



Handwriting Examination Test No. 20-5241/5 Summary Report

Each sample set contained either photographs or digital images of two tavern receipts (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 179 participants: 116 for 20-5241, and 63 for 20-5245 and are compiled into the following tables:

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Manufacturer's Information</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Summary Comments</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Table 1: Examination Results</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Table 2: Conclusions</u>	<u>29</u>
<u>Table 3: Additional Comments</u>	<u>67</u>
<u>Appendix: Data Sheet</u>	

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 photographs of two tavern receipts, front and back (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 Kyle Krug (K1) and Scott Granger (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 their own name (the receipt had no printed indicator of the signer's name). Each questioned document was selected from several versions that were dictated to each individual by a moderator. Two additional, unknown individuals provided the signatures on the front of questioned items Q1 and Q2 in a separate dictation session.

The handprinted text on the back of the Q1 receipt was produced by the K2 writer, Scott Granger. The handprinted text on the back of the Q2 receipt was produced by the K1 writer, Kyle Krug. The signatures on Q1 on Q2 were produced by two unidentified writers for whom no exemplar writing was provided.

Both K1 and K2 writers are male and left handed. The unidentified third writer (signature on Q1) is male and left handed. The unidentified fourth writer (signature on Q2) is male and right handed.

SAMPLE ASSEMBLY: Once predistribution results were obtained, all sample packs were prepared. For each sample pack, the ten photographs were packaged into a pre-labeled manila envelope, sealed with evidence tape, and initialed with "CTS". Digital download media were zipped and uploaded to the CTS portal.

VERIFICATION-

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

Three predistribution laboratories were inconclusive as to whether or not the K1 or K2 writers contributed the signatures on Q1 and Q2. One lab stated that the K1 writer did not contribute the Q1 signature, and the K2 writer did not contribute the Q2 signature. They were inconclusive if K1 authored the Q2 signature and if K2 authored the Q1 signature. No lab identified either of the known individuals as a possible contributor to either of the signatures.

Summary Comments

This test was designed to provide participants with a handprinted text and signature identification challenge involving two tavern receipts. Each sample set contained either photographs or digital images of each questioned receipt (Q1, Q2), as well as known writings provided by two individuals, Kyle Krug (K1) and Scott Granger (K2). Participants were provided with dictated exemplars of each receipt, requested signatures in the name of each suspected individual, 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 receipt. The K1 writer produced the handprinted text on Q2, and the K2 writer produced the handprinted text on Q1. The Q1 and Q2 signatures were produced by two distinct, unknown third parties (Refer to Manufacturer's Information for preparation details).

In regard 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 tavern receipts?" a breakdown of responses is described below. For Item Q1, a total of 178 participants (99.4%) identified the K2 writer (reported "A" or "B") as the writer of the handprinted text in Q1. Of those, 163 participants also eliminated the K1 writer (reported "D" or "E") as the writer of the handprinted text in Q1. The remaining fifteen participants were either Inconclusive (reported "C", 9 participants) or gave no response (6 participants) for the K1 writer. One participant identified the K1 writer and eliminated the K2 writer as the writer of the handprinted text in Q1.

For Item Q2, all 179 participants identified the K1 writer as the source of the handprinted text. Of those, 170 also eliminated the K2 writer as the source. The remaining nine participants were either Inconclusive (3 participants) or gave no response (6 participants) for the K2 writer.

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 tavern receipts?", a breakdown of responses is described below. For Item Q1, 176 out of 179 participants (98.3%) either eliminated (reported "D" or "E") or were inconclusive of (reported "C") both known writers as the source of the signature on the Q1 receipt. Specifically, 136 participants were inconclusive of both writers (77.2%), 31 participants reported an elimination of both writers (17.6%), and nine eliminated one writer and were inconclusive for the other (5.1%). Two participants were inconclusive of the K2 writer but gave no response for K1. The final participant identified K2 as the source of the Q1 signature and gave no response for K1; this is considered the only outlier.

For Item Q2, 175 out of 179 participants (97.8%) either eliminated or were inconclusive of both known writers as the source of the signature on the Q2 receipt. Specifically, 136 participants were inconclusive of both writers (77.7%), 32 participants reported an elimination of both writers (18.3%), and seven eliminated one writer and were inconclusive for the other (4.0%). One participant eliminated the K1 writer and gave no response for K2, and one was inconclusive for the K1 writer and gave no response for K2. Finally, one participant identified the K1 writer as the source of the Q2 signature with no response for K2, and one participant eliminated the K1 writer and identified the K2 writer as the source; these are the only outliers for Item Q2.

Summary Comments, continued

Some participants observed that the questioned signatures in Q1 and Q2 were unable to be meaningfully compared to the known signatures of K1 and K2 due to limiting comparison factors. In the context of the computer-generated receipt information, no name data was provided for the signer of the credit card authorization, limiting the information available. Also, the highly stylized nature of the requested signatures from the known writers was incomparable to the style of the questioned signatures. CTS intentionally limited the information provided in this way, anticipating that an inconclusive response would be acceptable for consensus. Due to these limiting comparison factors, and having firsthand knowledge of the creation of the questioned signatures, those reporting inconclusive ("C") were grouped with eliminations ("D", "E") for purposes of calculating the consensus percentages.

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 tavern receipts?

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
2AFRXP- 5245	E	A	6JM7FL- 5241	E	A
2CLAY7- 5241	E	A	6MB8E2- 5245	E	A
2LLC9M- 5241	E	A	6PTC3Y- 5241	E	A
2QZHXP- 5245	E	A	6T898Z- 5245	E	A
34LAY6- 5245	E	A	6ZTXBJ- 5245	E	A
37BH8K- 5241	E	A	72KKZR- 5245	E	A
3CDPLM- 5241	E	A	73XHKG- 5245	E	A
3F9K32- 5241	E	A	77EEXT- 5241	E	A
3YAYQM- 5245	C	A	794QWY- 5245	C	A
428983- 5241	E	A	79MPWH- 5241	E	A
44JC9L- 5241	E	A	7B79NK- 5241	D	B
4MV2LJ- 5241	E	A	7PR2J2- 5241	E	A
4U9AML- 5245	E	A	7TTWBG- 5245	E	A
4WF6EY- 5241	E	A	7YTNBX- 5241	E	A
6BCFM3- 5241	E	A	8Y88VV- 5241	E	A
6BVLLT- 5241	E	A	92CDU2- 5245	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
942L3G- 5245	E	A	CDFJEQ- 5241	E	A
9DTXEX- 5241	E	A	CERJBK- 5245	E	A
9GQJ4F- 5241	E	A	CLJYKW- 5245	E	A
9HHJ2Q- 5241	E	A	CNURYX- 5241	E	A
9P2PXX- 5241	E	A	CT9CZR- 5241	E	A
ACPUZD- 5245	E	A	CYV6BR- 5241	E	A
AKLPZW- 5241	E	A	D39JZA- 5245	E	A
ALZWLE- 5245	E	A	DGF6PU- 5241		A
AMBX8D- 5241	E	A	DJHDLR- 5241	E	A
ANZCPV- 5241	E	A	DK9CZP- 5245	E	A
APGWPD- 5241	E	A	DPPU4T- 5241	E	A
AXQXVT- 5245	E	A	DTNKGK- 5241	E	A
B6PUZB- 5241	E	A	DW2X7K- 5241	E	A
BCMY2K- 5245	E	A	DYCTRC- 5245	D	A
BJMQGN- 5241	E	A	DZP6WA- 5245	E	A
BK68PG- 5241	D	A	EG8N6Z- 5245	E	A
BPBDCU- 5241	E	A	ENQVKK- 5241	E	A
			F3KVTY- 5241	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
F9C3C8- 5245	E	A	GZC3C6- 5241	E	A
FBHZU9- 5241	E	A	HMN66F- 5245	C	B
FK4RAR- 5241	E	A	HUHAXG- 5241	E	A
FMWXYC- 5241	E	A	HVZR7A- 5241	E	A
FQRCD9- 5241	C	A	JB66T4- 5245	E	A
FV26EC- 5245	E	A	JBPDP7- 5241	E	A
FWFZQQ- 5241	C	A	JFGNY6- 5241	E	A
FX8MC8- 5245	E	A	JHKTLL- 5241		A
FX8Y6N- 5241	E	A	JJYEVN- 5241	E	A
G6RDRU- 5245	E	A	JNTCKD- 5241	E	A
GAFPBA- 5241	E	A	K82PXL- 5245	E	A
GDKLCL- 5245	C	A	KANZG6- 5241	E	A
GEQCWL- 5241	E	A	KBKTLJ- 5241	E	A
GF9U6E- 5241	E	A	KJELM3- 5241	E	A
GGWTB6- 5241	E	A	KQTXVG- 5245		A
GLC4QU- 5241	E	A	KR949L- 5241	E	A
GNFZRN- 5245	E	A	KWZ2Q3- 5241	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
LA8J9C- 5241		A	P4NK69- 5241	E	A
LJUHZG- 5245	E	A	P6GFRG- 5245	A	E
LQR8GL- 5241	E	A	P7XZRY- 5241	C	A
LRJT33- 5241	E	A	P9GRNG- 5241		A
LUR9RG- 5241	E	A	PQHPUJ- 5241	E	A
M8VQK9- 5241	E	A	PT7X3Y- 5245	E	A
MDXZR2- 5241	E	A	PUVCKG- 5241	E	A
ME9E7G- 5241	E	A	PZTRFJ- 5241	E	A
MKJT3Z- 5241	C	A	QANU36- 5241	D	A
MM66WJ- 5241	E	A	QB2QMW- 5241	E	B
MPUE6Y- 5245	E	A	QCCTAV- 5241	E	A
MTWCFR- 5241	E	A	QK4FX7- 5241	E	A
N47E7H- 5241	E	A	QRQ7HG- 5241	E	A
NFJ4YX- 5241	E	A	R27CUB- 5245	E	A
NKURKA- 5241	E	A	R9QF2D- 5245	E	A
NM78EB- 5245	E	A	RDKAYE- 5241	E	A
NYW2NJ- 5241	E	A	RG6PHY- 5241	D	A
P472DZ- 5245	E	A			

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
RHVMGD- 5241	E	A	VNW7LZ- 5241	E	A
RYHZV6- 5241	E	A	VQHKWB- 5241	E	A
T67X7D- 5245	E	A	VRVHGZ- 5245	E	A
T6KX8V- 5245	E	A	VW9HDR- 5241	E	A
T96PJX- 5241	D	B	W83LBD- 5245	E	A
TEGZQE- 5241	E	A	WBGV9U- 5245	E	A
TX9JPY- 5245	E	A	WBJTWR- 5241	D	A
U49HDU- 5241	E	A	WBYEZ3- 5245	E	A
U6NC8V- 5245	E	A	WCXRZU- 5245	E	A
U7UU6R- 5241	E	A	WEF84U- 5245	D	B
UGUWGT- 5241	C	A	WVNN7A- 5245		A
UNY2KU- 5245	E	A	WZ3BV9- 5241	D	B
V46KXC- 5245	E	A	X3NBVN- 5241	E	A
V47ME4- 5245	E	A	XD9E6A- 5245	E	A
V4N4MV- 5241	E	A	XVM389- 5241	E	A
VCX6TC- 5241	D	B	YKKPFT- 5241	E	A
VL4X7C- 5245	E	A	YRLAVP- 5241	E	A
			YYFJX9- 5241	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
YZT7G8- 5245	E	A			
Z4W22B- 5245	E	A			
Z64JY7- 5241	E	A			
Z7CWEM- 5245	E	A			
ZBP7EP- 5241	E	A			
ZFKZCQ- 5241	E	A			
ZP66JP- 5241	E	A			
ZT6FFP- 5245	E	A			

Response Summary - Handwriting on Q1

Total Participants: 179

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 tavern receipts?

Response	Handwriting on Q1		
	K1	K2	
A	1	171	
B	0	7	
C	9	0	
D	10	0	
E	153	1	

Response Key:

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.

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
2AFRXP- 5245	A	E	6MB8E2- 5245	A	E
2CLAY7- 5241	A	E	6PTC3Y- 5241	A	E
2LLC9M- 5241	A	E	6T898Z- 5245	A	E
2QZHXP- 5245	A	E	6ZTXBJ- 5245	A	E
34LAY6- 5245	A	E	72KKZR- 5245	A	E
37BH8K- 5241	A	E	73XHKG- 5245	A	E
3CDPLM- 5241	A	E	77EEXT- 5241	A	E
3F9K32- 5241	A	E	794QWY- 5245	A	C
3YAYQM- 5245	A	E	79MPWH- 5241	A	E
428983- 5241	A	E	7B79NK- 5241	B	D
44JC9L- 5241	A	E	7PR2J2- 5241	A	E
4MV2LJ- 5241	A	E	7TTWBG- 5245	A	E
4U9AML- 5245	A	E	7YTNBX- 5241	A	E
4WF6EY- 5241	A	E	8Y88VV- 5241	A	E
6BCFM3- 5241	A	E	92CDU2- 5245	A	E
6BVLLT- 5241	A	E	942L3G- 5245	A	E
6JM7FL- 5241	A	E	9DTXEX- 5241	A	E
			9GQJ4F- 5241	A	E

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
9HHJ2Q- 5241	A	E	CNURYX- 5241	A	E
9P2PXX- 5241	A	E	CT9CZR- 5241	A	E
ACPUZD- 5245	A	E	CYV6BR- 5241	A	E
AKLPZW- 5241	A	E	D39JZA- 5245	A	E
ALZWLE- 5245	A	E	DGF6PU- 5241	A	
AMBX8D- 5241	A	E	DJHDLR- 5241	A	E
ANZCPV- 5241	A	E	DK9CZP- 5245	A	E
APGWPD- 5241	A	E	DPPU4T- 5241	A	E
AXQXVT- 5245	A	E	DTNKGK- 5241	A	E
B6PUZB- 5241	A	E	DW2X7K- 5241	A	E
BCMY2K- 5245	A	E	DYCTRC- 5245	A	D
BJMQGN- 5241	A	E	DZP6WA- 5245	A	E
BK68PG- 5241	A	D	EG8N6Z- 5245	A	E
BPBDCU- 5241	A	E	ENQVKK- 5241	A	E
CDFJEQ- 5241	A	E	F3KVTY- 5241	A	E
CERJBK- 5245	A	E	F9C3C8- 5245	A	E
CLJYKW- 5245	A	E	FBHZU9- 5241	A	E

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
FK4RAR- 5241	A	E	HVZR7A- 5241	A	E
FMWXYC- 5241	A	E	JB66T4- 5245	A	E
FQRCD9- 5241	A	E	JBPDP7- 5241	A	E
FV26EC- 5245	A	E	JFGNY6- 5241	A	E
FWFZQQ- 5241	A	C	JHKTLL- 5241	A	
FX8MC8- 5245	A	E	JJYEVN- 5241	A	E
FX8Y6N- 5241	A	E	JNTCKD- 5241	A	E
G6RDRU- 5245	A	E	K82PXL- 5245	A	E
GAFPBA- 5241	A	E	KANZG6- 5241	A	E
GDKLCL- 5245	A	E	KBKTLJ- 5241	A	E
GEQCWL- 5241	A	E	KJELM3- 5241	A	E
GF9U6E- 5241	A	E	KQTXVG- 5245	A	
GGWTB6- 5241	A	E	KR949L- 5241	A	E
GLC4QU- 5241	A	E	KWZ2Q3- 5241	A	E
GNFZRN- 5245	A	E	LA8J9C- 5241	A	
GZC3C6- 5241	A	E	LJUHZG- 5245	A	E
HMN66F- 5245	B	C	LQR8GL- 5241	A	E
HUHAXG- 5241	A	E			

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
LRJT33- 5241	A	E	P7XZRY- 5241	A	D
LUR9RG- 5241	A	E	P9GRNG- 5241	A	
M8VQK9- 5241	A	D	PQHPUJ- 5241	A	E
MDXZR2- 5241	A	E	PT7X3Y- 5245	A	E
ME9E7G- 5241	A	E	PUVCKG- 5241	A	E
MKJT3Z- 5241	A	D	PZTRFJ- 5241	A	E
MM66WJ- 5241	A	E	QANU36- 5241	A	E
MPUE6Y- 5245	A	E	QB2QMW- 5241	B	E
MTWCFR- 5241	A	E	QCCTAV- 5241	A	E
N47E7H- 5241	A	E	QK4FX7- 5241	A	E
NFJ4YX- 5241	A	E	QRQ7HG- 5241	A	E
NKURKA- 5241	A	E	R27CUB- 5245	A	E
NM78EB- 5245	A	E	R9QF2D- 5245	A	E
NYW2NJ- 5241	A	E	RDKAYE- 5241	A	E
P472DZ- 5245	A	E	RG6PHY- 5241	A	D
P4NK69- 5241	A	E	RHVMGD- 5241	A	E
P6GFRG- 5245	A	E	RYHZV6- 5241	A	E
			T67X7D- 5245	A	E

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
T6KX8V- 5245	A	E	W9HDR- 5241	A	E
T96PJX- 5241	B	D	W83LBD- 5245	A	E
TEGZQE- 5241	A	E	WBGV9U- 5245	A	E
TX9JPY- 5245	A	E	WBJTWR- 5241	A	D
U49HDU- 5241	A	E	WBYEZ3- 5245	A	E
U6NC8V- 5245	A	E	WCXRZU- 5245	A	E
U7UU6R- 5241	A	E	WEF84U- 5245	B	D
UGUWGT- 5241	A	D	WVNN7A- 5245	A	
UNY2KU- 5245	A	E	WZ3BV9- 5241	A	E
V46KXC- 5245	A	E	X3NBVN- 5241	A	E
V47ME4- 5245	A	E	XD9E6A- 5245	A	E
V4N4MV- 5241	A	E	XVM389- 5241	A	E
VCX6TC- 5241	B	D	YKKPFT- 5241	A	E
VL4X7C- 5245	A	E	YRLAVP- 5241	A	E
VNW7LZ- 5241	A	E	YYFJX9- 5241	A	E
VQHKWB- 5241	A	E	YZT7G8- 5245	A	E
VRVHGZ- 5245	A	E	Z4W22B- 5245	A	E

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
Z64JY7- 5241	A	E			
Z7CWEM- 5245	A	E			
ZBP7EP- 5241	A	E			
ZFKZCQ- 5241	A	E			
ZP66JP- 5241	A	E			
ZT6FFP- 5245	A	E			

Response Summary - Handwriting on Q2Total Participants: **179**

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 tavern receipts?

Response	Handwriting on Q2		
	K1	K2	
A	173	0	
B	6	0	
C	0	3	
D	0	12	
E	0	158	

Response Key:
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.

Examination Results

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

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
2AFRXP- 5245	E	C	6JM7FL- 5241	C	C
2CLAY7- 5241	E	D	6MB8E2- 5245	D	D
2LLC9M- 5241	C	C	6PTC3Y- 5241	C	C
2QZHXP- 5245	D	D	6T898Z- 5245	C	C
34LAY6- 5245	C	C	6ZTXBJ- 5245	D	C
37BH8K- 5241	C	C	72KKZR- 5245	C	C
3CDPLM- 5241	C	C	73XHKG- 5245	C	C
3F9K32- 5241	C	C	77EEXT- 5241	E	E
3YAYQM- 5245	C	C	794QWY- 5245	E	E
428983- 5241	C	C	79MPWH- 5241	C	C
44JC9L- 5241	D	C	7B79NK- 5241	C	C
4MV2LJ- 5241	C	C	7PR2J2- 5241	C	C
4U9AML- 5245	C	C	7TTWBG- 5245	C	C
4WF6EY- 5241	C	C	7YTNBX- 5241	E	E
6BCFM3- 5241	C	C	8Y88WV- 5241	E	C
6BVLLT- 5241	C	C	92CDU2- 5245	C	C

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
942L3G- 5245	E	C	CDFJEQ- 5241	C	C
9DTXEX- 5241	C	C	CERJBK- 5245	E	E
9GQJ4F- 5241	C	C	CLJYKW- 5245	C	C
9HHJ2Q- 5241	C	C	CNURYX- 5241	C	C
9P2PXX- 5241	C	C	CT9CZR- 5241	D	D
ACPUZD- 5245	E	E	CYV6BR- 5241	E	E
AKLPZW- 5241	E	E	D39JZA- 5245	C	C
ALZWLE- 5245	C	C	DGF6PU- 5241		B
AMBX8D- 5241	C	C	DJHDLR- 5241	E	E
ANZCPV- 5241	C	C	DK9CZP- 5245	E	E
APGWPD- 5241	C	C	DPPU4T- 5241	C	C
AXQXVT- 5245	C	C	DTNKGK- 5241	D	D
B6PUZB- 5241	C	C	DW2X7K- 5241	D	D
BCMY2K- 5245	C	C	DYCTRC- 5245	D	D
BJMQGN- 5241	C	C	DZP6WA- 5245	C	C
BK68PG- 5241	C	C	EG8N6Z- 5245	C	C
BPBDCU- 5241	E	E	ENQVKK- 5241	C	C
			F3KVTY- 5241	C	C

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
F9C3C8- 5245	C	C	GZC3C6- 5241	D	D
FBHZU9- 5241	C	C	HMN66F- 5245	C	C
FK4RAR- 5241	E	C	HUHAXG- 5241	C	C
FMWXYC- 5241	C	C	HVZR7A- 5241	C	C
FQRCD9- 5241	C	C	JB66T4- 5245	E	E
FV26EC- 5245	C	C	JBPDP7- 5241	C	C
FWFZQQ- 5241	C	C	JFGNY6- 5241	C	C
FX8MC8- 5245	C	D	JHKTLL- 5241	C	C
FX8Y6N- 5241	E	E	JJYEVN- 5241	C	C
G6RDRU- 5245	C	C	JNTCKD- 5241	C	C
GAFPBA- 5241	D	D	K82PXL- 5245	C	C
GDKLCL- 5245	C	C	KANZG6- 5241	C	C
GEQCWL- 5241	C	C	KBKTLJ- 5241	C	C
GF9U6E- 5241	C	C	KJELM3- 5241	C	C
GGWTB6- 5241	D	C	KQTXVG- 5245	C	C
GLC4QU- 5241	C	C	KR949L- 5241	C	C
GNFZRN- 5245	D	D	KWZ2Q3- 5241	C	C

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
LA8J9C- 5241		C	P4NK69- 5241	C	C
LJUHZG- 5245	C	C	P6GFRG- 5245	E	C
LQR8GL- 5241	C	C	P7XZRY- 5241	C	C
LRJT33- 5241	C	C	P9GRNG- 5241		C
LUR9RG- 5241	C	C	PQHPUJ- 5241	C	C
M8VQK9- 5241	C	C	PT7X3Y- 5245	C	C
MDXZR2- 5241	C	C	PUVCKG- 5241	C	C
ME9E7G- 5241	E	E	PZTRFJ- 5241	C	C
MKJT3Z- 5241	C	C	QANU36- 5241	C	C
MM66WJ- 5241	C	C	QB2QMW- 5241	C	C
MPUE6Y- 5245	C	C	QCCTAV- 5241	C	C
MTWCFR- 5241	C	C	QK4FX7- 5241	C	C
N47E7H- 5241	C	C	QRQ7HG- 5241	C	C
NFJ4YX- 5241	C	C	R27CUB- 5245	C	C
NKURKA- 5241	D	D	R9QF2D- 5245	C	C
NM78EB- 5245	C	C	RDKAYE- 5241	C	C
NYW2NJ- 5241	C	C	RG6PHY- 5241	C	C
P472DZ- 5245	C	C			

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
RHVMGD- 5241	C	C	VNW7LZ- 5241	C	C
RYHZV6- 5241	C	C	VQHKWB- 5241	C	C
T67X7D- 5245	C	C	VRVHGZ- 5245	C	C
T6KX8V- 5245	C	C	VV9HDR- 5241	C	C
T96PJX- 5241	C	C	W83LBD- 5245	C	C
TEGZQE- 5241	C	C	WBGV9U- 5245	C	C
TX9JPY- 5245	C	C	WBJTWR- 5241	C	C
U49HDU- 5241	C	C	WBYEZ3- 5245	C	C
U6NC8V- 5245	C	C	WCXRZU- 5245	E	D
U7UU6R- 5241	C	C	WEF84U- 5245	C	C
UGUWGT- 5241	C	C	WVNN7A- 5245	C	C
UNY2KU- 5245	E	E	WZ3BV9- 5241	C	C
V46KXC- 5245	D	D	X3NBVN- 5241	C	C
V47ME4- 5245	C	C	XD9E6A- 5245	E	E
V4N4MV- 5241	C	C	XVM389- 5241	C	C
VCX6TC- 5241	C	C	YKKPFT- 5241	C	C
VL4X7C- 5245	C	C	YRLAVP- 5241	C	C
			YYFJX9- 5241	C	C

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
YZT7G8- 5245	D	D			
Z4W22B- 5245	C	C			
Z64JY7- 5241	D	D			
Z7CWEM- 5245	E	E			
ZBP7EP- 5241	C	C			
ZFKZCQ- 5241	C	C			
ZP66JP- 5241	C	C			
ZT6FFP- 5245	C	C			

Response Summary - Signature on Q1Total Participants: **179**

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

Response	Signature on Q1		
	K1	K2	
A	0	0	
B	0	1	
C	137	146	
D	16	16	
E	23	16	

Response Key:
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.

