the writer of Exhibit K1 (Zachary Eg) did not write the questioned signature on Exhibit Q2. The questioned signature on Exhibit Q2 is somewhat distorted and appears to be a simulation of the genuine signature of Zachary Eg. Simulations are drawn rather than handwritten, therefore, the writer of Exhibit K2 (Jake Pug) could neither be identified, nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on Exhibit Q2.
4TZEBQ-524	1. Dr. Eg. wrote the Questioned Body and Signature to Document Q-1. 2. Jake Pug wrote the Questioned Body portion to Document Q-2. 3. Dr. Eg. and Jake Pug can not Identified as to be the writer of the Questioned Signature, Document Q-2.



## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
4U72JP-523	The questioned prescription paper for Xanax was written and signed by Dr Zachary Eg. The questioned prescription paper for vicodin was written (excluding signature) by Jake Pug. The questioned prescription paper for vicodin was not signed by Dr. Zachary Eg. However Jake Pug cannot be identified or eliminated to sign it.
62HJE9-524	Q1: Comparison between the questioned handwriting (excluding the signature) on document Q1 and the specimen handwriting on document K1(a-d), purportedly written by Dr Zachary Eg, has disclosed a significant combination of similarities with no significant differences. Accordingly, the writer of the specimen handwriting on documents K1(a-d), purportedly written by Dr Zachary Eg, wrote the questioned handwriting on document Q1 (excluding the signature). Comparison between the questioned signature on document Q1 and the specimen signatures on documents K1(a-d), purportedly written by Dr Zachary Eg, has disclosed a significant combination of similarities with no significant differences. Accordingly, the writer of the specimen signatures on K1(a-d), purportedly written by Dr Zachary Eg, wrote the questioned signature on document Q1. Q2: Comparison between the questioned handwriting (excluding the signature) on document Q2 and the specimen handwriting on document K2(a-d), purportedly written by Jake Pug, has disclosed a significant combination of similarities with no significant differences. Accordingly, the writer of the specimen handwriting on documents K2(a-d), purportedly written by Jake Pug, wrote the questioned handwriting on document Q2 (excluding the signature). Examination of the questioned signature on document Q2 disclosed a number similarities, differences, and unaccounted for features when compared to the provided specimen signatures (K1(a-d) and K2(a-d)). Accordingly, no conclusion could be reached with respect to authorship of the questioned signature present on the document Q2.
64C68Y-524	It could be established that regarding the completion of document Q1, it was written by C, which discards that it was written by Jake Pug. Likewise, it was established that the completion of document Q2 was written by Jake Pug so it is ruled out that it was written by Zachary Eg. As for the signature signed in document Q1, it was written by Zachary Eg and not by Jake Pug; while the firm that appears in document Q2 cannot be identified so it is not possible to insert or discard Zachary Eg or Jake Pug.
68TN9G-524	I found a complete match between the handwriting characteristics of the questioned writing on Q1 and the handwriting of Zachary Eg, in quality and quantity that enable me to determine that the chance that they were written by different writers is negligible. I found a complete miss-match between the handwriting characteristics of the questioned writing on Q1 and the handwriting of Jake Pug, in quality and quantity that enable me to determine that the chance that they were written by the same writers is negligible. I found a complete match between the handwriting characteristics of the questioned writing on Q2, excluding the signature, and the handwriting of Jake Pug, in quality and quantity that enable me to determine that the chance that they were written by different writers is negligible. I found a complete miss-match between the handwriting characteristics of the questioned writing on Q2 and the handwriting of Zachry Eg, in quality and quantity that enable me to determine that the chance that they were written by the same writers is negligible. The finding in the signature on Q2 lack sufficient details to enable reaching a meaningful conclusion.
6M672G-524	3. All conclusions were reached independently of other conclusions reached. The following propositions were considered for each handwriting comparison and for each signature comparison: P1: The questioned handwriting/signature was written by the writer of the specimens. P2: The questioned handwriting/signature was not written by the writer of the specimens (i.e. was written by another person). Handwriting Conclusions: (i) I concluded that there is extremely strong support for the proposition P1 that the questioned handwriting on Q1 (Xanax) was written by the writer of the K1 specimens (attributed to Zachary Eg) rather than for the alternative proposition P2 that it was not written by this person. (ii) I concluded that there is strong support for the proposition P2 that the questioned handwriting on Q1 (Xanax) was not written by the writer of the K2 specimens (attributed to Jake Pug) rather than for the alternative proposition P1 that it was written by this person. (iii) I concluded that there is strong support for the proposition P2 (Vicodin) that the questioned handwriting on Q2 was not written by the writer of the K1 specimens (attributed to Zachary Eg) rather than for the alternative proposition P1 that it was written by this person. (iv) I concluded that



## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>there is extremely strong support for the proposition P1 that the questioned handwriting on Q2 (Vicodin) was written by the writer of the K2 specimens (attributed to Jake Pug) rather than for the alternative proposition P2 that it was not written by this person. Signature Conclusions: (v) I concluded that there is strong support for the proposition P1 that the questioned signature on Q1 (Xanax) was written by the writer of the K1 specimens (attributed to Zachary Eg) rather than for the alternative proposition P2 that it was not written by this person. (vi) No conclusion could be reached as a result of the comparison between the questioned signature on Q1 (Xanax) and the K2 specimens (attributed to Jake Pug). (vii) I concluded that there is moderate support for the proposition P2 that the questioned signature on Q2 (Vicodin) was not written by the writer of the K1 specimens (attributed to Zachary Eg) rather than for the alternative proposition P1 that it was written by this person. (viii) No conclusion could be reached as a result of the comparison between the questioned signature on Q2 (Vicodin) and the K2 specimens (attributed to Jake Pug).</p>
6NXVNJ-524	<p>1.) Questioned writings excluding the signatures: A: It is highly probable that Eg Zachary has written the body of questioned writings on Q1. E: It is highly probable that Eg Zachary has not written the body of questioned writings on Q2. E: It is highly probable that Jake Pug has not written the body of questioned writings on Q1. A: It is highly probable that Jake Pug has written the body of questioned writings on Q2. 2.) Questioned signatures: A: It is highly probable that Eg Zachary has written the questioned signature on Q1. D: It is probable that Eg Zachary has not written the questioned signature on Q2. D: It is probable that Jake Pug has not written the questioned signature on Q1. C: Cannot be identified or eliminated if Jake Pug has written the questioned signature on Q2.</p>
762XFM-524	<p>Physical examinations were conducted on the submitted exhibits. A study and comparison of the submitted material has resulted in the following conclusions: It is probable that Zachary Eg (S1) wrote the questioned writing and signature appearing on Exhibit Q1. It is probable that Zachary Eg (S1) did not write the questioned writing and signature appearing on Exhibit Q2. It is probable that Jake Pug (S2) did not write the questioned writing appearing on Exhibit Q1. There are indications that Jake Pug (S2) may not have written the questioned signature appearing on Exhibit Q1; however, the evidence is not conclusive. It is probable that Jake Pug (S2) wrote the questioned writing appearing on Exhibit Q2. No conclusion could be reached regarding whether or not Jake Pug (S2) wrote the questioned signature appearing on Exhibit Q2. Limitations were introduced to this examination due to the machine copied nature of all submitted exhibits, the small amount of writing present on each questioned document, and the short length of the "Zachary Eg" signature. Additionally, there is evidence to suggest that the questioned signature appearing on Exhibit Q2 is an attempt to simulate the true signature of Zachary Eg. Although the author of a simulated signature typically cannot be identified through forensic handwriting examination, it can be possible to reach a qualified opinion regarding authorship if sufficient evidence is present.</p>
78A42N-524	<p>IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that the questioned hand printed entries present on document Q-1 were written by Dr. Zachary Eg, the writer of K1a, K1b, and K1d, due to similarities of hand printing habit. ELIMINATION: It was determined that the questioned hand printed entries present on document Q-1 were not written by Jake Pug, the writer of K2a, K2b, and K2d, due to dissimilarities of hand printing habit. IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature present on document Q-1 was written by Dr. Zachary Eg, the writer of K1a-K1d, due to similarities of handwriting habit. ELIMINATION: It was determined that the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature present on document Q-1 was not written by Jake Pug, the writer of K2a-K2d, due to dissimilarities of handwriting habit. ELIMINATION: It was determined that the questioned hand printed entries present on document Q-2 were not written by Dr. Zachary Eg, the writer of K1a, K1b, and K1d, due to dissimilarities of hand printing habit. IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that the questioned hand printed entries present on document Q-2 were written by Jake Pug, the writer of K2a, K2b, and K2d, due to similarities of hand printing habit. ELIMINATION: It was determined that the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature present on document Q-2 was not written by Dr. Zachary Eg, the writer of K1a-K1d, due to dissimilarities of handwriting habit. ELIMINATION: It was determined that the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature present on document Q-2 was not written by Jake Pug, the writer of K2a-K2d, due to dissimilarities of handwriting habit.</p>

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
7923AV-523	FIRST. The questioned written text filling out the prescription named as Q1, was written by Doctor Zachary Eg. SECOND. The questioned written text filling out the prescription named as Q2, was written by Mr. Jake Pug. THIRD. The questioned signature of the prescription named as Q1, is authentic of Doctor Zachary Eg. FOURTH. The questioned signature of the prescription named as Q2, is fake. FIFTH. It is not possible to determine the author of the questioned signature considered as fake in the previous conclusion due to the reasons mentioned in the present report.
7CZBMH-524	After analyzing the evidence in this case, the following opinions have been formed: It has been determined that the writer of Item K1, submitted as the known writing of Dr. Zachary Eg, prepared the writing and signature on Item Q1. This is the strongest statement of association expressed by document examiners in handwriting comparisons. Significant similarities, and no differences, were noted between the questioned and known bodies of writing. This writer did not prepare the writing on Item Q2. This is the strongest statement of disassociation expressed by document examiners in handwriting comparisons. Significant differences, and no similarities, were noted between the questioned and known bodies of writing. There is a strong probability that this writer did not prepare the signature on Item Q2. The evidence is very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality is missing so that an elimination is not in order. The examiner is virtually certain that the questioned and known writings were not written by the same individual. Substantial significant dissimilarities and no significant similarities were observed, however limitations associated with absent characters, individualizing characteristics, or quantity of writing may be present. It has been determined that the writer of K2, submitted as the known writing of Jake Pug, prepared the writing on Item Q2. This is the strongest statement of association expressed by document examiners in handwriting comparisons. Significant similarities, and no differences, were noted between the questioned and known bodies of writing. This writer probably did not prepare the signature on Item Q2. The evidence contained in the handwriting points rather strongly toward the questioned and known writings having not been written by the same individual; however, it falls short of the "virtually certain" degree of confidence. Significant dissimilarities and no significant similarities were observed, however limitations associated with absent characters, individualizing characteristics, or quantity of writing may be present. This writer did not prepare the writing and signature on Item Q1. This is the strongest statement of disassociation expressed by document examiners in handwriting comparisons. Significant differences, and no similarities, were noted between the questioned and known bodies of writing.
7E4AVP-524	1. The questioned written body portion of "Q1" was WRITTEN by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1). 2. The questioned written body portion of "Q1" was NOT WRITTEN by Jake Pug (K2). 3. The questioned written body portion of "Q2" was NOT WRITTEN by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1). 4. The questioned written body portion of "Q2" was WRITTEN by Jake Pug (K2). 5. The questioned signature portion of "Q1" was WRITTEN by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1). 6. The questioned signature portion of "Q1" was NOT WRITTEN by Jake Pug (K2). 7. The questioned signature portion of "Q2" was NOT WRITTEN by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1). 8. The questioned signature portion of "Q2" was NOT WRITTEN by Jake Pug (K2). 9. The questioned signature portion of "Q2" was written by a third party in which I do not have known standards for at this time.
7F3LPR-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
7HL2TT-524	The questioned hand writing marked DC-001-2019-DQ-Q1 does correspond to the known elements of DR Eg. The questioned hand writing marked DC-001-2019-DQ-Q2 does not correspond to the known elements of DR Eg. The questioned hand writing marked DC-001-2019-DQ-Q1 does not correspond to the known elements of Jake Pug. The questioned hand writing marked DC-001-2019-DQ-Q2 does correspond to the known elements of Jake Pug. The questioned signature marked DC-001-2019-DQ-Q1 does correspond to the known elements of Dr. Eg. The questioned signature marked DC-001-2019-DQ-Q2 does not correspond to the known elements of Dr. Eg. The questioned signature marked DC-001-2019-DQ-Q1 does not come from the same graphic origin with the know elements of Jake Pug. The questioned signature marked DC-001-2019-DQ-Q2 does come from the same graphic origin with the know elements of Jake Pug.

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
7P8ANX-524	<p>RESULTS OF THE EXAMS: 1.) To what extent can one determine whether any of the known writers contributed to the body of the questioned writing (excluding the signature) in each of the recipes? Zachary Eg (K1): Q1 (Xanax) A It offers the same characteristics as far as form is concerned, disposition of the firm in its upward displacement, similar scriptural proportion, beginnings and endings correspond and the Inter verbal space identifies each other. Q2 (Vicodin) E Not written by Zachary Eg, the manuscripts have differences as far as form is concerned, thick strokes are also observed in this recipe, Mr. Zachary's writing is made with outlined (thin) strokes. Jake Pug (K2): Q1 (Xanax) E, They do not correspond to the scriptural contributions of Mr. Jake Pug the morphology of his writing differs from the writing of Q1, both letters and digits, Q2 (Vicodin) A, the recipe corresponds to the writing and samples collected from Mr. Jake Pug. Their scriptural features and peculiarities coincide with each other. 2.- To what extent can one determine if any of the known writers contributed to the signature in question in each of the recipes? Zachary Eg (K1) Q1 (Xanax) A, The signature elaborated in Q1 presents similar scriptural characteristics that correspond to each other, for example, shape, upward displacement, beginning and end ratios. Q2 (Vicodin) E, the signature does not correspond or was not written or prepared by Mr. Zachary Eg. It differs morphologically in alphanumeric characters. Jake Pug (K2) Q1 (Xanax) E, the Obrante Firm does not correspond to the automatisms generated generated in the doubt signature. Q2 (Vicodin) C, in this case it cannot be identified, since there are not enough scriptural characteristics to insert or discard</p>
7Z3KVJ-523	<p>It is identification that the writer of K1a-K1d authored and signed Q1. In addition, it is identification that the writer of K2a-K2d authored Q2. There is no conclusion as to the writer of the signature on Q2.</p>
7ZQ99U-524	<p>Q1: There were numerous habits in common observed between the hand printed body of Q1 and the hand printed specimens submitted for K1-Zachary Eg with no significant differences. It is my opinion that K1-Zachary Eg prepared the hand printed body of the prescription labeled Q1. There were numerous habits in common observed between the questioned signature "Zachary Eg" on Q1 and the signatures "Zachary Eg" submitted for K1-Zachary Eg with no significant differences. It is my opinion that K1-Zachary Eg prepared the questioned signature "Zachary Eg" on the prescription labeled Q1. Q2: There were numerous habits in common observed between the hand printed body of Q2 and the hand printed specimens submitted for K2-Jake Pug with no significant differences. It is my opinion that K2-Jake Pug prepared the hand printed body of the prescription labeled Q2. It is my opinion that K1-Zachary Eg probably did not prepare the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature on the prescription labeled Q2. No Conclusion is rendered as to if K2-Jake Pug prepared the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature on the prescription labeled Q2.</p>
8B4HZX-524	<p>Based on the comparisons of the known standards for Zachary Eg and Jake Pug the following conclusions are offered: Zachary Eg POSITIVELY AUTHORED the questioned writings found in the body of Q1 and PROBABLY authored the signature found on Q1 as well. Jake Pug POSITIVELY AUTHORED the questioned writings found in the body of Q2. There is NO BASIS TO CONCLUDE that either Eg or Pug authored the signature located at the bottom of Q2.</p>
8KCW77-524	<p>HANDWRITING: In my opinion, the evidence provides: Very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting on Q1 was written by the writer of the Zachary EG known material K1 over the proposition that the questioned handwriting was written by someone other than the writer of the known material. Very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting on Q2 was written by someone other than the writer of the Zachary EG known material K1 over the proposition that the questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the known material. Very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting on Q1 was written by someone other than the writer of the Jake PUG known material K2 over the proposition that the questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the known material. Very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting on Q2 was written by the writer of the Jake PUG known material K2 over the proposition that the questioned handwriting was written by someone other than the writer of the known material. SIGNATURES: In my opinion, the evidence provides: Very strong support for the proposition that the questioned signature on Q1 was written by the writer of the Zachary EG known material K1 over the proposition that the questioned signature was written by</p>

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>someone other than the writer of the known material. Approximately equal support for the proposition that the questioned signature on Q2 was written by the writer of the Zachary EG known material K1 and the proposition that the questioned signature was written by someone other than the writer of the known material. This is an inconclusive opinion with regard to the potential writer. Moderate support for the proposition that the questioned signature on Q1 was written by someone other than the writer of the Jake PUG known material K2 over the proposition that the questioned signature was written by the writer of the known material. Approximately equal support for the proposition that the questioned signature on Q2 was written by the writer of the Jake PUG known material K2 and the proposition that the questioned signature was written by someone other than the writer of the known material. This is an inconclusive opinion with regard to the potential writer. My opinions are based upon the information and material submitted, as well as the specific propositions provided. Should the case information, exhibit material, or propositions change, my opinions may also change. In particular, if different propositions are of interest, I should be contacted to discuss the matter further.</p>
8N9GBP-523	<p>Zachary Eg is the author of the questioned handwriting and signature of the document Q1. Jake Pug is the author of the questioned handwriting of the document Q2. Zachary Eg is not the author of the questioned handwriting of the document Q2. The questioned signature done in Q2 was probably not written by Zachary Eg. We can not identify or eliminate to Jake Pug like the author of the questioned signature done in the document Q2</p>
8UZNTX-524	<p>Methods: Visual examination and comparison of the submitted items utilizing a hand lens, revealed the following: Item #3 (Q1) Conclusions: The questioned prescription in Item #3(Q1), including the signature, was written by the writer of the known Zachary Eg samples in Item #1 (K1). This is based on substantial significant similarities with no significant differences between the questioned and known writing. Therefore, this prescription was not written by the writer of the known Jake Pug samples in Item #2 (K2). Item #4 (Q2) Conclusions: The questioned prescription in Item #4 (Q2), excluding the signature, was written by the writer of the known Jake Pug samples in Item #2 (K2). This is based on substantial significant similarities with no significant differences between the questioned and known writing. Therefore, the body of this questioned prescription was not written by the writer of the known Zachary Eg samples in Item #1(K1). The questioned signature on the prescription in Item #4(Q2) contains some pictorial similarities, as well as, substantial significant differences to the known Zachary Eg samples in Item #1(K1); therefore, this signature was probably not written by the writer of Item #1 (K1). The questioned signature on the prescription in Item #4 (Q2) is abbreviated and contains some elements of unnaturalness. This signature may be an attempt to simulate the signature of Zachary Eg (Item #1/K1). The act of simulation usually suppresses a writer's natural handwriting characteristics to an extent that precludes identification. Therefore, no opinion can be offered regarding this signature and the writer of the known Jake Pug samples in Item #2 (K2). Examination Limitations: This examination was limited by the abbreviated nature and unnaturalness of the questioned signature in Item #4 (Q2). Comments: All items are available for return.</p>
8Y7J9R-524	<p>1. The person who wrote the specimen writings on K1a, K1b and K1d wrote the questioned writings on Q1. 2. The person who wrote the specimen writings on K2a, K2b and K2d did not write the questioned writings on Q1. 3. The person who signed the specimen signatures on K1a to K1d signed the questioned signature on Q1. 4. The person who wrote the specimen writings on K1a, K1b and K1d did not write the questioned writings on Q2. 5. The person who wrote the specimen writings on K2a, K2b and K2d wrote the questioned writings on Q2. 6. The person who signed the specimen signatures on K1a to K1d did not sign the questioned signature on Q2. 7. It is not possible to express definite opinion as to whether the person who wrote the signatures on K2a, K2b and K2c wrote the questioned signature on Q2 or not.</p>
98G8K6-524	<p>Q1 - Handwriting: The writer of documents K1a to K1d, attributed to Dr. Zachary Eg, executed the writing on questioned document Q1. Q2 - Handwriting: The writer of documents K2a to K2d, attributed to Jake Pug, executed the writing on questioned document Q2. Q1 - Signature: The writer of documents K1a to K1d, attributed to Dr. Zachary Eg, executed the questioned signature on</p>

