



Handwriting Examination Test No. 22-5241/5 Summary Report

Each sample set contained either photographs or digital images of a suicide note (Q1) 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 184 participants: 93 for 22-5241, and 91 for 22-5245 and are compiled into the following tables:

Report Contents:	<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>4</u>
<u>Table 2: Conclusions</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>Table 3: Additional Comments</u>	<u>44</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 one photograph of a suicide note (Q1) and six photographs of known writings provided by two individuals (K1a-b, K2a-d). These included course of business writings for Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1) and course of business writings, dictated writing exemplars and requested signature exemplars provided by Julia Ali (K2). Participants were asked to determine if either of the two individuals contributed to the handprinted suicide note and signature contained in the questioned item.

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, Julia Ali was requested to sign in the name of Natalie Braxton-Porter, as this was the signature presented in the questioned item. The questioned document was selected from several versions that were dictated to the individuals by a moderator.

The handprinted suicide note Q1 was produced by the K2 writer, Julia Ali. The decedent's signature on the Q1 was also produced by the K2 writer. The K1 writer was female and left-handed, the K2 writer was female and right-handed.

SAMPLE ASSEMBLY: Once predistribution results were obtained, all sample packs were prepared. For each sample pack, the seven 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 predistribution laboratories stated that the Q1 handprinted text was produced by the K2 writer and not by the K1 writer. All predistribution laboratories stated that the Q1 signature was produced or probably produced by the K2 writer and not by the K1 writer.

Summary Comments

This test was designed to provide participants with a handprinted text and signature identification challenge involving a suicide note. Each sample set contained either photographs or digital images of the suicide note (Q1), as well as known writings provided by two individuals, Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1) and Julia Ali (K2). Participants were provided with multiple dictated exemplars of the suicide note, requested signatures in the name of Natalie Braxton-Porter (as this is the name contained in the questioned signature) from the K2 writer and course of business writing from both known writers. Participants were requested to determine if either of the known writers contributed to the handprinted text or signature in the suicide note. The K2 writer produced the handprinted text and signature on Q1 (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 the suicide note?" a breakdown of responses is described below. Of the 184 responding participants, a total of 183 participants (99%) identified the K2 writer (reported "A" or "B") as the source of the handprinted text in Q1. Of those 183, 166 participants (91%) also eliminated the K1 writer (reported "D" or "E") as the source of the handprinted text in Q1, and the remaining 17 provided no response in regard to the K1 writer. One participant eliminated both the K1 writer and the K2 writer (reported as "D") as sources of the handprinted text in Q1.

For Question 2 (Table 1b), "To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed the questioned signature on the suicide note?", a breakdown of responses is described below. Of the 184 responding participants, a total of 182 participants (99%) identified the K2 writer (reported "A" or "B") as the source of the signature in Q1. Of those 182, 164 participants (90%) also eliminated the K1 writer (reported "D" or "E") as the source of the signature in Q1; 17 provided no response in regard to the K1 writer; and one participant identified the K1 writer (reported as "A") as the source of the signature. Two participants were inconclusive regarding any contribution (reported as "C") by writers K1 and K2.

CTS Handwriting Examination tests are presented as high-resolution images of handwriting instead of original written materials for purposes of uniformity across the testing group. Due to this limiting comparison factor, and having firsthand knowledge of the creation of the questioned signature, those reporting inconclusive ("C") were grouped with eliminations ("D", "E") for purposes of calculating 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 the suicide note?

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
283828- 5241	E	A	4KLR6E- 5241	E	A
2CF8WD- 5241	E	A	68UCWH- 5241	E	A
2DAVE9- 5245	D	B	69PZ2L- 5245	E	A
2JYA4F- 5245	D	B	6WUU4G- 5245	E	A
2W6GUK- 5241	E	A	6ZPJE8- 5245	E	B
2YPDL6- 5245	E	A	72GZ4A- 5241	E	A
3ARU4A- 5241	E	A	794NX8- 5241	E	A
3KM6CG- 5241	E	A	7C6MLR- 5241	D	B
3MUF9K- 5245	E	A	7DXP6Z- 5241	E	A
44URDE- 5241	E	A	7DZDJK- 5245	E	A
44ZZGL- 5245	D	A	7F6XHQ- 5245	D	B
47ZAFG- 5245	E	A	7GYPEK- 5245	E	A
47ZC2E- 5241	E	A	7UJAU8- 5241		A
49637A- 5241		A	7YTMC7- 5245	E	A
49Rbfd- 5241		A	8HYGJ3- 5245	D	B
4AYQN6- 5241	E	A	8KMUB7- 5245	E	A
4G6EHJ- 5241	E	A			

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
8ZNFJ- 5245	E	A	B7DGF6- 5241	E	A
9APC9X- 5241	E	A	BMNZCC- 5241		A
9GMY3J- 5241	E	A	BNHNU8- 5241	E	A
9GRBXE- 5241	E	A	BPUHCT- 5241	E	A
9UA9M3- 5241	E	A	BQJTC7- 5245	E	B
9UTTUG- 5241	E	A	BX7H74- 5241		A
9V4W6Y- 5245	E	A	CAVTX8- 5245	E	A
9WJ6GT- 5241	E	A	CELAB7- 5241	E	A
9Z2EKD- 5245	E	A	CQ4Q6X- 5245		A
A2ML8R- 5245	E	A	CVBDU9- 5245	E	A
A3JL4U- 5245	D	B	CW73WN- 5245	E	A
ABWQH- 5245	E	A	DFVENU- 5241	E	A
AHW9QA- 5245	E	A	DNUYMW- 5241	E	A
AN376T- 5245	D	A	EBYCXZ- 5245	D	B
AYHWZ6- 5241		A	EEZ74G- 5245	E	A
AYLJDC- 5241		A	EFT9MQ- 5241	E	A
B4EWND- 5241	D	B	EG4B9P- 5241	E	A
B64ACC- 5245	E	A	EH6W9C- 5245	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
EHKALM- 5245	E	A	GYGGMN- 5241	E	A
EPJP92- 5241		A	GZQFRZ- 5245	E	A
EVQDW9- 5241	E	A	H7X8WQ- 5241	E	A
FDNY3M- 5241	E	A	HJLAA4- 5241	D	B
FEJEG7- 5241	E	A	HQGCGU- 5241	E	A
FFAMPU- 5241		A	HQXPLJ- 5245	E	A
FGHY8V- 5245	E	A	JBJJ9Y- 5241	E	A
FGKLK3- 5245	E	A	JMXRL7- 5245	E	A
FQEMBE- 5241	E	A	JQHMKR- 5245	E	A
FR33Q4- 5241	E	A	JUXXQT- 5245	E	A
FWEAM2- 5241	E	A	JWNBD7- 5245	E	A
FWYNH7- 5245	D	B	JXFEQZ- 5241	E	A
G2MUER- 5245	E	A	K4X4RL- 5245	D	D
G3ZPRY- 5245	E	A	K8JRFR- 5245	E	A
G6L82H- 5241	E	A	KBKRRX- 5245	D	B
GE99HR- 5241	E	A	KD7GAP- 5241	E	A
GQ4MDH- 5245	E	A	KLF7MN- 5241	E	A
GX27RL- 5245	E	A	KPDMQU- 5245	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
L2NE3H- 5245	E	A	NMKND9- 5241	D	B
L74Q9J- 5241	E	A	NNEFA2- 5241		A
LC8UWW- 5245	E	A	NP94RW- 5245	E	A
LEF383- 5245	E	A	NVXJG4- 5241	D	B
LF6FLE- 5245	E	A	P3AYLJ- 5245	D	B
LMA3Q2- 5245	E	A	P4JA6T- 5241		A
LPYFDZ- 5241		A	P4LZ9Q- 5245	E	A
LQQFDW- 5241	E	A	P84ZTC- 5245	E	A
LVL9ER- 5245	E	A	PHPEHZ- 5245	E	A
LVY3VD- 5241	E	A	PP2K7Q- 5241	E	A
LWVDRF- 5245	E	A	PUZXZH- 5241	E	A
MAX3FF- 5241	E	A	Q3JU8L- 5241	E	A
MHB7FZ- 5241	D	B	Q4DXUE- 5245	E	A
MQ7W9P- 5241	E	A	Q4ZMHJ- 5241	E	A
MU3VCZ- 5241	E	A	QB3L7Z- 5245	D	B
N3WCFB- 5241	E	A	QLX7ZC- 5245	E	A
NBNQAV- 5241	E	A	QQR4JN- 5241		A
NCL26Y- 5241		A	QV99KD- 5245	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
R3XH48- 5241	E	A	VRUDTW- 5241	E	A
R67QB7- 5241	D	B	VTJQ89- 5245	E	A
RWXWGD- 5245	E	A	W8ZW4T- 5245	E	A
RZDEL2- 5245	D	A	WDPJVT- 5241	E	A
T7HLND- 5245	E	A	WPKPNQ- 5241	E	A
T8QTTQ- 5241	E	A	WUC3E9- 5245	E	A
TF4PVC- 5245	E	A	WWJ2ZM- 5245	E	A
TQ9RAV- 5245	D	A	WXVZYG- 5245	E	A
TRZVMP- 5245	E	A	WY66B7- 5241	E	A
U92YU8- 5241	E	A	XBEVUT- 5245	E	A
URWNZN- 5245	E	A	XJ9Y3W- 5241	E	A
UWL86C- 5241	E	A	XQNPDG- 5241		A
UXFVM8- 5245	E	A	XUM29G- 5241		A
V77WBB- 5245	E	A	XXTL2N- 5245	E	A
V7T6KF- 5241	E	A	YJLYCC- 5241	E	A
V9YK8Y- 5241	E	A	YKZMK6- 5245	E	A
VBQK8V- 5245	E	A	YMLB9C- 5245	E	A
VRRMNY- 5245	E	A	YTPD6C- 5245	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
Z8R4MB- 5241	E	A			
ZCXVKY- 5245	E	A			
ZGV72T- 5241	E	A			
ZHM7ZP- 5241	E	A			
ZHN8TP- 5245	E	A			
ZLML67- 5245	E	A			
ZYE8KP- 5245	E	A			

Response Summary - Handwriting on Q1			Total Participants: 184
<i>To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the suicide note?</i>			
Response	Handwriting on Q1		
	K1	K2	
A	0	164	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.
B	0	19	
C	0	0	
D	22	1	
E	145	0	

*Total of responses for K1/K2 may not match the total number of participants, as not all participants provided responses for both writers.

Examination Results

To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed the questioned signature on the suicide note?

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
283828- 5241	E	A	4KLR6E- 5241	E	A
2CF8WD- 5241	E	A	68UCWH- 5241	E	A
2DAVE9- 5245	D	B	69PZ2L- 5245	E	A
2JYA4F- 5245	C	C	6WUU4G- 5245	E	A
2W6GUK- 5241	E	A	6ZPJE8- 5245	E	B
2YPDL6- 5245	E	A	72GZ4A- 5241	E	A
3ARU4A- 5241	E	A	794NX8- 5241	E	A
3KM6CG- 5241	E	A	7C6MLR- 5241	E	A
3MUF9K- 5245	E	A	7DXP6Z- 5241	D	B
44URDE- 5241	E	A	7DZDJK- 5245	E	A
44ZZGL- 5245	D	B	7F6XHQ- 5245	D	B
47ZAFG- 5245	E	A	7GYPEK- 5245	E	A
47ZC2E- 5241	E	A	7UJAU8- 5241		A
49637A- 5241		A	7YTMC7- 5245	E	A
49Rbfd- 5241		A	8HYGJ3- 5245	E	A
4AYQN6- 5241	E	A	8KMUB7- 5245	E	A
4G6EHJ- 5241	E	A	8ZNFJ- 5245	E	A

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
9APC9X- 5241	E	A	BNHNU8- 5241	E	A
9GMY3J- 5241	E	A	BPUHCT- 5241	E	A
9GRBXE- 5241	E	A	BQJTC7- 5245	E	B
9UA9M3- 5241	E	A	BX7H74- 5241		A
9UTTGW- 5241	E	A	CAVTX8- 5245	E	A
9V4W6Y- 5245	E	A	CELAB7- 5241	E	A
9WJ6GT- 5241	E	A	CQ4Q6X- 5245		A
9Z2EKD- 5245	E	A	CVBDU9- 5245	E	A
A2ML8R- 5245	E	A	CW73WN- 5245	E	A
A3JL4U- 5245	D	B	DFVENU- 5241	E	A
ABWQH- 5245	E	A	DNUYMW- 5241	E	A
AHW9QA- 5245	E	A	EBYCXZ- 5245	D	B
AN376T- 5245	D	A	EEZ74G- 5245	E	A
AYHWZ6- 5241		A	EFT9MQ- 5241	E	A
AYLJDC- 5241		A	EG4B9P- 5241	E	A
B4EWND- 5241	D	B	EH6W9C- 5245	E	A
B64ACC- 5245	E	A	EHKALM- 5245	E	A
B7DGF6- 5241	E	A	EPJP92- 5241		A
BMNZCC- 5241		A			

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
EVQDW9- 5241	E	B	HJLAA4- 5241	D	B
FDNY3M- 5241	E	A	HQGCGU- 5241	E	A
FEJEG7- 5241	E	A	HQXPLJ- 5245	E	B
FFAMPU- 5241		A	JBJJ9Y- 5241	E	A
FGHY8V- 5245	E	A	JMXRL7- 5245	E	A
FGKLG3- 5245	E	A	JQHLKR- 5245	E	A
FQEMBE- 5241	E	A	JUXXQT- 5245	E	B
FR33Q4- 5241	E	A	JWNBD7- 5245	E	A
FWEAM2- 5241	E	A	JXFEQZ- 5241	E	A
FWYNH7- 5245	D	B	K4X4RL- 5245	A	B
G2MUER- 5245	E	A	K8JRFR- 5245	E	A
G3ZPRY- 5245	E	A	KBKRRX- 5245	D	B
G6L82H- 5241	E	A	KD7GAP- 5241	E	A
GE99HR- 5241	E	A	KLF7MN- 5241	E	A
GQ4MDH- 5245	E	A	KPDMQU- 5245	E	A
GX27RL- 5245	E	A	L2NE3H- 5245	E	B
GYGGMN- 5241	E	B	L74Q9J- 5241	E	B
GZQFRZ- 5245	D	B	LC8UWW- 5245	E	A
H7X8WQ- 5241	E	A			

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
LEF383- 5245	E	A	P3AYLJ- 5245	D	B
LF6FLE- 5245	E	A	P4JA6T- 5241		A
LMA3Q2- 5245	E	A	P4LZ9Q- 5245	E	A
LPYFDZ- 5241		A	P84ZTC- 5245	E	A
LQQFDW- 5241	E	A	PHPEHZ- 5245	E	A
LVL9ER- 5245	E	B	PP2K7Q- 5241	E	A
LVY3VD- 5241	E	A	PUZXZH- 5241	E	A
LWVDRF- 5245	E	A	Q3JU8L- 5241	E	A
MAX3FF- 5241	E	A	Q4DXUE- 5245	E	A
MHB7FZ- 5241	D	B	Q4ZMHJ- 5241	E	A
MQ7W9P- 5241	E	A	QB3L7Z- 5245	D	B
MU3VCZ- 5241	E	A	QLX7ZC- 5245	E	A
N3WCFB- 5241	E	A	QQR4JN- 5241		A
NBNQAV- 5241	E	A	QV99KD- 5245	E	A
NCL26Y- 5241		A	R3XH48- 5241	E	A
NMKND9- 5241	D	B	R67QB7- 5241	D	A
NNEFA2- 5241		A	RWXWGD- 5245	E	A
NP94RW- 5245	E	A	RZDEL2- 5245	D	A
NVXJG4- 5241	D	B			

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
T7HLND- 5245	E	A	WUC3E9- 5245	E	A
T8QTTQ- 5241	E	A	WWJ2ZM- 5245	E	A
TF4PVC- 5245	E	A	WXVZXG- 5245	E	A
TQ9RAV- 5245	D	A	WY66B7- 5241	E	A
TRZVMP- 5245	E	A	XBEVUT- 5245	C	C
U92YU8- 5241	E	A	XJ9Y3W- 5241	E	A
URWNZN- 5245	E	A	XQNPDG- 5241		A
UWL86C- 5241	E	A	XUM29G- 5241		A
UXFVM8- 5245	E	A	XXTL2N- 5245	E	A
V77WBB- 5245	E	A	YJLYCC- 5241	E	A
V7T6KF- 5241	E	A	YKZMK6- 5245	E	A
V9YK8Y- 5241	E	A	YMLB9C- 5245	E	A
VBQK8V- 5245	E	B	YTPD6C- 5245	E	A
VRRMNY- 5245	E	A	Z8R4MB- 5241	E	A
VRUDTW- 5241	E	A	ZCXVKY- 5245	E	A
VTJQ89- 5245	E	A	ZGV72T- 5241	E	A
W8ZW4T- 5245	E	A	ZHM7ZP- 5241	E	A
WDPJVT- 5241	E	A	ZHN8TP- 5245	E	A
WPKPNQ- 5241	E	A			

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
ZLML67- 5245	E	A			
ZYE8KP- 5245	E	A			

Response Summary - Signature on Q1Total Participants: **184**

To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed the questioned victim's signature on the suicide note?

