Collaborative Testing Services, Inc
FORENSIC TESTING PROGRAM

P.O. Box 650820
Sterling, VA 20165-0820
e-mail: forensics@cts-interlab.com
Telephone: +1-571-434-1925
Web site: www.cts-forensics.com

Handwriting Examination
Test No. 23-5241/5 Summary Report

Each sample set contained either photographs or digital images of a robbery note (Q1) and known writings provided by two individuals (K1, K2). Participants were requested to examine these items and report their findings. Data were returned from 218 participants: 119 for 23-5241, and 99 for 23-5245 and are compiled into the following tables:

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 seven photographs, in either a physically printed format or digitally downloadable, of a robbery note (Q1) and known writings provided by two individuals (K1a-c, K2a-c). The known writings included course of business writings, and dictated exemplars for Reyna Verlice (K1) and Nicole Harrison (K2). Participants were asked to determine if either of the two individuals contributed to the handprinted robbery note in the questioned item.

SAMPLE PREPARATION: During production of the dictated known writing, both writers were instructed broadly on formatting in order to maintain general uniformity of appearance. The questioned document was selected from several versions that were dictated to the individuals by a moderator.

The handprinted robbery note (Q1) was produced by the K2 writer, Nicole Harrison. Both the K1 and K2 writers were female and right-handed.

VERIFICATION: All predistribution laboratories stated that the Q1 handprinted text was not produced by the K1 writer. Three of the four predistribution laboratories stated that the Q1 handprinted text was produced by the K2 writer. The fourth laboratory stated that Q1 was probably not produced by the K2 writer. After further review, it was decided that the test would be released as-is.

SAMPLE ASSEMBLY: Once verification was complete and sample preparation was done, each photo set was packaged and sealed. Digitally downloadable material was zipped and uploaded to the CTS Portal.

Summary Comments

This test was designed to provide participants with a handprinted text identification challenge involving a robbery note. Each sample set contained either photographs or digital images of the robbery note (Q1), as well as known writings provided by two individuals, Reyna Verlice (K1) and Nicole Harrison (K2). Participants were provided with multiple dictated exemplars of the robbery note, 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 in the robbery note. The K2 writer produced the handprinted text on Q1 (Refer to Manufacturer's Information for preparation details).

In Table 1, the question posed to participants was: "To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the body of questioned writing on the robbery note?" a breakdown of responses is as follows. Of the 218 responding participants, a total of 208 participants (95%) identified the K2 writer (reported "A" or "B") as the source of the handprinted text on Q1. Of those 208, 197 participants (90%) also eliminated the K1 writer (reported "D" or "E") as the source of the handprinted text on Q1, and the remaining 11 provided no response in regard to the K1 writer.

For the 10 participants who did not identify the K2 writer as the source of the handprinted text on Q1, seven eliminated the K1 writer (reported "D" or "E") as the source of the handprinted text on Q1 and for the K2 writer (reported "C"), many of these stated that the exemplars for writer K2 were limited in quality and quantity for a more conclusive determination. Two participants eliminated both the K1 writer and the K2 writer (reported "D" or "E") as sources of the handprinted text on Q1. One participant was inconclusive regarding any contribution (reported "C") by either writer K1 or K2.

Many participants qualified their responses by stating one or more of the following opinions: the exemplar materials were limited in quantity and quality; the handwriting of the known writers was of a common style and not highly individualized; the robbery note was brief and not complex.

Examination Results

To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the body of questioned writing on the robbery note?

TABLE 1- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1 K1	K2	WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1 K1	K2
2JMGNA-5241	D	B	4EJP42-5245	D	B
2MDZF7-5245	E	A	4G67LM-5245	D	C
2NV6X6-5245	D	B	4HYWR2-5245	D	B
2RD3RM-5245	E	A	4JCNKH-5245	E	A
2UZLTK-5241	E	A	669MH2-5245	D	B
2Y8G68-5241	E	A	6CA243-5241	E	A
3AECBY-5241	E	A	6Q9NV4-5245	E	A
3CXFJG-5241	D	B	6VRJZW-5241	E	A
3LLEAL-5241	E	A	747CZ4-5241	E	A
3MUDJA-5245	E	A	7E9LK8-5241	E	A
3NYQEX-5245	E	A	7F9DZ3-5241	E	A
3RBWLC-5245	D	B	7RDVB3-5245	D	A
3YAE2N-5245	E	A	7RMDXW-5245	E	A
43766E-5245	E	A	7TRZ8E-5241		A
49ETHG-5241		A	7YZLYX-5241	E	A
49R846-5241	E	A	7Z9XDD-5245	E	A
4A7P8B-5241		A			

TABLE 1- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1 K1	K2	WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1 K1	K2
83T3PH-5241	E	A	9YDU2H-5241	E	A
87C23C-5245	E	A	9ZAADU-5245	E	A
87D4J4-5241	D	B	A6TURE-5245	D	B
8B6YR3-5241	D	B	AK77K9-5245	D	B
8BAE64-5241	E	C	AUD6VU-5245	E	A
8DAXG3-5245	E	B	AXAQKC-5241	D	B
8E8ZUL-5241	D	B	BEGAVA-5245	E	A
8QLYL9-5245	E	A	BF97K3-5241		A
8T6BZ4-5245	E	C	BHFLR9-5241	E	A
96DDY8-5245	D	B	BHFLUU-5245	E	A
98H2GH-5241	E	B	BK4ZLQ-5241	E	A
98UDKW-5241		A	BNKAMV-5245	E	A
9CY7B7-5241	E	A	BXNDWY-5245	D	B
9DQ3ZZ-5241	E	A	C4BP7L-5241	E	A
9HGLV4-5241	E	A	C894VW-5241	E	A
9KQPPE-5241	E	A	CDC8JA-5241	E	A
9VDJ6H-5241	D	B	CDGMWB-5241	D	B
9W8ABW-5245	D	A	CGNRXQ-5241	E	A

TABLE 1- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1 K1	K2	WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1 K1	K2
CJ4GT9-5241	E	A	F8HCB2-5245	E	A
DB6ARE-5245	D	B	FG76LX-5241		A
DBPNHC-5245	D	A	FGPRGA-5241	D	B
DDAPDY-5241	E	A	FPH6G9-5245	E	C
DEMA69-5241	E	A	FRPGZV-5241	E	A
DGVJZQ-5241	E	A	FWGVGQ-5245		A
DPM3EY-5245	E	A	GHCW7Y-5241	E	A
DUKG4A-5245	D	B	GMERHM-5245	E	A
DUZMKK-5241	E	A	GML7FF-5241	E	A
DW6HXW-5245	E	A	GMRH3C-5245	D	B
E43KLU-5241	E	A	GQC8MP-5245	E	A
E8Y932-5245	D	D	GU6FMP-5241	E	A
EAQ8GY-5241	D	B	GU7B7V-5245	D	B
EFEWTW-5241	E	A	H24DTR-5241	E	A
EFVTKV-5245	E	A	H6NZUT-5245	E	A
EJEY6C-5241	E	A	HADUGR-5245	D	B
EYBZWR-5241	E	A	HAFCN4-5241	E	A
F2BNWZ-5241	E	A	HDC6DR-5245	E	A

TABLE 1- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1 K1	K2	WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1 K1	K2
HPAZX3-5245	D	B	L78HWN-5245	E	A
HWDY9R-5241	E	A	L9JZKE-5241	E	A
HYUFDP-5241	E	A	LGPYPU-5241	E	A
HYWXK2-5245	E	A	LK78DU-5245	D	B
JH9493-5241	E	A	LKNDDK-5245	E	A
JKABQT-5241	E	A	LZ2P3R-5241		A
JKCVH3-5241	E	A	M4TBAL-5241	E	A
K2HJDF-5245	E	A	M4WXQY-5241	D	B
KDVLRL-5241		A	MD8ZCZ-5245	D	A
KECHLL-5241	E	A	MHFMLV-5241	E	A
KFWMU4-5245	D	B	MR3JMW-5245	E	B
KRQ4J6-5241	E	A	MTFX9K-5241	E	A
KT3RWP-5245	E	A	MWY7H6-5241	E	B
KUDMK3-5245	D	B	MXTWNK-5245	E	A
KUH3W3-5241	E	A	N4RX44-5245	E	A
KXDT2T-5241	D	B	N676MZ-5241	D	B
KXGDT3-5241	E	A	NBWKHE-5245	E	A
KZM3TQ-5241	E	A	NM6GXM-5241	E	A

TABLE 1- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1 K1	K2	WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1 K1	K2
NQ4K4N-5241	E	A	QXXM6Q-5241	E	A
NR27JZ-5245	D	B	R374DE-5245	E	A
NXWLUH-5241	E	A	R9AAQV-5245	E	A
P3DVTP-5241	D	B	RFQR3H-5245	D	B
P8R9Y4-5245	E	A	RWYY2K-5241	E	A
PAAFBK-5241	E	A	RXFYLB-5241	E	A
PAW2PW-5241	E	A	T9V38Z-5241	E	A
PDD96J-5245	D	B	TG4W2T-5245	E	C
PNEPZF-5245	E	A	TLER2V-5245	E	A
PNFJJL-5241	E	A	TPC9EP-5241	E	A
PTVWQF-5241	E	A	TWDLET-5245	D	B
PX2MRK-5241	E	A	TZC7TC-5245	E	A
PYAZ9M-5245	E	A	TZWMAF-5245	E	A
QCED8Y-5245	D	B	U24EKT-5245	D	B
QFHD4P-5241	E	A	U24EME-5241	D	B
QFYE3K-5241	E	A	UA3K6B-5241	E	A
QLLDGZ-5245	C	C	UAFEE4-5245	D	B
QUXC9Q-5245	E	C	UAGD9C-5241	E	A

TABLE 1- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1 K1	K2	WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1 K1	K2
UDGN6C-5245	E	A	WR7BNA-5245	E	A
UDJAZT-5241	E	A	WVWBE7-5241	E	A
UYZJ2Q-5245	E	B	X8XJ8T-5245	E	A
UZTFQK-5241		A	XAQEV3-5241	E	A
V22UPD-5241	E	A	XQDT8U-5245	E	A
VBAGLK-5241	E	A	XU9VNE-5245	E	A
VCGYKF-5241	E	A	XUBDVQ-5245	E	A
VF2LKF-5241	D	B	XV9L4A-5241	E	A
VGW89F-5241	D	B	XY4DC8-5241	E	A
VPRAAQ-5241	E	A	Y6B2P9-5241		A
VQVCQF-5241	E	B	Y6B783-5241	E	A
W3QVUR-5245	E	A	YBUP3B-5245	E	A
W9EFYT-5241	E	D	YC89XF-5241	E	A
WBXGUE-5245	E	B	YHB32A-5245	E	A
WGC88M-5245	D	B	YHZ7Y6-5241	E	A
WJV939-5245	E	A	YLCB7J-5245	E	C
WJYR9K-5241	E	A	YPZHVM-5245	E	A
WKQMXE-5241	E	A	YYKU6E-5245	E	A

TABLE 1- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1 K1	Handwriting on Q1 K2	WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1 K1	Handwriting on Q1 K2
Z4BNEK-5241	E	A			
ZH9VDM-5241	E	A			
ZMN32L-5245	E	A			
ZWZ6L3-5245	E	A			
ZZCAUG-5245	E	B			

Response Summary - Handwriting on Q1

Total Participants: **218**

To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the body of questioned writing on the robbery note?

Response	Handwriting on Q1 K1	Handwriting on Q1 K2
A	0	157
B	0	51
C	1	8
D	49	2
E	157	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
2JMGNA-5241	Methods: Visual examination and comparison of the submitted items using a hand lens and a microscope revealed the following: Questioned to Known Handwriting Comparisons: Support for Same Source- Q1 was probably written by the writer of the samples in item K2. This is based on substantial similarities between the questioned and known writing. Support for Different Source- Q1 was probably not written by the writer of the samples in item K1. This is based on substantial differences between the questioned and known writing. Examination Limitations: This examination was limited by the amount of comparable sample. Requested Items: Please, submit additional requested and non-requested print and cursive samples from the writers of items K1 and K2. Remarks: All items are available for return.
2MDZF7-5245	The questioned handwriting in the questioned document (Robbery Note) Q1 was written quickly and without visible elements indicating intentional distortion. Questioned handwriting is midle degree of writing, midle font size, rounded shape, unexpressed upper and lower depassants, horizontal direction of writing above the line, right slant of writing, etc. The questionable handwriting of the Q1 text was compared with the undisputed handwriting of Reyna Verlice (K1) and Nicole Harrison (K2). The analyzes established similarities between the questioned handwriting (Q1) and the handwriting of Nicole Harrison (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: „P“, „u“, „t“, „a“, „l“, „t“, „h“, „g“, „d“, „n“, „h“, „r“, „c“ „s“, „ut“, „the“, „an“, „on“, „rt“, „po“, etc.
2NV6X6-5245	Nicole Harrison, the writer of K2a-c, may have prepared the questioned writings appearing in Q1.
2RD3RM-5245	The K1 writer has been eliminated as the writer of the Q1 handprinting. An opinion of "elimination" is a definitive conclusion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents (Q1, K1, and K2) provide very strong evidence supporting non-authorship. The K2 writer has been 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 documents provide very strong evidence supporting common authorship.
2UZLTK-5241	The robbery note (Q1) was written by "NICOLE HARRISON" and was not written by "REYNA INSISTS".
2Y8G68-5241	- The item Q1 shows no signs of forgery. There are many converging points between Q1 and the K2 items and also no diverging points that cannot be explained. - The item Q1 differs from the K1 items both in general and in particular. Indeed, in the K1 writings, there is a non-existent margin, a more dilated writing and the movement is opposite to the questioned writing. There are also slightly less important spaces between words.
3AECBY-5241	1. The writer of the specimen handwriting marked K2 wrote the disputed writing marked Q1. 2. The writer of the specimen handwriting marked K1 did not write the disputed handwriting marked Q1.
3CXFJG-5241	An impartial forensic examination involves the consideration of alternative propositions. For this examination I have considered the following propositions, separately for each specimen writer: P1 The writer of the specimen material wrote the questioned material. P2 A writer other than the writer of the specimen material wrote the questioned material. Considering each specimen writer separately, I have compared the features observed in the questioned handwriting to the features observed in the specimen writing. I have evaluated the quantity, quality and complexity of the questioned handwriting and the specimen writing, and the similarities and/or dissimilarities observed between them, against each of the propositions. Based on the evaluation of the evidence, in my opinion, the evidence provides moderate support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting on Q1 was written by a writer other than the K1 writer, over the alternative. Based on the evaluation of the evidence, in my opinion, the evidence