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
2AFRXP- 5245	C	E	6MB8E2- 5245	D	D
2CLAY7- 5241	D	E	6PTC3Y- 5241	C	C
2LLC9M- 5241	C	C	6T898Z- 5245	C	C
2QZHXP- 5245	D	D	6ZTXBJ- 5245	D	C
34LAY6- 5245	C	C	72KKZR- 5245	C	C
37BH8K- 5241	C	C	73XHKG- 5245	C	C
3CDPLM- 5241	C	C	77EEXT- 5241	E	E
3F9K32- 5241	C	C	794QWY- 5245	E	E
3YAYQM- 5245	C	C	79MPWH- 5241	C	C
428983- 5241	C	C	7B79NK- 5241	C	C
44JC9L- 5241	D	C	7PR2J2- 5241	C	C
4MV2LJ- 5241	C	C	7TTWBG- 5245	C	C
4U9AML- 5245	C	C	7YTNBX- 5241	E	E
4WF6EY- 5241	C	C	8Y88WV- 5241	C	E
6BCFM3- 5241	C	C	92CDU2- 5245	C	C
6BVLLT- 5241	C	C	942L3G- 5245	C	E
6JM7FL- 5241	C	C	9DTXEX- 5241	C	C
			9GQJ4F- 5241	C	C

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
9HHJ2Q- 5241	C	C	CNURYX- 5241	C	D
9P2PXX- 5241	C	C	CT9CZR- 5241	D	D
ACPUZD- 5245	E	E	CYV6BR- 5241	E	E
AKLPZW- 5241	E	E	D39JZA- 5245	C	C
ALZWLE- 5245	C	C	DGF6PU- 5241	B	
AMBX8D- 5241	C	C	DJHDLR- 5241	E	E
ANZCPV- 5241	C	C	DK9CZP- 5245	E	E
APGWPD- 5241	C	C	DPPU4T- 5241	C	C
AXQXVT- 5245	C	C	DTNKGK- 5241	D	D
B6PUZB- 5241	C	C	DW2X7K- 5241	C	C
BCMY2K- 5245	C	C	DYCTRC- 5245	D	D
BJMQGN- 5241	C	C	DZP6WA- 5245	C	C
BK68PG- 5241	C	C	EG8N6Z- 5245	C	C
BPBDCU- 5241	E	E	ENQVKK- 5241	C	C
CDFJEQ- 5241	C	C	F3KVTY- 5241	C	C
CERJBK- 5245	E	E	F9C3C8- 5245	C	C
CLJYKW- 5245	C	C	FBHZU9- 5241	C	C

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
FK4RAR- 5241	C	E	HVZR7A- 5241	C	C
FMWXYC- 5241	C	C	JB66T4- 5245	E	E
FQRCD9- 5241	C	C	JBPDP7- 5241	C	C
FV26EC- 5245	C	C	JFGNY6- 5241	C	C
FWFZQQ- 5241	C	C	JHKTLL- 5241	C	C
FX8MC8- 5245	C	C	JJYEVN- 5241	C	C
FX8Y6N- 5241	E	E	JNTCKD- 5241	C	C
G6RDRU- 5245	C	C	K82PXL- 5245	C	C
GAFPBA- 5241	D	D	KANZG6- 5241	D	B
GDKLCL- 5245	C	C	KBKTLJ- 5241	C	C
GEQCWL- 5241	C	C	KJELM3- 5241	C	C
GF9U6E- 5241	C	C	KQTXVG- 5245	C	C
GGWTB6- 5241	D	D	KR949L- 5241	C	C
GLC4QU- 5241	C	C	KWZ2Q3- 5241	C	C
GNFZRN- 5245	D	D	LA8J9C- 5241	C	
GZC3C6- 5241	D	D	LJUHZG- 5245	C	C
HMN66F- 5245	C	C	LQR8GL- 5241	C	C
HUHAXG- 5241	C	C			

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
LRJT33- 5241	C	C	P7XZRY- 5241	C	C
LUR9RG- 5241	C	C	P9GRNG- 5241	D	
M8VQK9- 5241	C	C	PQHPUJ- 5241	C	C
MDXZR2- 5241	C	C	PT7X3Y- 5245	C	C
ME9E7G- 5241	E	E	PUVCKG- 5241	C	C
MKJT3Z- 5241	C	C	PZTRFJ- 5241	C	C
MM66WJ- 5241	C	C	QANU36- 5241	C	C
MPUE6Y- 5245	C	C	QB2QMW- 5241	C	C
MTWCFR- 5241	C	C	QCCTAV- 5241	C	C
N47E7H- 5241	C	C	QK4FX7- 5241	C	C
NFJ4YX- 5241	C	C	QRQ7HG- 5241	C	C
NKURKA- 5241	D	D	R27CUB- 5245	C	C
NM78EB- 5245	C	C	R9QF2D- 5245	C	C
NYW2NJ- 5241	C	C	RDKAYE- 5241	C	C
P472DZ- 5245	C	C	RG6PHY- 5241	C	C
P4NK69- 5241	C	C	RHVMGD- 5241	C	C
P6GFRG- 5245	E	E	RYHZV6- 5241	C	C
			T67X7D- 5245	C	C

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
T6KX8V- 5245	C	C	W9HDR- 5241	C	C
T96PJX- 5241	C	C	W83LBD- 5245	C	C
TEGZQE- 5241	C	C	WBGV9U- 5245	C	C
TX9JPY- 5245	C	C	WBJTWR- 5241	C	C
U49HDU- 5241	C	C	WBYEZ3- 5245	C	C
U6NC8V- 5245	C	C	WCXRZU- 5245	E	E
U7UU6R- 5241	C	C	WEF84U- 5245	C	C
UGUWGT- 5241	C	C	WVNN7A- 5245	C	C
UNY2KU- 5245	E	E	WZ3BV9- 5241	C	C
V46KXC- 5245	D	D	X3NBVN- 5241	C	C
V47ME4- 5245	C	C	XD9E6A- 5245	E	E
V4N4MV- 5241	C	C	XVM389- 5241	C	C
VCX6TC- 5241	C	C	YKKPFT- 5241	C	C
VL4X7C- 5245	C	C	YRLAVP- 5241	C	C
VNW7LZ- 5241	C	C	YYFJX9- 5241	C	C
VQHKWB- 5241	C	C	YZT7G8- 5245	D	D
VRVHGZ- 5245	C	C	Z4W22B- 5245	C	C

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
Z64JY7- 5241	D	D			
Z7CWEM- 5245	E	E			
ZBP7EP- 5241	C	C			
ZFKZCQ- 5241	C	C			
ZP66JP- 5241	C	C			
ZT6FFP- 5245	C	C			

Response Summary - Signature on Q2Total Participants: **179**

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

Response	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2
A	0	0
B	1	1
C	142	138
D	18	14
E	18	23

Response Key:

- 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.

Conclusions

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
2AFRXP-5245	<p>1. The questioned text on back of the Q1 receipt presents same individual characteristics of forms, habits, proportion and is identified with samples written by Scott Granger (K2). 2. The questioned text on back of the Q1 receipts does not have the same characteristics of form, type of writing, therefore does not identify with the samples written by Kyle Krug (K1). 3. The questioned text on back of the Q2 receipt presents the same individual characteristics and is identified with the samples written by Kyle Krug (K1). 4. The question text on back of the Q2 receipt don't have the same characteristics and does not identify with the samples written by Scott Granger (K2). 5. The questioned signature of the receipt Q1 does not have the same characteristics and does not identify with the samples by Kyle Krug (K1). 6. The questioned signature of the receipt Q2 does not have the same characteristics and does not identify with the samples by Scott Granger. 7. The questioned signature of Q1, does not have sufficient characteristics to identify or eliminate the samples of signatures with K2. 8. The questioned signature of Q2, does not have sufficient characteristics to identify or eliminate the samples of signature with K1.</p>
2CLAY7-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
2LLC9M-5241	<p>The K1 writer (KRUG) has been eliminated as the writer of the questioned handprinting on the back side of Q1. 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 provide very strong evidence to support non-authorship. The K2 writer (GRANGER) is identified as the writer of the questioned handwriting on the back side of Q1. An opinion of "identification" is a conclusion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents provide very strong evidence supporting common authorship. The K1 writer (KRUG) has neither been identified nor eliminated as the writer of the Q1 signature. This is an inconclusive result because the material present in the questioned and known documents does not allow for a meaningful analysis and comparison. It is unreasonable and not appropriate to assign a conclusion of authorship or non-authorship given the evidence submitted. The K2 writer (GRANGER) has neither been identified or eliminated as the writer of the Q1 signature. This is an inconclusive result because the material present in the questioned and known documents does not allow for a meaningful analysis and comparison. It is unreasonable and not appropriate to assign a conclusion of authorship or non-authorship given the evidence submitted. The K1 writer (KRUG) is identified as the writer of the questioned handprinting on the back side of Q2. An opinion of "identification" is a conclusion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents provide very strong evidence supporting common authorship. The K2 writer (GRANGER) has been eliminated as the writer of the questioned handprinting on the back side of Q2. 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 provide very strong evidence to support non-authorship. The K1 writer (KRUG) has neither been identified or eliminated as the writer of the Q2 signature. This is an inconclusive result because the material present in the questioned and known documents does not allow for a meaningful analysis and comparison. It is unreasonable and not appropriate to assign a conclusion of authorship or non-authorship given the evidence submitted. The K2 writer (GRANGER) has neither been identified or eliminated as the writer of the Q2 signature. This is an inconclusive result because the material present in the questioned and known documents does not allow for a meaningful analysis and comparison. It is unreasonable and not appropriate to assign a conclusion of authorship or non-authorship given the evidence submitted.</p>
2QZHP-5245	<p>Kyle Krug (K1 writer) wrote the Q2 hand printing, but did not write the Q1 writing. Scott Granger (K2 writer) wrote the Q1 handwriting, but did not write the Q2 hand printing. The K1 and K2 writers probably did not write the signatures on Q1 and on Q2.</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
34LAY6-5245	K1 (Kyle King) wrote the non-signature questioned text on Q2. K1 (Kyle King) did not write the non-signature questioned text on Q1. K2 (Scott Granger) wrote the non-signature questioned text on Q1. K2 (Scott Granger) did not write the non-signature questioned text on Q2. The sample writings from K1 (Kyle King) and K2 (Scott Granger) were insufficient for the comparison examination to determine whether or not they wrote the questioned signatures on Q1 and Q2. It is possible that re-examinations using additional writings samples from K1 (Kyle King) and K2 (Scott Granger), freely and rapidly written with letter forms comparable to those of the Q1 and Q2 signatures, might result in more definitive findings.
37BH8K-5241	The comparison between the known writings on documents K2(a-d), purportedly by Scott Granger, to the questioned handwriting on document Q1 (excluding the signature) has disclosed a significant combination of similarities with no significant differences in handwriting habit. Accordingly, the writer of the known writings on documents K2(a-d), purportedly by Scott Granger, wrote the questioned handwriting on document Q1 (excluding the signature). The comparison between the known writings on documents K1(a-d), purportedly by Kyle Krug, to the questioned handwriting on document Q2 (excluding the signature) has disclosed a significant combination of similarities with no significant differences in handwriting habit. Accordingly, the writer of the known writings on documents K1(a-d), purportedly by Kyle Krug, wrote the questioned handwriting on document Q2 (excluding the signature). The stylised nature of the questioned signatures on documents Q1 and Q2 was found to not be comparable to the known handwritings and signatures purportedly written by Kyle Krug (K1(a-d)) or Scott Granger (K2(a-d)). Accordingly, it was not possible to determine whether or not the writers of the known handwritings and signatures purportedly written by Kyle Krug (K1(a-d)) or Scott Granger (K2(a-d)) wrote the questioned signatures on documents Q1 and Q2.
3CDPLM-5241	1.) Q1 Tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (the body of questioned writing excluding the signature)- was written by Scott Granger (K2) and was not written by Kyle Krug (K1). Q2 Tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020 (the body of questioned writing excluding the signature)- was written by Kyle Krug (K1) and was not written by Scott Granger (K2). 2.) Q1 Tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (the questioned signature) - Kyle Krug (K1) and Scott Granger (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated. Q2 Tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (the questioned signature)- Kyle Krug (K1) and Scott Granger (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated.
3F9K32-5241	1.The questioned writing of the document Q1, presents uniprocidence against the undoubtful K2 (a-b) Dictated exemplars for Scott Granger and K2 (d) Course of business writing for Scott Granger. 2.The questioned writing of the document Q2, presents uniprocidence against the undoubtful K1 (a-b) Dictated exemplars for Kyle Krug and K1 (d) Course of business writing for Kyle Krug. 3.No technical concept is issued on uniprocidence or not, of the questioned signature present in the document Q1, versus the reference material identified as K1 (c) Requested signatures for Kyle Krug, in his own name (collected separately and digitally assembled) y K2 (c) Requested signatures for Scott Granger, in his own name (collected separately and digitally assembled), contributed for analysis, taking into account that they do not comply with the technical aspect of similarity, that is to say, do not display enough identifying elements to reproduce the same circumstances of execution in graphic movements, individualising and determinants to set the constants and variants of the graphic gesture. This aspect is described in our guide to Graphological Analysis for Identifying Purposes, in which it is described the procedure, method and principles to be taken into account to perform graphological analysis in our laboratory. 4. No technical concept is issued on uniprocidence or not, of the questioned signature present in the document Q2, versus the reference material identified as K1 (c) Requested signatures for Kyle Krug, in his own name (collected separately and digitally assembled) y K2 (c) Requested signatures for Scott Granger, in his own name (collected separately and digitally assembled), contributed for analysis, taking into account that they do not comply with the technical aspect of similarity, that is to say, do not display enough identifying elements to reproduce the same circumstances of execution in graphic movements, individualising and determinants to set the constants and variants of the graphic gesture. This aspect is described in our guide to Graphological Analysis for Identifying Purposes, in

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
3YAYQM-5245	<p>which it is described the procedure, method and principles to be taken into account to perform graphological analysis in our laboratory.</p>
	<p>Visual and microscopic examinations of Exhibits Q1, Q2, K1a through K1d, and K2a through K2d were conducted. Exhibits Q1 and Q2 were compared with Exhibits K1a through K1d and K2a through K2d. The following was determined: KYLE KRUG The writer of Exhibits K1a through K1d (Kyle Krug) wrote the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit Q2. The writer of Exhibits K1a through K1d (Kyle Krug) could neither be identified, nor eliminated, as the writer of the questioned cursive entries on Exhibit Q1 or the questioned signatures on Exhibits Q1 and Q2, due to the submission of insufficient comparable known cursive writing and signatures and the limited characteristics of the questioned signature on Exhibit Q2. SCOTT GRANGER The writer of Exhibits K2a through K2d (Scott Granger) wrote the questioned cursive entries on Exhibit Q1. The writer of Exhibits K2a through K2d (Scott Granger) could neither be identified, nor eliminated, as the writer of the questioned signatures on Exhibits Q1 and Q2, due to the submission of insufficient comparable known signatures and the limited characteristics of the questioned signature on Exhibit Q2. The writer of Exhibits K2a through K2d (Scott Granger) did not write the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit Q2.</p>
428983-5241	<p>656/5000 A comparative inspection and analysis was carried out between the questioned texts Q1 and Q2 corresponding to the transaction receipts against the documents presented by Messrs: Kyle Kru (K1a-bc) and Scott Granger (K2a-bc), in order to establish the formal, structural and dynamic values that identify their graphic gesture (particularities with greater identifying value) comparative inspection that allowed to determine the following. UNIPROCEDENCIA MANUSCRITURAL, among the doubted texts Q1 versus the texts by Mr. Scott Granger. UNIPROCEDENCIA MANUSCRITURAL, between the doubted texts Q2 versus the texts of Mr. Kyle Kru.</p>
44JC9L-5241	<p>The text on the back of receipt Q1 was written by Scott Granger (K2). Scott Granger (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated as person who wrote signature on the front of document Q1. The signature on the front of document Q1 was probably not written by Kyle Krug (K1). The text on the back of receipt Q2 was written by Kyle Krug (K1). The signature on the front of document Q2 was probably not written by Kyle Krug (K1). Scott Granger (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated as person who wrote signature on the front of document Q2.</p>
4MV2LJ-5241	<p>1. The questioned cursive handwriting on Exhibit 1 (CTS Item Q1) and the known handwriting attributed to SCOTT GRANGER (CTS Items K2a-K2d) 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 hand printed text on Exhibit 2 (CTS Item Q2) and the known hand printed text attributed to KYLE KRUG have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics in agreement from another writer is considered extremely low. 3. Based on the examination of the evidence submitted, it cannot be determined whether or not KYLE KRUG, SCOTT GRANGER, or an unknown writer(s), wrote the questioned signature depicted on Exhibits 1 and 2 (CTS Items Q1-Q2). An adequate basis for a stronger opinion statement may be provided through an examination and comparison(s) from other possible writers.</p>
4U9AML-5245	<p>According to the document submitted: The writing on document Q1 was written by the author of the documents K2(a, b and d), Scott Granger. The writing on document Q2 was written by the author of the documents K1(a, b and d), Kyle Krug. A Neutral conclusion (no elimination nor identification) is reached for both writers, K1-Kyle Krug and K2-Scott Granger, considering the authorship of the signatures on Q1 and Q2.</p>
4WF6EY-5241	<p>The person who wrote the specimen writings on K2a, K2b and K2d wrote the questioned writings on Q1. The person who wrote the specimen writings on K1a, K1b and K1d wrote the questioned writings on Q2. The questioned signature on Q1 differs from the design of the specimen signatures on K1c and K2c. Hence, it has not been possible to do a comparison among themselves. The questioned signature on Q2 differs from the design of the specimen signatures on K1c and K2c. Hence, it has not been possible to do a comparison among themselves.</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
6BCFM3-5241	<p>Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING (KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d)): Identification. It was determined that the questioned writing, excluding the signature, on Item 2 (Item Q2) was prepared by KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d). No Conclusion. No conclusion could be reached whether or not the questioned signatures on Item 1 (Item Q1) and Item 2 (Item Q2) were prepared by KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), due to the lack of comparable known writing submitted for examination and the illegibility of the questioned and known signatures. HANDWRITING (SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d)): Identification. It was determined that the questioned writing, excluding the signature, on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d). No Conclusion. No conclusion could be reached whether or not the questioned signatures on Item 1 (Item Q1) and Item 2 (Item Q2) were prepared by SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), due to the lack of comparable known writing submitted for examination and the illegibility of the questioned and known signatures. If future examinations are desired, additional dictated and undictated known signatures should be obtained from KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), or any other logical suspect(s). Dictated known writing should be prepared in the exact wording as the questioned signatures and obtained on separate lined pieces of paper similar to the questioned item(s). Each repetition 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 writing prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known writing include business papers, letters, canceled checks, and/or applications.</p>
6BVLLT-5241	<p>1) The manuscripts from Q1 were executed by K2 (Scott Granger). 2) The Q2 manuscripts were executed by K1 (Kyle Krug). 3) The signature in Q1 cannot be identified or eliminated. 4) The signature in Q2 cannot be identified or eliminated.</p>
6JM7FL-5241	<p>It was determined that the note, Q-2, was written by Kyle Krug, K-1. It was determined that the note, Q-1, was written by Scott Granger, K-2. There was not a basis for identifying either Kyle Krug, K-1, or Scott Granger, K-2, as the writer of either signature on Q-1 and Q-2.</p>
6MB8E2-5245	<p>5. The writing on the back of the tavern receipt dated 10th July 2020, item Q1, shows many similarities to the writing of Scott Granger in items K2a to K2d. No single similarity is conclusive but the combination of similarities leads me to conclude that Scott Granger made that writing. 6. The writing on the back of the tavern receipt dated 18th July 2020, item Q2, shows many similarities to the writing of Kyle Krug in items K1a to K1d. The combination of similarities leads me to conclude that Kyle Krug made that writing. 7. My observations provide no evidence that the signature on either tavern receipt was written by either Kyle Krug or Scott Granger. I consider it likely that the signatures on the tavern receipts were written by some other person or persons.</p>
6PTC3Y-5241	<p>Due to the lack of requirements in the associated undisputed material (Kyle Krug samples), it is not possible to advance the requested inspection, due to lack of similarity in the signatures. Due to the lack of requirements in the associated undisputed material (Scott Granger), it is not possible to advance the requested inspection, due to lack of similarity in the signatures. Manuscript uniprocidence between the graphonomic characteristics of the doubted writings (writings from the tavern receipt July 10, 2020) and the undoubted ones (Scott Granger's writing). Manuscript uniprocidence between the graphonomic characteristics of the doubted writings (writings from the tavern receipt July 18, 2020) and the undoubted ones (Kyle Krug's writing).</p>
6T898Z-5245	<p>The handwriting standards submitted for K2-Scott Granger bore consistent subtle and significant similarities with the body of the questioned writing on the document labeled Q1. There were no significant differences observed. It is my opinion that the body of Q1 was written by K2-Scott Granger. The handwriting standards submitted for K1-Kyle Krug bore consistent subtle and significant similarities with the body of the questioned writing on the document labeled Q2. There were no significant differences observed. It is my opinion that the body of Q2 was written by K1-Kyle Krug..</p>
6ZTXBJ-5245	<p>SCOTT GRANGER DID THE HANDWRITING IN QUESTIONED DOCUMENT Q1 . KYLE KRUG DID THE HANDWRITING IN QUESTIONED DOCUMENT Q2. THE QUESTIONED SIGNATURE</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	ON EACH OF THE TAVERN RECEIPT WAS PROBABLY NOT WRITTEN BY KYLE KRUG. WE CANNOT BE IDENTIFIED OR ELIMINATED TO SCOTT GRANGER LIKE THE AUTHOR OF THE QUESTIONED SIGNATURE ON EACH OF THE TAVERN RECEIPT.
72KKZR-5245	For Q1: The results are very much more likely when Scott Granger is the writer of the text than Kyle Krug is the writer. For Q2: The results are very much more likely when Kyle Krug is the writer of the text than Scott Granger is the writer. For the signatures the results are "inconclusive" because there are no similar elements for comparing between the questioned material and the comparing material. Both signatures could be fictitious.
73XHKG-5245	The author of the K2a-d exemplar writings attributed to Scott Granger is identified as the author of the questioned writings appearing on Q1. The author of the K1a-d exemplar writings attributed to Kyle Krug is identified as the author of the questioned writings appearing on Q2. The contributors can neither be identified nor eliminated as the author of the questioned signatures appearing on Q1 and Q2 due to a lack of comparable specimen writing as well as the partially illegible nature of the questioned signatures. Should additional comparable normal course specimen writing be obtained, it is recommended that the additional specimen writings be submitted for examination.
77EEXT-5241	1. Handwriting on the object named Q1 is written by Scott Granger according the K2a (dictated exemplars for Scott Granger) and K2d (course of business writing for Scott Granger). 2. Handwriting on the object named Q2 is written by Kyle Krug according the K1b (dictated exemplars for Kyle Krug) and K1d (course of business writing for Kyle Krug). 3. Signatures found in the front page of both objects Q1 and Q2 are not the signatures of Kyle Krug and Scott Granger according to K1c and K2c (requested signatures for Kyle Krug and Scott Granger).
794QWY-5245	The signatures appearing on items Q1 and Q2 are completely different from each other. The specimen signatures attributed to each writer (K1c and K2c), do not agree with either of the questioned signatures, no significant similarities are observed. The questioned signatures differ from the specimens for each writer in proportions, slant and overall appearance. Neither Mr. Krug (K1c) nor Mr. Granger (K2c), signed the questioned signatures on items Q1 and Q2, they are both eliminated. No cursive writing samples were available for Mr. Krug (K1a-b and K1d) for comparison against the cursive writing notation appearing on item Q1, therefore he cannot be identified or eliminated at this time. Side-by-side comparison of the printed writing on item Q2 and the printed writing samples provided (K1a-b and K1d), however, do agree in spacing, slant, proportions, creation of letters and letter combinations. No significant differences were noted between the two bodies of writing. Kyle Krug is identified as the writer of the printed notation appearing on item Q2. The questioned cursive writing appearing on item Q1 was subsequently compared to the cursive writing samples attributed to Mr. Granger on items K2a-b and K2d. No significant differences were noted. The questioned cursive writing style agrees with Mr. Granger's cursive writing style as reflected in his specimen body. Similarities include, but are not necessarily limited to: spacing, heights of letters, slant, letter formations and combination of characters. Mr. Granger is identified as the writer of the cursive notation appearing on item Q1. Examination of the printed writing on item Q2 against the writing attributed to Mr. Granger was not possible at this time. Printed writing samples should be submitted before a proper comparison can be conducted. Mr. Granger (K2a-b and K2d) can neither be identified or eliminated of writing the notation on item Q2 at this time.
79MPWH-5241	In my opinion I conclude that:- 1. Scott Granger has written the "Questioned" handwritten content (excluding the signature) on 'Q1' dated 10 July 2020 2. Kyle Krug has written the 'Questioned' handwritten content(excluding the signature) on 'Q2' dated 18 July 2020
7B79NK-5241	There are indications that Scott Granger may have written the questioned extended writing on the document Q1; however, the evidence to that effect is far from conclusive. There are indications that Kyle Krug may have written the questioned extended writing on the document Q2; however, the evidence to that effect is far from conclusive. There is no basis for an elimination or identification of Scott Granger or Kyle Krug as having written the questioned signatures on documents Q1 and Q2.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
7PR2J2-5241	<p>HANDWRITING (KYLE KRUG): Identification. It was determined that the questioned handwriting on Item 2 (Item Q2) (excluding the signature) was prepared by KYLE KRUG, writer of Item 3 (Items K1 a-d). No Conclusion. No conclusion could be reached whether or not KYLE KRUG, writer of Item 3 (Items K1 a-d), prepared the questioned signatures on Items 1 (Item Q1) or 2 (Item Q2) due to the lack of comparable known signatures for comparison and partial illegibility of the questioned signatures. HANDWRITING (SCOTT GRANGER): Identification. It was determined that the questioned handwriting on Item 1 (Item Q1) (excluding the signature and overwriting) was prepared by SCOTT GRANGER, writer of Item 4 (Items K2a-d). No Conclusion. No conclusion could be reached whether or not SCOTT GRANGER, writer of Item 4 (Items K2a-d), prepared the questioned signatures on Items 1 (Item Q1) or 2 (Item Q2) due to the partial illegibility of the questioned signatures, the limited comparability of the submitted known writing, the lack of undictated known signatures, and the presence of unexplained characteristics with the Item 1 (Item Q1) signature. If additional handwriting comparisons are desired, additional dictated and/or undictated known writing should be obtained from KYLE KRUG, writer of Item 3 (Items K1 a-d), SCOTT GRANGER, writer of Item 4 (Items K2a-d), as well as any other logical suspect(s). The known signatures should be in the same name and format as the questioned signatures. Each dictated known signature should be obtained on separate sheets of paper similar in format to the questioned items. Numerous repetitions of each signature will be necessary in order to demonstrate the writers' range of variation and to obtain naturally prepared writing. Each repetition should be removed from the writer's view immediately upon completion. Undictated known writing consists of writing prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known signatures include business papers, letters and/or applications. The undictated known signatures should be contemporaneous to the questioned items.</p>
7TTWBG-5245	<p>1-1. The body of the questioned writing(excluding the signature) of Q1 was not written by Kyle Krug(K1). 1-2. The body of the questioned writing(excluding the signature) of Q1 was written by Scott Granger(K2). 1-3. The body of the questioned writing(excluding the signature) of Q2 was written by Kyle Krug(K1). 1-4. The body of the questioned writing(excluding the signature) of Q2 was not written by Scott Granger(K2). 2-1. Neither Kyle Krug(K1) nor Scott Granger(K2) can be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature of Q1. 2-2. Neither Kyle Krug(K1) nor Scott Granger(K2) can be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature of Q2.</p>
7YTNBX-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
8Y88VV-5241	<p>After an examination of documents submitted at this time, my conclusion regarding the handwritten notes on the back of the 2 receipts is as follows: The Q1 handwritten note was written by K2 Scott Granger. The Q2 handwritten note was written by K1 Kyle Krug. The signatures were compared to each set of known writings submitted by K1 Kyle Krug and K2 Scott Granger. My conclusion regarding the signatures on the front of the 2 receipts is as follows: K1 Kyle Krug cannot be identified or eliminated as having written Q2. K1 did not write Q1. K2 Scott Granger cannot be identified or eliminated as having written Q1. K2 did not write Q2.</p>
92CDU2-5245	<p>Handwriting in Q1: In view of the significant similarities observed, the questioned handwriting in "Q1" (Tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020) was written by Scott Granger, the writer of the known specimen handwriting in "K2a" to "K2d". In view of the significant differences observed, the questioned handwriting in "Q1" (Tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020) was not written by Kyle Krug, the writer of the known specimen handwriting in "K1a" to "K1d". Handwriting in Q2: In view of the significant similarities observed, the questioned handwriting in "Q2" (Tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020) was written by Kyle Krug, the writer of the known specimen handwriting in "K1a" to "K1d". In view of the significant differences observed, the questioned handwriting in "Q2" (Tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020), was not written by Scott Granger, the writer of the known specimen handwriting in "K2a" to "K2d". Signature in Q1: The design of the questioned signature in "Q1" was different and not comparable with the specimen signatures in "K1c". The evidence is therefore inconclusive. Although there was a slight resemblance in the design of the signature between the</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	questioned signature in "Q1" and the specimen signatures in "K2c", most parts of the signature were not comparable. The evidence is therefore inconclusive. Signature in Q2: The design of the questioned signature in "Q2" was different and not comparable with the specimen signatures in "K1c". The evidence is therefore inconclusive. The design of the questioned signature in "Q2" was different and not comparable with the specimen signatures in "K2c". The evidence is therefore inconclusive.
942L3G- 5245	Kyle Krug is the author of the writing present in the document Q2. However, he is not the author of the writing present in the document Q1. Scott Granger is the author of the writing present in the document Q1. However, he is not the author of the writing present in the document Q2. Kyle Krug is not the author of the signature present in the Q1. However, I cannot eliminate or identify Kyle Krug as the author of the signature present on the document Q2. Scott Granger is not the author of the signature present on the document Q2. However, I cannot eliminate or identify Scott Granger as the author of the signature present in document Q1.
9DTXEX- 5241	1. Scott Granger wrote the questioned writing on Q1, not Kyle Krug. 2. Kyle Krug wrote the questioned writing on Q2, not Scott Granger. 3. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not either Kyle Krug or Scott Granger wrote the questioned signatures on Q1 and Q2.
9GQJ4F- 5241	Questioned writing(excluding the signature) on Q1 was written by K2(Scott Granger). Questioned writing(excluding the signature) on Q2 was written by K1(Kyle Krug). Questioned signature on each of Q1 and Q2 cannot be identified.
9HHJ2Q- 5241	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 [Analyst]. 2. A VSC (Video Spectral Comparator) examination using various microscopic, infrared, ultraviolet, and alternate light source examination techniques was not performed on the Q1 and Q2 documents as originals were not submitted. 3. An ESDA (ElectroStatic Detection Apparatus) examination for the detection and reading of indented writing, typing or other identifying impressions was not performed on the Q1 and Q2 documents as originals were not submitted. 4. The handwritten content on the back of the Q1 document was written by the writer of the K2a-d documents, identified as Scott Granger. 5. The writer identified as Scott Granger can be neither identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on the front of the Q1 document. 6. The handwritten content on the back of the Q2 document was written by the writer of the K1a-d documents, identified as Kyle Krug. 7. The writer identified as Kyle Krug can be neither identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on the front of the Q2 document. If suspects are developed, request and non-request known handwriting specimens are requested from each suspect repeating the questioned information verbatim 15 -20 times on comparable exemplar forms, along with normal course of business specimens (drivers license, bank signature card, cancelled checks, applications, letters, forms of extended writing if possible, etc.), as this may provide a basis for comparison. Should the known handwriting specimens be procured, this case should be resubmitted for examination.
9P2PXX- 5241	FIRST.- The writing located on the back of the tavern receipt document dated July 10, 2020, identified as Q1, comes from the graphic origin of the undoubted elements of C. SCOTT GRANGER. SECOND.- The writing located on the back of the tavern receipt document dated July 18, 2020, identified as Q2, comes from the graphic origin of the undoubted elements of C. KYLE KRUG. THIRD.- Regarding the signature visible at the bottom of the front of the tavern receipt type document dated July 10, 2020, identified as Q1, due to the technical impossibility of not having indubitable elements homologous to the CC. KYLE KRUG and SCOTT GRANGER, technical opinion is inconclusive. FOURTH.- Regarding the signature visible at the bottom of the front of the tavern receipt type document dated July 18, 2020, identified as Q2, due to the technical impossibility of not having indubitable elements homologous to the CC. KYLE KRUG and SCOTT GRANGER, technical opinion is inconclusive.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
ACPUZD-5245	<p>a). The manuscripts in the RECEIPT OF THE TAVERN OF JULY 10, 2020 IDENTIFIED Q1, PRESENT GRAPHIC IDENTITY with the manuscripts of Mr. SCOTT GRANGER (K2a, K2b and K2d). b). The manuscripts in the RECEIPT OF THE TAVERN OF JULY 18, 2020 IDENTIFIED Q2, PRESENT GRAPHIC IDENTITY with the manuscripts of Mr. KYLE KRUG (K1a, K1b and K1d). c). The signature on the RECEIPT OF THE TAVERN OF JULY 10, 2020 IDENTIFIED Q1, DOES NOT PRESENT GRAPHIC IDENTITY with the signatures of Mr. KYLE KRUG (K1c) and MR SCOTT GRANGER (K2c). d). The signature on the RECEIPT OF THE TAVERN OF JULY 18, 2020 IDENTIFIED Q2, DOES NOT PRESENT GRAPHIC IDENTITY with the signatures of Mr. KYLE KRUG (K1c) and MR SCOTT GRANGER (K2c).</p>
AKLPZW-5241	<p>Based on examinations results I concluded the questioned signatures of exhibit Q1 and Q2 are not signed by same person that signed /wrote known samples of exhibit K1a-K1d and K2a and K2d. Based an examinations results I concluded that the written script from exhibit Q1 has been written from the same person that wrote known written samples from exhibit K2a-K2d. Based on examinations results I concluded that the written script from exhibit Q2 has been written from that has wrote known written samples from exhibit K1a-K1d.</p>
ALZWLE-5245	<p>GRAPHIC IDENTITY between the manuscripts that work in the document Q1 "Receipt of the tavern of July 10" and the reference samples of Mr. Scott Granger (K2). GRAPHIC IDENTITY between the manuscripts that work in the document Q2 "Receipt of the tavern of July 18" and the reference samples of Mr. Kyle Krug (K2). IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO ISSUE A CONCEPT, as it is not possible to identify or eliminate Messrs. Kyle Krug and Scott Granger, from the participation in the preparation of the investigated signature Q1 that appears in the "receipt of the tavern of July 10". That is, there is graphical heteroprocidence. IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO ISSUE A CONCEPT, as it is not possible to identify or eliminate Messrs. Kyle Krug and Scott Granger, from the participation in the preparation of the investigated signature Q2 that appears in the "receipt of the tavern of July 18". That is, there is graphical heteroprocidence.</p>
AMBX8D-5241	<p>1) The writer of the K2(a-d) specimen samples, reportedly Scott Granger, wrote the questioned writing on Q1, excluding the signature. 2) The writer of the K1(a-d) specimen samples, reportedly Kyle Krug, wrote the questioned writing on Q2, excluding the signature. 3) No conclusion has been reached whether or not either of the writers of the K1 or K2 specimen samples, Kyle Krug and Scott Granger, respectively, may have written the questioned illegible signatures on either Q1 or Q2.</p>
ANZCPV-5241	<p>Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING (KYLE KRUG –ITEM 3 / Items K1a-d): Identification. It was determined that the questioned handwriting (excluding signature) on Item 2 (Item Q2) was prepared by KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d). No Conclusion. No conclusion could be reached whether or not KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d) prepared the questioned signatures on Item 1 (Item Q1) and Item 2 (Item Q2) due to the lack of comparable known signatures and the illegibility of the questioned signatures. HANDWRITING (SCOTT GRANGER –ITEM 4 / Items K2a-d): Identification. It was determined that the questioned handwriting (excluding signature) on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d). No Conclusion. No conclusion could be reached whether or not SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d) prepared the questioned signatures on Item 1 (Item Q1) and Item 2 (Item Q2) due to the lack of comparable known signatures, the illegibility of the questioned signatures, and the presence of unexplained characteristics.</p>
APGWPD-5241	<p>2. The questioned handwritten entries (excluding the signature) on Exhibit 10(Q2) and the known writing attributed to KRUG 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 handwritten entries (excluding the signature) on Exhibit 9(Q1) and the known writing attributed to GRANGER have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics in agreement from another writer is considered extremely low. 4. The questioned handwritten entries (excluding the signature) on Exhibit 10(Q2) and the known writing attributed to GRANGER have significant characteristics not in agreement. It is considered extremely unlikely that GRANGER is the writer of the questioned</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
AXQXVT-5245	handwritten entries on Exhibits 10(Q2). 5.The questioned handwritten entries (excluding the signature) on Exhibit 9(Q1) and the known
	I. The Questioned and Known writing were not comparable for either suspect. I could neither identify nor eliminate the author of the signature on the front of Q-1 based on the Known samples submitted from GRANGER or KRUG. II. The note written on the back of Q-1 was not authored by KRUG. Based on the evidence submitted for GRANGER it was determined that the characteristics in his Known samples were consistent with those found on Q-1. GRANGER authored the note on the back of the receipt designated as Q-1. III. The Questioned and Known writing were not comparable for either suspect. I could neither identify nor eliminate the author of the signature on the front of Q-2 based on the Known samples submitted from GRANGER or KRUG. IV. The note written on the back of Q-2 was not authored by GRANGER. Based on the evidence submitted for KRUG it was determined that the characteristics in his Known samples were consistent with those found on Q-2. KRUG authored the note on the back of the receipt designated as Q-2.
B6PUZB-5241	There are many similarities and no significant differences between the Q1 and K2 handwriting. The nature of the similarities is such that, in our opinion, K2 is responsible for the Q1 handwriting. There are many similarities and no significant differences between the Q2 and K1 handwriting. The nature of the similarities is such that, in our opinion, K1 is responsible for the Q2 handwriting. There are no pictorial similarities between the signatures provided by K1 and K2 to either the signature on Q1 or Q2. As such, we are unable to carry out a meaningful signature comparison and are, therefore, unable to comment on whether or not either K1 or K2 is responsible for the signatures on Q1 or Q2.
BCMY2K-5245	Similarities and a lack of fundamental differences were observed between the material provided for the K2 specimen writer and the Q1 questioned document. No limitations were identified in the examination. In my opinion, the writer of the K2 material also produced the handwritten entries on the questioned document Q1. Similarities and a lack of fundamental differences were observed between the material provided for the K1 specimen writer and the Q2 questioned document. No limitations were identified in the examination. In my opinion, the writer of the K1 material also produced the handwritten entries on the questioned document Q2. My opinion in regard to the questioned signatures on Q1 and Q2 is inconclusive.
BJMQGN-5241	The existing questioned handwriting on the receipt dated as 10 July 2020 was made by Scott Granger. The existing questioned handwriting on the receipt dated as 18 July 2020 was made by Kyle Krug.
BK68PG-5241	FINDINGS: Visual examination, comparison and evaluation resulted in the following: 3a) Kyle Krug (K1) 3a.1) It is highly probable that the body of the questioned writing (excluding the signature) depicted on item Q1 was not written by the author – Kyle Krug of the K1 known writing sample. The lack of sufficient known cursive handwriting from Krug (K1) precludes an elimination at this time. 3a.2) The body of the questioned writing (excluding the signature) depicted on item Q2 was written by the author – Kyle Krug of the K1 known writing sample. 3a.3) No conclusion can be made as to whether the questioned signature depicted on item Q1 was or was not written by the author – Kyle Krug of the K1 known writing sample. The lack of directly comparable known writing precludes any definitive determination of authorship. 3a.4) No conclusion can be made as to whether the questioned signature depicted on item Q2 was or was not written by the author – Kyle Krug of the K1 known writing sample. The lack of directly comparable known writing precludes any definitive determination of authorship. Visual examination, comparison and evaluation resulted in the following: 3b) Scott Granger (K2) 3b.1) The body of the questioned writing (excluding the signature) depicted on item Q1 was written by the author – Scott Granger of the K2 known writing sample. 3b.2) It is highly probable that the questioned writing (excluding the signature) depicted on item Q2 was not written by the author – Scott Granger of the K2 known writing sample. The lack of sufficient known handprinting from Granger (K2) precludes an elimination at this time. 3b.3) No conclusion can be made as to whether the questioned signature depicted on item Q1 was or was not written by the author – Scott Granger of the K2 known writing sample. The lack of directly comparable known writing precludes any definitive determination of authorship. 3b.4) No