Response	Signature on Q1		
	K1	K2	
A	1	155	
B	0	27	
C	2	2	
D	20	0	
E	144	0	

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.

*Total of responses for K1/K2 may not match the total number of participants, as not all participants provided responses for both writers.

Conclusions

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
283828-5241	<p>Microscopic, instrumental, and comparative examination revealed the following: Based on the evidence provided, it was determined that the body of text on the questioned Q1 note was written by the K2 writer (Julia Ali). This finding is based on the presence of significant similarities (particularly in letter forms, attention to baseline, and spacing habits) found in comparing the Q1 writing to the K2 writing with no significant differences found. Based on the evidence provided, it was determined that the body of text on the questioned Q1 note was not written by the K1 writer (Natalie Braxton-Porter). This finding is based on the presence of differences (particularly in letter forms, lack of attention to baseline, and spacing habits) found in comparing the Q1 writing to the K1 writing with no significant similarities found. Based on the evidence provided, it was determined that the cursive "NATALIE BRAXTON-PORTER" signature on the questioned Q1 note was written by the K2 writer (Julia Ali) and was not written by the K1 writer (Natalie Braxton-Porter). This finding is based on the presence of common features in the K2 cursive signatures (particularly in letter forms, baseline habits, height ratios, and spacing habits) with no significant differences. The K1 writer was eliminated on the basis of significant differences that were found, to include letter shapes and formations, baseline habits, and slant.</p>
2CF8WD-5241	<p>In as much as it is possible to examine color copies in lieu of the original documents, it is my opinion that Julia Ali wrote the questioned writing and Natalie Braxton-Porter signature on the Q1 document. In as much as it is possible to examine color copies in lieu of the original documents, it is my opinion that Natalie Braxton-Porter did not write the questioned writing and Natalie Braxton-Porter signature on the Q1 document.</p>
2DAVE9-5245	<p>It is my opinion that the evidence observed provides strong support for the proposition that the Q1 questioned handwriting and signature were prepared by Julia Ali, writer of K2.</p>
2JYA4F-5245	<p>K2 is more likely to be the author of the note body. Fine and subtle details in the note match her writing and do not appear in in the K1 samples. The signature has an appearance of slowness which could indicate simulation, however there is not enough evidence to opine as to the author. There are suggestions that K2 may have written the signature. but several missing elements do not allow for an opinion of higher certainty.</p>
2W6GUK-5241	<p>The existing questioned handwriting on the suicide note was written by Julia Ali. The existing questioned signature in the name of Natalie Braxton-Porter on the suicide note was written by Julia Ali.</p>
2YPDL6-5245	<p>The range of variation exhibited in the Q-1 Porter signature and in the known signatures of Julia Ali contains substantial significant similarities. There are no significant dissimilarities. There are no limitations associated with absent characters, dissimilarities, and/or quantity of writing are present. The range of variation exhibited in the Q-1 writing "Family-...Love" and in the known writing of Julia Ali contains substantial significant similarities. There are no significant dissimilarities. There are no limitations associated with absent characters, dissimilarities, and/or quantity of writing are present. The range of variation exhibited in the Q-1 Porter signature and in the known signatures of Natalie Braxton Porter contains substantial significant dissimilarities. There are no limitations associated with absent characters, identifying characteristics, and/or quantity of writing are present. The range of variation exhibited in the Q-1 writing "Family-...Love" and in the known writing of Natalie Braxton Porter contains substantial significant dissimilarities. There are no limitations associated with absent characters, identifying characteristics, and/or quantity of writing are present.</p>
3ARU4A-5241	<p>Made the graphological comparison between the completion of the suicide note and the standard samples of comparison of the citizen Julia Ali (K2a, b, c, d) it was possible to evidence graphonomic coincidences in the following aspects: disposition, graphic times in the elaboration of the signs, interstructural separation, basic morphology of the graphs, inclination, orientation,</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>cohesions, speed, address, start and end points, which indicates that these texts were prepared by Julia Ali. As for the questioned signature in the suicide note against the standard samples of comparison of the citizen Julia Ali (K2a, b, c, d) it was possible to show graphonomic coincidences in the following aspects: disposition, graphic times in the elaboration of the signs, interstructural separation, basic morphology of the graphs, inclination, orientation, cohesions, speed, direction, start and end points, indicating that suicide note was signed by Julia Ali.</p>
3KM6CG-5241	<p>1- The body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the suicide note Was WRITTEN by Julia Ali and Was NOT WRITTEN by Natalie Braxton-Porter. 2- The questioned signature on the suicide note Was WRITTEN by Julia Ali and Was NOT WRITTEN by Natalie Braxton-Porter.</p>
3MUF9K-5245	<p>STAGE 1: The analysis begins without instruments, analyzing first the handwriting of the questioned documents and then the handwriting of the base documents, from left to right, from top to bottom, front and back, observing some of the characteristics such as beginnings, links, direction, speed, endings, etc. Afterwards, the analysis begins with optical instruments and specialized equipment to magnify the details starting with the writing of the questioned documents and later the writing of the collation base documents from left to right, from top to bottom, front and back, confirming, discovering and discarding some of the characteristics already mentioned. With the study established and carried out on the questioned documents and base of comparison, it is established that the handwriting contained in the documents indicated as questioned, corresponds to the handwriting indicated as base of comparison of Julia Ali, due to the existence of more similarities than differences. Translated with www.DeepL.com/Translator (free version)</p>
44URDE-5241	<p>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. Examination of the Q1 document revealed the following: The paper utilized for the suicide note is white, lined notebook paper. There are no visible watermarks and no additional marking on the paper other than the printed material. Q1 measures approximately 129mm x 174mm. There are blue writing lines, spaced approximately 7mm apart. There is a red vertical margin line, measuring approximately 7mm from the left edge. 2. The Q1 document was scanned for preservation. 3. An ESDA (ElectroStatic Detection Apparatus) examination for the detection and reading of indented writing, typing or other identifying impressions was performed on 10-19-2022. No indentations were found on the Q1 note. 4. A VSC (Video Spectral Comparator) examination using various microscopic, infrared, ultraviolet, and alternate light source examination techniques was conducted on 10-19-2022. No watermarks or security features were revealed on the paper. The ink on the Q1 document was consistent throughout. 5. It is the opinion of this examiner that the content writing on the Q1 document was written by the writer of the K2a-d documents, Julie ALI. 6. It is the opinion of this examiner that the signature on the Q1 document was written by the writer of the K2a-d documents, Julie ALI. 7. It is the opinion of this examiner that neither the content nor the signature on the Q1 document were written by the writer of the K1a-b documents, Natalie Braxton-Porter.</p>
44ZZGL-5245	<p>Handwriting examination: Writer K1: Natalie BRAXTON-PORTER. In relation to the questioned handwriting on Q1, it is my opinion that the evidence provides strong support for proposition P2 (the questioned handwriting was written by someone other than the known writer K1 BRAXTON-PORTER) over proposition P1 (the questioned handwriting was written by the known writer K1). Writer K2: Julia ALI. In relation to the questioned handwriting on Q1, it is my opinion that the evidence provides very strong support for proposition P1 (the questioned handwriting was written by the known writer K2 ALI) over proposition P2 (the questioned handwriting was written by someone other than the known writer K2). Signature examination: Writer K1: Natalie BRAXTON-PORTER. In relation to the questioned Natalie BRAXTON-PORTER signature on Q1, it is my opinion that the evidence provides moderate support for proposition P2 (the questioned signature was written by someone other than the known writer K1 BRAXTON-PORTER) over proposition P1 (the questioned signature was written by the known writer K1). Writer K2: Julia AL.</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	In relation to the questioned Natalie BRAXTON-PORTER signature on Q1, it is my opinion that the evidence provides strong support for proposition P1 (the questioned signature was written by the known writer K2) ALI over proposition P2 (the questioned signature was written by someone other than the known writer K2).
47ZAFG-5245	The indubitable writings offered as (K2) correspond to the writings of the questioned note (Q1). The signatures on the documents offered as (K2) with the legend "Natalie Braxton-Porter" correspond to the signature on the questioned note (Q1)
47ZC2E-5241	Examination and comparison of exhibits Q1 to K1a-b and K2a-d were conducted, and the following conclusions and observations are based upon my education, training and experience and the results are as follows: The questioned writing and signature present on the suicide note submitted in exhibit Q1 was written by the author of K2a-d (Julia Ali). The questioned writing and signature present on the suicide note submitted in exhibit Q1 was not written by the author of K1a-b (Natalie Braxton-Porter). Exhibits Q1 and K1a-b and K2a-d were scanned for preservation by Forensic Document Examiner XXX. The questioned evidence examined per this request will be returned to the Property Unit. Scans of this evidence will be retained in the Lab.
49637A-5241	It was determined that the questioned writing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by JULIA ALI, Item 3 (Item K2a-d).
49Rbfd-5241	The evidence provides very strong support for the hypothesis that the questioned suicide note (Q1) was written and signed by Julia ALI.
4AYQN6-5241	According to the analysis and comparison carried out, to the elements brought for inspection, the following could be determined: NO SINGLE HANDWRITING PROCEDURE between the graphonomic characteristics of the signature and doubtful texts attributed to Mrs. Natalie Braxton-Porter and doubtful business writing samples of Mrs. Natalie Braxton – Porter. SINGLE MANUSCRIPTURAL PROVENANCE between the graphonomic characteristics of the signature and doubtful texts attributed to Mrs. Natalie Braxton-Porter and doubtful business writing samples of Mrs. Julia Ali.
4G6EHJ-5241	It has been concluded that Julia Ali (K2) wrote the questioned material appearing on the Exhibit Q1 item. It has been concluded that Natalie Braxton Porter (K1) did not write the questioned material appearing on the Exhibit Q1 item.
4KLR6E-5241	Carrying out the confrontation of the texts and signatures that appear in the question document Q1, such as those of NATALIE BRAXTON-PORTER, compared to the handwritten samples submitted as indubitable by JULIA ALI and NATALIE BRAXTON, it was possible to establish that there is SINGLE PROCEDENCE between the texts and signatures doubtful support (Q1) such as Natalie Braxton Porter compared to the undoubted samples provided by Julia Ali (K2a-b, K2d and K2c). The foregoing in the first place because the texts that rest in the questioned document Q1 such as Natalie Porter compared to those provided by Julia Ali (K2a-b and K2d), there it was possible to see graphological constants that show convergence between them since they show similarities in its normal interlitteral and interverbal spaces, a strong pressure and variable speed, likewise, if I visualize the line box in the texts sinuous and horizontal linear displacement, the inclination or axial version is vertical. It was also possible to show that the points of attack and aucton are abrupt. The layout of the texts in relation to the horizontal is on the baseline. low sign height. Now, regarding the parallel signatures, they also present similarities in their interlitteral spaces that are compressed, normal interverbals, arrangement of the signatures on the graphic space on the baseline, strong pressure and variable speed, line box with respect to the low signs winding, sinuous linear displacement, supported attack points and abrupt finishing, the inclination or vertical axial version. Likewise, it was observed that they present signs that show similarities in their preparation such as N, B, P.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
68UCWH-5241	Upon completion of an examination and comparison of the questioned exhibit and the standards submitted in this case, it is the opinion of this examiner that the K-2 writer did write the questioned handwriting and signature found on the Q-1 exhibit. Conversely, it has been determined that the K-1 writer did not write the questioned handwriting and signature found on the Q-1 exhibit.
69PZ2L-5245	The questioned handwriting and signature on the suicide note, Q1, differs significantly from the specimens of Natalie Braxton-Porter. In my opinion she did not write out or sign it. The questioned handwriting and signature on the suicide note does, however, correspond closely with the specimens of Julia Ali. In my opinion she wrote out and signed the note.
6WUU4G-5245	First. The writing and signature that are stamped on a suicide note on lined paper, with text on the first line "Family-", identified as Q1; IT DOES NOT COME FROM THE SAME GRAPHIC ORIGIN WITH THOSE ELEMENTS INDUCED AS INDUBITABLE BY C. NATALIE BRAXTON-PORTER. Second. The handwriting and signature stamped on a suicide note on lined paper, with text on the first line "Family-", identified as Q1; IF IT IS GRAPHICALLY ATTRIBUTED WITH THOSE ELEMENTS INDICATED AS UNDUBITABLE OF THE C. JULIA ALI.
6ZPJE8-5245	Natalie Braxton-Porter did not write the hand printing nor the signature on Q1. It is highly probable that Julia Ali wrote the hand printing on Q1 and it likely that she also wrote the "Natalie Braxton-Porter" signature on Q1
72GZ4A-5241	In my professional opinion, the writer of the known specimens on items K2a, K2b, K2c and K2d (Julia Ali) wrote the questioned handwriting and signature on item Q1, not the writer of the known specimens on items K1a and K1b (Natalie Braxton-Porter).
794NX8-5241	Q1 was compared to K1. Substantial significant dissimilarities were noted. It is highly probable that the writer of K1 did not author any of the Q1 document. Q1 was compared to K2. Substantial significant similarities were noted. It is highly probable that the writer of K2 did author the entire Q1 document. After an examination of documents submitted at this time, it is my opinion that the writer of K1 can be eliminated as having written the Q1 document. The Q1 document was written by the writer of K2.
7C6MLR-5241	After analyzing the evidence in this case, the following opinions have been formed: It has been determined that the writer of Submission 001-C (K2a through K2d), submitted as the known writing of Julia Ali, prepared the "Natalie Braxton-Porter" signature on Submission 001-A (Q1). This is the strongest statement of association expressed by document examiners in handwriting comparisons. The observed quality and quantity of similar characteristics are such that the examiner would not expect to see that same combination of characteristics repeated in a body of writing prepared by another writer. There are no significant dissimilarities to conclude that the bodies of writing were not prepared by the same writer. There are no significant limitations with the items examined or the circumstances considered (e.g. the writer's skill level, sufficient number of known standards). This opinion does not assert that two or more bodies of writing were prepared by the same writer to the exclusion of all other writers. There is strong support for the conclusion that this writer prepared the printed writing on Submission 001-A (Q1). The bodies of writing exhibit a prevalence of similar characteristics to indicate they have been prepared by the same writer. There are insufficient dissimilar characteristics to indicate the bodies of writing have not been prepared by the same writer. The bodies of writing have limitations that prevent the examiner from providing a 'source identification' conclusion. It has been determined that the writer of Submission 001-B (K1a and K1b), submitted as the known writing of Natalie Braxton-Porter, did not prepare the "Natalie Braxton-Porter" signature on Submission 001-A (Q1). This is the strongest statement of disassociation expressed by document examiners in handwriting comparisons. The bodies of writing exhibit different handwriting characteristics and there are no significant limitations with the items examined or the circumstances considered (e.g. the writer's skill level, sufficient number of known standards, eliminating the possibility of