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	provides strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting on Q1 was written by the K2 writer, over the alternative.
3LLEAL-5241	It was determined that Document Q-1 was written by Nicole Harrison, the writer of (K2a, K2b and K2c), due to similarities of handwriting habit.
3MUDJA-5245	a.- The questioned writing that appears in questioned document Q1, does not correspond to the basis of comparison of Reyna Vertice. b.- The questioned writing that appears in questioned document Q1, it does correspond with the general and particular graphic elements with the basis of comparison of Nicole Harrison.
3NYQEX-5245	2.1 I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K2A-C"; 2.2 I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K1A-C";
3RBWLC-5245	In my opinion my findings provide strong support for the proposition that Q1 was written by some person other than Reyna Verlice. In my opinion my findings provide very strong support for the proposition that Q1 was written by Nicole Harrison rather than by some other person.
3YAE2N-5245	1. The manuscripts present on the sheet identified as Q1 have no graphic identity with the genuine manuscripts of Mrs. Reina Verlice. 2. The manuscripts present on the sheet identified as Q1 have graphic identity with the genuine manuscripts of Mrs. Nicole Harrison.
43766E-5245	Findings strongly support the proposition that the Q1 Robbery Note and K2 was written by the same person. There are many important similarities, no important differences, no limitations to the examination. Our expert opinion is that Q1 Robbery Note and K2 were written by the same person. According to the information on K2 that we received with the claim for the examination, Q1 was written by Nicole Harrison.
49ETHG-5241	Q1 was written by Nicole Harrison
49R846-5241	Based on my observations, I am of the opinion that: - (a). There is conclusive evidence to show that the questioned handwriting on item 'Q1' was not authored by the same Reyna Verlice whose known handwriting was provided on items 'K1A', 'K1B' and 'K1C'. Following thorough examination of the known handwriting of Reyna Verlice on items 'K1A', 'K1B' and 'K1C', I found out that the handwriting was written fluently with a good skill and no signs of disguise were observed in the dictated exemplars. Upon inter-comparison of the known handwriting of Reyna Verlice on items 'K1A', 'K1B' and 'K1C', the consistencies observed were strong enough to prove common authorship of this handwriting on items 'K1A', 'K1B' and 'K1C' whereas the variations observed were attributable to the handwriting of the same person. Therefore, the variations observed showed the range of natural variation of Reyna Verlice. The questioned handwriting on item 'Q1' was naturally written with a good skill and no signs of simulation or any kind of forgery or influence of external factors such as use of drugs, illness, emotional stress, writing instruments and others were observed. Upon comparison of the known handwriting of Reyna Verlice on items 'K1A', 'K1B' and 'K1C' with the questioned handwriting on item 'Q1', the differences observed were too unique to occur in the handwriting of the same person and they were found to be more significant than the similarities. This evidence proved uncommon authorship of the known handwriting of Reyna Verlice on items 'K1A', 'K1B' and 'K1C' and the questioned handwriting on item 'Q1'. Some of these unique differences included, but not limited to, internal proportion of letters (a, y, b, g and d), slant of letters and the relative spacing between the left margin (where it appears) and the first words in the sentences. (b). There is conclusive evidence to show that the questioned handwriting on item 'Q1' was authored by the same Nicole Harrison whose known handwriting was provided on items 'K2A', 'K2B' and 'K2C'. Following thorough examination of the known handwriting of Nicole Harrison on items 'K2A', 'K2B' and 'K2C', I found out that the handwriting was also written fluently with a good skill and no signs of disguise were observed in the dictated exemplars. Upon inter-comparison of the known handwriting of Nicole Harrison on items 'K2A', 'K2B' and 'K2C', the consistencies observed were strong enough to

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	prove common authorship of this handwriting on items 'K2A', 'K2B' and 'K2C' whereas the variations observed were attributable to the handwriting of the same person. Therefore, the variations observed showed the range of natural variation of Nicole Harrison. Upon comparison of the known handwriting of Nicole Harrison on items 'K2A', 'K2B' and 'K2C' with the questioned handwriting on item 'Q1', the similarities observed were too unique in nature and they were found to be more significant than the differences. This evidence proved common authorship of the known handwriting of Nicole Harrison on items 'K2A', 'K2B' and 'K2C' and the questioned handwriting on item 'Q1'. Some of these unique similarities included, but not limited to, pictorial resemblance of the handwriting on item 'Q1' with the one on items 'K2A' and 'K2B', skill of writing, internal proportion of letters (p, a, m, y, n, b, g and u), external proportion of letters l-l in the word "all" and slant of letters.
4A7P8B-5241	Source Identification: It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1) was prepared by NICOLE HARRISON, Item 3 (K2a-c).
4EJP42-5245	-It was found that Reyna Verlice did not write the Robbery Note. According to the official [Laboratory] scale, the level of certainty is "Very high probability" as the entire configuration of findings assessed as having high evidential value and is in complete conformity with the hypothesis in all respects -It was found that Nicole Harrison did write the Robbery Note. According to the official [Laboratory] scale, the level of certainty is "Very high probability" as the entire configuration of findings assessed as having high evidential value and is in complete conformity with the hypothesis in all respects
4G67LM-5245	The findings provide strong handwriting evidence that Reyna Verlice (K1) did not write the robbery note (Q1). The finding provide limited handwriting evidence that Nicole Harrison (K2) was the author of the robbery note (Q1). See comments below. [Table 3: Additional Comments.]
4HYWR2-5245	It's estimated that the text Q1 has been written by Nicole Harrison, author of sample K2. I'ts estimated that the text Q1 hasn't been written by Reyna Verlice, author of sample K1.
4JCNKH-5245	The questioned hand printing appearing on Item Q1 was written by Nicole Harrison, Item K2(a-c). The questioned hand printing appearing on Item Q1 was not written by Reyna Verlice, Item K1(a-c).
669MH2-5245	In my opinion there is: - MODERATELY STRONG evidence to support the proposition that Q1 WAS written by Nicole Harrison - MODERATE evidence to support the proposition that Q1 WAS NOT written by Reyna Verlice
6CA243-5241	NO UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT PROVENANCE between the writing samples of Mrs. REYNA VERLICE (k1a-b-c) and the writings of the theft note that demanded the money from the bank teller. UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT PROVENANCE between the writing samples of Ms. NICOLE HARISON (K2a-b-c) and the writings of the robbery note that demanded the money from the bank taller.
6Q9NV4-5245	The handwriting on the questioned robbery note (Q1) was WRITTEN by Nicole Harrison (K2). The handwriting on the questioned robbery note (Q1) was NOT WRITTEN by Reyna Verlice (K1).
6VRJZW-5241	1. There is sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K2A" to "K2C". 2.There is sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K1A" to "K1C".
747CZ4-5241	According to the analysis and comparison carried out on the related elements, it is possible to establish the NON-UNIQUE MANUSCRITUAL PROCEDENCE of the doubted text identified as: Item Q1 (Theft note), compared to the undoubted material identified as: Item K1a, K1b (Manuscript samples - dictations) and item K1c (Extra-procedural writings of the business writing course) by Ms. REYNA VERLICE. According to the analysis and comparison carried out on the related elements, it is possible to establish the MANUSCRIPT UNIQUE PROCEDENCE of the doubted text identified as: Item Q1 (Theft note), compared to the undoubted material identified as: Item K2a, K2b (Manuscript samples - dictations) and the item K2c (Extra-procedural writings of the business writing course) by Ms. NICOLE HARRISON.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
7E9LK8-5241	1. Los llenados manuscritos localizados en la nota de robo identificada como Item Q1, con respecto a los llenados manuscritos de la C. Reyna Verlice ubicados en los Items que se describen a continuación: Item K1a-b: Ejemplares dictados para Reyna Verlice Item K1c: Curso de redacción de negocios para Reyna Verlice NO CORRESPONDEN. 2.- Los llenados manuscritos localizados en la nota de robo identificada como Item Q1, con respecto a los llenados manuscritos de la C. Nicole Harrison ubicados en los lems que se describen a continuación: Item IK2 a-b: Ejemplares dictados para Nicole Harrison Item K2c: Curso de redaccion de negocios para Nicole Harrison SI CORRESPONDEN. [Provided Translation] 1. The handwritten fillings located in the theft note identified as Item Q1, regarding the handwritten completions of C. Reyna Verlice located in the Items described below: Item K1a-b: Copies dictated for Reyna Verlice Item K1c: Business writing course for Reyna Verlice THEY DO NOT CORRESPOND. 2.- The handwritten fillings located in the theft note identified as Item Q1, regarding C. Nicole Harrison's manuscript fillings located in the lems described below: Item IK2 a-b: Exemplars dictated for Nicole Harrison Item K2c: Business Writing Course for Nicole Harrison IF APPLICA
7F9DZ3-5241	MANUSCRIPT UNIQUE PROVENANCE between the doubted item (Theft note) and the undoubted item (scriptural samples and extra-procedural writings by Nicole Harrinson. Non-manuscript uniprovence between the doubted item (theft note) and the undoubted item (samples of writings and extra-procedural writings of Reyna Verlice.
7RDVB3-5245	Laboratory examination and side-by-side comparison of the questioned and uncontested writing in this case, as described in greater detail in the body of this report, leads to the following conclusions: 1. Reyna Verlice (K1a-c) probably did not fill out the handwritten notation at issue in this case (item Q1). 2. The person whose extended printed writing appears on items K2a-c, Nicole Harrison, also prepared the questioned notation (item Q1), she is identified.
7RMDXW-5245	Analysis and Comparison of the respective material revealed the following: 6.1. Similarities in respect of design and execution were identified between the disputed writing marked “Q1” and the specimen writing marked “K2A” to “K2C”. 6.2 Differences in respect of design and execution were identified between the disputed writing marked “Q1” and the specimen writing marked “K1A” to “K1C”. In light of the above analysis and comparison, I reached the following conclusions: 6.3 I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the disputed writing marked “Q1” was written by one writer; 6.3.1 Evidence suggests that the writer of the specimen writing marked “K2A” to “K2C” wrote the disputed writing marked “Q1”. 6.3.2 Evidence suggests that the writer of the specimen writing marked “K1A” to “K1C” did not write the disputed writing marked “Q1”.
7TRZ8E-5241	Robbery Note was written by Nicole Harrison
7YZLYX-5241	After comparison analysis of the questioned document Q1 with samples marked K1a K1b, Kc (Reyna) and samples marked K2a, K2b and K2c (Nicole). The results shows strong correspondence between Q1 and K2a, K2b and K2c in terms of element of style, excussion, and alignment of handwriting.
7Z9XDD-5245	THE HANDWRITING IN THE ROBBERY NOTE WAS WRITTEN BY NICOLE HARRISON .
83T3PH-5241	In our opinion the questionned writing Q1 has been written by Nicole Harrison (K2)
87C23C-5245	There are dissimilarities in the traits, habits, characteristics and elements of comparison that make up the formation of strokes, letter formation, beginning and end of strokes, connection, inclination, position (margin distance), size, angles, formation of loops, fluidity and ratio when comparing the writing on the identified document Q1 with the identified documents K1 A-C. There are similarities in the traits, habits, characteristics and elements of comparison that make up the formation of strokes, letter formation, beginning and end of strokes, connection, inclination, position (margin distance), size, angles, formation of loops, fluidity and ratio when comparing the writing on identified document Q1 with identified documents K2 A-C.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
87D4J4-5241	A comparative forensic examination of the exhibits resulted in the following findings: Reyna Verlice (K1A) probably did not write the handwritten text on Exhibit Q1. Nicole Harrison (K2A) probably wrote the handwritten text on Exhibit Q1.
8B6YR3-5241	A source identification could not be reached due to the limited quantity of comparable known writing and the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, strong characteristics in common were observed which indicate that NICOLE HARRISON, writer of Item 3 (K2a-c), may have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1). A source elimination could not be reached due to the limited quantity of comparable known writing and the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate that REYNA VERLICE, writer of Item 2 (K1a-c), may not have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1).
8BAE64-5241	The author of the K1 known handwriting did not write the questioned handwriting appearing on Q1. There is disagreement in a combination of significant handwriting characteristics. No conclusion. The author of the K2 known handwriting can neither be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned handwriting appearing on Q1. Both similarities and differences were observed. A more definite opinion may be reached if additional known handwriting exemplars could be submitted for examination and comparison.
8DAXG3-5245	In my opinion 1- Comparison of the writing within the questioned Robbery Note with the known writings of Nicole Harrison reveals numerous significant similarities in proportion and constructions, sufficient to indicate that there is a HIGH DEGREE of probability that she is responsible for the questioned writing. 2- Comparison of the writing within the questioned Robbery Note with the known writings of Reyna Verlice reveals numerous significant differences in proportion and construction sufficient to indicate that it is UNLIKELY that she is responsible for the questioned writing.
8E8ZUL-5241	The questioned handwriting on Q1 probably come from the writer of the known documents K2A to K2C, presented as Nicole Harrison. The questioned handwriting on Q1 probably do not come from the writer of the known documents K1A to K1C, presented as Reyna Verlice.
8QLYL9-5245	The Robbery Note(Q1) was written by Nicole Harrison(K2). The Robbery Note(Q1) was not written by Reyna Verlice(K1).
8T6BZ4-5245	Reyna Verlice did not write the questioned note. Nicole Harrison cannot be identified nor eliminated as writing the questioned note.
96DDY8-5245	It was requested that a handwriting comparison be conducted to determine, if possible, whether the questioned document (Q1) may have been written by either Reyna Verlice (K1) and Nicole Harrison (K2). Based upon a visual examination of the images submitted, the following opinions are rendered: There is a strong probability that the author of K1 did not write the questioned entries. There is a strong probability that the author of K2 wrote the questioned entries.
98H2GH-5241	In my opinion the handwriting evidence strongly supports the proposition Reyna Verlice is not the writer of Q1. In my opinion, the handwriting evidence supports the proposition Nicole Harrison is the writer of Q1.
98UDKW-5241	Strong individual characteristics were observed and identified between the questioned document marked "Q1" and the specimen writing on the documents marked from "K2a" to "K2c" that supports the proposition (made in subparagraph 4.3) that the writing in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the author of specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a" to "K2c".
9CY7B7-5241	It is determined that the Q1 document was written by the author of the K2A-C documents attributed to Nicole Harrison.
9DQ3ZZ-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
9HGLV4-5241	FIRST: The questioned writing identified as Q1 DOES NOT CORRESPOND to C. REYNA VERLICE. SECOND: The questioned writing identified as Q1, IF IT CORRESPONDS to C. NICOLE HARRISON.
9KQPPE-5241	In as much as it is possible to examine color copies in lieu of the original documents, it is my opinion that Nicole Harrison (K2) wrote the questioned writing on Q1. In as much as it is possible to examine color copies in lieu of the original documents, it is my opinion that Reyna Verlice (K1) did not write the questioned writing on Q1.
9VDJ6H-5241	There are indications that Reyna Verlice may not have written the questioned document, Q1. However, the evidence to that effect is far from conclusive. There are indications that Nicole Harrison may have written questioned document, Q1. However, the evidence to that effect is far from conclusive.
9W8ABW-5245	The writer of Exhibit K2 (Nicole Harrison) is identified as the writer of the questioned handwritten entries on Exhibit Q1. The writer of Exhibit K1 (Reyna Verlice) probably did not write the questioned handwritten entries on Exhibit Q1.
9YDU2H-5241	The writer of Items 3.1, 3.2 and 4 (Nicole Harrison) has been identified as having written Item 5. The writer of Items 1.1, 1.2 and 2 (Reyna Verlice) has been eliminated as having written Item 5.
9ZAADU-5245	The Person who wrote the known items of handwriting marked as K2A-B and K2C, also wrote the questioned item of handwriting marked as Q1.
A6TURE-5245	It has been concluded that the Nicole Harrison of the known material (Items K2a, K2b and K2c) probably wrote the writing on the questioned robbery note (Item Q1).
AK77K9-5245	Based upon comparison of provided request writing and collected course of business writing material with the questioned note, my conclusion is the material labeled as authored K-2 Nicole Harrison is probably the author of the questioned note. Based upon comparison of provided request writing and collected course of business writing material with the questioned note, my conclusion is the material labeled as authored K-1 Reyna Verlice is probably not the author of the questioned note.
AUD6VU-5245	-The questioned note was not wrriten by Reyna Verlice -The questioned note was wrriten by Nicole Harrison
AXAQKC-5241	The qestioned robbery note (Q1) was probably written by Nicole Harrison (K2), therefore were probably not made by Reyna Verlice (K1).
BEGAVA-5245	Ms. Nicole Harrison has written the robbery note under study.
BF97K3-5241	HANDWRITING: Source Identification: It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1) was prepared by NICOLE HARRISON, Item 3 (K2a-c).
BHFLR9-5241	After using the comparative spectroscopy device (VSC8000) and after using handwriting comparison techniques, it is concluded that the robbery note (Q1) was written by Nicole Harrison (K2) and not by Reyna Verlice (K1).
BHFLUU-5245	The questioned handwriting Q1 showed significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting K1a - K1c. As such, these questioned handwriting was not written by Reyna Verlice. The questioned handwriting Q1 showed similar characteristics in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting K2a – K2c. As such, these questioned handwriting was written by Nicole Harrison.
BK4ZLQ-5241	I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the questioned writing marked as “Q1” was not written by the writer of specimen writing marked as “K1A” to “K1C” but it was written by the writer of specimen writing marked as “K2A” to “K2C”.
BNKAMV-5245	Item Q1, presents correspondence in relation to items (K2a-K2b) and item (K2c), written by Nicole Harrison. These writings present the same graphic structure, since they contain the same general characteristics and graphic gestures.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
BXNDWY-5245	The evidence observed provides qualified support for the hypothesis that the questioned robbery note was written by Nicole Harrison.
C4BP7L-5241	Word "all" has different height between "a" and "l". Connection of the character "o" and "n", for example, word "money", and "one", is similar to the handwriting of K2. In addition, connection of "h" and "e" is similar to the handwriting of K2. Type of lowercase "b" is similar to K2, for example word "bag". Slant of the Q is similar to the slant of the handwritings of K2.
C894VW-5241	Since compatibility and similarities were determined between the comperative writings of K2 and Q1 in terms of letter form and size, degree of speed and fluency, personal style and special signs, stacking, slant and direction, course and pressure.
CDC8JA-5241	In my professional opinion, the writer of the known specimens on Items K2A, K2B and K2C (Nicole Harrison) wrote the questioned robbery note (Item Q1).
CDGMWB-5241	The writer of the known writing on item K1a-c probably did not write the questioned writing on item Q1. The writer of the known writing on item K2a-c probably wrote the questioned writing on item Q1.
CGNRXQ-5241	I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked as “Q1” was not written by the writer of the known specimen handwriting purported to be of Reyna Verlice, marked as “K1A”, “K1B” and “K1C”. I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked as “Q1” was written by the writer of the known specimen handwriting purported to be of Nicole Harrison, marked as “K2A”, “K2B” and “K2C”.
CJ4GT9-5241	The Robbery note is written by Nicole Harrison and not written by Reyna Verlice.
DB6ARE-5245	The writer of Exhibit K2 (Nicole Harrison) probably did write the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit Q1; however, due to an insufficient amount of comparable known writing, the evidence falls short of that necessary to support a conclusive opinion. The writer of Exhibit K1 (Reyna Vertice) probably did not write the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit Q1; however, due to an insufficient amount of comparable known writing, the evidence falls short of that necessary to support a conclusive opinion.
DBPNHC-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 digital image in lieu of the original document, it is my opinion that Nicole Harrison wrote the questioned writing on the questioned Item 1 document (Identification).
DDAPDY-5241	The question document labelled (Q1) was written by Nicole Harrison
DEMA69-5241	The conclusions after examination is: The robbery note (Q1) was written by (K2) "NICOLE HARRISON" and was not written by (K1) "REYNA INSISTS".
DGVJZQ-5241	1. After careful examination and comparison of the Questioned handwriting on Robbery Note (Q1) with routine handwriting of Reyna Verlice (K1C) and with dictated handwriting exemplars of Reyna Verlice (K1a-b), it is concluded that the Questioned handwriting on Robbery Note (Q1) is not written by Reyna Verlice (K1). Therefore, Reyna Verlice (K1) is not the author of Questioned handwriting on Robbery Note (Q1). 2. After careful examination and comparison of the Questioned handwriting on Robbery Note (Q1) with routine handwriting of Nicole Harrison (K2C) and with dictated handwriting exemplars of Nicole Harrison K2a-b, it is concluded that the Questioned handwriting on Robbery Note (Q1) is written by Nicole Harrison (K2). Therefore, Nicole Harrison (K2) is the author of Questioned handwriting on Robbery Note (Q1).
DPM3EY-5245	Based on my scientific examination of the documents submitted using an application of accepted forensic document examination tools, principles and techniques, and a significant disagreement or agreement of

