



Handwriting Examination Test No. 24-5241/5 Summary Report

Each participant received a sample pack containing photographs, either printed format or digitally downloadable, of a questioned item and known writings which they were asked to determine if either of the two individuals contributed to either the handprinted text and/or signature on the questioned item. Data were returned from 224 participants: 118 for 24-5241, and 106 for 24-5245 and are compiled into the following tables:

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Manufacturer's Information</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Summary Comments</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Table 1: Examination Results</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Table 2: Conclusions</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>Table 3: Additional Comments</u>	<u>52</u>
<u>Appendix: Data Sheet</u>	

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

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

Manufacturer's Information

Each sample pack contained photographs, in either a physically printed format or digitally downloadable, of a questioned item and known writings. Participants were asked to determine if either of the two individuals contributed to the handprinted credit card application, and/or signature in the questioned item.

SAMPLE PREPARATION: During production of the directed 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 completed by the individuals. During the production of the dictated signature portion, the writers were requested to sign in the name of Edward Wilson, as this was the signature presented in the questioned item.

VERIFICATION: Predistribution results were consistent with each other and the manufacturer's preparation information.

SAMPLE PACK 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.

Preparation Information			
<u>Items</u>	<u>Pseudonym</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Source</u>
K1a-d	Edward Wilson	Known: course of business, directed exemplars, dictated signature	Female, right-handed
K2a-d	Carry Andrews	Known: course of business, directed exemplars, dictated signature	Female, right-handed
Q1	Carry Andrews	Credit card application with handprinted text and signature	K2 writer

Summary Comments

This test was designed to provide participants with a handprinted text and signature identification challenge involving a credit card application. Each sample pack contained either photographs or digitally downloadable images of the credit card application (Q1), as well as known writings provided by two individuals, Edward Wilson (K1) and Carry Andrews (K2). Participants were provided with multiple directed exemplars of the credit card application, course of business writing, and dictated signature exemplars from both known writers. Participants were requested to determine if either of the known writers contributed to the handprinted text and/or signature in the credit card application. The K2 writer produced the handprinted text and signature on Q1. Refer to the Manufacturer's Information for preparation details.

For Question 1 (Table 1a), "To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the credit card application?", a breakdown is as follows. All 224 participants (100%) identified the K2 writer (reported "A" or "B") as the source of the handprinted text on Q1 and of those, 208 participants (93%) eliminated the K1 writer (reported "D" or "E") as the source of handprinted text.

For Question 2 (Table 1b), "To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed the questioned signature on the credit card application?", a breakdown of responses is as follows. A total of 215 participants (96%) identified the K2 writer (reported "A" or "B") as the source of the signature on Q1 and of those, 205 participants (95%) eliminated the K1 writer (reported "D" or "E") as the source of the signature. Of the nine participants who did not identify the K2 writer as the source of the signature on Q1, six participants could not identify nor eliminate (reported "C") both the K1 and K2 writers, two participants could not identify nor eliminate (reported "C") the K2 writer but eliminated the K1 writer and the remaining participant provided no response in regard to the K2 writer and eliminated the K1 writer.

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

Examination Results

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

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
22TLN4-5241	E	A	4EYDLM-5241	E	A
2F4VT8-5241	E	A	4HAP6F-5241	E	A
2FEZR4-5245		A	4MN7EK-5241	E	A
2FGJXE-5241	E	A	4MPWTF-5241	E	A
2H7WVP-5241	D	B	6AJ6XM-5245	E	A
2TGHLC-5241	E	A	6C7RBH-5241	E	A
2VUUNM-5245	E	A	6FZWQ8-5241	E	A
2ZPPKT-5245	E	A	6LPGUN-5245	E	A
32DLK8-5245	E	A	6M6DLM-5241	E	A
376VED-5241	E	A	6M92YK-5241	E	A
3DKMMQ-5241	D	B	6PRE6G-5245	E	A
3J9EPD-5245	D	B	6QJDJE-5241	E	A
3MPMDC-5245		A	6U6ZB3-5241	E	A
3UUEPV-5241	E	A	6ZQWX4-5245	E	A
3W96G4-5245	E	A	73RFGH-5245	E	A
4DH6FE-5245	E	A	76JC7B-5245	E	A
4DLLT6-5241	D	B			

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
7FY92G- 5241	E	A	9EJLNK- 5245	D	B
7H997N- 5245	D	B	9HGAWF- 5241	E	A
7P4B8Z- 5241	E	A	9HHZBB- 5241	E	A
7ZNH7P- 5241	E	A	9WF9RP- 5245	E	A
82F2JZ- 5241	E	A	9WYTZG- 5245	E	A
82FZMG- 5245	D	B	A8DDDA- 5245	E	A
87NJLA- 5245	E	A	AETA3G- 5241	D	B
89VNF- 5245	E	A	AMU99Y- 5241	D	B
8A4ZVD- 5245	E	A	APBRWA- 5245	E	A
8B4RA9- 5241	E	A	AR3QB8- 5245	E	A
8FBHDE- 5241	E	A	ARGAV6- 5245	D	B
8KQP2E- 5245	E	A	AY2DZL- 5245		A
8PMG8P- 5245	E	A	AYHBCY- 5245	E	A
8TJAW- 5245	D	B	AYR67- 5245		A
8VL988- 5245	D	B	BD2BNJ- 5245	E	A
94XJZX- 5241	E	A	BH6MB4- 5245	D	B
974ZEG- 5241	E	A	BKEMGA- 5241	D	B
98KX6L- 5245	D	B	BKWHZW- 5245	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
BPR8MV- 5241	E	A	DKBEP3- 5245	E	A
BRV6PC- 5241	E	A	DNQWY7- 5241	E	A
BTM44A- 5245	E	A	DYT9CD- 5245	E	A
BVW49G- 5245	D	B	DZHLYR- 5245	E	A
BYVHW7- 5245	E	A	E2CLGA- 5241	E	A
C3YDFA- 5241	E	A	ED78ER- 5241	E	A
C6V4D9- 5241	E	A	EGKZCC- 5245	E	A
C7AN7H- 5241	E	A	EUW4VE- 5241	D	B
C8M3R8- 5241	E	A	EZKPTF- 5241	E	A
CFXETB- 5241	E	A	F4V6TQ- 5241	E	A
CMHM9U- 5245	E	A	F8M2XC- 5245	E	A
CNRMD2- 5241	E	A	FC4RNC- 5241	E	A
CUJUVA- 5241	E	A	FHXND4- 5241	E	A
CX4L8D- 5245	E	A	FLTFKZ- 5241	E	A
CXH6RA- 5241	E	A	FREHH6- 5241	E	A
DB2D42- 5245	E	A	FU7GW3- 5241	E	A
DF4XMT- 5245	E	A	FUNHMC- 5241	E	A
DGLE3Q- 5245	E	A	G2Y9G3- 5241	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
G3ZYWW- 5245	D	B	KATCEN- 5241	E	A
G6YKD2- 5241	E	A	KKHCRJ- 5241		A
G9PH8R- 5245	E	A	KR9KJ6- 5241	E	A
GAVY94- 5241	E	A	KRN443- 5241	E	A
GCJFGQ- 5245	D	B	KX23ZL- 5245	E	A
GHD8W2- 5245	D	B	L8DF8W- 5245	E	A
GTPK44- 5245	E	A	LG346K- 5241	E	A
H9F4XW- 5245	E	A	LJ3C9U- 5245	D	B
HB8ZMQ- 5245	E	A	LXJW9- 5245	D	A
HHYM2N- 5245	E	A	LK6X6A- 5241	E	A
HKZ8M9- 5245	D	B	LPV8E9- 5241	E	A
HTQRU3- 5241	E	A	LX6WR8- 5241	D	B
HVURLM- 5245	E	A	LYHD6K- 5241	E	A
J4FC36- 5241	E	A	M7VL7L- 5245	E	A
JBP729- 5245	D	B	MBBDAL- 5245	E	A
JN8CEU- 5245	E	A	MCYPUZ- 5241	E	A
JTNJ3U- 5241	E	A	MDARFX- 5245	E	A
K9CEQ6- 5245	E	A	MHQY4X- 5245	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
N2HFP7- 5241	E	A	Q9DXGN- 5241	E	A
NBTL22- 5241	E	A	QA8QC8- 5241	E	A
NDWGHJ- 5245	E	A	QBCKNW- 5245	E	A
NF3XKV- 5245	D	A	QCCB3R- 5241	E	A
NJH79V- 5245		A	QGA2FJ- 5245	E	B
NMXZL8- 5241	E	A	QNK4LR- 5241		A
NQZNHW- 5245	D	B	QPYPXE- 5241	E	A
NU9V23- 5241	E	A	QUTHEN- 5241	E	A
NXH8LW- 5245	E	A	QYN9KZ- 5241	E	A
P7CED3- 5245	E	A	R329GR- 5241	D	B
PDB2V2- 5241	E	A	R32H3W- 5241	E	A
PHHRX8- 5245	E	A	R7H27Y- 5241	E	A
PLKQ9Z- 5245	E	A	RC9BFX- 5245	E	A
PPRMD3- 5245	E	A	RRJ2AP- 5241	E	A
PUDYUQ- 5241	E	A	RUNKGX- 5245	E	A
PW6X9P- 5241	E	A	T24RAM- 5245		A
Q4MRVY- 5245	D	A	T27D63- 5241		A
Q76UKQ- 5245	E	A	T66N23- 5241	A	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
TMHC7M- 5245		A	WBK7AU- 5241	E	A
TMKX23- 5245	D	B	WD6C9H- 5245	E	A
U7ETEQ- 5245	E	A	WFCHZK- 5245		A
UAQ46Z- 5245	E	A	WWFEYA- 5241		A
UFFPRT- 5241	E	A	X73PUM- 5241	E	A
UHMVDU- 5245	E	A	X7PZZB- 5241	E	A
UQXXYU- 5245	E	A	XAXG3J- 5241		A
UTZ6VR- 5241	E	A	XBEEUJ- 5245	E	A
UZPFD3- 5241	E	A	XD7BFW- 5241	E	A
V4KLAK- 5241	E	A	XEDPQJ- 5241	E	A
V9Y6Q2- 5241	E	A	XKJHHU- 5241	E	A
VBYG4T- 5241	E	A	XNZQ7T- 5245	D	B
VE442Q- 5241	E	A	Y2ARCB- 5241		A
VJTPNJ- 5245	E	A	Y7Z6X8- 5241	E	A
VTJ93R- 5245	E	A	YBC6BQ- 5241	E	A
VWGPFL- 5241	E	A	YDE2ME- 5241	E	A
W3KVUP- 5245	E	B	YGUHVH- 5241	E	A
WBHN3J- 5245	E	A	YH93M8- 5245	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
YHUHBB- 5241	E	A			
YVW3FV- 5245	E	A			
YXAGFB- 5245	E	A			
Z9JJZL- 5245	D	B			
ZB4J2N- 5241	E	A			
ZDEB9J- 5241	E	A			
ZDVHFL- 5245		A			
ZFMGUK- 5241	E	A			
ZLJHMJ- 5241	E	A			
ZLLZUU- 5241	E	A			
ZUX4WM- 5241	E	A			

Response Summary - Handwriting on Q1			Total Participants: 224
<i>To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the credit card application?</i>			
Response	Handwriting on Q1		
	K1	K2	
A	1	193	Response Key: A: Was WRITTEN by; B: Was PROBABLY WRITTEN by (some degree of identification); C: CANNOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED; D: Was PROBABLY NOT WRITTEN by (some degree of elimination); E: Was NOT WRITTEN by.
B	0	31	
C	0	0	
D	32	0	
E	176	0	

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

Examination Results

To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the questioned signature on the credit card application?

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
22TLN4- 5241	E	A	4EYDLM- 5241	E	A
2F4VT8- 5241	E	A	4HAP6F- 5241	E	A
2FEZR4- 5245		A	4MN7EK- 5241	E	A
2FGJXE- 5241	E	A	4MPWTF- 5241	E	A
2H7WVP- 5241	D	B	6AJ6XM- 5245	E	B
2TGHLC- 5241	C	C	6C7RBH- 5241	E	A
2VUUNM- 5245	E	A	6FZWQ8- 5241	D	B
2ZPPKT- 5245	E	A	6LPGUN- 5245	E	A
32DLK8- 5245	E	A	6M6DLM- 5241	D	B
376VED- 5241	D	A	6M92YK- 5241	E	A
3DKMMQ- 5241	D	B	6PRE6G- 5245	E	A
3J9EPD- 5245	D	B	6QJDJE- 5241	E	A
3MPMDC- 5245	D	B	6U6ZB3- 5241	E	A
3UUEPV- 5241	E	A	6ZQWX4- 5245	E	A
3W96G4- 5245	E	A	73RFGH- 5245	E	A
4DH6FE- 5245	E	A	76JC7B- 5245	E	A
4DLLT6- 5241	D	B			

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
7FY92G- 5241	E	A	9EJLNK- 5245	D	B
7H997N- 5245	D	B	9HGAWF- 5241	E	A
7P4B8Z- 5241	E	A	9HHZBB- 5241	E	A
7ZNH7P- 5241	D	B	9WF9RP- 5245	D	B
82F2JZ- 5241	D	B	9WYTZG- 5245	E	B
82FZMG- 5245	D	B	A8DDDA- 5245	E	A
87NJLA- 5245	E	A	AETA3G- 5241	D	B
89VNFY- 5245	E	A	AMU99Y- 5241	C	C
8A4ZVD- 5245	E	A	APBRWA- 5245	E	A
8B4RA9- 5241	E	A	AR3QB8- 5245	D	B
8FBHDE- 5241	E	A	ARGAV6- 5245	D	B
8KQP2E- 5245	E	A	AY2DZL- 5245		A
8PMG8P- 5245	E	A	AYHBCY- 5245	E	A
8TJAWE- 5245	D	B	AYYR67- 5245		B
8VL988- 5245	D	B	BD2BNJ- 5245	E	A
94XJZX- 5241	E	A	BH6MB4- 5245	D	B
974ZEG- 5241	E	A	BKEMGA- 5241	D	B
98KX6L- 5245	D	B	BKWHZW- 5245	E	A

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
BPR8MV- 5241	E	A	DKBEP3- 5245	E	A
BRV6PC- 5241	E	A	DNQWY7- 5241	E	A
BTM44A- 5245	E	A	DYT9CD- 5245	E	B
BVW49G- 5245	D	B	DZHLVR- 5245	E	A
BYVHW7- 5245	E	A	E2CLGA- 5241	E	A
C3YDFA- 5241	E	A	ED78ER- 5241	E	A
C6V4D9- 5241	E	A	EGKZCC- 5245	E	B
C7AN7H- 5241	D	B	EUW4VE- 5241	D	B
C8M3R8- 5241	E	A	EZKPTF- 5241	E	A
CFXETB- 5241	E	A	F4V6TQ- 5241	E	A
CMHM9U- 5245	E	A	F8M2XC- 5245	E	A
CNRMD2- 5241	E	A	FC4RNC- 5241	E	A
CUJUVA- 5241	E	A	FHXND4- 5241	E	A
CX4L8D- 5245	E	B	FLTFKZ- 5241	E	A
CXH6RA- 5241	E	A	FREHH6- 5241	E	A
DB2D42- 5245	D	B	FU7GW3- 5241	E	A
DF4XMT- 5245	D	B	FUNHMC- 5241	E	A
DGLE3Q- 5245	E	A	G2Y9G3- 5241	E	C

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
G3ZYWW- 5245	D	B	KATCEN- 5241	C	C
G6YKD2- 5241	E	A	KKHCRJ- 5241		A
G9PH8R- 5245	E	A	KR9KJ6- 5241	E	B
GAVY94- 5241	E	A	KRN443- 5241	E	A
GCJFGQ- 5245	D	B	KX23ZL- 5245	E	A
GHD8W2- 5245	D	C	L8DF8W- 5245	E	A
GTPK44- 5245	E	A	LG346K- 5241	E	A
H9F4XW- 5245	D	B	LJ3C9U- 5245	D	B
HB8ZMQ- 5245	E	A	LJXJW9- 5245	D	A
HHYM2N- 5245	E	A	LK6X6A- 5241	E	A
HKZ8M9- 5245	D	B	LPV8E9- 5241	E	A
HTQRU3- 5241	E	A	LX6WR8- 5241	D	B
HVURLM- 5245	E	A	LYHD6K- 5241	E	A
J4FC36- 5241	E	A	M7VL7L- 5245	E	A
JBP729- 5245	D	B	MBBDAL- 5245	E	A
JN8CEU- 5245	E	A	MCYPUZ- 5241	E	A
JTNJ3U- 5241	E	A	MDARFX- 5245	E	B
K9CEQ6- 5245	C	C	MHQY4X- 5245	E	A

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
N2HFP7- 5241	E	A	Q9DXGN- 5241	E	A
NBTL22- 5241	D	B	QA8QC8- 5241	E	A
NDWGHJ- 5245	C	C	QBCKNW- 5245	E	A
NF3XKV- 5245	D	B	QCCB3R- 5241	E	A
NJH79V- 5245		A	QGA2FJ- 5245	E	B
NMXZL8- 5241	E	A	QNK4LR- 5241		A
NQZNHV- 5245	D	B	QPYPXE- 5241	E	A
NU9V23- 5241	D	B	QUTHEN- 5241	E	A
NXH8LW- 5245	E	A	QYN9KZ- 5241	E	A
P7CED3- 5245	E	B	R329GR- 5241	E	A
PDB2V2- 5241	E	A	R32H3W- 5241	E	A
PHHRX8- 5245	E	A	R7H27Y- 5241	C	C
PLKQ9Z- 5245	E	A	RC9BFX- 5245	E	A
PPRMD3- 5245	E	A	RRJ2AP- 5241	E	A
PUDYUQ- 5241	E	A	RUNKGX- 5245	E	B
PW6X9P- 5241	E	A	T24RAM- 5245	D	B
Q4MRVY- 5245	E	A	T27D63- 5241		A
Q76UKQ- 5245	E	A	T66N23- 5241		A

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode- Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
TMHC7M- 5245	D	B	WBK7AU- 5241	E	A
TMKX23- 5245	D	B	WD6C9H- 5245	E	A
U7ETEQ- 5245	E	A	WFCHZK- 5245	D	B
UAQ46Z- 5245	E	A	WWFEYA- 5241		A
UFFPRT- 5241	E	A	X73PUM- 5241	E	A
UHMVDU- 5245	E	A	X7PZZB- 5241	E	A
UQXXYU- 5245	E	A	XAXG3J- 5241	E	
UTZ6VR- 5241	E	A	XBEEUJ- 5245	D	B
UZPFD3- 5241	E	A	XD7BFW- 5241	E	A
V4KLAK- 5241	E	A	XEDPQJ- 5241	E	A
V9Y6Q2- 5241	E	A	XKJHHU- 5241	D	B
VBYG4T- 5241	E	A	XNZQ7T- 5245	D	B
VE442Q- 5241	E	A	Y2ARCB- 5241		A
VJTPNJ- 5245	E	A	Y7Z6X8- 5241	E	A
VTJ93R- 5245	E	A	YBC6BQ- 5241	E	A
VWGPFL- 5241	E	A	YDE2ME- 5241	D	B
W3KVUP- 5245	E	B	YGUHVH- 5241	E	A
WBHN3J- 5245	E	A	YH93M8- 5245	D	B

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
YHUHBB-5241	E	A			
YVW3FV-5245	D	B			
YXAGFB-5245	E	A			
Z9JJZL-5245	D	B			
ZB4J2N-5241	D	B			
ZDEB9J-5241	E	A			
ZDVHFL-5245	D	B			
ZFMGUK-5241	E	A			
ZLJHMJ-5241	E	A			
ZLLZUU-5241	D	B			
ZUX4WM-5241	E	A			