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>alternative writing styles). There is strong support for the conclusion that this writer did not prepare the printed writing on Submission 001-A (Q1). The bodies of writing exhibit a prevalence of dissimilar characteristics to indicate they have not been prepared by the same writer. There are insufficient similar characteristics to indicate the bodies of writing have been prepared by the same writer. The bodies of writing have limitations that prevent the examiner from making an 'exclusion' conclusion. All requested examinations have been completed on this evidence. Submissions 001-A through 001-C will be forwarded to the [Laboratory] and will be returned to the submitting agency upon completion of the analysis. If further examinations are required, these submissions should be resubmitted along with any additional materials.</p>
7DXP6Z-5241	<p>There are many similarities and no significant differences between the questioned handwriting (Q1) and the known handwriting of Julia Ali (K2). The nature of the similarities are such that in our opinion, Julia Ali is responsible for the questioned handwriting. There are some similarities and no significant differences between the questioned signature (Q1) and the known handwriting of Julia Ali (K2). Allowing for the limited amount of handwriting in the questioned signature, the nature of the similarities is such that in our opinion, there is moderate support that Julia Ali is responsible for the questioned signature. By 'moderate support', we consider it very unlikely that another individual is responsible for the questioned signature. There are few similarities and a number of significant differences between the questioned signature (Q1) and the known signatures of Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1). The nature of the similarities and differences are such that in our opinion, there is strong support that Natalie Braxton-Porter is not responsible for the questioned signature. By 'strong support', we consider it extremely likely that another individual is responsible for the questioned signature.</p>
7DZDJK-5245	<p>As a result of the investigation, it has been reached a conclusion that the handwriting in the suicide note does not match with the signature of N.B.P. and that the writing and signature belongs to Julia Ali.</p>
7F6XHQ-5245	<p>A number of differences were noted in the letter constructions between Q1 and the specimens K1a and K1b. Significant differences were noted between the signature on Q1 and the signature specimens on K1a and K1b. However, only a limited number of specimen signatures were available. These findings offer Strong Support for the view that Q1 was written and signed by someone other than Natalie Braxton-Porter. A lot of similarities and no significant differences were noted in the letter constructions between Q1 and K2a,b and d. A lot of similarities were also noted between the signature on Q1 and the request specimens in K2c. While we would normally be unable to offer an opinion of the true author of a simulated signature, in this instance a combination of the findings of the letter and the "signature" were used to state a conclusion. These findings offer Strong Support for the view that Q1 was written and "signed" by Julia Ali. The scale in use here is: Conclusive, Strong, Limited, Inconclusive and can be both positive (ie "for" a proposed author) or negative (ie "not" the proposed author).</p>
7GYPEK-5245	<p>A) The Questioned writing Q1 DOES NOT CORRESPOND with the comparison base writing K1a, K1b of Natalie Braxton -Porter. B) The questioned writing that appears in questioned document Q1, IT CORRESPONDS with the general and particular graphic elements with the comparison base writing that appears in Julia Ali's K2a, K2b and K2d reference writing. C) The Questioned signature Q1 IS OF A DIFFERENT GRAPHIC ORIGIN with the base signatures of comparison K1a, K1b of Natalie Braxton-Porter. D) The questioned signature that appears in questioned document Q1, DOES HAVE GRAFIC CORRESPONDENCE with the mating base signature that appears in the K2a, K2b, K2C and K2d matching base documents of Julia Ali.</p>
7UJAU8-5241	<p>It was determined that the questioned hand printing and signature on Item 1 (Q1) were prepared by JULIA ALI, Item 3 (Item K2a-d).</p>
7YTMC7-5245	<p>The handwriting contained in the questioned suicide note, as well as the signature that subscribes it, correspond to the graphic origin of Julia Ali.</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
8HYGJ3-5245	There is a high probability, within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, that the text of the questioned note (Q-1) was written by Julia Ali (K-2) and not by Natalie Braxton-Porter (K-1). Within a reasonable degree of professional certainty, the signature on the questioned note (Q-1) was executed by Julia Ali (K-2) and not by Natalie Braxton-Porter (K-1).
8KMUB7-5245	Comprehensive consistencies between the handwriting features of the K2 writer and the Q1 note and signature, provided the basis for my Opinion that Julia Ali (K2a-K2d) wrote the questioned Q1 note and signature. It is further my Opinion that no person other than Julia Ali could have written the wrote the questioned Q1 note and signature.
8ZNFJ-5245	The K1 writer (Braxton-Porter) is eliminated as the writer of the Q1 handprinting. "Elimination" is an opinion 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 (Braxton-Porter) is eliminated as the writer of the Q1 signature. "Elimination" is an opinion 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 (Ali) is identified as the writer of the Q1 handprinting. "Identification" is an opinion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known document(s) provide very strong evidence supporting common authorship. The K2 writer (Ali) is identified as the writer of the Q1 signature. "Identification" is an opinion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known document(s) provide very strong evidence supporting common authorship.
9APC9X-5241	FIRST: The writing found in the Questioned Document, identified as item "Q1" does not belong to Natalie Braxton – Porter, this is in regards to the writing presented in the comparison exhibit documents identified as items " K1a" and "K1b", document under the name of the aforesaid person. SECOND: The signature found in the Questioned Document, identified as item "Q1" does not belong to Natalie Braxton – Porter, this is in regards to the signatures presented in the comparison exhibit documents identified as items " K1a" and "K1b", document under the name of the aforesaid person. THIRD: The writing found in the Questioned Document, identified as item "Q1" belongs to Julia Ali, this is in regards to the writing presented in the comparison exhibit documents identified as items " K2a" , "K2b" and "K2d" document under the name of the aforesaid person FOURTH: The writing found in the Questioned Document, identified as item "Q1" belongs to Julia Ali, this is in regards to the writing presented in the comparison exhibit documents identified as items " K2a" , "K2b" and "K2d" document under the name of the aforesaid person.
9GMY3J-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
9GRBXE-5241	Upon completion of an examination and comparison of the questioned exhibit and standards submitted in this case, it is the opinion of this examiner that the K2 writer did write the questioned text and questioned signature of the Q-1 exhibit.
9UA9M3-5241	The signature of "Natalie Braxton-Porter", from the suicide note found next to Natalie Braxton-Porter's body, was not executed by Natalie Braxton-Porter herself, but was executed by cet. Julia Ali. The handwritten inscriptions, which begin and end with the words: "Family - I cant take this life anymore ... miss you all more than you will ever know. Love-" Natalie Braxton-Porter", from the suicide note found next to Natalie Braxton-Porter's body, was executed not by Natalie Braxton-Porter herself, but by Cet. Julia Ali.
9UTTGW-5241	FIRST: IT IS ESTABLISHED THAT THE QUESTIONED WRITING IDENTIFIED AS DC1 (SUICIDE NOTE): WAS NOT WRITTEN BY NATALIE BRAXTON-PORTER. SECOND: IT IS ESTABLISHED THAT THE QUESTIONED DEED IDENTIFIED AS DC1 SUICIDE NOTE): WAS WRITTEN BY JULIA

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	ALI. FIRST: IT IS ESTABLISHED THAT THE QUESTIONED SIGNATURE IDENTIFIED AS DC1 (SUICIDE NOTE): WAS NOT WRITTEN BY NATALIE BRAXTON – PORTER. SECOND: IT IS ESTABLISHED THAT THE QUESTIONED SIGNATURE IDENTIFIED AS DC1 (SUICIDE NOTE): WAS WRITTEN BY JULIA ALI.
9V4W6Y-5245	There is Probability bordering on certainty that the note was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter. There is Probability bordering on certainty that the note was not signed by Natalie Braxton-Porter. There is Probability bordering on certainty that the note was written by Julia Ali. There is Probability bordering on certainty that the note was signed by Julia Ali. The questioned handwriting & signature are not authentic handwriting & signature of Natalie Braxton-Porter with a probability bordering on certainty. The questioned handwriting & signature have been written by Julia Ali with a probability bordering on certainty. Very High probability that NBP did not write and sign the Q1 Probability bordering certainty that JA wrote and signed Q1.
9WJ6GT-5241	The questioned writing on Q1 was written by the writer of the comparison documents K2, Julia Ali. The questioned writing on Q1 was not written by the writer of the comparison documents K1, Natalie Braxton Porter. The questioned signature on Q1 was written by the writer of the comparison documents K2, Julia Ali. The questioned signature on Q1 was not written by the writer of the comparison documents K1, Natalie Braxton Porter
9Z2EKD-5245	It was reached the conclusion that the handwritings in the document, where is marked with "Q1", did not regard to have written by the hand of Natalia Brnton-Porter. It was reached the conclusion that the signature in the document, where is marked with "Q1", did not regard to have written by the hand of Natalia Brnton-Porter. It was reached the conclusion that the handwritings in the document, where is marked with "Q1", regarded to have written by the hand of Julia Ali. It was reached the conclusion that the signature in the document, where is marked with "Q1", regarded to have written by the hand of Julia Ali.
A2ML8R-5245	1.The writings and signature as of NATALIE BRAXTON PORTER contained in the suicide note, Q1, DO NOT PRESENT IDENTITY with the writings and signatures of Mrs. NATALIE BRAXTON PORTER K1 a-K1b. 2.The writings and signature as of NATALIE BRAXTON PORTER contained in the suicide note, Q1, PRESENT IDENTITY with the writings and signatures prepared by Mrs. JULIA ALI K2a-K2d.
A3JL4U-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
ABWQHX-5245	The note depicted in Q1 contains hand printing and a signature. The writing appears naturally written and suitable for comparison. Based on the examination and comparison of the submitted questioned and known writing, the following conclusion were reached: Natalie Braxton-Porter Natalie Braxton-Porter was not the writer of the hand printing and signature depicted on Q1. Julia Ali Julia Ali was the writer of the hand printing and signature depicted on Q1.
AHW9QA-5245	1-The body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the suicide note WAS WRITTEN by Julia Ali AND WAS NOT WRITTEN BY Natalie Braxton-Porter. 2-The questioned signature on the suicide note WAS WRITTEN by Julia Ali AND WAS NOT WRITTEN BY Natalie Braxton-Porter.
AN376T-5245	Visual and microscopic examinations of Exhibits K1a, K1b, K2 through K2d, and Q1 were conducted. The questioned hand printed entries and questioned signature on Exhibit Q1 were compared with the known hand printing and signatures on Exhibits K1a, K1b, and K2a through K2d. The writer of Exhibits K1a and K1b (Natalie Braxton-Porter) probably did not write the questioned hand printed entries and questioned Natalie Braxton-Porter signature on Exhibit Q1; however, due to an insufficient amount of comparable known hand printing and signatures, the evidence falls short of that necessary to support a conclusive opinion. The writer of Exhibits K2a through K2d (Julia Ali) wrote the questioned hand printed entries and questioned Natalie Braxton-Porter signature on Exhibit Q1. Exhibit Q1 was digitally preserved and processed.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	Exhibits K1 and K2 were digitally preserved.
AYHWZ6-5241	Source Identification: It was determined that the questioned hand printing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) were prepared by JULIA ALI, writer of Item 3 (Item K2 a-d).
AYLJDC-5241	Julia Ali produced all the questioned hand printing present in the note that begins, "Family - I can't take this life...", (Q1-1) as well as the questioned Natalie Braxton-Porter signature (Q1-2) located at the end of the questioned note. Natalie Braxton-Porter did not produce any of the questioned hand printing present in the note that begins, "Family - I can't take this life...", (Q1-1) nor did she produce the questioned Natalie Braxton-Porter signature (Q1-2) located at the end of the questioned note.
B4EWND-5241	Examination and comparison of questioned item #Q1 with known items #K1a,b and #K2a-d resulted in the following opinions: The item #Q1 hand printing and signature were probably written by the writer of items #K2a-d, Julia Ali. Noted differences between the #Q1 and #K2a-d writings prevents a more definitive conclusion. If additional known writing of Julia Ali can be obtained, further examination would be warranted. The item #Q1 hand printing and signature were probably NOT written by the writer of items #K1a,b, Natalie Braxton-Porter. While unlikely, the possibility that the hand printing and signature on item #Q1 is the product of an alternate writing style of Natalie Braxton-Porter cannot be excluded. The conclusions expressed in this report are defined in the SWGDOC Standard Terminology for Expressing Conclusions of Forensic Document Examiners and are as follow: 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 the “virtually certain” degree of confidence. Examples—It has been concluded that the John Doe of the known material probably wrote the questioned material, or it is my opinion (or conclusion or determination) that the John Doe of the known material probably wrote the questioned material. probably did not—the evidence points rather strongly against the questioned and known writings having been written by the same individual, but, as in the probable range above, the evidence is not quite up to the “virtually certain” range. Examples—It has been concluded that the John Doe of the known material probably did not write the questioned material, or it is my opinion (or conclusion or determination) that the John Doe of the known material probably did not write the questioned material.
B64ACC-5245	Julia Ali wrote the questioned message entry and signature entry, document Q-1.
B7DGF6-5241	1. Signature in Item Q1: Suicide note (Test N°22-5241) under analysis was not written by Natalie Braxton Porter. 2. Handwriting in Item Q1: Suicide note (Test N°22-5241) under analysis was not written by Natalie Braxton Porter. 3. Signature in Item Q1: Suicide note (Test N°22-5241) under analysis was written by Julia Ali. 4. Handwriting written in Item Q1: Suicide note (Test N°22-5241) under analysis was written by Julia Ali.
BMNZCC-5241	Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING: Source Identification (JULIA ALI) It was determined that the questioned writing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by JULIA ALI, Item 3 (Item K2a-d).
BNHNU8-5241	The texts and signature present in the suicide note of doubt (Q1) do not present morphostructural or dynamographic characteristics compared to the contributions that reference K1a and K1b, were provided in the name of Mrs. Natalie Braxton-Porter. They were not made by Mrs. Natalie. Regarding the texts and signature present in the questioned suicide note (Q1), morphostructural and dynamographic correspondences were found that are identified or correspond to the graphic genesis provided by Mrs. Julia Ali in the reference samples K2a, K2b, K2c and K2d.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
BPUHCT-5241	1.The person who wrote the specimen writings on K1a and K1b did not write the questioned writings on Q1. 2.The person who wrote the specimen writings on K2a, K2b and K2d wrote the questioned writings on Q1. 3.The person who signed the specimen signatures on K1a and K1b, did not sign the Questioned Signature on Q1. 4.The person who wrote the specimen signatures on K2a, K2b and K2c, wrote the Questioned signature on Q1.
BQJTC7-5245	It is highly probable that the Julia Ali, who wrote the known comparison standards (Exhibits K2a, K2b, K2c and K2d) also wrote the body of the questioned suicide note (Exhibit Q1). Additionally, it is probable the same writer (Julia Ali) wrote the signature on the questioned suicide note (Exhibit Q).
BX7H74-5241	Source Identification: It was determined that the questioned writing (including the signature) on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by JULIA ALI, Item 3 (Item K2a-d).
CAVTX8-5245	In my opinion 1 - There are numerous significant differences between the questioned writing within the Note (Q1) and the known writings of Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1a, K1b) sufficient to indicate that they are not of common origin, and it is UNLIKELY she completed the text of the Q1. 2 - There are numerous significant differences between the questioned signature within the Note (Q1) and the known signatures of Natalie Braxton-Porter, (K1a, K1b) sufficient to indicate that they are not of common origin. The signature is therefore not a genuine example of Natalie Braxton-Porter's signature, and it is UNLIKELY that she completed it. 3 - There are numerous significant similarities between the questioned writing within the Note (Q1) and the known writings of Julia Ali, (K2a, K2b, K2c, K2d) which are wholly consistent with common authorship, to the degree of WRITTEN BY. 4 -There are numerous significant similarities between the questioned signature within the Note and the known writings of Julia Ali, (K2a, K2b, K2c, K2d) which are wholly consistent with common authorship, to the degree of WRITTEN BY.
CELAB7-5241	The body of question writing and the signature were written by Julia Ali.
CQ4Q6X-5245	Ms. Julia ALI, has been the only author of the questioned handwritten text and signature submitted to study.
CVBDU9-5245	If the questioned handwriting and signature are considered together, in my opinion there is conclusive evidence that they were not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter. If the questioned handwriting and signature are considered together, in my opinion there is conclusive evidence that they were written by Julia Ali.
CW73WN-5245	Handwriting (1) "Q1" vs "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d" On examination, I noted significant similarities in stroke quality, slant, the formation and the relative positioning of alphabet letters with respect to reference lines between the questioned handwriting, the suicide note shown in "Q1" and the specimen handwriting of Julia Ali shown in "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d". In view of the evidence, I am of the opinion that Julia Ali, the writer of the specimen handwriting in "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d" wrote the questioned handwriting, the suicide note shown in "Q1". (2) "Q1" vs "K1a" and "K1b" On comparing the questioned handwriting, the suicide note shown in "Q1" with the specimen handwriting of Natalie Braxton-Porter shown in "K1a" and "K1b", I noted exclusionary differences in stroke quality and the formation of alphabet letters between them. In view of the evidence, I am of the opinion that Natalie Braxton-Porter, the writer of the specimen handwriting in "K1a" and "K1b" did not write the questioned handwriting, the suicide note shown in "Q1". Signatures (1) "Q1" vs "K1a" and "K1b" On examination, I found the specimen signatures of Natalie Braxton-Porter shown in "K1a" and "K1b" to be fluently and spontaneously written with no hesitation. However, on comparing with the questioned signature shown in "Q1", I noted exclusionary differences in respect of the fluency, slant, the formation and relative positioning of alphabet letters between them. In view of the evidence, I am of the opinion that Natalie Braxton-Porter, the writer of the specimen signatures shown in "K1a" and "K1b" did not