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	document Q1. Q2 - Signature: It was not possible to determine if the writers of the documents K1a to K1d and K2a to K2d executed the questioned signature on document Q2.
9LX3Z2-524	<p>HANDWRITING (DR. ZACHARY EG): May Have (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached due to the presence of characteristics in the questioned writing not accounted for in the available known writing. However, numerous characteristics in common were observed which indicate DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), may have prepared the questioned hand printing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1). No Conclusion: Although inconsistencies were observed, no conclusion could be reached whether or not the questioned signature on Item 2 (Item Q2) was prepared by DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the limited nature of the questioned signature. HANDWRITING (JAKE PUG): Identification: It was determined that the questioned hand printing on Item 2 (Item Q2) was prepared by JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d). May Not Have (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the limited quantity of known writing available for comparison. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), may not have prepared the questioned hand printing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), prepared the questioned signature on Item 2 (Item Q2) due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the limited nature of the questioned signature. REQUEST FOR KNOWN WRITING. If future handwriting examinations are desired on the questioned writing, additional dictated and undictated known writing should be obtained from DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), and anyone else suspected of having prepared the remaining unidentified questioned writing. The dictated known writing should be hand printed and/or signature in the exact wording as the questioned writing and obtained on prescription paper similar to the questioned items. Each item should be removed from the writer's view upon completion and numerous repetitions may be necessary in order to obtain naturally prepared writing. Undictated known writing consists of hand printing and signatures prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known writing include business papers, letters, and applications.</p>
9R4RGA-523	<p>Inter comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned handwritten entries and Dr. Zachary Eg signatures appearing on Submission Q1 and the handwritten entries and Dr. Zachary Eg signature exemplars (reportedly) authored and provided by Dr. Zachary Eg appearing on Submissions K1a-K1d revealed several similarities in individual handwriting and signature characteristics and habits. Based upon the several similarities in individual handwriting and signature characteristics and habits, it is the opinion of the undersigned that the Questioned handwritten entries and Dr. Zachary Eg signatures appearing on Submission Q1 and the handwritten entries and Dr. Zachary Eg signature exemplars (reportedly) authored and provided by Dr. Zachary Eg share common authorship. Inter comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned handwritten entries appearing on Submission Q2 and the handwritten entries (reportedly) authored and provided by Jake Pug appearing on Submission K2a through K2d revealed several similarities in individual handwriting characteristics and habits. Based upon the several similarities in individual handwriting characteristics and habits, it is the opinion of the undersigned that the Questioned handwritten entries appearing on Submission Q2 and the handwritten entries (reportedly) authored and provided by Jake Pug appearing on Submission K2a through K2d share common authorship. It is the opinion of the undersigned examiners that no conclusion could be reached as to whether the Questioned Dr. Zachary Eg signature appearing on Submission Q2 and the Dr. Zachary Eg signature exemplars (reportedly) authored and provided by Jake Pug appearing on Submissions K2a and K2b. share common authorship. This is the zero point of the confidence scale. It is used when there are significantly limiting factors, such as disguise in the Questioned signature or a lack of comparable writing, and the examiner does not have even a leaning one way or another.</p>
9RN9WC-524	<p>The questioned handwriting and signature (Q1) were examined and compared with the control handwriting and signatures of Zachary Eg (K1) and those of Jake Pug (K2) respectively. (i) Similarities in line quality, writing movement and connection, design and construction details of the handwriting and signatures were found between Q1 and K1. Therefore, I opined that the</p>



## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>questioned handwriting and signature (Q1) were written by Zachary Eg. (ii) Differences in line quality, writing movement and connection, design and construction details of the handwriting and signatures were found between Q1 and K2. Therefore, I opined that the questioned handwriting and signature (Q1) were not written by Jake Pug. The questioned handwriting and signature (Q2) were examined and compared with the control handwriting and signatures of Zachary Eg (K1) and those of Jake Pug (K2) respectively. (i) Differences in line quality, writing movement and connection, design and construction details of the handwriting and signatures were found between Q2 and K1. Therefore, I opined that the questioned handwriting and signature (Q2) were not written by Zachary Eg. (ii) Similarities in line quality, writing movement and connection, design and construction details was found between questioned handwriting in Q2 and control handwriting in K2. Therefore, I opined that the questioned handwriting in Q2 was written by Jake Pug. Differences in design and writing style of the signatures were found between the questioned signature in Q2 and control signatures in K2; therefore, an effective like-with-like comparison could not be performed. I can neither confirm nor eliminate that the questioned signature in Q2 was written by Jake Pug.</p>
A7YDJV-524	<p>Analyzed the writings corresponding to document Q1, these are identified with the writings in documents K1 a and b, provided by DR Zachary Eg. The signature in document Q1 is identified with the samples provided by Mr. DR Zachary Eg. Once the documents corresponding to document Q2 have been analyzed, these are identified with the documents in documents K2 a and b, provided by Mr. Jake Pug. The signature in document Q2 cannot be identified, so it is necessary to request more samples from Messrs. Jake Pug and Zachary Eg</p>
A97NHK-524	<p>Handwriting - "Q1" vs "K1a", K1b" and "K1d": On examination, I noted significant similarities in stroke quality, slant and the formation of alphabet letters and numerals between the questioned handwritten entries shown in "Q1" and the specimen handwriting of Zachary Eg shown in "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d". In view of the significant similarities noted, I am of the opinion that Zachary Eg, the writer of the specimen handwriting in "K1a", K1b" and "K1d" wrote the questioned handwritten entries shown in "Q1". "Q1" vs "K2a", K2b" and "K2d": On comparing the questioned handwritten entries shown in "Q1" with the specimen handwriting of Jake Pug shown in "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d", I noted significant differences in stroke quality, slant and the formation of alphabet letters and numerals between them. In view of the significant differences noted, I am of the opinion that Jake Pug, the writer of the specimen handwriting in "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d" did not write the questioned handwritten entries shown in "Q1". "Q2" vs "K1a", K1b" and "K1d": On comparing the questioned handwritten entries shown in "Q2" with the specimen handwriting of Zachary Eg shown in "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d", I noted significant differences in stroke quality, slant and the formation of alphabet letters and numerals between them. In view of the significant differences noted, I am of the opinion that Zachary Eg, the writer of the specimen handwriting in "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d" did not write the questioned handwritten entries shown in "Q2". "Q2" vs "K2a", K2b" and "K2d": On comparing the questioned handwritten entries shown in "Q2" with the specimen handwriting of Jake Pug shown in "K2a", K2b" and "K2d", I noted significant similarities in stroke quality, slant and the formation of alphabet letters and numerals between them. In view of the significant similarities noted, I am of the opinion that Jack Pug, the writer of the specimen handwriting in "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d" wrote the questioned handwritten entries shown in "Q2". Signatures - "Q1" vs "K1a" to "K1d": On examination, I found the questioned signature against 'Signature:' shown in "Q1" to be fluently and spontaneously written with no hesitation. On comparing with the specimen signatures of Zachary Eg shown in "K1a" to "K1d", I noted significant similarities in stroke fluency, slant and the formation and relative positioning of strokes between them. In view of the significant similarities noted, I am of the opinion that Zachary Eg, the writer of the specimen signatures shown in "K1a" to "K1d" wrote the questioned signature against 'Signature:' shown in "Q1". "Q1" vs "K2a" to "K2c": On comparing the questioned signature against 'Signature:' shown in "Q1" with the specimen signatures provided by Jake Pug in "K2a" to "K2c", I noted significant differences in stroke fluency and the formation and relative positioning of strokes between them. In view of the significant differences noted, I am of the opinion that Jake Pug, the writer of the specimen signatures in "K2a" to "K2c" did not write the questioned signature against 'Signature:' shown in "Q1". "Q2" vs "K1a" to "K1d": I found the questioned signature against 'Signature:' shown in "Q2" to be poor in stroke fluency showing sign of hesitation. On</p>

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>comparing with the specimen signatures of Zachary Eg in "K1a" to "K1d", I noted significant differences in stroke fluency and the formation and relative positioning of strokes between them. In view of the significant differences noted, I am of the opinion that it is unlikely that Zachary Eg, the writer of the specimen signatures in "K1a" to "K1d" wrote the questioned signature against 'Signature:' shown in "Q2". "Q2" vs "K2a" to "K2c": On comparing the questioned signature against 'Signature:' shown in "Q2" with the specimen signatures provided by Jake Pug in "K2a" to "K2c", I noted differences in the design between them for an effective comparison. In view of the above observation, I am unable to ascertain if Jake Pug, the writer of the specimen signatures available in "K2a" to "K2c" wrote the questioned signature against 'Signature:' shown in "Q2". The evidence is therefore inconclusive.</p>
A9ABUR-524	<p>It was determined that the body and signature on the prescription, Q-1, was written by Dr. Zachary Eg, K-1. It was determined that the body of the prescription, Q-2, was written by Jake Pug, K-2. It was determined that the signature on the prescription, Q-2, was not written by Dr. Zachary Eg, K-1. It could not be determined whether or not the signature on the prescription, Q-2, was written by Jake Pug, K-2.</p>
ABZCZF-524	<p>The writer of Items K1a through K1d (Dr. Zachary Eg) has been identified as having written Item Q1. The writer of Items K2a through K2d (Jake Pug) has been identified as having written the hand printed portions of Item Q2. There is no conclusion (meaning cannot be eliminated or identified) as to whether or not either of the writers of Items K1a through K1d and K2a through K2d (Dr. Zachary Eg and Jake Pug) wrote the "Zachary Eg" signature on Item Q2. The potential that the "Zachary Eg" signature on Item Q2 is a simulation was one of the limiting factors in the examination.</p>
ADYXJ6-524	<p>Conclusions Wording: Q1 Handwriting: Similarities were noted between the questioned handwriting and the specimen handwriting attributed to Zachary EG (K1) in terms of pictorial similarity, size and size relationships, construction characteristics, fluency and speed, together with no significant differences. Notwithstanding the limitations imposed by the non-original nature of the specimen and questioned material, I concluded the author of the specimen handwriting attributed to Zachary EG (K1 author) wrote the questioned handwriting on Q1 (not including the signature). Q2 Handwriting: Similarities were noted between the questioned handwriting and the specimen handwriting attributed to Jake PUG (K2) in terms of pictorial similarity, size and size relationships, construction characteristics, fluency and speed, together with no significant differences. Notwithstanding the limitations imposed by the non-original nature of the specimen and questioned material, I concluded the author of the specimen handwriting attributed to Jake PUG (K2 author) wrote the questioned handwriting on Q2 (not including the signature). Q1 Signature: Similarities were noted between the questioned signature and the specimen signatures attributed to Zachary EG (K1) in terms of pictorial similarity, size and size relationships, construction characteristics, fluency and speed, together with no significant differences. Accordingly, I concluded the author of the specimen signatures attributed to Zachary EG (K1) wrote the questioned signature on Q1. Q2 Signature: The signature was observed to have indications of un-naturally executed writing displaying poor line quality, tremor, lack of speed, pen pressure variation, and blunt starts and stops. Further, differences were noted between the questioned signature and the specimen signatures attributed to Zachary EG (K1) and those attributed to Jake PUG (K2) in terms of pictorial similarity, size and size relationships, construction characteristics, fluency and speed and line quality. Accordingly, it was not possible to identify or eliminate either the K1 writer or the K2 writer as having signed the questioned document Q2.</p>
B8PYPR-523	<p>The person whose extended request exemplars and normal course of business writing appears on items K1 a-d (Dr. Zachary Eg), also wrote the prescription labeled as Q1 and did not write the prescription labeled as item Q2. Dr. Eg (K1 a-d), is identified (did sign) as having signed item Q1 and is eliminated (did not sign) as having signed item Q2. Jake Pug (K2 a-d), did not write the questioned prescription labeled Q1 and did write the questioned prescription labeled Q2. Jake Pug (K2 a-d) cannot be identified or eliminated as having signed either of the two (2) questioned prescriptions.</p>
BBR2BL-523	<p>1). The handwritten text on Item No. Q1 was written by Zachary Eg. 2). The "Zachary Eg" signature</p>

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	on Item No. Q1 was written by Zachary Eg. 3). It is highly probable that the handwritten text (excluding the "Zachary Eg" signature) on Item No. Q2 was written by Jake Pug. 4). Jake Pug cannot be identified or excluded as the writer of the "Zachary Eg" signature on Item No. Q2.
BJJFET-524	Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING (ZACHARY EG): Identification: It was determined that the Item 1 (Item Q1) questioned writing and signature were prepared by DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3, (Items K1a-d). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not DR. ZACHARY EG (Items K1a-d), prepared the Item 2 (Item Q2) questioned signature due to the presence of characteristics in the questioned signature not accounted for in the available known writing. However, characteristics were observed which indicate that the Item 2 (Item Q2) signature may be an attempt to simulate a signature in the likeness of the writing of DR. ZACHARY EG (Items K1a-d). HANDWRITING (JAKE PUG): Identification: It was determined that the Item 2 (Item Q2) questioned writing, excluding the signature, was prepared by JAKE PUG, Item 4, (Items K2a-d). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not JAKE PUG (Items K2a-d), prepared the Item 2 (Item Q2) questioned signature due to the presence of characteristics in the questioned signature not accounted for in the available known writing.
BRKZUP-524	Based on the evidence submitted, Dr. Zachary Eg produced all the questioned hand printing and the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature, on the prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/19, designated Q1. Based on the evidence submitted, Jake Pug did not produce all the questioned hand printing and the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature, on the prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/19, designated Q1. Based on the evidence submitted, Jake Pug produced all the questioned hand printing, excluding the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature, on the prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19, designated Q2. Based on the evidence submitted, Dr. Zachary Eg did not produce all the questioned hand printing, excluding the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature, on the prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19, designated Q2. Based on the evidence submitted, there is no conclusion if Dr. Zachary Eg or Zack Pud did or did not produced the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature, on the prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19, designated Q2.
BU3RNL-523	a.The body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on Q1(Xanax) was WRITTEN by Zachary Eg, but not written by Jake Pug. b.The body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on Q2(Vicodin) was WRITTEN by Jake Pug, but not written by Zachary Eg. c.The questioned signature on Q1(Xanax) was WRITTEN by Zachary Eg, but not written by Jake Pug. d.The questioned signature on Q2(Vicodin) was not WRITTEN by Zachary Eg. e.The questioned signature on Q2(Vicodin) CANNOT be IDENTIFIED as someone's writing.
BU6ECP-524	The questioned writing excluding the signature of the Prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/19 (Q1) were written by Dr. ZACHARY EG, documented by the analogies found. The questioned signature contained of the Prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/19 (Q1) was written by Dr. ZACHARY EG, documented by the analogies found. The questioned writing excluding the signature of the Prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19 (Q2) were written by JAKE PUG, documented by the analogies found. The signature contained of the Prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19 (Q2), was probably not written by JAKE PUG, a conclusion documented by the differences found.
BVWDJW-524	It is my conclusion Zachary Eng completed the text on Q-01. Dr. Eng is eliminated as a writer of the text on Q-02. It is my conclusion Jake Pug completed the text on Q-02. Jack Pug is eliminated as a writer of the text on Q-1. It is inconclusive as to whether or not Dr. Eng signed his name on Q-01. The Q-01 signature is within the range of variation exhibited by Dr. Eng. For further examination, obtain known prescriptions bearing Dr Eng's signature for comparison to the Q-01 signature. It is inconclusive if Dr Eng signed his name on Q-02. There is lack of comparability between the signatures as Q-02 is executed more slowly. Dr. Eng is a higher skilled writer and is capable of writing and signing his name. For further examination, obtain known exemplars of Dr. Eng writing his name, and additional request signatures and course of business signatures. It is inconclusive as to whether or not Jake Pug signed Q-01 or Q-02. Jake Pug signing the name "Zachary Eng" are the only cursive exemplars submitted. The Pug exemplars of signing "Zachary Eng" lack consistency in letter formation. Letter insertion and pen stops were observed in a couple of the Pug exemplar signatures. The Q-02 signature resembles more of writing a name instead of a



## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	signature. Known cursive exemplars that are naturally written by Jake Pug were not submitted for examination. For further examination, obtain numerous examples of Jake Pug course of business and request cursive handwriting, including requested Jake Pug writing the name "Zachary Eng".
BYXHWG-524	A: Findings strongly support the proposition that the questioned writing (Q) was written by the same person as comparison writing (K). E: Findings strongly support the proposition that the questioned writing (Q) was not written by the same person as comparison writing (K). C: Inconclusive.
C7QD8K-523	1. It has been concluded that the questioned writing and signature appearing on the face of the Q1 paper were written by the writer of the comparison Zachary Eg (K1) samples. And, Dr. Eg did not write the questioned writing and signature on the Q2 prescription. 2. It is my opinion that the questioned writing on the Q2 prescription was written by Jake Pug (K2), and no conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the K2 wrote the Q2 questioned signature.
CEKKRB-523	[No Conclusions Reported.]
CLLTFQ-524	1. The author of Items K1 (Zachary) wrote the questioned handwriting and signature on Item Q1. 2. The author of Items K2 (Pug) wrote the questioned handwriting on Item Q2. 3. The author of Item K1 can neither be identified nor eliminated as having written the signature on Item Q2. 3. The author of Item K2 can neither be identified nor eliminated as having written the signature on Item Q2. 4. The questioned signature on Item Q2 is consistent with a simulation.
CT6YAC-524	Handwriting comparisons, including macroscopic and microscopic examinations, were conducted on the questioned items and known writing samples. Dr. Eg wrote all of the handwritten entries on Item Q1. There are numerous significant similarities and no significant differences between the questioned writing and the known writing samples of Dr. Eg. Mr. Pug did not write any of the handwritten entries on Item Q1. There are numerous significant differences between the questioned writing and the known writing samples of Mr. Pug. Mr. Pug wrote the non-signature handwritten entries on Item Q2. There are numerous significant similarities and no significant differences between the questioned writing and the known writing samples of Mr. Pug. Dr. Eg did not write the non-signature handwritten entries on Item Q2. There are numerous significant differences between the questioned writing and the known writing samples of Dr. Eg. No conclusion was reached regarding whether Dr. Eg or Mr. Pug wrote the signature on Item Q2. Although there are significant differences between the questioned signature and the known signature samples, there are also features and characteristics of the questioned signature that are consistent with an effort to simulate (freehand imitate) the signature style of Dr. Eg. The simulation of another person's signature is often an effective disguise of a writer's true handwriting habits. For this reason, the maker of a simulated signature is not normally identifiable by means of comparative handwriting examination. Furthermore, simulated signatures cannot always be differentiated from signatures that have been disguised by the legitimate writer of the signature. In this case, the features and characteristics of the questioned signature may have resulted from an effort to disguise the normal signature style of Dr. Eg. The small number of course-of-business signatures by Dr. Eg was also a limitation during this examination. Forensic document examiners use a scale of opinions to describe the strength of opinions resulting from handwriting and signature comparisons. Opinions with various strengths were used in this report. The scale of opinions used by this laboratory follows this paragraph. Although some of the opinions on this scale were not used in this report, they are provided here so that the relative strength of the conclusions may be understood. Identification - This is the highest degree of confidence expressed. Based on evidence contained in the handwriting, the examiner has no reservations that the known writer actually wrote the writing in question. Strong Probability - The evidence is very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality is missing so that an identification is not in order. The examiner is virtually certain that the questioned and known writings were written by the same individual. Probable - The evidence contained in the handwriting points rather strongly toward the questioned and known writings having been written by the same individual; however, it falls short of a "virtually certain" degree of confidence. Indications - A body of writing has few features that are of significance for handwriting comparison purposes, but those features are in agreement with another body of writing. No Conclusion - This is the zero point of the confidence scale. The examiner does not have even a leaning one way or another. Indications Did Not - A