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	the unique, identifiable handwriting characteristics and distinctions in the questioned handwriting including but not limited to letter formation, spacing, height ratios, connecting strokes and diacritics, I have eliminated the person who authored the Reyna Verlice handwriting on the K1 documents as the author of the question document. Furthermore, I have identified the person who wrote the purported known Nicole Harrison handwriting on the K2 documents as the author of the questioned document. My opinion is consistent with the highest level of certitude established by the Scientific Working Group of Document Examiners.
DUKG4A-5245	There is substantial evidence which indicates that the questioned handwriting was probably produced by the writer of the K2 exemplars attributed to Nicole Harrison. Although this is not a conclusive identification, there were sufficient similarities to establish a strong likelihood that the writer of the K2 exemplars wrote the questioned handwriting. There is substantial evidence which indicates that the questioned handwriting was probably not produced by the writer of the K1 exemplars attributed to Reyna Verlice. Although this is not a conclusive elimination, there were sufficient differences to establish a strong likelihood that the questioned handwriting was prepared by another writer.
DUZMKK-5241	Item Q was written by the writer of Item K2a, b and c
DW6HXW-5245	It is highly probable, in the opinion of the examiner, that the writer of the K2 material and the writer of the questioned material are the same person.
E43KLU-5241	1. The doubted handwritings, recorded in the document identified as Q1 (robbery note), do not present the same scritural origin as the writings provided as reference material for comparison of Mrs. Reyna Verlice. 2. The doubted handwritings, recorded in the document identified as Q1 (robbery note), present the same scritural origin as the writings provided as reference material for comparison of Mrs. Nicole Harrison.
E8Y932-5245	Results: Q1: It is probable that K1 (Reyna Verlice) was not the writer of the hand printing depicted on Q1. There are indications that K2 (Nicole Harrison) was not the writer of the hand printing depicted on Q1, but the evidence is far from conclusive.
EAQ8GY-5241	Support for Common Source (NICOLE HARRISON (K2a-c)). A source identification could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, strong characteristics in common were observed which indicate NICOLE HARRISON (K2a-c), Item 3, may have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1). Support for Different Sources (REYNA VERLICE (K1a-c)). A source elimination could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, strong inconsistencies were observed which indicate REYNA VERLICE (K1a-c), Item 2, may not have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1). KNOWN WRITING INSTRUCTIONS If future examinations are desired, additional dictated and undictated known writing should be obtained from HARRISON (K2a-c), Item 3, and submitted to this Laboratory for comparison. The known writing should be comparable to the questioned writing in wording, style, and format. Dictated known writing should be prepared in the exact wording as the questioned writing and obtained on separate sheets of lined paper similar to the questioned item. Each repetition should be removed from the writer's view upon completion and numerous repetitions may be necessary in order to obtain naturally prepared writing. Undictated known writing consists of writing prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known writing include business papers, letters, and/or applications.
EFEWTW-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
EFVTKV-5245	The writing in item Q1 Theft Note regarding Item K2A, K2B and K2C was written by Nicole Harrison.
EJEY6C-5241	Q1 was written by K2 (Nicole Harrison)

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
EYBZWR-5241	Using the Handwriting analysis method, it is determined that the theft note was not written by Reyna Verlice. Using the Handwriting analysis method, it is determined that the robbery note was written by Nicole Harrison.
F2BNWZ-5241	In regards to writer K1: The writer of specimens K1a to K1c, attributed to Reyna Verlice, did not execute the handwriting on questioned document Q1. In regards to writer K2: The writer of specimens K2a to K2c, attributed to Nicole Harrison, executed the handwriting on questioned document Q1.
F8HCB2-5245	It is my opinion that the questioned writing was written by Nicole Harrison. It is further my opinion that the questioned writing was not written by Reyna Verlice.
FG76LX-5241	Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING: Source Identification: It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1) was prepared by NICOLE HARRISON, Item 3 (K2a-c).
FGPRGA-5241	In my expert opinion, K2 is likely the author of Q1. The characteristics present in K2 are present in Q1 and there are no fundamental differences between the two; however, this opinion is qualified because of the generic nature of the handwriting.
FPH6G9-5245	Nicole Harrison can neither be identified nor excluded as the writer of the questioned note. There are indications that she was the writer.
FRPGZV-5241	According to the analysis and comparison carried out on the related elements, it is possible to establish the NON-UNIQUE MANUSCRITUAL PROCEDENCE of the doubted text identified as: Item Q1 (Theft note), compared to the undoubted material identified as: Item K1a, K1b (Manuscript samples - dictations) and item K1c (Extra-procedural writings of the business writing course) by Ms. REYNA VERLICE. According to the analysis and comparison carried out on the related elements, it is possible to establish the MANUSCRIPT UNIQUE PROCEDENCE of the doubted text identified as: Item Q1 (Theft note), compared to the undoubted material identified as: Item K2a, K2b (Manuscript samples - dictations) and the item K2c (Extra-procedural writings of the business writing course) by Ms. NICOLE HARRISON.
FWGVGQ-5245	According, to our examinations, and findings, we say that the demanding note, is writen by Nicole Harrison.
GHCW7Y-5241	The questioned deed Q1 corresponds to the same graphic origin in relation to the deed provided as a basis for comparison C4, C5 and C6 (K2 A-B K2 C) in the name of C. Nicole Harrison.
GMERHM-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
GML7FF-5241	In my opinion I find that the Questioned Document - Item 'Q1' (Robbery Note) has been written by the author listed as 'K2' - Nicole Harrison
GMRH3C-5245	The writings on Q1 were probably written by the writer of K2, presented as from Nicole Harrison. The writings on Q1 were probably not written by the writer of K1, presented as from Reyna Verlice.
GQC8MP-5245	The questioned handwriting Q1 showed significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting K1a - K1c. As such, these questioned handwriting was not written by Reyna Verlice. The questioned handwriting Q1 showed similar characteristics in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting K2a – K2c. As such, these questioned handwriting was written by Nicole Harrison.
GU6FMP-5241	The existing questioned handwriting on the robbery note was written by Nicole Harrison.
GU7B7V-5245	Based on the examination and comparison of the examined material, the following conclusions were reached: It is highly probable that Nicole Harrison (Items K2a-c) did write the questioned Robbery Note described as Item Q1. It is highly probable that Reyna Verlice (Items K1a-c) did not write the questioned Robbery Note described as Item Q1.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
H24DTR-5241	After carrying out a detailed evaluative analysis of the doubted and undoubted material sent for study; Initially, it was determined that the doubtful manuscripts and those provided as a comparison standard met the suitability requirements to be subjected to comparative inspection. Once the previous procedure had been carried out, the corresponding inspection was carried out between the doubted manuscript and Nicole Harrison's manuscripts. Through direct observation and with the support of a thread-counting magnifying glass, all graphonomic aspects and sub-aspects susceptible to study were observed in both the doubted and undoubted material, finding that the identifying characteristics and determinants of the graphic identity of each manuscript are related to each other. , therefore establishing that Nicole Harrison is the author of the doubted manuscript. For its part, between the doubted manuscript and the manuscripts of Reyna Verlice there are significant differences and especially in the most relevant but less visible aspects, therefore it is established that Reyna Verlice is not the author of the Dubitado manuscript.
H6NZUT-5245	Nicole Harrison is the author of the handwriting questioned. The handwriting questioned was not reviewed by Reyna Verlice
HADUGR-5245	I have considered the following alternative propositions in relation to the questioned note: P1a: The questioned note was written by Nicole Harrison (K2). P2a: The questioned note was not written by Nicole Harrison (K2). P1b: The questioned note was written by Reyna Verlice (K1). P2b: The questioned note was not written by Reyna Verlice (K1). There are a number of similarities between the handwriting on the questioned note and the specimen writing of Nicole Harrison (K2), however, there are also a small number of features which cannot be exactly matched. There are some general style similarities between the handwriting on the questioned note and the specimen writing of Reyna Verlice (K1), however, there are also a number of features which do not match as well. The findings in relation to Nicole Harrison (K2) provide greater support for proposition P1a compared to the alternative proposition P2a. The findings in relation to Reyna Verlice (K1) provide slightly more support for proposition P2b compared to the alternative proposition P1b. In my opinion, there is strong evidence to show that Nicole Harrison (K2) was responsible for writing the questioned note and I consider it unlikely that another person was responsible. In my opinion, there is limited evidence to show that Reyna Verlice (K1) was not responsible for writing the questioned note. Although I cannot exclude the possibility that she may be responsible, I consider this to be less likely than the alternative proposition. Stronger opinions are not possible due to the nature and amount of the questioned handwriting.
HAFCN4-5241	after using the vsc 8000 instrument and handwriting comparsion techniques it is seen that the note (Q1) was written by k2 (Nicole Harrison), and not written by k1 (Reyna verlice)
HDC6DR-5245	The writer of the K2a, K2b, and K2c exemplars has been identified as the author of the Q1 note. The writer of the K1a, K1b, and K1c exemplars has been excluded as a possible author of the Q1 note.
HPAZX3-5245	Reyna VERLICE: In my opinion, the evidence provides strong support for the proposition that the questioned writing (Q1) was written by someone other than the writer of the known material (K1a-c) over the the proposition that the questioned writing (Q1) was written by the writer of the known material (K1a-c). Nicole HARRISON: In my opinion, the evidence provides strong support for the proposition that the questioned writing (Q1) was written by the writer of the known material (K2a-c) over the proposition that the questioned writing (Q1) was written by someone other than the writer of the known material (K2a-c).
HWDY9R-5241	1. Examination, comparison, and evaluation of the handwriting on the questioned and known writing samples resulted in the following opinions: a. Questioned handwriting Q1 (Laboratory item #5) was written by the author Nicole Harrison of the known writing samples K2A, K2B and K2C (Laboratory items #3-4). b. Questioned handwriting Q1 (Laboratory item #5) was not written by the author Reyna Verlice of the known writing samples K1A, K1B and K1C (Laboratory items #1-2).
HYUFDP-5241	As a result of examination and comparison based solely on the material submitted the following conclusions and observations are opinions based upon my experience, education and training and are as follows: 1. The Q1 robbery note was scanned for documentation by Forensic Document Examiner. 2. The Q1 note is executed in blue ink on half sheet of lined white notebook paper measuring approximately