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	write the questioned signature shown in "Q1". (2) "Q1" vs "K2a", "K2b" and "K2c" On comparing the questioned signature shown in "Q1" with the specimen signatures of Julia Ali shown in "K2a", "K2b" and "K2c", I noted significant similarities in respect of stroke fluency, slant, the formation and relative positioning of alphabet letters with respect to the reference line between them. In view of the evidence, I am of the opinion that Julia Ali, the writer of the specimen signatures shown in "K2a, "K2b" and "K2c" wrote the questioned signature shown in "Q1".
DFVENU-5241	1. The questioned handwriting on "Q1" showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting of "Julia Ali" and sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting of "Natalie Braxton-Porter". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was written by "Julia Ali" and was not written by "Natalie Braxton-Porter". 2. The questioned signature on "Q1" showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the simulated specimen signatures in the name of "Natalie Braxton-Porter" written by "Julia Ali" and sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen signatures of "Natalie Braxton-Porter". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned signature was written by "Julia Ali" and was not written by "Natalie Braxton-Porter".
DNUYMW-5241	The graphological characteristics of the study items K1 a-b were analyzed, samples of writing by Natalie Braxton - Porter, which when compared with the graphological characteristics of the writing that appears in the questioned note item Q1, it was found that it does not contain matching identifying elements. with the writings and signature of the questioned note. Subsequently, the graphological characteristics of the study items K2 a-b and K2c were analyzed, samples of Julia Ali's writing, which when compared with the graphological characteristics of the writing that appears in the questioned note item Q1, were found to have abundant identifying elements. Coincident with the writings and the signature of the questioned note in size, proportions, shape, beginnings and endings of the strokes, spatial and dynamic location, which allows us to conclude that the question note item Q1 was written by Julia Ali.
EBYCXZ-5245	The physical examination and comparison of Item 007 with Items 001 and 002 and Items 003 through 006 resulted in the following conclusions: It was determined Julia Ali (Items 003 through 006) probably wrote the questioned hand printed and signature entries on Item 007. This qualified conclusion is due to the lack of individualizing characteristics in the questioned hand printed entries. It was determined Natalie Braxton-Porter (Items 001 and 002) probably did not write the questioned hand printed and signature entries on Item 007. This qualified conclusion is due to the lack of individualizing characteristics in the questioned hand printed entries, the lack of verbatim comparability between Items 001 and 002 (course of business known writing) and the questioned document (Item 007), and the limited quantity of known signatures submitted for comparison.
EEZ74G-5245	Based on the examination and comparison of the questioned entries on Exhibit Q1 with the known entries on Exhibits K1a, K1b, and K2a through K2d, the following has been determined: Julia Ali (Exhibit K2a through K2d) wrote the questioned entries, hand printing and signature, on Exhibit Q1. Natalie Braxton-Porter (Exhibit K1a and K1b) did not write the questioned entries, hand printing and signature, on Exhibit Q1.
EFT9MQ-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
EG4B9P-5241	K1. The writer of the known handwriting and signature on K1 did not write the questioned handwriting or signature on Q1. K2. The writer of the known handwriting and signature on K2 wrote the questioned handwriting and signature on Q1.
EH6W9C-5245	Common authorship is established between the questioned handprinting and signature of the item Q1 suicide note and the K2a-K2d writing and signature samples submitted as being

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	authored by Julia Ali.
EHKALM-5245	A number of similarities were noted between the questioned handwriting and signature and the specimens attributed to Julia Ali. These similarities included such features as the handwriting and signature styles, size and size relationships, slope and individual letter constructions. Based on these similarities, it is my opinion that the author of the specimens attributed to Julia Ali has completed the handwriting and signature on the questioned note.
EPJP92-5241	<p>This report contains the results of the questioned document examinations. Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING. Source Identification: It was determined that the questioned hand printing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) were prepared by JULIA ALI (Item K2a-d), Item 3. See appendices for methods and limitations regarding the results of examinations. The evidence is being retained. This report conforms to the "Department of Justice Uniform Language for Testimony and Reports for Forensic Document Examinations". This report contains the opinions and interpretations of the issuing examiner(s) and is supported by records retained in the [Laboratory] files. Please allow a minimum of thirty days from the date of a discovery request for the [Laboratory] to provide the related materials. The [Laboratory] cannot ensure timely delivery of discovery requests received in less time. The work described in this report was conducted at the [Laboratory]. [Name] Questioned Documents Unit Appendices: Appendix A: Initial Assessment, Indented Writing, and Physicals Methodology: The methodology utilized when conducting an initial assessment or other non-comparison examination of documentary evidence involves an assessment of the submitted evidence to observe and note features of the submitted item(s), record characteristics which may be important for future examinations, assess the feasibility of the requested examinations, and identify other potentially probative examinations. 1) Analysis: The examination begins with a macroscopic (visual) examination using ambient lighting. If necessary, microscopic, optical, and/or electrostatic analysis of the submitted item(s) and the use of additional specialized equipment, lighting, and/or reference materials may be employed. The aforementioned methods and techniques will be utilized to assess the various substrates (to include polyethylene film products), writing, machine printing, mechanical impressions, indentations, watermarks, writing/printing mediums, and/or other documentary components of the submitted evidence. When conducting these types of initial assessments and physical examinations of the evidence, at a minimum, any probative characteristics observed that may be altered or destroyed by any other examinations (e.g., latent processing) must be recorded. These examination records may be used in future comparisons. The following equipment, methods and techniques may also be utilized during the initial assessment of the submitted evidence: Electrostatic Detection Apparatus (ESDA), Video Spectral Comparator (VSC), Hyperspectral Imaging (HSI Examiner), Digital Microscopy, Stereoscope/other microscopy, Various forms of specialized lighting, 3M Glare-Stop polarizing filters of various sizes, Various measuring devices such as calipers, rulers, etc. Various reference materials and/or software 2) Evaluation: Upon completion of the initial assessment the examiner will proceed to the appropriate procedure as determined by the assessment. In instances when examinations do not continue into a comparison procedure, results of the initial assessment deemed probative, indented writing results, and/or watermark results will be reported. These results may include, but are not limited to the following information (as applicable): Writing medium(s) and/or printing process(es) used to produce an item, Presence/absence of watermark and/or manufacturer's information, Self-adhesive/moisture-activated properties of an item, Presence/absence of indented writing and possible interpretation of the indentations, Suitability of an item for future examinations, Request for additional items, Any additional observations and assessments that are made and recorded for future examinations. 3) Verification and Review: Verifications are performed in instances when a printing process or an interpretation of the content of the indented writing is included in the results of examinations section of the report. Verifications ensure the accuracy of these examinations while additional reviews ensure the appropriate examinations have been conducted, the examiner's conclusions are consistent with technical notes, the technical notes contain sufficient supporting data and are within the limits of the</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-
Test

Conclusions

discipline, and all records conform to Laboratory standards. Limitations: Factors that may affect the examination process and/or the results rendered include: Prior destructive examinations, Non-original writing, Insufficient quantity of original material, Insufficient quantity of physical characteristics/class characteristics associated with the item(s), Limited/Lack of comparability, Oversized/bulky items, Poor condition of substrate (stretched, warped, cut, torn, or melted).

Appendix B: Handwriting Methodology: The methodology utilized when conducting a handwriting comparison involves a four-stage process in which a forensic document examiner can reach an opinion concerning whether two handwriting items were written by the same writer or different writers. 1) Analysis: The examination begins with the analysis of the items submitted for comparison to determine if the writing is original, naturally prepared, and exhibits characteristics suitable for comparison. Some of the characteristics that can be observed include: Beginning and ending strokes, Baseline features, Height relationship, Slant, Spacing, Line quality. 2) Comparison: The second stage is the side-by-side comparison of the items. The numerous characteristics exhibited in the writing between the items are compared to determine the similarities, differences, and limitations, if present. 3) Evaluation: The third stage is the formulation of a conclusion based on the significance and combination of the characteristics observed during the comparison and any limitations, if present. The conclusions that can be reached are:

- Source Identification – ‘Source identification’ is an examiner’s conclusion that two or more bodies of writing were prepared by the same writer. This conclusion is an examiner’s opinion that 1) the observed quality and quantity of similar characteristics are such that the examiner would not expect to see that same combination of characteristics repeated in a body of writing prepared by another writer; 2) there are no significant dissimilarities to conclude that the bodies of writing were not prepared by the same writer; and 3) there are no significant limitations with the items examined or the circumstances considered (e.g., the writers skill level, sufficient number of known standards). The basis for a ‘source identification’ conclusion is an examiner’s opinion that the observed similar characteristics provide extremely strong support for the proposition that the bodies of writing were prepared by the same writer and extremely limited or no support for the proposition that the writings were prepared by different writers. A ‘source identification’ is the statement of an examiner’s opinion (an inductive inference) that the probability that a different writer prepared the questioned body of writing is so small that it is negligible. NOTE: If a ‘source identification’ conclusion is rendered between a body of questioned writing and the known writing of a particular individual, no other handwriting comparison conclusions will be reported concerning the aforementioned body of identified questioned writing and any other known writers.
- Support For Common Source – ‘Support for common source’ is an examiner’s conclusion that two or more bodies of writing may have been prepared by the same writer. This conclusion is an examiner’s opinion that 1) the bodies of writing exhibit a prevalence of similar characteristics to indicate they may have been prepared by the same writer; 2) there are insufficient dissimilar characteristics to indicate that the bodies of writing may not have been prepared by the same writer; and 3) the bodies of writing have limitations that prevent the examiner from providing a ‘source identification conclusion. The degree of ‘support for common source’ may range from limited to strong. The basis for a ‘support for common source’ conclusion is an examiner’s opinion that the observed similar characteristics provide limited to strong support for the proposition that the bodies of writing may have been prepared by the same writer and insufficient support for the proposition that the writings may have been prepared by different writers.
- Inconclusive – ‘Inconclusive’ is an examiner’s opinion that no determination can be reached as to whether two or more bodies of writing were prepared by the same writer or by different writers. The basis for an ‘inconclusive’ conclusion is an examiner’s opinion that the bodies of writing have limitations that prevent the examiner from providing any conclusion regarding probable authorship.
- Support For Different Sources – ‘Support for different sources’ is an examiner’s conclusion that two or more bodies of writing may not have been prepared by the same writer. This conclusion is an examiner’s opinion that 1) the bodies of writing exhibit a prevalence of dissimilar characteristics to indicate they may not have been prepared by the same writer; 2) there are insufficient similar characteristics to

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	<p>indicate that the bodies of writing may have been prepared by the same writer; and 3) the bodies of writing have limitations that prevent the examiner from making an 'exclusion' conclusion. The degree of 'support for different sources' may range from limited to strong. The basis for a 'support for different sources' conclusion is an examiner's opinion that the observed dissimilar characteristics provide limited to strong support for the proposition that the bodies of writing may have been prepared by different writers and insufficient support for the proposition that the writings may have been prepared by the same writer. Source Exclusion – 'Source exclusion' in an examiner's conclusion that two or more bodies of writing were not prepared by the same writer. This conclusion is an examiner's opinion that the bodies of writing exhibit different handwriting characteristics and there are no significant limitations with the items examined or the circumstances considered (e.g., the writer's skill level, sufficient number of known standards, eliminating the possibility of alternative writing styles). The basis for a 'source exclusion' conclusion is an examiner's opinion that the observed different characteristics provide extremely strong support for the proposition that the bodies of writing were prepared by the different writers and extremely limited or no support for the proposition that the writings were prepared by the same writer. 4) Verification: The final stage of the examination process is the verification. This stage of the process is performed to ensure the appropriate examinations have been conducted, the examiner's conclusions are accurate and consistent with technical notes and are within the limits of the discipline, there is supporting data, and all records conform to Laboratory standards. Limitations: A conclusion provided during testimony or in a report is ultimately an examiner's decision and is not based on a statistically-derived or verified measurement or comparison to all other bodies of writing. When offering a 'support for common source' conclusion, the examiner shall explain the limitations that prevented a 'source identification conclusion. Likewise, when offering a 'support for different sources' conclusion, the examiner shall explain the limitations that prevented a 'source exclusion' conclusion. Factors that may affect the examination process and/or the results rendered include: Lack/Limited comparability of writing styles (Cursive vs. printing), Lack/Limited comparability of wording, Lack/Limited contemporaneous of the known writing, Prior destructive examinations, Non-original writing, Limited quality or quantity of writing, Distorted writing.</p>
EVQDW9-5241	<p>1. The writer of the known writing on item K1 can be eliminated as having written the questioned writing and signature on item Q1. 2. The writer of the known writing on item K2 was identified, within the limits of practical certainty*, as having written the questioned handwriting, excluding the signature on item Q1. This writer probably wrote the questioned signature on item Q1.</p>
FDNY3M-5241	<p>1. The legible texts contained in the doubtful suicide note indicated as Q1, present a scriptural uniorigin compared to the unrelated legible texts, provided as reference material of Mrs. Julia Ali. 2. The legible texts contained in the doubtful suicide note indicated as Q1, do not present scriptural uniorigin compared to the unrelated legible texts, provided as reference material of Mrs. Natalie Braxton - Porter. 3. The italic signature on the doubtful suicide note indicated as Q1, presents scriptural uniorigin compared to the italic signatures, provided as reference material of Mrs. Julia Ali. 4. The italic signature on the doubtful suicide note indicated as Q1, does not present a scriptural uniorigin compared to the italic signatures, provided as reference material of Mrs. Natalie Braxton – Porter.</p>
FEJEG7-5241	<p>The handwriting and signature on the Q1 suicide note is Julia Ali's.</p>
FFAMPU-5241	<p>Significant and individual similarities were found between the questioned writing and signature on Q1 and the specimen writings provided by Julia Ali on K2a-K2d. Julia Ali is identified as the writer of questioned writings and signature appearing on Q1.</p>
FGHY8V-5245	<p>Findings strongly support the proposition that the Q1 text (signature) and K2 text (signature) were written by the same person. There are many important similarities, no important differences, no limitations to the examination. The expert opinion is that Q1 text (signature) and K2 text</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	(signature) were written by the same person. According to the information on K2 that we received with the claim for the examination, Q1 was written (signed) by Julia Ali. Findings strongly support the proposition that the Q1 text (signature) and K1 text (signature) were not written by the same person. There are many important differences, no important similarities, no limitations to the examination. The expert opinion is that Q1 text (signature) and K1 text (signature) were not written by the same person. According to the information on K1 that we received with the claim for the examination, Q1 was not written (signed) by Natalie Braxton-Porter.
FGCLK3-5245	The body of questioned writing and questioned signature on suicide note were written by Julia Ali.
FQEMBE-5241	Elimination: It was determined the the writings on Document Q-1 was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter, the writer of K1a and K1b, due to dissimilarities of handwriting habit. Identification: It was determined the the writings on Document Q-1 (body and signature) was written by Julia Ali, the writer of k2a through K2d due to similarities of handwriting habit.
FR33Q4-5241	FIRST: The questioned writing inserted in the Suicide Note (Q1) and the writing inserted in the matching base document consisting of the Commercial Writing Course for Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1 a-b) was NOT written by Natalie Braxton-Porter. SECOND: The questioned deed inserted in the Suicide Note (Q1) and the deed inserted in the comparison base document consisting of Examples of Dictation for Julia Ali (K2a-b) and Commercial Writing Course for Julia Ali (K2d), IF it was written by Julia Ali. THIRD: The questioned signature inserted in the Suicide Note (Q1) and the signatures inserted in the matching base document consisting of the Commercial Writing Course for Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1 a-b) was NOT written by Natalie Braxton-Porter. FOURTH: The questioned signature inserted in the Suicide Note (Q1) and the signatures inserted in the matching base document consisting of Requested Signatures for Julia Ali, in the name of Natalie Braxton-Porter (collected separately) identified as (k2c) IF it was written by Julia Ali.
FWEAM2-5241	SINGLE HANDWRITTEN SOURCE: the writings and signature found in the suicide note document identified as doubtful Q1 compared to doubtful writings K2a-d
FWYNH7-5245	It has been concluded that the writer of Exhibit K1, submitted as the known writing of Natalie Braxton-Porter, probably did not write the questioned signature in Exhibit Q1. The evidence contained in the handwriting points rather strongly toward the questioned and known writings having been written by different individuals; however, it falls short of the "virtually certain" degree of confidence. There are indications that the writer of Exhibit K1 might not have prepared the questioned handprinted entries in Exhibit Q1. There is very little significant evidence present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known writings to form a more definite conclusion. This is a weak opinion. It is recommended that additional known hand printed writing of Natalie Braxton-Porter be submitted for further examination. The writer of Exhibit K2, submitted as the known writing of Julia Ali, probably prepared the questioned handprinted writing and signature in Exhibit Q1. 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 the "virtually certain" degree of confidence.
G2MUER-5245	The body of questioned writing on the suicide note (Q1) was written by Julia Ali. The questioned signature on the suicide note (Q1) was signed by Julia Ali.
G3ZPRY-5245	De los resultados de la Escritura se concluye: PRIMERA.- La escritura cuestionada identificada como Q1A y la cual se le atribuye a la C. NATALIE BRAXTON-PORTER, en donde la muestra se identifica como C1A, SE DETERMINA QUE NO CORRESPONDE A LA C. NATALIE BRAXTON-PORTER. SEGUNDA.- La escritura cuestionada identificada como Q1A y la cual se le atribuye a la C. NATALIE BRAXTON-PORTER, en donde la muestra se identifica como C1A, SE DETERMINA QUE LOS RASGOS CONTENIDOS EN LA ESCRITURA NO SON COINCIDENTES CON LAS MUESTRAS RECABADAS A LA C. NATALIE BRAXTON-PORTER. TERCERA.- La