TABLE 2

WebCode-
Test

Conclusions

conclusion can be made as to whether the questioned signature depicted on item Q2 was or was not written by the author – Scott Granger of the K2 known writing sample. The lack of directly comparable known writing precludes any definitive determination of authorship. REMARKS: 1) The handwriting findings are demonstrable through the use of enlarged illustrative charts. Please return the submitted items and allow at least three weeks for the necessary chart preparation. 2a) The submission of additional directly comparable known cursive writing from Kyle Krug (K1) may result in an elimination concerning the body of the questioned writing (excluding the signature) depicted on item Q1. The additional cursive writing should consist of a completed general handwriting form and five repetitions of all of the questioned writing depicted on item Q1 written (cursive style) on separate sheets of unlined paper approximating the same size as the questioned Q1 item. 2b) The submission of additional directly comparable known cursive writing from Kyle Krug (K1) may result in a definite conclusion concerning the questioned signatures depicted on items Q1 and Q2. The additional writing should consist of a completed general handwriting form and twenty repetitions of each questioned signature as depicted on item Q1 and item Q2, written on separate sheets of lined paper approximating the same size as the Q1 and Q2 items. 2c) The submission of additional directly comparable known handprinting from Scott Granger (K2) may result in an elimination concerning the body of the questioned writing (excluding the signature) depicted on item Q2. The additional handprinting should consist of a completed general handwriting form and five repetitions of all of the questioned writing depicted on item Q2 written (hand printed) on separate sheets of unlined paper approximating the same size as the questioned Q2 item. 2d) The submission of additional directly comparable known cursive writing from Scott Granger (K2) may result in a definite conclusion concerning the questioned signatures depicted on items Q1 and Q2. The additional writing should consist of a completed general handwriting form and twenty repetitions of each questioned signature depicted on item Q1 and item Q2, written on separate sheets of lined paper approximating the same size as the Q1 and Q2 items. In addition, the submission of at least five contemporaneous "course of business" signatures will be necessary for comparison purposes. 2e) All items will be returned to the submitting agency.

BPBDCU-
5241

In line with the questions asked, in the comparison of the writings and signatures on the documents subject to the examination and the existing comparison letters and signatures of the persons with the code numbers "K1" and "K2", made separately with the help of a microscope (LEICA Z16) and other optical instruments; Inversion of common letters and numbers, The starting and ending points of round letters and numbers, The general form and reverse style of signatures, Personal objections, In terms of calligraphic and other characteristic features, 1) Among the documents under examination, between the letters on the document specified as Q1 and the existing comparison letters of the person with code number "K2"; It has been observed that there is a similarity and similarity, and that the mentioned letters were obtained from the person with the code number "K2", 2) Among the letters on the document with the subject of examination as Q2 and the comparison letters of the person with code number "K1"; It has been observed that there is a similarity and similarity, and that the mentioned letters were obtained from the person with the code number "K1", 3) Between the signatures on the documents with the subject of inspection as Q1 and Q2 and the existing comparison signatures of the persons with code number "K1" and "K2"; differences were observed, and these specified signatures were not released by persons with code numbers "K1" and "K2", It has been concluded.

CDFJEQ-
5241

Determining whether the signatures on the front side of the Q1 and Q2 receipts are executed by Kyle Krug, Scott Granger, or another person, is not possible, due to the incomparable nature of the disputed signatures with the sample signatures. The written samples shall not contain graphic signs similar to those in the contested signatures.

CERJBK-
5245

In my opinion there is sufficient evidence to indicate that 1. The Handwriting on the Till Receipt dated "07/10/2020" (Q1) was WRITTEN BY Scott Granger. 2. It is UNLIKELY that Kyle Krug is responsible for the Handwriting on this receipt. 3. It is UNLIKELY that either Scott Granger or Kyle Krug is responsible for the questioned signature on this receipt. 4. The Handwriting on the Till Receipt dated "07/1/2020" (Q2) was WRITTEN BY Kyle Klug. 5. It is UNLIKELY that Scott Granger is responsible for the Handwriting on this receipt. 6. It is UNLIKELY that either Scott Granger or Kyle

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	Krug is responsible for the questioned signature on this receipt.
CLJYKW-5245	The forensic findings provide extremely strong support for the proposition that Scott Granger(K2) is responsible for writing the questioned text Q1 rather than the alternative proposition. The forensic findings provide extremely strong support for the proposition that Kyle Krug(K1) is responsible for writing the questioned text Q2 rather than the alternative proposition. The forensic findings provide no assistance in addressing the issue whether Mr. Granger or Mr. Krug wrote the signatures Q1 and Q2.
CNURYX-5241	Based on the documents submitted for examination, I have made the following opinions: 1) I have identified that the handwritten note on the back of the the Q1 receipt was written by the writer of the K2 documents, given as Scott Granger. I have eliminated Kyle Krueger as the writer of the note. 2) I am inconclusive as to whether or not Scott Granger or Kyle Krueger was the writer of the signature on the Q1. 3) I have identified that the handwritten note on the back of the Q2 receipt was written by the writer of the K1 documents, given as Kyle Krueger. I have eliminated Scott Granger as the writer of the note. 4) I am inconclusive as to whether or not Kyle Krueger was the writer of the signature on Q2. 5) Scott Granger was probably not the writer of the signature found on Q2.
CT9CZR-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
CYV6BR-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
D39JZA-5245	3.1. Manuscripts on the back of Joe's Tavern's July 10, 2020 commercial copy receipt do not bear graphic identity with genuine Kyle Krug signatures. 3.2. Manuscripts present on the back of Joe's Tavern's July 10, 2020 commercial copy receipt, do bear graphic identity with genuine Scott Granger signatures. 3.3 Manuscripts present on the back of Joe's Tavern's July 18, 2020 commercial copy receipt, do bear graphic identity with genuine Kyle Krug signatures. 3.4 Manuscripts on the back of Joe's Tavern's July 18, 2020 commercial copy receipt do not bear graphic identity with genuine Scott Granger signatures. 3.5 To determine who is the author of the signature presented on the face of the receipt of July 10, 2020, a greater number of manuscript samples from Messrs. Kyle Krug and Scott Granger is required. 3.6 To determine who is the author of the signature presented on the face of the receipt of July 18, 2020, a greater number of manuscript samples of Messrs. Kyle Krug and Scott Granger are required.
DGF6PU-5241	1. The body of questioned writing identify as Q2 correspond to Kyle Krung and the Q1 to Scott Granger. 2. In relation to the questioned signatures, it is not possible to identify the correspondence due to the lack of morphological and handwriting elements.
DJHDLR-5241	1. The Q1 signature does not correspond to the K1 (Kyle Krug) match. 2. The Q1 signature does not correspond to the K2 (Scott Granger) match. 3. The Q2 signature does not correspond to the K1 (Kyle Krug) match. 4. The Q2 signature does not correspond to the K2 (Scott Granger) match. 5. The writing of Q1 does not correspond to the K1 (Kyle Krug) check. 6. The writing of Q1 corresponds to the K2 (Scott Granger) check. 7. The writing of Q2 corresponds to the K1 (Kyle Krug) check. 8. The writing of Q2 does not correspond to the K2 (Scott Granger) check.
DK9CZP-5245	1.The signature on the front of Q1 and Q2 were not written by the writer of K1 (Kyle Krug) or the writer of K2 (Scott Granger). 2.The Handwriting on the back of Q1 was written by the writer of K2 (Scott Granger). 3The Handwriting on the back of Q2 was written by the writer K1 (Kyle Krug).
DPPU4T-5241	Answers to question 1: Entire of the back of the receipt dated 10 July 2020 (Q-1) were written by Scott Granger (K2), therefore they were not made by Kyle Krug (K1). Entire of the back of the receipt dated 18 July 2020 (Q-2) were written by Kyle Krug (K1), therefore they were not made by Scott Granger (K2), -Answer to question 2: It is impossible to identify or eliminate the person, who wrote the signatures on the front of both questioned receipts (Q1 and Q2) – all answers "C",
DTNKGK-5241	ELIMINATION: It was determined that the questioned handwritten words present on the back of document Q-1 were not written by Kyle Krug, the writer of K-1 through K-4 (K1a-d), due to many