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>body of writing has few features that are of significance for handwriting comparison purposes, but those features are in disagreement with another body of writing. Probably Did Not - The evidence points rather strongly against the questioned and known writings having been written by the same individual, but it is not quite up to the "virtually certain" range. Strong Probability Did Not - There is a virtual certainty that the questioned and known writings were not written by the same individual. Elimination - The examiner has no doubt that the questioned and known writings were not written by the same individual.</p>
D7BC6H-523	<p>1. The findings in order to determine the similarities and differences as below: a) Handwriting Q1 was written by K1. b) Handwriting Q1 was not written by K2. c) Handwriting Q2 was not written by K1. d) Handwriting Q2 was written by K2. 2. The findings in order to determine the similarities and differences as below: a) Signature Q1 was written by K1. b) Signature Q1 was not written by K2. c) Signature Q2 was not written by K1. d) Signature Q2 was not written by K2.</p>
DD7BE4-524	<p>On comparison, I found as follows : 1) The questioned handwriting Q1 showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting of Zachary Eg (K1). Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting Q1 WAS WRITTEN BY Zachary Eg (K1). 2) The questioned handwriting Q1 showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting of Jake Pug (K2). Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting WAS NOT WRITTEN BY Jake Pug (K2). 3) The questioned signature Q1 showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen signatures of Zachary Eg (K1). Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned signature Q1 WAS WRITTEN BY Zachary Eg (K1). 4)The specimen signatures K2 were simulated signatures of Zachary Eg written by Jake Pug. As such, there was high possibility of disguise and very little corresponding points of comparison. However, as the signature Q1 was positively identified as written by Zachary Eg, I am of the opinion that Jake Pug can be eliminated as the writer of questioned signature Q1. Therefore, questioned signature Q1 WAS NOT WRITTEN BY Jake Pug (K2). 5) The questioned handwriting Q2 showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting of Zachary Eg (K1). Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting Q2 WAS NOT WRITTEN BY Zachary Eg (K1). 6) The questioned handwriting Q2 showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting of Jake Pug (K2). Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting Q2 WAS WRITTEN BY Jake Pug (K2). 7) The questioned signature Q2 showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen signatures of Zachary Eg (K1). Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned signature Q2 WAS NOT WRITTEN BY Zachary Eg (K1). 8) The specimen signatures K2 were simulated signatures of Zachary Eg written by Jake Pug. As such, there was high possibility of disguise and very little corresponding points of comparison. Therefore, I am of the opinion that Jake Pug (K2) CANNOT BE IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED as the writer of the questioned signature Q2.</p>
DFXAVN-524	<p>The opinion is based on the differences in the writing skill and the unique individual characteristics observed between the writer K1 and writer K2.</p>
DQG269-523	<p>In this examination I have considered the following propositions for each of the specimen writers for each of the questioned items: P1 The writer of the specimen material wrote the questioned material. P2 A writer other than the writer of the specimen material wrote the questioned material. HANDWRITING: The questioned handwriting in Item Q1 displays similarities in features such as style, skill, speed and fluency, slant, spacing, alignment, proportions, character constructions and connections, when compared with the specimen handwriting in Item K1. No significant differences in features were observed. The questioned handwriting in Item Q1 displays significant differences in features such as skill, slant, proportions and character constructions, when compared with the specimen handwriting in Item K2. The questioned handwriting in Item Q2 displays significant differences in features such as skill, slant, proportions and character constructions, when compared with the specimen handwriting in Item K1. The questioned handwriting in Item Q2 displays similarities in features such as style, skill, speed and fluency, slant, spacing, alignment, proportions, character constructions and connections, when compared with the specimen handwriting in Item K2. No significant differences in features were observed. The questioned handwriting in Items Q1</p>

## TABLE 2

## WebCode-Test

## Conclusions

and Q2, and the specimen handwriting in Items K1 and K2 has been freely and fluently written with no evidence of attention to the writing process. I have evaluated the quantity, quality and complexity of the questioned and specimen handwriting, and the similarities and/or differences observed. I have assessed the evidence against each proposition. In my opinion, the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting in Item Q1 was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting in Item K1, over the alternative. In my opinion, the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting in Item Q2 was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting in Item K2, over the alternative. SIGNATURES: The questioned signatures in Items Q1 and Q2 are stylised signatures with limited legible characters. As such, a meaningful comparison of these signatures with handwritten material is not possible. The requested specimen signatures in Item K2a-c display significant pictorial dissimilarities to the questioned signatures in Items Q1 and Q2 and do not contain sufficient comparable features for a meaningful examination. Therefore, due to the limitations in the submitted material, no opinion can be expressed with respect to the K2 specimen material and the questioned signatures in Q1 and Q2. The questioned signature in Item Q1 displays similarities in features such as style, skill, speed and fluency, slant, spacing, alignment, proportions and construction, when compared with the specimen signatures in Item K1. No significant differences were observed. The questioned signature in Item Q1 and the specimen signatures in Item K1 have been freely and fluently written with no evidence of attention to the writing process. The questioned signature in Item Q2 displays some similarities and some dissimilarities in features when compared with the specimen signatures in Item K1. The questioned signature in Item Q2 also displays some lack of fluency and possible attention to the writing process, and limited complexity. I have evaluated the quantity, quality and complexity of the questioned and specimen signatures, and the similarities and/or dissimilarities observed. I have assessed the evidence against each proposition. In my opinion, the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned signature in Item Q1 was written by the writer of the specimen signatures in Item K1, over the alternative. Due to the limited quality and complexity of the questioned signature in Item Q2, the evidence provides approximately equal support for the propositions that the questioned signature was written by the K1 specimen writer in an unnatural manner, or that the questioned signature was written by another writer. This is an inconclusive result.

E33FXK-523 Handwriting comparison: The questioned writing (excluding signature) on the prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/19 (Q1) was written by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1). The questioned writing (excluding signature) on the prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/19 (Q1) was not written by Jake Pug (K2). The questioned writing (excluding signature) on the prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19 (Q2) was written by Jake Pug (K2). The questioned writing (excluding signature) on the prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19 (Q2) was not written by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1). Signature comparison: The questioned signature on the prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/19 (Q1) was written by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1). The questioned signature on the prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/19 (Q1) was not written by Jake Pug (K2). The questioned signature on the prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19 (Q2) was not written by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1). Jake Pug (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on the prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19 (Q2).

E6DQ4J-524 1)A similarity between the writings on the document numbered "Q1" and the signature written on behalf of "Dr. Zachary Eg (K1)" and the comparison writings of Dr. Zachary Eg (K1) has been established and it has been concluded that writings in question and signature were written by Dr. Zachary Eg. 2)A similarity between the writings on the document numbered "Q2" and the comparison writings of Jake Pub (K2) has been established and it has been concluded that writings in question were written by Jake Pub (K2). 3)A partial resemblance in signature on the document numbered "Q2" and the comparison signatures of Jake Pub (K2) has been established and it has been concluded that signature in question were possibly signed by Jake Pub.

EBVVK4-524 In our opinion the questioned handwriting on item Q1 was written by writer K1. The handwriting on item Q2 was written by Jake Pug /K2/, Dr. Eg /K1 writer/ was eliminated. It was determined that the signature on Q1 was written by Dr. Zachary Eg. There are many significant similarities in general characteristics and individual features between the questioned signature and his samples. The signature on item Q2 was not written by Dr. Zachary Eg, it is a freehand simulation of Dr. Eg's

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	signature. There were observed poor line quality, blunt beginning and ending points, uncertainty of movement.
EDMKCB-524	Based on the evidence received, there are indications Zachary Eg may have written the filled in portions of the prescription and signature in his name on the questioned document, Q1. Moreover, there are indications that Zachary Eg may not have written the filled in portions of the prescription or signature in his name on the questioned document, Q2. Based on the evidence received, there are indications Jake Pug may not have written the filled in portions of the prescription or signature in the name of Zachary Eg on the questioned document, Q1; however, the evidence to that effect is far from conclusive. Moreover, there are indications Jake Pug may have written the filled in portions of the prescription on the questioned document, Q2. There is no basis for an identification or elimination of Jake Pug as having written the signature in the name of Zachary Eg on the questioned document, Q2.
EHX78H-524	As a result of examination and comparison based solely on the material submitted the following conclusions and observations are opinions based upon my experience, education and training and are as follows: 1. The Q1 and Q2 documents were scanned for preservation by Criminalist. 2. A VSC (Video Spectral Comparator) examination using various microscopic, infrared, ultraviolet, and alternate light source examination techniques was performed on the Q1 and Q2 documents to evaluate the use of similar or non-similar inks. 3. An ESDA (ElectroStatic Detection Apparatus) examination for the detection and reading of indented writing, typing or other identifying impressions was performed on the Q1 and Q2 documents. No impressions were recovered. 4. The content on Q1 was written by the author of K1a-d (Dr. Zachary EG). 5. The signature on Q1 was written by the author of K1a-d (Dr. Zachary EG). 6. The content on Q2 was written by the author of K2a-d (Jake Pug). 7. The signature on Q2 was not written by the author of K1a-d (Dr. Zachary EG). 8. The signature on Q2 can be neither identified nor eliminated as being written by the author of K2a-d (Jake Pug). 9. The Q1 document was forwarded to the Latent Print Section for processing and evaluation. 10. The Q1 document was forwarded to the DNA Section for processing and evaluation.. DISPOSITION OF EVIDENCE: The original questioned evidence examined per this request will be returned to the Evidence Unit. Copies and/or scans of this evidence will be retained with the case file.
EZCGH2-523	The questioned writing in Q1 (including the signature) was written by Zachary Eg(K1). The questioned writing in Q2 (excluding the signature) was written by Jake Pug(K2). The questioned signature in Q2 was not written by Zachary Eg(K1). It could not be determined whether Jake Pug(K2) wrote the questioned signature in Q2.
F7KZHE-523	The Q1-questioned writing was written by K1-writer (Dr. Zachary Eg). The Q1-questioned signature was written by K1-writer (Dr. Zachary Eg). The Q2-questioned writing was written by K2-writer (Jake Pug). The Q2-questioned signature is not a natural written signature. It was counterfeit, imitated by an unknown person. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not one of the two writer of the known material wrote it.
FJ8A3Y-523	1.The range of variation exhibited in the Q1(including writing and signatures) and the known writing of Dr. Zachary(K1) have significant similarities. 2.The range of variation exhibited in the Q2(excluding signatures) and the known writing of Jake Pug(K2) have significant similarities. 3.The Q2 questioned signature and the known writing of Dr. Zachary(K1) have significant difference. 4.The formation of the Q2 questioned signature is different from the known writing of Jake Pug(K2). Therefore they lack of basis for comparison.
FLEPCQ-524	Regarding the completion of the body of the questioned writing Q1 (Xanax) was written by Zachary Eg (K1), and was not written by Jake Pug (K2). Regarding the completion of the body of the questioned writing Q2 (Vicodin) was written by Jake Pug (K2), and was not written by Zachary Eg (K1). Regarding the firm in question Q1 (Xanax) corresponds to Zachary Eg (K1), and was not signed by Jake Pug (K2). Regarding the firm in question Q2 (Vicodin) was not signed by Zachary Eg (K1) and cannot be identified.

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
FR2BNJ-524	The texts in (Q1) WAS WRITTEN by Dr. Zachary Eg, reference patterns (K1a)(K1b)(K1d). The texts in (Q2) WAS WRITTEN by Jake Pug, reference patterns (K2a)(K2b)(K2d). The signature in (Q1) WAS WRITTEN by Dr. Zachary Eg, reference standards (K1a)(K1b)(K1c)(K1d). The signature in (Q2) CANNOT BE IDENTIFIED OR ELIMINATED, reference standards (K1a)(K1b)(K1c).
FU9U6R-524	Q-1 was filled and signed by Mr. EG. The body of Q-2 was filled out by Mr. PUG. The printed name "Dr. Zachary Eg" above the signature on Q-2 was also authored by Mr. PUG. Mr. EG probably did not sign his name on Q-2.
FVZN83-524	The K1 writer (EG) has been identified as the writer of the Q1 handprinting and numerals. An opinion of "identification" is a definitive conclusion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents provides very strong evidence supporting common authorship. The K1 writer (EG) has been identified as the writer of the Q1 signature. An opinion of "identification" is a definitive conclusion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known signatures provides very strong evidence supporting common authorship. The K1 writer (EG) has been eliminated as the writer of the Q2 handprinting and numerals. An opinion of "elimination" is a definitive conclusion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents provides very strong evidence supporting non-authorship. The K1 writer (EG) probably did not write the Q2 signature. An opinion of "probably did not write" means that there is strong evidence in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents to support that common authorship is unlikely. This opinion falls short of the "virtually certain" degree of confidence. The K2 writer (PUG) has been eliminated as the writer of the Q1 handprinting and numerals. An opinion of "elimination" is a definitive conclusion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents provides very strong evidence supporting non-authorship. The K2 writer (PUG) has been eliminated as the writer of the Q1 signature. An opinion of "elimination" is a definitive conclusion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known signatures provides very strong evidence supporting non-authorship. The K2 writer (PUG) has been identified as the writer of the Q2 handprinting and numerals. An opinion of "identification" is a definitive conclusion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents provides very strong evidence supporting common authorship. The K2 writer (PUG) has neither been identified nor eliminated as the writer of the Q2 signature. This is an inconclusive result because the questioned and known signatures bear a combination of similarities and dissimilarities and there are indications that the Q2 signature is a simulation. It is unreasonable and not appropriate to assign a conclusion of authorship or non-authorship given the evidence submitted. Therefore, no conclusion as to authorship can be provided. There are indications that the Q2 signature is a freehand simulation. An opinion of "indications" means that there are very few features present, but the evidence that is present suggests simulation. This opinion is far from conclusive.
G2M348-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
G3D2KR-524	HANDWRITING (DR. ZACHARY EG – ITEM 3 (Items K1a-d): Identification: It was determined that the questioned hand printing and signature appearing on Item 1 (Item Q1), were prepared by DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d). May Not Have (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics, the simplicity of the signature, and the possibility of simulation. However, dissimilarities were observed which indicate DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d) may not have prepared the questioned signature on Item 2 (Item Q2). HANDWRITING (JAKE PUG – ITEM 4 (Items K2a-d): Identification: It was determined that the questioned hand printing appearing on Item 2 (Item Q2), was prepared by JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d). No Conclusion: Although dissimilarities were observed, no conclusion could be reached whether or not the questioned signature appearing on Item 2 (Item Q2) was prepared by JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d) due to the presence of unexplained characteristics, the simplicity of



## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	the signature, and the possibility of simulation.
G62ZRG-524	1- There was correspondence between the handwritings of Dr. Zachary Eg and the questioned handwritings on item (Q1),so it is determined that the body of questioned writing of Q1 was written by Dr. Zachary Eg and was not written by Mr. Jake Pug. 2- There was correspondence between the signatures of Dr. Zachary Eg and the questioned signature on item (Q1),so it is determined that the questioned signature on Q1 was written by Dr. Zachary Eg and was not written by Mr. Jake Pug. 3- There was correspondence between the handwritings of Mr. Jake Pug and the questioned handwritings on item (Q2),so it is determined that the body of questioned writing of Q2 was written by Mr. Jake Pug and was not written by Dr. Zachary Eg. 4-a)There was differences between the questioned signature on item (Q2) and the signatures of Dr. Zachary Eg. which indicates that the questioned signature on Item (Q2) was not signed by him. b) There was some similarities between the questioned signature on item (Q2) and the handwriting of Mr. Jake Pug, this indicates that the questioned signature on item (Q2)was probably signed by Mr. Jake Pug.
G7VGUJ-524	The questioned handwriting and signature on Q1 correspond closely to the specimen handwriting and signatures of K1 and are fluently written. In my opinion, K1 (Dr Zachary Eg) is the write of Q1. The questioned handwriting on Q2 corresponds closely to the specimen handwriting of K2 and is fluently written. In my opinion, K2 (Jake Pug) is the writer of Q2. The signature on Q2 has the appearance of being a copy of the genuine signature of Dr Eg. In my opinion, it was not written by K1 (Dr Eg). As the signature has the appearance of being a copy and does not appear to contain any natural handwriting features of the forger, the evidence as to whether or not K2 (Jake Pug) is the writer is inconclusive.
GF7JFJ-523	Questioned handwriting on Q1 was written by K1 - Zachary Eg and was not written by K2 - Jake Pug. Questioned handwriting on Q2 was written by K2 - Jake Pug and was not written by K1 - Zachary Eg. Questioned signature on Q1 was written by K1 - Zachary Eg and was not written by K2 - Jake Pug. Questioned signature on Q2 Was not written by K1 - Zachary Eg. In cannot be identified or eliminated if K2 has written questioned signature on Q2.
GJMQV7-524	On further examination and comparison, I found as follows: 1) The questioned handwriting "Q1" showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting "K1". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the specimens ("Zachary Eg"). 2)The questioned handwriting "Q2" showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting "K2". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the specimens ("Jake Pug"). 3)The questioned handwriting "Q1" showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting "K2". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was not written by the writer of the specimens ("Jake Pug"). 4)The questioned handwriting "Q2" showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting "K1". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was not written by the writer of the specimens ("Dr. Zachary Eg"). 5)The questioned signature "Q1" showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen signatures "K1". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned signature was written by the writer of the specimens ("Dr. Zachary Eg"). 6)The questioned signature "Q2" showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen signatures "K1". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned signature was not written by the writer of the specimens ("Dr. Zachary Eg"). 7) The questioned signature "Q1" showed some differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen signatures "K2". However, the specimen signatures (requested specimens K2a, K2b and K2c) were simulated specimen signatures of "Dr. Zachary Eg" written by "Jake Pug" and there is a possibility of disguise. Since the questioned signature "Q1" has been identified written by "Dr. Zachary Eg", I am of the opinion that the questioned signature "Q1" was not written by "Jake Pug". 8) The questioned signature "Q2" showed some differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen signatures "K2". However, the specimen signatures (requested specimens K2a, K2b and K2c) were simulated specimen signatures of "Dr. Zachary Eg" written by "Jake Pug" and therefore there is a possibility of disguise. Hence, I was not able to identified or eliminated "Jake Pug" as the writer of the questioned signature "Q2".