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	127mm x 185mm. The piece of paper has clean edges at the top and bottom of the written side. The left edge contains one prepunched hole. The Q1 note appears to have been cut from a larger piece of paper, indicating there may be a source document. The reverse side is blank. This note is handwritten, using lower case printing and cursive combination and appears naturally written. There are identifiable characteristics within this writing. 3. A VSC (Video Spectral Comparator) examination using various microscopic, infrared, ultraviolet, and alternate light source examination techniques was performed on the Q1 note. The ink on the Q1 note was consistent throughout the document. 4. An ESDA (ElectroStatic Detection Apparatus) examination for the detection and reading of indented writing, typing or other identifying impressions was not performed on the Q1 note. Oblique lighting was used for visualization of indented writing. No impressions were found. 5. The note was scanned at 600dpi as a tiff image and submitted to the FBI Robbery Note Database. 6. The Q1 note was written by the author of the K2a-c exemplars and course of business writing, Nicole Harrison. 7. The Q1 note was not written by the author of the K1a-c exemplars and course of business writing, Reyna Verlice.
HYWXK2-5245	1.Q1 (Robbery Note) was not written by K1 (Reyna Verlice). 2.Q1 (Robbery Note) was written by K2 (Nicole Harrison).
JH9493-5241	The robbery note (Q1) was written by K2 (Nicole Harrison)K and was not written by K1 (Reyna Verlice).
JKABQT-5241	FIRST: The handwriting printed on the document called “Theft Note”, undated, identified as Q1, DOES NOT COME FROM THE GRAPHIC ORIGIN OF THE INDUBITABLE ELEMENTS IN THE NAME OF C. REYNA VERLICE. SECOND: The handwriting stamped on the document called “Theft Note”, undated, identified as Q1, BY ITS EXECUTION IF IT IS ATTRIBUTED GRAPHICALLY WITH THOSE ELEMENTS INDICATED AS INDUBITABLE IN THE NAME OF C. NICOLE HARRISON.
JKCVH3-5241	Q1 to K1: It was determined the robbery note, Q1, was not written by Reyna Verlice, K1. Q1 to K2: It was determined the robbery note, Q1, was written by Nicole Harrison, K2.
K2HJDF-5245	1) The writer of the K1 samples is not the same writer of the questioned Q1 sample. 2) The writer of the K2 samples is the same writer of the questioned Q1 sample.
KDVLRL-5241	It is Highly Probable that Nicole Harrison is the writer of the Robbery Note.
KECHLL-5241	1. Analysis and comparison of the respective material presented me with the following facts: 1.1 Pertaining to the specimen writing on the documents marked “K1A” to “K1C” (purported to be of one “Reyna Verlice”): 1.1.1 Significant differences were identified between the said specimen writing and the questioned writing in respect of their discriminating elements, inter alia, letter design and construction, spacing, arrangement, slant and connections. 1.2 Pertaining to the specimen writing on the documents marked “K2A” to “K2C” (purported to be of a one “Nicole Harrison”): 1.2.1 Strong correspondences were identified between the said specimen writing and the questioned writing in respect of their discriminating elements, inter alia, letter design and construction, spacing, arrangement, slant and connections . Furthermore, no inexplicable differences occur between the respective writings. 2. In light of the above analysis and comparison, I concluded the following: 2.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked “Q1” was not written by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked as “K1A” to “K1C” (purported to be of one “Reyna Verlice”); 2.2 The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked “Q1” was written by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked as “K2A” to “K2C” (purported to be of one “Nicole Harrison”).
KFWMU4-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
KRQ4J6-5241	2) Visual examination, comparison, and evaluation of the submitted handwriting resulted in the following findings: 2.1) The questioned writing depicted on item Q1 was written by the author – Nicole Harrison of the K2 (a-c) handwriting samples. 2.2) The questioned writing depicted on item Q1 was not written by the

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	author – Reyna Verlice of the K1 (a-c) handwriting samples.
KT3RWP-5245	1) The question handwritting that appear in the Robbery's Note, IS CORRESPONDENCE with the Nicole Harrison's handwritting exemplars and with the handwritting domestic's notes. 2) The question handwritting that appear in te Robbery's Note, ISN'T CORRESPONDENCE with the Reyna Verlice's handwritting exemplars and with the handwritting domestic's notes.
KUDMK3-5245	1. Numerous consistencies between Q1 and the K2 Known writing samples, provide strong evidence to support the Opinion that Nicole Harrison (K2) very probably wrote the text of Q1. 2. Should numerous additional cursive known writings by K2 writer become available for another examination, a more definitive Opinion could be supported. 3. Several feature differences between Q1 and K1 Known writing samples, provide moderate evidence to support the Opinion that Reyna Verlice probably did not write the text of Q1. 4. The common writing styles involved with Q1, K2 and K3, were limiting factors in these examinations.
KUH3W3-5241	Examination and comparison of questioned item #Q1 with known items #K1A-C and #K2A-C resulted in the following opinions: - Item #Q1 was written by the writer of items #K2A-C, Nicole Harrison. The conclusions expressed in this report are defined in the SWGDOC Standard Terminology for Expressing Conclusions of Forensic Document Examiners and are as follow: - identification (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 evidence contained in the handwriting, that the writer of the known material actually wrote the writing in question.
KXDT2T-5241	HANDWRITING (NICOLE HARRISON, K2 A-C) Support for Common Source A source identification could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the limited quantity of known writing submitted for examination. However, characteristics in common were observed which indicate NICOLE HARRISON, Item 3 (K2 a-c), may have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1). HANDWRITING (REYNA VERLICE, K1 A-C) Support for Different Sources A source elimination could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the limited quantity of known writing submitted for examination. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate REYNA VERLICE, Item 2 (K1 a-c), may not have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1). REQUEST FOR KNOWN WRITING If future examinations are desired, additional known writing from HARRISON, Item 3 (K2 a-c), VERLICE, Item 2 (K1 a-c), or known writing from anyone else suspected of having prepared the questioned writing should be submitted. The known writing should be comparable to the questioned writing in wording, style, and format. Dictated known writing should be prepared in the exact wording as the questioned writing and obtained on separate pieces of lined paper similar to the questioned item. Each repetition may be necessary in order to obtain naturally prepared writing. Undictated known writing consists of writing prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known writing include business papers, letters, journals, and/or applications. Additional observations and assessments have been made regarding the submitted items and recorded for possible future examinations.
KXGDT3-5241	Comparison made between the questioned handwriting in Q1 and control handwriting written by Nicole Harrison (K2) revealed similarities in writing attributes relating to proportion, writing movements and connections between letters. On the other hand, comparison made between the questioned handwriting in Q1 and control handwriting written by Reyna Verlice (K1) revealed discrepancies in writing attributes relating to slant, writing movements, proportion, connection between letters and indentation of sentences. In view of the evidence found, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting in Q1 was written by Nicole Harrison (K2) but not by Reyna Verlice (K1).
KZM3TQ-5241	Preliminary Inspection: Initially, the preliminary inspection of the doubtful and reference or undoubted elements provided is carried out in order to verify compliance with the necessary requirements to carry out this type of inspection, such as originality, contemporaneousness, similarity and abundance established in the Inspection protocol. of Handwritten Writing establishing from said verification that the necessary requirements to carry out the requested inspection are met, therefore, the material is suitable for

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	comparative inspection. Comparative signature inspection: An inspection of the Q1 (Dubitado) manuscripts is carried out, finding in them highly identifying characteristic aspects in their graphic structures in terms of shape, order, size, direction, inclination, cohesion, and ideographisms, as well as the association of the different elements that they constitute it. Subsequently, an evaluation is carried out on the reference samples provided K1 a -b, c in the name of Reyna Verlice and K2 a – b, c in the name of Nicole Harrison in order to establish the formal, structural and dynamographic values that identify them, finding in said manuscripts representative and highly identifying aspects given the skill in configuring the different signs that make them up, the dispositive constancy of the signatures, the shapes of the elements, as well as the way in which the structures of the different characters or signs are associated and arranged as well as the movements that they gave to each of them, the above, based on the analysis carried out on all the signatures sent as a reference. Taking into account the above, the general and particular knowledge of the most representative graphic elements that at a formal, structural and dynamographic level that individualize the questioned signature object of inspection, and through the application of the graphonomic method where each of the aspects are analyzed. that compose it, notable correspondences were found with respect to the comparison models provided in the name of Nicole Harrison, especially in the intrinsic aspects, that is, all those manuscript aspects specific to the writer which are generated in an automated and unconscious manner, and that allow the identification of graphics.
L78HWN-5245	FIRST.- The questioned writing identified as Q1A, which is attributed to C. REYNA VERLICE reflected in the questioned document Q1, IS DETERMINED NOT TO APPLY. SECOND.- The questioned handwriting identified as Q1A, which is attributed to C. REYNA VERLICE reflected in the questioned document Q1, IT IS DETERMINED THAT THE FEATURES CONTAINED IN THE QUESTIONED DOCUMENT ARE NOT COINCIDENT WITH THE WRITING EMPHASIZED IN THE BASE SAMPLE OF COMPLIANCE OF THE C. REYNA VERLICE. THIRD.- The questioned writing identified as Q1A, which is attributed to C. NICOLE HARRISON reflected in the questioned document Q1, IS DETERMINED IF IT CORRESPONDS. FOURTH.- The questioned writing identified as Q1A, which is attributed to C. NICOLE HARRISON reflected in the questioned document Q1, IT IS DETERMINED THAT THE FEATURES CONTAINED IN THE QUESTIONED DOCUMENT ARE MATCHING THE WRITING RECAPED IN THE BASE SAMPLE OF COLLECTION OF C. NICOLE HARRISON.
L9JZKE-5241	1. In light of the above analysis and comparison, I reached the following conclusion: 1.2.1 I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question contained on the document marked as “Q1” were written by “Nicole Harrison” (the writer of the specimen material marked as “K2A” to “K2C”) and not by “Reyna Verlice” (the writer of the specimen material marked as “K1A” to “K1C”), therefore eliminating her as the writer.
LGPYPU-5241	There are many similarities and no significant differences between the known handwriting of Nicole Harrison (K2) and the questioned handwriting (Q1). The nature of the similarities is such that, in our opinion, Nicole Harrison is responsible for the questioned handwriting.
LK78DU-5245	The results to some degree support the proposition that Q1 not was written by K1. The results strongly support the proposition that Q1 was written by K2.
LKNDDK-5245	Based upon the available evidence it is my professional opinion that the author of K1, K2 and KC did not write the questioned robbery note.
LZ2P3R-5241	HANDWRITING: Source Identification: It was determined that the Item 1 (Q1) writing was prepared by NICOLE HARRISON, writer of Item 3 (K2a-c).
M4TBAL-5241	It has been observed that there are differences between the writings in the document numbered q1 and the comparative writings of k1 (Reyna verlice), and it has been concluded that the writings in the document numbered q1 did not come from the hand of Reyna verlice. It has been observed that there are compatibility between the writings in the document numbered q1 and the comparative writings of k2 (nicole harrison), and it has been concluded that the writings in question were written by nicole harrison (k2).