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>dissimilarities of handwriting habit. IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that the questioned handwritten words present on the back of document Q-1 were written by Scott Granger, the writer of K-5 through K-8 (K2a-d), due to many similarities of handwriting habit. IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that the questioned handwritten words present on the back of document Q-2 were written by Kyle Krug, the writer of K-1 through K-4 (K1a-d), due to many similarities of handwriting habit. ELIMINATION: It was determined that the questioned handwritten words present on the back of document Q-2 were not written by Scott Granger, the writer of K-5 through K-8 (K2a-d), due to many dissimilarities of handwriting habit. PROBABLY NOT: A definitive determination could not be reached as to whether the questioned signature present on document Q-1 was written by Kyle Krug, the writer of K-1 through K-4 (K1a-d), due to the lack of comparable signatures submitted for comparison. However, based on the known writing signature exemplars in my possession, inconsistencies in handwriting habit were observed that indicate that Kyle Krug, the writer of K-1 through K-4 (K1a-d), probably did not write the questioned signature on document Q-1. PROBABLY NOT: A definitive determination could not be reached as to whether the questioned signature present on document Q-1 was written by Scott Granger, the writer of K-5 through K-8 (K2a-d), due to the lack of comparable signatures submitted for comparison. However, based on the known writing signature exemplars in my possession, inconsistencies in handwriting habit were observed that indicate that Scott Granger, the writer of K-5 through K-8 (K2a-d), probably did not write the questioned signature on document Q-1. PROBABLY NOT: A definitive determination could not be reached as to whether the questioned signature present on document Q-2 was written by Kyle Krug, the writer of K-1 through K-4 (K1a-d), due to the lack of comparable signatures submitted for comparison. However, based on the known writing signature exemplars in my possession, inconsistencies in handwriting habit were observed that indicate that Kyle Krug, the writer of K-1 through K-4 (K1a-d), probably did not write the questioned signature on document Q-2. PROBABLY NOT: A definitive determination could not be reached as to whether the questioned signature present on document Q-2 was written by Scott Granger, the writer of K-5 through K-8 (K2a-d), due to the lack of comparable signatures submitted for comparison. However, based on the known writing signature exemplars in my possession, inconsistencies in handwriting habit were observed that indicate that Scott Granger, the writer of K-5 through K-8 (K2a-d), probably did not write the questioned signature on document Q-2. Note: With the submission of additional known writing signature exemplars, written in the names of those of the questioned signatures present on Q-1 and Q-2, from both Kyle Krug and Scott Granger, a more definitive conclusion may be reached.</p>
DW2X7K-5241	<p>1- The handwriting on the back side of Q1(Tavern receipt Dated 10 July 2020) was written by K2 (Scott Granger) and was NOT written by K1(Kyle Krug). 2-The handwriting on the back side of Q2(Tavern receipt Dated 18 July 2020) was written by K1 (Kyle Krug) and was NOT written by K2(Scott Granger). 3-The signature on the front side of Q1 ((Tavern receipt Dated 10 July 2020) was probably not written by both k1 (Kyle Krug) and K2(SCOTT GRANGER). 3- The signature on the front side of Q2 (Tavern receipt Dated 18 July 2020) CAN NOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED that were written by either K1 (Kyle Krug) nor K2 (Scott Granger).</p>
DYCTRC-5245	<p>Sufficient known material was available to reach conclusions involving author of written material on reverse of each receipt. Insufficient material was received to reach stronger conclusions involving authors of signatures.</p>
DZP6WA-5245	<p>1)The questioned writing on the back of Q1 was written by K2(SCOTT GRANGER). 2)The questioned writing on the back of Q2 was written by K1(KYLE KRUG). 3)It cannot be determined whether if K1 and K2 contributed to the questioned signatures on Q1 and Q2.</p>
EG8N6Z-5245	<p>Handwriting: For comparison Q1 to K2 and Q2 to K1: Findings support the proposition that the Q and K were written by the same person. There are many important similarities, no important differences, no limitations to the examination. The expert opinion is that the Q and K were written by the same person. According to the information on K that we received with the claim for examination Q was written by person ... For comparison Q1 to K1 and Q2 to K2: Findings support the proposition that the Q and K were not written by the same person. There are many important</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	differences, no important similarities, no limitations to the examination. The expert opinion is that the Q and K were not written by the same person. According to the information on K that we received with the claim for examination Q was not written by person ... Signatures: For all comparisons, Q1 and Q2 to K1 and K2: It is not possible to compare Q signatures with K comparison material. Q signatures are unreadable and there are no similar unreadable K signatures. Therefore Q signatures are not comparable with neither K text nor K signatures. In real case we would ask for a course of business signatures sample. After examining that we would state if the person spontaneously signs like that or not.
ENQVKK-5241	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 questioned cursive writing present on the credit card receipt submitted in exhibit Q1 was not written by the author of K1a-d (Kyle Krug). 2. The questioned printing present on the credit card receipt submitted in exhibit Q2 was written by the author of K1a-d (Kyle Krug). 3. No conclusion can be rendered regarding the questioned signatures on exhibits Q1 and Q2 when compared to K1a-d (Kyle Krug). 4. The questioned cursive writing present on the credit card receipt submitted in exhibit Q1 was written by the author of K2a-d (Scott Granger). 5. The questioned printing present on the credit card receipt submitted in exhibit Q2 was not written by the author of K2a-d (Scott Granger). 6. No conclusion can be rendered regarding the questioned signatures on exhibits Q1 and Q2 when compared to K2a-d (Scott Granger). 7. Exhibits Q1 and Q2 were scanned for preservation by Specialist XXX. 8. Exhibits Q1 and Q2 should be forwarded to the Latent Print and DNA Sections for processing.
F3KVTY-5241	The K2 specimen contributor Scott Granger is identified as the author of the questioned hand printed text on the reverse side of Q1. The K1 specimen contributor Kyle Krug is identified as the author of the questioned hand printed text on the reverse side of Q2. Neither contributor could be identified or eliminated as the author of the questioned signature appearing on the face of Q1 and Q2 utilizing the specimen writings provided. It is recommended that additional specimens signatures written during the normal course of business be obtained from both contributors and submitted for further examination.
F9C3C8-5245	Both the questioned signatures and both the signatures of the sample giving persons are different in structure, legibility and in letters, therefore their features and characteristics cannot be compared in merits.
FBHZU9-5241	Upon completion of an examination and comparison of the exhibits and standards submitted in this case, this examiner has reached the following opinions: The K2 writer did write the questioned text of the Q1 exhibit. The K1 writer did write the questioned text of the Q2 exhibit. It cannot be determined if either the K1 or K2 writer wrote the questioned signature of the Q1 exhibit. It cannot be determined if either the K1 or K2 writer wrote the questioned signature of the Q2 exhibit.
FK4RAR-5241	1) K1 : (Kyle Krug) did not write the note and signed the receipt (Q1) dated 10/7/2020 . 2) K1 : (Kyle Krug) is the writer of the note on the receipt (Q2) dated 18/7/2020 — either the signature cannot proven or denied . 3) K2 : (Scott Granger) is the writer of the note on the receipt (Q1) dated 10/7/2020 — either the signature cannot proven or denied . 4) K2 : (Scott Granger) did not write the note and signed the receipt(Q2) dated 18/7/2020 .
FMWXYC-5241	Questioned writings excluding the signatures - A: It is highly probable that Scott Granger has written the questioned writing on Q1. E: It is highly probable that Kyle Krug has not written the questioned writing on Q1. A: It is highly probable that Kyle Krug has written the questioned writing on Q2. E: It is highly probable that Scott Granger has not written the questioned writing on Q2. Questioned signatures - C: Cannot be identified or eliminated if Kyle Krug has written the questioned signature on Q1. C: Cannot be identified or eliminated if Scott Granger has written the questioned signature on Q1. C: Cannot be identified or eliminated if Kyle Krug has written the questioned signature on Q2. C: Cannot be identified or eliminated if Scott Granger has written the questioned signature on Q2.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
FQRCD9-5241	<p>Findings 20-5241 Forensic, comparative handwriting examinations using magnification and lighting resulted in the following: The writer of the questioned note on the reverse side of Exhibit Q1 and the writer of the K2 known exemplars is the same person. There is agreement in a combination of individualizing handwriting characteristics with the absence of any significant differences. The writer of the questioned note on the reverse side of Exhibit Q2 and the writer of the K1 known exemplars is the same person. There is agreement in a combination of individualizing handwriting characteristics with the absence of any significant differences. It was not possible to properly compare the K1 known writing with the questioned note on the reverse side of Exhibit Q1. Therefore, no conclusion could be reached. More specifically, the Exhibit Q1 note is written in cursive while the K1 known writing (excluding the signatures) is all hand printed. It may be possible to reach a more definitive opinion if 20 to 25 exemplars written in cursive and in the exact text of the Q1 note could be submitted for comparison. The known K2 writer did not write the questioned note on the reverse side of Exhibit Q2. Comparison found significant differences in handwriting characteristics. No conclusion could be reached regarding the questioned signature appearing on the front of Exhibit Q1. It was not possible to properly compare the Q1 questioned signature to either of the sets of known signatures contained in Exhibits K1 and K2. The questioned and known signatures are stylized, lack pictorial similarity and the name for the signature appearing on Exhibit Q1 is not known. Since the name on Exhibit Q1 is not known, the questioned and known signatures may be in different names. It may be possible to reach a more definitive opinion if the name appearing on the Exhibit Q1 signature line could be provided and if 20 to 25 signature exemplars in that name could be provided for comparison. No conclusion could be reached regarding the questioned signature appearing on the front of Exhibit Q2. It was not possible to properly compare the Q2 questioned signature to either of the sets of known signatures contained in Exhibits K1 and K2. The questioned and known signatures are stylized, lack pictorial similarity and the name for the signature appearing on Exhibit Q2 is not known. Since the name on Exhibit Q2 is not known, the questioned and known signatures may be in different names. It may be possible to reach a more definitive opinion if the name appearing on the Exhibit Q2 signature line could be provided and if 20 to 25 signature exemplars in that name could be provided for comparison.</p>
FV26EC-5245	<p>Results of Examinations: 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: In as much as it is possible to examine digital images in lieu of the original documents, it is my opinion that Scott Granger wrote the questioned text on the back of the Q1 receipt. (Identification). In as much as it is possible to examine digital images in lieu of the original documents, it is my opinion that Kyle Krug wrote the questioned text on the back of the Q2 receipt. (Identification). The questioned signatures on the front of the Q1 and Q2 receipt can neither be identified nor eliminated with the known writing of Kyle Krug nor Scott Granger. (Indeterminable). The questioned signatures are scrawled and indecipherable and not comparable to the known signature samples submitted for comparison. Additionally, the known signature samples consisted of request writing samples only, with no course of business samples provided to authenticate the request samples or establish a range of variation of signature styles for either of the known writers. These limitations hindered the examination and preclude a more conclusive opinion. Remarks: Conclusions defined in accordance with ASTM E1658-08 Standard Terminology for Expressing Conclusions of Forensic Document Examiners. Identification: this is the highest degree of confidence expressed by document examiners in handwriting comparisons. The examiner has no reservations whatever, and although prohibited from using the word "fact," the examiner is certain, based on evidence contained in the handwriting, that the writer of the known material actually wrote the writing in question. Indeterminable: this is the zero point of the confidence scale. It is used when there are significantly limiting factors, such as disguise in the questioned and/or known writing or a lack of comparable writing, and the examiner does not have even a leaning one way or another.</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
FWFZQQ-5241	<p>It is concluded that the person who performed the undoubted deeds (K1A, K1B, K1D) on behalf of Kyle Krug, wrote the filling in the questioned receipt identified as Q2. It is concluded that the person who made the undoubted deeds (K2a, K2b, and K2d) on behalf of Scott Granger, wrote the visible filling in the questioned receipt identified as Q1. I do not identify or delete Mr. Kyle Krug (K1c) as the author of the disputed signature visible on the disputed receipt designated Q1. Limiting: (s) Due to the lack of comparability between the doubted and undoubted samples, a result was not provided in this regard since they are required to be checked against the questioned firm. I do not identify or delete Mr. Scott Granger (K2c), as the author of the questioned signature visible on the questioned receipt Q2. Limiting: (s) Due to the lack of comparability between the doubted and undoubted samples, a result was not provided in this regard since they are required to be checked against the questioned firm. I do not identify or delete the person who performed the deeds (K1a, K1b and K1d), Kyle Krug, as the author of the handwritten deeds visible on the receipt questioned as Q1. Limiting: (s) Due to the lack of comparability between the doubted and undoubted samples, a result was not provided in this regard since they are required to be checked against the questioned firm. I do not identify or remove the person who performed the K2a, K2b and K2d deeds), Kyle Krug as the author of the visible handwritten deeds on the questioned receipt identified as Q2. Limiting: (s) Due to the lack of comparability between the doubted and undoubted samples, a result was not provided in this regard since they are required to be checked against the questioned firm. I do not identify or remove Mr. Kyle Krug (k1c) as the author of the disputed signature visible on the disputed receipt designated Q2. Limiting: (s) Due to the lack of comparability between the doubted and undoubted samples, a result was not provided in this regard since they are required to be checked against the questioned firm. I do not identify or delete Mr. Scott Granger K2c, as the author of the questioned signature visible on the questioned receipt called Q1. Limiting: (s) Due to the lack of comparability between the doubted and undoubted samples, a result was not provided in this regard since they are required to be checked against the questioned firm. The conclusions of this report are opinions based on the use of accepted professional and scientific practices.</p>
FX8MC8-5245	<p>Kyle Krug, writer of Items K1 (a-d) has been identified as the writer of the questioned hand printing appearing on the reverse of Item Q2. Krug could not be identified to nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature appearing on the face of Item Q2. Additionally, Krug could not be identified to nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature appearing on Item Q1 due to the lack of comparable known writing. Scott Granger, writer of Items K2(a-d) has been identified as the writer of the questioned writing appearing on the reverse of Item Q1. Granger probably did not write the questioned signature appearing on the face of Item Q1. Granger could not be identified to nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature appearing on the face of Item Q2 due to the lack of comparable known writing. Kyle Krug, Item K1 (a-d) has been eliminated as the writer of the questioned writing appearing on the reverse of Item Q1. Scott Granger, Item K2(a-d) has been eliminated as the writer of the questioned hand printing appearing on the reverse of Item Q2.</p>
FX8Y6N-5241	<p>a) The texts on the Q1 document were written by K2. b) The texts on the Q2 document were written by K1. c) K1 and K2 persons do not contribute signatures.</p>
G6RDRU-5245	<p>The writer of Exhibit K2 (Scott Grainger) wrote the questioned entries on the back of Exhibit Q1. The writer of Exhibit K1 (Kyle Krug) wrote the questioned entries on the back of Exhibit Q2. The writer of Exhibit K2 (Scott Grainger) could neither be identified, nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on the front of exhibit Q1 or on the front of exhibit Q2. The writer of Exhibit K1 (Kyle Krug) could neither be identified, nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on the front of exhibit Q1 or on the front of exhibit Q2.</p>
GAFPBA-5241	<p>ELIMINATION: It was determined the questioned handwritten back portion of document Q-1, dated 10 July 2020 was not written by Kyle Krug. IDENTIFICATION: It was determined the questioned handwritten back portion of document Q-2, dated 18 July 2020 was written by Kyle Krug. IDENTIFICATION: It was determined the questioned handwritten back portion of document Q-1, dated 10 July 2020 was written by Scott Granger. ELIMINATION: It was determined the questioned handwritten back portion of document Q-2, dated 18 July 2020 was not written by</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	<p>Scott Granger. PROBABLY NOT: Kyle Krug probably did not write the questioned unknown signature document Q-1, dated 10 July 2020. Due to lack of comparable signatures submitted. PROBABLY NOT: Kyle Krug probably did not write the questioned unknown signature document Q-2, dated 18 July 2020. Due to lack of comparable signatures submitted. PROBABLY NOT: Scott Granger probably did not write the questioned unknown signature document Q-1, dated 10 July 2020. Due to lack of comparable signatures submitted. PROBABLY NOT: Kyle Krug probably did not write the questioned unknown signature document Q-2, dated 18 July 2020. Due to lack of comparable signatures submitted. It is requested that exemplars be submitted of Kyle Krug and Scott Granger writing the questioned signature of documents Q-1 and Q-2 for future examinations.</p>
GDKLCL- 5245	<p>1. Kyle KRUG, 1.1.Item Q1, 1.1.1.Handwriting: The questioned handwritten entries contained within item Q1 are written in a connected script and the specimen material provided in the name of Kyle KRUG (Items 1a, 1b and 1d) consists of disconnected handwriting. I am unable to conduct an examination due to the lack of comparable specimen material and as a result my opinion is inconclusive. 1.1.2.Signature: The specimen signatures contained within Item 1c are purportedly signed in the name of Kyle KRUG. No specimen signatures were provided in the name of the questioned document (Item Q1) and therefore I am unable to conduct an examination due to the lack of comparable specimen material, and as a result my opinion is inconclusive. 1.2.Item Q2, 1.2.1.Handwriting: I have found a number of similarities between the questioned handwriting contained within item Q2 and the specimen material provided in the name of Kyle KRUG. The similarities are the kind I would expect to find if the writing was produced by the same writer. Therefore, I am of the opinion that the evidence provides strong support for the view that the questioned writing contained within item Q2 was produced by the specimen writer in the name of Kyle KRUG (Items 1a, 1b and 1d). 1.2.2.Signature: The specimen signatures contained within item 1c are purportedly signed in the name of Kyle KRUG. No specimen signatures were provided in the name of the questioned document (Item Q2) and therefore I am unable to conduct an examination due to the lack of comparable specimen material, and as a result my opinion is inconclusive. 2. Scott GRANGER, 2.1.Item Q1, 2.1.1.Handwriting: I have found a number of similarities between the questioned handwriting contained within item Q1 and the specimen material provided in the name of Scott GRANGER. The similarities are the kind I would expect to find if the writing was produced by the same writer. Therefore, I am of the opinion that the evidence provides strong support for the view that the questioned writing contained within item Q1 was produced by the specimen writer in the name of Scott GRANGER (Items 2a, 2b and 2d). 2.1.2.Signature: The specimen signatures contained within item 2c are purportedly signed in the name of Scott GRANGER. No specimen signatures were provided in the name of the questioned document (Item Q1) and therefore I am unable to conduct an examination due to the lack of comparable specimen material, and as a result my opinion is inconclusive. 2.2.Item Q2 2.2.1.Handwriting: I have found a number of differences between the questioned handwriting contained within item Q2 and the specimen material provided in the name of Scott GRANGER. The differences are the kind I would expect to find if the writing was produced by another writer. Therefore, I am of the opinion that the evidence provides qualified support for the view that the questioned writing contained within item Q2 was not produced by the specimen writer in the name of Scott GRANGER (Items 2a, 2b and 2d). 2.2.2.Signature: The specimen signatures contained within item 2c are purportedly signed in the name of Scott GRANGER. No specimen signatures were provided in the name of the questioned document (Item Q2) and therefore I am unable to conduct an examination due to the lack of comparable specimen material, and as a result my opinion is inconclusive.</p>
GEQCWL- 5241	<p>He text of the commercial copy dated July 18, 2020 was written by Scott Granger. Mr. Scott Granger cannot be identified or eliminated from the authorship of the signature of the commercial copy dated July 10, 2020 (Q1). The text of the commercial copy dated July 10, 2020 was written by Kyle Krug. Mr. Kyle Krug cannot be identified or removed from the authorship of the signature of the commercial copy dated July 18, 2020 (Q2).</p>
GF9U6E- 5241	<p>As a result of my examination it is my opinion that: 1. The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the handwritten entries on Q1 were written by the writer of the K2 samples (Scott Granger). 2. The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
GGWTB6-5241	handwritten entries on Q2 were written by the writer of the K1 samples (Kyle Krug). 3. No opinion can be expressed as to the authorship of the signatures appearing on Q1 and Q2.
GLC4QU-5241	Handwritings: In our opinion the questioned writing on item Q1 was written by writer K2 /Scott Granger/, and the handwriting on item Q2 was written by Kyle Krug /K1/. In both cases there were significant similarities in general characteristics and in the individual features between the questioned handwritings and the samples /Q1-K2, Q2-K1/. Signatures: Differences were observed in the structure, design and pictorial appearance of the questioned signatures and specimen signatures of K1 writer. The signatures were probably not written by K1. There were limited number of features which could be compared and these features were different /e.g. skill, slant, baseline/. The writer of K2 can not be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on Q1 item. The signature on Q2 was probably not written by K2.
GNFZRN-5245	Result(s) & Conclusion(s): 1. After careful examination and comparison of Questioned Handwriting on Q1 with course of business writing of Kyle Krug (K1d) and with dictated handwriting exemplars of Kyle Krug (K1a-b), it is concluded that the Questioned Handwriting on Q1 is not written by Kyle Krug (K1). Therefore, Kyle Krug (K1) is not the author of Questioned Handwriting on Q1. 2. After careful examination and comparison of Questioned Handwriting on Q2 with course of business writing of Kyle Krug (K1d) and with dictated handwriting exemplars of Kyle Krug (K1a-b), it is concluded that the Questioned Handwriting on Q2 is written by Kyle Krug (K1). Therefore, Kyle Krug (K1) is the author of Questioned Handwriting on Q2. 3. After careful examination and comparison of Questioned Handwriting on Q1 with course of business writing of Scott Granger (K2d) and with dictated handwriting exemplars of Scott Granger (K2a-b), it is concluded that the Questioned Handwriting on Q1 is written by Scott Granger (K2). Therefore, Scott Granger (K2) is the author of Questioned Handwriting on Q1. 4. After careful examination and comparison of Questioned Handwriting on Q2 with course of business writing of Scott Granger (K2d) and with dictated handwriting exemplars of Scott Granger (K2a-b), it is concluded that the Questioned Handwriting on Q2 is not written by Scott Granger (K2). Therefore, Scott Granger (K2) is not the author of Questioned Handwriting on Q2. 5. After careful examination of Questioned Signatures on Q1 and Q2 with requested signature exemplars of Kyle Krug (K1c), no conclusion could be drawn on the basis of provided evidence. 6. After careful examination of Questioned Signatures on Q1 and Q2 with requested signature exemplars of Scott Granger (K2c), no conclusion could be drawn on the basis of provided evidence.
GZC3C6-5241	Scott Granger the questioned handwritten entry on the back of document Q-1. Kyle Krug wrote the questioned handwritten entry on the back of document Q-2. Scott Granger probably did not write the questioned signature entry on on document Q-1; however due to the limited amount of standards, he is not eliminated as the writer. Kyle Krug probably did not write the questioned signature entry on on document Q-2; however due to the limited amount of standards, he is not eliminated as the writer.
HMN66F-5245	The body of questioned writing on the Q-1 document was not written by Kyle Krug (K-1). The body of questioned writing on the Q-2 document was written by Scott Grainger (K-2). There are indications or evidence to suggest that the Q-1 signature may not have been signed by either Kyle Krug (K-1) or Scott Grainger (K-2). The lack of directly comparable writing precludes a more definitive conclusion. There are indications or evidence to suggest that the Q-2 signature may not have been signed by either Kyle Krug (K-1) or Scott Grainger (K-2). The lack of directly comparable writing precludes a more definitive conclusion.
HMN66F-5245	There is a strong probability that the writer of Exhibit K-1, submitted as that of Kyle Krug, wrote the questioned handprinted text on the back of Exhibit Q-2. The evidence is very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality is missing so that an identification is not in order; however, the examiner is virtually certain that the questioned and known writings were written by the same individual. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the writer of Exhibit K-1 prepared the questioned signature in Exhibit Q-2. There was not enough comparable evidence to form a conclusive opinion. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the writer of Exhibit K-1 prepared any of the questioned writing in Exhibit Q-1. There was not enough comparable evidence to form a conclusive

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>opinion. The questioned writing on the back was in cursive and the known sample in K1 is printed. There is a strong probability that the writer of Exhibit K-2, submitted as that of Scott Granger, wrote the questioned cursive entries on the back of Exhibit Q-1. The evidence is very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality is missing so that an identification is not in order; however, the examiner is virtually certain that the questioned and known writings were written by the same individual. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the writer of Exhibit K-2, submitted as that of Scott Granger, prepared the questioned signature in Exhibit Q-1. There was not enough comparable evidence to form a conclusive opinion. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the writer of Exhibit K-2, submitted as that of Scott Granger, prepared any of the questioned writing in Exhibit Q-2. There was not enough comparable evidence to form a conclusive opinion. The questioned writing on the back was printed and the known sample in K2 has a limited amount of printed writing.</p>
HUHAXG-5241	<p>Comparisons between the questioned cursive writing present on the backside of the receipt designated Q1 and the known course-of-business and known request cursive writing designated K2, revealed the questioned cursive writing was produced by the same writer that produced the known cursive writing, Scott Granger. (Identification). Comparisons between the questioned cursive writing present on the backside of the receipt designated Q1 and the known course-of-business and known request hand printed said to be produced by Kyle Krug, designated K1, were not conducted because the questioned and known writing samples are not comparable. (Kyle Krug was eliminated as the writer of the questioned cursive writing present in Q1 by the identification of Scott Granger being the writer of the questioned cursive writing present in Q1). Comparisons between the questioned hand printing present on the backside of the receipt designated Q2 and the known course-of-business and known request hand printing designated K1, revealed the questioned hand printing was produced by the same writer that produced the known hand printing, Kyle Krug. (Identification). Comparisons between the questioned hand printing present on the backside of the receipt designated Q2 and the known course-of-business and known request cursive writing said to be produced by Scott Granger, designated K2, were not conducted because the questioned and known writing samples are not comparable. (Scott Granger was eliminated as the writer of the questioned hand printing present in Q2 by the identification of Kyle Krug being the writer of the questioned hand printing present in Q2). Comparisons were not conducted between the questioned signature present on the front side of the receipt designated Q1 and the known request signatures designated K1, said to contain the name Kyle Krug. (No Comparisons). Comparisons were not conducted between the questioned signature present on the front side of the receipt designated Q2 and the known request signatures designated K1, said to contain the name Kyle Krug. (No Comparisons). Comparisons were not conducted between the questioned signature present on the front side of the receipt designated Q1 and the known request signatures designated K2, said to contain the name Scott Granger. (No Comparisons). Comparisons were not conducted between the questioned signature present on the front side of the receipt designated Q1 and the known request signatures designated K2, said to contain the name Scott Granger. (No Comparisons).</p>
HVZR7A-5241	<p>Upon completion of an examination of the exhibits submitted in this case, this Examiner opines the following: The K-1 writer did author the Q-2 exhibit but not the Q-1 exhibit. The K-2 writer did author the Q-1 exhibit but not the Q-2 exhibit. No opinion could be rendered in regards to any of the submitted signatures, due to it being unknown what name is signed on the Q-1 (first letter appears to be a cursive "f" or "J") and Q-2 (first letter appears to be a "J") which does not correspond with the first initials of the submitted writers.</p>
JB66T4-5245	<p>The questioned writing excluding the signature of the tavern receipts dated 07/10/2020 (Q1) were written by Sr. SCOTT GRANGER (K2), documented by the analogies found such as the interliteral and interverbal spaces, the unions of the signs, the making of the letter "w" and the letter "l", among others. The questioned writing excluding the signature of the tavern receipts dated 07/18/2020 (Q2) were written by Sr. KYLE KRUG (K1), documented by the analogies found such as the linear displacement, the making of the letter "o", the design of the letter "f" and "d", inclination, among others. The questioned signature contained of the tavern receipts dated 07/10/2020 (Q1) and the signature contained of the tavern receipts dated 07/18/2020 (Q2) were not written by Sr. SCOTT</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	GRANGER (K2c), documented by the differences found such as the construction of the first sign similar to eight, the amorphous figure as the rubrics ends, the mold of the sign seen in the central part, the end of the first body of the rubric, among others. The signature contained of the tavern receipts dated 07/18/2020 (Q2) and the signature contained of the tavern receipts dated 07/10/2020 (Q1) were not written by KYLE KRUG (K1c), a conclusion documented by the differences found such as the design of the baseline, the confection of the letter "K", the box of the projection line goes up, among others.
JBPDP7-5241	In my opinion, receipt Q1 was written by Scott Granger (K2). In my opinion, receipt Q2 was written by Kyle Krug (K1). It is not possible to determine whether or not Scott Granger (K2) or Kyle Kurg (K1) wrote the signatures on the front of the receipts Q1 and Q2.
JFGNY6-5241	The questioned handwritten entries on the reverse side of Q1 and the known writing attributed to Granger have significant characteristics in agreement. The questioned handwritten entries on the reverse side of Q2 and the known writing attributed to Krug have significant characteristics in agreement. Based on an examination of the evidence submitted, it cannot be determined whether or not Granger and Krug wrote the questioned signatures on Q1 and Q2. The primary limiting factors were the stylized and abbreviated nature of the question signatures.
JHKTlk-5241	The text on document Q1 was written by K2 (Scott Granger). The text on document Q2 was written by K1 (Kyle Krug). It is not possible to determine the author of the signatures on documents Q1 and Q2.
JJYEVm-5241	THE Q2 TEXTS ARE UNIPROCEDENT WITH THE K1 SCRIPTURAL SAMPLES OF MR. KYLE KRUG. THE Q1 TEXTS ARE UNIPROCEDENT WITH THE K2 SCOTT GRANGER SCOTT GRANGER SCRIPTURAL SAMPLES. THE SIGNATURES Q1 AND Q2 ARE NOT SUITABLE FOR COLLECTION DUE TO THE LACK OF SIMILARITY OF GRAPHICS.
JNTCKD-5241	1.) The writing of the Q1 document corresponds to the writing of the K2 document (a, b and d), therefore document Q1 does not correspond to document K1 (a, b and d). The writing of the Q2 document corresponds to the writing of the K1 document (a, b and d), therefore the Q2 document does not correspond to the K2 document (a, b and d). 2.) The signature of the questioned document Q1 lacks traces and homologous designs with respect to documents K1 (a, b, c and d) and K2 (a, b, c and d), therefore it is not possible to make the signature attribution. The signature of the questioned document Q2 lacks lines and homologous designs with respect to documents K1 (a, b, c and d) and K2 (a, b, c and d), therefore it is not possible to make the signature attribution.
K82PXL-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
KANZG6-5241	Handwriting of question Q1 is in perfect agreement with the writings visible in K2. They present no point of dissent. The handwriting in question Q2 is in perfect agreement with that found in K1 and shows no point of divergence. Regarding the signature Q1, its form without reading easy to reproduce prevents it from being attributed to one of the authors even if we find some similarities in the writing K2. Concerning the Q2 signature, we find elements of the writing of the writer K2, in this case the inflated jamps and the tops of the letters in balloons as well as the finals in waves. However and concerning the two signatures Q1 and Q2, those visible on the dictations seem to be partly self-forged. This is why it would be desirable to verify the visible signatures on secure documents for example or certified.
KBKTLJ-5241	Kyle Klug is the writer of the hand printed text on Q2. Kyle Klug is eliminated as the writer of the handwritten text on Q1. I am unable to identify or eliminate Kyle Klug as the signer of the signatures on Q1 or Q2. This no conclusion is due to lack of known exemplars from Kyle Klug that are comparable to the questioned signatures. Scott Granger is the writer of the handwritten text on Q1. Scott Granger is eliminated as the writer of the hand printed text on Q2. I am unable to identify or eliminate Scott Granger as the signer of the signatures on Q1 or Q2. This no conclusion is due to lack of known exemplars from Scott Granger that are comparable to the questioned signatures.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
KJELM3-5241	It has been concluded that Kyle Krug (K1) wrote the questioned hand printed material appearing on the Exhibit Q2 receipt. It has been concluded that Scott Granger (K2) wrote the questioned handwritten material appearing on the Exhibit Q1 receipt. With the material available for comparison, it could not be determined whether or not the Kyle Krug (K1) or Scott Granger (K2) wrote the questioned signatures appearing on the Exhibit Q1 or Q2 items.
KQTXVG-5245	I have found the questioned handwriting on the body of Q1 to correspond closely with the specimens of Scott Granger, in my opinion, there is conclusive evidence he wrote it. I have found the questioned handwriting on the body of Q2 to correspond closely with the specimens of Kyle Krug. in my opinion, there is conclusive evidence he wrote it. There is no basis for any meaningful comparison between the signatures on Q1 and Q2 and the specimens of either Kyle Krug or Scott Granger. The evidence as to whether either of them signed these documents is inconclusive.
KR949L-5241	FIRST.- The writing located on the back of the tavern receipt document dated July 10, 2020, identified as Q1, comes from the graphic origin of the undoubted elements of C. SCOTT GRANGER. SECOND.- The writing located on the back of the tavern receipt document dated July 18, 2020, identified as Q2, comes from the graphic origin of the undoubted elements of C. KYLE KRUG. THIRD.- Regarding the signature visible at the bottom of the front of the tavern receipt type document dated July 10, 2020, identified as Q1, due to the technical impossibility of not having indubitable elements homologous to the CC. KYLE KRUG and SCOTT GRANGER, technical opinion is inconclusive. FOURTH.- Regarding the signature visible at the bottom of the front of the tavern receipt type document dated July 18, 2020, identified as Q2, due to the technical impossibility of not having indubitable elements homologous to the CC. KYLE KRUG and SCOTT GRANGER, technical opinion is inconclusive.
KWZ2Q3-5241	1. The questioned handwritten entries on the back of Exhibit Q2 and the known writing attributed to KRUG 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 handwritten entries on the back of Exhibit Q1 and the known writing attributed to GRANGER have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics in agreement from another writer is considered extremely low. 3. Based on an examination of the evidence submitted, it cannot be determined whether or not KRUG or GRANGER wrote either of the questioned signatures on the front of Exhibits Q1 and Q2. The primary limiting factor are the abbreviated and stylized nature of the questioned signatures.
LA8J9C-5241	The deed contained in the receipt dated July 18, 2020, correspondence in the handwriting of C. Kyle Krug. The deed contained in the receipt dated July 10, 2020, correspondence in the handwriting of C. Scott Granger.
LJUHZG-5245	1. Kyle Krug, the writer of K1a through K1d, wrote the questioned material on Q2. 2. Due to the lack of comparable signatures and the possibility of distortion or disguise contained within the Q2 signature, no conclusion could be reached as to whether or not Kyle Krug, the writer of K1a through K1d, prepared the questioned signature. 3. Scott Granger, the writer of K2a through K2d, wrote the questioned material on Q1. 4. Due to the lack of comparable signatures and the possibility of distortion or disguise contained within the Q2 signature, no conclusion could be reached as to whether or not Kyle Krug, the writer of K1a through K1d, prepared the questioned signature.
LQR8GL-5241	Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING - Identification (KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d)): It was determined that the questioned entry on the back of Item 2 (Item Q2) was prepared by KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d). Identification (SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d)): It was determined that the questioned entry on the back of Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), excluding any overwriting. No Meaningful Comparisons (KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d) and SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d)): No meaningful handwriting comparisons could be conducted between the Item 1 (Item Q1) and Item 2 (Item Q2) questioned signatures and either of the known writers due to the largely illegible nature of the questioned signatures, the limited complexity of the Item 2 (Item Q2) signature, the limited

TABLE 2

WebCode-
Test

Conclusions

comparability of the questioned signatures, and the lack of undictated known signatures.