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
GNYR2B-524	<p>Handwriting: The body writing on the two questioned prescription forms consists of small notational entries. If considered separately, some of these entries lack sufficient character and complexity for an opinion of authorship to be reached. However, when considered together the body writings on each separate form were consistent with having been completed by one writer. That is, one writer for the body writing on Q1 and one for the Q2 body writings. While I cannot totally exclude the possibility that within these there may be some small disconnected entries completed by a different writer, there was no evidence that this had occurred. A number of similarities were observed between the handwriting on the prescription form Q1 and the specimen handwriting attributed to Zachary Eg. These similarities are in both gross and subtle features such as style, size and size relationships, slope and individual letter constructions. Based on these similarities it is my opinion that the author of the specimens attributed to Zachary Eg completed the handwriting on the prescription form Q1. A number of similarities were observed between the handwriting on the prescription form Q2 and the specimen handwriting attributed to Jake Pug. These similarities are in both gross and subtle features such as style, size and size relationships, slope and individual letter constructions. Based on these similarities it is my opinion that the author of the specimens attributed to Jake Pug completed the handwriting on the prescription form Q2. Signatures: The signature style seen in the specimens attributed to Zachary Eg is of limited complexity and exhibits a moderate range of variation. The limited complexity means that it would be less difficult for a skilled writer to copy/simulate. This, and the variability in the signature style, increase the possibility that a simulated signature could be sufficiently similar to the specimens to escape detection. The questioned signature on the prescription form Q1 is entirely consistent in both gross and subtle features with the signature style seen in the specimens attributed to Zachary Eg. It contains no evidence of copying/simulation. However, if considered in isolation to the handwriting on the form, it does not contain sufficient complexity for a definitive opinion of authorship to be possible. Accordingly, it is my opinion the similarities observed provide indications the author of the specimens attributed to Zachary Eg completed the signature on the prescription form Q1. The questioned signature on the prescription form Q2 has some pictorial similarity to the signature style seen in the specimens attributed to Zachary Eg. However, it also contains a number of differences in features such as fluency, size relationships and both gross and subtle construction characteristics. Based on the similarities and differences observed, it is my opinion that the signature on the prescription form Q2 is the result of an attempt to copy/simulate the signature style of Zachary Eg. As the act of copying/simulation tends to mask the natural writing habits of the author, no opinion regarding authorship of this signature has been possible.</p>
GRGYGX-523	<p>In my opinion there is conclusive support for the proposition that the author of K1a-d (Zachary Eg) wrote the non-signature writing on Q1. In my opinion there is conclusive support for the proposition that the author of K2a-d (Jake Pug) wrote the non-signature writing on Q2. In my opinion there is very strong support for the proposition that the author of K1a-d (Zachary Eg) wrote the questioned signature in his own name on Q1. In my opinion there is very strong support for the proposition that someone other than Zachary Eg wrote the questioned signature in his name on Q2 simulating (copying) his signature style. Because of the likelihood that the signature on Q2 is a simulation of Zachary Eg's signature style it will not contain the natural handwriting features of its author. As such my comparisons with the reference writing and signatures of Jake Pug are severely limited. My findings are therefore inconclusive and I can neither exclude nor identify Jake Pug as the author of the questioned signature on Q2.</p>
GYH74D-523	<p>Based on the side by side comparisons of the writing and signatures located on the submitted questioned documents (Q1-Q2) to the submitted known standards of Dr. Zachary Eg (K1a-K1d) and the known standards submitted of Jake Pug (K2a-K2d) it is this examiners opinion that: 1. There is common authorship between the body writing and signature located on the Q1 document and the submitted known standards of Dr. Zachary Eg (K1a-K1d). Jake Pug writer of the K2a-K2d standards is eliminated as the writer of the Q1 document body and signature. 2. There is common authorship between the body writing located on the Q2 document and the submitted known standards of Jake Pug (K2a-K2d). Dr. Zachary Eg writer of the K1a-K1d standards is eliminated as the writer of the body writing located on the Q2 document. That on the Zachary Eg signature located on Q2: The Q2 Zachary Eg signature does not contain the repeating and natural</p>

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	characteristics observed in the (K1a-K1d) known Dr. Zachary Eg signature standards and based on those observations it is probable Dr. Zachary Eg is not the writer of the Q2 signature. The Q2 Zachary Eg signature has characteristics that this examiner associates with signatures that are copied or drawn from a model. It is this examiners opinion that since the Q2 Zachary Eg signature is a copy or drawing of a Dr. Zachary Eg genuine signature the known standards of Jake Pug (K2a-K2d) cannot be identified or eliminated for authorship to the Q2 Zachary Eg signature.
H64HFK-524	1. Q1(Including the signature) was written by Dr. Eg.(K1). 2. Q2(Including the signature) was not written by Dr.Eg.(K1). 3. Q2(Excluding the signature) was written by Jake Pug(K2). 4. The questioned signature Q2 cannot be identified.
H79CRB-523	1. Writer K1 wrote the text and signature on Q1. Writer K2 did not write the entries on Q1. 2. Writer K1 did not write the text on Q2. Writer K1 probably did not write the signature on Q2. 3. Writer K2 wrote the non-signature text entries on Q2. K2 can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the signature on Q2. 4. The signature on Q2 appears to be a simulation of a genuine signature by K1 (Dr. Zachary Eg). As with many simulations, the maker of the simulation departs from their normal writing habits when trying to recreate features of a genuine model signature of another person; the resulting simulation differs from the genuine known writer's habits, but contains insufficient habits of the normal writing by the simulation maker for identification of the simulator.
HC38V4-523	(i) The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned writing Q1 was written by the writer of the comparison sample K1. (ii) The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned writing Q1 was not written by the writer of the specimen writing K2. (iii) The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned writing Q2 was written by the writer of the specimen writing K2. (iv) The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned writing Q2 was not written by the writer of the specimen writing K1. (v) The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned "Zachary Egg" signature on Q1 is a genuine signature when compared to the specimen "Zachary Egg" signatures on K1. (vi) The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned "Zachary Egg" signature on Q1 is not a genuine signature when compared to the specimen "Zachary Egg" signatures on K2. (vii) The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned "Zachary Egg" signature on Q2 is not a genuine signature when compared to the specimen "Zachary Egg" signatures on K1. (viii) The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned "Zachary Egg" signature on Q1 is not a genuine signature when compared to the specimen "Zachary Egg" signatures on K2.
HMG7L7-523	[No Conclusions Reported.]
J9UCN7-524	The author of the K1a-K1d writing samples attributed to Dr. Zachary Eg is identified as the author of the questioned writing and signature on the Q1 prescription. The author of the K2a-K2d writing samples attributed to Jake Pug is identified as the author of the questioned writing on the Q2 prescription excluding the signature. The authors of the K1a-K1d and K2a-K2d writing samples attributed to Dr. Zachary Eg and Jake Pug can neither be identified nor eliminated as the author of the Q2 questioned signature. The questioned signature appears distorted and may not be representative of the writer's normal writing habits and abilities.
JJW69D-524	1. The handwriting in suspicious prescription Q1 is written Dr.Zuchury Eg. 2. The signature in suspicious prescription Q1 is authentic signature Dr.Zuchury Eg. 3. The handwriting in suspicious prescription Q2 is written Juke Puy. 4. The signature in suspicious prescription Q2 is not authentic signature Dr.Zuchury Eg, but we cannot identified or eliminated Juke Puy as a signatory.
JKMZFY-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
JMEW6T-524	HANDWRITING (DR. ZACHARY EG): Identification: It was determined that the questioned hand printing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) were prepared by DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), prepared the questioned signature on Item 2 (Item Q2) due to unexplained



## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	characteristics and the possibility of a simulation. HANDWRITING (JAKE PUG): Identification: It was determined that the questioned hand printing on Item 2 (Item Q2) was prepared by JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d) prepared the questioned signature on Item 2 (Item Q2) due to unexplained characteristics and the possibility of a simulation.
JMEYUX-523	Zachary Eg (K1) wrote the questioned entries including the signature on Item Q1. Jake Pug (K2) wrote the questioned entries excluding the signature on Item Q2. Signature on Item Q2: The signature on Item Q2 contains indications that it may be an attempt to simulate a genuine signature of Zachary Eg (K1). When a signature is simulated it is copied or drawn and so often does not fully display the normal identifying characteristics of the writer, which prevents a definite identification or elimination of the writer. However, based on the evidence present, the following was noted: It is probable that Zachary Eg (K1) did not write the questioned signature on Item Q2. No conclusion could be reached regarding whether or not Jake Pug (K2) wrote the questioned signature on Item Q2. There is a lack of sufficient, comparable cursive writing in the known writing submitted. Many of the first name "Zachary" entries in the known writing have illegible/distorted portions and the last name "Eg" is printed rather than written. The submission of cursive course of business known writing containing similar letters and letter combinations would be required to further evaluate the writer's cursive writing habits.
JNM2N9-524	The writings and the signature of the document Q1 were written by the writer of the comparison documents K1a to K1d, ie Mr. Zachary Eg. The writings of the Q2 document were written by the writer of the comparison documents K2a to K2d, i.e. Mr. Jake Pug. The signature of the Q2 document was not written by Mr. Zachary Eg and is an simulation of his signature whose author can not be identified.
JP6XBG-524	It is not possible to indicate whether the questioned signature on the Q2 prescription has been written or has not been written by K2 person. This signature contains to little features of his performer, is disturbed, not natural so much and it can not be excluded that he has been imitated based on the sample of original signature
JZZ7V6-524	The questioned hand printing and signature appearing on Item Q1 was written by Zachary Eg, writer of Item K1. The questioned hand printing and signature appearing on Item Q1 was not written by Jake Pug, writer of Item K2. The questioned hand printing appearing on Item Q2 was written by Jake Pug, writer of Item K2. The questioned hand printing appearing on Item Q2 was not written by Zachary Eg, writer of Item K1. Neither Zachary Eg, Item K1, nor Jake Pug, K2, could be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature appearing on Item Q2.
K7H268-524	Zachary Eg is identified as the author of the questioned writing and signature on Q1. Jake Pug is identified as the author of the questioned writings appearing on Q2 with the exception of the questioned signature. There was evidence found to suggest that the questioned signature appearing on Q2 is a simulation. Because writings of this nature do not normally exhibit a sufficient amount of the writers own normal writing habits, the identification of the writer is often times not possible. Therefore, nether of the contributors could be be identified or eliminated as the author of the questioned signature on Q2.
KFVTXQ-524	HANDWRITING (DR. ZACHARY EG): Identification: It was determined that the questioned writing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by DR. ZACHARY EG, the Item 3 (Items K1a – d) writer. No Conclusion: Although dissimilarities were noted with the K1 signatures, no conclusion could be reached whether the Item 2 (Item Q2) signature was or was not prepared by DR. ZACHARY EG, the Item 3 (Items K1a – d) writer, due to characteristics indicative of a possible simulation and the presence of unexplained characteristics. HANDWRITING (JAKE PUG): Identification: It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 2 (Item Q2) was prepared by JAKE PUG, the Item 4 (Items K2a – d) writer excluding the signature. No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether the Item 2 (Item Q2) signature was or was not prepared by JAKE PUG, the Item 4 (Item K2a – d) writer, due to characteristics indicative of a possible simulation and the presence of unexplained characteristics. Furthermore, it should be noted that simulated signatures do not usually represent the natural handwriting of the preparer(s) and

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	therefore it is unlikely that the Item 2 (Item Q2) signature will ever be identified to a particular individual through handwriting comparisons.
KRNCEG-524	For Q1; The prescription was written and signed by K1 (Dr Zachary). For Q2; The prescription was written by K2 (Jake Pug). The prescription was not signed by Dr Zachary. Indeed it was copied by someone else. However there is not enough indication that it was signed by Jake Pug.
KRP6A4-523	The items listed in this Certificate of Analysis were assessed and examined based on methodology described in the Forensic Document Unit (FDU) Test Methods (unless otherwise noted). The methodology used included macroscopic, microscopic, and handwriting examinations. Handwriting Opinions Regarding Dr. Zachary Eg: Dr. Zachary Eg, Items K1a – K1d, was the writer of the hand printing and the “Zachary Eg” signature on the questioned prescription for Xanax identified as Item Q1, which was depicted in the electronically submitted image named “19-523_Q1Q2”. Dr. Zachary Eg, Items K1a – K1d, was not the writer of the hand printing on the questioned prescription for Vicodin identified as Item Q2, which was depicted in the electronically submitted image named “19-523_Q1Q2”. It is probable that Dr. Zachary Eg, Items K1a – K1d, was not the writer of the “Zachary Eg” signature on the questioned prescription for Vicodin identified as Item Q2, which was depicted in the electronically submitted image named “19-523_Q1Q2”. This questioned signature was limited in quantity of writing for comparison purposes. Additionally, this questioned signature contained pictorial similarities to the known signatures of Dr. Zachary Eg, but were defective in execution. This could indicate an attempt to simulate a genuine signature of Dr. Zachary Eg. Handwriting Opinions Regarding Jake Pug: Jake Pug, Items K2a – K2d, was not the writer of the hand printing and the “Zachary Eg” signature on the questioned prescription for Xanax identified as Item Q1, which was depicted in the electronically submitted image named “19-523_Q1Q2”. Jake Pug, Items K2a – K2d, was the writer of the hand printing on the questioned prescription for Vicodin identified as Item Q2, which was depicted in the electronically submitted image named “19-523_Q1Q2”. Jake Pug, Items K2a – K2d, could not be identified to nor eliminated from being the writer of the “Zachary Eg” signature on the questioned prescription for Vicodin identified as Item Q2, which was depicted in the electronically submitted image named “19-523_Q1Q2”. This questioned signature was limited in quantity and quality of writing for comparison purposes. Additionally, this questioned signature contained pictorial similarities to the known signatures of Dr. Zachary Eg, but were defective in execution. This could indicate an attempt to simulate a genuine signature of Dr. Zachary Eg. These factors were limitations to the handwriting comparison, which resulted in a less than definitive opinion.
KTYAPD-524	The manuscripts in document Q1 "Prescription for Xanax" dated July 31, 2019, letterhead "Dr. Zachary Eg M.D.", WERE WRITTEN BY Dr. Zachary Eg. The manuscripts in document Q2 "Prescription for Vicodin" dated July 31, 2019, letterhead "Dr. Zachary Eg M.D.", WERE WRITTEN BY Jake Pug. The signature in document Q1 "Prescription for Xanax" dated July 31, 2019, letterhead "Dr. Zachary Eg M.D.", located in the lower left side area, "Signature" space, WAS WRITTEN BY Dr. Zachary Eg. Messrs. Zachary Eg and Jake Pug, CANNOT BE IDENTIFIED OR ELIMINATED from the participation in the preparation of the signature in document Q2 "Prescription for Vicodin" dated July 31, 2019, letterhead "Dr. Zachary Eg MD", located in the lower left side area, "Signature" space.
KZYT3-524	It has been concluded that Dr. Zachary Eg (K1) wrote the questioned material appearing on the Exhibit Q1 item. It has been concluded that Jake Pug (K2) wrote the questioned hand printing appearing on the Exhibit Q2 item. It has been determined that Dr. Zachary Eg (K1) probably did not write the questioned signature appearing on the Exhibit Q2 item. With the material available for comparison, it could not be determined whether or not Jake Pug (K2) wrote the questioned signature appearing on the Exhibit Q2 item.
L49BF4-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
L7ZAWM-524	HANDWRITING (DR. ZACHARY EG): Identification: It was determined the questioned writing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) were prepared by DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d). May Not Have (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached due to the presence of

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>unexplained characteristics and characteristics of slow and deliberate execution. However, dissimilarities were observed which indicate DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), may not have prepared the questioned signature on Item 2 (Item Q2). HANDWRITING (JAKE PUG): Identification: It was determined the questioned writing on Item 2 (Item Q2) (excluding the signature) was prepared by JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not the signature on Item 2 (Item Q2) was prepared by JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and characteristics of slow and deliberate execution.</p>
L99KQ7-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
LFTFVF-523	<p>Visual and microscopic examinations of Exhibits K1a through K1d, K2a through K2d, Q1 and Q2 were conducted. Exhibits Q1 and Q2 were compared to Exhibits K1a through K1d and K2a through K2d. The results are as follows: The writer of Exhibits K1a through K1d (Dr. Zachary Eg) wrote the questioned hand printed entries and questioned Zachary Eg signature on Exhibit Q1. The writer of Exhibits K1a through K1d (Dr. Zachary Eg) probably did not write the questioned hand printed entries and questioned Zachary Eg signature on Exhibit Q2; however, due to an insufficient amount of comparable known writing, the evidence fall short of that necessary to support a conclusive opinion. The writer of Exhibits K2a through K2d (Jake Pug) probably did not write the questioned hand printed entries and questioned Zachary Eg signature on Exhibit Q1; however, due to an insufficient amount of comparable known writing, the evidence fall short of that necessary to support a conclusive opinion. The writer of Exhibits K2a through K2d (Jake Pug) wrote the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit Q2. The writer of Exhibits K2a through K2d (Jake Pug) could neither be identified, nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned Zachary Eg signature on Exhibit Q2 due to an insufficient amount of comparable known writing.</p>
LGKGV-524	<p>Q1 body of writing was written by the same person that submitted K1a-d. Q1 signature was written by the same person that submitted K1a-d. Q2 body of writing was written by the same person that submitted K2a-d. Q2 signature cannot be identified or eliminated as having been written by K2a-d.</p>
LWVDU6-524	<p>Dr. Zachary Eg is identified as the writer of the hand printed entries and signature on Q1 (001-A1). Jake Pug is identified as the writer of the hand printed entries on Q2 (001-A2). No conclusion could be reached whether or not Dr. Zachary Eg or Jake Pug wrote the questioned signature on Q2 (001-A2). There are indications that the questioned signature on Q2 (001-A2) is a simulation.</p>
MAJLC4-524	<p>1. The questioned signature and handwritten entries on Exhibit 7 (CTS Item: Q1) and the known writing attributed to Dr. ZACHARY EG on Exhibits 1(1-2), 2 and 3 (CTS Items: K1a-d) have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics in agreement from another writer is considered extremely low. 2. The questioned ZACHARY EG signature on Exhibit 8 (CTS Item: Q2) bears features/characteristics indicative of an attempt to simulate a genuine "Zachary Eg" signature using a model(s) as a guide. No determination could be reached as to whether or not ZACHARY EG or JAKE PUG wrote the simulated signature. 3. The questioned handwritten entries on Exhibit 8 (CTS Item: Q2) and the known writing attributed to JAKE PUG on Exhibits 4(1-2), 5 and 6 (CTS Items: K2a-d) have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics in agreement from another writer is considered extremely low.</p>
MBQ2LV-524	<p>1. Exhibits 1-8 are further described as consisting of the following: 1-3 Known writing by Zachary, 4-6 Known writing by Pug, 7-8 Questioned Prescriptions. 2. The questioned handwritten entries on Exhibit 7 and the known writing attributed to Zachary have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics from another writer is considered extremely low. 3. The questioned handwritten entries on Exhibit 8, excluding the signature, and the known writing attributed to Pug, have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics from another writer is considered extremely low. 4. The questioned signature on Exhibit 8 and the known writing attributed to Zachary have some characteristics that are not in agreement. It is considered unlikely that Zachary is the writer of the questioned signature on Exhibit 8. 5. Based on an examination of the</p>

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	evidence submitted, it cannot be determined whether or not Pug wrote the questioned signature on Exhibit 8. 6. The findings in paragraphs 4 and 5 are limited due to the quality of the questioned signature on Exhibit 8. The questioned signature on Exhibit 8 bears features frequently associated with simulations. Simulated signatures often preclude the identification of the author by comparative examination.
MEQ6F4-524	Upon completion of an examination of the exhibits submitted in this case, this examiner opines the following: The K-1 writer DID write the Q-1 body of writing and signature, therefore the K-2 writer did not. The K-1 writer did NOT author the signature portion of the Q-2. The K-2 writer DID write Q-2 body of the writing, though it could not be determined if he authored the signature portion.
MLBB7H-524	1- The writing body and the signature of document Q1 (Xanax Medication): It was written by Zachary Eg, the above given the total agreement of the signs. Scriptural notes observed in the written doubt and the writing samples of Zachary Eg regarding its structure, dynamics and disposition. 2- The writing body of document Q2 (Vicodin medication) was written by Jake Pug, the formal, structural and dynamic similarity becomes evident observed in the writings of doubt and the writing samples of Jake Pug. 3- as for the signature observed in document Q2, similarity can be seen formal with the signature of Zachary Eg, which leads to conclude that it is a imitation so it is not possible to determine who developed it.
N2F2J8-524	The non-signature writing of the prescription for "Xanax", item Q1, shows many similarities to the writing of Dr Zachory Eg in items K1a to K1d. No single similarity is conclusive but the combination of similarities leads me to conclude that Dr Zachory Eg made that writing. The non-signature writing of the prescription for "Vicodin", item Q2, shows many similarities to the writing of Jake Pug in items K2a to K2d. The combination of similarities leads me to conclude that Jake Pug made that writing. My observations lead me to conclude that the signature in item Q1 is a genuine signature written by Zachory Eg. My observations lead me to conclude that the signature in the name of Zachory Eg in item Q2 was not written by Dr Eg but by some other person simulating the style of his signature. I am unable to say who that person was
N7VMDZ-523	It is highly probable the writer of the exemplars (K1) wrote the printing and signature on Q1. This opinion is based on the strong similarities between Q1 and K1 and the quantity and complexity of the writing, which means there is an extremely low likelihood of (1) a chance match of Q1 with another writer or (2) Q1 being a simulation of the K1 writing without showing evidence of the simulation process. It is highly probable the K1 writer did not write the printing on Q2. There are numerous significant structural and pictorial differences between the features present in K1 and those in the printing of Q2. Since several of these differences are repeated and there is evidence of naturalness, it is highly unlikely the K1 writer would possess a writing style with such markedly different features or would be able to successfully disguise that large quantity of writing. There is evidence to indicate the K1 writer may not have written the Q2 signature. There is an overall pictorial similarity between the questioned and known signatures, but several differences in form can be observed upon close inspection. This can be indicative of either simulation by another writer or disguise by the same writer. However, the differences seen in subtle features such as proportion are moderately more likely due to simulation by another writer than by disguise. It is highly probable the writer of the exemplars (K2) wrote the printing on Q2. This opinion is based on the strong similarities between Q2 and K2 and the quantity and complexity of the printed writing, which means there is an extremely low likelihood of (1) a chance match of Q2 with another writer or (2) Q2 being a simulation of the K2 writing without showing evidence of the simulation process. It is highly probable the K2 writer did not write the printing on Q1. There are numerous significant structural and pictorial differences between the features present in K2 and those in the printing of Q1. Since several of these differences are repeated and there is evidence of naturalness, it is highly unlikely the K2 writer would have a such a markedly different writing style or be able to successfully disguise that large quantity of writing. No determination could be made whether or not the K2 writer wrote the signatures on Q1 or Q2. The Q1 signature is somewhat stylized and not directly comparable to K2's version of that signature. Q2 appears to be a simulation of the K1 writer's natural signature and therefore also not of a comparable style to the K2 signatures.