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>escritura cuestionada identificadas como Q1A y la cual se dice que lleno el contenido del documento cuestionado identificado como Q1, que se le atribuye a la C. JULIA ALI, en donde la muestra se identifica como C2A, SE DETERMINA QUE SI CORRESPONDE A LA C. JULIA ALI. CUARTA.- La escritura cuestionada identificada como Q1A y la cual se dice que lleno el contenido del documento cuestionado identificado como Q1 que se le atribuye a la C. JULIA ALI, en donde la muestra se identifica como C2A, SE DETERMINA QUE LOS RASGOS CONTENIDOS EN LA ESCRITURA SI SON COINCIDENTES CON LAS MUESTRAS RECABADAS A LA C. JULIA ALI. De los resultados de la Firma se concluye: QUINTA.- La firma cuestionada identificada como Q1B y la cual se le atribuye a la C. NATALIE BRAXTON-PORTER, en donde la muestra se identifica como C1B, SE DETERMINA DIFERENTE ORIGEN GRÁFICO. SEXTA.- La firma cuestionada identificada como Q1B y la cual se le atribuye a la C. NATALIE BRAXTON-PORTER, en donde la muestra se identifica como C1B, SE DETERMINA QUE LOS RASGOS CONTENIDOS EN LA FIRMA NO SON COINCIDENTES CON LAS MUESTRAS RECABADAS A LA C. NATALIE BRAXTON-PORTER. SEPTIMA.- La firma cuestionada identificada como Q1B a nombre de NATALIE BRAXTON-PORTER y la cual se dice que plasmó como firma del documento cuestionado identificado como Q1, que se le atribuye a la C. JULIA ALI en donde la muestra se identifica como C2B, SE DETERMINA FIRMA AUTENTICA. OCTAVA.- La firma cuestionada identificada como Q1B a nombre de NATALIE BRAXTON-PORTER y la cual se dice que plasmó como firma del documento cuestionado identificado como Q1, que se le atribuye a la C. JULIA ALI en donde la muestra se identifica como C2B, SE DETERMINA QUE LOS RASGOS CONTENIDOS EN LA FIRMA SI SON COINCIDENTES CON LAS MUESTRAS RECABADAS A LA C. JULIA ALI. [Requested translation was not provided by time of report publication.]</p>
G6L82H-5241	<p>Findings Methods A visual examination and comparison of the submitted items was completed using a hand lens. Questioned to Known Comparisons The questioned note in Item #3 was written by Julia Ali, the purported writer of Item #2 (Source Identification). There are significant similarities between the questioned and known writing. The questioned note in Item #3 was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter, the purported writer of Item #1 (Source Exclusion). There are significant differences between the questioned and known writing. Remarks All items are available for return. If additional items are to be submitted, please re-submit the original items in their original [Laboratory] labeled packaging.</p>
GE99HR-5241	<p>In body of the will, We can see the several difference from the handwriting of Natalie, and find several similarity from the handwriting of Julia. 1. Apostrophe 2. Connection of the "f" and "o" 3. Allograph of "s, u, e" 4. Allograph of capital letter "I" In the signature of the will, We can see the several difference from the signature of Natalie, and find several similarity from the signature of Julia. 1. Connection of the "x" and "t" 2. Allograph of "t" 3. Allograph of capital letter "N, B, P" 4. Dot between signature "a" and "B" So we concludes that Natalie braxton is not a writer of the will, but Julia Ali is a writer of the will.</p>
GQ4MDH-5245	<p>The questioned writing and the signature on the suicide note were not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1). The whole suicide note and the signature were written by Julia Ali (K2).</p>
GX27RL-5245	<p>Handwriting comparison: The questioned writing (excluding signature) on the Suicide Note (Q1) was written by Julia Ali (K2). The questioned writing (excluding signature) on the Suicide Note (Q1) was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1). Signature comparison: The questioned signature on the Suicide Note (Q1) was written by Julia Ali (K2). The questioned signature on the Suicide Note (Q1) was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1).</p>
GYYGMN-5241	<p>Based upon an examination of the above listed items, it is my opinion that the handwritten material appearing on Q-1 was prepared by the same individual that prepared the handwritten material appearing in K-2. The agreement in writing features that support this opinion include but are not limited to: Fluid stroke movement exhibited in QD and Knowns, Letter design and construction, Directly comparable letter combinations and words, Stroke height relationships,</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	<p>Paragraph formatting. The terminology "was prepared by" (identification) as it appears in the SWGDOC (Scientific Working Group for Forensic Document Examination) published standard Terminology for Expressing Conclusions of Forensic Document Examiners is defined as a definite conclusion of identity. 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 the evidence contained in the handwriting, that the writer of the known material actually wrote the writing in question. It is further my opinion that the signature appearing on Q-1 was probably prepared by the same individual that prepared the signatures appearing in K-2. The agreement in writing features that support this opinion include but are not limited to: Fluid stroke movement exhibited in QD and Knowns, Letter design and construction, Proportional height relationships of letters, Word construction - the type and number of individual strokes or stroke configurations used to prepare the elements of the signature. The terminology "was prepared by" (identification) as it appears in the SWGDOC (Scientific Working Group for Forensic Document Examination) published standard Terminology for Expressing Conclusions of Forensic Document Examiners is defined as a definite conclusion of identity. 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 the evidence contained in the handwriting, that the writer of the known material actually wrote the writing in question. The terminology "probably was prepared by" is defined as 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 the "virtually certain" degree of confidence. It should be noted that the individual that prepared the handwritten material and signatures appearing in K-1 was excluded as the author of the signature and handwritten material appearing on Q-1.</p>
GZQFRZ- 5245	<p>The extended writing of the suicide note, item Q1, was written by Julia Ali, the writer of items K2a to K2d. There is strong evidence that the signature in item Q1 was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter, the writer of items K1a and K1b; there is strong evidence that it was written by Julia Ali.</p>
H7X8WQ- 5241	<p>Both the body of questioned writing and questioned signature on the suicide note were written by Julia Ali</p>
HJLAA4- 5241	<p>[No Conclusions Reported.]</p>
HQGCGU- 5241	<p>1.) Q1: The questioned suicide note (the body of questioned writing excluding the signature)- was written by Julia Ali (K2) and was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1). 2.) Q1: The questioned suicide note (the questioned signature) - was written by Julia Ali (K2) and was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1).</p>
HQXPLJ- 5245	<p>1. The handwritten text, in the cutout of the sheet of paper studied, without including the signature, if it has a graphic identity compared to the genuine manuscripts of Mrs. Julia Ali. 2. The signature on the cutout of the sheet of paper studied has a high probability of graphic identity compared to the genuine manuscripts of Mrs. Julia Ali.</p>
JBJJ9Y- 5241	<p>The body of questioned writing and signature on the suicide note (Q1) were written by Julia Ali (K2), therefore were not made by Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1).</p>
JMXRL7- 5245	<p>Based on the examination and comparison of the examined material, the following conclusions were reached: It is highly probable that Natalie Braxton-Porter (Item K1a-b) did not write the questioned hand printing and questioned Natalie Braxton-Porter signature appearing on the document described as Q1. It is highly probable that Julia Ali (Item K2a-d) did write the questioned hand printing and questioned Natalie Braxton-Porter signature appearing on the document described as Q1.</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
JQHLLR-5245	La escritura y firma contenida en la nota sucida identificada como Q1 no corresponde con la escritura y firma de Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1a-b). La escritura y firma contenida en la nota sucida identificada como Q1 si corresponde con la escritura y firma de Julia Ali (items K2a-d). The handwriting and signature contained in the suicide note identified as Q1 was not writing by Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1a-b). The handwriting and signature contained in the suicide note identified as Q1 was writing by Julia Ali (items K2a-d).
JUXXQT-5245	1. No evidence of significance was found to indicate that the questioned signature "Natalie Braxton-Porter" on Exhibit Q1 was executed by the K1 specimen writer. 2. It has been concluded that it is highly probable that the questioned signature "Natalie Braxton-Porter" on Exhibit Q1 was executed by the K2 specimen writer. 3. No evidence of significance was found to indicate that the handwriting on Exhibit Q1 was executed by the K1 specimen writer. 4. It has been concluded that the questioned handwriting on Exhibit Q1 was executed by the K2 specimen writer.
JWNBD7-5245	All wrote the questioned handprinted and signature entries on Q1.
JXFEQZ-5241	FIRST: The questioned writing that appears in the document already described (Q1, note from suicide), was NOT written by Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1). SECOND: The questioned writing that appears in the document already described (Q1, note from suicide), was written by Julia Ali (K2). THIRD: The questioned signature that appears on the document already described (Q1, note of suicide), was NOT written by Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1). FOURTH: The questioned signature that appears on the document already described (Q1, suicide note), was written by Julia Ali (K2).
K4X4RL-5245	The writer of Exhibit K2 (Julia Ali) wrote the questioned handprinted entries on Exhibit Q1. The writer of Exhibit K2 (Julia Ali) probably wrote the questioned "Natalie Braxton-Porter" signature on Exhibit Q1. The writer of Exhibit K1 (Natalie Braxton-Porter) probably did not write the questioned handprinted entries or signature on Exhibit Q1.
K8JRFR-5245	Natalie Braxton - Porter is not the author of the writing and signature of the identified document Q1. Julia Ali is the author of the writing and signature of the identified document Q1.
KBKRRX-5245	A definite conclusion could not be reached as to whether or not Julia Ali, Items K2a-d, prepared the questioned writing and signature on Item Q1. However, characteristics in common indicate that Ali, K2a-d, may have prepared the questioned writing and signature on Item Q1. A definite conclusion could not be reached as to whether or not Natalie Braxton-Porter, Items K1a-b, prepared the questioned writing and signature on Item Q1. However, characteristics observed indicate that Braxton-Porter, K1a-b, may not have prepared the questioned writing and signature on Item Q1.
KD7GAP-5241	Manuscript uniprovence of the questioned texts and the questioned signature (Q1) compared to the samples provided as unquestioned material of Mrs. Julia Ali. (K2a, K2b, K2d and K2c)
KLF7MN-5241	Once the comparative study between the doubtful manuscript and the doubtful manuscripts of NATALIE BRAXTON-PORTER and JULIA ALI has been carried out. It was found that the identifying aspects observed in the manuscripts contributed by JULIA ALI, are also observed in the doubtful manuscript, and it becomes evident in the construction of the signs, the way they are associated, the handling and location of the signs in space. graphic, location of the signature in relation to the text,
KPDMMQU-5245	Julia Ali (K2) wrote the questioned hand printed entries and the questioned 'Natalie Braxton-Porter' signature depicted on Exhibit Q1.
L2NE3H-5245	1 - The author of the K1 known writings and signatures, Natalie Braxton-Porter, did not write the questioned handwritten text or the "Natalie Braxton-Porter" signature appearing on the Q1

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	questioned document. 2 - The author of the K2 known writings, Julia Ali, wrote the questioned handwritten text appearing on the Q1 questioned document. 3 - The author of the K2 known writings, Julia Ali, probably wrote the questioned "Natalie Braxton-Porter" signature appearing on the Q1 questioned document.
L74Q9J-5241	The handprinting and signature were examined and addressed separately. For each comparison, the following set of propositions was considered: H1: the writer of the K1 specimen samples (NBP) wrote the questioned entry/signature, vs H2: the writer of the K2 specimen samples (JA) wrote the questioned entry/signature, vs H3: someone other than the writers of the specimen samples K1 or K2 wrote the questioned entry/signature. Note that, since the questioned sample is a suicide note, the proposition of disguise by the specimen writer (under H1) has been excluded from consideration. Opinion - Handprinting: The findings provide extremely strong support for proposition H2 over either proposition H1 or H3. Opinion - Signature: The findings provide very strong support for proposition H2 over either proposition H1 or H3.
LC8UWW-5245	Julia Ali (K2) wrote the questioned note (Q1) and signed the "Natalie Braxton-Porter" signature. Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1) did not write the questioned note (Q1) or sign the "Natalie Braxton-Porter" signature.
LEF383-5245	The [Laboratory] Scale of Conclusions: Natalie Braxton-Porter Level -3 both questioned writing and signature For Julia Ali Level +3 for both questioned writing and signature.
LF6FLE-5245	The writings and the signature of the Q1 document were written by the writer of the K2 documents, Mrs Julia Ali.
LMA3Q2-5245	It has been concluded the note and signature "Natalie Braxton-Porter", Q1, was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter, K1a-b. It has been concluded the note and signature "Natalie Braxton-Porter", Q1, was written by Julia Ali, K2a-d.
LPYFDZ-5241	There is conclusive evidence to show that the handwriting and signature on exhibit Q1 was authored by Julia Ali.
LQQFDW-5241	According to the analysis for the comparison made, and the elements related to study, it is possible to determine: Single handwritten origin between the spellings of the text and the signature attributed to Natalie Braxton-Porter present on folio q1, in front of the texts and signatures found on pages k29, k2b, k2c and k2d elaborated by Julie Ali; In considering agronomic and demographic characteristics such as interlitteral spacing, rule box, graphic times, inclination and cohesions between some specific letters. No single handwritten origin between the grams found in the texts and signature of pages k1a and k1b respecting to page q1 as an investigated note. In other words the text and signature were designed or written by Julia Ali.
LVL9ER-5245	In my opinion: 1. My findings provide extremely strong support for the proposition that the non-signature writing on Q1 was produced by someone other than Natalie Braxton-Porter. 2. My findings provide extremely strong support for the proposition that the signature on Q1 was written by someone other than Natalie Braxton-Porter. 3. My findings provide extremely strong support for the proposition that the non-signature writing on Q1 was produced by Julia Ali rather than by some other person. 4. My findings provide very strong support for the proposition that the signature on Q1 was written by Julia Ali rather than by some other person.
LVY3VD-5241	In my opinion I conclude that on examination and comparison of 'Q1' - 'Suicide Note' with all of the Exemplars I was given, that Julia Ali is responsible for having completed both the 'Questioned' handwritten content and the 'Questioned' signature on this document.
LWVDRF-5245	A). According to the analyzes carried out, the doubtful material provided, the reference patterns used for the present study and the technical reasoning previously exposed, it is determined; THAT THERE IS NO GRAPHIC ORIGIN The completed manuscript (Item Q1: Suicide Note) WAS NOT