Response Summary - Signature on Q1			Total Participants: 224
To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the questioned signature on the credit card application?			
Response	Signature on Q1		
	K1	K2	
A	0	152	
B	0	63	
C	6	8	
D	54	0	
E	154	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 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
22TLN4- 5241	<p>6.1 Several significant differences in respect of elements of style and execution were identified between the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting marked as "K1A", "K1B" and "K1D". 6.2 Several significant correspondences in respect of elements of style and execution were identified between the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting marked as "K2A", "K2B" and "K2D". 6.3 In conclusion I found the evidence to support the proposition that the writing in question marked "Q1", was written by the writer of the specimen writing marked "K2" and was not written by the writer of the specimen writing marked "K1". 6.4 Several significant differences in respect of rhythm and form were identified between the signature in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen signatures marked as "K1A" to "K1C". 6.5 Several significant correspondences in respect of rhythm and form were identified between the signature in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen signatures marked as "K2A" to "K2C". 6.6 In conclusion I found the evidence to support the proposition that the signature in question marked "Q1", is an authentic signature of the writer of the specimen signatures marked "K2" and is not an authentic signature of the writer of the specimen signatures marked "K1".</p>
2F4VT8- 5241	<p>The questioned signature and writing contained in the credit card application dated 03/06/23 with the name of "Wilson Edward M" indicated as Q1, DOES COME FROM THE GRAPHIC ORIGIN OF "Carry Andrews". La firma y escritura cuestionadas que obran contenidas en la solicitud de tarjeta de crédito de fecha 03/06/23 a nombre de "Wilson Edward M" señalada como Q1, SÍ PROVIENE DEL ORIGEN GRÁFICO DE "Carry Andrews".</p>
2FEZR4- 5245	<p>CONCLUSION: The handwriting and signature on the disputed credit card application correspond to Carry Andrew's handwriting and signature samples, (or was written by Carry Andrew)</p>
2FGJXE- 5241	<p>FIRST.- THE SIGNATURE AND HANDWRITING IN HIS NAME THAT ARE INCLUDED IN THE "CREDIT CARD APPLICATION" DO NOT CORRESPOND TO EDWARD WILSON, IN RELATION TO THE SIGNATURES AND HANDWRITING IN THE NAME OF THE SAME PERSON, WHICH ARE PROVIDED AS A BASIS FOR COMPARISON. SECOND.- WHETHER THE SIGNATURE AND HANDWRITING ON THE "CREDIT CARD APPLICATION" ARE ATTRIBUTABLE TO CARRY ANDREWS, IN RELATION TO THE SIGNATURES AND HANDWRITING OF CARRY ANDREWS PROVIDED AS A BASIS FOR COMPARISON. The foregoing, for the technical reasons set forth in the body of the expert report.</p>
2H7WVP- 5241	<p>Based on the evidence received, there are indications Carry Andrews may have filled-in and signed the signature in the name of Edward Wilson on the questioned document, Q1. There are indications Edward Wilson may not have filled-in or signed the signature in his name on the questioned document, Q1.</p>
2TGHLC- 5241	<p>In my opinion, the questioned handwriting on Item Q1 was written by the writer of the known specimen handwriting on Items K2a, K2b and K2d (Carry Andrews), not by the writer of the known specimen handwriting on Items K1a, K1b and K1d (Edward Wilson). No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the writer of the known specimen signatures on Items K1a, K1b and K1c (Edward Wilson) wrote the questioned signature on Item Q1. Limitation was present in the examination, such as no contemporaneous normal specimen signature available. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the writer of the known specimen signatures on Items K2a, K2b and K2c (Carry Andrews) wrote the questioned signature on Item Q1. Limitations were present in the examination, such as there were insufficient significant similarities observed, and the specimen signatures were simulated signatures.</p>
2VUUNM- 5245	<p>The questioned writings, excluding the signature of the document "Credit Card Application (Q1)", were written by CARRY ANDREWS (K2), due to the analogies found such as the baseline, spacing, locations and designs of the unions of the signs, "ut" of South, "om" of "com", the realization of the number six "6", the number zero "0", the letter "E", among others. The questioned signature contained in the document "Credit Card Application (Q1)" was written by CARRY ANDREWS (K2), documented by the analogies found such as, for example, preparation, beginnings, endings to create the letter "E", they agree in inclination, the basal line with a progressive ascending orientation, the last section with an</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
------------------	-------------

angular design, among others. The questioned writings, excluding the signature of the document "Credit Card Application (Q1)", were not written by EDWARD WILSON (K1), documented by the differences found such as the spaces between literals, the creation of the number nine "9", the creation of the number six "6", the arrangement of the line box for the letter "t", the links between the signs "or" in "Coordinator" and "on" in "operations", among others. The questioned signature contained in the document "Credit Card Application (Q1)" was not written by EDWARD WILSON (K1), a conclusion documented by the differences found such as the structure and movements to create the letter "E", design of the baseline; design, height and width of the first scallop; the making of the second scallop in terms of structure and inclination; in the making, kinetics and morphologies and direction of the last stroke, among others.

2ZPPKT- 5245	Based on the examination and comparison of the questioned entries on Exhibit Q1 with the known writing on Exhibits K1a through K1d and K2a through K2d, the following was determined: • Carry Andrews (Exhibits K2a through K2d) wrote the questioned entries on Exhibit Q1. • Edward Wilson (Exhibits K1a through K1d) did not write the questioned entries on Exhibit Q1.
32DLK8- 5245	Based on the handwriting examination, it is evident that the questioned writing on the credit card application was not written by Edward Wilson, excluding the signature. This conclusion is reached because the following distinct and frequently occurring features are not outstanding in his exemplars: 1. A "pig's tail" shape in the numeral 6. 2. Shapes of 0 and O that begin and end in a pointed formation at the top. 3. Extended, curved lower stroke on letter of y. 4. An inclined stroke on the lower part of the numeral 5. 5. A curved tail on the letter z. 6. A short joining between the left and right stroke on r. 7. A wavy stroke on the lower line of the numeral 2. 8. A short right end of the cross stroke. 9. A inclination of the slash. 10. A curved tail on the letter of a. On the other hand, the following unique and frequent features observed in the questioned handwriting match with Carry Andrews' exemplars, making it clear that the questioned handwriting was written by her: 1. A "pig's tail" shape in the numeral 6. 2. Shapes of 0 and O that begin and end in a pointed formation at the top. 3. Extended, curved lower strokes on letters of g and y. 4. An inclined stroke on the lower part of the numeral 5. 5. A curved tail on the letter z. 6. A small dot on the letter i. 7. A short joining between the left and right stroke on r. 8. A wavy stroke on the lower line of the numeral 2. 9. A larger lower stroke in the numeral 3 compared to the upper stroke. 10. An open top in the numeral 4, with a short right cross stroke. Regarding the signature in question, the following unique features are almost absent in the requested signatures for Edward Wilson, indicating it was not written by him: 1. A cross-stroke in the middle of the letter w. 2. A wide loop on the right stroke of the letter d. 3. The baseline of the writing is almost parallel to the baseline of the writing area. 4. A narrow gap between d and w. 5. Uniform size of strokes in the letter w. K2 signature, Carry Andrews' of Exemplar have more matching characteres of structure, forms of initial stroke, curve, cross point, wave, terminal stroke and overal alignment with K2 that have high weight and frequency like below, indicating it was written by her: 1. 'C' shape large initial stroke curve 2. small 2nd curve of 'E' 3. small eyelet of 1st 'd' curve 4. large eyelet of 2nd 'd' curve 5. small wave of 'w' 6. long terminal stroke 7. overal structure as 'Eelw~' 8. downsizing letter height & horizontal alignment
376VED- 5241	Comparisons between all the questioned hand printed/cursive combination writing located on the questioned Credit Card Application and the known writings said to be produced by Carry Andrew, revealed Carry Andrew produced all the questioned hand printed/cursive combination writing on Q1, as well as the questioned Edward M Wilson signature located at the bottom of the same Credit Card Application, Q1. Comparisons between all the questioned hand printed/cursive combination writing located on the questioned Credit Card Application and the known writings said to be produced by Edward M Wilson, revealed it is highly probable Edward M Wilson did not produce any of the questioned hand printed/cursive combination writing on Q1. Comparisons between the questioned Edward M Wilson signature located at the bottom of the questioned Credit Card Application and the known Edward M Wilson signatures revealed it is probable the questioned Edward M Wilson signature was not produced by Edward M Wilson.
3DKMMQ- 5241	Questioned writing (excluding the signatures): There is a strong probability that the author of the K2 known writing, also wrote the questioned writing. Questioned signature: There are indications that the

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	author of the K2 signatures, also wrote the questioned signature.
3J9EPD-5245	A source identification could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and limited clarity and detail of questioned writing submitted for examination. However, strong characteristics in common were observed which indicate CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2 a-d), may have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1). A source exclusion could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics, limited clarity and detail of the questioned writing submitted for examination, and the limited amount of submitted known writing. However, dissimilarities were observed which indicate EDWARD WILSON, Item 2 (Item K1 a-d), may not have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1).
3MPMDC-5245	HANDWRITING (Cary Andrews). Source Identification: It was determined the questioned writing on the Item 1 (Item Q1) Credit Card Application (excluding signature) was prepared by CARY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2a-d). Support For Common Source : A source identification could not be reached due to the limited nature of the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1). However, characteristics in common were observed which indicate the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) may have been prepared by CARY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2a-d). HANDWRITING (Edward Wilson). Support For Different Sources: A source exclusion could not be reached due to the limited nature of the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1). However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate EDWARD WILSON, Item 2 (Item K1a-d), may not have prepared the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1). Due to the limited nature of the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1), it is unlikely that a source identification or source exclusion conclusion will be rendered on this signature through handwriting comparisons.
3UUPEV-5241	Contributor number 2, Carry Andrews, is identified as the author of the questioned writing and signature appearing Q1
3W96G4-5245	The questioned credit card application was written by the victim's ex-wife, Carry Andrews.
4DH6FE-5245	First: The writing contained in the document indicated as questioned, if it belongs to the same graphic origin as C. Mrs. Carry Andrews
4DLLT6-5241	The writer of the known writing and signatures on item K1 probably did not write the questioned writing and signature on item Q1. The writer of the known writing on item K2 probably wrote the questioned writing and signature on item Q1.
4EYDLM-5241	Upon completion of an examination and comparison of the questioned exhibit and standards submitted in this case, it is the opinion of this examiner that the K2 writer did write the questioned text and signature of the Q-1 exhibit.
4HAP6F-5241	1. The questioned writing, recorded in the document identified as Q1 (credit card application), do not present the same scritural origin as the writings provided as reference material for comparison of Mr. Edward Wilson. 2. The questioned writing, recorded in the document identified as Q1 (credit card application), present the same scritural origin as the writings provided as reference material for comparison of Mrs. Carry Andrews. 3. The questioned signature, recorded in the document identified as Q1 (credit card application), do not present the same scritural origin as the signatures provided as reference material for comparison of Mr. Edward Wilson. 4. The questioned signature, recorded in the document identified as Q1 (credit card application), present the same scritural origin as the signatures provided as reference material for comparison of Mrs. Carry Andrews.
4MN7EK-5241	3.1 I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the handwriting and a signature in question on the document marked as "Q1" were written by K2 (Carry Andrews). 3.2 I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the handwriting and a signature in question on the document marked as "Q1" were not written by K1 (Edward Wilson).
4MPWTF-5241	By carrying out the graphological study between the completion of the credit card application against the writing samples and extra-process documents of Mrs. Carry Andrews (K2a, b, c), it was possible to

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	evidence extrinsic and intrinsic graphonomic coincidences such as interliteral and interverbal spacing, arrangement of the texts, height, size (dilation), linear displacement, inclination, links, shape of the strokes, starting and ending points; in addition to the elaboration of some spellings and numbers outside of what is conventionally learned, that is, very particular and identifying aspects of Mrs. Andrews' writing are observed, which allow us to conclude that these texts were elaborated by Mrs. Carry Andrews. For the foregoing, it is ruled out that the proceeding was prepared by Mr. Edward Wilson On the other hand, after carrying out the graphological analysis of the illegible signature that subscribes to the credit card application against the writing samples and extra-process documents of Mrs. Carry Andrews (K2a, b, c), it was possible to appreciate coincidences in graphonomic aspects such as height, proportionality, continuity of the layout, linear displacement, inclination, starting and ending points, arrangement of the signature, size of the layout, interstructural spacing, which allows the conclusion of the unproprietary manuscript, that is, that Mrs. Carry Andrews was the one who signed the questioned document. For the foregoing, it is ruled out that the signature was prepared by Mr. Edward Wilson
6AJ6XM- 5245	2. The questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit 1(1) and the known writing attributed to ANDREWS have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics in agreement from another writer is considered extremely low. 3. The questioned signature on Exhibit 1(1) and the known writing attributed to ANDREWS have some characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics in agreement from another writer is considered low. 4. The questioned hand printed entries and signature on Exhibit 1(1) and the known writing attributed to WILSON have significant characteristics that are not in agreement. It is considered extremely unlikely that WILSON is the writer of the questioned entries on Exhibit 1(1).
6C7RBH- 5241	1. The questioned (Q1) handwriting and signature was not written by the author of the specimen handwriting and signatures marked from "K1a" to "K1d". 2. The questioned (Q1) handwriting and signature was written by the author of the specimen handwriting and signatures marked from "K2a" to "K2d".
6FZWQ8- 5241	Questioned signature on card Q1 is simple, short, uncomplicated, illegible in most part (only first letter is legible) and disposable construction. In such a case with limited characteristics last conclusions can be only restricted. This lead us to answer that signature was probably written by Carry Anderws.
6LPGUN- 5245	The body and signature of questioned writing on the credit card application were written by K2(Carry Andrews). The body and signature of questioned writing on the credit card application were not written by K1(Edward Wilson).
6M6DLM- 5241	Findings: Methods: Visual examination and comparison of the submitted items was completed. A hand lens and microscope were used for the examination. Writing Comparison: Source Identification - Substantial similarities were noted between the samples in item K2 and the writing on the body of item Q1. The body of item Q1 was written by the writer of item K2. Support for Same Source - Strong similarities were noted between the samples in item K2 and the signature on item Q1. The signature on item Q1 was probably written by the writer of item K2. Source Exclusion - The writer of item K1 can be source excluded as the writer of the body of item Q1 based on substantial differences between the questioned and known writing. Support for Different Source - Strong differences were noted between the samples in item K1 and the signature on item Q1. The signature on item Q1 was probably not written by the writer of item K1. Examination Limitations: This examination was limited by: • The questioned signature on item Q1 is abbreviated and a conclusive opinion cannot be offered at this time. Requested Items: Please submit the listed items: • Additional requested and non-requested signature samples from the writer of item K1. • Additional requested signature samples in the name of Edward Wilson from the writer of item K2. Remarks: All items are available for return.
6M92YK- 5241	It has been concluded the Credit Card Application including the signature "Edward Wilson", Q1, was not written by Edward Wilson, K1. It has been concluded the Credit Card Application including the signature "Edward Wilson", Q1, was written by Carry Andrews, K2.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
6PRE6G-5245	<p>FIRST.- The questioned signature identified as Q1A and which is attributed to C. EDWARD WILSON, where the sample is identified as C1, IS DETERMINED TO CORRESPOND TO A FALSE SIGNATURE. SECOND.- The questioned writing identified as Q1B and which is attributed to C. EDWARD WILSON where the sample is identified as C1, IT IS DETERMINED THAT THE FEATURES CONTAINED DO NOT CORRESPOND TO THE SAMPLES OF C. EDWARD WILSON. THIRD.- The questioned signature identified as Q1A and which is attributed to C. CARRY ANDREWS, where the sample is identified as C2, IS DETERMINED TO CORRESPOND TO AN AUTHENTIC SIGNATURE. FOURTH.- The questioned writing identified as Q1A and which is attributed to C. CARRY ANDREWS where the sample is identified as C2, IT IS DETERMINED THAT THE FEATURES CONTAINED DO CORRESPOND TO THE SAMPLES OF C. CARRY ANDREWS.</p>
6QJDJE-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
6U6ZB3-5241	<p>1. ELIMINATION: It was determined that the questioned handwritten entries on document Q-1 were not written by the writer of documents K-1 through K-27 (K1a-K1d), Edward Wilson, due to dissimilarities of handwriting habit. Note: Documents K-3 through K-18 (K1c) were not used in this comparison, as they only contained signatures and no handwriting. 2. IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that the questioned handwritten entries on document Q-1 were written by the writer of documents K-28 through K-55 (K2a-K2d), Carry Andrews, due to many similarities of handwriting habit. Note: Documents K-30 through K-45 (K2c) were not used in this comparison, as they only contained signatures and no handwriting. 3. ELIMINATION: It was determined that the questioned "Edward Wilson" signature on document Q-1 was not written by the writer of documents K-1 through K-18 (K1a-K1c), Edward Wilson, due to dissimilarities of handwriting habit. Note: Documents K-19 through K-27 (K1d) were not used in this comparison, as they did not contain any "Edward Wilson" signatures prepared by Edward Wilson. 4. IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that the questioned "Edward Wilson" signature on document Q-1 was written by the writer of documents K-28 through K-45 (K2a-K2c), Carry Andrews, due to similarities of handwriting habit. Note: Documents K-46 through K-55 (K2d) were not used in this comparison, as they did not contain any "Edward Wilson" signatures prepared by Carry Andrews.</p>
6ZQWX4-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
73RFGH-5245	<p>There is unique graphic procedence between the question writings and signature that are part of the document called (Q1), "credit card aplication" included as material of doubt, with the caligraphic material called (K2) of its carry Andrews conformity with what is stated in thr graphological study section of this report. There is no unique graphic provenance between the questioned writing and signature that are part of the document called (Q1) "Credit card aplication" included as material of doubt, whit the caligraphic material provided called (K1) of Mr. Edwar Wilson, of conformity whith what is stated in the graphical study section of this report.</p>
76JC7B-5245	<p>1. After careful examination and comparison of the Questioned Handwriting on Credit Card Application (Q1) with course of business writing of Edward Wilson (K1d) and with directed handwriting exemplars of Edward Wilson (K1a-b), it is concluded that the Questioned Handwriting on Credit Card Application (Q1) is not written by Edward Wilson (K1). Therefore, Edward Wilson (K1) is not the author of Questioned Handwriting on Credit Card Application (Q1). 2. After careful examination and comparison of the Questioned Handwriting on Credit Card Application (Q1) with course of business writing of Carry Andrews on (K2d) and with directed handwriting exemplars of Carry Andrews (K2a-b), it is concluded that the Questioned Handwriting on Credit Card Application (Q1) is written by Carry Andrews (K2). Therefore, Carry Andrews (K2) is the author of Questioned Handwriting on Credit Card Application (Q1). 3. After careful examination and comparison of the Questioned Signature on Credit Card Application (Q1) with requested & directed signature exemplars of Edward Wilson (K1c & K1a-b), it is concluded that the Questioned Signature on Credit Card Application (Q1) is not written by Edward Wilson (K1). Therefore, Edward Wilson (K1) is not the author of Questioned Signature on Credit Card Application (Q1). 4. After careful examination and comparison of the Questioned Signature on Credit Card Application (Q1) with requested & directed signature exemplars of Carry Andrews (K2c & K2a-b),</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-
Test

Conclusions

it is concluded that the Questioned Signature on Credit Card Application (Q1) is written by Carry Andrews (K2). Therefore, Carry Andrews (K2) is the author of Questioned Signature on Credit Card Application (Q1).

7FY92G-
5241

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" to "K2b" and "K2d" and was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K1a" to "K1b" and "K1d". 2. I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the signature in question contained on the document marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen signatures contained on the documents marked as "K2a" to "K2c" and is therefore the known authentic signature of the writer of the specimen signatures contained on the documents marked as "K2a" to "K2c". 3. I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the signature in question contained on the document marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen signatures contained on the documents marked as "K1a" to "K1c".

7H997N-
5245

Examination and comparison of the questioned writing to the known writing of K-1 contains some significant differences. There are limitations associated with the quantity of known writing. Examination and comparison of the questioned writing to the known writing of K-2 contains some significant similarities. There are no significant differences. There are limitations associated with the quantity of known writing. Examination and comparison of the questioned signature to the known signatures of K-1 contains some significant differences. There are limitations associated with the quantity of known signatures. Examination and comparison of the questioned signature to the known signatures of K-2 contains some significant similarities. There are limitations associated with the quantity of known signatures.

7P4B8Z-
5241

ELIMINATION: It was determined that Document Q-1, informational portion was not written by the writer of K1a through K1d, Edward Wilson, due to dissimilarities of handwriting habit. ELIMINATION: It was determined that Document Q-1, signature portion was not written by the writer of K1a through K1d, Edward Wilson, due to dissimilarities of handwriting habit. IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that Document Q-1, informational portion was written by the writer of K2a through K2d Carry Andrews, due to similarities of handwriting habit. IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that Document Q-1, signature portion was written by the writer of K2a through K2d Carry Andrews, due to similarities of handwriting habit.