HANDWRITING INSTRUCTIONS: If future handwriting comparisons are desired regarding the questioned signatures, the name of the account holder(s) for the questioned items should be ascertained. Dictated and undictated known signatures should be obtained from KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), the true account holder(s), and any other logical suspect(s). The dictated signatures should be obtained on separate receipts similar in size to the questioned items, and each repetition should be removed from the writer's view upon completion. Numerous repetitions may be necessary in order to obtain naturally prepared writing. Undictated known writing consists of signatures prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible source of undictated known writing include business papers, letters, canceled checks, and/or applications.

LRJT33-
5241

(a) The questioned handwriting and signatures on each of the tavern receipts Q1 and Q2 have been examined and compared with the control handwriting and signatures written by Kyle Krug (K1) in K1a to K1d and those written by Scott Granger (K2) in K2a to K2d respectively. (b) Comparison between the questioned handwriting in Q1 and the control handwriting of Scott Granger (K2) revealed similarities in writing movements, connecting strokes, construction details and design of letters as well as relative alignments and proportion of letters/numerals. On the other hand, comparison between the questioned handwriting in Q1 and the control handwriting of Kyle Krug (K1) revealed differences in writing movements, connecting strokes, construction details and design of letters. In view of the above findings, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting in Q1 was written by Scott Granger (K2), but not Kyle Krug (K1). (c) Comparison between the questioned handwriting in Q2 and the control handwriting of Kyle Krug (K1) revealed similarities in writing movements, relative alignments, proportion, construction details and design of letters/numerals. Comparison between the questioned handwriting in Q2 and the control handwriting of Scott Granger (K2) revealed differences in connecting strokes of letters, writing movements, construction details and design of letters/numerals. In view of the above findings, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting in Q2 was written by Kyle Krug (K1), but not Scott Granger (K2). (d) Comparison of the questioned signature in Q1 with the control signatures of Kyle Krug (K1) and Scott Granger (K2) respectively revealed differences in pictorial designs, so an effective like-with-like comparison could not be made. In view of the above findings and limitation, I am of the opinion that a common authorship between the questioned signature in Q1 and the control signatures of Kyle Krug (K1) or Scott Granger (K2) could neither be confirmed nor eliminated. (e) Comparison of the questioned signature in Q2 with the control signatures of Kyle Krug (K1) and Scott Granger (K2) respectively revealed differences in pictorial designs, so an effective like-with-like comparison could not be made. In view of the above findings and limitation, I am of the opinion that a common authorship between the questioned signature in Q2 and the control signatures of Kyle Krug (K1) or Scott Granger (K2) could neither be confirmed nor eliminated.

LUR9RG-
5241

The body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (Q1) was written by Scott Granger (K2). The body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020 (Q2) was written by Kyle Krug (K1). Kyle Krug (K1) cannot be identified or eliminated with the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (Q1). Scott Granger (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated with the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (Q1). Kyle Krug (K1) cannot be identified or eliminated with the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020 (Q2). Scott Granger (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated if the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020 (Q2).

M8VQK9-
5241

The specific propositions considered in this case were: P1 The questioned writing was written by the writer of the known material. P2 The questioned writing was written by someone other than the writer of the known material. Handwriting examination: In my opinion, the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition P2 that the questioned handwriting Q1 was written by someone other than the writer of the K1 (Kyle KRUG) material, over the proposition P1 that the questioned handwriting Q1 was written by the writer of the K1 material. In my opinion, the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition P1 that the questioned handwriting Q1 was written by the writer of the K2 (Scott GRANGER) material, over the proposition P2 that the questioned handwriting

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>Q1 was written by someone other than the writer of the K2 material. In my opinion, the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition P1 that the questioned handwriting Q2 was written by the writer of the K1 (Kyle KRUG) material, over the proposition P2 that the questioned handwriting Q2 was written by someone other than the writer of the K1 material. In my opinion, the evidence provides strong support for the proposition P2 that the questioned handwriting Q2 was written by someone other than the writer of the K2 (Scott GRANGER) material, over the proposition P1 that the questioned handwriting Q2 was written by the writer of the K2 material. Signature examination: The known signatures of Kyle KRUG (K1) and Scott GRANGER (K2) bear no pictorial resemblance to either of the questioned signatures Q1 or Q2, and therefore no meaningful examination can be conducted. No opinion can be expressed regarding the potential writer of the Q1 and Q2 signatures. The opinions I have expressed are based upon the information and material submitted, as well as the specific propositions outlined above. 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>
MDXZR2-5241	<p>Q1 (Excluding the signature): +3 The results strongly support that Scott Granger wrote the questioned writing. -2 The results support that Kyle Krug did not write the questioned writing. Q2 (Excluding the signature): -2 The results support that Scott Granger did not write the questioned writing. +3 The results strongly support that Kyle Krug wrote the questioned writing. C which applies to the signatures would be: The results equally supports... (both hypothesis, baysian approach with logical reasoning).</p>
ME9E7G-5241	<p>a) The texts on the Q1 document were written by K2. b) The texts on the Q2 document were written by K1. c) K1 and K2 persons do not contribute to signatures.</p>
MKJT3Z-5241	<p>Granger wrote the handwritten text on the back of Item 1. There are numerous significant similarities and no significant differences. Granger probably did not write the handwritten text on the back of Item 2. There are a number of significant differences, but the known writing is not fully comparable to the questioned writing. Krug wrote the hand printed text on the back of Item 2. There are numerous significant similarities and no significant differences. No conclusion was reached as to whether Krug wrote the handwritten text on the back of Item 1. The questioned writing and known writing are not sufficiently comparable to allow for an opinion of authorship. No conclusion was reached as to whether Krug or Granger wrote the signatures on the front of Items 1 and 2. The questioned signatures are not sufficiently comparable to the known writing of Krug or Granger to allow for an opinion of authorship. In addition, no conclusion was reached as to whether the Items 1 and 2 signatures were written by the same or different individuals. The questioned signatures lack sufficient comparability to make that determination.</p>
MM66WJ-5241	<p>The writing in the questioned text "Kayle, your blue eyes..." on Item No. Q1 was written by Scott Granger. The writing in the questioned text "Don't ignore me..." on Item No. Q2 was written by Kyle Krug.</p>
MPUE6Y-5245	<p>3. Based upon the examination of the questioned items with the writings submitted of as known of Kyle Krug (1a-1d) and Scott Granger (2a-2d), the following opinions are rendered: The author of known writing 1a-1d (Krug) wrote the hand printed note on the back of questioned item 2 (receipt dated 18 July 2020). The author of known writing 2a-2d (Granger) wrote the hand printed note on the back of questioned item 1 (receipt dated 10 July 2020). There is no conclusion as to whether or not either submitted known writer may have written the signature appearing the front of the questioned items. An opinion of "no conclusion" was rendered due to several limitations in this examination. The include: The signatures are highly simplified and it is unknown what name they are. There is no comparable writing in the submitted known. Further reasoning is outlined in the Comments section (additional notes) [Table 3 - Additional Comments].</p>
MTWCFR-5241	<p>1.It is determined that, K1 (KYLE KRUG) has contributed to the body of Q2 (dated 18 July 2020), excluding the signature. It is also determined that K2 (SCOTT GRANGER) has contributed to the body of Q1 (dated 10 July 2020), excluding the signature. 2.It cannot be identified whether either of K1 (KYLE KRUG) OR K2 (SCOTT GRANGER) have contributed to the signature of Q1 (dated 10</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
N47E7H-5241	July 2020) and Q2 (dated 18 July 2020) due to the difference in structure between the signature specimen provided and their original signatures.
NFJ4YX-5241	Having advanced the graphological analysis, it allowed to show that the completion of the questioned document (Q1) compared to the standard comparison manuscripts of Mr. Scott Granger present in documents K2a, K2b, K2c and K2d, show graphonomic coincidence in the following aspects: graphic times in the elaboration of the signs, wide interstructural separation, basic morphology of the spellings, inclination, orientation, cohesions, so it indicates the manuscript uniprocidence. Once the graphological analysis was carried out, it allowed to show that the completion of the questioned document (Q2) compared to the standard comparison manuscripts of Mr. Kyle Krug present in documents K1a, K1b, K1c and K1d, show graphonomic coincidence in the following aspects: graphic times in the elaboration of the signs, wide interstructural separation, basic morphology of the spellings, inclination, orientation, cohesions, thus indicating the manuscript uniprocidence. Regarding the analysis of the signatures present in the questioned documents (Q1 and Q2) compared to the calligraphic contributions, they do not allow them to be identified or eliminated
NKURKA-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
NM78EB-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
NYW2NJ-5241	First: The questioned handwriting on the reverse of the note dated July 10, 2020 (Q1), was analyzed and compared with the comparison handwriting sent and it is concluded that it was written by Scott Granger (K2). Second: The questioned handwriting on the reverse of the note dated July 18, 2020 (Q2), was analyzed and compared with the comparison handwriting sent and it is concluded that it was written by Kyle Krug (K1). Third: The questioned signature of the receipts dated July 10 and July 18, both of the year 2020 (Q1-Q2), were analyzed and compared respectively with the signatures of Kyle Krug and Scott Granger (K1c – K2c), respectively, not finding homologous graphic elements between them so it is not possible to establish their graphic identity.
P472DZ-5245	HANDWRITING (SCOTT GRANGER) - Identification. It was determined that SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), prepared the handwriting on Item 1 (Item Q1) (excluding the overwriting and the signature). No Conclusion. Although pictorial dissimilarities were noted with the Item 1 (Item Q1) and the Item 2 (Item Q2) signatures, no conclusion could be reached whether or not either of the signatures were or were not prepared by SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), due to the limited comparability of the signatures, the lack of undictated known signatures, the illegibility in the signatures, and the presence of unexplained characteristics. HANDWRITING (KYLE KRUG) - It was determined that KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), prepared the handwriting on Item 2 (Item Q2) (excluding the signature). No Conclusion. Although pictorial dissimilarities were noted with the Item 1 (Item Q1) and the Item 2 (Item Q2) signatures, no conclusion could be reached whether or not either of the signatures were or were not prepared by KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), due to the limited comparability of the signatures, the lack of undictated known signatures, the illegibility in the signatures, and the presence of unexplained characteristics. If future handwriting comparisons are desired, additional dictated and undictated known signatures should be obtained from KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), and SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), and/or from any other logical suspect(s). The known signatures should be comparable to the questioned signatures in wording, format, and style. Undictated known signatures consist of writing prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known signatures include business papers, letters, canceled checks, and/or applications.
P472DZ-5245	1. I am of the opinion that, a. the questioned handwriting in Q1 was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting in K2a, K2b and K2d. b. the questioned handwriting in Q2 was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting in K1a, K1b and K1d. 2. No effective comparison between the questioned signature in Q1/Q2 and the specimen signatures in K1c/K2c can be done. The

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	evidence is therefore inconclusive.
P4NK69-5241	<p>1. After careful examination and comparison of questioned writing on item No.01a with normal course of business writing of Scott Granger on item No. 09 and with dictated writing exemplars of Scott Granger on item No. 07 & item No. 08, it is concluded that the questioned writing on item No. 01a is written by Scott Granger. Therefore, Scott Granger is the author of Questioned writing on item No. 01a. 2. After careful examination and comparison of questioned signature on item No.01b with dictated signature exemplars of Kyle Krug on item no. 06 and with dictated signature exemplars of Scott Granger on item No. 10, no opinion can be expressed as to whether or not questioned signature was written by Scott Granger or Kyle Krug. Therefore, the result is inconclusive. 3. After careful examination and comparison of questioned writing on item No.02a with normal course of business writing of Kyle Krug on item No. 05 and with dictated writing exemplars of Kyle Krug on item No. 03 & item No. 04, it is concluded that the questioned writing on item No. 02a is written by Kyle Krug. Therefore, Kyle Krug is the author of Questioned writing on item No. 02a. 4. After careful examination and comparison of questioned signature on item No.02b with dictated signature exemplars of Kyle Krug on item no. 06 and with dictated signature exemplars of Scott Granger on item No. 10, no opinion can be expressed as to whether or not questioned signature was written by Kyle Krug or Scott Granger. Therefore, the result is inconclusive.</p>
P6GFRG-5245	<p>Based on my examination of the evidence given it is my professional expert opinion that I have identified the person who wrote the Kyle Krug handwriting and signatures on the K1 documents as the author of the anonymous handwriting on the questioned documents Q1 and Q2. Additionally, it is my professional expert opinion that I have eliminated the person who authored the Kyle Krug signatures and handwriting on the K1 documents as the author of either of the signatures on the questioned documents. Furthermore, I have eliminated the person who signed the Scott Granger signatures on the K2 documents as the author of the signature on the Q2 document. Finally, it is my professional expert opinion that neither of the authors of the Kyle Krug and Scott Granger signatures and handwriting on the K documents can be identified or eliminated as an author of the signature on the Q1 document. I request additional exemplars to better make a determination.</p>
P7XZRY-5241	<p>Scott Granger, the Item 4 writer, prepared the body of handwriting on the rear side of Item 1(Q1). This opinion is based on the notation of significant similarities and no differences between the submitted bodies of writing. Scott Granger probably did not prepare the body of the hand printed Item 2 note. This opinion is based on the notation of significant differences and some similarities between the submitted bodies of writing, but also a limited amount of hand printed standards. Kyle Krug, the Item 3 writer, prepared the body of hand printing on the rear side of Item 2(Q2). This opinion is based on the notation of significant similarities and no differences between the submitted bodies of writing. No conclusion could be reached as to whether Kyle Krug prepared the body of the handwritten Item 1 note. This opinion is based on a lack of known handwriting (cursive) from Krug with which to compare to the mostly handwritten note. No conclusion could be reached as to whether Scott Granger or Kyle Krug prepared the questioned signatures appearing on the front sides of Item 1 or Item 2. This opinion is based on the notation of a general lack of comparability between the questioned and known signatures submitted. Forensic document examiners use a scale of opinions to describe the strength of 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</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-
Test

Conclusions

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.

P9GRNG-
5241

Q1: The examination consisted of comparing stroke and letter formations, individual stroke patterns, line direction, proportions, connecting strokes, spacing, initial, and final stroke formations. Certain similarities between the note on the back of Q-1 and the purported known writing of Scott Granger, K-2, were identified. For example, but not limited to: 1: The wide spacing between words and crowding of letters within words. 2: The letter "m" in the word "come" looks like in "n" in both the known and questioned writing. 3: The unique style of writing "2", with a straight line at the bottom, is found in both the known writing and Q-1, back. 4: The capital letter "J" in the word "Just", in the middle of a sentence, is in both the known writing and the back of Q-1. 5: The known writing is thready with ill-formed letter structure. This is found to be true in Q-1, back also. The signature of K-2 could neither be identified or eliminated as the writer of the signature in question, Q-1 front.) This is further explained in the comments section below [Table 3 - Additional Comments]. Q2: The examination consisted of comparing stroke and letter formations, individual stroke patterns, line direction, proportions, connecting strokes, spacing, initial, and final stroke formations. Certain similarities between the note on the back of Q-2 and the purported known writing, K-1, were identified. For example, but not limited to: 1: The capital letter "D" in the word "Don't" has a flat side on the right as it approaches the baseline in both the known writing, K-1b, and the questioned writing, Q-2, back. 2: The spacing between words and sentences is very similar when comparing the known writing to Q-2, back. 3: Lower extenders do not return to the baseline in both the known writing and Q-2, back. 4: The terminal stroke in the printed letter "A", in the license plate number, has a terminal stroke longer than the initial stroke in both the purported known writing and the questioned document. 5: The letter "f" is formed like a figure eight in both the known K-1 writing and the questioned Q-2 note. The signature on the front of Q-2 can not be identified, as no similar characteristics were found in K-1c.

PQHPUJ-
5241

1) THE BODY OF THE QUESTIONED WRITTING Q1 was written by Scott granger. 2) THE BODY OF THE QUESTIONED WRITTING Q2 was written by Kyle krug . 3)The questioned signatures on each of the receipts cannot be identified or eliminated.

PT7X3Y-
5245

A comparative handwriting examination of the handwriting and signatures on Q1, Q2, K1, and K2 resulted in the following findings: The writer who prepared the known exemplars on K2 prepared the questioned handwriting on Q1. This finding is supported by the presence of significant and substantial corresponding characteristics such as alignment, arrangement, spatial relationships, connecting strokes, and letter and number formations with the absence of any fundamental differences. The writer who prepared the known exemplars on K1 prepared the questioned handwriting on Q2. This finding is supported by the presence of significant and substantial corresponding characteristics such as alignment, arrangement, spatial relationships, connecting strokes, and letter and number formations with the absence of any fundamental differences. The writer who prepared the known exemplars on K2 did not prepare the questioned handwriting on Q2. This finding is based on the presence of significant and fundamental differences. The writer who prepared the known exemplars on K1 did not prepare the questioned handwriting on Q1. This finding is based on the presence of significant and fundamental differences. No conclusion could be reached regarding the signatures appearing on Q1 or Q2 due to the lack of comparability. In order for an examination of the signatures to be conducted, the same name prepared in the same style (cursive to cursive and hand printing to hand printing) should be provided.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
PUVCKG-5241	<p>NO UNIPROCEDENCE MANUSCRITURAL among the graphonomic characteristics of the doubtful manuscripts Q1 text on tavern receipt dated July 10, 2020 and undoubted from Mr. KYLE KRUG. UNIPROCEDENCIA MANUSCRITURAL among the graphonomic characteristics of the doubtful manuscripts Q2 text on tavern receipt dated July 18, 2020 and undoubted from Mr. KYLE KRUG. UNIPROCEDENCIA MANUSCRITURAL among the graphonomic characteristics of the doubted manuscripts Q1 text on tavern receipt dated July 10, 2020 and undoubted from Mr. SCOTT GRANGER. NO UNIPROCEDENCE MANUSCRITURAL among the graphonomic characteristics of the doubted manuscripts Q2 text on tavern receipt dated July 18, 2020 and undoubted from Mr. SCOTT GRANGER. Due to the lack of requirements in the undisputed material attached, signatures of Mr. KYLE KRUG, it is not possible to advance the requested inspection, the requirement of graphic similarity is not met. Due to the lack of requirements in the undoubted material attached, signatures of Mr. SCOTT GRANGER, it is not possible to advance the requested inspection, the requirement of graphic similarity is not met.</p>
PZTRFJ-5241	<p>1) THE BODY OF THE QUESTIONED WRITTING Q1 was written by Scott granger. 2) THE BODY OF THE QUESTIONED WRITTING Q2 was written by . 3)The questioned signatures on each of the receipts cannot be identified or eliminated.</p>
QANU36-5241	<p>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). A nine point conclusion scale is used. In brief it has the following levels. 1 extremely strong support, 2 strong support, 3 moderate support and 4 limited support for proposition P1 over P2; 5 inconclusive; 6 limited support, 7 moderate support, 8 strong support and 9 extremely strong support for P2 over P1. Handwriting Conclusions: (i) I concluded that there is strong support for the proposition P2 that the questioned handwriting on Q1 was not written by the writer of the K1 specimens (attributed to Kyle Krug) rather than for the alternative proposition P1 that it was written by this person. (ii) I concluded that there is extremely strong support for the proposition P1 that the questioned handwriting on Q1 was written by the writer of the K2 specimens (attributed to Scott Granger) rather than for the alternative proposition P2 that it was not written by this person. (iii) I concluded that there is extremely strong support for the proposition P1 that the questioned handwriting on Q2 was written by the writer of the K1 specimens (attributed to Kyle Krug) rather than for the alternative proposition P2 that it was not written by this person. (iv) I concluded that there is extremely strong support for the proposition P2 that the questioned handwriting on Q2 was not written by the writer of the K2 specimens (attributed to Scott Granger) rather than for the alternative proposition P1 that it was written by this person. Signature Conclusions: (v) No conclusion could be reached as a result of the comparison between the questioned signature on Q1 and the K1 specimen signatures and handwriting (attributed to Kyle Krug). (vi) No conclusion could be reached as a result of the comparison between the questioned signature on Q1 and the K2 specimen signatures and handwriting (attributed to Scott Granger). (vii) No conclusion could be reached as a result of the comparison between the questioned signature on Q2 and the K1 specimen signatures and handwriting (attributed to Kyle Krug). (viii) No conclusion could be reached as a result of the comparison between the questioned signature on Q2 and the K2 specimen signatures and handwriting (attributed to Scott Granger).</p>
QB2QMW-5241	<p>WRT the Handwriting: " The author of the K1 specimen writing, attributed to Kyle Krug, wrote the questioned handwriting on Q2 (not including the Signature)". " The author of the K2 specimen writing, attributed to Scott Granger, wrote the questioned handwriting on Q1 (not including the Signature)". WRT to the Signature: K1 - "The examination was inconclusive due to lack of comparability between the K1 signature samples, attributed to Kyle Krug, and the questioned signatures." K2 - "The examination was inconclusive due to lack of comparability between the K2 signature samples, attributed to Scott Granger, and the questioned signatures."</p>
QCCTAV-5241	<p>Questioned writing(excluding the signature) on Q1 was written by K2(Scott Granger). Questioned writing(excluding the signature) on Q2 was written by K1(Kyle Krug). Questioned signature on each</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	of Q1 and Q2 cannot be identified.
QK4FX7-5241	1) Q1: The writing on the tavern receipt dated July 10, 2020, was not written by Kyle Krug. Q2: The writing on the tavern receipt dated July 18, 2020, if it was written by Kyle Krug. Q1: The deed on the tavern receipt dated July 10, 2020, if written by Scott Granger. Q2: The writing on the tavern receipt dated July 18, 2020, was not written by Scott Granger. 2) It is not possible to determine whether the signatures that appear on the tavern receipts dated July 10, 2020 (Q1) and July 18, 2020 (Q2), were made or not, by Kyle Krug or Scott Granger, because they do not present homologous elements of comparison.
QRQ7HG-5241	Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING - Identification (KYLE KRUG, ITEM 3 (ITEMS K1a-d)): It was determined that KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), prepared the questioned writing on the back side of Item 2 (Item Q2). HANDWRITING - Identification (SCOTT GRANGER, ITEM 4 (ITEMS K2a-d)): It was determined that SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), prepared the questioned writing on the back side of Item 1 (Item Q1). No Conclusion (KYLE KRUG, ITEM 3 (ITEMS K1a-d) and SCOTT GRANGER, ITEM 4 (ITEMS K2a-d)): No conclusion could be reached whether or not KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), or SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), prepared the questioned signatures on the front of Item 1 (Item Q1) and Item 2 (Item Q2) due to the illegibility of the questioned signatures, lack of comparability, and the wide range of variation observed within the Item 4 (Item K2c) known signatures of SCOTT GRANGER. If additional handwriting comparisons are requested on the Item 1 (Item Q1) and Item 2 (Item Q2) signatures, undictated authorized (same name) receipt signatures from KYLE KRUG, SCOTT GRANGER, and anyone else suspected of having prepared the questioned signatures should be obtained and submitted to this Laboratory for comparisons.
R27CUB-5245	K1 Writer (Kyle Krug): Based upon the presence of numerous significant similarities observed in a variety of unique handwriting habits and execution characteristics (i.e. height relationships, writing style, writing movement and individual letter/numeral formation(s), character spacing, and overall writing skill and ability, as well as the lack of any significant dissimilarities or unnatural handwriting characteristics, I have determined that the author of the known writings attributed to the Exhibit K1 writer, Kyle Krug, wrote the questioned written text appearing on the reverse side of the Exhibit Q2 receipt. Based upon the presence of numerous significant dissimilarities observed in a variety of unique handwriting habits and execution characteristics (i.e. height relationships, writing style, writing movement and individual letter/numeral formation(s), character spacing, and overall writing skill and ability, I have determined that the author of the known writings attributed to the Exhibit K1 writer, Kyle Krug, did not write the questioned written text appearing on the reverse side of the Exhibit Q1 receipt. Although differences were observed, due to the lack of comparable exemplar writings, evaluating the significance of the noted dissimilarities was not possible. As such, the author of the known writings attributed to the Exhibit K1 writer, Kyle Krug, can neither be identified nor eliminated (i.e., inconclusive) as having written either of the questioned signatures appearing on the Exhibit Q1 and Q2 receipts. If additional comparison material could be obtained and submitted more conclusive determinations may be possible. K2 Writer (Scott Granger): Based upon the presence of numerous significant similarities observed in a variety of unique handwriting habits and execution characteristics (i.e. height relationships, writing style, writing movement and individual letter/numeral formation(s), character spacing, and overall writing skill and ability, as well as the lack of any significant dissimilarities or unnatural handwriting characteristics, I have determined that the author of the known writings attributed to the Exhibit K2 writer, Scott Granger, wrote the questioned written text appearing on the reverse side of the Exhibit Q1 receipt. Based upon the presence of numerous significant dissimilarities observed in a variety of unique handwriting habits and execution characteristics (i.e. height relationships, writing style, writing movement and individual letter/numeral formation(s), character spacing, and overall writing skill and ability, I have determined that the author of the known writings attributed to the Exhibit K2 writer, Scott Granger, did not write the questioned written text appearing on the reverse side of the Exhibit Q2 receipt. Although differences were observed, due to the lack of comparable exemplar writings, evaluating the significance of the noted dissimilarities was not possible. As such, the author of the known writings attributed to the Exhibit K2 writer, Scott Granger, can neither be identified nor eliminated