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>WRITTEN by Ms. Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1a-b). B). According to the studies carried out, the doubtful material provided, the reference patterns used for the present study and the technical reasoning explained above, it is determined THAT THERE IS UNIFORM GRAPHIC PROCEDURE. The completed manuscripts (Item Q1: Suicide Note) WAS WRITTEN by Ms. Julia Ali, (K2a-b) (K2d). C). According to the studies carried out, the doubtful material provided, the reference patterns used for the present study and the technical reasoning explained above, it is determined that THERE IS NO UNIFORM GRAPHIC PROCEDURE. The signature made (Item Q1: Suicide Note) WAS NOT WRITTEN by Natalie Braxton-Poner (K1a) (K1b). D). According to the studies carried out, the doubtful material provided, the reference patterns used for the present study and the technical reasoning explained above, it is determined THAT THERE IS UNIFORM GRAPHIC PROCEDURE. The signature made (Item Q1: Suicide Note) WAS WRITTEN by Julia Ali. (K2a) (K2b) (K2c).</p>
MAX3FF-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
MHB7FZ-5241	<p>There is strong support for a common source between the Item Q1 hand printed entries and signature and the known writing of Julia Ali. The basis for this conclusion is that it is the examiner's opinion that the observed similar characteristics provide strong support for the proposition that the bodies of writing may have been prepared by the same writer and insufficient support for the proposition that the writings may have been prepared by different writers. It should be noted that Items 3a and 3b, submitted as requested known writing, exhibited significant similarities with respect to format, indicating that the subject possibly was privy to viewing the original questioned document. Because of this limitation, these writings were not utilized in this comparative examination. Should an additional examination be desired it is requested that additional collected known writings be submitted. There is strong support for a source exclusion between the Item Q1 hand printed entries and signature and the known writing of Natalie Braxton-Porter. The basis for this 'source exclusion' conclusion is the examiner's opinion that the observed different characteristics provide limited support for the proposition that the bodies of writing were prepared by the different writers and insufficient support for the proposition that the writings were prepared by the same writer. Limitations in this examination include known items that are not original and are only in the form of collected standards. Should an additional examination be desired it is requested that additional collected known writings be submitted.</p>
MQ7W9P-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
MU3VCZ-5241	<p>The writer of Item 2, Item 3 and Item 4 (Julia Ali) has been identified as the writer of the Item 5 Suicide Note and the signature. The writer of Item 1 (Natalie Braxton-Porter) has been eliminated as the writer of the Item 5 Suicide Note and the signature.</p>
N3WCFB-5241	<p>Methods Visual examination and comparison of the submitted items utilizing a hand lens revealed the following: Questioned to Known Writing Comparisons Substantial similarities with no significant differences were noted between the samples in K2 and the writing on the note in item Q1. The note in item Q1 was written by the writer of K2. Therefore, the writer of K1 did not write the note in item Q1. Remarks All items are available for return to the submitting agency.</p>
NBNQAV-5241	<p>1. THE QUESTIONED WRITING IDENTIFIED AS "Q1" DOES NOT COME FROM THE SAME GRAPHIC ORIGIN, WITH RESPECT TO THE K1A AND K1B WRITING SAMPLES. 2. THE DOUBTED SIGNATURE INDICATED AS "Q1", DOES NOT COME FROM THE SAME GRAPHIC ORIGIN, WITH RESPECT TO THE SAMPLES MENTIONED AS K1A AND K1B. 3. THE QUESTIONED WRITING IDENTIFIED AS "Q1", IF IT COMES FROM THE SAME GRAPHIC ORIGIN, WITH RESPECT TO THE K2A, K2B, K2C AND K2D WRITING SAMPLES. 4.- THE DOUBTED SIGNATURE INDICATED AS "Q1", IF IT COMES FROM THE SAME GRAPHIC</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	ORIGIN, WITH RESPECT TO THE SAMPLES MENTIONED AS K2A, K2B, K2C AND K2D.
NCL26Y-5241	HANDWRITING (JULIA ALI): Source Identification: It was determined the questioned writing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) were prepared by JULIA ALI, Item 3 (Item K2a-d).
NMKND9-5241	There is a strong probability that Natalie Braxton-Porter did not write the signature in her name on the questioned document, Q1. There are indications that Natalie Braxton-Porter may not have written the handwriting on the questioned document, Q1. There is a strong probability that Julia Ali wrote the signature in the name of Natalie Braxton-Porter on the questioned document, Q1. There are indications that Julia Ali may have written the handwriting on the questioned document, Q1.
NNEFA2-5241	The writing and signature that appears on the document marked with Q1, if it has the same graphic origin as the writing and signature that appears on the documents marked with K2a, K2b, K2c and K2c.
NP94RW-5245	The questioned handwriting that corresponds to the suicide note identified as "Q1" does not correspond to the handwriting used as the basis for comparison of Natalie Braxton-Porter, but does correspond to the handwriting used as the basis for comparison of Julia's body of writing Ali. The questioned signature that corresponds to the suicide note identified as "Q1" does not correspond to the signatures used as a basis for comparison of Natalie Braxton-Porter, but does correspond to the signatures used as a basis for comparison of Julia's body of writing Ali.
NVXJG4-5241	Questioned writing: Q1 vs K1 The lack of Nathalie Braxton-Porter's writing and the fact that the pieces are photographs require a certain reserve in the examination. The comparison of Q1 and K1 materials shows divergent points. Indeed, there are differences in the fluency of the layout and the allignment of the lines. As a matter of fact, the layout is less fluent and the lines do not follow those of the paper in K1. In Q1, the word spaces are smaller and the dimension varies. On the contrary, it remains stable in K1. In Q1: the "l" lack of the vertical lines, the "u" shows a split line at the end, the "t" is sometimes curved In K1, these elements cannot be found. The "t" is always vertical. The letter "k" presents a final which takes its source at the base of the vertical line in K1 which is different from Q1. The writer of Q1 is different from the one of K1. Q1 vs K2. The comparison of Q1 and K2 shows convergent points. We find a comparable layout. In both case, we can find : a progressive left margin, identical word spaces, a similar allignment of the lines A similar dimension difference occurs in both Q1 and K2 : larger at the beginning of the text and smaller at the end. The specificity of the letters "l", "u", "k" and "t" that were explained before are similar in Q1 and K2. There is no real differences between Q1 and K2. The author of the writings visible in Q1 is the same as the one visible in K2. Questioned signature: Q1 vs K1 The Q1 signature presents differences with the K1 signature. Indeed, we find in K1 elements that do not exist in Q1: angles that abut on the base line, capitals that cross the baseline, a more stretched signature, upwards and to the right, punctuation on the "l", a propulsive and dynamic movement. Q1 vs K2 The comparison of the Q1 signature and the K2 signature shows many convergent points (no divergent points). Among the most compelling were: the rounding which arises on the base line, the proportions of the signature, the lack of punctuation, a similar general layout, the space left between the text and the signature... the author of the Q1 signature is the writer of the K2 signature.
P3AYLJ-5245	There is very strong evidence to support the proposition that Julia Ali wrote out the body of the letter Q1 and moderately strong evidence to support the proposition that she also wrote out the signature on this letter. There is very strong evidence to support the proposition that Natalie Braxton-Porter did not write out or sign the letter Q1.
P4JA6T-5241	1-The suicide note of item Q1 was written by Julia Ali. 2-The signature in the end of the suicide note of item Q1 was written by Julia Ali.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
P4LZ9Q-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
P84ZTC-5245	JULIA ALI was the author of the questioned handwriting and signature made in the document analysed.
PHPEHZ-5245	Side by side visual comparisons were conducted between the Q1 note and each set of known writings described as K1 and K2 to determine whether or not the Q1 note was written by either writer. Handwriting comparisons involve the characterization and evaluation of both the overt and subtle characteristics in the submitted material. It is the conclusion of this examiner that the Q1 note and signature were not written by the person who wrote the material in K1 which was submitted as the known writing of Natalie Braxton-Porter. Also, it is the conclusion of this examiner that the Q1 note and signature were written by the writer of K2 which was submitted as the known writing of Julia Ali. A conclusion of "were written by," is reached when; the cumulative range of variation exhibited in the questioned writing and known writing contains sufficient significant similarities, there are no significant dissimilarities, absent characters if any are insignificant, and, the questioned and known writings are sufficient in quantity and individualizing characteristics for a complete and thorough examination.
PP2K7Q-5241	1. The body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) Q1 was written by K2 identify as Julia Ali. 2. The questioned signature in Q1 was written by K2 Julia Ali.
PUZXZH-5241	1. After careful examination and comparison of the Questioned Signature on Q1 with routine signatures of Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1 a-b), it is concluded that the Questioned Signature on Q1 is not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1). Therefore, Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1) is not the author of the Questioned Signature on Q1. 2. After Careful examination and comparison of the Questioned Handwriting on Q1 with routine handwriting of Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1 a-b), it is concluded that the Questioned Handwriting on Q1 is not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1). Therefore Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1) is not the author of the Questioned Handwriting on Q1. 3. After careful examination of the Questioned Signature on Q1 with requested signatures by Julia Ali in the name of Natalie Braxton-Porter (k2 a-b, K2 c), it is concluded that the Questioned Signature on Q1 is written by Juli Ali (K2). Therefore, Juli Ali (K2) is the author of the Questioned Signature on Q1. 4. After Careful examination and comparison of the Questioned Handwriting on Q1 with routine handwriting of Julia Ali (K2 d) and with dictated handwriting exemplars of Julia Ali (K2 a-b), it is concluded that the Questioned Handwriting on Q1 is written by Juli Ali (K2). Therefore Juli Ali (K2) is the author of the Questioned Handwriting on Q1.
Q3JU8L-5241	Signatures: The comparison of gross and subtle features observed in the questioned signature on item Q1 to those found in the specimen signatures attributed to Natalie BRAXTON-PORTER on items K1A and K1B disclosed a significant combination of fundamental differences. Accordingly, the questioned signature on item Q1 was not written by the writer of the signatures attributed to Natalie BRAXTON-PORTER. The comparison of gross and subtle features observed in the questioned signature on item Q1 to those found in the specimen signatures attributed to Julia ALI on items K2A – K2D disclosed a significant combination of similarities with no fundamental differences. Accordingly, the questioned signature on item Q1 was written by the writer of the signatures attributed to Julia ALI. Handwriting: The comparison of gross and subtle features observed in the questioned handwriting on item Q1 to those found in the specimen handwriting attributed to Natalie BRAXTON-PORTER on items K1A and K1B disclosed a significant combination of fundamental differences. Accordingly, the questioned handwriting on item Q1 was not written by the writer of the handwriting attributed to Natalie BRAXTON-PORTER. The comparison of gross and subtle features observed in the questioned handwriting on item Q1 to those found in the specimen handwriting attributed to Julia ALI on items K2A – K2D disclosed a significant combination of similarities with no fundamental differences. Accordingly, the questioned handwriting on item Q1 was written by the writer of the handwriting attributed to Julia

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
ALI.	
Q4DXUE-5245	1. The writing of the suicide note was written and corresponds to Julia Ali. 2. The questioned signature located at the end of the suicide note was written and corresponds to Julia Ali.
Q4ZMHJ-5241	Natalie-Braxton-Porter didn't write the suicide note. Natalie-Braxton-Porte didn't sign the suicide note. Julia Ali wrote the suicide note. Julia Ali wrote the signature on the suicide note.
QB3L7Z-5245	There is substantial evidence which indicates that the questioned handwriting and signature were probably not produced by the writer of the "Natalie Braxton-Porter" exemplars. Although this is not a conclusive elimination, there were sufficient differences to establish a strong likelihood that the questioned handwriting and signature were prepared by another writer. There is substantial evidence which indicates that the questioned handwriting and signature were probably produced by the writer of the "Julia Ali" exemplars. Although this is not a conclusive identification, there were sufficient similarities to establish a strong likelihood that the writer of the "Julia Ali" exemplars wrote the questioned handwriting and signature.
QLX7ZC-5245	The writings questioned excluding the signing of the Suicide Note (Q1) were written by Mrs. JULIA ALÍ (K2), documented by the analogies found. Among the common characteristics is the typographic design, the constancy in the line box, inclination, inter literal spaces, Structure beginnings and opening of the vowel "o", Production, beginnings, endings and size of the letter "s" in " things" and "this" Confection of the signs "o" and "r" in "more" Design, link and projection of the letters "fo" in "forgive" and "for", among others. The questioned signature contained in the Suicide Note (Q1) was written by Ms. JULIA ALÍ (K2) documented by the analogies found as the construction in three scriptural bodies. Slight tilt to the left. Preparation, beginnings, auctions, projection of the letter "B". Amorphous design, beginnings, auctions to produce the letter "r". The particularity of the juxtaposed connection between the signs "x" and "t" in Braxton. Location, beginnings and auctions to build the vowel "a". The exclusive in the preparation and graphic development of the final signs "o" and "n" in Braxton, among others. The questioned writing and questioned signature contained in the Suicide Note (Q1) were not written by Mrs. NATALIE BRAXTON PORTER, (K1), this decision is substantiated and documented with the differences found, such as the construction of graphic signs. Design, proportionality, ornaments, beginnings and endings of the letter "N", "B" and "P". Inclination of the signs. Confection of the letters "F", "a", "k". Location on the graphic plane. Projection of the scriptural line, among others.
QQR4JN-5241	Source Identification: It was determined that JULIA ALI, Item 3 (Item K2a-d), prepared the questioned writing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1).
QV99KD-5245	It can be established that there are divergences between the compared elements of the writings and the doubtful signature contained in the document (Qi), compared to the doubtful material as extra process material of Mrs. Nattalie Braxton Porter (writings and signatures) contained in the documents ((kia) and (kib). There is no GRAPHICAL SINGLE PROCEDURE between (Qi) versus (kl). Graphic convergences were found between the questioned document (Ql), against the unquestionable writings and signatures (extra process material and writing samples) provided for study by Mrs. Julia Ah contained in the documents (k2a), (k2b), (k2c), and (k2d). There is a GRAPHIC SINGLE PROCEDURE between (01) versus (k2).
R3XH48-5241	See previous page [Table 1: Examination Results]
R67QB7-5241	There are indications that the K1 writer did not write the Handwriting on Q1. It is highly probable that the K1 writer did not write the signature on Q1. It is highly probable that the K2 writer wrote the Handwriting on Q1. The K2 writer wrote the signature on Q1.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
RWXWGD-5245	1. The questioned writing in Q1 (including the signature) was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter(K1). 2. The questioned writing in Q1 (including the signature) was written by Julia Ali(K2).
RZDEL2-5245	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 a copy in lieu of the original document, it is my opinion that Julia Ali wrote the questioned writing on Item 1. (Identification) It is probable that Natalie Braxton-Porter did not write the questioned writing on Item 1. The non-original nature and limited amount of writing submitted for comparison hindered the examination and precludes a more definitive result. (Probably did not)
T7HLND-5245	We are of view that: Natalie Braxton-Porter neither wrote nor signed the questioned Suicide Note. Julia Ali wrote and signed the questioned Suicide Note.
T8QTTQ-5241	The writer of the K2 documents (K2a, K2b, K2c, and K2d) has been identified as the author and signer of the Q1 document. The writer of the K1 documents (K1a and K1b) has been excluded as a possible author of the Q1 note or signature. The author of the K1a and K1b documents did not write the Q1 note or signature.
TF4PVC-5245	In accordance with accepted methodology and following industry-wide standards in the field of Forensic Document Examination, it is my professional opinion, within scientific certainty, that Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1a-b), did not write or sign her name where it appears in the questioned suicide note (item Q1), she is eliminated. It is also my professional opinion that Julia Ali (K2a-d), handwrote the questioned suicide note (Q1) and signed the name, "Natalie Braxton-Porter" on the bottom of the note, she is identified.
TQ9RAV-5245	Results / Opinions / Interpretations: The items were assessed and examined based on methodology described in the Forensic Document Unit (FDU) Test Methods (unless otherwise noted). The methodology used included macroscopic, microscopic, and handwriting examinations. Handwriting Examination: Regarding Natalie Braxton-Porter: The known writing of Natalie Braxton-Porter consisted of two (2) pages of non-request known writing in Item K1, individually marked as Pages K1a and K1b. It is highly probable that Natalie Braxton-Porter was not the writer of the questioned suicide note in Item Q1. No request known writing was submitted, due to circumstances related to the investigation. This posed a limitation to the examination. Regarding Julia Ali: The known writing of Julia Ali consisted of three (3) pages of request known writing and one (1) page of non-request known writing in Item K2, individually marked as Pages K2a-K2d, respectively. Julia Ali was the writer of the questioned suicide note in Item Q1.
TRZVMP-5245	The questioned handwriting and signature in the questioned document (Suicide Note) Q1 was written quickly and without visible elements indicating intentional distortion. Questioned handwriting is middle degree of writing, middle font size, rounded shape, unexpressed upper and lower depressants, horizontal direction of writing above the line, written in almost vertical letters (without slope), almost disconnected lower-case handwriting, etc. The questioned signature is middle degree of writing, middle font size, slightly expressed depressants, horizontal direction of writing on the line, with a slope slightly to the right and with the connections between letters, etc. The questionable handwriting and signature of the Q1 text was compared with the undisputed handwriting of Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1) and Julia Ali (K2). The analyzes established similarities between the questioned handwriting and signature (Q1) and the handwriting of Julia Ali (K2). The similarities are reflected in general and individual characteristics. They have the same degree of writing, writing slope, font size, letter proportion, placement of text in space (written line), writing speed, etc. The similarities is also reflected in the way of writing the letters of letter parts and the connections between letters: „F“, „a“, „m“, „i“, „l“, „y“, „c“, „n“, „b“, „t“, „h“, „r“, „o“