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
M4WXQY-5241	Comparison of the questioned writing on Exhibit 5 to the known writing samples of Harrison disclosed numerous significant similarities in the handwriting characteristics. These similarities provide strong support for the proposition that the questioned writing and known writing samples may have been written by the same writer and insufficient support for the proposition that the writings may have been prepared by different writers. The primary limiting factors in this portion of the examination were a few features in the questioned writing that were either unrepresented or not well represented in the known writing samples of Harrison. Comparison of the questioned writing on Exhibit 5 to the known writing samples of Verlice disclosed significant dissimilarities and some similarities in the handwriting characteristics. These dissimilarities provide strong support for the proposition that the questioned writing and known writing samples may not have been written by the same writer and insufficient support for the proposition that the writings may have been prepared by the same writer. The primary limiting factors in this portion of the examination were the amount of known writing available for comparison and the presence of some similarities between the questioned and known writing.
MD8ZCZ-5245	The items listed in this Certificate of Analysis were assessed and examined based on methodology described in the Forensic Document Unit (FDU) Test Methods (unless otherwise noted). The methodology used included macroscopic, microscopic, and handwriting examinations. The document in Item Q1 was considered the questioned document. The hand printing on the document in Item Q1 was compared to the request and non-request known writing of Reyna Verlice in Item K1 and Nicole Harrison in Item K2. It is highly probable that Nicole Harrison (Item K2) was the writer of the questioned hand printing on the document in Item Q1. It is probable that Reyna Verlice (Item K1) was not the writer of the questioned hand printing on the document in Item Q1. Limitations were present in the handwriting comparison, which resulted in less than definitive opinions. The questioned hand printing on the document in Item Q1 was limited in quantity. Additionally, the known writing of Reyna Verlice (Item K1) and Nicole Harrison (Item K2) were similar in style and skill.
MHFMLV-5241	Using Handwriting Comparison techniques, it is concluded that K2 (Nicole Harrison) has written the robbery note (Q1).
MR3JMW-5245	Reyna Verlice is eliminated as the writer of the demand note. Nicole Harrison probably wrote the demand note.
MTFX9K-5241	CONCLUSION 1: THE WRITING CONTAINED IN THE DOCUMENT DESCRIBED IN POINT Q1, WITH RESPECT TO THE WRITING CONTAINED IN THE DOCUMENT DESCRIBED IN POINT S1, DOES NOT COME FROM THE SAME GRAPHIC ORIGIN. CONCLUSION 2: THE WRITING CONTAINED IN THE DOCUMENT DESCRIBED IN POINT Q1, WITH RESPECT TO THE WRITING CONTAINED IN THE DOCUMENT DESCRIBED IN POINT S2, IF IT COMES FROM THE SAME GRAPHIC ORIGIN.
MWY7H6-5241	Taking into account results of the conducted comparative examinations of the robbery note (Q1) and known writings, it should be stated that: - the questioned note (Q1) was probably written by Nicole Harrison (K2), - the robbery note (Q1) was not written by Reya Verlice (K1).
MXTWNK-5245	The examination is a comparison of questioned writing to known writing. The finding was: First, after comparing item k2a-b with item K2c, I found that item k2a-b shows more connected stroke features than item K2c. Item k2a-b shows more consistent writing features particularly the arrangement of letters which were the same as item Q1. I excluded the writing in item Q1 was imitated handwriting. Second, the range of variations and writing habits of the letter formation and stroke features in Q1 is significantly different from those in K1a-b, and K1c, and critically similar to those in K2a-b. Especially when I used the geometric pattern to observe the variation and writing habits of words [the] in Q1, and words[the],[money],[in],[gets],[hurt],[cops] etc. in K2a-b. It can be seen both of them show similarly consistent variation in the words[the],[money],[in],[gets],[hurt],[cops]. Although the same person for a different purpose may change the writing formations and exhibit various stroke features, the writer's consistent writing habits and range of writing variation still can be found through analysis and evaluation. Based on my analysis and comparison above, I conclude that the Question handwriting Q1 (Robbery Note) was written by Specimen handwriting K2 (Nicole Harrison)

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
N4RX44-5245	I am of the opinion that the writer of K1A to K1C did not write the questioned handwriting in Q1. I am of the opinion that the writer of K2A to K2C wrote the questioned handwriting in Q1.
N676MZ-5241	I have concluded that there is very strong evidence that the robbery note, item Q1, was written by Nicole Harrison, the writer of items K2A, B, and C. I consider it very unlikely that the robbery note was written by Reyna Verlice.
NBWKHE-5245	1. In respect of the specimen writing on the documents marked “K1A” to “K1C” (purported to be of one “Reyna Verlice”): 1.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked “Q1” was not written by the writer of the specimen writing. 2 In respect of the specimen writing on the documents marked “K2A” to “K2C” (purported to be of one “Nicole Harrison”): 2.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked “Q1” was written by the writer of the specimen writing;
NM6GXM-5241	Once the graphonomic method stage was completed, as established in the handwriting inspection protocol, the following was determined: MANUSCRIPT UNIQUE PROVENANCE of the document of doubt identified with item Q1, compared to the undoubted material (scriptural samples and extra-procedural documents) identified with items K2A, K2B and K2C of Ms. NICOLE HARRISON. NO UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT PROVENANCE of the document of doubt identified with item Q1, compared to the undoubted material (scriptural samples and extra-procedural documents) identified with items K1A, K1B and K1C of Ms. REYNA VERLICE.
NQ4K4N-5241	The robbery note Q1 was written by the author of the known writing samples K2A-K2C/Nicole Harrison. The robbery note Q1 was not written by the author of the known writing samples K1A-K1C/Reyna Verlice.
NR27JZ-5245	The writer of the K2 exemplars probably wrote Q1, and the writer of the K1 exemplars probably did not. METHODS The ANSI/ASB Standard for Examination of Handwritten Items and SWGDOC Standard for Terminology for Expressing Conclusions of Forensic Document Examiners were used and can be found here: https://www.nist.gov/ organization-scientific-area-committees-forensic-science/ forensic-document-examination-subcommittee. The [Laboratory's] Trace Analysis Unit's Handwriting test method, which includes administrative directives, was also followed. Note that the "identification" and "elimination" levels of the SWGDOC Standard for Terminology for Expressing Conclusions of Forensic Document Examiners are not used for handwriting source comparisons in this laboratory. INTERPRETATION AND RESULTS Q1 was examined first and was assessed to have been naturally written and have medium complexity, meaning a moderately low likelihood of observing the same combination of handwriting features in more than one writer. There was no evidence of multiple writers contributing to the Q1 handwriting. The K1 exemplars were intra-compared and appeared to be naturally written and consistent with one writer. Likewise, the K2 exemplars were intra-compared and appeared to be naturally written and consistent with one writer. Comparison of K1a-c and Q1 revealed some similarities, including short ascending strokes in "l", "t", and "h", but far more dissimilarities. In particular, there were differences in slant, spacing, left margin indentation, and relative height proportion in "d". Because the writing on Q1 is more rightward-slanted than the K1 writing, there was some uncertainty whether other dissimilarities between the two samples could be due to the difference in slant rather than indicative of different writers. In sum, for the comparison of the Q1 and K1 writing, the combination of the observations was assessed as somewhat to moderately divergent than what would be expected if the K1 writer wrote Q1. Numerous similarities were observed between Q1 and K2a-c, such as left margin indentation, relative height proportions, and connecting strokes. Not all handwriting features in the Q1 writing could be accounted for however. For the comparison of the Q1 and K2 writing, the combination of observations was assessed as moderately to largely expected if the K2 writer wrote Q1. Overall, the findings provide moderate support for the K2 writer having written Q1 rather than the K1 writer or an unknown writer.
NXWLUH-5241	1 In respect of the specimen writing on the documents marked “K1A” to “K1C”: 1.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked “Q1” was not written by the writer of the specimen writing. 2 In respect of the specimen writing on the documents marked “K2A” to “K2C”: 2.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked “Q1” was written by the writer of the specimen writing.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
P3DVTP-5241	I would try to clarify the exact nature of the evaluation, but if no further information was provided, the following would be the conclusion outlined in the report: If considered as a 'closed' set involving only writers K1 and K2, then the findings provide extremely strong support for H2 over H1. However, if considered as a 'open' set involving writers K1, K2, and some other unknown writer, then the findings provide more support for H2, than either H1 or H3, with the strength of that support being weak.
P8R9Y4-5245	The comparison of the questioned document to the know material of Reyna VERLICE revealed significant deviations. In contrast to this result, the comparison to the known material of Nicole HARRISON showed significant matches. Therefore, Nicole HARRSION is the writer of the questioned document.
PAAFBK-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
PAW2PW-5241	- The body of questioned writing on the robbery note. Was WRITTEN by K2 (Nicole Harrison). - The body of questioned writing on the robbery note. Was NOT WRITTEN by K1 (Reyna Verlice).
PDD96J-5245	I have found a number of similarities between the questioned handwriting on item Q1 and the specimens of Nicole Harrison. In my opinion, these differences provide strong evidence to show that she wrote it and I consider it unlikely that some other person was responsible. The handwriting on Q1 differs from the specimens of Reyna Verlice and in my opinion there is strong evidence that she did not write it.
PNEPZF-5245	Based on the documents submitted for comparison to the Robbery Note, it is my professional opinion that the person who wrote K2A, K2B, and K2C is the author of the Robbery Note.
PNFJJL-5241	The graphological characteristics of the study items K1 a-b-c writing samples of Reyna Verlice were analyzed, 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 identifying elements that coincide with the writings and signature of the questioned note. Subsequently, the graphological characteristics of the study items K2 a-b-c writing samples of Nicole Harrison were analyzed, which when compared with the graphological characteristics of the writing that appears in the questioned note item Q1, it was found that it presents abundant identifying elements coinciding with the writings and signature of the questioned note in size, proportions, shape, beginnings and endings of the strokes, spatial location, inclination and dynamics, which allows us to conclude that the question note item Q1 was written by Nicole Harrison.
PTVWQF-5241	The evidence supports the proposition that the handwriting in question on the document marked as “Q1” was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting on the documents marked “K1A” to “K1C”; The evidence supports the proposition that the handwriting in question on the document marked as “Q1” was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting on the documents marked “K2A” to “K2C”.
PX2MRK-5241	The handwritten texts of the note of the bank robbery on July 20, 2023, present handwritten uniprocedence, with the graphonomic characteristics of the handwriting samples provided by Nicole Harrison, as well as the extraprocedural writings of Nicol Harrison's commercial handwriting course.
PYAZ9M-5245	1. La escritura que obra en el documento señalado como "nota de robo" e identificado como Q1, no corresponde por su ejecución a la escritura de la persona de nombre Reyna Verlice 2. La escritura que obra en el documento señalado como "nota de robo" e identificado como Q1, si corresponde por su ejecución a la escritura de la persona de nombre Nicole Harrison. [Provided Translation] 1. The writing that appears in the document indicated as "Robbery Note" and identified as Q1, due to its execution, does not correspond to the writing of the person named Reyna Verlice 2. The writing that appears in the document indicated as "Robbery Note" and identified as Q1, if it corresponds due to its execution to the writing of the person named Nicole Harrison.
QCED8Y-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
QFHD4P-5241	It is highly possible that Q1 was written by K2. The bases for that conclusion are 1. The slant of the letters in Q1 and K2, 2. The spacing of the letters in Q1 and K2, 3. The forms of 'y' and 'g' in Q1 and K2. etc.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
QFYE3K-5241	First: The questioned writing inserted in the document identified as Q1 (Robbery note) DOES NOT CORRESPOND to the comparison base writing inserted in the documents identified as (K1ABC) by Reyna Verlice. Second: The questioned writing inserted in the document identified as Q1 (Theft Note) does CORRESPOND to the comparison base writing inserted in the documents identified as (K1ABC) by Nicole Harrison.
QLLDGZ-5245	The writing on the questioned robbery note has been completed in a basic lower-case semi-cursive style. It is limited in both content and handwriting complexity. Both similarities and differences in handwriting features were noted between the questioned writing and the specimens attributed to Reyna Verlice (K1). It has not been possible to determine whether these differences are variations not seen in the specimen material, or are evidence of another author's involvement. Accordingly, no opinion regarding authorship has been possible and the examination was inconclusive. Similarities in handwriting features were noted between the questioned writing and the specimens attributed to Nicole Harrison. However, given the limitations in quantity and complexity of the questioned handwriting, these similarities were insufficient for any opinion of authorship and the examination was inconclusive.
QUXC9Q-5245	1. The robbery note was not written by Reyna Verlice (K1). 2. Nicole Harrison (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the robbery note.
QXXM6Q-5241	1. The questioned handwriting on Q1 showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting on K2a, K2b and K2c. Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the specimens ("Nicole Harrison"). 2. The questioned handwriting on Q1 showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting on K1a, K1b and K1c. Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was not written by the writer of the specimens ("Reyna Verlice").
R374DE-5245	The questioned handwriting Q1 showed significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting K1a - K1c. As such, these questioned handwriting was not written by Reyna Verlice. The questioned handwriting Q1 showed similar characteristics in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting K2a – K2c. As such, these questioned handwriting was written by Nicole Harrison.
R9AAQV-5245	It has been concluded that the author of the Nicole Harrison writing on the documents referred to as K2a-c is the author (identification) of the writing on the questioned document referred to as Q1. It has been concluded that the author of the Reyna Verlice writing on the documents referred to as K1a-c did not author (Elimination) the writing on the document referred to as Q1.
RFQR3H-5245	A definite conclusion could not be reached as to whether or not Nicole Harrison, Items K2A-C, prepared the questioned writing on the Item Q1 Robbery Note. However, characteristics in common indicate that Harrison, K2A-C, may have prepared the questioned writing on Item Q1. A definite conclusion could not be reached as to whether or not Reyna Verlice, Items K1A-C, prepared the questioned writing on the Item Q1 Robbery Note. However, characteristics observed indicate that Verlice, K1A-C, may not have prepared the questioned writing on Item Q1.
RWYY2K-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
RXFYLB-5241	Analysis and Comparison of the respective material revealed the following facts: 1. Several significant correspondences in respect of elements of style and execution exist between the handwriting in question marked as “Q1” and the specimen handwriting marked as “K2a” to “K2c”. 2. Several significant differences in respect of elements of style and execution exist between the handwriting in question marked as “Q1” and the specimen handwriting marked as “K1a” to “K1c”. In light of the above analysis and comparison, I reached the following conclusions: I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked as “Q1” was written by the writer of the specimen material marked as “K2a” to “K2c”, “Nicole Harrison” and not written by the writer of the specimen material marked “K1a” to “K1c”, therefore eliminating “Reyna Verlice” as the writer.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
T9V38Z-5241	1. ELIMINATION: It was determined that the questioned writing on document Q-1 was not written by the writer of K-1 through K-12 (K1a-c), Reyna Verlice, due to many dissimilarities of handwriting habit. 2. IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that the questioned writing on document Q-1 was written by the writer of K-13 through K-25 (K2a-c), Nicole Harrison, due to many similarities of handwriting habit.
TG4W2T-5245	Reyna Verlice did not write the questioned note. Nicole Harrison cannot be identified or excluded as the writer of the questioned note.
TLER2V-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
TPC9EP-5241	The writer of the specimens provided on K2a-c is identified as the author of the questioned writing appearing Q1.
TWDLET-5245	The questioned handwritten entries on Q1 and the known writing attributed to K2 have some characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics from another writer is considered low. The questioned handwritten entries on Q1 and the known writing attributed to K1 have some characteristics that are not in agreement. It is considered unlikely that John Doe is the writer of the questioned entries on Exhibit 1.
TZC7TC-5245	The disputed writing stamped on the theft note was written by Nicole Harrison, and was not written by Reyna Verlice.
TZWMAF-5245	The questioned handwriting in Q1 did not correspond to the handwriting in K1. The questioned handwriting in Q1 did correspond to the handwriting in K2.
U24EKT-5245	Based on the physical examination and comparison of Item 005 (Q1) with Items 001 and 002 (K1) and Items 003 and 004 (K2), the following was determined: - Nicole Harrison (Items 003 and 004) probably wrote the questioned entries on Item 005. - Reyna Verlice (Items 001 and 002) probably did not write the questioned entries on Item 005. The above qualified conclusions are due to the general nature of the handwriting characteristics of the questioned writing (Item 005) and specimen writings (Items 001 through 004).
U24EME-5241	Q1 questioned note was compared to K1 in an effort to determine, if possible, whether Q1 was written by the same person who wrote K1 or if Q1 was written by someone other than the writer of K1. My opinion, based on documents submitted at this time, is that K1 probably did not write the Q1 questioned note. Q1 questioned note was compared to K2 in an effort to determine, if possible, whether or not Q1 was written by the same person who wrote K2 or if Q1 was written by someone other than the writer of K2. My opinion, based on documents submitted at this time, is that K2 probably wrote the Q1 questioned note.
UA3K6B-5241	In respect of the questioned writing on the Questioned Document marked "Q1", I identified strong correspondence in respect of elements of style and execution (including letter design and construction, dimensions, spacing, letter arrangements and alignment) between the said writing on (Q1) and the specimen writing marked "K2 (a to C)" Based on the above mentioned observations, I found the evidence to provide strong support for the propositions that the writing in question WAS WRITTEN by the writer of the specimen writing marked "K2".
UAFEE4-5245	A comparative handwriting examination of the above-described items resulted in the following: The writer of the known K2a through K2c handwriting exemplars, Nicole Harrison, probably also wrote the questioned writing on Item Q1. This finding is based upon agreement in slant, height and spatial relationships, letter formations and connecting strokes. A finding of “probable” falls short of a conclusive opinion. The term is used here to express the weight of the evidence exhibited by corresponding similarities observed through the comparison of a limited amount of comparable writing. It may be possible to reach a more definitive opinion if additional known dictated and regular course of business writing from the writer of Items K2a through K2c could be submitted for comparison. The writer of the known K1a through K1c handwriting exemplars, Reyna Verlice, probably did not write the questioned