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	(i.e., inconclusive) as having written either of the questioned signatures appearing on the Exhibit Q1 and Q2 receipts. If additional comparison material could be obtained and submitted more conclusive determinations may be possible.
R9QF2D-5245	* Handwriting comparison: The questioned handwriting (excluding signature) on the tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (Q1) was written by Scott Granger (K2). The questioned handwriting (excluding signature) on the tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (Q1) was not written by Kyle Krug (K1). The questioned handwriting (excluding signature) on the tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020 (Q2) was written by Kyle Krug (K1). The questioned handwriting (excluding signature) on the tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020 (Q2) was not written by Scott Granger (K2). * Signature comparison: Kyle Krug (K1) cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (Q1). Kyle Krug (K1) cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020 (Q2). Scott Granger (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (Q1). Scott Granger (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020 (Q2).
RDKAYE-5241	The handwritin 20-5241-EQ-Q1 Does not correspond to Kyle Krug. The handwritin 20-5241-EQ-Q1 Does correspond to Scott Granger. The handwritin 20-5241-EQ-Q2 Does correspond to Kyle Krug. The handwritin 20-5241-EQ-Q2 Does not correspond to Scott Granger. The signature 20-5241-FQ-Q1 CANNOT be identifies or eliminated to Scott Granger o Kyle Krug. The signature 20-5241-FQ-Q2 CANNOT be identifies or eliminated to Scott Granger o Kyle Krug.
RG6PHY-5241	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 Kyle Krug, prepared the note 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. The evidence indicates that this writer may not have prepared the note on Item Q1, but the evidence falls far short of that necessary to support a definite conclusion. Few significant dissimilarities and possibly some similarities were observed, however limitations associated with absent characters, individualizing characteristics, or quantity of writing may be present. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not this writer prepared the signatures on Items Q1 and Q2. Insufficient significant similarities and insufficient significant dissimilarities were observed. There may be some similarities or dissimilarities or both. Limitations associated with absent characters, individualizing characteristics, or quantity of writing may be present. It has been determined that the writer of Item K2, submitted as the known writing of Scott Granger, prepared the note 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 probably did not prepare the note 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. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not this writer prepared the signatures on Items Q1 and Q2. Insufficient significant similarities and insufficient significant dissimilarities were observed. There may be some similarities or dissimilarities or both. Limitations associated with absent characters, individualizing characteristics, or quantity of writing may be present.
RHVMGD-5241	HANDWRITING (KYLE KRUG): Identification. It was determined that the body of the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on Item 2 (Item Q2) was written by KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1 a-d). No Conclusion. No conclusion could be reached whether or not KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1 a-d), prepared the questioned signatures on Items 1 and 2 (Items Q1 and Q2) due to the lack of comparability, limited legibility, and the lack of undictated known signatures. HANDWRITING (SCOTT GRANGER): Identification. It was determined that the body of the questioned writing (excluding the signature and overwriting) on Item 1 (Item Q1) was written by SCOTT GRANGER,

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	<p>Item 4 (Items K2a-d). No Conclusion. No conclusion could be reached whether or not SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), prepared the questioned signatures on Items 1 and 2 (Items Q1 and Q2) due to the lack of comparability, limited legibility, and the lack of undictated known signatures. If future signature comparisons are desired, undictated known signatures should be obtained from KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d) and SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d). Dictated and undictated known signatures should be obtained from any other logical suspect(s). The known signatures should be comparable to the questioned signatures in style, wording and format. Dictated known signatures should be obtained on separate pages similar to the questioned items. Numerous repetitions may be necessary in order to obtain naturally prepared signatures, and each repetition should be removed from the writer's view upon completion. Undictated known signatures are those that are prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known signatures include business papers, letters, canceled checks, and/or applications.</p>
RYHZV6- 5241	<p>FIRST CONCLUSION: based on analysis of evidence, it has been concluded that Kyle Krug WROTE the handwritten note on the back of receipt (item Q2). SECOND CONCLUSION: based on analysis of evidence, it has been concluded that Kyle Krug NOT WROTE the handwritten note on the back of receipt (item Q1). THIRT CONCLUSION: based on analysis of evidence, it has been concluded that Scott Granger WROTE the handwritten note on the back of receipt (item Q1). FOURT CONCLUSION: based on analysis of evidence, it has been concluded that Scott Granger NOT WROTE the handwritten note on the back of receipt (item Q2).</p>
T67X7D- 5245	<p>Based upon the available evidence it is my professional opinion that Q1 was written by the writer of K2a-K2d. Same wording for other opinions.</p>
T6KX8V- 5245	<p>The questioned handwriting, Q1, was written by the writer of the Scott Granger, K2, exemplars. The questioned handwriting, Q2, was written by the writer of the Kyle Krug, K1, exemplars. No determination could be made as to whether or not the questioned signatures were produced by either of the exemplar writers. The Kyle Krug, K1, signatures were stylized and different from the questioned signatures. The Scott Granger, K2, signatures were partly legible and not comparable with the questioned signatures. A like for like comparison could not be accomplished, therefore a proper examination could not be conducted.</p>
T96PJX- 5241	<p>It is highly probable that Scott Granger wrote the questioned writing on the back of Q1. It is highly probable that Scott Granger did not write the questioned writing on the back of Q2. It is highly probable that Kyle Krug wrote the questioned writing on the back of Q2. It is highly probable that Kyle Krug did not write the questioned writing on the back of Q1.</p>
TEGZQE- 5241	<p>In as much as it is possible to examine digital images in lieu of the original documents, it is my opinion that the K2 writer wrote the questioned body of writing on Q1 and the K1 writer wrote the questioned body of writing on Q2. Furthermore, the questioned signature on Q1 and Q2 can neither be identified nor eliminated with the known writing of K1 and K2. Remarks: Submission of 20-30 collected signature samples of both the K1 and K2 writers from the same time period as the questioned documents is needed for a subsequent examination.</p>
TX9JPY- 5245	<p>Based on the examination and comparison of the questioned entries on Exhibits Q1 and Q2 with the known entries on Exhibits K1a through K1d and K2a through K2d, the following has been determined: Kyle Krug (Exhibits K1a through K1d) wrote the questioned entries on Exhibit Q2 (extended writing only, excluding signature). Kyle Krug (Exhibits K1a through K1d) did not write the questioned entries on Exhibit Q1 (extended writing only, excluding signature). Scott Granger (Exhibits K2a through K2d) wrote the questioned entries on Exhibit Q1 (extended writing only, excluding signature). Scott Granger (Exhibits K2a through K2d) did not write the questioned entries on Exhibit Q2 (extended writing only, excluding signature). It cannot be determined whether Kyle Krug (Exhibits K1a through K1d) or Scott Granger (Exhibits K2a through K2d) wrote the questioned signatures on Exhibits Q1 and Q2. The inconclusive findings above are necessitated by the lack of comparable signatures submitted for examination, and by the presence of characteristics in the questioned writing which were not fully demonstrated in the submitted known writing.</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
U49HDU-5241	<p>Examination and comparison of questioned items #Q1 and #Q2 with known items #K1a-d and #K2a-d resulted in the following opinions: The non-signature writing on item #Q1 was written by the writer of items #K2a-d, Scott Granger. The non-signature writing on item #Q2 was written by the writer of items #K1a-d, Kyle Krug. Kyle Krug can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the signatures on items #Q1 and #Q2. The known writing of Kyle Krug is not comparable to the signatures on items #Q1 and #Q2. Scott Granger can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the signatures on items #Q1 and #Q2. The known writing of Scott Granger is not comparable to the signatures on items #Q1 and #Q2.</p>
U6NC8V-5245	<p>I find a wide range of similarities between the questioned non-signature handwriting on the receipt Q1 and the reference writings of Scott GRANGER. Furthermore, I find significant differences to the reference writings of Kyle KRUG. In my opinion, based on the submitted material, my findings provide extremely strong support for the proposition that the non-signature writing on the receipt Q1 was written by Scott GRANGER. I find a wide range of similarities between the questioned non-signature handwriting on the receipt Q2 and the reference writings of Kyle KRUG. Furthermore, I find significant differences to the reference writings of Scott GRANGER. In my opinion, based on the submitted material, my findings provide extremely strong support for the proposition that the non-signature writing on the receipt Q2 was written by Kyle KRUG.</p>
U7UU6R-5241	<p>1. The questioned signature on "Q1" was different in structure from the specimen signatures of "Kyle Krug" and "Scott Granger". Hence, it is not possible to carry out a suitable comparison of the handwriting characteristics to ascertain the authorship of this questioned signature. "Kyle Krug" or "Scott Granger" cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on "Q1". 2. The questioned signature on "Q2" was different in structure from the specimen signatures of "Kyle Krug" and "Scott Granger". Hence, it is not possible to carry out a suitable comparison of the handwriting characteristics to ascertain the authorship of this questioned signature. "Kyle Krug" or "Scott Granger" cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on "Q2". 3. The questioned handwriting on "Q1" showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting of "Scott Granger" and sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting of "Kyle Krug". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was written by "Scott Granger" and was not written by "Kyle Krug". 4. The questioned handwriting on "Q2" showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting of "Kyle Krug" and sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting of "Scott Granger". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was written by "Kyle Krug" and was not written by "Scott Granger".</p>
UGUWGT-5241	<p>The items listed were assessed and examined based on the methodology described in the Forensic Document Unit (FDU) Test Methods (unless otherwise noted). The methodology used included macroscopic, microscopic, and handwriting examinations. Handwriting examination: The documents in Q1, Q2, K1, and K2 are non-original, which is a limitation to the handwriting examination because the microscopic features of the writing cannot be fully assessed. Q1: Kyle Krug (K1) cannot be identified to nor eliminated as the writer of the cursive writing depicted on Q1, excluding the signature. The writing on Q1 is mostly connected, cursive forms while the writing in K1 is hand printing, which are not comparable letter forms. No conclusion is offered regarding the signature depicted on Q1 in comparison to the writing in K1. The signature in Q1 is stylized, where portions of characters are not distinguishable, which was a limitation to an examination. Additionally, the only signatures in K1 are of the name "Kyle Krug" which does not appear comparable to the signature in Q1. It is highly probable that Scott Granger (K2) was the writer of the cursive writing depicted on Q1, excluding the signature. No conclusion is offered regarding the signature depicted on Q1 in comparison to the writing in K2. The stylization of the signature in Q1 was a limitation to the examination. Additionally, the only signatures in K2 are of the name "Scott Granger" which does not appear comparable to the signature in Q1. Q2: It is highly probable that Kyle Krug (K1) was the writer of the hand printing depicted on Q2. No conclusion is offered regarding the signature depicted on Q2 in comparison to the writing in K1. The signature on Q2 is</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	stylized, possibly starting with "Je", which is a limitation to an examination. Additionally, the only signatures in K1 are of the name "Kyle Krug" which does not appear comparable to the signature in Q2. It is probable that Scott Granger (K2) was not the writer of the hand printing depicted on Q2. No conclusion is offered regarding the signature depicted on Q2 in comparison to the writing in K2. The signature on Q2 is stylized, possibly starting with "Je", which is a limitation to an examination. Additionally, the only signatures in K2 are of the name "Scott Granger" which does not appear comparable to the signature in Q2.
UNY2KU-5245	The signatures of documents Q1 and Q2 do not belong to either of the two questioned. Kyle Krug wrote the note for the Q2 document. Scott Granger wrote the Q1 note.
V46KXC-5245	It is my expert opinion that the K2 writer, designated as Scott Granger, wrote the text on Q1. It is my expert opinion that the K1 writer, designated as Kyle Krug, wrote the text on Q2. The K1 and K2 writers are probably not the authors of either signature on Q1 and Q2.
V47ME4-5245	Based on the comparison of the questioned writing on the back of the receipts Q1 and Q2 with the known writing of K1 (Kyle Krug) and K2 (Scott Granger), it was determined that the questioned writing on Q1 was written by Scott Granger and was not written by Kyle Krug. Likewise the questioned writing on Q2 was written by Kyle Krug and was not written by Scott Granger. However, the signatures on the front of the receipts Q1 and Q2 cannot be identified or eliminated to the known signatures of K1 (Kyle Krug) and K2 (Scott Granger) due to they do not have corresponding characters for comparison.
V4N4MV-5241	Kyle Krug wrote the "Don't . . . sorry." entry on the back of Q2. Scott Granger wrote the "Kayla . . . week!" entry on the back of Q1. Kyle Krug cannot be identified or excluded as the writer of the signatures on the front of the questioned receipts Q1 or Q2. Scott Granger cannot be identified or excluded as the writer of the signatures on the front of the questioned receipts Q1 or Q2.
VCX6TC-5241	HANDWRITING (KYLE KRUG, ITEM 3, (Items K1 a-d)) - May Have (Qualified Opinion). A definite determination could not be reached due to the lack of sufficient clarity and detail in Item 2 (Item Q2). However, significant characteristics in common were observed which indicate KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d) may have prepared the questioned hand printing in Item 2 (Item Q2) excluding the signature. May Not Have (Qualified Opinion). A definite determination could not be reached due to the lack of comparable cursive known writing and the lack of sufficient clarity and detail in Item 1 (Item Q1). However, significant dissimilarities were observed which indicate KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d) may not have prepared the questioned handwriting in Item 1 (Item Q1) excluding the signature. HANDWRITING (SCOTT GRANGER, ITEM 4, (Items K2 a-d)) - May Have (Qualified Opinion). A definite determination could not be reached due to the lack of clarity and detail in Item 1 (Item Q1). However, significant characteristics in common were observed which indicate SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), may have prepared the questioned handwriting in Item 1 (Item Q1) excluding the signature. May Not Have (Qualified Opinion). A definite determination could not be reached due to the lack of comparable hand printed known writing and the lack of sufficient clarity and detail in Item 2 (Item Q2). However, significant dissimilarities were observed which indicate SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4, (Items K2a-d), may not have prepared the questioned hand printing in Item 2 (Item Q2) excluding the signature. SIGNATURES (KYLE KRUG, ITEM 3, (Items K1 a-d)) - No Conclusion. No conclusion could be reached whether or not KYLE KRUG, Item 3, (Items K1a-d), prepared the questioned signatures in Item 1 (Item Q1) and Item 2 (Item Q2), due to the lack of comparability between the questioned signatures and the available known signatures (Item K1c). SIGNATURES (SCOTT GRANGER, ITEM 4, (Items K2 a-d)) - No Conclusion. No conclusion could be reached whether or not SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4, (Items K2a-d), prepared the questioned signatures in Item 1 (Item Q1) and Item 2 (Item Q2), due to the lack of comparability between the questioned signatures and the available known signatures (Item K2c). If future handwriting comparisons are requested regarding the questioned signatures, undictated known signatures should be obtained from any logical suspect(s). Undictated known signatures consist of writing prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known signatures include business papers, letters, canceled checks, and/or applications.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
VL4X7C-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
VNW7LZ-5241	<p>(i) The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned writing on Q1 was written by the writer of the specimen writing K2. (ii) The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned writing on Q2 was written by the writer of the specimen writing K1. (iii) The evidence provides very strong support that the questioned signature on Q1 is not a genuine signature when compared to the specimen signatures on K1. (iv) The evidence provides very strong support that the questioned signature on Q1 is not a genuine signature when compared to the specimen signatures on K2. (v) The evidence provides very strong support that the questioned signature on Q2 is not a genuine signature when compared to the specimen signatures on K1. (vi) The evidence provides very strong support that the questioned signature on Q2 is not a genuine signature when compared to the specimen signatures on K2.</p>
VQHKWB-5241	<p>Receipt writings dated July 18, 2020 were written by Kyle Krug. Receipt writings dated July 18, 2020 were not written by Scott Granger. Receipt writings dated July 10, 2020 were written by Scott Granger. The receipt writings dated July 10, 2020 were not written by Kyle Krug. For the signature of the questioned receipt dated July 18, 2020, it is not possible to establish who wrote the signature due to lack of requirements in the standard material due to the lack of similarity of the samples. For the signature of the questioned receipt dated July 10, 2020, it is not possible to establish who wrote the signature due to lack of requirements in the standard material due to the lack of similarity of the samples.</p>
VRVHGZ-5245	<p>Handwriting: When compared, the questioned handwriting on item Q1 and the specimen handwriting on item K2 displays significant similarities of handwriting features such as style, skill, speed, fluency, slant, baseline alignment, spacing, proportions and constructions, with no notable differences or evidence of attention to the writing process. The questioned handwriting on Q1 and the specimen handwriting on K1 contain limited quantity of comparable handwriting style. However, where comparable the questioned handwriting on item Q1 and the specimen handwriting on item K1 displays some differences in handwriting features of slant, spacing, proportions and character constructions. When compared, the questioned handwriting on item Q2 and the specimen handwriting on item K1 displays significant similarities of handwriting features such as style, skill, speed, fluency, slant, baseline alignment, spacing, proportions and constructions, with no notable differences or evidence of attention to the writing process. The questioned handwriting on Q2 and the specimen handwriting on K2 contain limited quantity of comparable handwriting style. However, where comparable the questioned handwriting on item Q2 and the specimen handwriting on item K2 displays differences in handwriting features of slant, spacing, proportions and character constructions. I have evaluated the quantity, quality and complexity of the questioned and specimen handwriting in each item, and the similarities and/or dissimilarities observed. I have assessed the evidence against each proposition for each questioned item and for each specimen writer. In my opinion, the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the writer of the specimen handwriting in Item K2 wrote the questioned handwriting in Item Q1, over the alternative proposition that someone other than the K2 specimen writer (including the K1 specimen writer) wrote the questioned handwriting. Therefore, it is my opinion that the questioned handwriting in Item Q1 was written by the K2 specimen writer. In my opinion, the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the writer of the specimen handwriting in Item K1 wrote the questioned handwriting in Item Q2, over the alternative proposition that someone other than the K1 specimen writer (including the K2 specimen writer) wrote the questioned handwriting. Therefore, it is my opinion that the questioned handwriting in Item Q2 was written by the K1 specimen writer. Signatures: I have conducted a preliminary examination of the questioned signatures in Items Q1 and Q2 and the specimen signatures in Items K1 and K2. The specimen signatures in K1 and K2 bear no resemblance to the questioned signatures in Items Q1 and Q2 and, as such, there are no comparable features. Further, the questioned signatures in Items Q1 and Q2 contain limited legible characters and a comparison with the specimen handwriting of each writer is not possible. Therefore, a meaningful comparison of the questioned signatures with the specimen material</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	provided is not possible and no opinion as to authorship can be provided. The result is inconclusive.
VV9HDR-5241	It was determined the note, Q1 (excluding the signature), was written by Scott Granger, K2. It was determined the note, Q2 (excluding the signature), was written by Kyle Krug, K1. It was determined the note, Q1 (excluding the signature), was not written by Kyle Krug, K1. It was determined the note, Q2 (excluding the signature), was not written by Scott Granger, K2. Due to the illegible and non-comparable signatures on the receipts Q1 and Q2, there was not a basis for identifying or eliminating Kyle Krug, K1 or Scott Granger, K2 as being the writer of the Q1 and Q2 signatures. If further examination is desired, please submit known signatures in the exact wording to the questioned signatures.
W83LBD-5245	I found many distinctive similarities and no significant differences between the handwriting of Scott Granger and handwriting on the reverse of Q1. In my opinion, the possibility of another writer being involved is negligible and the only explanation for my findings in that Scott Granger made this handwriting. I also found many distinctive similarities and no significant differences between the handwriting of Kyle Krug and the handwriting on the reverse of Q2. In my opinion, the possibility of another writer being involved is negligible and the only reasonable explanation for my findings is that Kyle Krug made this handwriting.
WBGV9U-5245	I found correspondence in writing characteristics between the writing in Q1 and the samples K2 in the name of Scott Granger and in my opinion it was written by him. I found differences in writing characteristics between the writing in Q1 and the samples K1 in the name of Kyle Krug and in my opinion it was not written by him. I found correspondence in writing characteristics between the writing in Q2 and the samples K1 in the name of Kyle Krug and in my opinion it was written by him. I found differences in writing characteristics between the writing in Q1 and the samples K2 in the name of Scott Granger and in my opinion it was not written by him. The signature in Q1 differs in shape from the sample signatures. I can't determine whether it was signed by either one of the suspects. If I would receive course of business signatures from the suspects, I might be able to determine whether the signature was signed by one of them. The signature in Q2 differs in shape from the sample signatures and there is no basis for comparison. I can't determine whether it was signed by either one of the suspects.
WBJTWR-5241	1. Examination, comparison, and evaluation of the handwriting on the questioned and known writing samples resulted in the following opinions: a. Laboratory item # 7, Invoice #Q200208, Q1 handwriting was written* by the author Scott Granger of the known writing samples K2 (Laboratory items # 4-6, Invoice # Q200208). b. Laboratory item # 8, Invoice #Q200208, Q2 handwriting was written* by the author Kyle Krug of the known writing samples K1 (Laboratory items # 1-3, Invoice # Q200208). c. Laboratory Item # 7, Invoice #Q200208, Q1 handwriting probably may not have been written* by the author Kyle Krug of the known writing samples K1 (Laboratory items # 1-3, Invoice # Q200208). The following limitations preclude a more definitive opinion: -absent handwriting features because of lack of comparable writing: print versus cursive. d. Laboratory item # 8, Invoice #Q200208, Q2 handwriting probably may not have been written* by the author Scott Granger of the known writing samples K2 (Laboratory items # 4-6, Invoice # Q200208). The following limitations preclude a more definitive opinion: -absent handwriting features because of lack of comparable writing: print versus cursive. e. No conclusion* can be made between Laboratory item # 7, Invoice #200208, Q1 illegible signature and author Kyle Krug of the known writing samples K1, Laboratory items # 1-3, Invoice #Q200208. The following limitations preclude a more definitive opinion: -unknown identity of the credit card owner and lack of signature exemplars from the credit card owner, purportedly the signatory of Q1 signature. f. No conclusion* can be made between Laboratory item # 7, Invoice #200208, Q1 illegible signature and author Scott Granger of the known writing samples K2, Laboratory items # 4-6, Invoice #Q200208. The following limitations preclude a more definitive opinion: -unknown identity of the credit card owner and lack of signature exemplars from the credit card owner, purportedly the signatory of Q1 signature. g. No conclusion* can be made between Laboratory item # 8, Invoice #200208, Q2 illegible signature and author Kyle Krug of the known writing samples K1, Laboratory items # 1-3,