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	„e“, „P“, „s“, „w“, „k“, „fo“, „ti“, „or“, „N“, „B“, „x“, „alie“, „rax“, „rter“, etc.
U92YU8-5241	Lab item #5 (Q1A- handwriting and Q1B- signature), Invoice #Q200642 was written by the author Julia Ali of the known writing samples Lab items #2-4 (K2a-K2d/Invoice #Q200642)
URWNZN-5245	Both the hand printed note on Q1, as well as the signature on Q1 can be identified as the writing of the K2 writer (Ali). Both observable evidence of non-genuineness with respect to the K1 writer (Braxton-Porter), as well as the identification of another writer justify an elimination of the K1 writer as having produced the Q1 questioned note and signature.
UWL86C-5241	Both the body of questioned writing and questioned signature on the suicide note were written by Julia Ali
UXFVM8-5245	The body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) in Q1 "SUICIDE NOTE" were written by Julia Ali (K2a, K2b, K2c, K2d). The questioned signature in Q1 "SUICIDE NOTE" was written by Julia Ali (K2a-K2b, K2c).
V77WBB-5245	Based upon the available evidence it is my professional opinion the body of the questioned suicide note, Q1, and the "Natalie Braxton-Porter" signature on the Q1 questioned suicide note were not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter. Based upon the available evidence it is my professional opinion that the body of the questioned suicide note, Q1, and the signature on the Q1 suicide note were written by Julia Ali.
V7T6KF-5241	MANUSCRIPTURAL UNIQUE PROVENANCE between the doubtful spellings (item Q1 (Suicide Note)) and the unquestioned spellings (item K2a, K2b, K2c, K2d) NO MANUSCRIPTURAL PROVENANCE between the doubtful spellings (item Q1 (Suicide Note)) and the unquestioned spellings (item K1a, K1b).
V9YK8Y-5241	3) Visual examination, comparison, and evaluation of the submitted handwriting resulted in the following findings: 3.1) The body of the questioned writing depicted on item Q1 was written by the author – Julia Ali of the K2 (a-d) handwriting samples. 3.2) The body of the questioned writing depicted on item Q1 was not written by the author – Natalie Braxton-Porter of the K1 (a,b) handwriting samples. 3.3) The "Natalie Braxton-Porter" signature entry depicted on item Q1 was written by the author – Julia Ali of the K2 (a-d) handwriting samples. 3.4) The "Natalie Braxton-Porter" signature entry depicted on item Q1 was not written by the author – Natalie Braxton-Porter of the K1 (a,b) handwriting samples.
VBQK8V-5245	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 extremely strong support for the proposition P2 that the questioned handwriting on Q1 was not written by the writer of the K1 specimens (attributed to Natalie Braxton-Porter) rather than for the alternative proposition P1 that it was written by this person. This is a level (9) conclusion. (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 Julia Ali) rather than for the alternative proposition P2 that it was not written by this person. This is a level (1) conclusion. Signature Conclusions (iii) I concluded that there is extremely strong support for the proposition P2 that the questioned signature in the name Natalie Braxton-Porter on Q1 was not written by the writer of the K1 specimens (attributed to Natalie Braxton-Porter) rather than for the alternative proposition P1 that it was written by this person. This is a level (9) conclusion. (iv) I concluded that there is strong support for the

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	proposition P1 that the questioned signature in the name Natalie Braxton-Porter on Q1 was written by the writer of the K2 specimens (attributed to Julia Ali) rather than for the alternative proposition P2 that it was not written by this person. This is a level (2) conclusion.
VRRMNY-5245	E. substantial incompatibility between the features of the questioned handwriting and the reference handwriting. A. Full compatibility between the features of the questioned handwriting and the reference handwriting. No inconsistencies observed.
VRUDTW-5241	The text of the note (Q1) and the signature on the suicide note was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter. The suicide note including signature was written by Julia Ali.
VTJQ89-5245	The suicide note(including the signature) was written by Julia Ali.
W8ZW4T-5245	Julia Ali, Item K2(a-d), has been identified as the writer of the questioned material appearing on Item Q1. Natalie Braxton-Porter, Item K1(a-b), has been eliminated as the writer of the questioned material appearing on Item Q1.
WDPJVT-5241	Handwriting- The questioned Q1 handwriting displays some similarities, dissimilarities and differences in writing features, when compared with the specimen K1 handwriting. No significant attention to the writing process was observed. The questioned Q1 handwriting displays similarities in writing features, when compared with the specimen K2 handwriting. No significant differences or attention to the writing process were observed. I have evaluated the quantity, quality, and complexity of the questioned Q1 and specimen K1 and K2 handwriting, and the similarities and differences observed. I have assessed the evidence against each of the propositions for each specimen writer. In my opinion, the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the writer of the specimen K2 handwriting wrote the questioned Q1 handwriting, over the alternative proposition that a writer other than the writer of the specimen K2 handwriting wrote the questioned Q1 handwriting (including specimen K1 writer). Signature- The questioned Q1 signature displays some similarities, dissimilarities and differences in writing features, when compared with the specimen K1 signatures. No significant attention to the writing process was observed. The questioned Q1 signature displays similarities in writing features, when compared with the specimen K2 signatures. No significant differences or attention to the writing process were observed. I have evaluated the quantity, quality, and complexity of the questioned Q1 and specimen K1 and K2 signatures, and the similarities, dissimilarities and differences observed. I have assessed the evidence against each of the propositions for each specimen writer. In my opinion, the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the writer of the specimen K2 signatures wrote the questioned Q1 signature, over the alternative proposition that a writer other than the writer of the specimen K2 signatures wrote the questioned Q1 signature (including specimen K1 writer).
WPKPNQ-5241	3.1 Handwriting comparison – Q1 vs K1 (Natalie Braxton-Porter) - The questioned handwriting in item Q1 was examined and compared with control handwriting in item K1 written by Natalie Braxton-Porter. The questioned handwriting and the control handwriting displayed discrepancies in writing features in terms of the design and writing movements of the English letters (l, u, o, s). Moreover, the connection of strokes of the word ‘for’ in the questioned handwriting in item Q1 was different as compared with control handwriting in item K1. In view of the above findings, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting on Q1 was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter who wrote the control handwriting on K1. 3.2 Handwriting comparison – Q1 vs K2 (Julia Ali) - The questioned handwriting in item Q1 was examined and compared with control handwriting in item K2 written by Julia Ali. The questioned handwriting and the control handwriting displayed similarities in writing features in terms of the structural details and writing movements of the English letters (a, b, e, f, o, r, s, v, y). Moreover, the connection of strokes of the words such as ‘for’ and ‘forgive’ in the questioned

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>handwriting in item Q1 were similar as compared with control handwriting in item K2. In view of the above findings, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting on Q1 was written by Julia Ali who wrote the control handwriting on K2.</p>
	<p>3.3 Signature comparison – Q1 vs K1 (Natalie Braxton-Porter) - The questioned signature on Q1 was examined and compared with the control signatures on K1 written by Natalie Braxton-Porter. The questioned signature displayed discrepancies in writing features in terms of the structural details, writing movements, slanting, connection of strokes in the English letters (B, N, P, o, r, x). In view of the above findings, I am of the opinion that the questioned signature on Q1 was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter who wrote the control signatures on K1.</p>
	<p>3.4 Signature comparison – Q1 vs K2 (Julia Ali) - The questioned signature on Q1 was examined and compared with the control signatures on K2 written by Julia Ali. The questioned signature and the control signatures displayed similarities in writing features in terms of the structural details and writing movements of the English letters (B, N, P, a, e, n, r, x). Moreover, similarities in connection of strokes in the English letters 'atalie', 'rax' and 'rter' were similar between the questioned signature and the control signatures. In view of the above findings, I am of the opinion that the questioned signature on Q1 was written by Julia Ali who wrote the control signatures on K2.</p>
WUC3E9-5245	<p>As a result of the investigation, it has been reached a conclusion that the handwriting in the suicide note does not match with the signature of Natalie Braxton-Porter and that the writing and signature belongs to Julia Ali.</p>
WWJ2ZM-5245	<p>[No Conclusions Reported.]</p>
WXVZXG-5245	<p>The results very strongly support the proposition that the writing was done/not done by....</p>
WY66B7-5241	<p>In my opinion the handwriting evidence very strongly supports the proposition that Julia Ali wrote the questioned handwriting and signature on item Q1. In my opinion the handwriting evidence very strongly supports the proposition that Natalie Braxton porter did not write the questioned handwriting and signature on item Q1.</p>
XBEVUT-5245	<p>In my opinion, the writer of the specimen material K2 produced the handwriting on Q1. In my opinion, there is qualified support for the proposition that the Q1 signature is not a genuine BRAXTON-PORTER signature. I am unable to comment on authorship. My opinion as to whether the Q1 signature was produced by K2 writer is inconclusive.</p>
XJ9Y3W-5241	<p>ELIMINATION: It was determined that the questioned writing on document Q-1 was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter, the purported writer of K-1 through K-10 (K1a and K1b), due to many dissimilarities of handwriting habit. IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that the questioned writing on document Q-1 was written by Julia Ali, the purported writer of K-11 through K-36 (K2a through K2d), due to many similarities of handwriting habit. ELIMINATION: It was determined that the questioned "Natalie Braxton-Porter" signature on document Q-1 was not written by Natalie Braxton-Porter, the purported writer of K-1 through K-10 (K1a and K1b), due to many dissimilarities of handwriting habit. IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that the questioned "Natalie Braxton-Porter" signature on document Q-1 was written by Julia Ali, the purported writer of documents K-11 through K-36 (K2a through K2d), due to similarities of handwriting habit.</p>
XQNPDG-5241	<p>Source Identification: It was determined that the questioned writing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by JULIA ALI, Item 3 (Item K2 a-d).</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
XUM29G-5241	HANDWRITING: Source Identification: It was determined that the questioned hand printing and signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) were prepared by Julia Ali, Item 3 (K2a-d).
XXTL2N-5245	The suicide note (Q1) does not bear the signature and handwriting of Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1a, K1b) it bears the signature and handwriting of Julia Ali (K2a, K2b, K2c, K2d).
YJLYCC-5241	Result 1: In the questioned manuscripts that make up the suicide note with the title "Family" written on a sheet of lined paper, page identified as Q1, the above with the exception of the handwriting (signature) visible at footnote reading "Natalie Braxton-Porter"; the general and individualizing scriptural characteristics unique to the manuscripts provided as elements of comparison in the name of Julia Ali, contained in the documents numbered as, K2a, K2b and K2d. Interpretation 1: By virtue of what is indicated in the previous result, it is interpreted that the manuscripts previously described, were made by the author of the elements of comparison provided on behalf of Julia Ali, identified as K2. Result 2: In the questioned manuscripts that read "Natalie Braxton-Porter" visible at the bottom of the suicide note with the title "Family" written on a sheet of lined paper, page identified as Q1; The general and individualizing scriptural characteristics were observed, one from the manuscripts provided as elements of comparison and which are described as: signatures made by Julia Ali, with the name of Natalie Braxton-Porter, identified as K2c, as well as dictated copies of Julia Ali, identified like K2a and K2b. Interpretation 2: By virtue of what is indicated in the previous result, it is interpreted that the questioned manuscripts (signature), previously described, were made by the author of the elements of comparison provided on behalf of Julia Ali, identified as K2.
YKZMK6-5245	First: The question handwriting wasn't written by Natalie Braxton-Porter. Second: The question handwriting was written by Julia Ali. Third: The question signature wasn't written by Natalie Braxton-Porter. Fourth: The question signature was written by Julia Ali.
YMLB9C-5245	Information provided was that K-2's exemplars were dictated. My understanding is that procedure did not include showing visual of the suicide note to subject during the dictation session. This understanding is strongly reflected in stated opinion.
YTPD6C-5245	The known writing (including signature) of K2 (Julia Ali) provides a reasonable insight into the normal variation in the writing compared with the Questioned writing (including signature), similarities were observed in the overall words design, proportions, letter connection(or, ton), and details of construction which can be excluded the questioned signature was written by someone other than Julia Ali. In other words, the differences between the Questioned writing (including signature) and known writing (including signature) K1 (Natalie Braxton-Porter) provide critical evidence such as the letter features of [k],[s]; initial stroke of letter [o] and writing formation. The conclusion is the Questioned writing (including signature) was not written by known writing (including signature) of K1 (Natalie Braxton-Porter) the Questioned writing (including signature) was written by known writing (including signature) of K2 (Julia Ali).
Z8R4MB-5241	The suicide note and signature with the name Natalie Braxton Porter located on the document, were written by Mrs. JULIA ALI
ZCXVKY-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
ZGV72T-5241	In our opinion, the handwriting (Q1) has been written by Julia Ali (K2). In our opinion, the signature (Q2) is false. It has been written by Julia Ali
ZHM7ZP-5241	It is my opinion that: 1. The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the handwritten entries on the questioned document, item 1, were not written by the writer of the BRAXTON-PORTER handwriting specimens, items 2 to 3. 2. The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the handwritten entries on the questioned document, item 1, were written by the writer of the ALI handwriting specimens, items 4 to 7. 3. The evidence

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	<p>provides very strong support for the proposition that the signature on the questioned document, item 1, was not written by the writer of the BRAXTON-PORTER signature specimens, items 2 & 3. 4. The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the signature on the questioned document, item 1, was written by the writer of the ALI handwriting specimens, items 4 to 7.</p>
ZHN8TP- 5245	<p>For handwriting: 1) The questioned handwriting that appear in the suicide note, isn't corresponds with Natalie Braxton-Porter's handwriting in course of business writing. 2) The questioned handwriting that appear in the suicide note, is corresponds with Julia Ali's handwriting in dictated exemplars and course of business writing. For signature: 1) The questioned signature that appear in the suicide note, isn't the same graphic origin with Natalie Braxton-Porter's signature in course of business writing. 2) The questions signature that appear in the suicide note, is the same graphic origin with Julia Ali's dictated exemplars and course of business writing.</p>
ZLML67- 5245	<p>The questioned suicide note (Q1), consisting of handprinted entries and a signature, was written by the author of the handwriting submitted as known of Julia Ali (K2). The author of the writing submitted as known of Natalie Braxton-Porter (K1) did not write the questioned suicide note (Q1).</p>
ZYE8KP- 5245	<p>Handwriting: Significant similarities in the formation and relative positioning of letters were observed in the handwritten text between Q1 and K2, while significant differences in the same were observed in between Q1 and K1. It was concluded that the writer of the specimen handwriting in K2 wrote the questioned handwriting in Q1, while the writer of the specimen handwriting in K1 did not write the questioned handwriting in Q1. Signature: Significant differences in the formation, slant, and relative alignment of letters were observed in the signature "Natalie Braxton-Porter" between Q1 and K1. It was concluded that it was highly unlikely that the writer of the specimen signatures in K1 wrote the questioned signature in Q1. Significant similarities in the formation and relative alignment of letters were observed in the signature "Natalie Braxton-Porter" between Q1 and K2. It was concluded that the writer of the specimen signatures in K2 wrote the questioned signature in Q1.</p>