7ZNH7P-
5241

Handwriting Examination: The writer of the specimen handwriting on documents K2a, K2b and K2d, attributed to Carry Andrews, wrote the questioned handwriting on Q1. Signature Examination: The writer of the specimen signatures on documents K2a, K2b and K2c, attributed to Carry Andrews, probably wrote the questioned signature on Q1.

82F2JZ-
5241

HANDWRITING The questioned handwriting in Item Q1 displays numerous similarities in features, as well as dissimilarities/differences in some alignment, proportions and construction, when compared with the specimen handwriting in Item K1. No evidence of significant attention to the writing process was observed. The questioned handwriting in Item Q1 displays similarities in features such as style, skill, speed and fluency, slant, spacing, alignment, proportions, construction and connections, when compared with the specimen handwriting in Item K2. No significant differences in features or evidence of significant attention to the writing process was observed. I have evaluated the quantity, quality, and complexity of the questioned Item Q1 and specimen Items K1 and K2 handwriting, and the similarities and/or dissimilarities/differences observed. I have assessed the evidence against each proposition for each specimen writer. For specimen K1, I have assessed the likelihood of observing the evidence as low to very low if the specimen writer wrote the questioned handwriting and very high if someone other than the specimen writer wrote the questioned handwriting. For specimen K2, I have assessed the likelihood of observing the evidence as very high if the specimen writer wrote the questioned handwriting and low to very low if someone other than the specimen writer wrote the questioned handwriting. As a result, in my opinion the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition someone other than the specimen K1 writer wrote the questioned handwriting, over the alternative. Further, in my opinion the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition the specimen K2 writer wrote the questioned

TABLE 2

WebCode-
Test

Conclusions

handwriting, over the alternative. SIGNATURE The questioned signature in Item Q1 displays pictorial similarities, as well as dissimilarities/differences in spacing, slant, alignment and proportions, when compared with the specimen signatures in Item K1. No evidence of significant attention to the writing process was observed. There are minor limitations to the exam with regards to complexity and only requested specimen signatures available for comparison. The questioned signature in Item Q1 displays similarities in features such as style, skill, slant, spacing, alignment, proportions, construction and connections, when compared with the specimen signatures in Item K2. No significant differences in features or evidence of significant attention to the writing process was observed. There are minor limitations to the exam with regards to complexity and unknown how specimen signatures requested (i.e., whether/what model provided). I have evaluated the quantity, quality, and complexity of the questioned Item Q1 and specimen Items K1 and K2 signatures, and the similarities and dissimilarities/differences observed. I have assessed the evidence against each proposition for each specimen writer. For specimen K1, I have assessed the likelihood of observing the evidence as low if the specimen writer wrote the questioned signature, and high to very high if someone other than the specimen writer wrote the questioned signature. For specimen K2, I have assessed the likelihood of observing the evidence as high to very high if the specimen writer wrote the questioned signature, and low if someone other than the specimen writer wrote the questioned signature. As a result, in my opinion the evidence provides strong support for the proposition someone other than the specimen K1 writer wrote the questioned signature, over the alternative. Further, in my opinion the evidence provides strong support for the proposition the specimen K2 writer wrote the questioned signature, over the alternative.

82FZMG-5245 Visual and microscopic examinations of Exhibits K1a through K1d, K2a through K2d and Q1 were conducted. The questioned hand printed entries and signature on Exhibit Q1 were compared with the known hand printing and signatures on Exhibits K1a through K1d, and the known hand printing and cursive writing on Exhibits K2a through K2d. There were limitations in the examination and comparison of Exhibits K1a through K1d, K2a through K2d and Q1, due to an insufficient amount of comparable known writing and the limited amount of recognizable letter forms in the questioned and known signatures. However, the results are as follows: The writer of Exhibits K2a through K2d (Carry Andrews) probably wrote the questioned Edward Wilson signature on Exhibit Q1. The writer of Exhibits K2a through K2d (Carry Andrews) probably wrote the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit Q1. The writer of Exhibits K1a through K1d (Edward Wilson) probably did not write the questioned Edward Wilson signature and hand printed entries on Exhibit Q1. Exhibits K1a through K1d, K2a through K2d and Q1 were digitally preserved.

87NJLA-5245 - The questioned handwriting and signature Q1 showed similar characteristics in handwriting and signature characteristics from the specimens handwriting and signature K2. As such, this questioned handwriting and signature was written by Carry Andrews. - The questioned handwriting and signature Q1 showed differences characteristics in handwriting and signature characteristics from the specimens handwriting and signature K1. As such, this questioned handwriting and signature was not written by Edward Wilson.

89VNFX-5245 [No Conclusions Reported.]

8A4ZVD-5245 The hand printing of the credit card application DOES NOT CORRESPOND with the directed exemplars and the course of business writing by Edward Wilson. The hand printing of the credit card application DOES CORRESPOND with the directed exemplars and the course of business writing by C. Carry Andrews. The questioned signature DOES NOT CORRESPOND with the signatures made by Citizen Edward Wilson on his requested signatures and the directed exemplars K1a and K1b. The questioned signature DOES CORRESPOND with the signatures made by Citizen Carry Andrews on his requested signatures and the directed exemplars K2a and K2b.

8B4RA9-5241 FIRST.- THE SIGNATURE APPEARING ON THE FRONT OF THE CREDIT CARD APPLICATION FORM, DATED JUNE 3, 2023 (Q1), DOES NOT CORRESPOND, DUE TO ITS STROKES, TO EDWARD WILSON M UPON BEING COMPARED WITH THE ELEMENTS PROVIDED FOR SAID PURPOSE. SECOND.- THE HANDWRITING APPEARING ON THE FRONT OF THE CREDIT CARD APPLICATION

TABLE 2

WebCode-
Test

Conclusions

FORM, DATED JUNE 3, 2023 (Q1), DOES NOT CORRESPOND, DUE TO ITS STROKES, TO EDWARD WILSON M UPON BEING COMPARED WITH THE ELEMENTS PROVIDED FOR SAID PURPOSE. THIRD.- THE SIGNATURE APPEARING ON THE FRONT OF THE CREDIT CARD APPLICATION FORM, DATED JUNE 3, 2023 (Q1), DOES CORRESPOND, DUE TO ITS STROKES, TO CARRY ANDREWS UPON BEING COMPARED WITH THE ELEMENTS PROVIDED FOR SAID PURPOSE. FOURTH.- THE HANDWRITING APPEARING ON THE FRONT OF THE CREDIT CARD APPLICATION FORM, DATED JUNE 3, 2023 (Q1), DOES CORRESPOND, DUE TO ITS STROKES, TO CARRY ANDREWS UPON BEING COMPARED WITH THE ELEMENTS PROVIDED FOR SAID PURPOSE.

8FBHDE-
5241

A comparative inspection is carried out between the dubious text and signature contained in the questioned document (Q1 credit card application), compared to the handwritten samples (K1 A-B-C) provided by Edward Wilson and extra-procedural writings (notes attached to a K1D letter-size sheet) by Edward Wilson, where with the support of the elements of optical and light aid, the aspects and sub-aspects of a graphonomic nature were inspected, such as: pressure, morphology, dimension, cohesion, linear displacement, inclination, proportionality, starting and ending points, velocity and identifying and individualizing elements, among others; evidencing discrepancies between the graphonomic characteristics of the text and signature, dubious (Q1 credit card application) and indubitable handwritten samples (K1, A-B-C) and extra-procedural writings (K1D). Similarly, the comparative inspection was carried out between the dubious text and signature on the questioned document (Q1 credit card application), compared to the handwritten samples (K2 A-B-C) provided by Carry Andrews and extra-procedural writings (notes attached to a K2D letter-size sheet) by Carry Andrews, where with the support of the elements of optical and light aid, the aspects and sub-aspects of a graphonomic nature were inspected, such as: pressure, morphology, dimension, cohesion, linear displacement, inclination, proportionality, starting and ending points, velocity and identifying and individualizing elements, among others; observing concordances between the graphonomic characteristics of the text and signature dubious (credit card application Q1) and indubitable handwritten samples (K2 A-B-C) and extra-procedural writings (K2D) NO UNIPROPRIETY OF MANUSCRIPT between the graphonomic characteristics of the text and signature dubious (credit card application Q1) and indubitable manuscript samples (K1 A-B-C) provided by Edward Wilson and extra-procedural writings Edward Wilson (K1 D) HANDWRITTEN UNIPROVENANCE between the graphonomic characteristics of the text and signature dubious (Q1 credit card application) and undoubted manuscript samples (K2 A-B-C) provided by Carry Andrews and extra-procedural writings by Carry Andrews (K2D).

8KQP2E-
5245

The signature following the text reading 'Signature' on a document in the Credit Card Application, Applicant Information section, described as Q1, subject of analysis, it was not written by Mr. Edward Wilson. The handwriting on a document in the Credit Card Application, Applicant Information section, described as Q1, subject of analysis, it was not written by Mr. Edward Wilson. The signature following the text reading 'Signature' on a document in the Credit Card Application, Applicant Information section, described as Q1, subject of analysis, it was written by Carry Andrews. The handwriting on a document in the Credit Card Application, Applicant Information section, described as Q1, subject of analysis, it was written by Carry Andrews.

8PMG8P-
5245

There are dissimilarities in the features, habits, characteristics and element of comparison that make up the formation of strokes, formation of letters, fluency and rhythm when comparing the signature in the document identified Q1 with the documents identified K1a, K1b and K1c. There are similarities in the habits and characteristics when comparing the formation of letters, fluency, proportion, size, position, beginning of strokes, and inclination when comparing the signature in the document identified Q1 with the signature in the documents identified K2a, K2b and K2c. There are dissimilarities in the features, habits, characteristics and element of comparison that make up the formation of letters, inclination, size, alignment with respect to the baseline and connection between the letters when comparing the writing in the document identified Q1 with the writing in the documents identified K1a, K1b and K1d. There are similarities in the features, habits, writing characteristics when comparing the strokes, letter formation, inclination, size, alignment in relation to the baseline and connection between letters, when comparing the writing of the document identified Q1, with the writing of the documents identified K2a, K2b and

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
K2d.	
8TJAWE-5245	A definite conclusion could not be reached as to whether or not Carry Andrews, Items K2a-d, prepared the questioned writing on the Item Q1 credit card application. However, characteristics in common indicate that Andrews, K2a-d, may have prepared the questioned writing on Item Q1. A definite conclusion could not be reached as to whether or not Edward Wilson, Items K1a-d, prepared the questioned writing on the Item Q1 credit card application. However, characteristics observed indicate that Wilson, K1a-d, may not have prepared the questioned writing on Item Q1.
8VL988-5245	EDWARD WILSON (ITEM 2). Support for Different Sources: A source exclusion could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the limited clarity and detail of the questioned document. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate EDWARD WILSON, Item 2 (Item K1a-d), may not have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1), excluding the signature. Support for Different Sources: A source exclusion could not be reached due to the limited clarity and detail of the questioned document, the presence of unexplained characteristics, the limited complexity and quantity of the questioned signature. However, limited inconsistencies were observed which indicate EDWARD WILSON, Item 2 (Item K1a-d), may not have prepared the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1). CARRY ANDREWS (ITEM 3). Support for Common Source: A source identification could not be reached due to the limited clarity and detail of the questioned document. However, strong characteristics in common were observed which indicate CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2a-d), may have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1), excluding the signature. Support for Common Source: A source identification could not be reached due to the limited clarity and detail of the questioned document, the presence of unexplained characteristics, and the limited complexity and quantity of the questioned signature. However, limited characteristics in common were observed which indicate CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2a-d), may have prepared the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1).
94XJZX-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
974ZEG-5241	The body of questioned writing and the questioned signature on Q1 were written by K2 (Carry Andrews).
98KX6L-5245	Although similarities were noted between the handwritten entries on the questioned document (Q1) and the specimen writing supplied by Edward Wilson (K1a, K1b, K1d) some small differences were also noted. Some of these differences were considered significant. The signature on the questioned document was an abbreviated, cursive signature. Although it was visually similar to the specimen signatures supplied by Edward Wilson (K1a, K1b, K1c) there were some differences noted. These findings offer strong support for the view that Edward Wilson did not complete and sign the credit card agreement, Q1. A lot of similarities were noted when Q1 was compared to the handwriting specimens supplied by Carry Andrews (K2a, K2b, K2d) including some character constructions that were considered significant (the "o", "0" and "6"). While we would not generally compare a questioned signature with specimens supplied by one person in another person's name, in this instance we did compare the questioned signature with those supplied by Carry Andrews (K2a, K2b, K2d). This comparison showed a lot of similarities in the construction of the questioned signature and those supplied by Carry Andrews. However, the comparison is limited by the brevity and simplistic nature of the signature. Overall, the findings offer strong support for the view that the questioned document was completed and signed by Carry Andrews.
9EJLNK-5245	In my opinion my findings provide very strong support for the proposition that the questioned non-signature writing on Q1 was produced by Carry ANDREWS rather than some other person. In my opinion my findings provide very strong support for the proposition that the questioned non-signature writing on Q1 was produced by some person other than Edward WILSON. In my opinion my findings provide very strong support for the proposition that the questioned signature on Q1 was produced by Carry ANDREWS rather than some other person In my opinion my findings provide strong support for the proposition that the questioned signature on Q1 was produced by some person other than Edward

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
WILSON.	
9HGAWF-5241	1 In light of the above analysis and comparison, I reached the following conclusion: I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting and signature in question contained on the document marked as "Q1" were written by "Carry Andrews" (the writer of the specimen material marked as "K2a" to "K2d") and not by "Edward Wilson" (the writer of the specimen material marked as "K1a" to "K1d"), therefore eliminating him as the writer.
9HHZBB-5241	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The person who wrote the specimen writings on K2a, K2b and K2d, wrote the questioned writings on Q1. • The person who wrote the specimen writings on K1a, K1b and K1d, did not write the questioned writings on Q1. • The person who wrote the specimen signatures on K2a, K2b and K2c, wrote the questioned signature on Q1. • The person who signed the specimen signatures on K1a, K1b and K1c, did not sign the questioned signature on Q1.
9WF9RP-5245	Results of the examination strongly support the proposition that Q and K1 text was not written by the same person. There are many differences and no significant similarities between the two. There were no limitations to examination. Our expert opinion is that the Q and K1 text was not written by the same person. Results of the examination support the proposition that Q and K1 signatures were probably not written by the same person. There are some differences and not many similarities between the two. There were limitations to examination – simple signature. Our expert opinion is that the Q and K1 signatures were probably not written by the same person. Results of the examination strongly support the proposition that Q and K2 text was written by the same person. There are many similarities and no significant differences between the two. There were no limitations to examination. Our expert opinion is that the Q and K2 text was written by the same person. Results of the examination support the proposition that Q and K2 signatures were written by the same person. There are some similarities and no significant differences between the two. There were limitations to examination – simple signature. Our expert opinion is that the Q and K2 signatures were probably written by the same person.
9WYTZG-5245	The writer of K1 did not produce neither the handwritten text nor the questioned signature on Q1. The writer of K2 produced the handwritten text on Q1. The writer of K2 probably produced the questioned signature on Q1, which is a simulation. This questioned signature is simple in construction, not complex, but the knowns are adequate.
A8DDDA-5245	The handwriting of Q1 doesnot comes from K1. The handwriting of Q1 does come from K2. The signature of Q1 doesnot comes from K1. The signature of Q1 does come from K2.
AETA3G-5241	It is probable that the Item K2 author wrote the questioned handwriting on Item Q1. There is strong agreement in a combination of handwriting characteristics and an absence of any significant differences. A finding of "probable" falls short of an identification and is based on the weight of the evidence in light of limitations encountered during the exam. More specifically, the exam was limited because of the nature of the questioned handwriting. The questioned handwriting contained a limited number of individualizing characteristics. There are indications that the Item K2 author may have written the signature on Item Q1. There is agreement in a combination of a very limited number of individual handwriting characteristics and an absence of any significant differences. An "indications" opinion falls far short of an identification and is based on the weight of the evidence in light of limitations encountered during the exam. More specifically, the exam was limited because the questioned signature was stylized, brief and abbreviated. It is probable that the Item K1 author did not write the questioned handwriting on Item Q1. There is strong disagreement in a combination of handwriting characteristics. A finding of "probable" falls short of an elimination and is based on the weight of the evidence in light of limitations encountered during the exam. More specifically, the exam was limited because of the nature of the questioned handwriting. The questioned handwriting contained a limited number of individualizing characteristics. There are indications that the Item K1 author may not have written the signature on Item Q1. There is disagreement in a very limited number of individual handwriting characteristics. An "indications" opinion falls far short of an elimination and is based on the weight of the evidence in light of limitations encountered during the exam. More specifically, the exam was limited because the questioned signature was stylized, brief and abbreviated.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
AMU99Y-5241	It is my opinion that: 1. The evidence provides very strong support for the Proposition P1 that the questioned handwritten entries on the body of the document, Q1, were written by the writer of the ANDREWS handwriting specimens, K2a, K2b & K2d, over the Proposition P2. 2. The evidence provides very strong support for the Proposition P2 that the questioned handwritten entries on the body of the document, Q1, were not written by the writer of the WILSON handwriting specimens, K1a, K1b & K1d, over the Proposition P1. 3. The evidence provides approximately equal support for the Proposition P1 that the questioned signature on the document, Q1, was written by the writer of the WILSON signature specimens, K1a, K1b and K1c, and the Proposition P2 that the questioned signature was written by another writer. 4. The evidence provides approximately equal support for the Proposition P1 that the questioned signature on the document, Q1, was written by the writer of the ANDREWS signature specimens, K2a, K2b and K2c, and the Proposition P2 that the questioned signature was written by another writer.
APBRWA-5245	The main points of the analysis, comparison, and evaluation in this case are as follows: The examination compares questioned writing to known writing. The finding was: First, after comparing item k1a-b with item K1c, I found that item k1 (written by Edward Wilson) shows consistently written habits and the written features of "A", "B", "6", "@", "M"; words connection of "ar", "ay", "te", "ti", "ty"; space and arrangement between "sq" were different with item Q1. Second, the range of variations and writing habits of the letter formation and stroke features in item K2 (written by Carry Andrews) are similar to those in item Q1. Especially when I superimposed the words: "letter city", "Big City Bank", "City Square", "2000", and "09/16/1991", marked "x" including the signature "the name of Edward Wilson" between item K2 and item Q1, both of them were found almost the same. Because the item k2a-c were Requested exemplars and were impossible for someone to imitate, therefore based on my analysis and comparison above, I conclude that Question handwriting Q1 was written by Specimen handwriting K2 (Carry Andrews)
AR3QB8-5245	The handwritten text on Q1 is not the authentic writing of Edward Wilson with probability bordering on certainty, and is the authentic writing of Carry Andrews, with probability bordering on certainty. The signature on Q1 is not an authentic signature of Edward Wilson with probability bordering on certainty, but was executed as a simulation, trying to copy the authentic signatures of Edward Wilson, and was executed by Carry Andrews, with probability bordering on certainty.
ARGAV6-5245	There is a high probability that the Carry Andrews of the known material (Exhibit K2) wrote the body and signature found on the credit card application (Exhibit Q1).
AY2DZL-5245	Both the writing and the questioned signature have been made by Carry Andrews.
AYHBCY-5245	Handwriting: Significant similarities in the formation and relative positioning of letters were observed in the handwritten text between Q1 and K2, while significant differences in the same were observed in between Q1 and K1. It was concluded that the writer of the specimen handwriting in K2 wrote the questioned handwriting in Q1, while the writer of the specimen handwriting in K1 did not write the questioned handwriting in Q1. Signature: Significant differences in the formation, slant, and relative alignment of letters were observed in the signature between Q1 and K1. It was concluded that it was highly unlikely that the writer of the specimen signatures in K1 wrote the questioned signature in Q1. Significant similarities in the formation and relative alignment of letters were observed in the signature between Q1 and K2. It was concluded that it was highly likely that the writer of the specimen signatures in K2 wrote the questioned signature in Q1.
AYR67-5245	Source Identification: It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1), excluding the signature, was prepared by CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2 a-d). Support For Common Source : A source identification could not be reached due to the limited nature of the questioned signature and the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, characteristics in common were observed with the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1), which indicate that CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2 a-d), may have prepared the questioned signature. Support For Different Sources : A source exclusion could not be reached due to the limited nature of the questioned signature and the presence of unexplained