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>Invoice #Q200208. The following limitations preclude a more definitive opinion: -unknown identity of the credit card owner and lack of signature exemplars from the credit card owner, purportedly the signatory of Q2 signature. h. No conclusion* can be made between Laboratory item # 8, Invoice #Q200208, Q2 illegible signature and author Scott Granger of the known writing samples K2, Laboratory items # 4-6, Invoice #Q200208. The following limitations preclude a more definitive opinion: -unknown identity of the credit card owner and lack of signature exemplars from the credit card owner, purportedly the signatory of Q2 signature.</p>
WBYEZ3-5245	<p>Analyzing the two questioned texts Q1 and Q2, we concluded that they are different in their general and individual handwritten characteristics, and that they were written by two persons. Comparing the questioned handwriting of the text Q1 with the undisputed/specimen handwriting of Scott Granger - K2, handwriting similarities were found. The similarities are reflected in general and individual characteristics. First of all, they have the same degree of writing, writing slope, font size, letter proportion, placement of text in space, etc. The similarities is also reflected in the way of writing letters, letter parts and numbers: "K", "a", "y", "u", "b", "r", "s", "t", "m", "h", "w", "J", "l", "F", "d", "k", "x", "lue", "are", "tty", "week", "2", "20", "5", etc. Comparing the questioned handwriting of the text Q2 with the undisputed/specimen handwriting of Kyle Krug - K1, handwriting similarities were found. The similarities are reflected in general and individual characteristics. First of all, they have the same degree of writing, writing slope, font size, letter proportion, placement of text in space, space between words and lines, etc. The similarities is also reflected in the way of writing letters and numbers: "D", "o", "n", "t", "g", "r", "m", "K", "y", "k", "W", "h", "p", "b", "s", "f", "d", "a", "6", "3", "5", "8", "9", "89", etc. Comparing the questioned signatures Q1 and Q2 with the undisputed/specimen handwriting and the signatures Kyle Krug - K1 and Scott Granger - K2, we can neither confirm nor eliminate these two scriptors, because the submitted undisputed/specimen handwriting and signatures are not sufficient for the comparison procedure to identify the scriptors of these two questioned signatures. Eventually, we could make a comparison if the experimental signatures of the suspects were subsequently submitted, which would be written in the names like the questioned signatures.</p>
WCXRZU-5245	<p>Questioned writing (excluding the signature) on document Q1 was written by K2 - Scott Granger, and was not written by K1 - Kyle Krug. Questioned writing (excluding the signature) on document Q2 was written by K1 - Kyle Krug, and was not written by K2 - Scott Granger. Questioned signature on document Q1 was not written by K1 - Kyle Krug and was probably not written by K2 - Scott Granger. Questioned signature on document Q2 was not written by K1 - Kyle Krug nor by K2 - Scott Granger.</p>
WEF84U-5245	<p>The K2 writer probably wrote the handwriting on the back of Q1. The comparison was somewhat limited because there is a wide range of variation within the Q1 (and K2 handwriting), and not all characteristics in Q1 could be accounted for. However, there are strong similarities between numerous features in the K2 and Q1 handwriting, particularly in character construction and relative sizes of characters. It is unlikely another writer would exhibit this same level of conformance in his/her writing. It is highly probable the K1 writer wrote the back of Q2. There were very strong similarities between almost all features in the K1 and Q2 handwriting, including multiple variations of some characters. It is highly unlikely another writer would exhibit this same level of conformance in his/her writing. No determination could be made whether the K1 writer or the K2 writer wrote either the Q1 or Q2 signatures. There are no pictorial similarities between either known signatures or the questioned signatures. However, non-request signatures are needed to determine whether the known signatures submitted are indicative of each writer's natural signature before an authorship opinion can be reached.</p>
WVNN7A-5245	<p>Based on the physical examination and comparison of Exhibits Q1 and Q2 with Exhibits K1a through K1d, it was determined the writer of Exhibits K1a through K1d (Kyle Krug) wrote the questioned text (non-signature) entry on Exhibit Q2. It could not be determined whether or not the writer of Exhibits K1a through K1d (Kyle Krug) wrote the signature entries on Exhibits Q1 and Q2 due to a lack of comparability between different-name entries. Based on the physical examination and comparison of Exhibits Q1 and Q2 with Exhibits K2a through K2d, it was determined the writer</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	<p>of Exhibits K2a through K2d (Scott Granger) wrote the questioned text (non-signature) entry on Exhibit Q1. It could not be determined whether or not the writer of Exhibits K2a through K2d (Scott Granger) wrote the signature entries on Exhibits Q1 and Q2 due to a lack of comparability between different-name entries.</p>
WZ3BV9- 5241	<p>Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING (KYLE KRUG): Identification: It was determined that the questioned body of hand printing on Item 2 (Item Q2) was prepared by KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), prepared the questioned signatures on Item 1 (Item Q1) and Item 2 (Item Q2) due to a lack of comparable known signatures submitted for comparison and the illegible nature of the questioned signatures. May Not Have (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the limited quantity of comparable known writing submitted for comparison. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), may not have prepared the questioned body of handwriting on Item 1 (Item Q1) (excluding overwriting). HANDWRITING (SCOTT GRANGER): May Have (Qualified Opinion): A definite determination could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, numerous characteristics in common were observed which indicate SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), may have prepared the questioned body of handwriting on Item 1 (Item Q1) (excluding overwriting). No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), prepared the questioned signatures on Item 1 (Item Q1) and Item 2 (Item Q2) due to a lack of comparable known signatures submitted for comparison and the illegible nature of the questioned signatures. Request for Known Writing: If future examinations are desired on the questioned Item 1 (Item Q1) and Item 2 (Item Q2) signatures and/or the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1), additional dictated and undictated known signatures and writing should be obtained from KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), or any other logical suspect(s). The known signatures/writing should be comparable to the questioned signatures/writing in name/wording, style, and format. Dictated known signatures/writing should be prepared in the exact name/wording as the questioned signature/writing and obtained on separate pieces of paper similar to the questioned items. Each repetition 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 signatures/writing consists of signatures/writing prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known signatures and writing include business papers, letters, canceled checks, and applications.</p>
X3NBVN- 5241	<p>Questioned writing(excluding the signature) on Q1 was written by K2(Scott Granger). Questioned writing(excluding the signature) on Q2 was written by K1(Kyle Krug). Questioned signature on each of Q1 and Q2 cannot be identified.</p>
XD9E6A- 5245	<p>[No Conclusions Reported.]</p>
XVM389- 5241	<p>Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING KYLE KRUG, ITEM 3 (ITEMS K1a-d): Identification. It was determined that the questioned hand printing on Item 2 (Item Q2) was prepared by KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), excluding the signature. No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d) prepared the Item 1 (Item Q1) and/or the Item 2 (Item Q2) signatures due to the illegible nature of portions of the questioned and known signatures, lack of comparability, and the absence of undictated known signatures. HANDWRITING SCOTT GRANGER, ITEM 4 (ITEMS K2a-d): Identification. It was determined that the questioned handwriting on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), excluding the signature and the overwritten portions. No Conclusion: No conclusion could be reached whether or not SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d) prepared the Item 1 (Item Q1) and/or the Item 2 (Item Q2) signatures due to the illegible nature of portions of the questioned and known signatures, lack of comparability, and the absence of undictated known signatures. HANDWRITING INSTRUCTIONS If future handwriting comparisons are desired concerning the questioned signatures, additional dictated and undictated known signatures should be obtained</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>from any logical suspect(s). The known signatures should be prepared in the names of the individuals on the questioned receipts. Dictated known signatures should be obtained on separate receipt forms similar to the questioned items and each should be removed from the writer's view upon completion. Numerous repetitions may be necessary in order to obtain naturally prepared writing. Undictated known signatures consist of writing prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known signatures include business papers, letters, canceled checks, and/or applications.</p>
YKLPFT-5241	<p>In our opinion, the similarities found during the examination of the received documents, allow us to conclude that the individual that wrote item K1 contributed to the handwriting on the back side of item Q2. In our opinion, the similarities found during the examination of the received documents, allow us to conclude that the individual that wrote item K2 contributed to the handwriting on the back side of item Q1. The comparison of the signatures on items Q1 and Q2 does not show a correspondence with the known signatures on items K1 and K2, however, as both questioned signatures show few or none defined graphic characteristics, in our opinion it is not possible to prove or disprove that the individuals that wrote items K1 and K2 were the authors of the signatures on items Q1 and Q2.</p>
YRLAVP-5241	<p>Methods: Visual examination and comparison of the submitted items utilizing a hand lens revealed the following: Questioned to Known Comparisons: Source Identification- The note in item Q1 was written by the writer of item K2. Substantial significant similarities were noted between the questioned and known writing. Source Exclusion- The note in item Q1 was not written by the writer of item K1. Substantial significant differences were noted between the questioned and known writing. Source Identification- The note in item Q2 was written by the writer of item K1. Substantial significant similarities were noted between the questioned and known writing. Source Exclusion- The note in item Q2 was not written by the writer of item K2. Substantial significant differences were noted between the questioned and known writing. Inconclusive- No conclusion can be offered regarding the signature on the receipt in item Q1 or the signature on the receipt in item Q2. Examination Limitations: This examination was limited by the abbreviated nature of the questioned signatures in items Q1 and Q2 as well as by the comparability of the samples in items K1 and K2. Requested Items: Please submit samples from the writer of item K1 and the writer of item K2 signing the names on the receipts in items Q1 and Q2 multiple times.</p>
YYFJX9-5241	<p>This report contains the results of the questioned document examinations. Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d): Identification. It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 2 (Item Q2) (excluding the signature) was prepared by KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d). No Conclusion. No conclusion could be reached whether or not KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), prepared the questioned signatures on Item 1 (Item Q1) or Item 2 (Item Q2) due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the lack comparability between the questioned and known signatures for comparison. HANDWRITING SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d): Identification. It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1) (excluding the signature) was prepared by SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d). No Conclusion. No conclusion could be reached whether or not SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), prepared the questioned signatures on Item 1 (Item Q1) or Item 2 (Item Q2) due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the lack comparability between the questioned and known signatures for comparison. If future handwriting examinations are requested, additional dictated and undictated known signatures should be obtained from KYLE KRUG, Item 3 (Items K1a-d), SCOTT GRANGER, Item 4 (Items K2a-d), and anyone else suspected of preparing the questioned signatures. The known signatures should be comparable to the questioned signatures in wording, style, and format. Dictated known writing should be prepared in the exact wording as the questioned writing and obtained on separate credit card receipts similar to the questioned items. Each repetition 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 writing prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known writing include business papers, letters, canceled checks, and/or applications.</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
YZT7G8-5245	<p>1. The text written entries on document Q1 were not written by Kyle Krug with a probability bordering to certainty, as the entire configuration of findings compiled, discussed and assessed as having high evidential value is in complete conformity with this hypothesis in all respects, pending examination of originals. 2. The text written entries on document Q2 were written by Kyle Krug with a probability bordering to certainty, as the entire configuration of findings compiled, discussed and assessed as having high evidential value is in complete conformity with this hypothesis in all respects, pending examination of originals. 3. The text written entries on document Q1 were written by Scott Granger with a probability bordering to certainty, as the entire configuration of findings compiled, discussed and assessed as having high evidential value is in complete conformity with this hypothesis in all respects, pending examination of originals. 4. The text written entries on document Q2 were not written by Scott Granger with a probability bordering to certainty, as the entire configuration of findings compiled, discussed and assessed as having high evidential value is in complete conformity with this hypothesis in all respects, pending examination of originals. 5. The signatures on documents Q1 and Q2 are not genuine signatures of either Kyle Krug or Scott Granger, and their execution cannot be attributed to them.</p>
Z4W22B-5245	<p>The questioned tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 was written (excluding signature) by Scott Granger. The questioned tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020 was written (excluding signature) by Kyle Krug. Neither Kyle Krug nor Scott Granger can be identified or eliminated to sign both of the questioned tavern receipts, or one of them.</p>
Z64JY7-5241	<p>It has been concluded that Scott Granger (Exhibit K2) wrote the handwritten note found on the reverse side of the Exhibit Q1 Tavern receipt, dated 10 July 2020. It has been concluded that Scott Granger (Exhibit K2) probably did not write either the signature found on Exhibit Q1 or on Exhibit Q2. It has been concluded that Kyle Krug (Exhibit K1) wrote the handwritten note found on the reverse side of the Exhibit Q2 Tavern receipt, dated 18 July 2020. It has been concluded that Kyle Krug (Exhibit K1) probably did not write either the signature found on Exhibit Q1 or on Exhibit Q2.</p>
Z7CWEM-5245	<p>According to the analysis carried out, the doubted material provided, the reference patterns used for the present study and the technical reasoning presented above, it is determined that THERE IS NO GRAPHIC IDENTITY between the questioned firm (Q1) compared to the standard firms (K1c). THERE IS NO GRAPHIC IDENTITY between (Q2) versus the standard signatures (K2c). According to the analysis carried out, the doubted material provided, the reference patterns used for the present study and the technical reasoning presented above, it is determined that THERE IS GRAPHIC IDENTITY among the questioned writings (Q1) compared to the K2a, K2b standard writings and K2d. GRAPHIC IDENTITY EXISTS between (Q2) versus the written patterns K1a, K1b and K1d.</p>
ZBP7EP-5241	<p>The handwriting on the document Q1 was written by the author of the handwriting on the document K2a-b-d, as in Scott Granger. It is not possible to identify nor eliminate Scott Granger and/or Kyle Krug as the author of the signatures on the documents Q1 and Q2. The conclusion is neutral. The handwriting on the document Q2 was written by the author of the handwriting on the documents K1a-b-d, as in Kyle Krug.</p>
ZFKZCQ-5241	<p>The writer of Items 1-3 (K1-Kyle Krug) has been identified as the writer of the questioned entries appearing on Item 8 (Q2) excluding the signature. The writer of Items 1-3 (K1-Kyle Krug) has been eliminated as the writer of the questioned entries appearing on Item 7 (Q1) excluding the signature. The writer of Items 4-6 (K2-Scott Granger) has been identified as the writer of the questioned entries appearing on Item 7 (Q1) excluding the signature. The writer of Items 4-6 (K2-Scott Granger) has been eliminated as the writer of the questioned entries appearing on Item 8 (Q2) excluding the signature. There is no conclusion (meaning cannot be eliminated or identified) as to whether or not the writers of Items 1-3 (K1-Kyle Krug) and Items 4-6 (K2-Scott Granger) wrote either of the questioned signatures appearing on Item 7 (Q1) or Item 8 (Q2). The examination was limited by the absence of directly comparable signature standards.</p>
ZP66JP-5241	<p>K1 wrote the handwriting on Q2. It is not possible to compare the signatures on Q1 and Q2 to K1's signatures. K2 wrote the handwriting on Q1. It is not possible to compare the signatures on Q1 and Q2 to K2's signatures.</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
ZT6FFP- 5245	<p>The questioned handwriting has been speedily and fluently completed. No evidence of features commonly associated with copying or disguise were noted. A number of similarities were observed between the specimen handwriting attributed to Scott GRANGER and the questioned note with text beginning "Kayla, your..." (Q1). These similarities included such features as the writing style, size and size relationships, fluency and individual letter constructions. Based on these similarities it is my opinion that the author of the specimen handwriting attributed to Scott Granger completed the questioned note with text beginning "Kayla, your..." (Q1). A number of similarities were also observed between the specimen handwriting attributed to Kyle KRUG and the questioned note with text beginning "Don't ignore me..." (Q2). These similarities included such features as the writing style, size and size relationships, fluency and individual letter constructions. Based on these similarities it is my opinion that the author of the specimen handwriting attributed to Kyle KRUG completed the questioned note with text beginning "Don't ignore me..." (Q2). The two questioned signatures bore little or no resemblance to the signature specimens attributed to either KRUG or GRANGER. Due to these differences, no meaningful comparison of the questioned and specimen signatures was possible. Accordingly no opinions of authorship have been possible in relation to the questioned signatures and the examination was inconclusive.</p>

Additional Comments

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
2AFRXP- 5245	1. There are not enough characteristics in the formation of letters, writing habits, beginning and end of strokes when comparing the signature in the identified document Q1 with identified document K2. 2. There are no individual characteristics in the formation of letters, size, inclination, however, as there is a limited number of samples to compare, I cannot identify or eliminate the author of the signature of the document identified Q2 with K1 since to compare both documents there only initials in handwritten and illegible signature.
2QZHXP- 5245	Additional signature samples by K1 and K2 that are course of business samples would provide the basis for additional examinations regarding the questioned signatures.
37BH8K- 5241	Please refer to section 3 [Table 2: Conclusions].
3CDPLM- 5241	The signatures in Kyle Krug (K1) and Scott Granger (K2) comparative material represent different, inadequate and incompatible forms in relation to the signatures Q1 Tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (the questioned signature) and Q2 Tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (the questioned signature).
3F9K32- 5241	According to the above [Table 2 - Conclusions] and taking into account our guide, in which the procedure, method and principles are described that must be taken into account to carry out the Graphological Analysis for Identifying Purposes, it cannot be determined whether any of the known writers contributed to the signature questioned on each of the tavern receipts.
3YAYQM- 5245	The submission of fifteen to twenty known normal course-of-business signature samples of Kyle Krug and Scott Granger and exact-text exemplars of Kyle Krug, writing in cursive, may provide the basis for additional conclusions. Exhibits Q1, Q2, K1a through K1d, and K2a through K2d were digitally preserved. Exhibits Q1, Q2, K1, and K2 will be returned to the submitting agency. Examination Result "C" was chosen due to the submission of insufficient comparable known cursive writing of Kyle Krug and the requested signatures of Kyle Krug and Scott Granger were not comparable in style to the questioned signatures on Exhibits Q1 and Q2. In addition, the signature on Exhibit Q2 is limited in sufficient characteristics for a comparison examination.
428983- 5241	260/5000 As for the study requested of the firms, no comparative inspection is carried out because it does not meet one of the suitability requirements, including similarity, it being understood that they must comply with the same font and extension of the same.
44JC9L- 5241	Some similarities and differences between questioned signature on the front of document Q1 and the writing of Scott Granger were found. Comparative handwriting of Scott Granger is not sufficient to perform examination of questioned signature on the front of receipt Q2. Comparative handwriting from Scott Granger should be expanded.
4U9AML- 5245	Additional comparison material is requested to continue analyses on signatures: cursive writing and unsolicited signatures from both writers.
4WF6EY- 5241	The questioned signature on Q1 differs from the design of the specimen signatures on K1c and K2c. Hence, it has not been possible to do a comparison among themselves. The questioned signature on Q2 differs from the design of the specimen signatures on K1c and K2c. Hence, it has not been possible to do a comparison among themselves.
6BVLLT- 5241	The signatures in dispute from Q1 and Q2, are incomparable to the signature models of the respective holders (K1 and K2).
6JM7FL- 5241	The signatures on Q-1 and Q-2 were mostly illegible and were of minimal value for making a definite conclusion.
6T898Z- 5245	The signatures standards submitted for K1-Kyle Krug and K2-Scott Granger were not sufficient for comparison with the questioned signatures.

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
77EEXT- 5241	To define an objective conclusion, regarding the signatures, if it is possible, we must have free models signed by Kyle Krug and Scott Granger in previous time and before, as near as possible the dates of Q1 and Q2.
794QWY- 5245	Examination and comparison as described in greater detail in the body of this report leads to the following conclusions: 1. Kyle Kruger (K1c) did not sign either of the questioned receipts (Q1 or Q2). 2. Mr. Kruger (K1a-b and K1d) can neither be identified or eliminated of writing the cursive handwritten notation appearing on item Q1. Contemporaneous Cursive writing samples must be submitted for proper comparison before a stronger opinion may be rendered. 3. Kyle Kruger (K1a-b and K1d) is identified as the author of the printed notation appearing on item Q1. 4. Scott Granger (K2c) did not sign either of the questioned receipts (Q1 or Q2). 5. Mr. Granger (K2a-b and K2d) is identified as the author of the cursive notation appearing on item Q1. 6. Scott Granger (K2a-b and K2d) can neither be identified or eliminated of writing the printed notation appearing on item Q2. Contemporaneous printed writing samples must be submitted for proper comparison before a stronger opinion may be rendered.
79MPWH- 5241	No Opinión can be expressed one way or the other as to the authorship of the 'Questioned' signatures on the two Tavern Receipts 'Q1' and 'Q2' . No comparable material .
7B79NK- 5241	The questioned signatures on documents Q1 and Q2 are not pictorially similar to the signature exemplars attributed to either Scott Granger or Kyle Krug; however, there are few discernible letter forms in the questioned signatures on documents Q1 and Q2. A proper handwriting comparison requires, from any and all subjects, an extensive and contemporaneous representation of the same characters and words in the same style present in the questioned handwriting. The extended writing on questioned document Q1 appears to be written in a composite handwriting style. The extended writing on questioned document Q2 appears to be written in print handwriting style. The exemplars attributed to Scott Granger are written in a composite handwriting style and the exemplars attributed to Kyle Krug are written in a print handwriting style. If you would like to continue your investigation from a handwriting standpoint, it might be useful to obtain verbatim handwriting exemplars from all subjects written in a similar handwriting style.
7PR2J2- 5241	Regarding the use of answer C, please see below for reasons: No conclusion could be reached whether or not KYLE KRUG, writer of Item 3 (Items K1a-d), prepared the questioned signatures on Items 1 (Item Q1) or 2 (Item Q2) due to the lack of comparable known signatures for comparison and partial illegibility of the questioned signatures. No conclusion could be reached whether or not SCOTT GRANGER, writer of Item 4 (Items K2a-d), prepared the questioned signatures on Items 1 (Item Q1) or 2 (Item Q2) due to the partial illegibility of the questioned signatures, the limited comparability of the submitted known writing, the lack of undictated known signatures, and the presence of unexplained characteristics with the Item 1 (Item Q1) signature.
7TTWBG- 5245	Regarding the the questioned signatures of Q1 and Q2, because there is no basis for comparison. Neither Kyle Krug(K1) nor Scott Granger(K2) can be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signatures of Q1 and Q2.
8Y88VV- 5241	Q1 appears to have illegible letters which prohibit the comparison process to K2. One can only guess what the letters may be. The Q1 signature most likely is a fake name with disguised letter forms in an effort to not be identified. Or possibly someone else signed it for Scott Granger. It cannot be determined. Q2 appears to have illegible letters which prohibit the comparison process to K1. The first letters of the first and last name appear to be a 'J' and a 'D'. One can only guess what the letters may be. The Q2 signature most likely is a fake name with disguised letter forms in an effort to not be identified. Or possibly someone else signed it for Kyle Krug. It cannot be determined.
942L3G- 5245	When performing the comparative analysis of the signature present in Q1 with the signatures present in k2c, a limited amount of characteristics resulting from the distortion present in the know samples is observed. The signature present in k2c are not fluent, irregularities in the line quality and letter formation, which could be the product from the disguise of writing. Due to the finding I cant eliminate or identify Scott Granger as the author of the signature present in the identified document

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
	<p>Q1. When performing the comparative analysis of the signature present in the document Q2 with the signatures present in the document K1c, a difference in proportion and slant is observed. However, cannot observe more elements of comparison since the signature present in the K1c document is product of initials made in handprinting and the signature in Q2 is an cursive and partially illegible signature. Due to the absence of the a comparison element I cannot identify or eliminate Kyle Krug as the author of the signature present on the Q2 document.</p>
9DTXEX- 5241	<p>The reason that both writers Kyle Krug and Scott Granger 'cannot be identified or eliminated' is due to the significant differences in the signature basic design and hence, lack of comparable features between the two questioned signatures and the known specimens of both Kyle Krug and Scott Granger.</p>
9HHJ2Q- 5241	<p>Additional testing would be completed on original evidence.</p>
ACPUZD- 5245	<p>For comparative technical analyses, the morphostructural characteristics and the dynamics of the strokes that make up the doubted and indubitated spellings were took into account, in terms of initiations and terminations, bending and extension movements, spontaneity, inclination, proportionality, general configuration, construction of letters, links, rhythm, rotation and finishing of strokes. While it is true that the identity of the manuscripts in documents Q1 and Q2 is established, it is also true that the identity of the signatures made therein cannot be established, given the notorious discrepancies presented by them in the face of the indubitated K1 and K2.</p>
ALZWLE- 5245	<p>4.1. The firms investigated Q1 and Q2 correspond to graphic structures of simplified construction, whose complexity of the graphic route (reduced number of strokes and low difficulty in drawing) can be executed by an individual who has medium writing ability. 4.2. In neither of the two cases of the firms investigated in Q1 and Q2, is there documentary physical evidence, which allows the technical expert to objectively demonstrate the following premises: That the firms investigated in Q1 and Q2 have been the product of invented firms, by anyone with scriptural ability, including Messrs. Scott and Kyle. That the signatures in Q1 and Q2 have been signed by a person other than Messrs. Scott Granger and Kyle Krug.</p>
AMBX8D- 5241	<p>In terms of the questioned signatures, the limited amount of questioned material (i.e., each was a single illegible signature) severely restricted any examination and comparison. Although each questioned signature was completely divergent from the specimen samples provided, the possibility of disguise by either of these writers cannot be precluded. As such, no determination regarding authorship was warranted based on the samples provided.</p>
BCMY2K- 5245	<p>The Q1 and Q2 questioned signatures are not comparable to either of the specimen writers (K1 or K2) as they are in a different style and form. Despite the fact the questioned signatures Q1 and Q2 are fluent and appear to be produced with skill, I cannot discount that they may be a spurious signature of one or both of the specimen writers or they are simply a different form of signature to the specimen signatures provided (i.e. a legitimate different style). As such, no comparison is able to be conducted, with no similar features to compare and my opinion is inconclusive with regard to the Q1 and Q2 signatures.</p>
BJMQGN- 5241	<p>The transcription of the questioned signature on the receipt dated as 18 July 2020 (Q2) is different to Kyle Krug and Scott Granger signatures' transcription. In addition, reference samples similar to Kyle Krug and Scott Granger questioned signatures' transcription were not submitted for comparison. Therefore, it is impossible to determine whether Kyle Krug or Scott Granger made the questioned signature or not. The transcription of the questioned signature on the receipt dated as 10 July 2020 (Q1) is different to Kyle Krug and Scott Granger signatures' transcription. In addition, reference samples similar to Kyle Krug and Scott Granger questioned signatures' transcription were not submitted for comparison. Therefore, it is impossible to determine whether Kyle Krug or Scott Granger made the questioned signature or not.</p>
CLJYKW- 5245	<p>Regarding the signatures. It is obvious that both the questioned signatures Q1 and Q2 differ from specimen signatures provided by both Mr. Granger and Mr. Krug. Before commencing the</p>

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
	examination, our lab would suggest to the mandating authority to 1) investigate whether the signatures in question correspond to the signatures of respective credit card holders, 2) collect course of bussiness signatures of Mr. Granger and Mr. Krug.
CNURYX- 5241	Concerning my inconclusive opinions: While the Scott Granger signature on the front of Q1 had some characteristics in common with the known signature exemplars, there were also several differences. I do not know if this is because these were provided by him as request writing with an attempt at disguise, or if there was an attempt by him to disguise his signature on the receipt, or perhaps he has more than one style of signature. It is also possible there was a different writer than the writer of the note. Because I do not have any cursive writing of Kyle Krueger other than his signature, which does not contain similar letters, I was inconclusive as to whether he is the writer of the signatures found on Q1 and Q2. I reserve the right to amend my opinions if additional samples are provided.
DJHDLR- 5241	For the present case, eight (8) analyzes were carried out, of which four (4) correspond to signature and four (4) to writing, which yielded the results indicated in the conclusions.
DK9CZP- 5245	In my opinion, first, the writer of K1 shows nature variations from the exemplars of K1a to K1d, and the biggest differences with signature on the front of Q1 and Q2 was the formats of letters, the connection of letters, size of letters. Second the writer of K2 shows left handed characteristics from the exemplars of K2a to K2d, and the biggest differences with signature on the front of Q1 and Q2 was the slant of letter, terminal stroke, size of letters.
DPPU4T- 5241	concern the response "C": Signature on the front of the receipt dated 10 july 2020 (Q-1) due to its illegible, simplified and short form, as well as having only one signature specimen, it was decided to qualify for tests to a limited extent. Signature on the front of the receipt dated 18 july 2020 (Q-2) constituting a two-part, partially legible structure, which has a simplified form, not having a sufficient number of distinctive features, and thus cannot be qualified for comparative tests. In the comparative material of both people: Kyle Krug (K1) and Scott Granger (K2), there are no adequate forms that could be compared with questioned signature on the receipt dated 10 july 2020 (Q-1) (as well as on the receipt dated 18 july 2020 (Q-2)). It should be noted that the requested signatures for Scott Granger (K2) do not show stable form, moreover, the degree of freedom in their writting differs from the method of implementation of the downloaded letter patterns. This is the basis for applying for supplementing Scott's Granger comparative material. At the stage of the research, the comparative material of both people: Kyle Krug (K1) and Scott Granger (K2), is insufficient to undertake the research commisioned in relations to the questioned signatures on the front of both receipts (Q1 and Q2).
DW2X7K- 5241	In our opinion, the signature on the front side of Q2(Tavern receipts Dated 18 July 2020) CAN NOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED that were written by either K1 (Kyle Krug) nor K2 (Scott Granger) because of lack of readable letters at this signature, that we can compared with the handwriting of both suspects and also because of dissimilarities of compositions between them.
DYCTRC- 5245	Answers are based on available material. Suspects' own signatures as knowns were provided. No request writing of first and/or last name of each receipt signature name was provided. No ruler or other way to gauge actual size of questioned and known material was in available images. No examples of Kayla Jones's writing/printing was available. Request writing instruction should have included print this – write this – for additional known material.
DZP6WA- 5245	The style of the signatures of K1 and K2 are not similar to the signatures on Q1 and Q2. They are not able to be compared. From the information of two tavern receipts, the bills are paid by credit cards. We suggest collecting some signatures from the credit card holders in order to find out whether if these signatures are written by the credit card holders.
EG8N6Z- 5245	It is not possible to compare Q signatures with K comparison material. Q signatures are unreadable and there are no similar unreadable K signatures. Therefore Q signatures are not comparable with neither K text nor K signatures. In real case we would ask for a course of business signatures sample. After examining that we would state if the person spontaneously signs like that or not.