Additional Comments

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
283828- 5241	Indentations were observed in the images of some of the exhibits, particularly those on the blue substrate seen in K1a and K2d. The text could not be deciphered. If the original documents became available, ESDA examinations of all exhibits would be suggested in order to rule out any possibility of tracing or other manipulation.
2JYA4F- 5245	It appears to me that K2 was allowed to view the questioned document when providing the requested samples. Formatting and margins match too closely to be coincidental.
3MUF9K- 5245	CONCLUSIONS SIGNATURE: The analysis begins without instruments, first analyzing the signature of the base documents, and then the signature of the questioned documents, from left to right, from top to bottom, front and back, observing some of the characteristics such as beginnings, links, direction, speed, endings, etc. Afterwards, the analysis begins with optical instruments and specialized equipment to magnify the details, starting with the signature of the base documents for comparison, and then the signature of the questioned documents, from left to right, from top to bottom, front and back, confirming, discovering and discarding some of the aforementioned characteristics. With the study established and carried out on the questioned documents and comparison basis, it is established that the signature contained in the document indicated as questioned, corresponds to the signature presented indicated as comparison basis of Julia Ali, due to the existence of more similarities than differences. Translated with www.DeepL.com/Translator (free version)
44ZZGL- 5245	Handwriting examination: The examination was limited by the amount of handwriting available in the questioned document Q1 and known material K1a, b from Natalie BRAXTON-PORTER. In each of the writings, many characters are absent, and others are present only once or twice. Signature examination Only four known signatures of Natalie BRAXTON-PORTER (K1) were supplied for the examination, which may not represent the full range of variation of the writer's normal signing behaviour. The signatures provided by Julia ALI (K2) were not written as the normal signing behaviour of the writer in their own name, but in the name of the of another person in Q1. Therefore, treated somewhat like a handwriting examination. The questioned signature Q1 and known signatures K1 and K2 were non-original in nature. I have taken the reproductions of the non-original documents to be true and accurate representations of the original document that they depict.
47ZAFG- 5245	To determine the conclusions, two methods of analysis were carried out; Firstly, the analysis method for writings was used to determine who signed the note. Consequently, the signature analysis method was used to determine who signed the note.
69PZ2L- 5245	Unless we have missed anything, the trial was far too simple.
794NX8- 5241	The identification of an individual as the author of questioned writing is based upon a finding by the examiner of class and individual characteristics sufficient in number and force for the examiner to base an opinion of identity to a reasonable degree of certainty. Such findings were found in this case with regards to the writings submitted by K2.
7C6MLR- 5241	The examination was affected by the amount of known writing submitted for comparison and the generic quality of the writing, questioned and known. It should be noted that the Technical Review was conducted by [Name], sole proprietor of [Laboratory].
7YTMC7- 5245	The following methods were used: Handwriting analysis method, Signature analysis method. The following equipment was used: Loupes, magnifying glasses and specialized equipment (optical).
9GMY3J- 5241	work with non-original documents

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
9UTTGW- 5241	For this comparison, the signature and handwriting analysis method was used.
9V4W6Y- 5245	The quantity of K1 material was not optimum.
A2ML8R- 5245	It should be noted that, the signature as of NATALIE BRAXTON PORTER, Q1, presents the structure, morphology and graphic routes similar to the authentic signatures of Mrs. JULIA ALI K2a-K2d., giving rise to be part of her calligraphic gesture. For the comparative technical analyses, the morphostructural characteristics and the dynamics of the strokes that make up the doubtful and undoubted spellings were taken into account, in terms of initiations and endings, flexion and extension movements, spontaneity, inclination, proportionality, general configuration, construction of letters, links, rhythm, rotation and finish of the strokes. It is important to state that the documents sent for study correspond to photostatic impressions, material that is not considered technically suitable for this type of analysis, however, they are able to detect specific production characteristics that allow establishing Graphic Identity and Not Graphic Identity. Even if they had sent the documents in original, these are the results obtained.
ABWQH- 5245	There are tear patterns depicted in the image of the note in Q1 which may be suitable for a physical match examination. If the original note depicted in Q1 and a notebook or sheets of paper consistent to the note in Q1 is recovered in the investigation, please contact the laboratory to discuss further examinations.
AN376T- 5245	The submission of ten to fifteen comparable known writing samples, containing similar words, letters and signatures as within the questioned entries, of Natalie Braxton-Porter may provide the basis for additional conclusions.
AYLJDC- 5241	Basis For Examinations: Examinations, analysis, and comparisons were performed using instruments, equipment and procedures that are generally accepted in the field of forensic document examination. As part of my examinations, I also rely, in part, on numerous published standards distributed by the Scientific Working Group for Forensic Document Examiners (SWGDOC). The SWGDOC standards can be found at http://www.swgdoc.org/index.php/standards/published-standards .
BNHNU8- 5241	WERE USED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS INSTRUMENTAL TEST OF WIDE VISUAL FIELD
CAVTX8- 5245	Had the original Q1 been available for examination, I would have carried out an ESDA examination for indentations. I would also have carried out a VSC examination of the inks used to complete the note and the signature. I have assumed that the author of K2a - K2d was not shown the original Q1 before providing the writing samples.
CVBDU9- 5245	Given the differences from one writer and the similarities to the other writer, it seems sensible in this case to treat the questioned handwriting and signature together albeit they cannot be directly compared with each other. If only the signature had been present the evidence eliminating K1 or identifying K2 might be slightly weaker. It is rare to provide a conclusive opinion but this is one of the few cases where the evidence supports such a conclusion - by combining the handwriting/signature AND considering the two potential writers.
CW73WN- 5245	The images that used for the examination are assumed to be true and accurate reproduction of their original documents.
DFVENU- 5241	The examination was based on comparison of handwriting characteristics such as line quality, formation of letters, spacing and connection strokes between the questioned handwriting/ questioned signature and the specimen handwriting/ specimen signature respectively.
EBYCXZ- 5245	The conclusion "probably did write" is a qualified opinion that means there is more evidence for, than against, the known writer. There are similarities between the handwriting characteristics

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
	<p>present in the questioned and known writings, but there is a limitation(s) that precludes a higher degree of confidence. The conclusion "probably did not write" is a qualified opinion that means there is more evidence against, than for, the known writer. There are dissimilarities between the handwriting characteristics present in the questioned and known writings, but there is a limitation(s) that precludes a higher degree of confidence. Item 001 Course of business writing for Natalie Braxton-Porter (Agency Item #: K1a), Item 002 Course of business writing for Natalie Braxton-Porter (Agency Item #: K1b), Item 003 Dictated exemplars for Julia Ali (Agency Item #: K2a), Item 004 Dictated exemplars for Julia Ali (Agency Item #: K2b), Item 005 Requested signatures for Julia Ali, in the name of Natalie Braxton-Porter (collected separately and digitally assembled) (Agency Item #: K2c), Item 006 Course of business writing for Julia Ali (Agency Item #: K2d), Item 007 Suicide Note (Agency Item #: Q1).</p>
EG4B9P- 5241	<p>Handwriting K1. Differences in letter form/design were observed between the known handwriting on K1 and the questioned handwriting on Q1. K2. Significant similarities in proportions, size, slant, style, spacing, baseline alignment, and letter form/design were observed between the known handwriting on K2 and the questioned handwriting on Q1. There were no fundamental differences. Signature K1. Differences in pictorial design and fluency of execution were observed between the known signature on K1 and the questioned signature on Q1. K2. Significant similarities in pictorial design, size, and fluency of execution were observed between the known signatures on K2 and the questioned signature on Q1. There were no fundamental differences.</p>
EVQDW9- 5241	<p>*Practical Certainty - Since it is not possible to collect and examine samples of everyone's handwriting it is not possible to make an identification with absolute certainty. However, all scientific research to date and the continuous inability to disprove the principle that no two people share the same combination of handwriting habits have demonstrated that even without a numerical threshold, handwriting examiners can reliably make identifications.</p>
FDNY3M- 5241	<p>Scientific method taking into account the phases of: observation, indication or signaling of the distinctive characters (individualizing characteristics), confrontation and identity judgments.</p>
FWEAM2- 5241	<p>The comparative inspection and analysis was carried out through the use of optical magnification instruments (10x magnifying glass) to the writings and signature found in the suicide note document identified as Q1, compared to the unquestionable writings K2a-d, taking into account the aspects and graphonomic sub-aspects, where it was found that the graphisms under study presented coincident graphonomic aspects</p>
HQXPLJ- 5245	<p>As it is an aptitude test, both doubtful and unquestionable documentation is studied as if it were available in original. The instruments used are those that are regularly used in this type of study, despite the fact that they were not used because the images are digitized.</p>
JMXRL7- 5245	<p>It was noted that there appear to be indentations of on some of the known specimens; however, these were unable to be examined from the submitted electronic copies.</p>
K4X4RL- 5245	<p>The submission of the original document represented by Exhibit Q1 may provide the basis for additional conclusions.</p>
K8JRFR- 5245	<p>1. There are differences in characteristics, habits and elements that make up the formation of strokes, size, connection, beginning and ending strokes when compare the handwriting of the identified document Q1 with identification documents K1a and K1b. 2. There are similarities in the characteristics, habits and elements that make up the size of letters, beginning and ending strokes, fluidity, formation of letters when comparing the writing of the identified document Q1 with the writings of the identified documents K2a, K2b and K2d. 3. There are differences in the individual characteristics, habits and elements that make up the connection, strokes, size, proportion, writing ability, formation of letters, beginning and ending strokes, inclination, fluidity when comparing the signature of the identified document Q1 with documents identified K1a and K1b. 4. There are similarities in the characteristics, habits and elements that make up the formation of letters, beginning and ending strokes, relation to the baseline, inclination, size,</p>

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
	proportion when comparing the signature of the identified document Q1 with the identified documents K2a to K2c.
L74Q9J- 5241	Disclaimer -- It is important to note that all opinions expressed in a report are based upon relevant background information and specific exhibits provided to the examiner, as well as the proposition set utilized in the evaluation and as laid out in the report. Should the information, exhibit material, or propositions change, the opinion may also change. In particular, if different propositions are of interest, please contact the examiner to discuss the matter further. Also note that this evaluation process is based upon a personal assessment by the examiner of the relevant probabilities that apply in a given situation with that assessment deriving from the examiner's training, ongoing professional development, and experience, including proficiency testing of related skills.
LEF383- 5245	The conclusion scale we use is a nine level scale: +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4
NMKND9- 5241	Due to a lack of detail and possible misinterpretation of foreign matter reflected in copies, it is usually our policy not to base positive identification or elimination of a subject by handwriting comparison on any type of reproduction. High resolution copies of handwriting evidence documents, however, can be used to report qualified analysis results which are admissible in court. Furthermore, irrespective of the degree to which a signature may appear to be genuine, an image of a signature appearing on a copy of an official document does not demonstrate that the original of that signature was written on the original document, unless and until the original document is submitted for forensic examination. The reason is any document and signature can be merged by photocopy or digital techniques to produce a copy that appears to be an image of a signed document. Should the original documents be obtained, they can be submitted, along with the known writing from all subjects for additional comparisons. 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. Many of the letters and letter combinations in the questioned writing were not present for comparison in the known writing you submitted. It might be useful to collect extended known writing attributed to all subjects that has been written in the normal course of business, contemporaneous to the questioned document. This may include correspondence written by the subjects. Moreover, any additional known signatures attributed to Natalie Braxton-Porter, can be submitted for comparison. These may include any signatures written in the normal course of business, contemporaneous to the time of offense.
NNEFA2- 5241	Having submitted the document marked with Q1, compared with the replicas marked with K2a and K2b, it is observed that they maintain the same margins (left and right), the same number of words on the line, spaces between words, so the points coincide. extrinsic and intrinsic reference.
NP94RW- 5245	When carrying out the analysis and study of all the elements provided, both questioned as a basis for comparison, using the signature and writing methods, it was possible to observe that there are more correspondences in the characteristics and graphic gestures of the suicide note identified as "Q1" with the graphic features and gestures of Julia Ali's writing and signatures, that is, the questioned writing and signature "Q1" if it was made by Julia Ali.
Q4DXUE- 5245	The writing and signature of Natalie Braxton was analyzed and her participation in its realization was ruled out; Julia Ali's writing and signature were analyzed, with the result that it was this person who wrote and signed the suicide note.
QV99KD- 5245	The development of the report is subject to the qualities found in the documents submitted for study, since they are in a digital file and not in a physical one.
RZDEL2- 5245	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

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	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. Probably did not: the evidence points rather strongly against the questioned and known writings having been written by the same individual (...) the evidence is not quite up to the “virtually certain” range.
TF4PVC-5245	Multiple fundamental differences exist between the questioned writing and signature on item Q1 and the uncontested writing and signatures attributed to Natalie Braxton-Porter from among the uncontested normal course of business documents submitted (K1a-b). The request and normal course of business writing attributed to Julia Ali show consistent spacing (inter and intra), slant, proportions, letter formations, and letter combinations with the questioned writing appearing on item Q1. In addition, no significant differences were noted between the two sets of writing.
TQ9RAV-5245	Remarks: The questioned suicide note in Item Q1 is suitable for a physical match examination. Should white, lined paper or a notebook containing white, lined paper with similar class characteristics be collected, submit the new item(s), as well as the questioned suicide note in Item Q1 to the laboratory for further comparison. Images of Items Q1, K1, and K2 have been retained by the FDU. Definition of the Handwriting Opinions: The opinion identification means the evidence contained in the handwriting was in agreement in the individualizing characteristics and there were no significant, inexplicable differences between the questioned and known writings; therefore, the writings had common authorship. The opinion highly probable not means the evidence contained in the handwriting was very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality was missing so an elimination was not in order. However, the examiner was virtually certain the questioned and known writings were not written by the same individual.
U92YU8-5241	Lab item #5 (Q1A- handwriting and Q1B- signature), Invoice #Q200642 was not written by the author Natalie Braxton-Porter of the known writing samples Laboratory item #1 (K1a-K1b/Invoice #Q200642)
URWZN-5245	I adhere to current SWGDOC (and the replacement ANSI/ASB, where applicable) standards. In any instance where I am reporting based on reproductions (regardless of quality) my conclusion would be tempered to reflect that limiting factor. I am providing conclusion terminology which does not reflect such a limiting factor, as the instructions specifically indicated that I should assume originals (writing media on paper) were provided for the purpose of this test. If I were to temper conclusion terminology due to the actual limiting factor (submission of digital non-originals), my identification and elimination terms would have been reported as highly probable genuine and highly probable non-genuine (an expression of virtual certainty) to provide appropriate tempering.
UXFVM8-5245	Although the graphic gesture of Mrs. Julia Ali shows variability in different graphological aspects, its individualizing characteristics allow us to establish graphic identity with the handwriting in the suicide note and rule out the participation of Mrs. Natalie Braxton Porter.
V9YK8Y-5241	4) Additional Comments: 4.1) The above findings are demonstrable through the use of enlarged illustrative charts. If testimony is anticipated, please return all items and allow at least three weeks for the necessary preparation. 4.2) All submitted items are being returned to the submitting Agency.
VBQK8V-5245	4. 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 document, 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. The original writing pad from which the paper of Q1 came (assuming it was from a pad) should be sought,

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
Z8R4MB- 5241	along with any other sheets of paper from that pad, for potential examination. The conclusion is supported by the coincidences in the type of writing, inclination, height of short signs, location in space, descending row box of words such as "Family", "here", "Nataly", "terrible", "closest ", among other. Also in the beginning of letters "N", "B" and links in the surname "Braxton" and in the word "Forgive" letters "Fo".
ZHM7ZP- 5241	As with all CTS handwriting examinations, for the purposes of this examination it is assumed that all non-original documents are true and accurate representations of the original documents.

-End of Report-
(Appendix may follow)

Test No. 22-5241: Handwriting Examination

DATA MUST BE SUBMITTED BY **Nov. 28, 2022, 11:59 p.m. EST** TO BE INCLUDED IN THE REPORT

Participant Code: U1234D

WebCode: BWBQAA

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 suspected suicide. The victim's husband found her dead with an apparent suicide note next to her body. The husband claims there is no way the victim would have committed suicide. Her husband believes that another individual is responsible for her death. Police are investigating the victim's former friend, Julia Ali. The known writing from the victim consists only of course of business writing, whereas the known writing for Julia Ali consists of both course of business writing and dictated exemplars of the suicide note. Please examine the questioned suicide note to determine which, if either, of the individuals contributed the handprinting and/or signature in the questioned document.

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: Course of business writing for Natalie Braxton-Porter

Item K2a-b: Dictated exemplars for Julia Ali

Item K2c: Requested signatures for Julia Ali, in the name of Natalie Braxton-Porter (collected separately and digitally assembled)

Item K2d: Course of business writing for Julia Ali

Item Q1: Suicide Note

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 the suicide note?

K1 (Natalie Braxton-Porter)	K2 (Julia Ali)
Q1 (suicide note) <input type="text"/>	Q1 (suicide note) <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 the suicide note?

K1 (Natalie Braxton-Porter)	K2 (Julia Ali)
Q1 (suicide note) <input type="text"/>	Q1 (suicide note) <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)