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	characteristics. However, dissimilarities were observed with the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1), which indicate that EDWARD WILSON, Item 2 (Item K1 a-d), may not have prepared the questioned signature. Due to the limited nature of the Item 1 (Item Q1) signature, it is doubtful that this signature would ever be identified to a particular writer through handwriting comparisons.
BD2BNJ-5245	Edward Wilson did not fill out or sign the questioned Application. Carry Andrews did fill out and sign the questioned Application.
BH6MB4-5245	Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING (CARRY ANDREWS). Support for Common Source: A source identification could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and limited clarity and detail in the submitted images. However, strong characteristics in common were observed which indicate CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2a-d), may have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1). HANDWRITING (EDWARD WILSON). Support for Different Sources: A source exclusion could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and limited submitted known writing. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate EDWARD WILSON, Item 2 (Item K1a-d), may not have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1). If future examinations are desired, the original of Item 1 (Item Q1) should be submitted as well as additional dictated and undictated known writing from CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2a-d), EDWARD WILSON, Item 2 (Item K1a-d), and/or 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 in the exact wording as the questioned writing and obtained on separate forms similar to the questioned item. Each repetition should be removed from the writer's view upon competition and multiple 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 documents, letters, cancelled checks, and/or applications.
BKEMGA-5241	To the level of highly probable, it is concluded that the writer of the submitted known K-2 specimens also wrote the questioned entries and signature entry on Exhibit Q1. To the level of indications, it is concluded that the writer of the submitted known K-1 specimens did not write the questioned entries and signature entry on Exhibit Q-1.
BKWHZW-5245	Based on the examination and comparison of the examined material, the following conclusions were reached: It is highly probable that Carry Andrews (Writer K2) wrote the questioned extended writing and purported "Edward Wilson" signature appearing on the document described as Item Q1. It is highly probable that Edward Wilson (Write K1) did not write the questioned extended writing and purported "Edward Wilson" signature appearing on the document described as Item Q1.
BPR8MV-5241	IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that the questioned writing on document Q-1 was written by the writer of K-28 - K-55, Carry Andrews, due to similarities of handwriting habit. IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that the questioned signature on document Q-1 was signed by the author of K-28 - K-45, Carry Andrews, due to similarities of handwriting habit.
BRV6PC-5241	1. In light of the above analysis and comparison, I reached the following conclusions: 1.1 I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the handwriting in question, in the document marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting in the documents marked as "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d". 1.2 I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the handwriting in question, in the document marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting in the documents marked as "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d". 1.3 I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the signature in question in the document marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen signatures in the documents marked as "K1a", "K1b" and "K1c". 1.4 I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the signature in question in the document marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen signatures in the documents marked as "K2a", "K2b" and "K2c".
BTM44A-5245	The signature on the credit card application was writers by Carry Andrews; also, she was contributed to the body of questioned writing.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
BVW49G-5245	<p>A comparative handwriting examination of the questioned and known handwriting and signatures appearing on the above-described exhibits resulted in the following findings: Based on a comparative examination of the evidence provided, it was determined that the body of text on the questioned Q1 application was probably written by the K2 writer (Carry Andrews). This finding is based on the presence of similarities (particularly in letter and digit forms, and attention to baseline) found in comparing the Q1 writing to the K2 writing. The finding is limited by the fact that the questioned and known / submitted writing consist of hand printed letter forms which are simplistic in nature. Based on the evidence provided, it was determined that the body of text on the questioned Q1 application was probably not written by the K1 writer (Edward Wilson). This finding is based on the presence of differences (particularly in letter and digit forms, slant, and attention to baseline) found in comparing the Q1 writing to the K1 writing. The finding is limited by the fact that the questioned and known / submitted writing consist of hand printed letter forms which are simplistic in nature. Based on the evidence provided, it was determined that the cursive "Edward Wilson" signature on the questioned Q1 note was probably written by the K2 writer (Carry Andrews) and was probably not written by the K1 writer (Edward Wilson). This finding is based on the presence of more common features in the K2 cursive signatures (particularly in letter forms, baseline habits, slant, and spacing habits) that were not as common in the comparison of the K1 writer. The findings were limited by the presence of variations in features of both the K1 and K2 writers including baseline habit, shape of certain movements, and the shape and movement of the terminal stroke.</p>
BYVHW7-5245	<p>We are of view that: -Edward Wilson neither wrote nor signed the questioned Credit Card Application. -Carry Andrews wrote and signed the questioned Credit Card Application.</p>
C3YDFA-5241	<p>Handwritten uniprovenance between the completion of the credit application Q1 and the Carry Andrews K2 handwritten writing pattern sample. Handwritten uniprovenance between the signature present in the credit application Q1 and the handwritten signature pattern samples of Carry Andrews K2.</p>
C6V4D9-5241	<p>In light of the above analysis and comparison, I concluded the following: 1.1 In respect of the questioned writing on the document marked "Q1": 1.1.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned writing was not executed by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d". 1.1.2 The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned writing was executed by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d". 1.2 In respect of the questioned signature on the document marked "Q1": 1.2.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned signature was not executed by the author of the specimen signatures on the documents marked "K1a", "K1b" and "K1c". 1.2.2 The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned signature was executed by the author of the specimen signatures on the documents marked "K2a", "K2b" and "K2c".</p>
C7AN7H-5241	<p>Handwriting: The writer of specimens K2a to K2d wrote the questioned handwriting on Q1. Signature: The writer of specimens K2a to K2d probably wrote the questioned signature on Q1.</p>
C8M3R8-5241	<p>Result 1: According to the method for the analysis of SIGNATURES and WRITING by EDWARD WILSON, when analyzing and comparing the signatures and writing basis for comparison, with the questioned signature and writing, indicated as Q1, we found sufficient and decisive differences, so has reached the following conclusions: Conclusion 1: The questioned signature that appears on the document already described in the subject of this opinion DOES NOT CORRESPOND TO EDWARD WILSON. Conclusion 2: The questioned writing that appears in the document already described in the subject of this opinion DOES NOT CORRESPOND TO EDWARD WILSON. Result 2: According to the method for the analysis of SIGNATURES and WRITING by CARRY ANDREWS, when analyzing and comparing the signatures and writings as a basis for comparison, with the questioned signature and writing, indicated as Q1, we found sufficient and decisive similarities, so it has been reached the following conclusions: Conclusion 1: The questioned signature that appears on the document already described in the subject of this opinion DOES CORRESPOND to CARRY ANDREW. Conclusion 2: The questioned deed in the document already described in the object of the present opinion DOES CORRESPOND to CARRY ANDREW.</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
CFXETB- 5241	With the support of the optical instrument (magnifying glass) and the optical and lighting equipment (document buyer), the preliminary inspection of the materials subject to technical analysis is first carried out, in order to verify the suitability of the elements of doubt (Q1) and the unquestioned elements (K1 and K2), where it was established that said elements meet the suitability requirements to carry out the comparative inspection such as originality, coevality, abundance and similarity, therefore they are suitable for graphological comparison. Once the suitability of the inspection elements has been established, we also proceed with the support of the optical instrument (magnifying glass) and the optical and lighting equipment (document buyer) to compare the doubtful material (Q1) with the doubtful material (K1 and K2), where graphonomic aspects and sub-aspects of order, size, pressure, speed, direction or linear displacement, inclination, cohesion, shape, idiographism or idiotism were examined, where the following was established: • UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT PROVENANCE of the disputed writing and signature on the credit card application (Q1), compared to the undoubted material of Carry Andrews (K2) • NO UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT PROVENANCE of the disputed writing and signature on the credit card application (Q1), compared to the undoubted material of Edward Wilson (K1)
CMHM9U- 5245	K2 is the author of the hand printing and signature on the document (credit card application).
CNRMD2- 5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
CUJUVA- 5241	After examining both the completion and the signature, observed in the doubt document and after the corresponding comparison, it was found that between the doubted manuscripts, and the manuscripts (completion and signature), provided by Carrey Andrews, there is complete graphonomic agreement, in what is related to the form and structure of signs, as well as the writing dynamics. It is important to keep in mind that some signs retain a high identification value given their uniqueness and repetitiveness; As is the particular case of the number (6) and the signs (x and @), as well as the linear displacement of the signature among others. Based on the above and after having examined and compared the doubted and undoubted manuscripts, it was concluded that both the completion and the signature, observed in the doubted document, were written by Carry Andrews In relation to the comparative examination requested between the manuscripts observed in the doubted document and those provided by Mr. Edward Wilson, differences were found in the dynamic and structural aspects analyzed; therefore, it is concluded that the manuscripts and the signature on the application for a registration card credit were not written by Edward Wilson.
CX4L8D- 5245	The investigated signature that appears on document Q1 "CREDIT CARD APPLICATION" ", in the "Signature" area, was probably written by Carry Andrews. - The handwritten texts investigated in document Q1 "CREDIT CARD APPLICATION" were written by Carry Andrews.
CXH6RA- 5241	UNIQUE MANUSCRITUAL PROVENANCE between the handwritten completion and signature on the "CREDIT CARD APPLICATION" form of the "BIG CITY BANK" of doubt (Q1) and the undoubted handwriting material of Ms. KARRY ANDREWS (K2A, K2B, K2C, K2D).
DB2D42- 5245	the handwritten entries on Q1 are similar to the K2 writing in every respect and there are not fundamental differences supporting the potential for a writer other than K2. The Q signature is not complex enough to offer a strong foundation, but there is evidence to suggest that K2 was likely the writer. To that extent, the K1 writer is probably eliminated.
DF4XMT- 5245	I am of the opinion that the questioned extended handprinted entries on the credit card application (Q1) were not written by Edward Wilson (K1). I am of the opinion that the questioned extended handprinted entries on the credit card application (Q1) were written by Carry Andrews (K2). I am of the opinion that the questioned signature located at the bottom left of the credit card application (Q1) was probably not written by Edward Wilson (K1). I am of the opinion that the questioned signature located at the bottom left of the credit card application (Q1) was probably written by Carry Andrews (K2). The less than definitive opinion reached on the questioned signature in Q1 was due to the simplistic nature of the

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	signature and its relative value for identification.
DGLE3Q-5245	a) The questioned writing that appears in questioned document Q1, does not correspond to the basis of comparison of Edward Wilson. 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 Carry Andrews. c) The questioned signature that appears in questioned document Q1, does not correspond with the Edward Wilson 's signature exemplars. d) The questioned signature that appears in questioned document Q1, it does correspond with the Carry Andrews signature exemplars.
DKBEP3-5245	The questioned, hand-printed text appearing on the Credit Card Application (Item No. Q1) was written by Carry Andrews. The questioned Disclaimer and Authorization Signature appearing on the Credit Card Application (Item No. Q1) was written by Carry Andrews.
DNQWY7-5241	Examination and comparison of exhibit Q1 to exhibits K1a-d and K2a-d were conducted, and the following conclusions and observations are based upon my education, training and experience and the results are as follows: Exhibits Q1 and K1a-d and K2a-d were scanned/photocopied for preservation by Forensic Document Examiner XXX. The questioned printing and signature present on exhibit Q1 when compared with exhibits K1a-d were written by the author of K1a-d (Carry Andrews). The questioned printing and signature present on exhibit Q1 when compared with exhibits K2a-d were not written by the author of K2a-d (Edward Wilson).
DYT9CD-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
DZHLVR-5245	FIRST.- The handwritten writing located in the document called "Credit card application", dated 06/03/23, identified as Q1; IT DOES NOT COME FROM THE GRAPHIC ORIGIN WITH THOSE ELEMENTS INDICATED AS INDUBITABLE IN THE NAME OF C. EDWARD WILSON. SECOND.- The handwritten writing located in the document called "Credit card application", dated 06/03/23, identified as Q1; IF IT IS ATTRIBUTED GRAPHICALLY TO THOSE ELEMENTS INDICATED AS INDUBITABLE IN THE NAME OF C. CARRY ANDREWS. THIRD.- The handwritten signature located on the document called "Credit card application", dated 06/03/23, identified as Q1; IT DOES NOT COME FROM THE GRAPHIC ORIGIN WITH THOSE ELEMENTS INDICATED AS INDUBITABLE IN THE NAME OF C. EDWARD WILSON. QUARTER.- The handwritten writing located in the document called "Credit card application", dated 06/03/23, identified as Q1 no; IF IT IS ATTRIBUTED GRAPHICALLY TO THOSE ELEMENTS INDICATED AS INDUBITABLE IN THE NAME OF C. CARRY ANDREWS.
E2CLGA-5241	Handwritten uniprovence of the writings and signature found in the credit card application document identified as doubtful q1, compared to the texts and signature written in the doubtful documents identified as k2a-d provided by Mrs. Carry Andrews.
ED78ER-5241	1. There is a sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen writing on the documents marked as "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d". 2. There is a sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen writing on the documents marked as "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d". 3. There is a sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the signature in question marked as "Q1a" was not signed by the writer of the specimen signatures on marked as "K1a1", "K1b1" and "K1c1" to "K1c16". 4. There is a sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the signature in question marked as "Q1a" was signed by writer of the specimen signatures on marked as "K2a1", "K2b1" and "K2c1" to "K2c16".
EGKZCC-5245	In our opinion, the questioned writing Q1 was written by writer K2 /Cary Andrews/. There were significant similarities in general characteristics and in the individual features between the questioned handwriting and the samples of K2. The questioned signature is stylized, illegible, has few individual characteristics. Similarities were observed in the structure, design of the questioned signature and specimen signatures of K1 writer. There were limited number of features which could be compared but these features were different, so we determined the signature were not written by K1. There were not only structural and formal similarities between the questioned signature and the K2 samples, but in the

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	individual characteristics we have found a lot of matches. These findings suggest that the signature was written by person K2, but because of the low complexity, simple design of the signature on Q1 and the variability of the samples from K2, in our opinion, the questioned signature was probably written by K2.
EUW4VE-5241	QUESTION1: K1-Q1 INDICATION OF NON ASSOCIATION (TEST=D). K2-Q1 HIGH DEGREE OF ASSOCIATION (TEST=B). QUESTION 2: K1-Q1 INDICATION OF NON ASSOCIATION (TEST=D). K2-Q1 INDICATION OF ASSOCIATION (TEST=B).
EZKPTF-5241	1. No evidence of significance was found to indicate that the questioned writing and the questioned signature 'Edward Wilson' on Exhibit Q1 were executed by the K1(a-d) specimen writer. 2(a). It has been concluded that it is highly probable that the questioned writing on Exhibit Q1 was executed by the K2(a-d) specimen writer. 2(b). It has been concluded that the questioned signature 'Edward Wilson' on the Exhibit Q1 was executed by the K2(a-d) specimen writer.
F4V6TQ-5241	3.1 I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the questioned handwriting on the document marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d"; 3.2 I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the questioned signature on the document marked as "Q1" was not signed/written by the writer of the specimen signatures on the documents marked as ""K1a", "K1b" and "K1c"; 3.3 I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the questioned handwriting on the document marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d"; 3.4 I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the questioned signature on the document marked as "Q1" was signed/written by the writer of the specimen signatures on the documents marked as "K2a", "K2b" and "K2c".
F8M2XC-5245	Carry Andrews, writer of Item K2(a-d), has been identified as the writer of the questioned material appearing on Item Q1. Edward Wilson, writer of Item K1(a-d), has been eliminated as the writer of the questioned material appearing on Item Q1.
FC4RNC-5241	In my opinion I conclude that the author of the 'Known' writings I am informed is Carry Andrew's has written both the Questioned handwriting and Signature on the 'Questioned' Credit Card Application
FHXND4-5241	UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT PROVENANCE between the doubted writings (filling out the credit application) and the undoubted material (samples of Mrs. Carry Andrews's handwriting). UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT PROVENANCE between the doubted signature (signature present in the lower left area of the credit application) and the doubted material (handwritten writing samples of Mrs. Carry Andrews).
FLTFKZ-5241	FINDINGS: FIRST. THE HANDWRITING AND SIGNATURE APPEARING ON THE CREDIT CARD APPLICATION FORM, IDENTIFIED AS Q1, DO NOT MATCH DUE TO ITS WRITING, IN RELATION TO THE HANDWRITING AND SIGNATURE SHOWN AS BASIS FOR COMPARISON IN THE NAME OF "EDWARD WILSON". SECOND. THE HANDWRITING AND SIGNATURE APPEARING ON THE CREDIT CARD APPLICATION FORM, IDENTIFIED AS Q1, CORRESPOND TO "CARRY ANDREWS", IN RELATION TO THE HANDWRITING AND SIGNATURE SHOWN AS BASIS FOR THE COMPARISON IN THE NAME OF "CARRY ANDREWS".
FREHH6-5241	I found the evidence to support the proposition that the writing and signature in question marked "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen marked "K2", and not the writer of specimen marked "K1".
FU7GW3-5241	there are differences 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, size, angle, formation of loops when comparing the writing on the questioned document Q1 with the identified documents K1a-d. there are differences in the traits, habits, characteristics and elements of comparison that make up the formation of strokes, beginning and end of strokes, connection, inclination, angle, formation of loops when comparing the questioned signature the writing on document Q1 with the identified documents K1a-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, size, angle, formation of loops when comparing the writing on the

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	questioned document Q1 with the identified documents K2a-d. there are similarities in the traits, habits, characteristics and elements of comparison that make up the formation of strokes, beginning and end of strokes, connection, inclination, angle, formation of loops when comparing the questioned signature the writing on document Q1 with the identified documents K2a-c.
FUNHMC-5241	Laboratory item # 7(Q1-handwriting and signature), Invoice # Q201139 was written by the author (Carry Andrews) of the known writing samples (laboratory items # 4-6 (K2a-d). Laboratory item # 7(Q1-handwriting and signature), Invoice # Q201139 was not written by the author (Edward Wilson) of the known writing samples (laboratory items # 1-3 (K1a-d).
G2Y9G3-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
G3ZYWW-5245	Based on the physical examination and comparison of the questioned documents with the submitted known writing, the following was determined: It was determined that Carry Andrews (Items 004 through 006) probably wrote the questioned handprinted entries on Item 007. This qualified conclusion is due to limited amount of letter formations and letter combinations available for comparison and the general nature in which the document was written. It was determined that Carry Andrews (Items 004 through 006) probably signed the questioned signature on Item 007. This qualified conclusion is due to illegible letter formations and the lack of complexity of the signature on the questioned document. It was determined that Edward Wilson (Items 001 through 003) probably did not write the questioned handprinted entries on Item 007. The qualified conclusion is due to the limited amount of letter formations and letter combinations available for comparison and the general nature in which the document was written. It was determined that Edward Wilson (Items 001 through 003) probably did not sign the questioned signature on Item 007. This qualified conclusion is due to illegible letter formations and the lack of complexity of the signature on the questioned document.
G6YKD2-5241	Based on the comparisons, it was found that: (i) The questioned writing on the Credit Card Application (Q1) was written by Carry Andrews (K2) and not by Edward Wilson (K1). (ii) The questioned signature on the Credit Card Application (Q1) was written by Carry Andrews (K2) and not by Edward Wilson (K1).
G9PH8R-5245	The handwriting and signature on the questioned document (Q1) were likely written by Carry Andrews (K2), based on the strong similarities observed in the provided comparison samples. Q1 and K2 share consistent characteristics in letter connectivity, numeral forms, signature curvature, and pen pressure. Specifically, the numerals "2," "4," and "5" exhibit similar curved features between Q1 and K2, and their signatures reveal matching patterns in pen pressure and spatial arrangement. In contrast, Edward Wilson's (K1) handwriting and signature differ significantly from Q1, displaying limited connectivity, angular forms, and irregular pen pressure. Based on this analysis, it is concluded that Q1 was written by Carry Andrews (K2), while there is no evidence to suggest that Edward Wilson (K1) authored the document.
GAVY94-5241	1. UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT PROVENANCE between the bodies of writing that constitute the completion of the credit card application and the signature in the name of Mr. EDWARD WILSON questioned; with the standard writing bodies of Mrs. CARRY ANDREWS. 2. NO UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT PROVENANCE between the bodies of writing that constitutes the completion of the credit card application and the questioned signature present on it, with the bodies of writing of Mr. EDWARD WILSON.
GCJFGQ-5245	D = -2 The results support that the questioned writing was not written by Edward Wilson. B = +2 The results support that the questioned writing was written by Carry Andrews. 9 point conclusion scale with 0 meaning inconclusive. +4 +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 -4
GHD8W2-5245	In my opinion there is strong evidence to support the proposition that Carry Andrews wrote out the body of the credit card application form but the evidence as to whether or not she also wrote the signature is inconclusive. In my opinion, there is strong evidence to support the proposition that Edward Wilson did not write out the body of the credit card application and moderate evidence to support the proposition that he did not write the signature in his name on this application. As the signature appears to be a simulation of Mr Wilson's signature it is not possible to determine who wrote it as the writer's own natural