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	writing on Item Q1. Although a limited number of similarities was observed, this finding is based upon differences observed in slant, height and spatial relationships, and in letter formations. A finding of "probably did not" falls short of a conclusive opinion. The term is used here to express the weight of the evidence exhibited by differences observed through the comparison of a limited amount of comparable writing. It may be possible to reach a more definitive opinion if additional known dictated and regular course of business writing from the writer of Items K1a through K1c could be submitted for comparison.
UAGD9C-5241	There are numerous significant differences between the questioned writing within the Robbery Note (Q1) and the known writings of Reyna Verlice (K1a, K1b, K1c) sufficient to indicate that they are not of common origin. There are numerous significant similarities between the questioned writing within the robbery Note and the known writings of Nicole Harrison, (K2a, K2b, K2c) which are wholly consistent with common authorship, to the degree of WRITTEN BY. So the body of questioned writing within the robbery Note Was WRITTEN by Nicole Harrison, and Was NOT WRITTEN by Reyna Verlice.
UDGN6C-5245	De acuerdo al método para el análisis de escritura a analizar minuciosamente la escritura cuestionada (Q1, Nota de robo), en comparación con las escrituras proporcionadas como base de cotejo de Reyna Verlice (K1) y de Nicole Harrison (K2) se encontró lo siguiente: - Diferencias suficientes y determinantes en referencia a Reyna Verlice; y - Similitudes suficientes y determinantes con Nicole Harrison. [Provided Translation] According to the method for handwriting analysis to thoroughly analyze the questioned writing (Q1, Robbery Note), in comparison with the writings provided as a basis for comparison by Reyna Verlice (K1) and Nicole Harrison (K2) the following was found : - Sufficient and decisive differences in reference to Reyna Verlice; and - Sufficient and decisive similarities with Nicole Harrison.
UDJAZT-5241	1. The handwriting contained in the questionable document identified as evidence Item Q1 does not match with the handwriting attributed to Ms. Reyna Verlice, contained in the unquestionable documents identify as Item K1. 2. The handwriting contained in the questionable document identified as Item Q1 matches with the handwriting attributed to Ms. Nicole Harrison, contained in the unquestionable documents identified as Item K2.
UYZJ2Q-5245	It is my opinion that the evidence observed provides qualified support for the proposition that the questioned writing depicted on Qc1 was written by Nicole Harrison, Kc2, over the proposition that the questioned writing was written by someone other than Nicole Harrison.
UZTFQK-5241	It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by NICOLE HARRISON, Item 3 (Item K2a-c).
V22UPD-5241	The examination and comparison of exhibit Q1 with exhibits K1a-c (Reyna Verlice) and K2a-c (Nicole Harrison) were completed and the following conclusions and observations are based upon my education, training and experience and the results are as follows: Exhibits Q1 and K1a-K2c were scanned for preservation by Forensic Document Examiner. The questioned handprinting present on the bank robbery note submitted in exhibit Q1 was not written by the author of K1a-c (Reyna Verlice). The questioned handprinting present on the bank robbery note submitted in exhibit Q1 was written by the author of K2a-c (Nicole Harrison). An ESDA (ElectroStatic Detection Apparatus) examination for the detection and reading of indented writing, typing or other identifying impressions was not performed on Q1 as the documents are photos. A VSC (Video Spectral Comparator) examination was not completed on exhibits Q1 as the documents were photos.
VBAGLK-5241	The writer of the known writing on K2 wrote the questioned writing on Q1.
VCGYKF-5241	UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT PROVENANCE (the writings found in the extortion note document identified as doubted Q1 compared to the doubtful writings K2a-d and K2C corresponding to Mrs. Nicole Harrison.
VF2LKF-5241	Methods: A visual examination and comparison of the submitted items was completed. Questioned to Known Comparisons: The questioned writing in Item #3 was probably written by Nicole Harrison, the purported writer of Item #2 (Support for Same Source). There were significant similarities between the questioned and known writing. The questioned writing in Item #3 was probably not written by Reyna

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	Verlice, the purported writer of Item #1 (Support for Different Source). There were significant differences between the questioned and known writing. Examination Limitations: The examination was limited by the amount of comparable sample. Requested Items: Please submit the following if additional handwriting analysis is requested: - Additional non-requested print samples from both Reyna Verlice and Nicole Harrison. - Additional requested samples from both Reyna Verlice and Nicole Harrison writing the words in #3 multiple times. Remarks: All items are available for return. If additional items are to be submitted, please re-submit the original items in their original labeled packaging.
VGW89F-5241	HANDWRITING (NICOLE HARRISON, Item 3 (K2a-c)): Support for Common Source (Strong) A source identification could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the limited quantity of questioned and comparable known writing submitted for examination. However, strong characteristics in common were observed which indicate NICOLE HARRISON, Item 3 (K2a-c), may have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1). HANDWRITING (REYNA VERLICE, Item 2 (K1a-c)): Support for Different Sources (Strong) A source elimination could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the limited quantity of questioned and comparable known writing submitted for examination. However, strong inconsistencies were observed which indicate REYNA VERLICE, Item 2 (K1a-c), may not have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1).
VPRAAQ-5241	the question document was writing by K2
VQVCQF-5241	1. Reyna Verlice is not the scriptor of the Robbery Note. 2. Nicole Harrison probably is the scriptor of the Robbery Note.
W3QVUR-5245	Based on the examination and comparison of the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit Q1 with the known hand printed entries on Exhibits K1a through K1c and K2a through K2c, the following has been determined: o Nicole Harrison (Exhibits K2a through K2c) wrote the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit Q1. o Reyna Verlice (Exhibits K1a through K1c) did not write the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit Q1.
W9EFYT-5241	It has been concluded that Reyla Verlice (K1) did not prepare the questioned material appearing on the Exhibit Q1 item. It has been determined that Nicole Harrison (K2) probably did not prepare the questioned material appearing on the Exhibit Q1 item.
WBXGUE-5245	Significant differences observed in line quality and formation of letters between questioned writing in Q1 and known specimens in K1a to K1c. The writer of K1a to K1c did not write the questioned writing in Q1. Similarities observed in formation of letters between questioned writing in Q1 and known specimens in K2a to K2c. There are indications that the writer of K2a to K2c wrote the questioned writing in Q1.
WGC88M-5245	Similarities and a lack of fundamental differences were observed between the specimen material provided in the name Nicole HARRISON (K2 writer) and the Q1 robbery note. Given the limitation of brevity and complexity of the Q1 writing, in my opinion, there is qualified support for the proposition that the K2 writer (HARRISON) also produced the handwriting on Q1. Differences were observed between the specimen material provided in the name Reyna VERLICE (K1 writer) and the Q1 robbery note. Given the limitation of brevity and complexity of the Q1 writing, in my opinion, there is qualified support for the proposition that the K1 writer (VERLICE) also produced the handwriting on Q1.
WJV939-5245	The submitted robbery note presented, WAS NOT WRITTEN by Reyna Verlice; WAS WRITTEN by Nicole Harrison.
WJYR9K-5241	Result: In the manuscripts that read "put all the money in the bag and no one gets hurt no cops" visible in a paper cutout with lines, specific and individualizing scriptural characteristics were observed with the manuscripts that Nicole Harrison made in the documents identified as K2A to K2C Interpretation: By virtue of the above result, the manuscripts in question were written by Nicole Harrison
WKQMXE-5241	A comparative inspection is carried out between the doubted text contained in the questioned document (theft note Q1), compared to the handwriting samples (dictations K1 A-B) provided by Reyna Verlice and