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
NMJZP8-524	1. In our opinion, Dr. Zachary Eg has written the text Q1. 2. In our opinion, Dr. Zachary Eg has written the signature Q1. 3. In our opinion, Jake Pug has written the text Q2. 4. In our opinion, Dr. Zachary Eg has not written the signature Q2. 5. In our opinion, it cannot be identified or eliminated if Jake Pug has written the signature Q2.
NRR7LD-524	1. The body questioned writing of prescription "Q1 (Xanax dated 7/31/19)" presents uniprocidence against the undoubtful samples (dictated exemplars, requested signatures and course of business) collected from Dr. Zachary Eg. 2. The body questioned writing of prescription "Q2 (Vicodin dated 7/31/19)" presents uniprocidence against the undoubtful samples (dictated exemplars, requested signatures and course of business) collected from Jake Pug. 3. The signature in question on the prescription "Q1 (Xanax dated 7/31/19)" presents uniprocidence against the undoubtful samples (dictated exemplars, requested signatures and course of business) collected from Dr. Zachary Eg. 4. The signature in question on the prescription "Q2 (Vicodin dated 7/31/19)", don't shows uniprocidence against the undoubted samples (dictated exemplars of the form, requested signatures and course of business) collected from Dr. Zachary Eg. 4.1. The signature in question on the prescription "Q2 (Vicodin dated 7/31/19)", can't be identified or eliminated uniprocidence against the undoubted samples (dictated exemplars of the form, requested signatures and course of business) collected from Jake Pug.
NU27NY-523	Writing Examination: The writing characteristics exhibited in the questioned writing were visually examined then compared to the writing characteristics exhibited in the known writing. The comparative significance of the characteristics observed were then evaluated and resulted in the following conclusions: Q1: In as much as it is possible to examine a digital image in lieu of the original document, it is my opinion that Zachary Eg wrote the questioned manuscript printing and signature on Q1. Q2 Manuscript Printing: In as much as it is possible to examine a digital image in lieu of the original document, it is my opinion that Jake Pug wrote the questioned manuscript printing on Q2. Q2 Manuscript Signature: The questioned Zachary Eg signature on Q2 can neither be identified nor eliminated with the known writing of Zachary Eg nor Jake Pug. The questioned signature exhibits characteristics associated with simulation and therefore, may not be able to be identified or eliminated with any writer.
NVU4W7-524	Description of Evidence Submitted: The following evidence items were received for Forensic Document Examination. Item No., Description: 1. Original Questioned Prescription for Xanax dated 31-07-2019 marked as Q1 bearing Questioned Handwriting and Questioned Signature (01 page). 2. Original Questioned Prescription for Vicodin dated 31-07-2019 marked as Q2 bearing Questioned Handwriting and Questioned Signature (01 page). 3. Original dictated handwriting exemplars of Dr. Zachary Eg marked as K1a & K1b (02 pages). 4. Original requested signature exemplars of Dr. Zachary Eg marked as K1c (01 page). 5. Original course of business writing of Dr. Zachary Eg marked as K1d (01 page). 6. Original dictated handwriting exemplars of Jake Pug marked as K2a & K2b (02 pages). 7. Original requested signature exemplars of Jake Pug marked as K2c (01 page). 8. Original course of business writing of Jake Pug marked as K2d (01 page). The case consists of total 08 evidence items. Method: ACE-V Methodology was used. Dates of Examination(s) Performed: Start Date: 01-10-2019, End Date: 01-11-2019. Result(s) & Conclusion(s): 1. After careful examination and comparison of Questioned Handwriting on item no.01 with course of business handwriting of Dr. Zachary Eg on items no. 05 and Jake Pug on item no. 08 and with dictated handwriting exemplars of Dr. Zachary Eg on items no. 03 and Jake Pug on item no.06, it is concluded that Questioned Handwriting on item no. 01 is written by Dr. Zachary Eg .Therefore, Dr. Zachary Eg is the author of Questioned Handwriting on item no. 01. 2. After careful examination and comparison of Questioned Handwriting on item no. 02 with course of business handwriting of Dr. Zachary Eg on items no. 05 and Jake Pug on item no. 08 and with dictated handwriting exemplars of Dr. Zachary Eg on item no. 03 and Jake Pug on item no. 06, it is concluded that Questioned Handwriting on item no. 02 is written by Jake Pug. Therefore, Jake Pug is the author of Questioned Handwriting on item no. 02. 3. After careful examination and comparison of Questioned Signature on item no. 01 with course of business signatures of Dr. Zachary Eg on item no. 05 and with requested signature exemplars of Dr. Zachary Eg on items no. 03 & 04 and Jake Pug on item no. 06 & 07, it is concluded that Questioned Signature on item no.



## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>01 is written by Dr. Zachary Eg. Therefore, Dr. Zachary Eg is the author of Questioned Signature on item no. 01. 4. After careful examination and comparison of Questioned Signature on item no. 02 with requested Signature exemplars of Jake Pug on items no. 06 &amp; 07 and with course of business signatures of Jake Pug on item no. 08, it is concluded that Questioned Signature on item no. 02 is not written by Jake Pug. Therefore, Jake Pug is not the author of Questioned Signature on item no. 02. 5. After careful examination and comparison of Questioned Signature on item no. 02 with course of business Signature of Dr. Zachary Eg on items no. 05 and with requested Signature exemplars of Dr. Zachary Eg on items no. 03 &amp; 04, it is concluded that Questioned Signature on item no. 02 is not written by Dr. Zachary Eg. Therefore, Dr. Zachary Eg is not the author of Questioned Signature on item no. 02.</p>
NZN4B2-524	<p>The examination performed was for handwriting and hand printing. This included macro and micro examination. Dr. Zachary Eg, writer K1, wrote the questioned hand printing and signature on Item Q1. This opinion is based on the notation of significant similarities and no differences between the questioned and known bodies of writing submitted. Dr. Zachary Eg, writer K1, did not write the questioned hand printing on Item Q2. This opinion is based on the notation of significant differences and very few similarities between the questioned and known bodies of writing submitted. Jake Pug, writer of K2, wrote the hand printing on Item Q2. This opinion is based on the notation of significant similarities and no differences between the questioned and known bodies of writing submitted. Jake Pug, writer of K2, did not write the hand printing or signature on Item Q1. This opinion is based on the notation of significant differences and very few similarities between the questioned and known bodies of writing submitted. No conclusion could be reached as to whether Jake Pug or Dr. Zachary Eg were the writers of the questioned signature on Item Q2. This opinion is based on the notation of both similarities and differences between the questioned and known writings submitted as well as what appears to be characteristics of a simulation exhibited in blunt endings of some strokes and slow and unnatural movements of the writing instrument in other strokes. Simulations can also be prepared by the true name writer of a questioned writing as a method of disguise. The writer of a simulation is often difficult to determine through a comparative examination. Forensic document examiners use a scale of opinions to describe the strength of an opinions resulting from handwriting comparisons. Opinions with various strengths were used in this report. The scale of opinions used in this laboratory follows this paragraph. Although some of the opinions on this scale were not used in this report, they are provided here so that the relative strength of the conclusions may be understood. Identification - This is the highest degree of confidence expressed. Based on evidence contained in the handwriting, the examiner has no reservations that the known writer actually wrote the writing in question. Strong Probability - The evidence is very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality is missing so that an identification is not in order. The examiner is virtually certain that the questioned and known writings were written by the same individual. Probable - The evidence contained in the handwriting points rather strongly toward the questioned and known writings having been written by the same individual; however, it falls short of a "virtually certain" degree of confidence. Indications - A body of writing has few features that are of significance for handwriting comparison purposes, but those features are in agreement with another body of writing. No Conclusion - This is the zero point of the confidence scale. The examiner does not have even a leaning one way or another. Indications Did Not - A body of writing has few features that are of significance for handwriting comparison purposes, but those features are in disagreement with another body of writing. Probably Did Not - The evidence points rather strongly against the questioned and known writings having been written by the same individual, but it is not quite up to the "virtually certain" range. Strong Probability Did Not - There is a virtual certainty that the questioned and known writings were not written by the same individual. Elimination - The examiner has no doubt that the questioned and known writings were not written by the same individual.</p>
P4K92Q-524	<p>There are many similarities and no significant differences between the specified questioned handwriting in Q1 and the known handwriting of Zachary Eg. The nature of the similarities is such that in our opinion, Zachary Eg is responsible for the specified questioned handwriting in Q1. There are many similarities and no significant differences between the specified questioned handwriting in Q2 and the known handwriting of Jake Pug. The nature of the similarities is such that in our</p>

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>opinion, Jake Pug is responsible for the specified questioned handwriting in Q2. There are many similarities and no significant differences between the specified questioned signature in Q1 and the known signatures of Zachary Eg. The nature of the similarities is such that in our opinion, Zachary Eg is responsible for the specified questioned signature in Q1. The specified questioned signature in Q2 bears some pictorial similarities to the known signatures of Zachary Eg, however there are a number of significant differences between the specified questioned signature in Q2 and the known signatures of Zachary Eg. The nature of the similarities and differences is such that in our opinion, there is strong support that Zachary Eg is not responsible for the specified questioned signature in Q2. By 'strong support', we consider it extremely likely that another individual is responsible for simulating a genuine signature of Zachary Eg. We are unable to comment on the ability of Jake Pug, or anyone else, to produce a simulation of a genuine signature of Zachary Eg.</p>
P6C8GA-523	<p>The author of the known writings and signatures appearing throughout the Exhibit K1a through K1d documents, Dr. Zachary Eg, wrote the questioned written text and questioned "Zachary Eg" signature appearing on the Exhibit Q1 prescription. The author of the known writings and signatures appearing throughout the Exhibit K2a through K2d documents, Jake Pug, did not write the questioned written text or the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature appearing in the body of the Exhibit Q1 prescription. The author of the known writings and signatures appearing throughout the Exhibit K2a through K2d documents, Jake Pug, wrote the questioned written text appearing in the body of the Exhibit Q2 prescription. No conclusion could be reached as to whether the author of the known writings and signatures appearing throughout the Exhibit K2a through K2d documents, Jake Pug, wrote the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature appearing on the Exhibit Q2 prescription. The author of the known writings and signatures appearing throughout the Exhibit K1a through K1d documents, Dr. Zachary Eg, did not write the questioned written text appearing in the body of the Exhibit Q2 prescription. The author of the known writings and signatures appearing throughout the Exhibit K1a through K1d documents, Dr. Zachary Eg, probably did not write the questioned the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature appearing on the Exhibit Q2 prescription.</p>
P77XK4-524	<p>Q1 was written and sign by Zachary Eg. Q2 was written by Jake Pug, but was not sign by him or Zachary Eg.</p>
PA6AG4-524	<p>Based on all the findings of the examinations and comparisons, in my professional opinion, a) The questioned writing on item Q1 was written by the writer of the known writings on items K1a, K1b and K1d (Dr. Zachary Eg) and not by the writer of the known writings on items K2a, K2b and K2d (Jake Pug). b) The questioned writing on item Q2 was written by the writer of the known writings on items K2a, K2b and K2d (Jake Pug) and not by the writer of the known writings on items K1a, K1b and K1d (Dr. Zachary Eg). c) The questioned signature on item Q1 was written by the writer of the known signatures on items K1a, K1b and K1c (Dr. Zachary Eg) and not by the writer of the known signatures on items K2a, K2b and K2c (Jake Pug). d) The writer of the known signatures on items K1a, K1b and K1c (Dr. Zachary Eg) and the writer of the known signatures on items K2a, K2b and K2c (Jake Pug) cannot be identified or eliminated from being the writer of the questioned signature on item Q2.</p>
PGRXHZ-524	<p>1. Exhibits 1-8 are further described as consisting of the following: 1(K1 a-b) - Exemplars by EG; 2(K1c) - Exemplar by EG; 3(K1d) - Standard by EG; 4(K2a-b) - Exemplars by PUG; 5(K2c) - Exemplar by PUG; 6(K2d) - Standard by PUG; 7(Q1) - Questioned prescription for Xanax; 8(Q2) - Questioned prescription for Vicodin. 2. The questioned hand printed entries and signature on Exhibit 7(Q1) and the known writing attributed to EG have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics in agreement from another writer is considered extremely low. 3. The questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit 8(Q2) and the known writing attributed to EG have significant characteristics that are not in agreement. It is considered unlikely that EG is the writer of the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit 8(Q2). 4. The questioned signature on Exhibit 8(Q2) and the known writing attributed to EG have some characteristics that are not in agreement. It is considered unlikely that EG is the writer of the questioned signature on Exhibit 8(Q2). 5. The questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit 8(Q2) and the known writing attributed to PUG have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics in agreement from another writer is</p>

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	considered extremely low. 6. Based on an examination of the evidence submitted, it cannot be determined whether or not PUG wrote the questioned signature on Exhibit 8(Q2). The questioned signature on Exhibit 8(Q2) bears features frequently associated with simulated signatures. Simulations are attempts by one writer to copy the signature style of another writer. Simulations often preclude the identification of the author by comparative examination.
PGUKYE-524	1. I have found that the 'Questioned' handwriting on 'Q1' was written by Zachary Eg (K1). 2. I have found that the 'Questioned' signature on 'Q1' was written by Zachary Eg (K1). 3. I have found that the 'Questioned' writing on 'Q2' was written by Jake Pug (K2). 4. I have found that the 'Questioned' signature on 'Q2' is a simulation of the genuine signature of Zachary Eg written by an unknown author with the intention to be taken as genuine.
PXDHXK-524	Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING (ZACHARY EG): May Have (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and lack of clarity and detail of the submitted Items. However, characteristics in common were observed which indicate ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1 a-d), may have prepared the body of the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1). A definite determination could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics, the limited nature of the questioned signatures, and the lack of clarity and detail of the submitted Items. However, characteristics in common were observed which indicate that ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1 a-d), may have prepared the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1). May Not Have (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the lack of clarity and detail of the submitted items. However, dissimilarities were observed which indicate that ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1 a-d), may not have prepared the body of the questioned writing on Item 2 (Item Q2). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1 a-d), prepared the questioned signature on Item 2 (Item Q2), due to the limited nature of the questioned signature and the presence of unexplained characteristics. HANDWRITING (JAKE PUG): May Have (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics, and the lack of clarity and detail of the submitted Items. However, characteristics in common were observed which indicate that JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2 a-d), may have prepared the body of the questioned writing on Item 2 (Item Q2). May Not Have (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached due to the limited nature of the signature and the lack of clarity and detail of the submitted Items. However, dissimilarities were observed which indicate that JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2 a-d), may not have prepared the questioned signature Item 1 (Item Q1). A definite determination could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics, and the lack of clarity and detail of the submitted Items. However, dissimilarities were observed which indicate that JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2 a-d), may not have prepared the body of the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2 a-d), prepared the questioned signature on Item 2 (Item Q2) due to the limited nature of the questioned signature and the presence of unexplained characteristics.
QG7BCB-523	Dr. Eg wrote the questioned patient name, address, date, RX, MD and signature entries on document Q-1. Jake Pug wrote the questioned patient name, address, date, RX, and MD entries on document Q-2. The questioned signature entry on document Q-2 is a simulation. An opinion relative to authorship cannot be determined.
QQTA3F-524	The writings of the document (Q1), were made by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1), therefore they were not made by Jake Pug (K2). The writings of the document (Q2), were not made by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1), since they were made by Jake Pug (K2). The signing of the document (Q1), was made by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1), therefore it was not done by Jake Pug (K2). The signing of the document (Q2), was not done by Dr. Zachary Eg (K1), and was not done by Jake Pug (K2).
QRH92R-523	Handwriting: Zachary Eg(K1): Q1 (Xanax) was written by Zachary EG (K1). Q2 (Vicodin) was not written by Zachary Eg (K1). Jake Pug (K2): Q1 (Xanax) was not written by Jake Pug (K2). Q2 (Vicodin) was written by Jake Pug (K2). Signatures: Zachary Eg (K1): Q1 (Xanax) was probably written by Zachary Eg (K1). Q2 (Vicodin) cannot be identified eliminated. Jake Pug (K2): Q1



## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	(Xanax)was probably not written by Jake Pug (K2). Q2 (Vicodin) cannot be identified eliminated.
QZDDUT-524	1. The body of questioned writing (excluding the signatura) on the Prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/19 (Q1) was written by Zachary Eg (K1). 2. The body of questioned writing (excluding the signatura) on the Prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19 (Q2) was written by Jake Pug (K2). 3. The questioned signatura on the Prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/19 (Q1) was written by Zachary Eg (K1). 4. The questioned signatura on the Prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19 (Q2) cannot be identified o eliminated with Zachary Eg (K1) or Jake Plug (K2).
R2RUUR-524	The writer of the 123458 documents (EG) wrote the body of the questioned writing on the 123456 document. The writer of the 123458 documents (EG) probably wrote the questioned signature on the 123456 document. The writer of the 123459 documents (PUG) wrote the questioned writing in the body of the 123457 document. The signature on the 123457 document does not exhibit the normal and natural appearance of genuine writing. Therefore, neither the writer of the 123458 documents (EG), nor the writer of the 123459 documents (PUG) can be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on the 123457 document.
R8EM6R-523	There is substantial evidence which indicates that the questioned Q1 handwriting and signature were probably produced by the writer of the "Zachary Eg" K1 exemplars. Although this is not a conclusive identification, there are sufficient similarities to establish a strong likelihood that the writer of the exemplars wrote the questioned document. There is substantial evidence which indicates that the questioned Q2 handwriting was probably not produced by the writer of the "Zachary Eg" K1 exemplars. Although this is not a conclusive elimination, there are sufficient differences to establish a strong likelihood that the questioned handwriting was prepared by another writer. There is some evidence which indicates that the questioned Q2 signature may not have been produced by the writer of the "Zachary Eg" K1 exemplars. Although this is not a conclusive elimination, there are sufficient differences to establish a likelihood that the questioned signature was prepared by another writer. There is substantial evidence which indicates that the questioned Q2 handwriting was probably produced by the writer of the "Jake Pug" K2 exemplars. Although this is not a conclusive identification, there are sufficient similarities to establish a strong likelihood that the writer of the exemplars wrote the questioned handwriting. There is substantial evidence which indicates that the questioned Q1 handwriting was probably not produced by the writer of the "Jake Pug" K2 exemplars. Although this is not a conclusive elimination, there are sufficient differences to establish a strong likelihood that the questioned handwriting was prepared by another writer. No determination could be made as to whether or not the questioned Q1 and Q2 "Zachary Eg" signatures were produced by the writer of the "Jake Pug" K2 exemplars. This examination was limited because the exemplars of the "Zachary Eg" name consisted of a different style that exhibited a wide range of variation and were all requested or provided for the purpose of this examination, which could be potentially self-serving. There was also a lack of cursive writing within the non-requested exemplars for comparison with the questioned signatures. Therefore, a conclusive or qualified opinion could not be rendered.
RJ97FQ-523	In my opinion there is conclusive evidence that Dr Eg wrote and signed the Prescription Q1 . By this I mean that I consider that the possibility of any other person (including Jake Pug)being responsible can be excluded. In my opinion there is conclusive evidence that Jake Pug wrote the Prescription Q2. By this I mean that I consider that the possibility of any other person (including Dr Eg)being responsible can be excluded. The signature on this prescription shows a number of significant differences to the specimen signatures of Dr Eg and, in my opinion, there is conclusive evidence that he did not sign this prescription. As the signature appears to be an attempt to copy the genuine signature of Dr Eg, I am unable to determine who may have produced this signature. The evidence is inconclusive.
RTBGT9-524	3.1 Scriptural uniprocidence of the full Q1 with the K1 samples. 3.2 Scriptural uniprocidence of the full Q2 with the K2 samples. 3.3 Scriptural uniprocidence of signature Q1 with the K1 samples. 3.4 Scriptural heteroprovenance of signature Q2 with the K1 samples. 3.5 No graphic identity of signature Q2 with samples K2.