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	handwriting characteristics will be suppressed.
GTPK44- 5245	I found the evidence to supports the proposition that the writing and signature in questioned marked "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen writing and signature marked "K2", not the writer of specimen writing marked "K1".
H9F4XW- 5245	HANDWRITING (CARRY ANDREWS). Source Identification: It was determined that the questioned hand printing on Item 1 (Q1) was prepared by CARRY ANDREWS, writer of Item 3 (K2 a-d). Support for Common Source: A source identification could not be reached due to the limited nature of the questioned signature. However, similarities were observed which indicate CARRY ANDREWS, writer of Item 3 (K2 a-d), may have prepared the questioned signature on Item 1 (Q1). It should be noted, the due to the limited nature of the signature, it is doubtful if this signature would be identified through additional examinations. HANDWRITING (EDWARD WILSON). Support for Different Source: A source exclusion could not be reached due to the limited nature of the questioned signature and the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, dissimilarities were observed which indicate EDWARD WILSON, writer of Item 2 (K1 a-d), may not have prepared the questioned signature on Item 1 (Q1). It should be noted, the due to the limited nature of the signature, it is doubtful if this signature would be excluded through additional examinations.
HB8ZMQ- 5245	The body of writing and the signature on the questioned credit card application (Q1) was not written by Edward Wilson (K1). The body of writing and the signature on the questioned credit card application (Q1) was written by Carry Andrews (K2).
HHYM2N- 5245	Comparison of Questioned Handwriting (Q1) to Known Handwriting Exemplars of CARRY ANDREWS (K2)- The range of variation exhibited in the questioned handwriting and in the known handwriting contains substantial significant similarities; There are no significant dissimilarities; and no limitations associated with absent characters, dissimilarities and/or quantity of writing are present. Limitations: None. OPINION: The handwriting on (Q1) WAS WRITTEN by the author CARRY ANDREWS of the known exemplars (K2). This opinion conforms to the SWGDOC (Scientific Working Group for Document Examiners opinion "Identification Did Write" in a range of suggested opinions. (see above illustration for a graphic representation of the SWGDOC Opinion Scale). Comparison of Questioned Handwriting (Q1) to Known Handwriting Exemplars of EDWARD WILSON (K1)- The range of variation exhibited in the questioned handwriting and in the known handwriting contains substantial significant dissimilarities; and no limitations associated with absent characters, identifying characteristics, and/or quantity of writing are present. There may be absent characters. There may be similarities. Limitations: None. OPINION: The handwriting on (Q1) WAS NOT WRITTEN by the author EDWARD WILSON of the known exemplars (K1). This opinion conforms to the SWGDOC (Scientific Working Group for Document Examiners opinion "Elimination Did Not Write" in a range of suggested opinions. (see above illustration for a graphic representation of the SWGDOC Opinion Scale) [Referenced scale was not included in the report]. Comparison of Questioned Signature (Q1) to Known Signature Exemplars of CARRY ANDREWS (K2)- The range of variation exhibited in the questioned signature and in the known signatures contains substantial significant similarities; There are no significant dissimilarities; and no limitations associated with absent characters, dissimilarities and/or quantity of writing are present. Limitations: None. OPINION: The signature on (Q1) WAS WRITTEN by the author CARRY ANDREWS of the known exemplars (K2). This opinion conforms to the SWGDOC (Scientific Working Group for Document Examiners opinion "Identification Did Write" in a range of suggested opinions. (see above illustration for a graphic representation of the SWGDOC Opinion Scale) [Referenced scale was not included in the report] . Comparison of Questioned Signature (Q1) to Known Handwriting Exemplars of EDWARD WILSON (K1)- The range of variation exhibited in the questioned signature and in the known signatures contains substantial significant dissimilarities; and no limitations associated with absent characters, identifying characteristics, and/or quantity of writing are present. There may be absent characters. There may be similarities. Limitations: None OPINION: The signature on (Q1) WAS NOT WRITTEN by the author EDWARD WILSON of the known exemplars (K1) This opinion conforms to the SWGDOC (Scientific Working Group for Document Examiners opinion "Elimination Did Not Write" in a range of suggested opinions. (see above illustration for a graphic representation of the SWGDOC Opinion

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	Scale) [Referenced scale was not included in the report].
HKZ8M9-5245	There is substantial evidence which indicates that the questioned handwriting and signature were probably produced by the writer of the exemplars attributed to Carry Andrews. Although this is not a conclusive identification, there were sufficient similarities to establish a strong likelihood that the writer of the exemplars wrote the questioned handwriting and signature. There is substantial evidence which indicates that the questioned handwriting and signature were probably not produced by the writer of the exemplars attributed to Edward Wilson. Although this is not a conclusive elimination, there were sufficient differences to establish a strong likelihood that the questioned handwriting and signature were prepared by another writer.
HTQRU3-5241	It is opinion that the writings and signature on document Q1 do not originate from the hand of Edward Wilson (K1). It is opinion that the writings and signature on document Q1 were made by Carry Andrews (K2).
HVURLM-5245	HANDWRITING: 1.- The question handwriting that appear in a Credit Card Application ISN 'T CORRESPONDENCE with the Edward Wilson's handwriting exemplars. 2.- The question handwriting that appear in a Credit Card Application IS CORRESPONDENCE with the Carry Andrews's handwriting exemplars. SIGNATURES: 1.- The question signature that appear in a Credit Card Application ISN 'T CORRESPONDENCE with the Edward Wilson's signatures exemplars. 2.- The question signature that appear in a Credit Card Application IS CORRESPONDENCE with the Carry Andrew's signatures exemplars.
J4FC36-5241	The evidence supports the proposition that the handwriting in question was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting on the documents marked "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d". The evidence supports the proposition that the handwriting in question was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting on the documents marked "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d". The evidence supports the proposition that the signature in question was not written by the author of the specimen signatures on the documents marked "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d". The evidence supports the proposition that the signature in question was written by the author of the specimen signatures on the documents marked "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d".
JBP729-5245	It is highly probable that the K1 writer (Edwards) did not write the handprinting and numerals on Q1. An opinion of "highly probable did not write" means that there is very strong evidence in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents to support common authorship is highly unlikely. This opinion falls within the "virtually certain" degree of certainty. The K1 writer (Edwards) probably did not write the signature on Q1. An opinion of "probably did not write" means that there is strong evidence in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents to support that common authorship is unlikely. This opinion falls short of the "virtually certain" degree of certainty. It is highly probable that the K2 writer (Andrews) wrote the handprinting and numerals on Q1. An opinion of "highly probable wrote" means that there is very strong evidence in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents to support common authorship is highly likely. This opinion falls within the "virtually certain" degree of certainty. The K2 writer (Andrews) probably wrote the signature on Q1. An opinion of "probably wrote" means that there is strong evidence in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents to support that common authorship is more likely than not. This opinion falls short of the "virtually certain" degree of certainty.
JN8CEU-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
JTNJ3U-5241	1. The body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the credit card application was not written by Edward Wilson. 2. The questioned signature on the credit card application was not written by Edward Wilson. 3. The body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the credit card application was written by Carry Andrews. 4. The questioned signature on the credit card application was written by Carry Andrews.
K9CEQ6-5245	Due to the design of the Credit Card Application form, the questioned handwritten entries consisted of disconnected text and numeric entries. If considered separately some of these entries lacked sufficient

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
--------------	-------------

individuating character for an opinion of authorship to be reached. However, when considered together the entries were consistent with having been completed by one writer. While I cannot totally exclude the possibility that within these there may be some small disconnected entries completed by a different writer, there was no evidence that this had occurred. A number of similarities were observed between the questioned handwriting and the specimens attributed to Carry Andrews (K2). These similarities were in features such as writing style, slope, baseline habits, size and size relationships and individual letter constructions. Based on the similarities observed, it is my opinion that the questioned handwriting was completed by the author of the specimens attributed to Carry Andrews (K2). The questioned signature on the Application bore some pictorial similarity to the signature style seen in the specimens attributed to Edward Wilson. However, it differed from them in features such as fluency, size relationships, and both gross and subtle construction characteristics. Based on these findings, I concluded that the questioned signature was the result of an attempt to simulate/copy the signature style seen in the specimens attributed to Edward Wilson. Some similarities were observed between the questioned signature and the specimen signatures completed by Carry Andrews in the name Edward Wilson (K2 signatures). However, due to the limited content and complexity of the questioned signature, no opinion regarding authorship could be reached.

KATCEN-5241	Examination and comparison of questioned item #Q1 with known items #K1a-d and #K2a-d resulted in the following opinions: The non-signature portion of item #Q1 were written by the writer of items K2a-d, Carry Andrews. Neither of the submitted known writers (Edward Wilson and Carrie Andrews) can be identified nor excluded as the writer of the questioned signature on item #Q1. Areas of poor line quality and the simplistic nature of the item #Q1 signature prevents a determination of authorship.
KKHCRJ-5241	The writing and signatures on the document marked Q1 (credit card application) are similar to the writing and signatures of Carry Andrews, therefore they have the same graphic origin.
KR9KJ6-5241	The writing of the Q1 document were written by the writer of the K2 documents, Mme Carry Andrews. The signature « Edward Wilson » of the Q1 document was probably written by the writer of the K2 documents, Mme Carry Andrews; The signature « Edward Wilson » of the Q1 document was not written by the writer of the K1 documents, M. Edward Wilson and is a simulation of his signature.
KRN443-5241	Preliminary Inspection: Initially, the preliminary inspection of the doubtful and 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, contemporaneity, similarity and abundance established in the Handwritten Writing Inspection protocol, establishing from said verification that the necessary requirements are met to carry out the requested inspection. Comparative inspection of texts and signature: An inspection of the Q1 manuscripts (Dubitado) was carried out, finding in them characteristic graphonomic aspects highly identifiable 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 constitute both the texts of completion and the signatures. Subsequently, an assessment is made of the reference samples provided K1a, K1b, K1c and K1d in the name of Edward Wilson and K2a K2b, K2c and K2d in the name of Carry Andrews in order to establish the formal, structural and dynamographic values that identify them each scribe, finding in these manuscripts representative and highly identifying aspects given the ability to configure the different signs that make them up. the dispositional constancy of the texts and 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 gave each of them, the above, based on the analysis carried out on all the manuscripts and signatures sent as a reference of each sampler. Taking into account the above, the general and particular knowledge of the most representative graphic elements that at the formal, structural and dynamographic level that individualize the texts of completion and of the questioned signature object of inspection, through the application of the comparative graphonomic method, where each of the aspects and sub-aspects that compose it are analyzed, notable correspondences were found with respect to the comparison models (texts and signatures) provided on behalf of Carry Andrews, especially in the intrinsic, that is, all those manuscript aspects of the writer which are generated in an automated and unconscious way, and which allow the identification of the graphisms. To what extent

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	can it be determined whether any of the well-known writers contributed to the body of the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the credit card application? K2 (Carry Andrews) - A To what extent can it be determined whether any of the well-known writers contributed to the disputed signature on the credit card application? K2 (Carry Andrews) - A
KX23ZL-5245	The handwriting on the Q1 credit card application was not written by Edward Wilson. The handwriting on the Q1 credit card application, was written by Carry Andrews. The signature on the Q1 credit card application was not written by Edward Wilson. The signature on the Q1 credit card application was written by Carry Andrews.
L8DF8W-5245	CARRY ADREWS CONTRIBUTED TO THE SIGNATURE AND WRITTEN COMPLETION OF THE APPLICATION
LG346K-5241	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", "K1b" and "K1d" (purported to be of one "Edward Wilson"); 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", "K2b" and "K2d" (purported to be of a one "Carry Andrews"). 3 The evidence supports the proposition that the signature in question on the document marked "Q1" was not written by the author of the specimen signatures on the documents marked as "K1a" to "K1c" (purported to be of one "Edward Wilson"); 4 The evidence supports the proposition that the signature in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the author of the specimen signatures on the documents marked as "K2a" to "K2c" (purported to be of one "Carry Andrews").
LJ3C9U-5245	HANDWRITING (CARRY ANDREWS, ITEM 3, ITEM K2A-D): Strong Support for Common Source: A source identification could not be reached due to the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, strong characteristics in common were observed which indicate CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2 a-d), may have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1), excluding the signature. Limited Support for Common Source: A source identification could not be reached due to the limited quantity and quality of characteristics present in the questioned signature. However, limited characteristics in common were observed which indicate CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2 a-d), may have prepared the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1). HANDWRITING (EDWARD WILSON, ITEM 2, ITEM K1A-D): Support for Different Sources: A source exclusion could not be reached due to the limited quantity of known writing submitted for comparison and the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate EDWARD WILSON, Item 2 (Item K1 a-d), may not have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1), excluding the signature. Inconclusive: No conclusion could be reached whether EDWARD WILSON, Item 2 (Item K1 a-d), prepared the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and limited quantity and quality of characteristics present in the questioned signature. REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL KNOWN WRITING: If future examinations are desired, additional known writing from CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2 a-d), EDWARD WILSON, Item 2 (Item K1 a-d), or anyone suspected of preparing the questioned writing and signature should be submitted. The known writing should be comparable to the questioned signature and writing in wording, style, and format. Dictated known writing should be prepared in the exact wording as the questioned writing and obtained on separate forms 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, canceled checks, and/or applications.
LJXJW9-5245	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 Carry Andrews wrote the questioned manuscript printing and signature on Item 1 (Identification). There are indications that Edward Wilson did not write the questioned manuscript printing and signature on Item 1

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	(Indications Did Not Write). The non original nature of the questioned and known documents, combined with the limited amount of known writing, hindered the examination and precludes a more conclusive result.
LK6X6A-5241	Both of The hand printing and signature on the questioned credit card application (Q1) Was WRITTEN by The victim's ex-wife, Carry Andrews (K2).
LPV8E9-5241	1. No evidence of significance was found to indicate that the questioned handwriting and questioned signature "Edward Wilson" on Exhibit Q1 was executed by the K1 (a - d) specimen writer. 2a. It has been concluded that it is highly probable that the questioned handwriting on Exhibit Q1 was executed by the K2 (a - d) specimen writer. 2b. It has been concluded that the questioned signature "Edward Wilson" on Exhibit Q1, was executed by the K2 (a - c) specimen writer.
LX6WR8-5241	The results strongly support the proposition that K1 (Edward Wilson) did not write the application text. The results strongly support the proposition that K2 (Carry Andrews) wrote the application text. The results to some degree support the proposition that K1 (Edward Wilson) did not write the questioned signature. The results to some degree support the proposition that K2 (Carry Andrews) wrote the questioned signature.
LYHD6K-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", "K1b" and "K1d." 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", "K2b" and "K2d." The evidence supports the proposition that the signature in question on the document marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen signatures on the documents marked "K1a" to "K1c." The evidence supports the proposition that the signature in question on the document marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen signatures on the documents marked "K2a" to "K2c."
M7VL7L-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
MBBDAL-5245	The person who wrote the specimen writing and signature on the papers marked as K2a, K2b, K2c and K2d also wrote the questioned writings and signature on the paper marked as Q1.
MCYPUZ-5241	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 "K2b" and "K2d. Also, there are similarities in respect of design and execution were identified between the disputed signature marked "Q1" and the specimen signatures 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 "K1b" and "K1d". Also, there are differences in respect of design and execution were identified between the disputed signature marked "Q1" and the specimen signatures marked "K1a" to "K1c". Considering 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 and signature marked "Q1" were written by one writer. 6.3.1 Evidence suggests that the writer of the specimen writing and signatures marked "K2a" to "K2d" wrote the disputed writing and signature marked "Q1". 6.3.2 Evidence suggests that the writer of the specimen writing and signatures marked "K1a" to "K1d" did not write the disputed writing and signature marked "Q1".
MDARFX-5245	It has been concluded the writer of the K1 documents (presumed to be written in the hand of Edward Wilson) has been eliminated as the writer or signer of the Q1 document. Furthermore, it has also been concluded that the writer of the K2 documents (presumed to be Carry Andrews) was the author of the handwritten items in the body of the Q1 document and probably was the author of the signature on the Q1 document.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
MHQY4X-5245	I came to the following conclusions: 1. The evidence supports the proposition that the writing and signature in question on the document marked "Q1" were written by the author of the specimen writing and signature on the document marked "K2a", "K2b", "K2c" and "K2d". 2. The evidence supports the proposition that the writing and signature in question on the document marked "Q1" were not written by the author of the specimen writing and signature on the document marked "K1a", "K1b", "K1c" and "K1d".
N2HFP7-5241	The writer of the known writings on K2a-d wrote the questioned writings on Q1. The writer of the known writings on K2a-d wrote the questioned signature on Q1.
NBTL22-5241	It has been concluded that Carry Andrews (K2) wrote the questioned handprinted material appearing on the Exhibit Q1 item. Further, it has been determined that Carry Andrews probably wrote the questioned signature appearing on the Exhibit Q1 item. It has been concluded that Edward Wilson (K1) did not write the questioned handprinted material appearing on the Exhibit Q1 item. Further, it has been determined that Edward Wilson probably did not write the questioned signature appearing on the Exhibit Q1 item.
NDWGHJ-5245	In my opinion, the evidence provides strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting was produced by someone other than the K1 specimen writer, over the proposition that it was produced by K1. In my opinion, the evidence provides strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting was produced by the K2 specimen writer, over the proposition that it was produced by someone other than K2. In my opinion, the evidence provides approximately equal support for the proposition that the Q sig is either a genuine signature of the K1 writer and that it is not a genuine signature.
NF3XKV-5245	The laboratory examination and comparison of the questioned and uncontested documents submitted, which were examined in accordance with accepted methodology in the field of Questioned Documents, and following industry wide standards, leads to the following conclusions: 1. Edward Wilson (K1a - d) probably did not fill-in, or sign the Credit Card Application at issue in this case (Q1). 2. Carry Andrews (K2a - d) hand wrote the printed portion of the disputed Credit Card Application (Q1), she is identified. 3. Carry Andrews (K2a - d) probably signed the name "Edward Wilson" that appears at the bottom of the questioned application (Q1). The signature of "Edward Wilson" is probably a simulation of his authentic signature style which is reflected in the uncontested documents submitted (K1a - d).
NJH79V-5245	1. It is highly probable that Carry Andrews, the writer of K2a through K2d, prepared the "Edward Wilson" signature and the hand-printed entries appearing in Q1.
NMXZL8-5241	The writings and the signature on Q1 was written/signed by K2 (Carry ANDREWS). The writings and the signature on Q1 was not written/signed by K1 (Edward WILSON).
NQZNHW-5245	Taken together, the handwriting and signature on Q1 show similarities to the specimens of Carrie Andrews and differences to those of Edward Wilson. In my opinion, these similarities provide strong evidence to support the proposition that Carrie Andrews rather than Edward Wilson wrote out and signed Q1.
NU9V23-5241	The writer of Items 4-6 (Carry Andrews) has been identified as the writer of the questioned hand printed entries (excluding the signature) appearing on Item 7. The writer of Items 1-3 (Edward Wilson) has been eliminated as the writer of the questioned hand printed entries (excluding the signature) appearing on Item 7. There are indications (meaning a degree of likelihood) that the writer of Items 4-6 (Carry Andrews) wrote the questioned signature appearing on Item 7. The examination was limited by the need for additional requested signatures from the writer of Items 4-6 (Carry Andrews) writing the Edward Wilson signature. It is probable (meaning a high degree of likelihood) that the writer of Items 1-3 (Edward Wilson) did not write the questioned signature appearing on Item 7. The examination was limited by the absence of course of business signatures for the writer of Items 1-3 (Edward Wilson).
NXH8LW-5245	– The questioned writing (excluding signature) on the credit card application (Q1) was written by Carry Andrews (K2). – The questioned writing (excluding signature) on the credit card application (Q1) was