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	extra-procedural writings from Reyna Verlice's business writing course (K1 C) where with the support of optical and lighting aid elements, the graphonomic aspects and sub-aspects were inspected such as: Pressure, morphology, dimension, cohesion, linear displacement, inclination, proportionality, initiation and termination points, speed and identifying and individualizing elements among others; evidencing discrepancies between the graphonomic characteristics of the doubted text (theft note Q1) and undoubted ones (the handwritten samples (dictations K1 A-B) and extra-procedural writings (K1 C)). Similarly, the comparative inspection was carried out between the doubted text contained in the questioned document (theft note Q1), compared to the handwriting samples (dictations K2 A-B) provided by Nicole Harrison and extra-procedural writings from Nicole's business writing course Harrison (K2 C) where with the support of optical and lighting aid elements, the graphonomic aspects and sub-aspects were inspected such as: Pressure, morphology, dimension, cohesion, linear displacement, inclination, proportionality, initiation points and completion, speed and identifying and individualizing elements among others; observing concordances between the graphonomic characteristics of the doubted text (theft note Q1) and undoubted ones (the handwriting samples (dictations K2 A-B) and extra-procedural writings (K2 C)). NO UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT PROVENANCE between the graphonomic characteristics of the doubted text (theft note Q1) and the undoubted handwriting samples (dictations K1 A-B) provided by Reyna Verlice and extra-procedural writings from Reyna Verlice's business writing course (K1 C). MANUSCRIPT UNIPROVENANCE between the graphonomic characteristics of the doubted text (theft note Q1) and undoubted handwriting samples (dictations K2 A-B) provided by Nicole Harrison and extra-procedural writings from Nicole Harrison's business writing course (K2 C).
WR7BNA-5245	Through the analysis of the scriptures taken as collation, based on the characteristics of general order and graphic gestures analyzed and comparing with the scripture questioned, it is necessary that the scripture questioned was not made by Reyna Verlice, it was done only by Nicole Harrison.
WVWBE7-5241	1. I found the evidence to support the proposition that, the specimen writing marked as "K2A" to "K2C" and the questioned writing marked as "Q1" were written by the same writer (author). 2. I found the evidence to support the proposition that, the specimen writing marked as "K1A" to "K1C" and the questioned writing marked as "Q1" were not written by the same writer (author).
X8XJ8T-5245	The robbery note was written by person K2 (Nicole Harrison) and was not written by person K1 (Reyna Verlice).
XAQEV3-5241	1. Significant similarities in respect of design and execution were identified between the questioned writing marked as “Q1” and the specimen writing marked as “K2A” to “K2B” and “K2C”. Therefore, I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the questioned writing marked as “Q1” was written by the writer of the specimen materials marked as “K2A” to “K2B” and “K2C”. 2. Significant differences in respect of design and execution were identified between the questioned writing marked as “Q1” and the specimen writing marked as “K1A” to “K1B” and “K1C”. Therefore, I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the questioned writing marked as “Q1” was not written by the writer of the specimen materials marked as “K1A” to “K1B” and “K1C”.
XQDT8U-5245	According to the analyzes carried out, the doubtful material provided, the reference patterns for the present study and the tecnhincal reasoning explained above, it is determined that: THERE IS NO GRAPHIC IDENTITY between the Article Manuscripts (Q1). Theft Note. Front (K1A, K1B). Dictated examples (K1C). Commercial Writting Course for REYNA VERLICE. THERE IS GRAPHIC IDENTITY between the Article Manuscripts (Q1). Theft Note. (K2A, K2B). Dictated examples. (K2C) Commercial writting Course for NICOLE HARRISON.
XU9VNE-5245	K1: Level on conclusion scale: -2. The results support that the writing was not written by K1. The results are at least 100 times more probable if the alternative hypothesis is true compared to if the main hypothesis is true. K2: Level on the conclusion scale: +3. The results strongly support that the writing was written by K2. The results are at least 6 000 times more probable if the main hypothesis is true compared to if the alternative hypothesis is true. We use a nine level conclusion scale.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
XUBDVQ-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
XV9L4A-5241	After the graphological comparison between the completion of the theft note and the standard comparison samples (writing tests and extra-process material) of Mrs. Nicole Harrison (K2a, b, c), it was possible to evidence graphonomic coincidences in the following aspects: interliteral and intervarbal spacing, arrangement of the texts, height, size (dilation), linear displacement, inclination, links, shape of the strokes, beginning and end points, which allows us to indicate that these texts were written by Nicole Harrison. Therefore, it is ruled out that the document was prepared by the citizen Reyna Verlice.
XY4DC8-5241	Questioned document – Q1 robbery note was compared to two person's handwriting: K1 (Reyna Verlice) and K2 (Nicole Harrison) and the similarities were found with K2 (Nicole Harrison) handwriting in following handwriting characteristics: - Class characteristics: handwriting structure and writers skill; Size and shape of the letters; - Individual characteristics in following letters: "Y"; "b"; "m"; "S"; "g"; "th"; "ts".
Y6B2P9-5241	As a result of the comparison made between the handwritings on the "q" document subject to examination and the "k1" and "k2" comparison documents sent for comparison; The handwritings in the "q" document, which is the subject of the examination, were found to be compatible with the comparative writings in the "k2" document, and it was concluded that the handwritings in the subject of the examination came from the "k2" hand.
Y6B783-5241	I found sufficient evidence to support that the writing in question in the document marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen writing in the documents marked as "K2A" to "K2C" and was not written by the writer of the specimen writing in the documents marked as "K1A" to "K1C".
YBUP3B-5245	FIRST The blue manual writings that say "put all the money in the bag/ and no one gets hurt/ no cops", which appear on the sheet of blue horizontal striped paper (Q1), PRESENT GRAPHIC IDENTITY with the prepared manual writings by Mrs. NICOLE HARRISON, in the handwriting samples (K2A and K2B) and extra-process documents (K2C). SECOND The participation of Mrs. REYNA VERLICE (K1A - K1C) in the execution of the blue manual writings that say "put all the money in the bag/ and no one gets hurt/ no cops" (Q1) is ruled out.
YC89XF-5241	1.- The handwriting of the robbery note delivered to the bank teller on July 20, 2023, does not correspond to Reyna Verlice 2.- Corresponds to Nicole Harrison the handwriting of the robbery note delivered to the bank teller on July 20, 2023.
YHB32A-5245	The author of the submitted Exhibit K1 known writings, Reyna Verlice, did not write the questioned handwritten text appearing on the Exhibit Q1 document. The author of the submitted Exhibit K2 known writings, Nicole Harrison, wrote the questioned handwritten text appearing on the Exhibit Q1 document.
YHZ7Y6-5241	2.1 I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen material marked as "K2A" to "K2C". 2.2 I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen writing marked as "K1A" to "K1C".
YLCB7J-5245	1. Questioned document (Q1) was not written by Reyna Verlice (K1). 2. Questioned document (Q1) — Nicole Harrison (K2) cannot be identyfied or eliminated.
YPZHVM-5245	Side by side visual comparisons were conducted between the handwriting submitted in Item Q and the handwritings submitted in Items K1 and K2 to determine whether or not Item Q was written by either writer. Handwriting comparisons involve the characterization and evaluation of both the overt and subtle characteristics in the submitted materials. It is the conclusion of this examiner that the Item Q note was written by the writer of Item K2 which was submitted as the known writings of Nicole Harrison. A conclusion of "was 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.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
YYKU6E-5245	It is highly probable Nicole Harrison (K2) produced the questioned hand printed - cursive writing combination writing on the questioned bank note (Q1). (HIGHLY PROBABLE DID PRODUCE) It is highly probable Reyna Verlice (K1) did not produced the questioned hand printed - cursive writing combination writing (Q1) on the questioned bank note. (HIGHLY PROBABLE DID NOT PRODUCE)
Z4BNEK-5241	The Note (Q1) was written by Nicole Harrison (K2) and not by Reyna Verlice (K1).
ZH9VDM-5241	It is my opinion that: 1. The evidence provides very strong support for the Proposition (P2A) that the questioned handwritten entries on the document, item 3, were NOT written by the writer of the VERLICE handwriting specimens, items 1.1 & 1.2. 2. The evidence provides very strong support for the Proposition (P1A) that the questioned handwritten entries on the document, item 3, WERE written by the writer of teh HARRISON handwriting specimens, items 2.1 & 2.2.
ZMN32L-5245	The author of the K2 known writings submitted as being authored by Nicole Harrison is identified as the author of the Q1 questioned writing.
ZWZ6L3-5245	The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked as “Q1” was written by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked as “K2A” to “K2C”.
ZZCAUG-5245	1. Reyna Verlice did not write the Q-1 Robbery Note 2. Nicole Harrison probably wrote the Q-1 Robbery Note

Additional Comments

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
2RD3RM-5245	A mixture of similarities and dissimilarities were observed between Q1 and K1. Additionally, the handprinting on Q1 has been identified as having been written by the K2 writer. A writer may be eliminated as having executed writing by skill level, a sufficient amount of significant differences, and/or the identification of another writer.
3CXFJG-5241	The complexity of the questioned writing, being somewhat limited in development from copy book, and the somewhat limited quantity, has limited the examination process and outcome.
3NYQEX-5245	3.1 Significant similarities in respect of design and execution were identified between the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting marked as "K2A-C"; 3.2 Significant differences in respect of design and execution were identified between the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting marked as "K1A-C";
3RBWLC-5245	If the original note was available, it would be examined for the possible presence of any indented impressions of writing.
3YAE2N-5245	All documentation is digitized, however, it is considered original for the purposes of this study.
49R846-5241	The techniques used in this analysis included physical visual examination of features, sketching of features and use of a microscope for magnification of features.
4EJP42-5245	The two writer samples had a lot of similarities in their features. This case was a good example regarding the importance of complexity of the compared handwriting groups during the forensic comparison.
4G67LM-5245	In relation to K2 (C. Nicole Harrison CANNOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED): I found a number of similarities between Q1 and K2 including similarities in style (cursive and script mix), letter construction, graphic ability and a tendency to leave a gap between the writing and the left margin. However, there was a limited amount of questioned handwriting material to compare to and differences in construction in some of the letters was observed also. Additionally, a number of the similarities in letter construction/letter forms were found to be generic and thus less significance was placed in these similarities. The questioned note (Q1) was written in a mixture of cursive and script. However, much of the specimen writing (K2) was written in a mainly script style which limited the examination and comparison. Although it was noted that there was a left margin gap in specimens K2A/B and the robbery note (Q1), the margin gap in K2A/B was not as pronounced as the gap in Q1 and little significance was placed in this similarity. The rightward sloping or angling of K2s handwriting was not as pronounced or as consistent as the rightward sloping/angling of writing on the robbery note (Q1). Overall, while more similarities than differences were found between the handwriting of Q1 and K2, there was insufficient evidence to reach a conclusion of "probably written by". In a wider or more expanded scale, a conclusion beyond inconclusive likely would have been selected e.g. limited or moderate.
4HYWR2-5245	Both the texts Q1, K1 and K2 have been written following a calligraphic model, without straying too far from the learned model; which has made it difficult to detect graphic habitualisms. This has been confirmed in the common execution of the some letters and links between them.
4JCNKH-5245	Conclusion Definitions: Identification - if there is agreement in all individualizing characteristics and there are no significant, inexplicable differences between the questioned and the known writing, then an identification is appropriate. This is the highest degree of confidence expressed by Forensic Document Examiner's in handwriting comparisons. Elimination - if there are significant differences between the questioned and known writing at any level of the analyses, then an elimination is appropriate. This, like the definite conclusion of identification, is the highest degree of confidence expressed by Forensic Document Examiner's in handwriting comparisons.
669MH2-5245	In assessing the significance of my findings I have used the following scale: none/limited/moderate/moderately strong/strong/very strong/extremely strong/conclusive

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
6CA243-5241	The aspects that identified the authorship of the robbery note by Ms. NICOLE HARRISON were: • The right tilt • The links of the letters “ts” in the word “gets”, “op” in “cops” and “ey” in “money” • The angular morphology of the arches of the “h”, “n”, “m” • The upper seal of the letters “o” • The hooked beginning of the ovals of the “g”, among others.
6VRJZW-5241	1. There are similarities in terms of design and execution between the specimen handwriting marked as “K2A” to “K2C” and the questioned handwriting marked as “Q1”. 2. There are differences in terms of design and execution between the specimen handwriting marked as “K1A” to “K1C” and the questioned handwriting marked as “Q1”.
747CZ4-5241	For this inspection, a 10x magnifying glass was used.
7Z9XDD-5245	AFTER CAREFULLY EXAMINING THE HANDWRITING IN THE ROBBERY NOTE AND COMPARING IT TO K1 : REYNA VERLICE HANDWRITING , WE FOUND DIFFERECES IN THE NATURE OF THE HANDWRITING ADDITIONALLY , THE HANDWRITING IN THE ROBBERY NOTE EXHIBITED AN EXCELLENT LEVEL OF LINEARITY , WHILE K1 : REYNA VERLICE,S HANDWRITING SHOWED A MODERATE LEVEL OF LINEARITY . FURTHERMORE , THERE WERE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN THE FEATURES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HANDWRITING BETWEEN THEM . AFTER CAREFULLY EXAMINING THE HANDWRITING IN THE ROBBERY NOTE AND COMPARING IT TO K2 : NICOLE HARRISON,S HANDWRITING , WE FOUND A REMARKABLE SIMILARITY BETWEEN THEM IN TERMS OF THE NATURE OF THE HANDWRITING WHICH IS FLUENT AND SMOOTH WITHOUT ANY RESTRICTIONS OR DISTURBANCE IN THE PATH OF HANDWRITING MOVEMENT . ADDITIONALLY , THEY DEMONSTRATED AN EXCELLENT LEVEL OF HANDWRITING PROFICIENCY AND SHARE COMMON FEATURES . FURHTERMORE , SIMILARITIES WERE OBSERVED IN THE SPACING BETWEEN WORDS AND THE MANNER IN WHICH THE LETTERS WERE CONNECTED .
87D4J4-5241	A finding of "probably did not" means that the evidence points rather strongly against the questioned and known writings having been written by the same individual. A finding of "probably wrote" means that the evidence contained in the handwriting points rather strongly toward the questioned and known writings having been written by the same individual.
8B6YR3-5241	If additional handwriting comparisons are desired, additional dictated and undictated known writing should be obtained from REYNA VERLICE, writer of Item 2 (K1a-c), NICOLE HARRISON, writer of Item 3 (K2a-c), and any other logical suspect(s). The known writing should be comparable to the questioned writing in wording, style, and format. Dictated known writing should be obtained on separate sheets of lined paper similar in size to the questioned item and each should be removed from the writer’s view upon completion. Numerous repetitions may be necessary in order to obtain naturally prepared writing. Undictated known writing consists of writing prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known writing include business papers, letters, and/or applications. The known writing should be contemporaneous to the questioned item.
8BAE64-5241	The author of the K2 known handwriting can neither be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned handwriting appearing on Q1. Both similarities and differences were observed. It could not be determined at this time if these observed differences were due to variation or a different writer. A more definite opinion may be reached if additional K2 known handwriting exemplars could be submitted for examination that represent the writer's full range of variation.
8DAXG3-5245	Would request exemplars be produced using black ball point pen.
8E8ZUL-5241	the comparative analysis between the handwriting of the questioned document and K2 shows no difference and general and morphological caracteristics similarities but the handwriting is not individualized enough for an identification.
8T6BZ4-5245	Additional standards from Nicole Harrison are requested.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
96DDY8-5245	A qualified opinion was rendered in this examination due to the following reasons: - the examination was limited to digital reproductions, and - the writing is mostly hand printing from all documents submitted, but the examination of some cursive writing collected from the author of K2 may have been of benefit.
98UDKW-5241	Both sets of writing have a smooth and free flowing appearance. I found the specimen suitable for analysis. All sets of writing have no indication of intentional disguise and showed individual characteristics on which identification could be based.
9VDJ6H-5241	A greater number of known standards are usually necessary to establish a range of natural variation of a writer. Therefore, it would be beneficial to obtain additional exemplars from the subjects in this case writing the questioned document verbatim.
9ZAADU-5245	A visual examination and comparison of the submitted items was completed using a stereo microscope and hand lens. The opinion is based on the similarities found in various general and individual characteristics of handwriting between questioned item and known items when compared on the well-established principle of comparing "like with the like".
AXAQKC-5241	The submitted robbery note (Q1) is a short handwritten record. The comparative material consists of similar graphisms. In the case of K1 (Reyna Verlice), differences predominate and in case of K2 (Nicole Harrison) features similar to the qestioned forms predominate. Therefore, they authorize the elimination (K1) and identyfication (K2) of preparator only to a probable extent. So it goes, it is necessary to suplement the comparative material of bot women.
DB6ARE-5245	The submission of ten to fifteen exact-text exemplars and/or comparable normal course-of-business known writing samples of Reyna Vertice and Nicole Harrison, containing words, letters and numerals as within the questioned entries, may provide the basis for additional conclusions.
DBPNHC-5245	Results defined in accordance with ASTM E1658-08 Standard Terminology for Expressing Conclusions of Forensic Document Examiners. Identification: This is the highest degree of confidence expressed by document examiners in handwriting comparisons. The examiner has no reservations whatever, and although prohibited from using the word “fact,” the examiner is certain, based on evidence contained in the handwriting, that the writer of the known material actually wrote the writing in question.
DDAPDY-5241	All documents are coloured print out not original documents.
DW6HXW-5245	It is the protocol of this examiner to downgrade SWGDOC standardized conclusion terminology when limiting factors exist. While the clarity and quality of the images provided were excellent, the fact that non-originals (digital images) were submitted rather than originals is considered a limiting factor. Highly probable is a strong conclusion (to a virtual degree of certainty), but provides acknowledgement of the existing limiting factor.
E43KLU-5241	Scientific method taking into account the phases of: observation, indication or signaling of the distinctive characters (individualizing characteristics), confrontation and identity judgments.
E8Y932-5245	Remarks: Qualified opinions were rendered in this case because of the limitations were present in the handwriting examination, which included: - Some characteristics in the questioned writing could not be reconciled based on the known writing, - The questioned writing was a limited amount without repetitions of some features, which was a limitation to assessing range of variation.
EYBZWR-5241	The writing analysis method was used to respond to the established questions: Analysis 1. 1. Firstly analyzing the questioned writing Q1, consisting of the (theft note), preliminary analysis, analysis without optical instruments, analysis with optical instruments and analysis with video spectral comparator. 2. Analyzing comparison writing K1a-b, consisting of (examples taught by Reyna Verlice) and K1c (business writing course for Reyna Verlice), preliminary analysis, analysis without optical instruments, analysis with optical instruments and analysis with video spectral comparator. 3. Comparison of extrinsic reference points (PRE'S) and intrinsic reference points (PRI'S). 4. Analysis of results, evaluation of each of the results of the confrontation (matching/questioning), finding no associations. 5. Conclusion, deed Q1 (theft note) does not correspond to Reyna Verlice. Analysis 2. 1. Analyzing the questioned writing Q1, consisting of