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
RTYHXY-524	Upon completion of an examination and comparison of the exhibits and standards submitted in this case, this examiner has reached the following opinions: The K1 writer did write the questioned text and signature of the Q-1 exhibit. The K2 writer did write the questioned text of the Q-2 exhibit. There is a strong probability that neither the K1 nor K2 writer wrote the questioned signature of the Q-2 exhibit. The last opinion is not conclusive due to the non-original nature of the submitted evidence. Further examination will require the submission of the original evidence.
T4RMYB-524	According to the technical analysis carried out, it is concluded: The manuscripts of the completion and signature of article Q1 recipe for xanax dated 07/31/19, is UNIPROCEDENT with the manuscript samples of DR Zachary Eg (K1 a-b, K1 c, K1 d,). The manuscript of the completion of article Q2 recipe for Vicodin dated 07/31/19, is UNIPROCEDENT with the manuscript samples of Jacke Pug (K2 b, K2 a and K2 d). The signature in article Q2 prescription for Vicodin dated 07/31/19, it is NOT possible to insert or discard Jake Pug because it does not meet the requirement of graphic similarity. The manuscripts of the completion and signature of article Q2 recipe for Vicodin of 07/31/19 are not UNIPROCEDENT with the manuscript samples of Dr. Zachary Eg (K1 a-b, K1 c, K1 d).
TXJ2CY-524	1. The questioned handwritten entries on Q1 and the known writing attributed to Zachary have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics from another writer is considered extremely low. 2. Excluding the signature, the questioned handwritten entries on Q2 and the known writing attributed to Pug, have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics from another writer is considered extremely low. 3. The questioned signature on Q2 and the known writing attributed to Zachary have some characteristics that are not in agreement. It is considered unlikely that Zachary is the writer of the questioned signature on Q2. 4. Based on an examination of the evidence submitted, it cannot be determined whether or not Pug wrote the questioned signature on Q2. 5. The primary limiting factor in findings 3 and 4 above is the quality of the questioned signature on Q2. The questioned signature on Q2 bears features commonly associated with simulation. Simulated signatures often preclude an association with the author by comparative examination.
TZQLWR-524	1.) Q1 (Xanax)(the body of questioned writing excluding the signature) - was written by Zachary Eg (K1) and was not written by Jake Pug (K2). Q2 (Vicodin)(the body of questioned writing excluding the signature) - was not written by Zachary Eg (K1) and was written by Jake Pug (K2). 2.) Q1 (Xanax) (the questioned signature) - was written by Zachary Eg (K1) and was not written by Jake Pug (K2). Q2 (Vicodin) (the questioned signature) - was not written by Zachary Eg and Jake Pug (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated.
U22NHQ-524	Dr. Eg filled out and signed Q1 but he did not fill out or sign Q2. Jake Pug contributed to the hand printing on Q2 but he could neither be identified or eliminated as the writer of the signature on Q2.
U62PQ2-524	The text of the prescription Q1 was written by Zachary Eg (K1), as well as the signature on this document. The text of the prescription Q2 was written by Jake Pug (K2). The signature on the prescription Q2 is counterfeited and wasn't written by Zachary Eg (K1). The signature on the prescription Q2 imitates of genuine signatures of Zachary Eg. Jake Pug (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated as person who wrote signature on the Q2 document.
UB448V-523	Side by side visual comparisons were performed between the question material and the known writings. Handwriting comparisons involve the characterization and evaluation of both the overt and subtle characteristics in the submitted material. It is the conclusion of this examiner that the Item Q1 hand printed material and signature were written by the writer of Item K1 which was submitted as the known writing of Dr. Zachary Eg. It is the conclusion of this examiner that the Item Q2 hand printing was written by the writer of Item K2, which was submitted as the known writing of Jake Pug. It was concluded that the questioned signature on Item Q2 was not written by the writer of Item K1. No conclusion could be reached regarding the Item Q2 signature and the known writing in Item K2. The writing of the Item Q2 signature field was relatively even in pressure, and showed what

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	appeared to be unnatural changes in direction in the lowercase y. The requested writing of the signature field reading "Zachary Eg", as written by Jake Pug, was illegible and may not represent the full range of variation of cursive writing of that writer. A finding of "was written by" is the conclusion of the examiner that the observed characteristics of the items provide extremely strong support for the hypothesis that two items came from the same writer, and that there is no support for the hypothesis that the two came from different writers.
UCV2F3-524	Graphic characteristic's study of questioned checks Q1 allows to conclude that Q1 was written by the same person. The writing is homogeneous. Graphic characteristic's study of questioned checks Q2 allows to conclude that Q2 was written by the same person. The writing is homogeneous. The comparative observation of major graphic elements, allows to conclude that Q1 was written and signed by Dr EG. The comparative observation of major graphic elements, allows to conclude that Q2 was not written by Dr EG. The comparative observation of major graphic elements allows us to conclude that Q2 was written by Jake PUG. The Q2 signature was not written by Dr EG, but it's impossible to determinate if Jake PUG signed it or not.
VGU733-524	1)A similarity between the writings on the document numbered "Q1" and the signature written on behalf of "Dr. Zachary Eg (K1)" and the comparison writings of Dr. Zachary Eg (K1) has been established and it has been concluded that writings in question and signature were written by Dr. Zachary Eg. 2)A similarity between the writings on the document numbered "Q2" and the comparison writings of Jake Pub (K2) has been established and it has been concluded that writings in question were written by Jake Pub (K2). 3)A partial resemblance in signature on the document numbered "Q2" and the comparison signatures of Jake Pub (K2) has been established and it has been concluded that signature in question were possibly signed by Jake Pub.
VMGHRA-524	The author of the K1 known handwriting and signatures wrote the questioned handwriting and signatures appearing on Q1. There is agreement in a combination of individualizing handwriting characteristics and an absence of any significant differences. The author of the K2 known handwriting wrote the questioned handwriting (excluding signature) appearing on Q2. There is agreement in a combination of individualizing handwriting characteristics and an absence of any significant differences. No conclusion could be reached regarding whether or not the author of the K1 known signatures or the author of the K2 known signatures wrote the questioned signature appearing on Q2. Neither author could be identified nor eliminated as having written the questioned signature. The Q2 signature does not appear naturally written. It has a deliberate and slow, hand-drawn appearance with blunt beginning and ending strokes and awkward pen movements that is consistent with simulation. It is seldom possible to identify the author of a simulation through handwriting comparison. The writer's attempt to emulate a model signature or disguise their own signature limits the individual characteristics of the writer being present.
VNNX22-523	The questioned Q2 "Dr. Zachary Eg" signature is a so-called slave copy forgery. In such a case, the writer try to give shape of the name bearer's signature, while block – as much as he can – the features of his own writing movement. Therefore, the signature does not reflect the unique features of the forger, so these kind of signatures can only be compare to the name holder's specimens. Thus, it is not possible to make a well-founded expert opinion on the possible origin of person K2.
VPKJNZ-523	Handwriting in Q1 was written by K1a-K1d, signature in Q1 was written by K1a-K1d, handwriting in Q2 was written by K2a-K2d, signature in Q2 was not written by K1a-K1d and K2a-K2a.
VUX27G-524	This report contains the results of the questioned document examinations. Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING (DR. ZACHARY EG): Identification: It was determined that the questioned hand printing and the "Zachary Eg" signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) were prepared by DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), prepared the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature on Item 2 (Item Q2), due to the presence of unexplained characteristics, the presence of distorted writing, and that the possibility of the use of a model signature cannot be ruled out. Distorted writing may not contain the normal handwriting characteristics of the writer(s) and it is unlikely that this writing will be identified with a specific writer(s) through a handwriting comparison. HANDWRITING (JAKE PUG): Identification: It was determined that the questioned hand printing on Item 2 (Item Q2) was

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	prepared by JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), prepared the questioned "Zachary Eg" signature on Item 2 (Item Q2), due to the presence of unexplained characteristics, the presence of distorted writing, and that the possibility of the use of a model signature cannot be ruled out. Distorted writing may not contain the normal handwriting characteristics of the writer(s) and it is unlikely that this writing will be identified with a specific writer(s) through a handwriting comparison.
VY6MVZ-524	Based upon the available evidence it is my professional opinion that the author of the non-signature writing and signature on Q1 was written by the writer of K1A-C. Based upon the available evidence it is my professional opinion that the author of the non-signature writing on Q2 was written by the writer of K2A-C. My opinion is inconclusive regarding who wrote the signature on Q2.
W9AYNM-523	Q-1 signature was authored by same hand as author of K-1. The body of writing in Q-1 was authored by same hand as author of K-1. Q-2 signature was authored by UNKNOWN hand. The body of writing in Q-2 was authored by same hand as author of K-2.
WA4KGE-524	HANDWRITING (DR. ZACHARY EG): Identification: It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1), including the signature, was prepared by DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not DR. ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d) prepared the questioned signature on Item 2 (Item Q2) due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and characteristics indicative of a simulation. Because a simulated signature does not usually contain the natural handwriting characteristics of the writer(s), it is unlikely this signature will be identified with its writer through a handwriting comparison. HANDWRITING (JAKE PUG): Identification: It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 2 (Item Q2), excluding the signature, was prepared by JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2a-d) prepared the questioned signature on Item 2 (Item Q2) due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and characteristics indicative of a simulation. Because a simulated signature does not usually contain the natural handwriting characteristics of the writer(s), it is unlikely this signature will be identified with its writer through a handwriting comparison.
WQVKAY-524	Q1: Very strong evidence to support the proposition that this document was written and signed by Dr Zachary. Very strong evidence to support the proposition that this document was not written by Jake Pug. Q2: Very strong evidence to support the proposition that this document was written by Jake Pug. Very strong evidence to support the proposition that this document was not written by Dr Zachary. Strong evidence to support the proposition that this document was not signed by Dr Zachary. Inconclusive as to whether or not it was signed by Jake Pug.
WQWBJ3-524	a). The manual writings and the signature of the Xanax Prescription (Q1) PRESENTS GRAPHIC IDENTITY with the scriptural samples and extra-process documents of Mr. ZACHARY EG (K1a - K1d). b). The manual writings of the Vicodin Prescription (Q2) PRESENTS GRAPHIC IDENTITY with the scriptural samples and extra-process documents of Mr. JAKE PUG (K2a - K2d). c). The signature of the Vicodin Prescription (Q2) DOES NOT PRESENT GRAPHIC IDENTITY with the scriptural samples and extra-process documents of Mr. ZACHARY EG (K1a - K1d) and is therefore an IMITATION that does not allow an author to be determined.
WTZ737-524	Q2 signature maybe written by a third party, but K2 couldn't rule out the imitation.
WZZXHA-523	writings on Q1 and writings of Zachary known K1(s) were compared and findings below were pointed; gaps between letters, size of letters, style of connection lines between letters (e.g.: hand-writings style between e and r in word of "sterling" and k and e in word of "Jake"), caligraphic features such as the slope of the upper line in letter J in word Jake, the slope of the parallel lines of all three strokes of letter E in word "Eg", ending stroke of letter a in word Max and Day. As per these findings listed above our conclusion is that writing on Q1 were written by Zachary Eg. signatures on Q1 and signatures of Zachary known K1(s) were compared and findings below were pointed; majuscule style of beginning the signature, slope of the lines drawn after z-liked letter, alignment of

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>Z-liked letter and the rest of the signature, connection style of E-liked letter and g-liked letter, slope and the length of the ending line of g-liked letter. As per these findings listed above our conclusion is that signature on Q1 was drawn by Zachary Eg. writings on Q2 and writings of Jake Pug known K2(s) were compared and findings below were pointed; characteristic view of letter R in word Rose, narrow gap in letter p in word "Pug", ending style of letter n in word "Vicodin", sharp style of upper-edge of letter n in word "Vicodin", letter b-liked drawn style of number-6. As per these findings listed above our conclusion is that writing on Q2 were written by Jake Pug. signatures on Q2 and signatures of Zachary Eg known K1(s) and Jake known K2(s) were compared and findings below were pointed; it is so explicit and dramatic that the construction of lines of signature Q2 is so loose, there is wide gaps between figures of signature, round form of E-liked letter. however the known signatures of Zachary Eg is not compatible with the features of the signature Q2 in terms of the following such as ; skill level of drawing signature, alignment of Z-liked letter and the rest of the signature, as per these finding listed above our conclusion is that signature on Q2 was not drawn by Zachary Eg. apart from this, When a person imitates someone else's signature, he/she involuntarily-unintentionally reflects his or her own signature habits to the signature he/she wants to imitate. it has been determined that Jake has not signed his own signature. Instead he signed as "zachary eg". because of this deficiency it can not be determined if he signed or not signed signature on Q2</p>
XAZH9L-524	<p>Examination and comparison of questioned items #Q1 and #Q2 with known items #K1(a-d) and #K2(a-d) resulted in the following opinions: The questioned writing and signature on item #Q1 was written by the writer of items #K1(a-d), Dr. Zachary Eg. The non-signature writing on item #Q2 was written by the writer of item #K2(a-d), Jake Pug. Dr. Zachary Eg and Jake Pug can neither be identified nor excluded as the writer of the questioned signature on item #Q2. The possibility that the item #Q2 signature is an attempt by Jake Pug to simulate a genuine signature of Dr. Zachary Eg or an attempt by Dr. Zachary Eg to disguise his own signature cannot be excluded.</p>
XULEK6-523	<p>FIRST. The questioned handwriting on the prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/2019 and named as Q1A; CORRESPONDS TO the handwriting provided by ZACHARY EG. SECOND. The questioned handwriting on the prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/2019 and named as Q1A; DOES NOT CORRESPOND TO the handwriting provided by JAKE PUG. THIRD. The questioned handwriting on the prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/2019 and named as Q2A; DOES NOT CORRESPOND TO the handwriting provided by ZACHARY EG. FOURTH. The questioned handwriting on the prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/2019 and named as Q2A; CORRESPONDS TO the handwriting provided by JAKE PUG. FIFTH. The questioned signature on the prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/2019 and named as Q1B; the result corresponds to an AUTHENTIC SIGNATURE for ZACHARY EG. SIXTH. The questioned signature on the prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/2019 and named as Q1B; the result corresponds to a FALSE SIGNATURE for JAKE PUG. SEVENTH. The questioned signature on the prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/2019 and named as Q2B; the result corresponds to a FALSE SIGNATURE for ZACHARY EG. EIGHTH. The questioned signature on the prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/2019 and named as Q2B; the result corresponds to a FALSE SIGNATURE for JAKE PUG.</p>
Y2NKZ9-523	<p>It can be seen that signature on Q2 was imitated from signature on Q1 which was written by Dr. Zachary Eg and it is difficult to give conclusive answer for who wrote the signature. As the result answer can only exclude the writer of Dr. Zachary Eg but can not determine who is the simulator.</p>
YDHRLY-523	<p>First: the writing and signature questioned that appear in the document Q1 (Xanax), correspond to Zachary eg. Second: the writing and signature questioned that appear in the document Q2 (Vicodin), does not correspond to Zachary Eg. Third: the writing questioned that appear in the document Q2 (Vicodin), correspond to Jake Pug. Fourth: the signature questioned that appear in the document Q2 (Vicodin), presents discrepancies in their graphics elements with the base check writing provided so it is likely not to correspond to Jake Pug.</p>
YJL93Q-524	<p>The prescription (Q1), was written by Dr. Zachary Eg. including the signature. The prescription (Q2), was written by Jake Pug. excluding the signature. The prescription (Q2) signature, was not written by Dr. Zachary Eg., and can not be identified or eliminated by Jake Pug.</p>



## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
YU4HYX-524	<p>Body of Questioned Writing (excluding the signature entry): Visual examination, comparison and evaluation resulted in the following: 3.1A1 Q1 - The handwritten entries depicted on item Q1 were written by Dr. Zachary Eg, author of the K1 known writing samples. 3.1A2 Q1 - The handwritten entries depicted on item Q1 were not written by Jake Pug, author of the K2 known writing samples. 3.1B1 Q2 - The handwritten entries depicted on item Q2 were written by Jake Pug- author of the K2 known writing samples. 3.1b2 Q2 - The handwritten entries depicted on item Q2 were not written by Dr. Zachary Eg, author of the K1 known writing samples. Signature Entry: Visual examination, comparison and evaluation resulted in the following: 3.2a1) Q1 -The "Zachary Eg" signature entry depicted on item Q1 was written by Dr. Zachary Eg - author of the K1 known writing samples. 3.2a2) Q1 - The "Zachary Eg" signature entry depicted on item Q1 was not written by Jake Pug- author of the K2 known writing samples. 3.2b1) Q2 - The "Zachary Eg" signature entry depicted on item Q2 was not written by Dr. Zachary Eg- author of the K1 known writing samples. 3.2b2 Q2 - No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not Jake Pug - author of the K2 known writing samples wrote the " Zachary Eg" signature entry as depicted on item Q2. The "Zachary Eg" signature entry depicted on item Q2 is a simulation of a genuine "Zachary Eg" signature. When a signature is simulated, it is copied or drawn from a genuine model signature and the simulation does not contain the true handwriting habit patterns of the writer (simulator), for this reason Jake Pug (K2) can neither be identified nor eliminated as the author of the "Zachary Eg" signature entry depicted on item Q2.</p>
YYWPBE-524	<p>Q1 Handwriting: Similarities were noted between the questioned and specimen handwriting attributed to the K1 author in terms of pictorial similarity, size and size relationships, construction characteristics, fluency and speed, together with no significant differences. Notwithstanding the limitations imposed by the non-original nature of the specimen and questioned material, I concluded the author of the specimen handwriting attributed to the K1 author wrote the questioned handwriting. Q1 Signature: The questioned signature's attributes fit well within the range of variation exhibited by the specimen signatures attributed to the K1 author. Accordingly, I concluded the author of the specimen signatures attributed to the K1 author wrote the questioned signature. Q2 Handwriting: Similarities were noted between the questioned and specimen handwriting attributed to the K2 author in terms of pictorial similarity, size and size relationships, construction characteristics, fluency and speed, together with no significant differences. Notwithstanding the limitations imposed by the non-original nature of the specimen and questioned material, I concluded the author of the specimen handwriting attributed to the K2 author wrote the questioned handwriting. Q2 Signature: The questioned signature bears gross pictorial similarities to all the specimen signatures. However, there were a number of unresolved differences between the Q2 signature and the specimen K1 and K2 signatures. These differences could not be resolved based on the specimens provided. Accordingly, the examination to determine authorship of the Q2 signature was inconclusive with respect to the authors of the specimen signatures attributed to the K1 and K2 authors.</p>
Z2KBPM-523	<p>Based on the examination and comparison of Exhibits Q1 and Q2 with Exhibits K1a through K1d and K2a through K2d, the following has been determined: Dr. Zachary Eg (Exhibits K1a through K1d) wrote the questioned entries depicted on Exhibit Q1. Dr. Zachary Eg (Exhibits K1a through K1d) did not write the questioned hand printed entries depicted on Exhibit Q2. Dr. Zachary Eg (Exhibits K1a through K1d) probably did not write the questioned signature depicted on Exhibit Q2. Jake Pug (Exhibits K2a through K2d) did not write the questioned hand printed entries depicted on Exhibit Q1. Jake Pug (Exhibits K2a through K2d) wrote the questioned hand printed entries depicted on Exhibit Q2. Jake Pug (Exhibits K2a through K2d) probably did not write the questioned signature depicted on Exhibit Q1. It cannot be determined whether Jake Pug (Exhibits K2a through K2d) wrote the questioned signature depicted on Exhibit Q2. The qualified and inconclusive findings are necessitated by the submission of non-original questioned exhibits, limited of comparable cursive writing submitted for examination, and in some cases characteristics of simulation (e.g., blunt strokes, pen lifts, and shaky line quality) observed in the questioned signature.</p>
Z3DAXU-524	<p>HANDWRITING - Questioned handwriting on "Q1": 1. In view of the significant similarities observed between the questioned and specimen handwriting, the questioned handwriting on "Q1"</p>