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	not written by Edward Wilson (K1). – The questioned signature on the credit card application (Q1) was written by Carry Andrews (K2). – The questioned signature on the credit card application (Q1) was not written by Edward Wilson (K1).
P7CED3- 5245	1. The questioned handprinted entries on Exhibit 1(9) and the known writing by ANDREWS have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics in agreement from another writer is considered extremely low. 2. The questioned signature on Exhibit 1(9) and the known writing by ANDREWS have some characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics in agreement from another writer is considered low. 3. The questioned handprinted/signature entries on Exhibit 1(9) and the known writing by WILSON have significant characteristics that are not in agreement. It is considered extremely unlikely that WILSON is the writer of the questioned entries on Exhibit 1(9).
PDB2V2- 5241	Style of some small letter, "e", "t", "i", etc. matches with the style of the small letters in the K2`s writing. It is hard to find the likelihood with the style of the small letters written by K1. Line quality of the signature looks like that of K2.
PHHRX8- 5245	Based on examination of available material it is my opinion to highest degree of certainty that the author of K2 handwriting also authored Q-1 handwriting. Based on examination of available material it is my opinion to highest degree of certainty that the author of K2 signature also authored Q-1 signature.
PLKQ9Z- 5245	Handwriting: I am of the opinion that the writer of the specimen handwriting in "K1" did not write the questioned handwriting in "Q1". I am of the opinion that the writer of the specimen handwriting in "K2" wrote the questioned handwriting in "Q1". Signatures: I am of the opinion that the writer of the specimen signatures in "K1" did not write the questioned signature in "Q1". I am of the opinion that the writer of the specimen signatures in "K2" wrote the questioned signature in "Q1".
PPRMD3- 5245	Side by side visual comparisons were conducted between the handwriting submitted in Item Q1 and the handwritings submitted in Items K1 and K2 to determine whether or not the Item Q1 questioned material was written by either of the known writers. 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 Q1 hand printed fields and signature field were not written by the writer of Item K1, which was submitted as the known writing of Edward Wilson. It is also the conclusion of this examiner that the Item Q1 hand printed fields and signature were written by the writer of Item K2 which were submitted as the known writings of Carry Andrews. 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.
PUDYUQ- 5241	FINDINGS: ONE.- After analyzing the execution, the signature in the document "CREDIT CARD APPLICATION," DOES NOT BELONG TO EDWARD WILSON. The foregoing is based on the original signatures for comparison. TWO.- After analyzing the execution, the handwriting in the document "CREDIT CARD APPLICATION," DOES NOT BELONG TO EDWARD WILSON. The foregoing is based on the original handwriting for comparison. THREE.- The signature in the document "CREDIT CARD APPLICATION," BELONGS TO CARRY ANDREWS. The foregoing is based on the original signatures for comparison. FOUR.- The handwriting in the document "CREDIT CARD APPLICATION," BELONGS TO CARRY ANDREWS. The foregoing is based on the original handwriting for comparison. Documents fully described hereby.
PW6X9P- 5241	1. The body of questioned(Q1) it was written by Carry Andrews and it was not written by Edward Wilson. 2.The questioned signature on the credit card application(Q1) it was written by Carry Andrews and it was not written by Edward Wilson.
Q4MRVY- 5245	RESULTS: The items listed in this Certificate of Analysis were assessed and examined based on the methodology described in the Forensic Document Unit (FDU) Test Methods (unless otherwise noted). The methodology used included macroscopic, microscopic, and handwriting examinations. The opinions

TABLE 2

WebCode-
Test

Conclusions

listed below were the result of a comparison between the questioned document (Q1) to the known writing of Edward Wilson (K1a-K1d) and Carry Andrews (K2a-K2d). Limitations to the Handwriting Examination: The questioned writing in the body of Q1 contained hand printing with connections, which lacked complexity. Additionally, the questioned "Edward Wilson" signature lacked complexity due to the stylization of the decipherable characters. Furthermore, the known writing of Edward Wilson (K1) and Carry Andrews (K2) contained limited request-known repetitions (Pages K1a-K1b and K2a-K2b, respectively) of the questioned writing, excluding the questioned "Edward Wilson" signature in Q1. Likewise, the known writing of Edward Wilson (K1) and Carry Andrews (K2) contained limited samples of non-request known writing (Pages K1d and K2d, respectively). The lack of complexity in the questioned writing in Q1 and the limited samples of known writing in K1 and K2 were limitations to the handwriting comparison, which resulted in less than definitive opinions. Handwriting Examination – Edward Wilson (K1): It was probable that Edward Wilson was not the writer of the body of the questioned writing, excluding the questioned "Edward Wilson" signature, on the document in Q1. It was highly probable that Edward Wilson was not the writer of the questioned "Edward Wilson" signature on the document in Item 001. Handwriting Examination – Carry Andrews (K2): It was highly probable that Carry Andrews was the writer of the body of the questioned writing, as well as the questioned "Edward Wilson" signature on the document in Q1.

- Q76UKQ-5245 The questioned handwriting and signature in the questioned document CREDIT CARD APPLICATION (Q1) was written quickly and without visible elements indicating intentional distortion. Questioned handwriting is middle degree of writing, middle font size, rounded shape, unexpressed upper and lower descenders, horizontal direction of writing on the line, vertical slant of writing, etc. Questioned signature is middle degree of writing, middle font size, rounded shape, unexpressed upper and lower descenders, horizontal direction of writing on the line, vertical slant of writing, weakly expressed lateral extensions, etc. The questionable handwriting and signature of the Q1 text was compared with the undisputed handwriting of Edward Wilson (K1) and Carry Andrews (K2). The analysis established similarities between the questioned handwriting and signature (Q1) and the handwriting of Carry Andrews (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 are also reflected in the way of writing the letters of letter parts and the connections between letters: „W“, „l“, „s“, „o“, „n“, „E“, „d“, „t“, „6“, „5“, „8“, „9“, „4“, „te“, „ty“, „tor“, „on“, etc.
- Q9DXGN-5241 In as much as it is possible to examine color copies in lieu of the original documents, it is my opinion that Carry Andrews (K2) wrote the questioned writing and signature on Q1. In as much as it is possible to examine color copies in lieu of the original documents, it is my opinion that Edward Wilson (K1) did not write the questioned writing and signature on Q1.
- QA8QC8-5241 Result 1: In the signature visible next to where is written "Signature", in the document identified as "CREDIT CARD APPLICATION" (Q1), general, specific and individualizing characteristics were observed that were consistent with the handwriting of Carry Andrews visible in the documents identified as K2a, K2b and K2c. Interpretation 1: The questioned signature was written by Carry Andrews. Result 2: In the handwritten visible in the document identified as "CREDIT CARD APPLICATION" (Q1), general, specific and individualizing characteristics were observed that were consistent with the handwriting of Carry Andrews visible in the documents identified as K2a, K2b and K2d. Interpretation 2: The questioned handwriting was written by Carry Andrews.
- QBCKNW-5245 1. In light of the analysis and comparison, I reached the following conclusions: 1.1 The evidence supports that the questioned writing in the document marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen writing in the documents marked as "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d" and was not written by the writer of the specimen writing in the documents marked as "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d". 1.2 The evidence supports that the questioned signature in the document marked as "Q1" was signed by the writer of the specimen signatures in the documents marked as "K2a-c" and was not signed by the writer of the specimen signatures in the documents marked as "K1a-c".
- QCCB3R-5241 Between the writings and signature in the document under examination and the comparative writings and signatures of K2; Since the compatibility and similarities in terms of composition form, habits,

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	stacking, slope, direction, course were determined, the writings and signature in question belong to K2.
QGA2FJ-5245	The results weakly support the hypothesis that the document was written by Carry ANDREWS compared to the alternative, that the document was written by someone else, including Edward WILSON.
QNK4LR-5241	The questioned document is totally written by Carry Andrews, including the signature.
QPYPXE-5241	1. I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the handwriting on the document in question marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d"; 2. I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the handwriting on the document in question marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d"; 3. I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the signature in question marked as "Q" was written by the writer of the specimen signatures on the document marked as "K2c" ("B1" to "B18"); 4. I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the signature in question marked as "Q" was not written by the writer of the specimen signatures on the document marked as "K1c" ("A1" to "A18").
QUTHEN-5241	Carry Andrews is the writer and signer of the Question document (Q1).
QYN9KZ-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
R329GR-5241	Some significant similarities in class and individual characteristics were noted in the K2 known writing when compared to the Q1 writing. The similarities in K2 when compared to Q1 include but are not limited to the following characteristics: a high skill level, spacing between letters, placement on the line, slant, baseline habits, and actual letter formations. After an examination of documents submitted at this time and based on a reasonable degree of professional certainty, it is my opinion that the questioned writing appearing on Q1 was probably written the same person who wrote K2. Furthermore, it is my opinion that it is highly probable that the Q1 questioned signature was written by the same person who wrote the K2 signatures. K1 can be eliminated as having written any of the Q1 questioned document and the questioned signature.
R32H3W-5241	- The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned writing marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen material marked as "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d". - The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned signature marked as "Q1.1" was not written by the writer of the specimen signatures marked as "K1a.1", "K1b.1" and "K1c.1" to "K1c.16". - The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned writing marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen material marked as "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d". - The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned signature marked as "Q1.1" was written by the writer of the specimen signatures marked as "K2a.1", "K2b.1" and "K2c.1" to "K2c.16".
R7H27Y-5241	1. The questioned handwriting on "Q1" showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting of "Edward Wilson" and sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting of "Carry Andrews". Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting on "Q1" was not written by "Edward Wilson" and was written by "Carry Andrews". 2. The questioned signature on "Q1" showed some differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen signatures of "Edward Wilson". However, due to the absence of collected specimen and limited handwriting characteristics, I was not able to form an opinion to ascertain whether or not this questioned signature was written by the writer of the specimens. "Edward Wilson" cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on "Q1". 3. The questioned signature on "Q1" showed some similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen signatures of "Carry Andrews" in the name of "Edward Wilson". However, due to the specimen signatures being simulated specimen signatures, I was not able to form an opinion to ascertain whether or not this questioned signature was written by the writer of the specimens. "Carry Andrews" cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on "Q1".

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
RC9BFX-5245	The comparison of the questioned document to the know material of Edward WILSON revealed significant deviations. In contrast to this result, the comparison to the known material of Carry ANDREWS showed significant matches. Therefore, Carry ANDREWS is the writer of the questioned document.
RRJ2AP-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
RUNKGX-5245	The body of questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the credit card application was written by Carry Andrews - K2 and was not written by Edward Wilson - K1. The questioned signature on the credit card application was probably written by Carry Andrews - K2 and was not written by Edward Wilson - K1.
T24RAM-5245	Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING - CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2 a-d). Source Identification: It was determined that the questioned hand printing and numerals on Item 1 (Item Q1) were prepared by CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2 a-d). Support for Common Source (Strong): A source identification could not be reached due to the limited nature of the Item 1 (Item Q1) signature. However, strong characteristics in common were observed which indicate CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2 a-d), may have prepared the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1). HANDWRITING – EDWARD WILSON, Item 2 (Item K1 a-d). Support for Different Sources (Strong): A source exclusion could not be reached due to the limited nature of the Item 1 (Item Q1) signature. However, strong inconsistencies/dissimilarities were observed which indicate EDWARD WILSON, Item 2 (Item K1 a-d), may not have prepared the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1).
T27D63-5241	- The body of questioned writing on the credit card application Was WRITTEN by K2 (Carry Andrews). - The questioned signature on the credit card application Was WRITTEN by K2 (Carry Andrews).
T66N23-5241	The body of questioned writing on the credit card application Was WRITTEN by K2 (Carry Andrews). The questioned signature on the credit card application Was WRITTEN by K2 (Carry Andrews).
TMHC7M-5245	CARRY ANDREWS (Item 3, Item K2a-d). Source Identification: It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1) (excluding the signature) was prepared by CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2a-d). Support for Common Source: A source identification could not be reached regarding the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) due to the limited legibility/complexity of the signature. However, characteristics in common were observed which indicate CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2a-d), may have prepared the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1). EDWARD WILSON (Item 2, Item K1a-d). Support for Different Sources: A source exclusion could not be reached regarding the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) due to the limited legibility/complexity of the signature, lack of undictated known signatures from EDWARD WILSON, and the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate EDWARD WILSON, Item 2 (Item K1a-d), may not have prepared the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1). ADDITIONAL HANDWRITING CONSIDERATIONS: Due to the limited legibility/complexity of the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1), it is unlikely that a particular individual will ever be identified or eliminated as having prepared it through handwriting comparisons.
TMKX23-5245	It was concluded that the writer of the K2 specimens, Carry Andrews, probably prepared the questioned writing and signature depicted on the Q1 specimen.
U7ETEQ-5245	There is extremely strong support that the Q1 and the K2a-K2c writing from the same source. There is extremely strong support that the Q1 and the K1a-K1c writing is from different sources rather than the same source.
UAQ46Z-5245	The range of variation exhibited in the Q1 (including questioned signature and the body of questioned writing) and the known writing of K2 have significant similarities.
UFFPRT-5241	In light of the above analysis and comparison, I concluded the following: 1.1 In respect of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K1a, K1b and K1d": 1.1.1 The evidence supports the proposition

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	<p>that the writing in question on the document marked "Q1" was not written by the author of the specimen writing. 1.2 In respect of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a, K2b and K2d": 1.2.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the author of the specimen writing. 1.3 In respect of the specimen signature on the documents marked "K1a, K1b and K1c": 1.3.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the signature in question on the document marked "Q1" was not written by the author of the specimen signatures. 1.4 In respect of the specimen signature on the documents marked "K2a, K2b and K2c": 1.4.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the signature in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the author of the specimen signatures.</p>
UHMVDU- 5245	CARRY ANDREWS was the author of the handwriting and signature in the questioned document
UQXXYU- 5245	<p>1.- The writings of Mr. Edward Wilson (K1a, K1b, K1d) DO NOT PRESENT GRAPHIC IDENTITY with the writings that complete the Credit Card Application (Q1). 2.- The signatures made by Mr. Edward Wilson (K1a - K1c) DO NOT PRESENT GRAPHIC IDENTITY with the signature that appears as his work in the lower left part of the Credit Card Application (Q1). 3.- The writings of Mrs. Carry Andrews (K2a, K2b and K2d), PRESENT GRAPHIC IDENTITY with the writings that complete the Credit Card Application (Q1). 4.- The signatures prepared by Mrs. Carry Andrews (K2a - K2c), PRESENT GRAPHIC IDENTITY with the signature of "Edward Wilson", which appears in the lower left part of the Credit Card Application (Q1).</p>
UTZ6VR- 5241	<p>1. I found evidence to support the proposition that the specimen writing on the documents marked as "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d" and the questioned writing on the document marked as "Q1" were written by the same author. 2. I found evidence to support the proposition that, the specimen writing on the documents marked as "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d" and the writing in question on the document marked as "Q1" were not written by the same author. 3. I found evidence to support the proposition that, the specimen signatures on the documents marked as "K2a" to "K2c" and the questioned signature on the document marked as "Q1" were signed by the same author. 4. I found evidence to support the proposition that, the specimen signatures on the documents marked as "K1a" to "K1c" and the questioned signature on the document marked as "Q1" were not signed by the same author.</p>
UZPFD3- 5241	<p>1) The questioned writing (Q1) on the credit card application (the body of questioned writing excluding the signature) - was written by Carry Andrews (K2) and was not written by Edward Wilson (K1). 2) The questioned writing (Q1) on the credit card application (the questioned signature) - was written by Carry Andrews (K2) and was not written by Edward Wilson (K1).</p>
V4KLAK- 5241	<p>ONE.- After analyzing the execution, the signature in the Credit Card Application DOES NOT BELONG to Edward Wilson. The foregoing is based on Edward Wilson's original signatures provided as unquestionable for comparison. TWO.- After analyzing the execution, the signature in the Credit Card Application BELONGS to Carry Andrews. The foregoing is based on Carry Andrews' original signatures provided as unquestionable for comparison. THREE.- After analyzing the execution, the handwriting in the Credit Card Application DOES NOT BELONG to Edward Wilson. The foregoing is based on Edward Wilson's original handwriting provided as unquestionable for comparison. FOUR.- After analyzing the execution, the handwriting in the Credit Card Application BELONGS to Carry Andrews. The foregoing is based on Carrey Andrews' original handwriting provided as unquestionable for comparison. The foregoing due to the technical reasons mentioned in this opinion. This essay is certified by ANAB (ANSI National Accreditation Board) pursuant to the requirements of ISO/IEC 17025:2017 standard. [Certificate number] and supplemental brief available in https://www.anab.org/.</p>
V9Y6Q2- 5241	both questioned writing and signature was written by carry andrews
VBYG4T- 5241	<p>The evidence supports the proposition that the writing and signature in question on document marked "Q1" was written by the writer of specimens marked "K2a-d". and The evidence supports the proposition that the writing and signature in question on document marked "Q1" was not written by the writer of</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	specimens marked "K1a-d".
VE442Q-5241	The graphological characteristics of the study items K1 a-b-c-d writing samples of Edward Wilson were analyzed, which when compared with the graphological characteristics of the writing that appear 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-d writing samples of Carry Andrews were analyzed, which when compared with the graphological characteristics of the writing that appear in the questioned note item Q1, it was found that it presents abundant identifying elements coinciding with the writings and the 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 Carry Andrews.
VJTPNJ-5245	Cary Andrews wrote the questioned handprinted entries and handwritten signature entry, document Q-1.
VTJ93R-5245	1 In respect of the questioned writing on the document marked "Q": 1.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned writing was not executed by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K1"; 1.2 The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned writing was executed by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K2". 2 In respect of the questioned signature on the document marked "Q": 2.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned signature was not executed by the author of the specimen signatures on the documents marked "K1"; 2.2 The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned signature was executed by the author of the specimen signatures on the documents marked "K2".
VWGPFL-5241	The existing questioned handwriting and the signature on the credit card application was made by Carry Andrews.
W3KVUP-5245	In my opinion: 1. There is a pictorial similarity between the questioned signature and the genuine signature of Edwards Wilson, however there are numerous differences in the proportions and constructions, sufficient to indicate that it is not genuine but it has been written in an attempt to simulate the genuine signature of Edward Wilson. 2. There are sufficient differences between the provided known writings of Edward Wilson to exclude him as the author of the questioned writing and signature and it is unlikely he completed either. 3. There are sufficient similarities between the questioned writing and the samples from Carry Wilson to indicate that it is highly probable that she is responsible for this writing. 4. Despite the perceived simulation, there are numerous significant similarities in construction and proportions to indicate that it is Probable that Carr Wilson completed the questioned signature.
WBHN3J-5245	Based on my thorough analysis of the items provided to me, facts discovered in the evidence presented, and applying accepted forensic document examination tools, principles and techniques, it is my professional expert opinion that I have identified the person who authored the K2 handwriting and signed the K2 signatures as the person who wrote the questioned handwriting and signed the questioned signature.
WBK7AU-5241	In case of the body text, it is shown that allograph of arabic number '6' is similar to that of K2. Baseline of 'p' and 'q' also resembles that of K2. Especially, 'W' of 'Wilson' is very similar to that of K2a and K2b. Connection between 'e' and 'n' gives me hint. In case of the signature, allograph of capital letter 'E' and loop of small letter 'd' are very likely to be written by K2.
WD6C9H-5245	Q1 was written by K2. Q1 was not written by K1.
WFCHZK-5245	This report contains the results of the questioned document examinations. Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING. Source Identification: It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2 a-d). Support for Common Source: A source identification could not be reached due to the limited complexity of the Item 1 (Item Q1) signature. However, characteristics in common were observed which indicate CARRY ANDREWS, Item 3 (Item K2

TABLE 2

WebCode-
Test

Conclusions

a-d), may have prepared the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1). Support for Different Sources: A source exclusion could not be reached due to the limited complexity of the Item 1 (Item Q1) signature. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate EDWARD WILSON, Item 2 (Item K1 a-d), may not have prepared the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1). It should be noted that due to the limited complexity of the Item 1 (Item Q1) signature, simulation of the signature cannot be ruled out and it will be unlikely to identify a known writer through a handwriting comparison.

WWFEYA-
5241

Carry Andrews contributed in the filling and signing of the credit card application in question.