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	the (theft note), preliminary analysis, analysis without optical instruments, analysis with optical instruments and analysis with video spectral comparator. 2. Analyzing K2a-b comparison writing, consisting of (examples taught by Nicole Harrison) and K2c (business writing course for Nicole Harrison) preliminary analysis, analysis without optical instruments, analysis with optical instruments and analysis with video spectral comparator. 3. Comparison of extrinsic reference points (PRE'S) and intrinsic reference points (PRI'S). 4. Analysis of results, evaluation of each of the results of the confrontation (matching/questioning), finding associations. 5. Conclusion, deed Q1 (theft note) does correspond to Nicole Harrison.
F2BNWZ-5241	Q1 shows no signs of unnatural execution. There were no significant limits to the examination and comparison.
FGPRGA-5241	To the extent of the qualified identification of K2, the K1 writer probably did not author Q1. Several characteristics present in K1 do not appear in Q1; however, the skill level of both writers is comparable and I cannot fully eliminate K1 based on the limited evidence.
FPH6G9-5245	The examination of additional known writing standards, including additional writing standards for Nicole Harrison, might provide data to support a definitive finding regarding the authorship of the questioned note.
FRPGZV-5241	For the inspection, a 10x magnifying glass was used.
FWGVGQ-5245	However that we could find some of similarityes, in the Reyna Verlicke handwriting, it's not inough to determine that the demanding note, is writen by her. We would like to had the "demanding note", in original because it would be more eficcent, to follow the dynamic of writing and to qualiffy better the fine caracteristcs, of the writer in this demanding note.
GHCW7Y-5241	The method used was: Handwriting analysis method
GMRH3C-5245	The writings on Q1 and K2 show similarities in general and detailed caracteristics, but do not show a high degree of individualization. They do not display any differences. The writings on Q1 and K1 display differences in general and detailed cacarteristics, but are not highly individualized.
GU7B7V-5245	These findings are based on the examination of reproductions of the evidence. The undersigned is obligated to acknowledge that certain types of evidence cannot be examined from non-original documents by including this qualification and tempering conclusion terminology as appropriate. The undersigned requests the submission of the original, written ink on paper, or higher-quality reproductions of all Items for further examination.
H24DTR-5241	Comparative analysis method of graphonomic aspects, through direct observation and with the help of a magnifying glass thread counting instrument
HADUGR-5245	If the original of the questioned note were available then an indented impressions examination would be undertaken to ascertain if there were any indented impressions of handwriting that may provide intelligence and/or information as to its origin and/or authorship. It is noted that both RV and NH share similar writing styles, however, there are suitable subtle differences between the two sets of writing to differentiate the pair of writers. The opinions submitted are low to mid range qualified opinions based on the scale currently utilised.
HDC6DR-5245	In case there is any confusion about the above conclusions, the information provided indicates that the author of the K2a, K2b, and K2c is Nicole Harrison. If that information is correct, she is the author of the Q1 robbery note.
HPAZX3-5245	Assumptions: Although the questioned document is not dated, I have assumed that the timeframe between the known and questioned documents is reasonable in the context of the examination. I have also assumed that both Reyna VERLICE and Nicole HARRISON are adult writers. Limitation: The examination was limited by the amount of writing available in the questioned document, with many characters absent, and others present only once or twice. Feedback: The quality of the known writing is

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	not representative of casework encountered in my laboratory and is too ideal (i.e. the questioned writing is repeated four times in the requested samples and there is also course of business writing). I believe the proficiency test would be more worthwhile, and more representative of casework, if less than ideal known writing was used.
K2HJDF-5245	Limitations: This examiner was provided with two sets of samples with the assumption that the K1 samples were all written by one writer and that the K2 samples were all written by one writer, but a writer other than K1. This analysis is partially qualified because high quality digital images were provided for analysis. If the original documents were provided, the opinions provided could be altered.
KRQ4J6-5241	3.1) 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. 3.2) All submitted items are being returned to the submitting Agency.
KUH3W3-5241	Testing for indented writing would be conducted if the original robbery note was available.
L9JZKE-5241	1.1 Analysis and Comparison of the respective material revealed the following facts: 1.1.1 Several significant similarities in respect of elements of style were identified between the handwriting in question contained on the document marked as “Q1” and the specimen handwriting contained on the documents marked as “K2A” to “K2C”. 1.1.2 Several significant dissimilarities in respect of elements of style were identified between the handwriting in question contained on the document marked as “Q1” and the specimen handwriting contained on the documents marked as “K1A” to “K1C”.
LKNDDK-5245	Based upon the available evidence it is my professional opinion that the author of K1, K2, and K3 wrote the questioned robbery note.
MD8ZCZ-5245	Images of the submitted items were retained by the FDU. Definitions of Handwriting Opinions: The opinion “highly probable” means that the evidence contained in the handwriting is very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality is missing so that an identification is not in order. However, the examiner is virtually certain that the questioned and known writings were written by the same individual. The opinion “probable not” means that the evidence contained in the handwriting points rather strongly against the questioned and known writings having been written by the same individual. However, it falls short of the “virtually certain” degree of confidence.
MHFMLV-5241	K1 (Reyna Verlice), did not write on the note (Q1)
N4RX44-5245	Discrepancy found in marking of the files (for example K1A vs K1a) and file name (CTS23-5425) in the zip files
NM6GXM-5241	For the inspection, a 10x magnifying glass was used as an optical instrument.
P3DVTP-5241	Above opinion (and the evaluation of the findings) used the following 3 propositions, H1: writer K1 wrote the questioned text on Q1, H2: writer K2 wrote the questioned text on Q1, and H3: someone other than writers K1 or K2 wrote the questioned text on Q1.
QFYE3K-5241	According to the Graphoscopic-Comparative study carried out between the comparison base writing inserted in the documents identified as (K1ABC) by Reyna Verlice with the questioned writing inserted in the questioned document (robbery note) identified as (Q1) with mostly differences in its general order and graphic gestures; while the writing inserted in the documents identified as (K2ABC) by Nicole Harrison with the writing questioned inserted in the questioned document (robbery note) identified as Q1 presents mostly similarities.
QLLDGZ-5245	The combination of the small quantity and limited complexity of the questioned handwriting has meant it has not been possible to identify or eliminate either of the specimen writers.
QUXC9Q-5245	The similarities of the handwritings between K2a-b and K2c are not good. We would like to know more details about how the police collected dictated exemplars from Nicole Harrison. If possible, we would like

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	to invite Nicole Harrison to our laboratory to provide more samples of handwritings for further examination.
TG4W2T-5245	The examination of additional known writing of Nicole Harrison, such as normal course-of-business writings or a handwriting exemplar packet, might yield more definitive conclusions than those stated in this report. Specifically useful would be cursive writing and hand printed samples.
U24EKT-5245	The conclusion probably wrote is a qualified opinion that means there is more evidence for, than against, the known writer. There are similarities between the handwriting characteristics 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.
U24EME-5241	I reserve the right to change my opinion should additional documents become available for comparison purposes.
UA3K6B-5241	The Law of ACE (Analysis, Comparison and Evaluation) which is the fundimental principle underlying handwriting and signature examination, was applied to reach the above conclusion.
UDGN6C-5245	Las conclusiones varían de acuerdo a los criterios de aceptación establecidos por este laboratorio en relación a los elementos base de cotejo proporcionados, para efectos de dar contestación específica a la prueba de proficiencia se toma como referencia los diferentes resultados establecidos en esta. [Provided Translation] The conclusions vary according to the acceptance criteria established by this laboratory in relation to the basic comparison elements provided. For the purposes of giving a specific answer to the proficiency test, the different results established in it are taken as reference.
VBAGLK-5241	Similarities in space, sizing, slant, speed, proportions, letter design construction and baseline alignment were observed between the known writing on K2 and the questioned writing on Q1, there were no fundamental differences. Differences were observed in spacing, letter construction and proportions were observed between the known writing on K1 and the questioned writing on Q1. There were no limitations.
VCGYKF-5241	The comparative inspection and analysis was carried out through the use of optical magnification instruments (10x magnifying glass) to the writings found in the extortion note document identified as Q1, compared to the undoubted writings K1a-d and KC1 of Mrs. Reina Verlice and K2a-d and KC2, by Mrs. Nicole Harrison, taking into account the graphonomic aspects and sub-aspects, where it was found that the graphisms under study corresponding to the writings K2a-d and KC2, presented coincident graphonomic aspects, while the corresponding writings K1a -d and KC1 did not present graphonomic coincidences.
VGW89F-5241	If future hand printing comparisons are desired, dictated and undictated known writing should be obtained from REYNA VERLICE, Item 2 (K1a-c), NICOLE HARRISON, Item 3 (K2a-c), and any other logical suspect(s). The known writing should be comparable to the questioned writing in wording, style, and format. Dictated known writing should be obtained on separate sheets of lined paper similar in size to the questioned item and each should be removed from the writer's view upon completion. Numerous repetitions may be necessary in order to obtain naturally prepared writing. Undictated known writing consists of writing prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known writing include business papers, letters, canceled checks, and/or applications.
W3QVUR-5245	If testimony is required, the undersigned should be notified at least three weeks prior to the scheduled trial or hearing date. Notes and data to support findings and opinions in this report are available upon request.
W9EFYT-5241	It would be of value to submit the original of the Exhibit Q1 item for indented writing examination should it become available.
WVWBE7-5241	1. Similarities in respect of elements of styles and execution were identified between the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" the specimen writing marked as "K2A" to "K2C". 2. Differences in respect of elements of style and execution were identified between the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" the

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	specimen writing marked as "K1A" to "K1C".
XU9VNE-5245	For K1: the reason for reporting level -2 is that the writing style of the questioned material does not contain enough personal details.
YBUP3B-5245	For the comparative technical analysis, the morphostructural characteristics and dynamics of the strokes that make up the doubted and undoubted manual writings were taken into account, in terms of initiations and endings, flexion and extension movements, spontaneity, inclination, proportionality, construction of letters, links, rhythm and finishing of the strokes. It is important to state that the documents sent for study correspond to photostatic prints, material that is not considered technically suitable for this type of analysis; however, specific production characteristics can be detected in them that allow establishing Graphic Identity and Non-Graphic Identity. Even if they had sent the documents in original, these are the results obtained.
YC89XF-5241	We analyzed the writing of Reyna Verlice, once her participation in its execution was rulled out, we analized the Nicole Harrison writing identifyong that it was seh, who made the writing of the robbery note.
YLCB7J-5245	Nicole Harrison (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated. Similarities and differences in both questioned (Q1) and known (K2) handwriting were found. The known material (K2) is not adequate in terms of speed and inclination. The known material (K2) was written at a slower pace as compared to the questioned document (Q1). Known material from Nicole Harrison (K2) should be collected, adequate in terms of writing speed and inclination.
YYKU6E-5245	These examinations are limited because: The known writing submitted from Nicole Harrison (K2) was of a limited amount. If additional known writing is submitted from Nicole Harrison further examinations can be conducted and more conclusive opinions may be reached. The known writing submitted from Reyna Verlice (K1) was of a limited amount. If additional known writing is submitted from Nicole Harrison further examinations can be conducted; however, a more conclusive opinions will not be rendered due to the opinion of Elimination becoming non-relevant in Questioned Document Examination. This is based on the foundation that all the handwriting samples in the world were not examined/compared to this questioned writing sample.
ZH9VDM-5241	For the purposes of this examination, it has been assumed that: 1. All non-original documents are true and accurate reproductions of the original documents. 2. The submitted specimen documents are representative of the range of variation typical of the writers they are attributed to. Should either of these assumptions prove to be wrong or inaccurate, a re-examination will have to be undertaken.
ZWZ6L3-5245	The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked as “Q1” was not written by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked as “K1A” to “K1C”.

-End of Report-
(Appendix may follow)

Collaborative Testing Services ~ Forensic Testing Program

Test No. 23-5241: Handwriting Examination

DATA MUST BE SUBMITTED BY **Nov. 27, 2023, 11:59 p.m. EST** TO BE INCLUDED IN THE REPORT

Participant Code: U1234D WebCode: 2GWFGZ

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 responded to the armed robbery of a local bank on July 20, 2023. The suspect gave the teller a note demanding money. The police believe their suspect to be Reyna Verlice. Reyna insists she didn't write the note or have anything to do with the robbery. Reyna has implicated her roommate, Nicole Harrison, as the individual who robbed the bank. Known course of business writings and dictated exemplars for Reyna and Nicole have been collected. Please examine the submitted robbery note to determine, which, if either, of the individuals contributed to the handwriting on the questioned robbery note.

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

Items Submitted (Sample Pack HWP - Photographs):
Item K1a-b: Dictated exemplars for Reyna Verlice
Item K1c: Course of business writing for Reyna Verlice
Item K2a-b: Dictated exemplars for Nicole Harrison
Item K2c: Course of business writing for Nicole Harrison
Item Q1: Robbery 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 on the robbery note?

	K1 (Reyna Verlice)	K2 (Nicole Harrison)
Q1 (Robbery Note)		

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

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

3.) Additional Comments

Participant Code: U1234D
WebCode: 2GWFGZ

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)