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>was written by Zachary Eg, the writer of the known specimen handwriting on "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d". 2. In view of the significant differences observed between the questioned and specimen handwriting, the questioned handwriting on "Q1" was not written by Jake Pug, the writer of the known specimen handwriting on "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d". Questioned handwriting on "Q2": 3. In view of the significant similarities observed between the questioned and specimen handwriting, the questioned handwriting on "Q2" was written by Jake Pug, the writer of the known specimen handwriting on "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d". 4. In view of the significant differences observed between the questioned and specimen handwriting, the questioned handwriting on "Q2" was not written by Zachary Eg, the writer of the known specimen handwriting on "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d". SIGNATURES - Questioned signature on "Q1": 5. In view of the significant similarities observed between the questioned and specimen signatures, the questioned signature on "Q1" was written by Zachary Eg, the writer of the known specimen signatures on "K1c" and "K1d". 6. In view of the significant differences observed between the questioned and specimen signatures, the questioned signature in "Q1" was not written by Jake Pug, the writer of the known specimen signatures on "K2c". Questioned signature on "Q2": 7. In view of the differences observed between the questioned and specimen signatures, it is unlikely that the questioned signature in "Q2" was written by Zachary Eg, the writer of the known specimen signatures and handwriting on "K1a" to "K1d". 8. In view of the similarities and differences observed between the questioned and specimen signatures, and taking into consideration the limited comparable features, it is inconclusive as to whether the questioned signature on "Q2" was written by Jake Pug, the writer of the known specimen signatures and handwriting on "K2a" to "K2d".</p>
Z7VYBY-524	<p>Have thoroughly examined and found that handwriting and signature on document Q1 and handwriting and signature of Dr. Zachary Eg have the same features of writing, shape and handwriting characteristics. Therefore commented that it is the handwriting and the signature of the same person. The handwriting on the document Q2 and the handwriting of Jake Pug have the same features of writing, shape and handwriting characteristics. Therefore commented that it is the handwriting of the same person. For the signature on the document Q2 and the signature of Dr. Zachary Eg and the handwriting of the word "Dr. Zachary Eg" of Jake Pug, have different features of writing, shape and handwriting characteristics. Therefore gave an opinion that it was not the signature of both of them.</p>
ZLKW3Y-524	<p>a.- The writings in document Q1 (doubted) of the prescription for "Xanax 0.5 mg" dated "7/31/19" with letterhead "Dr. Zachary Eg M.D" PRESENTS GRAPHIC UNIPROCEDENCE, against the calligraphic reference samples (K1a-b-c-d) of Dr. Zachary Eg. b.- The writings in document Q2 (doubted) of the prescription for "Vicodin / # 500" dated "7/31/19" with letterhead "Dr. Zachary Eg M:D" PRESENTS GRAPHIC UNIPROCEDENCE, against the calligraphic reference samples (K2a-b-c-d) of Mr. Jake Pug. c.- The signature that works in the lower left area on the pre-printed "Signature" line of document Q1 (doubted) of the prescription for "Xanax 0.5 mg" dated "7/31/19" with letterhead "Dr. Zachary Eg M.D" PRESENTS GRAPHIC UNIPROCEDENCE, against the calligraphic reference samples (K1a-b-c-d) of Dr. Zachary Eg. d.- The investigated signature that works in document Q2 of the prescription for "Vicodin / # 500" dated "7/31/19" with letterhead of "Dr Zachary Eg MD" arranged in the lower right area on the preprinted line "Signature" IS NOT IDENTIFIED against calligraphic reference samples (K1a-b-c-d) of Dr. Zachary Eg. e.- IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO DETERMINE UNIPROCEDENCE OR HETEROPROCEDENCE of the investigated firm that works in document Q2 of the prescription for "Vicodin / # 500" dated "7/31/19" with letterhead of "Dr Zachary Eg MD" provided in the lower right area on the preprinted "Signature" line and the calligraphic reference samples (K2a-b-c-d), of Mr. Jake Pug close to the present graphological confrontation.</p>
ZP34HL-524	<p>Similar comparison elements are observed in the writing in the identified document Q1, when compared with the known samples in the documents identified K1a-b and K1d. However, there are dissimilarities when the known samples K1a-b and K1d are compared with the identified document Q2. Dissimilar comparison elements are observed in the writing in the identified document Q1, when compared with the known samples K2a-b and K2d. However, there are similarities when comparing the known samples K2a-b and K2d with the identified document Q2. Similar comparison elements are observed in the signature in the identified document Q1, when compared</p>

## TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>with the signatures in the identified document K1c. However, there are dissimilarities when compared to the signature of the identified document Q2. Differences are observed in the comparison elements in the signature present in the identified document Q1, when compared with the signatures in the identified document K2c. However, there are indications of similarity when compared to the signatures in the document identified Q2. Jake Pug cannot be dismissed as the author of Dr. zachary Eg's signature in the document identified Q2. She has the ability to have made such a signature, with probability she has changed her own writing habits. That is why I have to conclude that I probably wrote, since the indications alternative is not provided.</p>
ZUZFKD-523	<p>Q1 Handwriting: Similarities and lack of fundamental differences observed compared to K1 specimen writer. In my opinion, the Q1 handwritten entries were produced by the K1 writer. Q2 Handwriting: Similarities and lack of fundamental differences observed compared to K2 specimen writer. In my opinion, the Q2 handwritten entries were produced by the K2 writer. Q1 signature: Similarities and lack of fundamental differences observed between Q1 signature and the K1 specimen signatures. In my opinion, the Q1 signature is a genuine EG signature (K1 writer). Q2 signature: Differences were observed between the Q2 signature and the K1 specimen signatures. In my opinion, the Q2 signature is not a genuine EG signature (K1 writer). My opinion regarding authorship of this signature is inconclusive.</p>
ZVBG7C-524	<p>It is my opinion that: 1. The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned signature appearing on the document, item Q1, was written by the writer of the Dr Zachary Eg specimen signatures, items K1a-d. 2. The questioned signature on the document item Q2, appears to be the product of a simulation/disguise process. Due to the nature of such signatures, it is not possible to express an opinion regarding authorship. 3. The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting appearing on the document, item Q1, was written by the writer of the Dr Zachary Eg handwriting specimens, items K1a,b,d. 4. The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting appearing on the document, item Q2, was written by the writer of the Jake Peg handwriting specimens, items K2a,b,d.</p>



# Additional Comments

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
2LJ9FT-524	The "C" response is justified by restrictions on the side of evidence. The questioned signature on Prescription Q2 (Vicodin) was qualified only to establish its authenticity , i.e. to compare with Zachary's Eg (K2) graphism, at the same time it does not qualify for comparison with Jake's Pug (K2) graphism.
2XBRVK-524	Specimen signatures on K2a, K2b and K2c were simulated specimen signatures written by Jake Pug (not original signature of "Jake Pug"). The specimen signatures could be disguised and differences observed would not be significant to indicate different writers. Therefore, Jake Pug can not be identified or eliminated as the writer of questioned signature 'Q2'
37N4MQ-523	The prescription (Q2) signature cannot be Identified or Eliminated by neither Jake Pug. or any other person except Dr.Zachary Eg.
3LGVDP-524	[Laboratory] have a nine grade scale of conclusions: +4, +3, +2, +1, 0, -1, -2, -3, -4
42TPKL-523	The Q2 "Zachary Eg" signature exhibits characteristics of a simulated signature compared to the naturally executed genuine signatures of Dr. Zachary Eg. The nature of the Q2 "Zachary Eg" simulated signature precludes a meaningful comparison and conclusion with the known writing of Jake Pug (K2a-d).
48EJHJ-524	The Q2 signature "Zachary Eg" exhibits some observed differences from the known signature of Zachary Eg, which indicates he is probably not the writer of the signature, Q2. However, the Q2 signature could be a simulated forgery written by Jake Pug, K2.
4J7BZ3-524	Understanding the above [Table 2: Conclusions], it is clear that graphological studies on illegible signatures by way of imitation, it is not possible to establish with certainty who or those who intervened in the elaboration of the manuscripts of the same position since the own graphic gesture is not being shaped but by the On the contrary, approximations or copies of the gesture of another person are made, which affects the scriptural graphic result without leaving enough proper aspects to identify the possible author of the writings of doubt.
4LA7K6-524	No conclusion Zachary Eg, K1 and Jake Pug, K2 with Q2 signature. Could not rule out possible simulation with the Q2 signature.
4Q8PNP-523	The submission of the original documents represented by Exhibits Q1, Q2, K1(a-d) and K2(a-d) may provide the basis for additional conclusions.
4U72JP-523	The signature examination of the questioned prescription paper for vicodin revealed that it shows some general similarities with the authentic signature of Dr. Zachary Eg, which is in contradiction with major differences raised in intrinsic characteristics of the writer. This questioned signature has no specific characteristic of Dr. Zachary Eg, and then cannot be assigned to him. It results from an imitation. Its confrontation with the signatures of Jake Pug (dictated) reveals many differences between them and some partial similarities (observed in the form of letter "g"). These similarities don't allow to attribute the questioned signature to Jake Pug. However, the differences don't eliminate him from being the author.
68TN9G-524	The examples for Jake Pat contain natural writing while the signature on Q2 is an imitation signature and therefore it is difficult to see if there is a connection.The signature on Q2 does not contain Jake pat's personal handwriting characteristics and therefor we couldn't determine whether he wrote it or someone else.
6M672G-524	4. The level "C" results (no conclusion) were arrived at as a result of there being too few comparable letter forms and stylised signature elements between the questioned Zachary Eg signatures on documents Q1 and Q2 and the specimen handwriting and signatures (the latter being written in the name Zachary Eg) attributed to Jake Pug on the K2 documents. Although instructions were received to treat the submitted photographs as original documents, it is not possible to extract the same level of detail from the signatures and handwriting from a photograph as from original

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	documents. Therefore, the examinations have been limited to an extent by the reproduction nature of the documents. Where necessary, findings have been appropriately qualified taking into account this limitation and other intrinsic limitations to the examination and possibly more than if I had been provided with the originals. In addition, with the benefit of the original questioned documents, examinations using oblique lighting techniques and the ESDA would be undertaken for the possible presence of latent writing impressions which may reveal other information of potential relevance to determining the origins and/or history of the document. Other standard forensic examination techniques, such as the use of the Video Spectral Comparator to examine and compare the paper and ink, could be considered for use in determining other issues with respect to the preparations of the original questioned documents.
762XFM-524	Due to the limited amount of comparable material available for comparison of the Jake Pug (S2) signature specimens with the Q2 signature – the short length of the “Zachary Eg” signature, and the suitability of only “Zachary” in the S2 signatures – in combination with the evidence suggesting that the Q2 signature is an attempted simulation of the true signature of Zachary Eg, no conclusion could be reached regarding whether or not Jake Pug (S2) wrote the Q2 signature.
7923AV-523	The questioned signature of the prescription named as Q2, is an imitation of that of Doctor Zachary Eg. Limited signatures include few or no elements of the handwriting characteristics of the author, as he copies the external forms of the signature, in an act that differs from a natural handwriting, this causing difficulties for a possible identification. The reduced extension of the questioned signature, in this case, adds up to the difficulties mentioned before. For that reason, it will not be possible, in this case, neither identify nor exclude the possibility that Mr. Jake Pug might have written it. However, the comparative study of that signature with the known handwriting of Mr. Jake Pug, in the provided documents, allows to find certain common elements with the questioned signature. Even if these analogies are considered insufficient to formulate a conclusion of common authorship, they aim at not excluding him of such possibility.
7CZBMH-524	The examination of the signature on Item Q2 was hindered by the slowly drawn nature of the writing line. It should be noted that the Technical Review was conducted by [Name].
7E4AVP-524	These conclusions were all based upon the limited supplied known standards that were photographic digital reproductions. If possible, original known writings/signatures of both Dr. Zachary Eg and Jake Pug with at least 25 standards in total should be submitted to me for further examinations.
7HL2TT-524	A writing analysis was carried out on the signature identified as dc-001-2019-DQ-Q2 with the Jake Pug check writing, since the signature is semi-readable in structure and allows it to be confronted with the writing in order to confirm the result obtained in the signature analysis related to that questioned element
7ZQ99U-524	The "Zachary Eg" signature on the prescription labeled Q2 bore consistent differences between the "Zachary Eg" signatures submitted for both K1-Zachary Eg and K2-Jake Pug. Although the "Zachary Eg" signature on Q2 most resembled the specimens submitted for K1-Zachary Eg, the Q2 signature bore tremor and subtle differences from those submitted for K1-Zachary Eg. The signature on Q2 bore indications of slow preparation. However I do not believe the signature on Q2 is above the skill level of either writer K1-Zachary Eg or K2-Jake Pug.
8KCW77-524	As the K2 ‘signatures’ are not in the name of the K2 writer, this comparison is more akin to a handwriting examination than a true signature examination. The conclusion scale used within this laboratory is: The evidence provides very strong support for proposition X over proposition Y. i.e. The evidence very strongly favours one proposition over the other. The evidence provides strong support for proposition X over proposition Y. i.e. The evidence strongly favours one proposition over the other. The evidence provides moderate support for proposition X over proposition Y. i.e. The evidence moderately favours one proposition over the other. The evidence provides approximately equal support for proposition X and proposition Y. i.e. The evidence does not differentiate between the propositions because the probability of the evidence given each proposition is roughly equal. This is an inconclusive opinion with regard to potential writer.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
8UZNTX-524	No opinion Q2 signature and K2 writer: The questioned signature on the prescription in Item #4 (Q2) is abbreviated and contains some elements of unnaturalness. This signature may be an attempt to simulate the signature of Zachary Eg (Item #1/K1). The act of simulation usually suppresses a writer's natural characteristics to an extent that precludes identification. Therefore, no opinion can be offered regarding this signature and the writer of the known Jake Pug samples in Item #2 (K2).
98G8K6-524	Q2 - Signature: Based on features such as the slow execution and the general design, it was not possible to determine if the questioned signature was executed by Dr. Zachary Eg as a disguised process (for later denial) or executed by someone else than Dr. Zachary Eg as a simulation process.
A97NHK-524	The quality of photographs provided for the test could be better. The photographs that used for the examination are assumed to be true and accurate reproduction of their original documents. The conclusions rendered in the report depend much on the quality and also the amount of handwritten entries provided for examination and comparison. In this CTS handwriting testing, Test No. 19-542, the amount of the questioned handwritten entries in Q1 and Q2 was found to be rather limited for comparison, nevertheless characteristics in the handwriting in respect to the stroke quality, formation of letters and numerals and their linkage and pen lift were noted while comparing with the respective specimens provided. The inconclusive result rendered for the authorship of the questioned signature against 'Signature:' shown "Q2" vs "K2a" to "K2c" was due to the differences noted in the design and stroke quality between them. The possibility that it could be simulated by the writer of "K2a" to "K2c" cannot be ruled out.
A9ABUR-524	There are irregularities in the line quality and letter formation observed when comparing the signature on the prescription, Q-2, and the known writing of K-2. As a patient, K-2 had legitimate signatures of Dr Zachary Eg available for observation for simulation.
ABZCZF-524	The potential that the "Zachary Eg" signature on Item Q2 is a simulation was one of the limiting factors in the examination. It is usually not possible to identify or eliminate any potential authors of a simulated signature.
ADYXJ6-524	1) It would be standard practice to undertake ESDA examination of the questioned documents. 2) With respect to examination responses: a 'C' was entered as a conclusion with respect to the Q2 signature and the K1 and K2 specimen writers. The absence of any habitual natural features or characteristics in the Q2 signature make it impossible to conduct a meaningful comparison. Thus, from a strict logical approach, there are sufficient grounds to render an inconclusive opinion regarding authorship of the Q2 signature by the K1 and K2 writers - notwithstanding that the Q1 signature has already been identified as being produced by the K1 author, and that the Q2 writing has been identified as being produced by the K2 author.
B8PYPR-523	The signature at issue on prescription Q2 cannot be compared to the request exemplars prepared by Jake Pug. The request exemplars represent Jake Pug signing the name of Dr. Zachary Eg in his normal cursive writing, while the signature of Dr. Eg on item Q2 is a simulation of his authentic signature style. A simulation is an attempt by an individual to copy or imitate the signature of another and in so doing that person hides his own characteristics.
BBR2BL-523	The questioned "Zachary Eg" signature on item No. Q2 exhibits characteristics associated with simulated writing.
BRKZUP-524	This examination was limited because only three known non-request or course-of-business "Zachary Eg" signatures were submitted for comparison. If additional known, non-request or course-of-business "Zachary Eg" signatures are submitted, produced by Dr. Zachary Eg, additional examinations can be conducted, and a more definitive opinion may be reached.
BU3RNK-523	a. According to dictated exemplars and requested signatures for Dr. Zachary Eg, the type of writing of the known writings for Dr. Zachary Eg is different from the questioned signature on Q2(Vicodin). b. The questioned signature on Q2(Vicodin) is similar with requested signatures for Dr. Zachary Eg, but the internal consistency cannot be identified. c. According to dictated exemplars and requested signatures for Dr. Jake Pug, the type of writing of the known writings for Jake Pug is different from the questioned signature on Q2(Vicodin), but the possibility of imitation by Jake Pug or others

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	cannot be eliminated. d. Therefore, the questioned signature on Q2(Vicodin) CANNOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED.
BYXHWG-524	We examined the materials as if they have been originals.
CT6YAC-524	No conclusion was reached regarding whether Dr. Eg or Mr. Pug wrote the signature on Item Q2. Although there are significant differences between the questioned signature and the known signature samples, there are also features and characteristics of the questioned signature that are consistent with an effort to simulate (freehand imitate) the signature style of Dr. Eg. The simulation of another person's signature is often an effective disguise of a writer's true handwriting habits. For this reason, the maker of a simulated signature is not normally identifiable by means of comparative handwriting examination. Furthermore, simulated signatures cannot always be differentiated from signatures that have been disguised by the legitimate writer of the signature. In this case, the features and characteristics of the questioned signature may have resulted from an effort to disguise the normal signature style of Dr. Eg. The small number of course-of-business signatures by Dr. Eg was also a limitation during this examination.
DD7BE4-524	Specimen signatures for K2 were simulated signatures of Zachary Eg by Jake Pug. As such, there was high possibility of disguise and any differences observed could be the result of this. These specimen signatures (K2) also have very few points of comparison against the questioned signatures Q1 and Q2. As no significant similarities were observed between specimen signatures K2 and the questioned signature Q2, therefore, Jake Pug CANNOT BE IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED as the writer of signature Q2.
E33FXK-523	Similarities were observed between the questioned signature on the prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19 (Q2) and the known writing and signature of Jake Pug (K2) on the construction of the letter "a" and the upper parts of the letters "y" and "g", also differences were observed on the letter "E" and the lower parts of the letters "g" and "y". However, based on the characteristics of the similarities and the differences observed, Jake Pug (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on the prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19 (Q2).
EBVVK4-524	In cases when signature is simulated to identify the imitator difficult, often impossible. We found not only differences, but similarities between the Q2 questioned signature and the samples of K2, therefore we could not eliminate and could not identify him.
EDMKCB-524	In this particular case, the signature in the name of Zachary Eg on the questioned document, Q2, exhibits hesitation, lack of fluidity, may be unnaturally prepared and could be an attempt at disguise or deliberation. Without the submission of original questioned documents, it cannot be determined if there was any attempt at simulation, tracing or if a model was used to create the signature. Furthermore, additional known writings from Jake Pug signing the name Zachary Eg should be submitted for comparison.
EZCGH2-523	The appearance of questioned signature in Q2 is similar to the signature of Dr. Zachary Eg(K1). Therefore, the questioned signature in Q2 is a signature that is imitated by someone. The characteristics of the questioned signature in Q2 do not reflect enough the writing habits of the writer. It could not be determined whether Jake Pug(K2) wrote the questioned signature in Q2.
F7KZHE-523	Although the K2-writer is the person who wrote the Q2 questioned writing there is no specific evidence to "connect" him with the signature in the same questioned document. That's why the "no conclusion" is the best choice because some imitation was observed (significantly limiting factor).
FJ8A3Y-523	The formation of the Q2 questioned signature is different from the known writing of Jake Pug(K2). Therefore they lack of basis for comparison.
FLEPCQ-524	The author of the signature cannot be identified, since the signature presents the same morphology of the signature signature, but it presents tremors, lack of speed, dynamics, the box of the line is different.
FR2BNJ-524	Given the characteristics found in the Signature made in (Q2) and compared to the reference