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
ENQVKK- 5241	Nothing to compare - signatures could be from other writers - receipts may have been pulled out of a stack used by happenstance. K1 a-d writer - writer has the skill level to produce the signatures, question if they can write cursive. k2a-d writer - lacks skill level overall to produce the signatures. No non-request signatures were submitted for either writer.
FBHZU9- 5241	The K1 and K2 writers submitted multiple samples of their normal, natural signatures. These samples are dissimilar from the questioned signatures of the Q1 and Q2 exhibits. This does not mean, however, that neither of the K writers wrote the questioned signatures. The questioned signatures may be simulations, disguises, or the genuine signatures of other persons. None of these possibilities can be determined from the known signature samples provided, and thus authorship cannot be determined.
FK4RAR- 5241	1) K1 : (Kyle Krug) we cannot prove or deny the signature on the receipt (Q2) dated 18/7/2020 , because there are some indicative features of his handwriting, but they are not sufficient to prove or deny it . 2) K2 : (Scott Granger) we cannot prove or deny the signature on the receipt (Q1) dated 10/7/2020 , because there are some indicative features of his handwriting, but they are not sufficient to prove or deny it .
FMWXYC- 5241	The questioned signatures on samples Q1 and Q2 both had many differences and no similarities with the comparison samples of Kyle Krug and Scott Granger. The questioned signatures were illegible and not very complicated and that is why it was not possible to eliminate Kyle Krug nor Scott Granger as possible writers.
FQRCD9- 5241	The K1 known writing is entirely hand printed (excluding the stylized signature) while the entire Q1 note is written in cursive. It is not possible to properly compare cursive writing to hand printing. The Q1 and Q2 signature names are not known. The signatures are illegible; the names do not appear on the receipt and were not provided by the submitter. Furthermore, all of the signatures are somewhat stylized (some highly stylized) and illegible, and the questioned signatures lack pictorial similarity to the known signatures submitted for comparison. Without knowing the names on the questioned receipts, one cannot know if they are comparing signatures written in the same name.
FV26EC- 5245	The questioned signatures are scrawled and indecipherable, and not comparable to the known signature samples submitted for comparison. Additionally, the known signature samples consisted of request writing samples only, with no course of business samples provided to authenticate the request samples or establish a range of variation of signature styles for either of the known writers. These limitations hindered the examination and preclude a more conclusive opinion.
FWFZQQ- 5241	In this case, the manuscript analysis method (graphoscopic) was used. Additionally, the laboratory used the 6000 HS Video Spectrum Comparator equipment and the Regula 5001 MK Microscope.
FX8MC8- 5245	A limiting factor in this examination was the lack of comparable cursive writing of both Krug and Granger. More definitive conclusions may be possible with the submission of additional non-request signatures of both Kyle Krug and Scott Granger. It may also prove beneficial to submit multiple samples of additional request writing of both Krug and Granger signing the name in question appearing on Item Q2 as this signature appears to be a different name. For instance, the first letter of the first name in Item Q2 appears to be a "J" and the first letter of the last name appears to be a "D". It may also prove beneficial to submit multiple repetitions of Kyle Kruger signing the name in question appearing on Item Q1.
GDKLCL- 5245	(a) Obtain collected and dictated specimen material of Kyle KRUG writing the handwritten entries contained within item Q1. (b) Obtain specimen signatures of the writers whose names appear on items Q1 and Q2. (c) Obtain dictated specimen material of Kyle KRUG and Scott GRANGER signing the names contained within items Q1 and Q2.
GEQCWL- 5241	The graphological analysis of the signatures Q1 and Q2 of doubt was not possible, since the reference elements of Kyle Krug and Scott Granger are not similar in morphology, which is why no objective comparison elements were located

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
GF9U6E-5241	The signatures on Q1 and Q2 bear no pictorial similarities and are based on different construction characteristics. This is also the case with the sample signatures K1c and K2c. No meaningful comparison can be made between the questioned and sample signatures.
GGWTB6-5241	The writer K2 can not be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on Q1 receipt. There were differences in pictorial appearance and structure between the Q1 signature and specimens of K2. Because of this there were limited number of features to compare, which were mostly different, but a few similar writing lines, form were also observed. We could not eliminate the possibility of disguise, therefore we could not eliminate and could not identify the writer K2.
GLC4QU-5241	The term "no conclusion" has been used in conclusion for Questioned signatures because Questioned signatures on Q1 and Q2 are incomparable with requested signature exemplars of Kyle Krug (K1c) and Scott Granger (K2c). The Questioned Signatures are stylized and lack distinguishing comparable features (letter formations, joining etc.) that are required for comparison, whereas, requested signature exemplars of Kyle Krug (K1c) and Scott Granger (K2c) have letters and are joined / connected by connecting strokes showing distinguishable features for comparison.
HMN66F-5245	It is recommended that comparable known writing from both known subjects be submitted for additional examination. Please provide cursive samples from subject K1. Please provide more printed writing from the subject K2. Also, have both writers create signatures in the name of both Q1 and Q2.
HUHAXG-5241	Examinations and/or comparisons could not be conducted between the questioned signature present on the front side of the receipt designated Q1, and the known request signatures said to be produced by Kyle Krug (K1) and the known request signatures said to be produced by Scott Granger (K2) because the name contained within the questioned signature Q1 is not legible. In short, these signature comparisons cannot be conducted because it is not known if the name within the questioned signature designated Q1, is or is not comparable to the known signature names said to be Kyle Krug (K1) or Scott Granger (K2). (No Exam). Examinations and/or comparisons could not be conducted between the questioned signature present on the front side of the receipt designated Q2 and the known request signatures designated K1 (Kyle Krug) and K2 (Scott Granger), because the name contained within the questioned signature (Q2) appears to read "Jon Doe". In short, the name within the questioned signature which appears to be "Jon Doe" is not comparable to the names within the known signatures said to have been produced by Kyle Krug (K1) and/or Scott Granger (K2). (No Exam).
HVZR7A-5241	This examiner selected option "C" in regards to the signature portions due to the lack of compatible standards for comparison. The signatures appearing in the questioned exhibits appear to be different than the names of the two known writers.
JHKTLK-5241	The signatures both on Q1 and Q2 pose a number of different questions. In principle, there are not (or not enough) elements for comparison, and therefore the conclusions incline towards answer C "cannot be identified or eliminated". Even if there might be a few elements, it is considered to be dangerous to provide with an answer other than C. In order to be able to proceed with the examination, we would request more known signatures of both candidates. These new signatures should be "not for comparison", which means signatures on already existing documents, belonging to a similar period of time, as well as signatures including other possible different models of signatures the candidates may have, if any. Summarising, even if we provided C as the answer, we consider the analysis of these questioned signatures would be closed/finalised only after receiving the extra signatures requested.
JJYEVN-5241	REGARDING THE Q1 AND Q2 SIGNATURES, IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO PERFORM THE CHECK BECAUSE THERE ARE NO COMPARISON POINTS TO BE ABLE TO CARRY OUT A GRAPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS WITH AN OBJECTIVE RESULT, THAT IS, IT DOES NOT MEET ONE OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE INDISPENSABLE GRAPH.
JNTCKD-5241	Presumptive information was found between documents Q1 and K2 (a, b, c and d), likewise between document Q2 and K1 (a, b, c and d), however this information is insufficient to reach a

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
	categorical conclusion; It should be noted that this forensic laboratory issues only accurate and not presumptive conclusions.
KANZG6-5241	In a concrete case, informal signatures cannot be assigned as well as those that are easy to reproduce. The comparison documents concerning the signatures come exclusively from dictations. As a result, the conclusion cannot be formal unlike the writing where notes presenting the current writing have been provided.
KBKTLJ-5241	I am unable to identify or eliminate Kyle Klug as the signer of the signatures on Q1 or Q2. This no conclusion is due to lack of known exemplars from Kyle Klug that are comparable to the questioned signatures. I am unable to identify or eliminate Scott Granger as the signer of the signatures on Q1 or Q2. This no conclusion is due to lack of known exemplars from Scott Granger that are comparable to the questioned signatures.
KJELM3-5241	The questioned signatures appearing on the Exhibit Q1 and Q2 items are different in style and appear to have different letters and letter combinations than the known material for Kyle Krug (K1) and Scott Granger (K2). Therefore, these items are not very comparable with the known material and no conclusive opinion could be rendered regarding the questioned signatures.
LA8J9C-5241	The signature contained in the receipt dated July 18, 2020, cannot be determined, since there are no common elements of comparison with the signatures of Kyle Krug, that is, they do not homologate each other, they are of different design, therefore, a comparison cannot be made and a categorical conclusion can be made. The signature contained in the receipt dated July 10, 2020, cannot be determined, since there are no common elements of comparison with the Scott Granger signatures, that is, they do not homologate each other, they are of different design, therefore, a comparison cannot be made and a categorical conclusion can be made.
LQR8GL-5241	Limitations regarding comparisons to questioned signatures: largely illegible nature of the questioned signatures, the limited complexity of the Item 2 (Item Q2) signature, the limited comparability of the questioned signatures, and the lack of undictated known signatures.
LUR9RG-5241	Scott Granger (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated with the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (Q1), because the compared signature does not have enough distinctive features characteristic of the writer. We recommend sending the original official register of signature of Scott Granger to examine again with the questioned signature and the rest of items. Kyle Krug (K1) cannot be identified or eliminated with the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (Q1), because there is not comparable stokes between the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020 (Q1) and Kyle Krug items (K1). We recommend sending the original official register of signature of Kyle Krug to examine again with the questioned signature and the rest of items. Scott Granger (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated with the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020 (Q2), because there is not comparable stokes between the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020 (Q2) and Scott Granger items (K2). We recommend sending the original official register of signature of Scott Granger to examine again with the questioned signature and the rest of items. Kyle Krug (K1) cannot be identified or eliminated with the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020 (Q2), because there is not comparable stokes between the questioned signature on the tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020 (Q2) and Kyle Krug items (K1). We recommend sending the original official register of signature of Kyle Krug to examine again with the questioned signature and the rest of items.
M8VQK9-5241	The known signatures of Kyle KRUG (K1) and Scott GRANGER (K2) are both pictorially dissimilar to each of the questioned signatures Q1 and Q2. As such, no meaningful examination can be undertaken.
MDXZR2-5241	No conclusions regarding signatures due to lack of comparability.
MKJT3Z-5241	Response "C" used due to insufficient comparability between the questioned and known writing.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
MM66WJ-5241	Neither Kyle Krug nor Scott Granger can be identified or excluded as the signers of the questioned receipts. Additional samples of known, course-of-business signatures for Krug and Granger might provide data to support more definitive findings.
MPUE6Y-5245	Additional NOTES: The opinion of "No Conclusion" was rendered for both questioned document signatures. This occurred for the following reasons: The signatures are at least partially, if not fully, illegible. The names that the signatures are purported to represent are unknown – therefore it is impossible to assign a pen/writing movement to a particular grapheme or letter formation due to the aforementioned simplification and illegible nature of the questioned signature. K1 does not have 'cursive' writing provided in the exemplar – it is all hand printed. There are no directly comparable writings for the names(?)/signatures appearing on the face of the questioned documents (the side bearing transaction information). Ultimately, it is unknown if the subjects who wrote the materials on the back of the receipts may have used a receipt from a different patron to Joe's Tavern – they took a receipt from an unrelated transaction and wrote on it. o Should that be the case, the name on the front of the receipt may be some random person and be unrelated entirely to the subject's writing on the reverse of it. It should be also noted that when there is non-comparable material submitted for examination, the standard within our field dictates that the examination for that writing should be discontinued. SWGDOC E01-13 – Standard for Examination of Handwritten Items 7.11 Evaluate the comparability of the bodies of writing (questioned writing to known writing or exclusively questioned writing). 7.11.1 If the bodies of writing are not comparable, discontinue comparison and request comparable known writing, if appropriate. 7.11.1.1 If comparable known writing is made available, return to 7.10. If comparable known writing is not made available, discontinue these procedures and report accordingly. The presence of what appears to be one letter formation (or two) in light of the rest of the signature should dictate that the examiner stop examination as there is insufficient information as to the nature of the questioned signatures. SUMMARY: Though there is no evidence to indicate that the known writers may have written either of the questioned signatures, there is an insufficiency of information (and comparable writing) for any opinion to be rendered regarding those signatures.
N47E7H-5241	Regarding the questioned signature present in documents Q1 and Q2 compared to the manuscript samples of Scott Granger and Kyle Krug, it is concluded that it is not possible to insert or discard those mentioned in the authorship of the questioned signatures, since the The analyzed material presents some similarities and at the same time discrepancies, especially of a morphological, dimensional and structural type in the general configuration of some of the signs that compose them, which allow establishing the same or non-manuscript authorship.
NM78EB-5245	Regarding the THIRD conclusion, no (homologous) graphic elements of comparison were found between (Q1-Q2) and (K1c-K2c) to be able to establish with certainty their graphic identity, since according to the method established in this laboratory, a format for handwriting identification would have to be applied, by the expert, and dictation according to the graphic elements required and specific.
P472DZ-5245	The design of the questioned signatures in Q1 and Q2 were different from the specimen signatures in K1c and K2c.
P4NK69-5241	The term "inconclusive" in point 02 & 04 has been used due to following limitations; i. Questioned signatures on tavern receipts marked as Q1 & Q2 are pictorially different from signature exemplars marked as K1c & K2c. ii. Comparison cannot be performed due to the absence of common characters / features.
P7XZRY-5241	Answer "C" was used due to a lack of comparability between the questioned and known writing submitted.
P9GRNG-5241	The signature of K-2 could neither be identified or eliminated as the writer of the signature in question, Q-1 front. Both the known signature(s) K-2c and the questioned Q-1 signature have end strokes moving to the left. However; not enough similarities were present for an identification. A lot of variation was noted in the request writing, K-2c. This is an indication the writer attempted to

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
QANU36- 5241	<p>disguise his writing.</p> <p>4. The level "C" results (no conclusion) for the signatures were arrived at as a result of there being too few comparable letter forms and stylised signature elements between each of the questioned signatures on documents Q1 and Q2 and the specimen handwriting and signatures attributed to both Kyle Krug and Scott Granger on the K1 and K2 documents, respectively. 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 documents. Therefore, the examinations have been limited to an extent by the reproduction nature of the documents. In this case, however, such limitations are unlikely to have affected the results. 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.</p>
QB2QMW- 5241	<p>Wording such as "contributed" is problematic and should be avoided or clarified. Perhaps a disclaimer such as this would be required if a request was received with this wording: "Conclusions do not totally preclude the possibility of short incidental writings or entries by another writer."</p>
QK4FX7- 5241	<p>It was not possible to carry out the study with the questioned elements and those of comparison, because they do not present homologous elements that allow a comparative study to be carried out and to reach a conclusion.</p>
QRQ7HG- 5241	<p>The Item Q1 and Item Q2 signatures cannot be identified or eliminated due to illegibility in the questioned signatures and lack of comparability with the known signatures.</p>
R9QF2D- 5245	<p>The signatures appearing on Q1 and Q2 are stylized signatures, do not present any comparable character (graphic elements) with the specimen comparison signatures of the named Kyle Krug (K1) and Scott Granger (K2) and are totally different from them and therefore the two suspects cannot be eliminated nor identified as being the authors of the questioned signatures appearing on Q1 and Q2.</p>
RDKAYE- 5241	<p>In the case of the signatures, it cannot be determined whether Scott Garnger and Kyle Krug contributed or not, because the questioned signatures (Q1 and Q2) do not have the same homology, structure, design or features with respect to K1C and K2C, which does not allow to identify the signer</p>
RG6PHY- 5241	<p>The examination was hindered by the lack of course-of-business signatures from both subjects in this case. It is recommended that course-of-business signatures from both subject's be obtained and submitted for examination. It was also hindered by the lack of comparability between the questioned notes, one mostly printed writing one mostly cursive writing, to the known exemplars. Item K1 contains mostly printed writing, with a few connected letters, and Item K2 contains a mix of printed, cursive, and connected printing. It is recommended that both subjects prepare additional requested exemplars that correspond to the questioned writing.</p>
RYHZV6- 5241	<p>(Indeterminable or cannot be identified or eliminated): No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the Kyle Krug and Scott Granger (of the items K1c and K2c) signature the questioned material (Items Q1 and Q2) because the known signatures appears to be distorted, and it is not possible to establish it is natural signatures because the range of variation (direction of strokes; line quality; overall pressure; proportion; simplification; size; slant; spacing; speed, etc.) is widespread.</p>
T96PJX- 5241	<p>The examination of additional known writing of both writers in the same style and text as the questioned writing on the back of Q1 and Q2 may provide the basis for more conclusive opinions. No conclusion could be reached whether or not either Scott Granger or Kyle Krug wrote the questioned signature on Q1 and Q2. The examination was limited by the lack of comparable signatures submitted for examination.</p>

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
TX9JPY- 5245	If further attention is warranted in this matter, it will be necessary to submit additional requested and normal course of business writing from Kyle Krug (Exhibits K1a through K1d), Scott Granger (Exhibits K2a through K2d), and/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 receipt forms. Normal course of business writing 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 and opinions in this report are available upon request.
U49H DU- 5241	The names of the individuals on the Q1 and Q2 receipts are unclear. The provided known writing of Kyle Krug and Scott Granger is not comparable to the signatures on items Q1 and Q2. Therefore, no meaningful conclusion as to the authorship of either questioned signature can be made.
U6NC8V- 5245	The signatures on the receipts Q1 and Q2 are written in stylised forms and I am therefore unable to read the names in which they are written. However, I find that both questioned signatures are pictorially different to the signatures of both the reference writers, Kyle KRUG and Scott GRANGER, and may well have been written in different names. As such, I am unable to make any meaningful comparisons between the questioned signatures and either of the reference signatures or non-signature handwritings; my findings for these comparisons are inconclusive. Our conclusion scale uses the following levels of support for the stated proposition: Extremely strong, Very Strong, Strong, Moderately Strong, Moderate, Weak and Inconclusive. Therefore, the conclusions given above in section 3) [Table 2 - Conclusions] are at the top of our scale.
U7UU6R- 5241	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The examination was based on comparison of handwriting characteristics such as line quality, formation of letters, formation of numerals and connection strokes between the questioned handwriting/ questioned signature and the specimen handwriting/ specimen signature respectively. 2. There was no corresponding characters for comparison between the questioned signatures on "Q1" and "Q2" and specimen signatures of "Kyle Krug" and "Scott Granger".
UGUWGT- 5241	Images of the items listed above are being retained. More definitive opinions may be possible with the submission of the original documents depicted in Q1 and Q2 and additional known writing from subjects of interest in the investigation including repetitions of the same writing in question on Q1 and Q2 in hand printing, cursive, and signatures. Please contact the FDU for assistance prior to the collections of additional known writing. Definition of Handwriting Opinions: The opinion "highly probable" means that the evidence contained in the handwriting is very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality is missing so that an identification is not in order. However, the examiner is virtually certain that the questioned and known writings were written by the same individual. The opinion "no conclusion" means that the evidence contained in the handwriting possesses significant limiting factors that hinder analysis. 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 "probably 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.
V46KXC- 5245	I cannot assume that either writer has an alternate signature style because the exemplars in this matter were limited in number. Therefore, my opinions regarding both signatures are qualified.
V4N4MV- 5241	The signatures on the front of the receipts were not comparable to the known writing of Kyle Krug or Scott Granger.
VNW7LZ- 5241	The signature answers were all "c" as each of the questioned signatures were fundamentally dissimilar to each set of specimen signatures

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
VRVHGZ- 5245	Propositions considered: I have considered each of the following propositions for each of the specimen writers and the questioned handwriting/signatures individually: the writer of the specimen material wrote the questioned material; and someone other than the writer of the specimen material wrote the questioned material. Further examination of the questioned signatures can be conducted if additional comparable specimen signatures are provided.
VV9HDR- 5241	A signature comparison of Q1 and Q2 was not conducted due to non-comparable and illegible signatures.
W83LBD- 5245	There is no pictorial resemblance between the signatures on Q1 and Q2 and the specimens provided. I am unable to determine if these signatures were made by Krug or Granger in a style which differs from the specimens and my findings in respect are essentially inconclusive.
WBGV9U- 5245	The complete the examination, course of business signatures of both suspects should have been collected and sent for comparison. The image resolution is not high enough to see all the fine writing characteristics. Higher resolution is recommended in the future.
WBJTWR- 5241	Although the logic conclusion for the comparisons of Q1 to K1 and Q2 to K2 handwriting would be a result of absolute elimination since a known writer was already identified for the two questioned bodies of handwriting (Q1-was written by K2 and Q2 was written by K1), the approach taken was a conservative one. As such, the comparisons of Q1 to K1 and Q2 to K2 were considered independently and therefore, they resulted in a less definitive opinion of elimination because of the limitation associated with the lack of comparable features regarding the type of handwriting: print versus cursive. For both questioned signatures, the result was inconclusive because it is unknown who is the credit card owner. The first step should be a comparison between the questioned signatures and the rightful owner of the credit card. This comparison should be conducted first in order to identify or eliminate this person. Depending on the result of this comparison, a further comparison could be performed between the questioned signatures Q1 and Q2 and the knowns. The lack of signature exemplars from the credit card owner precludes the completion of this first step and therefore no conclusion could be made between Q1 and Q2 and K1 and K2.
WCXRZU- 5245	The features of the signature on the Q1 document show significant differences compared to the requested signatures of Scott Granger (K2). However the requested signatures of K2 show lack of stability and present a large variation in the shapes of the letters. In such a situation, in a real case additional signatures that have been produced by K2 throughout the course of day-to-day business would be required.
WEF84U- 5245	"Highly probable" is this laboratory's strongest opinion and is the highest level of examiner certainty that can be supported. For the back of Q1, there is a strong probability of the findings given K2 wrote it and a low probability of the findings given K1 or someone else wrote it. For the back of Q2, there is a very strong probability of the findings given K1 wrote it and a low probability of the findings given K2 or someone else wrote it. No determination could be made whether the K1 writer or the K2 writer wrote either the Q1 or Q2 signatures. There are no pictorial similarities between either known signatures or the questioned signatures. However, non-request signatures are needed to determine whether the known signatures submitted are indicative of each writer's natural signature before an authorship opinion can be reached.
WVNN7A- 5245	"C" was selected on signature entries due to lack of comparability between different-name entries. K1 writer signature is in the name "Kyle Krug". K2 writer signature is in the name "Scott Granger". The Q1 and Q2 signature names are unknown.
WZ3BV9- 5241	The response "C" was used for all of the comparisons with the questioned signatures on Q1 and Q2 because of the illegible nature of the questioned signatures and the lack of comparable known signatures.
XVM389- 5241	Questioned and known signatures are not comparable and the signatures are illegible.

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
YRLAVP- 5241	This examination was limited by the abbreviated nature of the questioned signatures in items Q1 and Q2 as well as by the comparability of the samples in items K1 and K2.
Z4W22B- 5245	The graphics of the two questioned signatures and those of Kyle Krug and Scott Granger reference signatures, show notable dissimilarities between them, observed in the graphic forms, the axes of the letters and the arrangement of the signatures in relation to the baseline. However, the dissimilarities noted do not allow neither to designate nor exclude Kyle Krug or Scott Granger from being authors of the two questioned signatures, or one of them. Because these both signatures (or one of them): May correspond to imaginary signatures that would have been established by the known writers Kyle Krug or Scott Granger, or by one of them; Can be established by other people who paid the bills ; and in this case the tavern receipt dated 10 july 2020, would have been collected by scott granger to write the questioned text; and the tavern receipt dated 18 july 2020, would have been collected by Kyle Krug to write the questioned text.
Z64JY7- 5241	The submitted comparison signatures for both Mr. Krug and Mr. Granger were "request" signatures. Additional signatures of both individuals from "non-requested" sources may prove helpful in reaching a more definitive conclusion regarding the writer of the signatures.
ZBP7EP- 5241	The signature on the Q1 document is not of similar morphology to the known signatures. It is therefore not possible to compare the signatures with each other. The signature on the Q2 document is not of similar morphology to the known signatures. It is therefore not possible to compare the signatures with each other.
ZFKZCQ- 5241	The submission of additional known signature standards from Kyle Krug (Items 1-3/K1 a-d) and Scott Granger (Items 4-6/K2a-d) may assist in determining who wrote the questioned signatures appearing on Items 7 (Q1) and Item 8 (Q2). The standards should be written to dictation, using a ball point pen on lined paper and should duplicate each of the questioned signatures as they appear on Item 7 (Q1) and Item 8 (Q2). Machine copies are acceptable as known standards. Any subsequent submissions made on this case should include all of the previously submitted items.
ZP66JP- 5241	Regarding the signatures, none of the questioned signatures can be compared to either K1 or K2's signatures because they do not have the same "structure". Thus, we cannot conduct comparative analyses and express an opinion.
ZT6FFP- 5245	Further banking enquiries could be undertaken to determine the identity of the holders of the cards used to pay the questioned receipts. If these are not KRUG or GRANGER, signature specimens could be obtained from them and submitted for comparison with the questioned signatures. It would also be worthwhile obtaining course of business signature specimens for KRUG and GRANGER.

-End of Report-
(Appendix may follow)

Test No. 20-5241: Handwriting Examination

DATA MUST BE SUBMITTED BY **Nov. 30, 2020, 11:59 p.m.** TO BE INCLUDED IN THE REPORT

Participant Code: U1234A

WebCode: CTQT8K

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:

Police are investigating a case of stalking via threatening notes that were left for a bartender at her place of work. When collecting merchant copies of transaction receipts from the bartop, the victim, Kayla Jones, noticed a handwritten note on the back of a receipt on two different occasions. Each one addresses her by name and includes personal information. Based on the dates of the receipts, two men who were in the tavern during the victim's shift were determined to be suspects. Please examine the notes in question to determine which, if either, of the individuals contributed to the handwriting on the back side and signature on the front side of each receipt.

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 Kyle Krug.

Item K1c: Requested signatures for Kyle Krug, in his own name (collected separately and digitally assembled).

Item K1d: Course of business writing for Kyle Krug.

Item K2a-b: Dictated exemplars for Scott Granger.

Item K2c: Requested signatures for Scott Granger, in his own name (collected separately and digitally assembled).

Item K2d: Course of business writing for Scott Granger.

Item Q1: Tavern receipt dated 10 July 2020.

Item Q2: Tavern receipt dated 18 July 2020.

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 tavern receipts?

K1 (Kyle Krug)	K2 (Scott Granger)
Q1 (dated 10 July 2020) <input type="text"/>	Q1 (dated 10 July 2020) <input type="text"/>
Q2 (dated 18 July 2020) <input type="text"/>	Q2 (dated 18 July 2020) <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 tavern receipts?

K1 (Kyle Krug)	K2 (Scott Granger)
Q1 (dated 10 July 2020) <input type="text"/>	Q1 (dated 10 July 2020) <input type="text"/>
Q2 (dated 18 July 2020) <input type="text"/>	Q2 (dated 18 July 2020) <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)