X73PUM-
5241

Having advanced the analysis of the handwritten writing presented in the proceedings of the questioned document (credit card application dated 03/06/23 Q1), this handwritten writing presents uniprocedure with the handwriting samples, which are attached to Mrs. Carry Andrews, since among the handwritings found in the credit card application form, there are several similarities with the handwritings presented in the handwriting samples of Carry Andrews. 2. Having advanced the analysis of the handwritten signature that is printed on the questioned document (credit card application dated 03/06/23 Q1), this handwritten signature presents uniprocedure with the handwriting samples (signatures) that are attached to Mrs. Carry Andrews, since among the handwritings that are presented in the signature printed on the credit card application form, there are several similarities with the handwritings that are presented in the handwriting samples (signatures) of Carry Andrews. 3. Having advanced the analysis of the handwritten writing presented in the proceedings of the questioned document (credit card application dated 03/06/23 Q1), this handwritten writing does not present a uniprocedure with the handwritten samples that are attached to Mr. Edward Wilson, since among the handwriting found in the credit card application form, there are several differences with the handwriting presented in the handwritten samples of Edward Wilson. 4. Having advanced the analysis of the handwritten signature that is printed on the questioned document (credit card application dated 03/06/23 Q1), this handwritten signature does not present a uniprocedure with the handwriting samples (signatures) that are attached to Mrs. Carry Andrews, since among the handwriting that is presented in the signature printed on the credit card application form, there are several differences with the handwriting that is presented in the handwriting samples (signatures) of Edward Wilson.

X7PZZB-
5241

Comparison of Questioned Handwriting in Q1 vs Known and Requested Handwriting of Edward Wilson in K1 and Carry Andrews K2 Questioned handwriting on the Credit Card Application in Item Q1 was examined and compared with the directed exemplars in Items K1a and K1b and the course of business handwriting in Item K1d of Edward Wilson as well as those control handwriting in Items K2a, K2b and K2d of Carry Andrews. The questioned handwriting and the control handwriting of Edward Wilson and Carry Andrews are in form of script style. Similarities in writing features relating to design and construction details of letters and Arabic numerals together with connection between letters were observed between the questioned handwriting and the control handwriting of Carry Andrews. Nevertheless, comparison of the questioned handwriting and the control handwriting of Edward Wilson revealed discrepancies in writing features in terms of construction details and writing movements of letters and Arabic numerals as well as connections between adjacent letters. In view of the above findings, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting on the Credit Card Application in Item Q1 was WRITTEN by Carry Andrews who wrote the control handwriting in Items K2a, K2b, and K2d and was NOT WRITTEN by Edward Wilson who wrote the control handwriting in Items K1a, K1b, and K1d. Comparison of Questioned Signature in Q1 vs Known and Requested Signatures of Edward Wilson in K1 and Carry Andrews K2 Questioned signature on the Credit Card Application in Item Q1 was examined and compared with the signatures on the exemplars in Items K1a and K1b and the requested control signatures in Item K1c written by Edward Wilson as well as those control signatures in Item K2a, K2b and K2c written by Carry Andrews, in the name of "Edward Wilson". The questioned and control signatures written by Carry Andrews displayed close resemblance with each other in their pictorial appearance and were executed in a continuous stroke manner in cursive form. They displayed fluency in their execution and similarities in writing characteristics relating to pictorial design, baseline alignment, relative proportion and alignment of strokes and the writing movement of initial and ending portions of the signatures. On the other hand, discrepancies in individual writing characteristics in terms of relative

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	proportion and alignment of strokes, alignment with baseline, and the writing movement relating to the execution of initial and terminal strokes of the signatures were observed. In view of the above findings, I am of the opinion that the questioned signature on the Credit Card Application in Item Q1 was WRITTEN by Carry Andrews who wrote the control signatures in Items K2a, K2b, and K2c and was NOT WRITTEN by Edward Wilson who wrote the control signatures in Items K1a, K1b, and K1c.
XAXG3J-5241	Q1 (Credit card application) was not written by K1 (Edward Wilson), Q1 (Credit card application) was written by K2 (Carry Andrews)
XBEEUJ-5245	FIRST the questioned handwritten entries contained in the Q1 credit application form, sample "Q1-Handwritten", have not been produced, by the author of sample "K1 Wilson Edward M", Mr Edward Wilson. SECOND. The questioned handwritten entries contained in the Q1 credit application form, sample "Q1- Handwritten", have been produced by the author of the sample "K2 Carry Andrews", Ms Carry Andrews. THIRD. It is estimated under the reservations expressed in the report that the questioned signature on the Q1 credit application form, sample "Q1-Signature", is a forgery and was not produced by the author of sample "K1 Wilson Edward M", Mr Edward Wilson. FOURTH It is estimated under the reservations expressed in the report that the questioned signature on the Q1 credit application form, sample "Q1-Signature", considered as a forgery in the previous conclusion, has been produced by the author of the sample "K2 Carry Andrews", Ms Carry Andrews.
XD7BFW-5241	A) IN OUR OPINION, THE HAND PRINTING (Q1) HAS BEEN WRITTEN BY CARRY ANDREWS (K2) B) IN OUR OPINION, THE SIGNATURE (Q1) IS FALSE. IT HAS BEEN WRITTEN BY CARRY ANDREWS (K2)
XEDPQJ-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
XKJHHU-5241	Methods: A visual examination and comparison of the submitted items was completed. Questioned to Known Comparisons: The questioned Credit Card Application in Item #3, except for the signature, was written by Carry Andrews, the purported writer of Item #2 (Source Identification). There are substantial significant similarities between the questioned and known writings. The questioned Credit Card Application in Item #3, except for the signature, was not written by Edward Wilson, the purported writer of Item #1 (Source Exclusion). The signature at the bottom of the questioned Credit Card Application in Item #3 was probably written by Carry Andrews, the purported writer of Item #2 (Support for Same Source). There are some similarities between the questioned and known writings. The signature at the bottom of the questioned Credit Card Application in Item #3 was probably not written by Edward Wilson, the purported writer of Item #1 (Support for Different Source). There are some differences between the questioned and known writings. Examination Limitations: The examination was limited by the abbreviated/partially scrawled signature on the questioned Credit Card Application in Item #3. A more conclusive opinion is not possible. Remarks: All items are available for return. If additional items are to be submitted, please re-submit the original items in their original BCI labeled packaging.
XNZQ7T-5245	It was requested that a handwriting comparison be conducted to determine, if possible, authorship of the writing and signature depicted on Q1. The questioned writing was visually compared to the writing and signatures in K1 (submitted as known writing of Edward Wilson) and K2 (submitted as known writing of Carry Andrews). Results: It is probable that the author of the writing in K1 (submitted as known writing of Edward Wilson) was not the writer of the hand printing, numbers, and signature depicted in Q1. It is probable that the author of the writing in K2 (submitted as known writing of Carry Andrews) was the writer of the hand printing, numbers, and signature depicted on Q1.
Y2ARCB-5241	FIRST: IT IS ESTABLISHED THAT THE WRITING CONTAINED IN THE QUESTIONED DOCUMENT (CREDIT CARD APPLICATION) IDENTIFIED AS Q1, IN RELATION TO THE WRITING CONTAINED IN THE DOCUMENTS PROVIDED AS COMPARISON IDENTIFIED K2a, K2-b, K2c and K2d, WAS WRITTEN BY CARRY ANDREWS. SECOND: IT IS ESTABLISHED THAT THE WRITING CONTAINED IN THE QUESTIONED DOCUMENT (CREDIT CARD APPLICATION) IDENTIFIED AS Q1, IN RELATION TO THE SIGNATURE CONTAINED IN THE DOCUMENTS PROVIDED AS COMPARISON IDENTIFIED K2a, K2-b, K2c and K2d, WAS SIGNED BY CARRY ANDREWS.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
Y7Z6X8-5241	1. I found sufficient evidence to support the stated 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 as (K1a, K1b and K1d), alleged to be of Edward Wilson; 2. I found sufficient evidence to support the stated 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 as (K2a, K2b and K2d), alleged to be of Carry Andrews; 3. I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the signature in question on the documents marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen signatures on the documents marked as (K1a, K1b and K1c), alleged to be of Edward Wilson, 4. I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the signature in question on the document marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen signatures on the documents marked as "D1" to "D18" (K2a, K2b and K2c), alleged to be of Carry Andrews.
YBC6BQ-5241	Upon completion of an examination and comparison of the questioned exhibit and K-2 writer, it is this examiner's opinion the K-2 writer did write the questioned text and signature appearing on the Q-1 exhibit.
YDE2ME-5241	Carry Andrews (K2) wrote the questioned hand printed entries depicted on Exhibit Q1, and probably wrote the questioned 'Edward Wilson' signature depicted on Exhibit Q1. Edward Wilson (K1) did not write the questioned hand printed entries depicted on Exhibit Q1, and probably did not write the questioned 'Edward Wilson' signature depicted on Exhibit Q1.
YGUHVV-5241	1a) There is conclusive evidence to show that the questioned handwriting on Item Q1 was not authored by the same Edward Wilson whose known handwriting is provided on items K1a, K1b and K1d. 1b) There is conclusive evidence to show that the questioned handwriting on Item Q1 was authored by the same Carry Andrews whose known handwriting is provided on items K2a, K2b and K2d. 2a) There is conclusive evidence to show that the questioned signature on Item Q1 was not authored by the same Edward Wilson whose known signatures are provided on items K1a, K1b and K1c. 2b) There is conclusive evidence to show that the questioned signature on Item Q1 was authored by the same Carry Andrews whose known signatures are provided on items K2a, K2b and K2c.
YH93M8-5245	The matching graphical features found between the questioned writing (item Q1) and the comparison writings (items K2a-d) indicate that Carry Andrews made the handwritten entries that constitute the content of the questioned credit card application. Graphical differences were found between the signature on item Q1 and the comparison signatures of Edward Wilson. However, the simple form of the questioned signature did not allow for a categorical conclusion. Therefore, it was concluded that Edward Wilson probably did not write the signature on the questioned credit card application. On the other hand, the requested signatures for Carry Andrews, in the name of Edward Wilson (items K2a-c), and the questioned signature show a number of graphic similarities which lead us to conclude that the signature on item Q1 was probably written by Carry Andrews.
YHUHBB-5241	Conclusions: 1.- The writing does not correspond to Edward Wilson. 2.- The signature does not correspond to Edward Wilson. 3.- The writing does correspond to Carry Andrews. 4.- The signature does correspond to Carry Andrews.
YVW3FV-5245	The body of questioned writing was not written by K1 (Edward Wilson). The body of questioned writing was written by K2 (Carry Andrews). The signature on the credit card application was probably not written by K1 (Edward Wilson). The signature on the credit card application was probably written by K2 (Carry Andrews).
YXAGFB-5245	Based on the documents provided, it is the opinion of this examiner that the application and signature on Q1 were written by the same person who wrote the K2 series of exemplars, Carry Andrews. Unique, individualized writing characteristics including (but not limited to) slant, sizing and proportions, initial and terminal strokes, connecting strokes, and numerical similarities between K2 and Q1 support this opinion, as indicated in the accompanying visual charts.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
Z9JJZL-5245	<p>I have considered the following alternative propositions in relation to the questioned handwriting/signature: P1a The questioned handwriting/signature was written by Edward Wilson (1). P1b The questioned handwriting/signature was not written by Edward Wilson (K). P2a The questioned handwriting/signature was written by Carry Andrews (2). P2b The questioned handwriting/signature was not written by Carry Andrews (2). Both Edward Wilson and Carry Andrews write in a pictorially similar style and share a number of similarities between their natural writings. I have noted a number of similarities between both of the writers with the questioned handwriting and signature. However, I have noted some subtle similarities between the questioned handwriting and signature when compared to the known handwriting of Carry Andrews, these correspond with subtle differences to the writing and signature of Edward Wilson. Such as, the join combinations between the letters on, om and ty along with subtle features such as the kink in the bottom of the 2, placement of the q relevant to the baseline, shape of the smaller triangular e head and the angle of the date separators. In regard to the questioned signature, there are also subtle similarities to Carry Andrews' attempts at signing Edward Wilson's name which in turn are also subtle differences from Edward Wilson's genuine signatures. These include the flat baseline versus a stepped up baseline, the larger loop shape and proportions, the close proximity between the larger loop and the next character and the letter n with a longer right hand leg compared to left hand leg. If the circumstances are such that only Carry Andrews or Edward Wilson was responsible for the questioned handwriting and signature, then I consider that the findings provide slightly more support for the propositions P2a in relation to Carry Andrews and P1b in relation to Edward Wilson. In my opinion, there is some limited evidence to show that Carry Andrews rather than Edward Wilson wrote out and signed the questioned Credit Card Application. I can by no means exclude the possibility that Edward Wilson may have been responsible for some, or all, of the questioned entries, including smaller and/or isolated entries, but I consider this slightly less likely than the alternative that Carry Andrews was responsible.</p>
ZB4J2N-5241	<p>In my opinion, the handwriting evidence very strongly supports the proposition that Carry Andrews wrote the details on Q1. In my opinion, the handwriting evidence very strongly supports the proposition that Edward Wilson did not write the handwriting on Q1. In my opinion, the handwriting evidence strongly supports the proposition that Carry Andrews wrote the signature of Edward Wilson on Q1. In my opinion, the handwriting evidence strongly supports the proposition that Edward Wilson did not write the signature of Edward Wilson on Q1. Appendix - Handwriting Conclusion Scale. 1. Very strongly supports the proposition that the subject is the writer. 2. Strongly supports the proposition that the subject is the writer. 3. Supports the proposition that the subject is the writer. 4. Weakly supports the proposition that the subject is the writer 5. Inconclusive 5. Handwriting evidence is inconclusive This conclusion scale can apply to the subject not being the writer. 6. Weakly supports the proposition that the subject is not the writer 7. Supports the proposition that the subject is not the writer 8. Strongly supports the proposition that the subject is not the writer 9. Very strongly supports the proposition that the subject is not the writer</p>
ZDEB9J-5241	<p>THE WRITING AND SIGNATURE CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT "Q1" REGARDING THE WRITING AND SIGNATURE K1a, K1b, K1c and K1d, DO NOT COME FROM THE SAME GRAPHIC ORIGIN. THE WRITING AND SIGNATURE CONTAINED IN DOCUMENT "Q1" REGARDING THE WRITING AND SIGNATURE K2a, K2b, K2c and K2d, IF THEY COME FROM THE SAME GRAPHIC ORIGIN.</p>
ZDVHFL-5245	<p>HANDWRITING (ITEM 3, CARRY ANDREWS): Source Identification: It was determined that the Item 1 (Item Q1) questioned hand printing and numerals were prepared by CARRY ANDREWS, writer of Item 3 (Item K2a-d). Support for a Common Source: A source identification could not be reached due to the limited complexity of the Item 1 (Item Q1) questioned signature. However, characteristics in common were observed which indicate that CARRY ANDREWS, writer of Item 3 (Item K2a-d), may have prepared the Item 1 (Item Q1) questioned signature. HANDWRITING (ITEM 2, EDWARD WILSON): Support for Different Sources: A source elimination could not be reached to the limited complexity of the Item 1 (Item Q1) questioned signature and limited quantity of known signatures for comparison. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate that EDWARD WILSON, writer of Item 2 (K1a-d) may not have prepared the Item 1 (Item Q1) questioned signature.</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
ZFMGUK- 5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
ZLJHMJ- 5241	<p>As a result of examination and comparison based solely on the material submitted the following conclusions and observations are opinions based upon my experience, education and training and are as follows: 1. The Q1, K1a-d and K2a-d documents were scanned for preservation by Forensic Document Examiner. 2. A VSC (Video Spectral Comparator) examination using various microscopic, infrared, ultraviolet, and alternate light source examination techniques was performed on the Q1 document. All inks used in the preparation of this Q1 document reacted consistently. 3. An ESDA (ElectroStatic Detection Apparatus) examination for the detection and reading of indented writing, typing or other identifying impressions was performed on the Q1 document. No impressions were recovered. 4. The body of the Q1 document was written by the writer of the K2a-d known exemplars, Carry Andrews. 5. The signature on the Q1 document was written by the writer of the K2a-d known exemplars, Carry Andrews. 6. The body of the Q1 document was not written by the writer of the K1a-d known exemplars, Edward Wilson. 7. The signature on the Q1 document was not written by the writer of the K1a-d known exemplars, Edward Wilson.</p>
ZLLZUU- 5241	<p>Handwriting – There are many similarities and no significant differences between questioned handwritten entries and the known handwriting of Carry Andrews. The nature of the similarities is such that, in our opinion, Carry Andrews is responsible for the questioned handwritten entries. Signature – While there is a pictorial similarity between the questioned signature and the known signatures of Edward Wilson, there are some significant differences in the fine detail. The nature of the differences is such that, in our opinion, there is strong support that Edward Wilson is not responsible for the questioned signature. By “strong support” we consider it extremely unlikely that Edward Wilson is responsible for the questioned signature. There are some similarities and no significant differences between the questioned signature and the known handwriting of Carry Andrews. The nature of the similarities is such that, in our opinion, there is moderate support that Carry Andrews is responsible for the questioned signature. By “moderate support” we consider it very unlikely that a person other than Carry Andrews is responsible for the questioned signature.</p>
ZUX4WM- 5241	<p>I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q" was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as" K2a-b and K2d. I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the signature in question marked as "Q1A" was written by the writer of the specimen signatures marked as" K2a1, K2b1 and K2c1 to K2c16. I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q" was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as" K1a-b and K1d. I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the signature in question marked as "Q1A" was not written by the writer of the specimen signatures marked as" K1a1, K1b1 and K1c1 to K1c16.</p>

Additional Comments

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
2FEZR4- 5245	We detected diversity and important graphic gestures between the handwritten and signature disputed with the directed exemplars for Carry Andrews, thats why whe conclude that was written by Carry Andrews.
2FGJXE- 5241	The current TEST was performed by the expert at the [Laboratory].
2TGHLC- 5241	No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the writer of the known specimen signatures on Items K1a, K1b and K1c (Edward Wilson) wrote the questioned signature on Item Q1. Limitation was present in the examination, such as no contemporaneous normal specimen signature available, which affected the consideration of the attempt to disguise. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the writer of the known specimen signatures on Items K2a, K2b and K2c (Carry Andrews) wrote the questioned signature on Item Q1. Limitations were present in the examination, such as there were insufficient significant similarities observed, and the specimen signatures were simulated signatures of Edward Wilson (not her own signature).
376VED- 5241	This examination is limited because there are few unique identifiable characteristics within the questioned signature as well as the known Edward M Wilson signatures. This examination is also limited because the questioned Edward M Wilson signature is pictorially similar to the known Edward M Wilson signatures and it is probable the questioned Edward M Wilson signature is a free hand simulation of a genuine Edward M Wilson signature.
4DH6FE- 5245	Second: The signature contained in the document indicated as questioned, if it belongs to the same graphic origin as C. Mrs. Carry Andrews.
4HAP6F- 5241	Scientific method taking into account the phases of: observation, indication or signaling of the distinctive characters (individualizing characteristics), confrontation and identity judgments.
4MN7EK- 5241	For the Laboratory Affidavit, the expert marked the signatures as follows: The disputed signature was marked as "Q". The specimen signatures of K2 (Carry Andrews) were marked as "B1" to "B18". The specimen signatures of K1 (Edward Wilson) were marked as "A1" to "A18".
7FY92G- 5241	1. I found several significant correspondences in respect of elements of style and execution between the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a" to "K2b" and "K2d". 2. I found several significant differences in respect of elements of style and execution between the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting marked as "K1a" to "K1b" and "K1d". 3. I found several significant correspondences in respect of elements of style and execution between the signature in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen signatures marked as "K2a" to "K2c". 4. I found several significant differences in respect of elements of style and execution between the signature in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen signatures marked as "K1a" to "K1c".
7ZNH7P- 5241	Q1 Signature Based on the moderately-low complexity of the questioned signature on Q1, some considerations were given to a disguise process (for later denial) by K1 writer and to a simulation process by someone other than K1 and K2 writers leading to qualified opinions.
82F2JZ- 5241	Propositions: I have considered each of the following propositions for each specimen writer and for both the handwriting and signatures, separately: P1 the writer of the specimen material wrote the questioned material P2 a writer other than the specimen writer wrote the questioned material
82FZMG- 5245	The submission of the following may provide the basis for additional conclusions: - Five to ten supplemental comparable normal course-of-business signatures and hand printing samples of Edward Wilson. - Five to ten supplemental signature exemplars and normal course-of-business hand printing samples of Carry Andrews, containing words, letters and numerals as within the questioned entries.
8B4RA9- 5241	The current TEST was carried out by the expert at the [Laboratory].