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	standard signatures (K1a), (K1b), (K1c), (K1d) made by Dr. Zachary Eg there is no graphic identity. Similarly, they were checked against the reference patterns (K2a)(K2b)(K2c) made by Mr. Jake Pug, there is no graphic identity. Therefore, it can be said that the signature in question is an imitation from which its autor cannot be determined.
FU9U6R-524	The signed name "Zachary Eg" on Q-2 appears to be a "Simulated Forgery" written by someone who is familiar with or has access to the Known signatures of Mr. EG. The author of a "Simulated Forgery" cannot be identified nor eliminated because the forger gives up their own writing habits and characteristics in order to try and copy or duplicate the victim's signature.
FVZN83-524	This is an inconclusive result because the questioned and known signatures bear a combination of similarities and dissimilarities and there are indications that the Q2 signature is a simulation. It is unreasonable and not appropriate to assign a conclusion of authorship or non-authorship given the evidence submitted. Therefore, no conclusion as to authorship can be provided.
G62ZRG-524	The body of questioned writing in our above conclusion means all handwritings including Name of Dr. Zachary Eg.( excluding the signature ).
GF7JFJ-523	The questioned signature on Q2 refers to the overall construction of the authentic signature. Disturbances were found in the strokes of questioned signature and in its details. During the creation of a simulated forgery, the writer attempts to duplicate the writing style of origin signature. By doing this, the forger leaves behind little, if any, of his own distinctive writing style. Therefore, it is not possible to determine who has written questioned signature Q2.
GJMQV7-524	The specimen signatures (requested specimens K2a, K2b and K2c) were simulated specimen signatures of "Dr. Zachary Eg" written by "Jake Pug". These specimen signatures were not original signatures of "Jake Pug" and therefore there is a possibility of disguise. Hence, I was not able to identified or eliminated "Jake Pug" as the writer of the questioned signature "Q2".
GNYR2B-524	C Responses: As it has not been possible to identify the author of the Q1 signature it is not possible to exclude Jake Pug. The Q2 signature is the product of unnatural writing behaviour so no opinion regarding its authorship has been possible.
HC38V4-523	Cs were given for the signature on Q2 as the question relates to authorship and the signature is dissimilar to both sets of known signatures.
HMG7L7-523	There are some same writing features and some different writing features between the signatures of Q2 and K2, so the C is the suitable conclusion.
J9UCN7-524	The Q2 questioned signature is pictorially similar to the Q1 questioned signature and exemplar signatures attributed to Dr. Zachary Eg. The Q2 signature may be a simulation. The printed "Dr Zachary Eg. M.D." text are not in the same relative position on the Q1 and Q2 prescriptions while the remaining printed text is. Additionally, there the spacing is wider between the "Eg" and "M.D." printed text on the Q1 prescription in comparison to the Q2 prescription.
JJW69D-524	The signature in suspicious prescription Q2 is written slowly and unnaturally it is an imitation of the authentic signature of Dr.Zuchury Eg. The person who imitated this signature did not write with his handwriting and cannot be identified, but also cannot claim that Juke Puy did not write the qeshioned signature.
JMEW6T-524	A simulation is generally an attempt to imitate the signature or writing of another person. As a result, a simulation is not naturally prepared writing and a handwriting comparison between the simulation and natural writing is of little or no value in determining the author. Because a simulation contains few or none of the handwriting characteristics of the preparer, it is doubtful if the signature will ever be identified with the writings of a known individual.
JMEYUX-523	"C" response, Cannot be Identified or Eliminated, for Q2 signature and Jake Pug (K2): There is a lack of sufficient, comparable cursive writing in the K2 known writing submitted. Many of the first name "Zachary" entries in the known writing have illegible/distorted portions and the last name "Eg" is printed rather than written. The signature on Item Q2 contains indications that it may be an

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	attempt to simulate a genuine signature of Zachary Eg (K1). When a signature is simulated it is copied or drawn and so often does not fully display the normal identifying characteristics of the writer, which prevents a definite identification or elimination of the writer. Other comments: I would do a VSC exam of the inks and ESDA on Q1 and Q2 in a real case. I think that they should offer "Indications Did" and "Indications Did Not" in the choices of conclusions. The instructions say that the probable categories are "some degree" of elimination or identification, so I guess that is supposed to cover it. But it would be good to have wording consistent with what the field is doing.
JZZ7V6-524	The questioned signature appearing on Item Q2 appears to have been written somewhat slowly and could be an attempt to simulate the genuine signature of Zachary Eg. The submission of the original Item Q2 may allow for a more definitive conclusion.
K7H268-524	An indented writing examination of Q1 and Q2 may provide some additional information helpful to the investigation.
KRNCEG-524	For Q1; The prescription was written and signed by K1 (Dr Zachary). For Q2; The prescription was written by K2 (Jake Pug). The prescription was not signed by Dr Zachary. Indeed it was copied by someone else. However there is not enough indication that it was signed by Jake Pug.
KRP6A4-523	Digital copies of the submitted images are being retained by the Forensic Document Unit. Definitions of Handwriting Opinions: The opinion "identification" means that the evidence contained in the handwriting is in agreement in the individualizing characteristics and there are no significant, inexplicable differences between the questioned and known writings; therefore the writings have common authorship. The opinion "could not be identified to nor eliminated from" means that the evidence contained in the handwriting has minimal significant similarities or significant differences and there are limiting factors. This is the zero point of the confidence scale, and the examiner does not have a leaning one way or another. The opinion "probable not" means that the evidence contained in the handwriting points rather strongly against the questioned and known writings having been written by the same individual. However, it falls short of the "virtually certain" degree of confidence. The opinion "elimination" means that the evidence contained in the handwriting has significant differences between the questioned and known writings; therefore the writings do not have common authorship.
KZYT3-524	The qualified opinions expressed above are due in part to the nature of the questioned signature appearing on the Exhibit Q2 item. Portions of the questioned signature are slowly and deliberately executed and it appears to be a simulation of a genuine signature of the K1 author.
LFTFVF-523	The submission of more known writing from both writers in the form of exact-text exemplars and/or normal-course-of-business writings containing hand printing, cursive, and signatures may provide the basis for additional conclusions. Exhibits K1a through K1d, K2a through K2d, Q1 and Q2 were digitally preserved and processed. Exhibits K1a through K2d, K2a through K2d, Q1 and Q2 will be returned.
LGKGV-524	The writer of K2a-d appears to have written out all of the letters in the word "Zachery". The K2a-d writer did not write the word "Eg" in cursive script. Therefore, no cursive sample of the word "Eg" was submitted by the K2a-d writer. He cannot be identified or eliminated as having written the Q2 signature.
MEQ6F4-524	It is possible that the Q-2 signature was an attempt at simulation of the K-1 writer's true signature, hence the response of "c" for the Q-2 signature.
MLBB7H-524	In the case of conclusion C. In this case it corresponds to the determination of that there is an imitation of the signature of Zachary Eg, in these cases it is not possible to identify the author because he is dedicated to making lines that are not they are characteristic of their scriptural ability, therefore, it does not leave characteristics that allow to identify it technically.
N7VMDZ-523	A "C" response was given for the evaluation of the comparison of the Q1 and Q2 signatures to the K2 writing because of lack of sufficient comparability and evidence. Signature movements are highly habitual. When a signature is partially stylized, such as at least part of the genuine signature of K1,



TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	not all movements will have comparable features in a fully legible version of that signature written by a different person. When a signature is a simulation, as the Q2 signature appears to be, it is not fully naturally written, so the writing habits of the simulator may not be apparent. The few areas of the questioned signatures that appeared to be written naturally (Q2) and legibly (Q1 and Q2) had both similarities and differences compared to the K2 writing. Considering the comparison independently (meaning without influence from the examination of the K1 writing) meant that there was insufficient evidence to make a writership opinion. In our lab, we do not give full identification in terms of individualization. Highly probable is the highest degree of certainty that can be expressed. Also per lab policy, a separate report is written for each writer. The conclusions in (3) above reflect that, with the first three paragraphs being taken from the report on K1 and the last three from the report on K2.
NRR7LD-524	Regarding to the signature in question on prescription "Q2 (Vicodin dated 7/31/19)", the undoubtful samples (dictated exemplars, requested signatures and course of business) collected from Dr. Zachary Eg., are enough to the eliminated uniprocidence; Nevertheless, the undoubtful samples (dictated exemplars, requested signatures and course of business) collected from Jake Pug, are not sufficient to the IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED, uniprocidence.
NU27NY-523	The Q2 signature bears a pictorial similarity to the K1 signatures but displays many dissimilarities in habitual slant, letter forms and connecting strokes in addition to subtle characteristics associated with simulation including little variation in pen pressure, blunt beginning and ending strokes and tremulous writing in large movements. Because of the presence of characteristics associated with simulation, the identification or elimination of any writer may not be possible, nor can the possibility of auto-forgery be excluded.
NZN4B2-524	The lack of a conclusion on the signature on Items Q2 is based on the notation of both similarities and differences between the questioned and known writings submitted including what appears to be characteristics of a simulation exhibited in blunt endings of some strokes and slow and unnatural movements of the writing instrument in other strokes. Simulations can also be prepared by the true name writer of a questioned writing as a method of disguise. The writer of a simulation is often difficult to determine through a comparative examination.
PA6AG4-524	a) The reasons of the conclusions "cannot be identified or eliminated " are due to limiting factors such as follows: i). The presence of both similarities and differences between the questioned signature on item Q2 and the known specimens of Dr Zachary. ii). The difference in the signature design and a lack of comparable features between the questioned signature on item Q2 and the known specimens of Jake Pug. b) 'Original' items Q1 and Q2 must be submitted to the laboratory in order to allow the laboratory to analyze the writing ink used and to examine the presence of indented impressions and signs of forgery.
PGUKYE-524	There are differences seen in the shapes, angles and proportions when comparing the 'Questioned' signature on 'Q2' to the genuine signatures of Mr Eg. There are similarities seen in layout and general letter forms meaning the 'Questioned' signature on 'Q2' is a simulation of the genuine signature of Zachary Eg. As it is an attempt at simulation I cannot determine authorship as when simulating an author is suppressing the natural way that they write and attempting to copy how the other person writes their signature meaning that their own characteristics are generally not seen. Therefore I cannot uniquely connect or exclude Jake Pug (K2) as the author of the 'Questioned' signature on 'Q2'.
PXDHXK-524	No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether ZACHARY EG, Item 3 (Items K1 a-d), prepared the questioned signature on Item 2 (Item Q2), due to the limited nature of the questioned signature and the presence of unexplained characteristics. No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether JAKE PUG, Item 4 (Items K2 a-d), prepared the questioned signature on Item 2 (Item Q2) due to the limited nature of the questioned signature and the presence of unexplained characteristics.
QQTAF3-524	It is determined that the signature of the questioned document (Q2) was not made by Dr Zachary

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	(K1) or Jake Pug (K2), since sufficient evidence was analyzed and that is why that conclusion was reached.
QRH92R-523	Signature Q2: We found similarities and differences, but because of limited material in signature we cannot exclude simulation. Our conclusion is inconclusive (C).
QZDDUT-524	The questioned signature on the Prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19 (Q2) cannot be identified or eliminated with Zachary Eg (K1) or Jake Plug (K2), because was not possible to find enough common features.
R2RUUR-524	The signature on the 123457 document does not exhibit the normal and natural appearance of genuine writing.
RTBGT9-524	The study of manuscripts and autograph signatures should be done on original documents but not in photographic reproductions, because in the originals, the general movements of the strokes can be objectively monitored.
T4RMYB-524	Cannot insert or discard the signature of document Q2 because it does not meet the requirement of graphic similarity.
TZQLWR-524	The graphic image of signature Q2 is similar to authentic signature Q1. The stroke of letter "y" is disturbed. Moreover, the letters "y" and "E" are written at a relatively slow pace.
U22NHQ-524	The Q2 signature appears to have been an attempt at a simulation and as such, writers of simulations cannot be identified.
VMGHRA-524	The Q2 signature does not appear naturally written. It has a deliberate and slow, hand-drawn appearance with blunt beginning and ending strokes and awkward pen movements that is consistent with simulation. It is seldom possible to identify the author of a simulation through handwriting comparison. The writer's attempt to emulate a model signature or disguise their own signature limits the individual characteristics of the writer being present.
WQWBJ3-524	The signature of the Q2 document is part of an imitation, it does not allow to determine the authorship, since people with medium caligraphic skill can execute strokes that do not perform in their normal graphic development or simply reproduce preset features that denote morphologies similar to authentic signatures, without leaving in their work enough elements to allow them to be fully identified as authors. This implies that it cannot identify or eliminate the possible involvement of Mr. JAKE PUG (K2a - K2d) in the preparation of the signature Q2. For comparative technical analyses, the morphostructural and dynamic characteristics of the strokes that make up the hesitant and undoubted spellings were taken into account, in terms of initiations and endings, bending and extension movements, spontaneity, proportionality, general configuration, construction of letters and numbers, links, rhythm, rotation and finishing of strokes.
WZZXHA-523	dictated exemplars and requested signatures & writings are compatible with each other. That's why we'd conclude that there was not any intention to change the signature-writing while dictated.
XAZH9L-524	Neither of the known writers can be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on #Q2. The signature on #Q2, while pictorially similar to known signatures of Dr. Zachary Eg, contains some characteristics commonly found in simulated or disguised signatures. Therefore, a determination of authorship is not warranted.
XULEK6-523	ZACHARY EG is responsible for the authorship of the prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/2019 handprinting (handwriting and signature). JAKE PUG is responsible for the authorship of the prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/2019 handwriting. In regards to the signature, it was not handprinted either ZACHARY EG and JAKE PUG. This proficiency test was performed by [Laboratory].
YDHRLY-523	Additional comments: as regards conclusion 4 (fourth), more graphic comparison elements would have to be collected to be able to establish their correspondence with certainty according to the method of our lab.



TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
YJL93Q-524	The prescription (Q2) signature cannot be Identified or Eliminated by neither Jake Pug. or any other person except Dr.Zachary Eg
YU4HYX-524	The reason for the "c" response is as follows: 4.1) The "Zachary Eg" signature entry depicted on item Q2 is written in a slow manner, pictorially similar to the true signature of Zachary Eg (K1) and may be either: a) written by the K2 writer as a simulation of the true signature of Zachary Eg (K1) whereby the true writing habits of the K2 writer are not displayed or b) written by a writer other than the K2 writer. Date Range of Testing Activities: 10/3/2019 to 10/10/2019. Evidence Disposition: All submitted items are being returned to the submitter. 4.2) a) The above findings are demonstrable through the use of enlarged illustrative charts. If testimony is anticipated, please allow at least three weeks for the necessary preparation. b) Report Wording conforms to [Laboratory] wording for Questioned Document Examiners.
Z2KBPM-523	If further attention is warranted, the original documents should be submitted for additional examination. It will also be necessary to submit additional requested and normal course of business writing from Dr. Zachary Eg (Exhibits K1a through K1d) or Jake Pug (Exhibits K2a through K2d), or any other subject(s) under consideration. The requested writing specimens should be written in ballpoint pen and repeat the questioned entries ten (10) to fifteen (15) times each on separate sheets of lined and unlined paper and/or on blank prescription slips. Normal course of business writings should include numerous cancelled checks, legal documents, and driver's license, bank, mortgage, and rental applications, etc. If testimony is required, the undersigned should be notified at least three weeks prior to the scheduled trial or hearing date. Notes and data to support findings, conclusions and opinions in this report are available upon request.
ZLKW3Y-524	Given the conditions of construction and execution of the doubted firm, it is not possible to attribute or distort the participation of Mr. Jake Pug in the execution of the firm under study, established in document Q2.
ZUZFKD-523	Given the non-genuine opinion for the Q2 questioned signature relates to the process (i.e. unnatural writing behaviours) and differences were observed when compared to K1 specimen EG signatures; the authorship opinion attached to this is inconclusive. I am unable to determine whether the unnatural writing signs are as a result of disguise by the K1 writer or simulation by the K2 writer or another writer. I did not conduct a comparison between the K2 "specimen" signatures and the Q1/Q2 questioned signatures. The K2 signatures were pictorially different to Q1/Q2 and not in the name of this specimen writer (PUG). Therefore, my opinion is inconclusive.
ZVBG7C-524	It is not normal practice to request signature specimens from an individual for another writer.

-End of Report-  
(Appendix may follow)

## Test No. 19-524: Handwriting Examination

DATA MUST BE SUBMITTED BY **Nov. 25, 2019, 11:59 p.m.** TO BE INCLUDED IN THE REPORT

Participant Code: U1234A

WebCode: HGRKWR

The Accreditation Release section can be accessed by using the "Continue to Final Submission" button above. This information can be entered at any time prior to submitting to CTS.

### Scenario:

A pharmacist at a retail pharmacy contacted Dr. Eg about suspicious prescriptions she had received on his prescription paper. Dr. Eg tells her one of his prescription pads is missing. He does not remember writing the prescriptions submitted to the pharmacist. Dr. Eg then reported the missing prescription pad and the prescriptions received by the pharmacist to police. Investigators have obtained the prescriptions (Q1 and Q2) as well as handwriting from Dr. Eg (K1) and Jake Pug (K2), a patient of Dr. Eg and the person who submitted the prescriptions to the retail pharmacy.

*Please Note: The Handwriting Examination test is composed of photographic/digital reproductions of original handwriting. All items are to be treated as originals for the purposes of this test.*

### Items Submitted (Sample Pack HWP - Photographs):

Item K1a-b: Dictated exemplars for Dr. Zachary Eg

Item K1c: Requested signatures for Dr. Zachary Eg (collected separately and digitally assembled)

Item K1d: Course of business writings for Dr. Zachary Eg

Item K2a-b: Dictated exemplars for Jake Pug

Item K2c: Requested signatures for Jake Pug (collected separately and digitally assembled)

Item K2d: Course of business writings for Jake Pug

Item Q1: Prescription for Xanax dated 7/31/19

Item Q2: Prescription for Vicodin dated 7/31/19

**Examination Results**

Select your responses from the following list and insert the appropriate letters in the space provided in the tables. If the wording differs from the normal wording in your reports, adapt these conclusions as best as you can and use your preferred wording for your written conclusions. Clarification or explanation of findings can be documented in the written Conclusions section.

- A. Was WRITTEN by
- B. Was PROBABLY WRITTEN by (some degree of identification)
- C. CANNOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED\*
- D. Was PROBABLY NOT WRITTEN by (some degree of elimination)
- E. Was NOT WRITTEN by

\*Should the response "C" be used, please document the reason in the Additional Comments section of this data sheet.

1.) To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on each of the prescriptions?

Zachary Eg (K1)	Jake Pug (K2)
Q1 (Xanax) <input type="text"/>	Q1 (Xanax) <input type="text"/>
Q2 (Vicodin) <input type="text"/>	Q2 (Vicodin) <input type="text"/>

(Using the provided response key, please enter only one letter in each blank in the above chart.)

2.) To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed the questioned signature on each of the prescriptions?

Zachary Eg (K1)	Jake Pug (K2)
Q1 (Xanax) <input type="text"/>	Q1 (Xanax) <input type="text"/>
Q2 (Vicodin) <input type="text"/>	Q2 (Vicodin) <input type="text"/>

(Using the provided response key, please enter only one letter in each blank in the above chart.)

**3.) What would be the wording of the Conclusions in your report?**

**4.) Additional Comments**

## RELEASE OF DATA TO ACCREDITATION BODIES

The Accreditation Release is accessed by pressing the "Continue to Final Submission" button online and can be completed at any time prior to submission to CTS.

CTS submits external proficiency test data directly to ASCLD/LAB, ANAB, and/or A2LA. Please select one of the following statements to ensure your data is handled appropriately.

- This participant's data is intended for submission to ASCLD/LAB, ANAB, and/or A2LA. (Accreditation Release section below must be completed.)
- This participant's data is **not** intended for submission to ASCLD/LAB, ANAB, and/or A2LA.

Have the laboratory's designated individual complete the following steps **only if your laboratory is accredited in this testing/calibration discipline** by one or more of the following Accreditation Bodies.

**Step 1: Provide the applicable Accreditation Certificate Number(s) for your laboratory.**

ANAB Certificate No.   
(Include ASCLD/LAB Certificate here)

A2LA Certificate No.

**Step 2: Complete the Laboratory Identifying Information in its entirety.**

Authorized Contact Person and Title

Laboratory Name

Location (City/State)