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
98KX6L- 5245	The scale in use in this organisation is: Inconclusive, limited , strong , conclusive and these terms can be used to support either that a questioned text WAS written by someone or that a questioned text was NOT written by someone.
9EJLNK- 5245	In a real case it would be unexpected for signature specimens taken from a suspect accused of simulating a victim's signature to produce a signature of the same design and format as that produced by the victim. If the Q1, K1 and K2 signatures are signatures learned to a given model by two individuals with different names (and different real signatures) to the names given in the PT scenario then this affects the document examiner's assessment. This is because it would be normal for a document examiner to consider the possibilities of chance resemblance or simulation when considering signatures. In the instance given above chance resemblance and simulation are taken away because the signatures are learned from a model by both K1 and K2. Additionally, in most cases real, genuine signatures are learned and matured over a long period of time and therefore contain stable, repeatable features. If the signatures in this case were learned just for the PT then they are likely to not be repeatable in the same way. I have taken into consideration the possibility that the PT materials were produced as above when coming to my conclusions.
AETA3G- 5241	A more definitive opinion may be possible if additional non-requested known handwriting and signatures that repeat the questioned name from both the Item K1 writer and the Item K2 writer could be submitted for examination. This laboratory utilizes the 9-point opinion scale which includes the "indications did write" and "indications did not write" opinions. Regarding the questioned signature, an "indications did write" opinion would be rendered in this case in regard to the K2 author. Regarding the questioned signature, an "indications did not write" opinion would be rendered in regard to the K1 author.
ARGAV6- 5245	This examiner is virtually certain that the questioned and Exhibit K2 known writings were written by the same individual.
BKEMGA- 5241	The submission of additional known K-1 specimens from a broad array of sources could provide the basis for a less qualified conclusion.
BKWHZW- 5245	The undersigned would request the original, written-ink-on-paper, versions of all evidence to conduct a more thorough examination of features that were not fully reproduced in the submitted electronic reproductions.
BPR8MV- 5241	By identifying, I do not have to exclude any other writers
BWV49G- 5245	If the original documents had been submitted, ESDAs likely would have been performed to see if there were any indentations of value. If there were any other suspected writers, request, collected, and course of business writings in the same style and wording should have been submitted. Course of business signatures of EDWARD WILSON should have been submitted, since the questioned signature was in that name.
C3YDFA- 5241	The body of the questioned writing Q1 presents similarities with the body of the K2 Writing, below are described some identifying characteristics: Similar height, straight line box, fast speed, linear displacement or horizontal direction, inclination or axial version to the left, degree of grouped cohesion, shape of the arc and straight links, upper and lower location, abrupt attack point and sharp finishing points, is made with mixed strokes. The stroke of the vowel "i" together with the dot is of similar height to the consonant "l" that has the name "Wilson". Vowel "E" present at the beginning of the name Edward is made on the baseline of the line At the end of the vowel "E", it joins with the oval of the consonant "d" in the lower area of the name Edward Left inclination of the final consonant "M" of the first line. Digit "6" made with a very particular automatism that resembles a vowel "U". Second digit "9" of the year "1991" from left to right is made floating (above the baseline) with a small hook in the lower right area. Upper link in the syllables: "ty" of the word city, "te" of the word letter, "on" of the word wilson, "om" of the word com and in the number "86" of the telephone number 8604 The bar of the consonant "z" of the word citizen, is made shorter on the left side. The comma, which separates the number 83,000, is made short and floating, above the baseline of the line. The oval of the consonant "q" of the word square, is

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
	made on the baseline of the line, and in the lower area it is made with a hook. The consonant "k" in the word Bank is made up of a vertical stroke and a semi-curved stroke on the right side, located in the lower third of the first stroke. There is variability in the marking of the point of the vowel "i", sometimes it is written and other times it is not. A/ The questioned signature Q1 has similarities with the signature of K2. Some identifying characteristics are described below: Similar height, straight line box, fast speed, linear or horizontal movement, inclination or axial version to the right, normal attack point and sharp end point; the initial vowel "E" and the eyelet of the consonant "d" are made on the line, the upper protruding loop stroke is made inflated and blunt-tipped; the stroke that follows (festoony) after the upper protruding loop is very close to it, the end of the spun stroke is ascending.
CMHM9U-5245	We Studied the similarities and differences between two signatures (Q1 signature and K2 signature) and two hand printing (Q1 and K2) by using microscope.
CNRMD2-5241	From the expertise of the handwriting and signature in evidence Q#1 and comparison with the known handwritings and signatures in the evidences: K2a, K2b, K2c, and K2d, there are identifying general and individual characteristics that match each other.
CX4L8D-5245	The signature investigated in Q1, presents varied graphonomic convergences with respect to the reference samples of Carry Andrews, however, there are some divergences that were not resolved through the reference samples, since they are reduced, added to the fact of having a doubtful signature whose format corresponds to a simplified construction signature, which due to its minimum constitutive strokes, provides little graphical written information, preventing the resolution of the aforementioned divergences; therefore, the conclusion of the technical study will be given in terms of orientation, according to the guidelines established in procedure [Lab specific information], used to carry out the forensic technical study. The graphic convergences evidenced between the handwritings investigated that appear in the document "CREDIT CARD APPLICATION" & 1 and the handwritings of Carry Andrews, correspond to the same calligraphic development whose individualizing features are typical of an automated graphic gesture, characterized by the movements that generate the graphics, the overall image and particular features, which despite the writing variability of this scribe, the abundance of reference writing, allowed the respective graphic identification of the investigated handwritings to be carried out and a conclusion to be issued in accordance with procedure [Lab specific information], used for the forensic technical study.
CXH6RA-5241	The authorship of the completion of element Q1 by Mrs. "Carry Andrews, was determined by the inclined shape of the number "6", and the cohesions of the letters "to" in the word "Coordinator" and "ti", " on" of "operations". Regarding the signature of doubt (Q1), its authorship was determined by Mrs. "Carry Andrews" by aspects such as: the location in space, the hooked beginning of the "E", the descending line box and the amplitude of the "l" loop.
ED78ER-5241	During examination and comparison of the questioned material with specimen material I observed the following: 1. There are differences in terms of design and execution between the specimen writing on the documents marked as "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d" the questioned writing on the document marked as "Q1". 2. There are similarities in terms of design and execution between the specimen writing on the documents marked as "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d" the questioned writing on the document marked as "Q1". 3. There are differences in terms of design and execution between the specimen signatures marked as "K1a1", "K1b1" and "K1c1" to "K1c16" the questioned signature marked as "Q1a". 4. There are similarities in terms of design and execution between the specimen signatures marked as "K2a1", "K2b1" and "K2c1" to "K2c16" the questioned signature marked as "Q1a".
EJW4VE-5241	MORE COURSE OF BUSINESS MATERIAL WAS NEEDED
F8M2XC-5245	Conclusion definitions: The conclusion "identification" means that there is agreement in all individualizing characteristics and there are no significant inexplicable differences between the questioned and known writing. The conclusion "elimination" means that there are significant differences between the questioned and known writing.

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
FLTFKZ- 5241	The current TEST was carried out by the expert at the [Laboratory].
G2Y9G3- 5241	The requested signatures for Carry Andrews, in the name of Edward Wilson, are simulations of the questioned signature. They were not produced in a natural uncontrolled environment. The author had to mimic the signature of another person. Hence, the writing characteristics are not unique to the author. Therefore, it is not valid to compare between the two.
G3ZYWW- 5245	The conclusion probably did write is a qualified opinion that means there is more evidence for, than against, the known writer. There are similarities between the handwriting characteristics present in the questioned and known writings, but there is a limitation(s) that precludes a higher degree of confidence. The conclusion probably did not write is a qualified opinion that means there is more evidence against, than for, the known writer. There are dissimilarities between the handwriting characteristics present in the questioned and known writings, but there is a limitation(s) that precludes a higher degree of confidence. Item 001 = K1a and K1b Item 002 = K1c Item 003 = K1d Item 004 = K2a and K2b Item 005 = K2c Item 006 = K2d
G9PH8R- 5245	All documents are colored printouts, not original documents.
KATCEN- 5241	The signature appearing on Q1 is simplistic in nature and contains areas of poor line quality (slowly executed.) My attempts to trace the signature in question resulted in signatures that were arguably indistinguishable from the Q1 signature.
KKHCRJ- 5241	From the comparison of characteristics of general order and group of graphic gestures, an association was obtained between the dubious writing and signatures and the writing and signatures in the name of Carry Andrews.
KX23ZL- 5245	For the development of the proficiency test, the photographic/digital reproductions of the writing were considered as originals according to the instructions of the service provider.
LXJW9- 5245	Conclusions defined in accordance with ASTM E1658-08 Standard Terminology for Expressing Conclusions of Forensic Document Examiners. Identification: This is the highest degree of confidence expressed by document examiners in handwriting comparisons. The examiner has no 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. Indications Did Not: A body of writing has few features which are of significance for handwriting comparison purposes, but those features are not in agreement with another body of writing.
LX6WR8- 5241	Weaker conclusions on the signature due to shortness and simplistic style.
NBTL22- 5241	The qualified opinions expressed above are due in part to the limited number of characteristics present in the questioned signature for identification/elimination purposes.
NQZNHW- 5245	Bearing in mind the similarities between the two handwritings, it would have been more interesting to have only seen specimens from Edward Wilson.
NU9V23- 5241	FOR INVESTIGATIVE PURPOSES ONLY: The submission of additional standards from both the writer of Items 1-3 (Edward Wilson) and the writer of Items 4-6 (Carry Andrews) may assist in determining who wrote the signature on Item 7. It is requested that the writer of Items 1-3 (Edward Wilson) provide course of business signatures. Possible sources for course of business samples include cancelled checks and other bank related documents, letters and diaries, employment and education related documents, tax forms, medical forms, DMV forms, as well as prison/police/inmate/court related documents. Machine copies are acceptable as known standards. It is requested that the writer of Items 4-6 (Carry Andrews) provide additional requested standards of the "Edward Wilson" signature. The signature standards should be written to dictation, using a ballpoint pen on lined paper. It is recommended that 20-25 signature standards be obtained. Any subsequent submissions made on this case should include all of the

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
	previously submitted items.
PUDYUQ- 5241	The current TEST was carried out by the expert at the [Laboratory].
Q4MRVY- 5245	REMARKS: It is possible that more definitive handwriting opinions may be reached regarding the questioned writing and "Edward Wilson" signature in Q1 with the submission of additional request and non-request known writing of Edward Wilson, Carry Andrews, or other subjects of interest in this investigation. Please contact the FDU prior to the collections and submission of documentary evidence. Images of the submitted documents have been retained by the FDU. DEFINITIONS OF HANDWRITING OPINIONS: The opinion probable not indicates the evidence contained in the handwriting pointed rather strongly against the questioned and known writings as having been written by the same individual. However, it fell short of the "virtually certain" degree of confidence. The opinion highly probable not indicates the evidence contained in the handwriting was very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality was missing so an elimination was not in order. However, the examiner was virtually certain the questioned and known writings were not written by the same individual. The opinion highly probable indicates the evidence contained in the handwriting was very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality was missing so an identification was not in order. However, the examiner was virtually certain the questioned and known writings were written by the same individual.
QPYPXE- 5241	1. Significant similarities in respect of design and execution were identified between the handwriting on the document in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d"; 2. Significant differences in respect of design and execution were identified between the handwriting on the document in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting marked as "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d"; 3. Significant similarities in respect of design and execution were identified between the signature in question marked as "Q" and the specimen signatures on the document marked as "K2c" ("B1" to "B18"); 4. Significant differences in respect of design and execution were identified between the signature in question marked as "Q" and the specimen signatures on the document marked as "K1c" ("A1" to "A18");
R32H3W- 5241	- Differences in respect of design and execution were identified between the questioned writing marked as "Q1" and the specimen writing marked as "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d". - Differences in respect of design and execution were identified between the questioned signature marked as "Q1.1" and the specimen signatures marked as "K1a.1", "K1b.1" and "K1c.1" to "K1c.16". - Similarities in respect of design and execution were identified between the questioned writing marked as "Q1" and the specimen writing marked as "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d". - Similarities in respect of design and execution were identified between the questioned signature marked as "Q1.1" and the specimen signatures marked as "K2a.1", "K2b.1" and "K2c.1" to "K2c.16".
R7H27Y- 5241	1. The examination was based on comparison of handwriting characteristics such as line quality, formation of strokes, formation of letters, formation of numerals and connection strokes between the questioned handwriting/ questioned signature and the specimen handwriting/ specimen signature respectively. 2. There was no collected specimen signatures of "Edward Wilson". 3. The specimen signatures of "Carry Andrews" were in the name of "Edward Wilson". Therefore, these were considered simulated specimen signatures and not the original signatures of "Carry Andrews".
UHMVDU- 5245	After analyzing, we evaluated the concordances and disimilarities getting the conclusion mentioned before
UQXXYU- 5245	It is taken into account that the writings and signatures correspond to characteristic lines and movements that are typical of the calligraphic, individual and automated gesture that each person possesses. Although the graphic structures of the writings and the signature that appear in document Q1 denote constructions similar to the writings and signatures made in the calligraphic samples by Messrs. Edward Wilson (K1a - K1c) and Carry Andrews (K2a - K2c), in them it is possible to detect dinamographics characteristics that individualize their calligraphic gesture. The above allows us to establish that the writings and signature of document Q1 present Graphic Identity compared to the writings and signatures made by Mrs. Carry Andrews (K2a - K2d), given the specific production characteristics they present, in

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	terms of starting and ending points, angles, links, inclinations, construction of paths, fluidity and spontaneity in their movements.
UTZ6VR-5241	During examination and comparison of the disputed material with specimen material I observed the following: 1. There are similarities in respect of elements of style and execution between the specimens writing on the documents marked as "K2a", "K2b" and "K2d" and the questioned writing on the document marked as "Q1". 2. There are differences in respect of elements of style and execution between the specimens writing on the documents marked as "K1a", "K1b" and "K1d" and the questioned writing on the document marked as "Q1". 3. There are similarities in respect of elements of style and execution between the specimen signatures on the documents marked as "K2a" to "K2c" and the questioned signature on the document marked as "Q1". 4. There are differences in respect of elements of style and execution between the specimen signatures on the documents marked as "K1a" to "K1c" and the questioned signature on the document marked as "Q1".
V4KLAK-5241	The current TEST was carried out by the expert at the [Laboratory].
W3KVUP-5245	Had I been provided with the original questioned document I would have examined the document with ESDA and oblique lights to reveal any indentations.
WBHN3J-5245	A microscopic examination was conducted and distinct and significant similarities were found in letter formation, numeral formation, spacing, height ratios in adjacent characters, diacritics and symbols. The similarities found in the K2 writing compared to the questioned writing are outstanding and unlike the characters in the K1 writing compared to the questioned writing.
WWFEYA-5241	According to the results obtained by the aforementioned analyses, the sign and filling of the credit card application in question belongs to Carry Andrews
XAXG3J-5241	Questioned document – Q1 (Credit card application) was compared to two person's handwriting: K1 (Edward Wilson), and K2 (Carry Andrews) and the similarities were found with K2 (Carry Andrews) handwriting in following handwriting characteristics: - Class characteristics: handwriting structure and writers skill; Size and shape of the letters; - Individual characteristics in following letters: "E"; "W – like latter"; "conjunction between E and next stroke" and "final strokes of signature"
XBEEUJ-5245	Both specimens samples are each based on two copies issued on documents with the same invoice format as the questioned document shows, and were handwritten by two people under investigation. In addition there are sixteen consecutive signatures in two columns, which were requested for this study from both authors, forming a number large enough to reliably show their range of individual variation. Both the unquestionable signatures on the credit card application forms and those of each series of signatures maintain the same characteristics as each other, showing gestures, movements and tendencies typical of their respective authors. However both, the questioned signature and those found in the two specimens exhibit the same model of limited extension and therefore, there are a relative scarcity of features and characteristics on which to base the study. Is for this reason why ultimately both the degree of suitability of the questioned sample, like those of the signatures included in the specimens samples, were finally assessed as "limited" to obtain categorical conclusions. With regard the handwritings examinations there aren't any limitations to be considered.
XNZQ7T-5245	Remarks: Qualified opinions were rendered in this case because of the limitations were present in the handwriting examination, which included that the questioned writing was a limited amount and some variation present was not fully captured in known writing.
Y2ARCB-5241	For this comparative handwriting analysis, the methods for correspondence analysis of handwriting and signature and attribution of the writing and signature of the questioned document were used. The comparative video spectral equipment "VSC 8000" was used to confirm the graphic gestures of the letters and signature.
YDE2ME-5241	The less than definitive conclusions with respect to the questioned 'Edward Wilson' signatures is due to the brevity of the questioned signature and resulting limited value for identification.

TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
YXAGFB- 5245	I would provide visual charts which would clearly indicate the similarities between K2 and the Q1 application writing both in the body and the simulated signature of "Edward". Similarities which would be illustrated in my visual charts would include: terminal tick on "9", slant in the signature "Edward", the number "5", "Big City Bank" sequence, the number "6", the "d" in Edward, the connecting stroke between 'o' and 'm' in ".com". There are of course more, but these similarities would represent the bulk of supporting observations for my opinion. Although there are some shared writing characteristics, these subtle differences are sufficient and significant to support my opinion.
Z9JJZL- 5245	If only the known handwriting and signature of Edward Wilson had been submitted, it is likely that the evidence regarding the authorship of the signature would have been inconclusive. The handwriting aspect may also have been inconclusive. It is only because of Carry Andrew's known handwriting and attempts to write Edward Wilson's signature that allows the subtle features of both writers to be distinguished from one another to allow opinions of authorship to be expressed either way. This is a case which would ideally need to be considered as a limited access scenario.
ZUX4WM- 5241	Similarities in respect of design and construction between the handwriting in question marked as "Q" and the specimen handwriting marked as K2a-b and K2d. Similarities in respect of design and construction between the signature in question marked as "Q1A" and the specimen signatures marked as K2a1, K2b1 and K2c1 to K2c16. Significant differences in respect of design and construction between the handwriting in question marked as "Q" and the specimen handwriting marked as K1a-b and K1d. Significant differences in respect of design and construction between the signature in question marked as "Q1A" and the specimen signatures marked as K1a1, K1b1 and K1c1 to K1c16.

**-End of Report-
(Appendix may follow)**

Test No. 24-5241: Handwriting Examination

DATA MUST BE SUBMITTED BY **Nov. 18, 2024, 11:59 p.m. EST** TO BE INCLUDED IN THE REPORT

Participant Code: U1234A

WebCode: 2GFQFY

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

Scenario:

Police are investigating a suspected credit card fraud case. Edward Wilson has claimed his information was stolen and used to open a credit card. He states he did not open this credit card nor does he recognize any of the charges. The victim's ex-wife, Carry Andrews is the current suspect. Investigators are asking you to examine the questioned credit card application and determine which, if either, of the individuals contributed to the hand printing and signature on the application.

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: Directed exemplars for Edward Wilson

Item K1c: Requested signatures for Edward Wilson, in his own name

Item K1d: Course of business writing for Edward Wilson

Item K2a-b: Directed exemplars for Carry Andrews

Item K2c: Requested signatures for Carry Andrews, in the name of Edward Wilson

Item K2d: Course of business writing for Carry Andrews

Item Q1: Credit Card Application

Examination Results

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

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

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

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

	K1 (Edward Wilson)		K2 (Carry Andrews)
Q1 (credit card application)	<input type="text"/>	Q1 (credit card application)	<input type="text"/>

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

2.) To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the questioned signature on the credit card application?

	K1 (Edward Wilson)		K2 (Carry Andrews)
Q1 (credit card application)	<input type="text"/>	Q1 (credit card application)	<input type="text"/>

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

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

4.) Additional Comments

RELEASE OF DATA TO ACCREDITATION BODIES

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

CTS submits external proficiency test data directly to 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 ANAB and/or A2LA. (Accreditation Release section below must be completed.)
- This participant's data is not intended for submission to 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.

A2LA Certificate No.

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

Authorized Contact Person and Title

Laboratory Name

Location (City/State)